

CTESIAS AS HISTORIAN OF THE PERSIAN WARS

J. M. BIGWOOD

THE BATTLE OF PLATAEA according to the history of Ctesias of Cnidus preceded the battle of Salamis. This egregious blunder, which is certainly an error of the historian, not of Photius, to whom we are indebted for a summary of this part of the work, is a famous one.¹ Yet despite it Ctesias' version of the Persian Wars did not fail to impress certain authors of the ancient world, although most avoided his grosser errors. Nor have some modern scholars, ransacking all the late sources in the search for fresh insights, found it unprofitable reading.² An examination of the account in its entirety should reveal how hazardous is the procedure of picking out seemingly attractive details without close scrutiny of the whole, and will perhaps tell us a little about how history was sometimes written in the fourth century.

Almost nothing is known about Ctesias' life beyond the bare facts that he was a native of Cnidus and spent some seven years as physician at the court of Artaxerxes II, before leaving Persia in 398/7. We have no information as to when he was born. However, since he seems to have written his *Persica* between 398/7 and circa 390, i.e., more than thirty years after the date normally accepted as the date of the publication of Herodotus' *Histories*, he can scarcely have had much contact with men

¹I discussed briefly the accuracy of Photius' summary of Ctesias and other aspects of the epitome in "Ctesias' Account of the Revolt of Inarus," *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 2-5, as well as this particular error (4). On Photius' summaries and excerpts in general there is now an important study by T. Hägg, *Photios als Vermittler Antiker Literatur* (Uppsala 1975), which I saw after I had completed the present article.

²J. Labarbe, "Chiffres et modes de répartition de la flotte grecque à l'Artemision et à Salamine," *BCH* 76 (1952) 384-441 (cf. *La loi navale de Thémistocle* [Paris 1957]), does not question the accuracy of the details from Ctesias which he is prepared to accept; nor does N. G. L. Hammond, "The Battle of Salamis," in *Studies in Greek History* (Oxford 1973) 251-310, a revision of *JHS* 76 (1956) 32-54. Even the very sceptical A. R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* (London 1962) 11 ff., is not sceptical enough. C. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* (Oxford 1963) 7 ff., has laid particular emphasis on the minimal value of Ctesias and of the later sources in general. For useful comments on Ctesias' account of the wars see further the brief discussion (2060-2061) in F. Jacoby's article "Ktesias," *RE* 11 (1922) 2032-2073 (the most important study of Ctesias), and also A. Momigliano, "Tradizione e invenzione in Ctesia," *Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome 1969) 181-212 (a reprint of *AeR* 12 [1931] 15-44). The works of Hammond, Burn, Hignett, Jacoby, and Momigliano, cited above, will hereafter be referred to by author's name only. The following are too uncritical to be helpful: C. Lanzani, "I Περσικά di Ctesia," *Rivista di Storia Antica* 5 (1900) 214 ff. and 6 (1902) 66 ff.; W. F. König, *Die Persika des Ktesias von Knidos* (Graz 1972); P. Green, *The Year of Salamis 480-479 B.C.* (London 1970).

who actually took part in the Persian Wars.³ Herodotus was much better off in this respect. Nor, although Ctesias had unrivalled opportunities for acquiring familiarity with all things Persian, does he seem to have had an extensive acquaintance with the Greek world. On his return from Persia he had set foot on Rhodes and he had also visited Sparta (F 30.75). But there is nothing in his work to suggest further travels. Herodotus, who had journeyed much more extensively, had a far superior knowledge of Greece as he collected and compared (although he did not always do this systematically) the traditions of widely different communities. Can Ctesias' account really correct or even supplement the version given by Herodotus, which, although it has many deficiencies, is unquestionably by far our best and fullest source for the Persian Wars?⁴ Some generalities require attention before we embark on the detailed analysis.

Ctesias' account of the wars is preserved only in Photius' epitome, a summary which is jejune in the extreme, and consequently there is much about it that we do not know or do not know for certain. For one thing we cannot be sure how detailed it was. Ctesias of course was not writing, like his predecessor, a work on the Persian Wars and what led up to them. His version, part of a general history of Persia to 398/7, was clearly much briefer than Herodotus' account. Although he had devoted five books (7–11), and perhaps part of a sixth,⁵ to tales of Cyrus the Great, including in full the Eastern campaigns (F 9.2–3), which to Herodotus were not worth reporting (1.177), he awarded only two books (12 and 13) to the entire reigns of Cambyses, Darius, and Xerxes. There was a lot of territory to cover here—Cambyses' Egyptian campaign, the Magian usurper, Darius' expedition to Scythia, the conspiracy which ended Xerxes' life, and other events. The Persian Wars must have formed at most only a small part of this section of the history.⁶

³Survivors at the time of his arrival at the Persian court are unlikely. But it is of course not impossible that he heard tales of eyewitnesses in his youth, if he was born ca 450. For the details of his life see Jacoby, 2032 ff. The singularly brief treatment of the reign of Darius II (one book, when the first years of the reign of Artaxerxes II were given at least four) does not lend support to T. S. Brown's belief (*The Greek Historians* [Lexington, Mass., 1973] 79) that Ctesias' visit to Persia lasted 17 years (see Jacoby, *loc. cit.*).

⁴Not much reference will be made to the post-Herodotean sources. Their value is at best questionable and clearly some are not independent of Ctesias. Despite G. Gottlieb, *Das Verhältnis der ausserHerodoteischen Überlieferung zu Herodot* (Bonn 1963) 80 ff., it is certain that one of the most important of the later accounts, that of Ephorus (the source of Diodorus' version, as is generally agreed), has been to some extent influenced by Ctesias: see A. von Mess, "Untersuchungen über Ephoros," *RhM* 61 (1906) 360 ff. and my comments in *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 5 f.

⁵The story of Cyrus' youth, which Photius' summary of books 7–23 does not include, perhaps belonged to book 6.

⁶Photius has preserved much more from books 12 and 13 than from most of the other

Indeed it is possible that Ctesias did not deal with all the major events of the wars or all the events on an equal scale. The summary of Xerxes' campaign (F 13.27 ff.) includes Thermopylae, followed by Plataea, the Persian attack on Delphi, the sack of Athens, and finally an apparent second attack on Delphi. The omissions here are as remarkable as the chronology. Did Ctesias forget Artemisium? His Persian fleet begins at 1,000 (F 13.27). *En route* apparently it suffers little in storms or battle since at Salamis it is more than the thousand (F 13.30—*ὕπερ τὰς χιλίας*).⁷ This, however, will not prove an omission. Herodotus believed erroneously that enormous losses off the coasts of Magnesia and Euboea were made good by the time that the fleet reached Phalerum by reinforcements from a few Greek islands (8.66).⁸ Ctesias might have held a similar belief.

Again, there is no explicit allusion to Mycale. After Salamis Photius merely reports that 12 myriads perished *ἐν ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἀπάσαις μάχαις* (F 13.30). But which were "all the remaining battles"?⁹ And, to regress to earlier times, what has happened to the entire Ionian Revolt? Photius, after completing his account of Darius' disastrous Scythian expedition and its immediate consequences (F 13.21), appears to proceed directly to the campaign of Marathon (F 13.22). When he lists the motives for Xerxes' campaign he does not refer, as one would expect, to the burning of Sardis (cf. Hdt. 7.8), but to events which occurred during and just after the Scythian expedition (F 13.25).¹⁰ Did this historian from Asia Minor have no knowledge at all of Ionia's attempt to shake off the Persian yoke?¹¹ We cannot be certain. The list of motives attributed to Xerxes

books of Ctesias' history. His account of Xerxes' expedition is somewhat less than one-third of the epitome of the entire three reigns. But this will not permit us to judge the length of *Ctesias'* account. On Photius' typically uneven summarising see *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 2 f.

⁷It is not clear whether it has increased in size or whether the first number has been rounded off.

⁸G. Roux, "Eschyle, Diodore, Plutarque racontent la bataille de Salamine," *BCH* 98 (1974) 55 ff. finds a Persian fleet of 1207 credible for Salamis. But 400 vessels were lost in a storm off the Magnesian coast (Hdt. 7.190) and a further 200 in the attempt to circumnavigate Euboea (Hdt. 8.7 and 8.13), apart from the considerable losses in battle. Hignett 345 ff. correctly emphasizes the absurdity of the belief that the fleet at Salamis is back to its original strength, whatever its initial total, and whatever its losses.

⁹I do not understand Jacoby's claim (2061) that this is the figure for the Persian losses in the whole campaign and that Ctesias' tradition knows nothing of the horrors of Xerxes' retreat (Hdt. 8.115).

¹⁰Desire for revenge seems to have been as prominent a cause of historical events in Ctesias as it is in Herodotus.

¹¹It is possible that his native city did not take part: Herodotus does not record the participation of Cnidus. We should observe that Ctesias transferred at least one notable event of the Ionian Revolt, i.e., the destruction of the sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma, to

might be incomplete, and the words *Δαῖτις δὲ ἐπανιών ἐκ Πόντου . . .* (F 13.22), with which Photius initiates the Marathon campaign, could conceivably have reference to the end of the Ionian Revolt, rather than to the aftermath of the disastrous Scythian venture.¹²

There are other questions which we cannot answer on the basis of Photius' summary, one of them being the problem of the sources of Ctesias' account. Although Ctesias declared that he based his history on what he himself saw in Persia and on what Persians told him (T 8), thus asserting his claim to be considered a genuine practitioner of the art of *historie*, in part of his history he may owe as much, or even more, to Greeks as to Persians.¹³ His account of the Persian Wars does not appear on the whole to be especially favourable to the Persians. Like his account of Darius' ignominious failure in Scythia (F 13.21) it suggests rather the reverse. Its sources may have been in part what he heard in Cnidus, what he learned from Greeks at the Persian court or elsewhere (above, 20), although some contribution by Persians is not impossible.¹⁴

However, we should also not overlook the possibility that Ctesias was indebted at least in part to literary sources. It was standard practice to use information from a predecessor whom one maligned.¹⁵ Herodotus may have provided Ctesias with some insights. At any rate, despite all the differences, the two accounts clearly had much in common. Take the exiled Spartan king Demaratus. In Ctesias (F 13.27) seemingly he engages in dialogue with Xerxes at the Hellespont¹⁶ (cf. Hdt. 7.101 ff.,

the reign of Xerxes and that he was followed in this by some later historians (below, Appendix 1). Strabo goes further (14.1.5), claiming that Xerxes also fired "the other temples except that at Ephesus." But it is not certain whether this too derives from Ctesias.

¹²We do not know what Datis was doing in the Black Sea. There is no good evidence for his career prior to the campaign of Marathon. For his supposed siege of Lindos see the so-called Lindian Temple Chronicle (C. Blinkenberg, *Lindos: Fouilles de l'Acropole 2 Inscriptions* [Berlin and Copenhagen 1941] 1 coll. 181 ff. and 194 ff.). The episode has been variously assigned to 490 and to 494. Burn 210 f. and 218, who cites the earlier literature, argues for the latter date. But the story is surely apocryphal: cf. F. Jacoby, "Herodotos," *RE Suppl.* 2 (1913) 506 f. and Blinkenberg *loc. cit.*

¹³Cf. *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 14. That tales which seem Persian can in fact be Greek is admirably illustrated by A. Demandt's demonstration ("Die Ohren des falschen Smerdis," *Iranica Antiqua* 9 [1972] 94–101) that the story of Otanes' daughter (Hdt. 3.68 ff.) must be Greek and not, as has been thought, oriental.

¹⁴On the problem of the sources see further 29ff. below.

¹⁵The important question of how far Ctesias was indebted to Herodotus for information, discussed by Jacoby, 2051 ff., is usually brushed aside or completely ignored. That some of Ctesias' "facts" were borrowed from Herodotus is certain. But the whole subject, a difficult one and one requiring re-examination, is too large for the scope of the present discussion.

¹⁶On direct speech in the original see *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 5.

although the setting is Doriscus and Demaratus does not "prevent the Persian attack on Sparta"; indeed later [7.235] he advocates one). After Xerxes' initial failure to take Thermopylae, he participates (with others) in a conference (in Hdt. 7.209 the timing is not quite the same and he is apparently alone with Xerxes). Demaratus' role in Ctesias is not identical but very similar to his role in Herodotus and the two accounts share other common elements (below, 31), although we do not know how far the similarities extended or how far Photius, who seems to be trying to emphasize the differences, has failed to record what resembled Herodotus' narrative.

Ctesias might have consulted literary authorities in addition to Herodotus. After all his polemic embraced Hellenicus as well as Herodotus (F 16.62).¹⁷ Nor, although its role can be exaggerated, can one entirely rule out one further source, Ctesias' own imagination. Fabrication is not unknown in his history. Xenophon's silence about the part which Ctesias played in the embassy to the Greeks after Cunaxa, this λαμπρόν ψεύσμα as Plutarch terms it (*Art.* 13.5–6—F 23), does indeed suggest that Ctesias could improve upon the facts by falsification.

If Photius' summary raises a number of questions which do not admit of completely satisfactory answers, we are on less treacherous ground over Ctesias' attitude to Herodotus, for one of Ctesias' aims was quite obviously to discredit his predecessor's entire work. Herodotus is scorned as a frequent liar and as a spinner of yarns (T 8, where Photius adds that in almost everything Ctesias' account contradicted that of Herodotus). Herodotus' *muthoi* and his lies are again castigated in T 13 and F 16.62.

Two further passages should be cited. Jacoby has drawn attention to them, but they are such splendid specimens of Ctesias' methods that they deserve emphasis.¹⁸ Early in the history in a discussion of Ethiopian burial customs Ctesias ridicules Herodotus for stating that the Ethiopians poured *hyelos* over the dead bodies (which would have mutilated them—Diod. 2.15.1–2—F 1). His text of Herodotus may have read *γυμνώσαντες* for *γυνψάντες*, as Müller suggested.¹⁹ But even this will not excuse Ctesias. There is no ambiguity in Herodotus' statement that the Ethiopians inserted the bodies into pillars made of *hyelos* (3.24).

The second passage in which Ctesias blatantly misrepresents Herodotus concerns the founding of the Median Empire (Diod. 2.32.2–3—F 5).²⁰ Here Herodotus is credited by Ctesias with the statement that the

¹⁷And he may have used him for details; cf. Jacoby, 2053 and 2061.

¹⁸Jacoby, 2050 f.

¹⁹*Ctesiae Cnidii Fragmenta* (Paris 1844, appendix to Didot edition of Herodotus) 27.

²⁰In the first chapters of Book 2 Diodorus is summarising Ctesias' history directly (Jacoby 2042; cf. R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* [Washington, D.C. 1973] 195 n. 32), not an intermediary, as is still sometimes supposed. In 2.32.2–3, as

Assyrian Empire lasted for 500 years (instead of 520), that the founder of the Median Empire was Cyaxares (instead of Deioces), and that the Median Empire arose many generations after the collapse of Assyria, when Herodotus clearly dated its creation to the period when Assyria was still mistress of Asia (1.95). This second passage suggests more than mere careless reading. It looks as if Ctesias has wilfully distorted Herodotus' meaning to give greater credibility to his own version of Median history.

No doubt his antagonism to Herodotus is inspired at least in part by the fact that the tales which he heard were often not identical to what Herodotus reports. From the passage cited above (T 8), where Ctesias emphasises the authenticity of his history as well as indulging his spleen, it is evident that above all he is striving to vindicate his claim to be considered *the* historian of Persia. But the polemical attitude to Herodotus and the quality of the criticisms should be borne in mind when we scrutinize his account of the Persian Wars. Ctesias' antagonism to Herodotus is such that, if it did not lead him into fabrication, it could certainly lead him to choose an inferior or obviously false tale merely for the sake of proving Herodotus wrong.

MARATHON, THERMOPYLAE, AND PLATAEA

With some suspicions in our minds we are now ready to look at Ctesias' account in detail and first of all the campaign of Marathon (a meagre three lines in Photius' summary—F 13.22), or rather the fate of the Persian general Datis.²¹ Herodotus tells us that after the battle Datis returned safely to Susa along with his fellow-general Artaphernes and the captive Eretrians (6.119), although he has nothing further to report of him. In Ctesias, however, he dies on the battle-field. Since the Athenians refuse to surrender the body, the story provides Xerxes with one powerful excuse for a war of revenge, and it neatly rounds off Datis' career, which Herodotus has failed to do. It cannot be correct. Surely Herodotus' informants would have known the story if there were any truth in it? It does, however, make for good drama and this should be noted. However dry and tedious Photius' summary may be (and it is very tedious),

earlier in 2.15.1–2, he must be reproducing (somewhat naively) Ctesias' misrepresentations of Herodotus' account. Diodorus in these passages had no compelling motive for ridiculing or distorting Herodotus' narrative; Ctesias did. Note that in 8.16, where Diodorus is following a different source, he lauds the justice of Deioces, not as here the justice of Cyaxares.

²¹Some of the details which Philostratus provides (*Vita Apollonii* 1.23.1 ff.) on the Eretrians carried off to Asia may well be derived from Ctesias, as is suggested by F. Grosso, "Gli Eretriosi deportati in Persia," *RFIC* 86 (1958) 350 ff. The influence of Ctesias on this work is considerable; cf. Jacoby 2073. On Philostratus' Eretrian episode see further R. J. Penella, "Scopelianus and the Eretrians in Cissia," *Athenaeum* n.s. 52 (1974) 295–300.

the parts of the history which have been more fully preserved leave no doubt at all that one of Ctesias' primary aims was to write an entertaining narrative. This naturally raises the question of how far his version of Xerxes' expedition was a sensationalised version.²²

Ctesias' account of Thermopylae (F 13.27), about which we are somewhat better informed, presents a series of divergences from Herodotus' version, and, when he states that with Xerxes was the Thessalian Thorax, he could quite well be right.²³ At least this does not conflict with his predecessor's narrative. Herodotus repeatedly draws attention to the Medism of the Aleuadae, which he dates to the beginning of Xerxes' reign (7.6, cf. 7.130) and which cannot be dated later than the expedition to Tempe (7.172 and 174).²⁴ His account of the battle does not mention Thorax and his brother by name, but the allusion to Thessalians who act as guides to the Persian army as it advances after victory into Doris (8.31) suggests that they were close at hand.²⁵

²²For Ctesias' love of melodrama cf. *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 21 and A. Cizek, "The Life of Cyrus the Great viewed by Herodotus, Ctesias and Xenophon," *AntCl* 44 (1975) 531–552. One of the most striking features of Ctesias' narrative, in those passages where we can adequately compare his version with that of Herodotus, is its much greater sensationalism. Note, for example, Ctesias' account of the Persian capture of Sardis—a son of Croesus is slain before his father's eyes, Croesus' wife commits suicide by leaping from the walls (F 9.4), Croesus himself escapes from Cyrus three times before his pardon (F 9.5), and similar items.

²³Θώραξ δὲ ὁ Θεσσαλὸς καὶ Τραχινίων οἱ δυνατοὶ . . . παρήσαν στρατιὰν ἔχοντες. Also present is Demaratus (cf. 22–23 above), as well as the completely unknown Hegias of Ephesus. Photius' reference to an army (Thessalian? Trachinian? both?) is ambiguous, although H. D. Westlake, "The Medism of Thessaly," *JHS* 56 (1936) 14 understands it as a Thessalian army. The Aleuads with some adherents might have been present at Thermopylae and there was a Thessalian contingent at Plataea (Hdt. 9.31). But that Thessaly provided many fighting men to Persia as early as 480 is at best doubtful. Herodotus gives very little information about Thessalian activities and his account suggests lukewarm enthusiasm for Persia (Westlake 21 ff.).

A Trachinian army on the Persian side is also doubtful. Very little is known of Trachis during the campaign and about Malis of which it is a part. Diodorus' claim that *Leonidas'* force included 1,000 Malians (11.4.7) is very weak evidence (Hignett 19 and 118 argues against it). But although the traitor according to Herodotus was a Trachinian and although there were doubtless Persian sympathizers, Trachis and Malis were surely not openly hostile to the Greeks (cf. Hdt. 7.175), fighting after all in the territory of Trachis (Hignett 132). It is unlikely that Malis provided troops to Xerxes until after Thermopylae (Hdt. 8.66; cf. 9.31). Herodotus' list of those who medized earlier (7.132) must be anachronistic (see How and Wells *ad loc.*).

²⁴Cf. 9.1 and 9.58. On the Aleuadae see now N. Robertson, "The Thessalian Expedition of 480 B.C.," *JHS* 96 (1976) 100 ff.

²⁵Hdt. 8.31 implies that the whole of the Persian army or the greater part of it proceeded south via Doris, which cannot be right (Hignett 134). But it is quite possible that a detachment advanced into Doris, while the main part of the army took the coast route. The anecdote which credits Thessalians with saving Theban lives in the battle (Hdt. 7.233), and which is ridiculed by Plutarch *De Malignitate* 866d ff., is of course suspect because of its anti-Theban bias and the branding of the Thebans after surrender.

Few, however, would be tempted by Ctesias' remaining innovations. We can never trust him over the size of armies, although occasionally he reduces Herodotus' vast hordes to more plausible dimensions.²⁶ Obviously we cannot believe the statistics of the present passage. Xerxes initially attempts to force the pass with 10,000 men, then with 20,000, and finally with 50,000 (cf. the climax—1,000, 2,000, 4,000 men—in the folk-tale of Darius' capture of Babylon—Hdt. 3.157). Herodotus' half-legendary account of Thermopylae has degenerated into total legend.

A second attempt to provide statistics which are lacking in Herodotus' account, i.e., the size attributed to the contingent which turned Leonidas' position, is equally misguided. Herodotus' narrative (7.215 and 7.83) suggests that he believed that all 10,000 Immortals accompanied Hydarnes along the Anopaia path and topographical discussions often accept this number.²⁷ It may be an exaggeration. At any rate Ctesias' figure of 40,000 is ludicrous. It betrays perhaps a desire to embroider upon the glories of the Spartan stand. Clearly there is no knowledge of the military situation or of the terrain.

What of the participants in the struggle? Ctesias tells us of a Persian general named Artapanus, who is unknown to Herodotus' narrative. We may well hesitate to believe him; the historian after all who should have been so well informed on all matters relative to Persia is frequently wrong about Persia's leaders.²⁸ If we inquire more closely into the identity of this Artapanus, initial doubts about him are confirmed.

At the beginning of his summary of Xerxes' reign Photius mentions as one of the most prominent figures at the court Artapanus the son of Artasyras (F 13.24).²⁹ A later section of the epitome describes the assassination of Xerxes plotted by an Artapanus and the assassin's intrigues to win the throne (F 13.33–F 14.34), a passage which would have been lurid in the original; this is a subject which never failed to inspire eloquence in Ctesias. Photius refers to the assassin merely as Artapanus:

²⁶I discussed this in *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 10 f.

²⁷E.g., W. K. Pritchett, "New Light on Thermopylae," *AJA* 62 (1958) 203 ff.; cf. Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography* 1 (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1965) 72, and Burn 409 ff. In Diodorus 11.8.5 the force numbers 20,000, which looks like an attempt on the part of Ephorus to combine a figure deduced from Herodotus' account with the number given by Ctesias.

²⁸I give examples in *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 6 ff. It is significant that Herodotus' tradition on Darius' fellow-conspirators (3.70), though not perfect, is much superior to that of Ctesias.

²⁹Ctesias shows great interest in (and has perhaps too exact a knowledge of) the father. A Hyrcanian ruler Artasyras joins Cyrus just after his victory over Astyages (Nic. Dam. *FGrHist* 90 F 66.46—based on Ctesias): a Hyrcanian Artasyras plays a very prominent role in the reigns of Cambyses and Darius (F 13.9: F 13.15–16); he dies (F 13.23) seemingly at about the same time as Darius—in extreme old age, if all these references are to the same man.

he does not name his father. But in this section we are certainly dealing with the son of Artasyras, a figure who loomed large, as is now clear, both at the beginning and end of Ctesias' account of Xerxes.³⁰

Since Photius' summary of Xerxes' reign makes no reference to any Artapanus other than the son of Artasyras, it is reasonable to assume that the commander at Thermopylae (the father's name is not given) is the same man.³¹ In other words, the history of this period in Ctesias has seemingly undergone considerable simplification. One man, it would appear, fulfils the roles of adviser, general, and assassin, which in reality belong to three entirely different individuals.³² Artapanus will thus owe

³⁰For the plot against Xerxes cf. Diod. 11.69.1 ff., a tale clearly modelled on Ctesias' account (*Phoenix* 30 [1976] 5 f. and 23 n. 89). The very similar story of Justinus 3.1.1 ff. also derives ultimately from Ctesias (Aristotle *Pol.* 5 1311 b gives a different version). It should be noted that in Photius both the assassin and the son of Artasyras are described as being very powerful (F 13.33 and F 13.24) and, furthermore, that Diodorus' assassin is Hyrcanian (11.69.1), as is the family of Artasyras (above, n. 29). There can be no doubt that the assassin is the son of Artasyras. And this man, the commander of the bodyguard in Diodorus 11.69.1, the *praefectus* in Justinus 3.1.2 (cf. Nepos 21.1.5), is presumably also the chiliarch with whom in Plutarch's tale (*Them.* 27) Themistocles has an audience.

The name, however, poses problems. The later tradition (i.e., Diod., Justinus, Nepos, Plut. and others) is unanimous in giving 'Αρτάβανος (Lat. *Artabanus*). In Aristotle we have 'Αρταπάνης. A and M, the mss of Photius (which are not always reliable in reproducing the names in Ctesias; see *Phoenix* 30 [1976] 8 f.) present an inconsistency. In F 13.24–34 the name throughout is 'Αρτάπανος (M² gives a variant 'Αρτάβανος at F 13.33 line 15; cf. A¹ at F 14.34 line 26), but at F 14.35 line 6, just after the story of the assassin, we are introduced to a different man with the words ἄλλος 'Αρτάβανος (Jacoby's reading, which I verified from microfilms of A and M, and not 'Αρτάπανος as in R. Henry, *Photius, Bibliothèque* 1 [Paris 1959]; for the other discrepancies between the texts of Jacoby and Henry see now the useful list in T. Hägg, *GötGelAnz* 228 [1976] 32 ff.). Despite this inconsistency, which may result from a simple scribal error, Ctesias probably called his assassin 'Αρτάπανος. This is the *lectio difficilior* and Aristotle's 'Αρταπάνης gives it some support (on the terminations -os -es of Persian names in Greek see R. Schmitt, "Medisches und persisches Sprachgut bei Herodot," *ZDMG* 117 [1967] 139). The later Greek tradition has perhaps confused two names, or substituted a familiar for an uncommon name (cf. *Phoenix* 30 [1976] 23 n. 89), i.e., if we are really dealing here with two distinct Persian names. Although it was formerly believed (cf. F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* [Marburg 1895] 31 f.) that the Classical tradition reflected one name only, modern scholars distinguish Old Persian *Arta-bānu-, for which there is now good indirect evidence and which in Greek would normally be 'Αρτάβανος, from *Arta-pāna- (the evidence for this name is meagre), which should give Greek 'Αρτάπανος/ης: see E. Benveniste, *Titres et noms propres en iranien ancien* (Paris 1966) 83 and 107 f. and M. Mayrhofer, "Onomastica Persepolitana," *SBWien* 286.1 (1973) 163.

³¹Momigliano 203 also makes this assumption. If the general were a different Artapanus, we might have expected Photius to draw attention to this.

³²At the beginning of the reign, where Artapanus and Mardonius are labelled the most influential men (F 13.24), Artapanus seemingly usurps the position of the Herodotean Artabanus (son of Hystaspes). The Mardonius of F 13.24, who is here called

his position at Thermopylae only to a degeneration in the tradition. He cannot have been a general in Xerxes' Greek campaign.

Ctesias does not appear to do better with the Greek participants. According to Herodotus (7.213 ff.), the guide who treacherously escorted Hydarnes' force by the Anopaia path was the Trachinian Ephialtes. Herodotus is not necessarily right. Many must have known of the path and the Pylagori might have found it convenient to fix the blame on Ephialtes. But Herodotus has at least a reason (the decision of the Pylagori) for branding this man as the traitor. He is also aware that tradition had named others, Onetes of Carystus and Corydallus of Anticyra. There is nothing to be said in favour of Ctesias' leading Trachinians, Calliades and Timaphernes, about whom Herodotus has not heard. Indeed the half-Greek, half-Persian second name cannot be correct, although the hybrid form may be a scribal confusion, not an error of the historian.³³

From the implausible data in Ctesias' account of Thermopylae we turn to the absurdities of his version of Plataea. The Greek forces are ludicrous; 300 Spartans, 1,000 perioeci, 6,000 from the other cities are ranged against 120,000 Persians commanded by Mardonius.³⁴ Pausanias' army it seems has been confused with the Greek forces at Thermopylae. Surely this intolerable muddle will not help us solve the problem of which contingents accompanied *Leonidas*, although more than one scholar has found it useful.³⁵

Then there is Mardonius' fate, for Mardonius instead of dying on the battle-field escapes wounded.³⁶ The sequel to the battle, Ctesias' version of the Persian attack on Delphi, is equally noteworthy. Herodotus' account of this venture (as well as his many other tales of divine inter-

ὁ παλαιός, is perhaps not Herodotus' young, hot-headed general, but his father, i.e., Gobryas (Gobryas is wrongly named Mardonius in Ctesias' account of Darius and his fellow-conspirators—F 13.16).

³³For the problem of *ms* corruption in the names cf. above, n. 30. J. Marquart, *Philologus* 54 (1895) 437, has suggested the Aeolic Τιμαφένης for Timaphernes. On the Medism of Trachis see above, note 23.

³⁴Ctesias' total for Mardonius' army is more plausible than that of Herodotus (300,000–8.113), but it is still much too high. Hignett 355 estimates 50,000, Burn 511 suggests 60,000–70,000.

³⁵E. Obst, "Der Feldzug des Xerxes," *Klio* Beiheft 12 (1913) 67 f. and G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*² (Gotha 1895) 674 f., use Ctesias to support the claim (based on Diod. 11.4.5) that the Greek forces at Thermopylae included 1,000 perioeci and their presence is often accepted. However, the figure in Diodorus may be only the product of an attempt by Ephorus to bring the numbers given by Herodotus (7.202) into harmony with the total of 4,000 Peloponnesians given in Simonides' epigram (Hdt. 7.228): cf. Hignett 116 f. and R. H. Simpson, "Leonidas' Decision," *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 8 n. 41.

³⁶This part of the story reappears in Justinus 2.14.5.

vention in human affairs) engenders some scepticism.³⁷ But we should not be deceived by the often rather pedestrian appearance of Photius' summary into thinking that Ctesias was less credulous. His Mardonius, presumably as a punishment for intended sacrilege, was killed by hail-stones in an attempt to pillage Delphi and there might have been other marvels.³⁸ Xerxes' grief adds a note of pathos, again characteristic of Ctesias, although it is not unknown in Herodotus' narrative.

But the crowning absurdity is of course the chronological blunder which makes Plataea precede Salamis. How could Ctesias have come to believe this monstrous perversion of the truth, and who supplied him with his facts, to reintroduce the very difficult question of the sources of his account? The ridiculous ordering of the battles makes for a tidy North-South geographical sequence. Are we dealing merely with the simplifications of an ignorant Persian, or should we seek a different explanation? At times Herodotus has been led astray by the prejudices of his informants. Could bias conceivably have played a role in this part of Ctesias' narrative?³⁹

That either the historian or his informants had a political axe to grind is, on first appearances at least, an attractive possibility. Ctesias had visited Sparta (above, 20). He was a native of Cnidus, which revolted from Athens in 412/11 and was until 394 an important Spartan naval base.⁴⁰ If his work had a pro-Spartan flavour this would not surprise us. Indeed we know that part of his history, the account of contemporary events, gave evidence of stark prejudice. Plutarch ridicules Ctesias' partiality for Sparta and for the Spartan Clearchus as well as his pre-occupation with his own activities (*Art.* 13.7—*T* 7b), although Ctesias'

³⁷See Hignett 439 ff. and Burn 426.

³⁸Dreams and omens naturally abounded in Ctesias' narrative (a good example in *F* 12.14). At times he rejects Herodotean miracles, as with the tale of the mule which bore a foal (*F* 13.26: cf. *Hdt.* 3.153). But he has his own to substitute: lions guard the corpse of Astyages (*F* 9.6); the mules which are to convey the body of Artaxerxes I to its burial-place refuse to move until after the assassination of his son 45 days later (*F* 15.48). The theme of wrongdoing and its punishment by the gods, so important in Herodotus, may also have been an important theme in Ctesias; Cambyses' death without heir seems to be a punishment for the murder of his brother (*F* 13.14). Ctesias might also have viewed the failure of Xerxes in Greece and his ignominious death as the consequences of sacrilege committed in Babylon. This is Aelian's story (*V. H.* 13.3), a tale derived (probably indirectly) from Ctesias. However, we know very little about this aspect of his history.

³⁹Jacoby, 2061, suggested a Persian informant. Momigliano, 205, argues that the error (and the account as a whole) derives from popular Greek tradition which would have viewed Salamis as the real victory of the Wars and therefore as the culminating one. Hignett 9 opts for pro-Spartan bias.

⁴⁰For Cnidus' short-lived defection from Sparta after the battle of Cnidus see G. L. Cawkwell, "The ΣΤΝ Coins Again," *JHS* 83 (1963) 152–154.

pro-Spartan proclivities were apparently not strong enough to deter him from boasting of the aid which he rendered to the Athenian Conon (F 30.73 and F 32—Plut. *Art.* 21.4) as well as to Clearchus (F 27.67 and F 28—Plut. *Art.* 18.1–4).

How far did prejudice colour his account of the Persian Wars? Naturally Ctesias lauded the heroism of the Spartans at Thermopylae. He might also have been guilty of enhancing it (above, 26). Athens' role in the invasion appears also to have been depreciated. At least she contributes a very small fleet at Salamis, only 110 ships when the Greek fleet totals 700 (F 13.30).⁴¹ But we must not exaggerate this aspect of the narrative. Apparently Athens' heroes, Miltiades (F 13.22), Aristides, and Themistocles (F 13.30), were awarded at least a significant role in the wars, and other parts of Ctesias' history suggest that he could be more attracted by a tale because it was a good one than because it was politically slanted.⁴²

The story of Plataea as written by the friend of Clearchus might initially seem to be a tendentious one. The forces commanded by Pausanias might suggest that, whereas Herodotus strove to emphasise the Athenian role in this battle, Ctesias denied Athens any role at all.⁴³ The aberrant chronology, whereby Plataea immediately succeeds Thermopylae, might appear to serve as an effective contradiction to the traditions about Spartan selfishness and her refusal to move North of the Isthmus which make such a substantial contribution to Herodotus' account (8.4; 8.40 etc.). However, we should look more closely. There is certainly little trace here of specifically Spartan informants. Surely Spartans would have known the composition of Pausanias' army, if they did not know the battle-sequence? Sparta has produced a minuscule force. The Persian army too, although it heavily outnumbers the Greek forces, is a very modest one, 12 myriads out of 80. The Battle of Plataea in fact has turned into a minor engagement between a few Greeks and a small detachment

⁴¹For the number 700 see below, 31ff. Hdt. 8.44 gives 180 as the Athenian contribution. Obst (above, n. 35) 72 defends 110 as the number of Athenian ships which engaged at Salamis. Labarbe, *Chiffres* (above, n. 2) 407 ff., accepts it as the number of ships which transferred the evacuees from Athens to Salamis (he gives an unusual meaning to Photius' *πληρώσαντες*) and finds the figure useful in calculating the Athenian losses at Artemisium (71 ships). But the number is at least suspect. Jacoby 2061 suggests anti-Athenian prejudice. The story of the Cretan archers at Salamis (below, 34ff.) might also have detracted from Athens' glory.

⁴²Ctesias' account of the great Athenian expedition to Egypt in the middle of the fifth century is flattering despite the small Athenian fleet, and perhaps over-laudatory: see *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 16.

⁴³If the forces at Plataea have been confused with those at Thermopylae (above, 28), Ctesias' 6,000 men "from the other cities" should be compared with Herodotus' figures for Thermopylae, i.e., circa 3,000 from the Peloponnese (7.202) and circa 3,000 from central Greece (7.202 and 203), if the Locrians supplied about 1,000.

of the Persian army proceeding South to the decisive battle, Salamis, which expels all the Persian forces from Greece. This is scarcely a pro-Spartan account. Surely the blunders owe their origin to stark simplification, confusion, and ignorance, not to prejudice?⁴⁴

SALAMIS

In the preceding analysis we have unearthed singularly little that is even potentially useful to the serious historian. However, it is from Ctesias' account of Salamis in particular (F 13.30) that modern scholars have wrung plausible tradition. Are they justified in this?

Ctesias' narrative once more was not totally unlike that of his predecessor. Ctesias did not scorn, like some modern accounts, the famous tales of Themistocles' messages to Xerxes, or at least not both of them.⁴⁵ Photius' words—*φεύγει Ξέρξης βουλή πάλιν καὶ τέχνη Ἀριστείδου καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους*—suggest a variant version of the second message, the message which caused Xerxes' hasty departure from Greece. And Ctesias' account may have influenced our later versions of the story. It is to be noted that Plutarch abandons Themistocles' confrontation with Eurybiades (Hdt. 8.108) and awards Aristides an important role in the affair (*Them.* 16: cf. *Aristeides* 9), as seemingly did Ctesias' narrative.⁴⁶ Plutarch also alters the identity of the messenger, turning the Herodotean Sicinnus into the royal eunuch Arnakes.⁴⁷ Ctesias, whose history is filled with eunuchs, might well have been responsible for this transformation.

However, the similarities to Herodotus' account recede before the many divergences, a number of which are quite clearly erroneous.⁴⁸ We have seen (above, 30) that Ctesias' figure for the Athenian fleet is at least suspect. The size of the total Greek fleet, which has tempted one scholar, is ludicrous. It numbers 700 ships where Herodotus gave 380 (8.82). Has Ctesias or his source arrived at it by combining the fleets of Artemisium and Salamis? Or is this a tradition which was designed to

⁴⁴There is not enough evidence to permit a decision between Greek ignorance and Persian ignorance.

⁴⁵Some are prepared to accept the first message. Hignett 241 f. and 403 ff. rejects both.

⁴⁶Note Plutarch's words (*Them.* 16)—*ἡ Θεμιστοκλέους καὶ Ἀριστείδου φρόνησις*. A. J. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles* (Montreal and London 1975) 26 also suggests the influence of Ctesias. But it is not certain that Plutarch's source is Phainias as surmised by R. Laqueur, "Phainias," *RE* 19 (1938) 1583 f. We cannot of course tell from Photius' words whether Themistocles and Aristides in Ctesias played an equal role in the scheme or whether Ctesias has abandoned the traditional enmity between the two.

⁴⁷According to Polyaeus 1.30.4 he is Arsaces.

⁴⁸One detail seems preferable to a detail in Herodotus (below, n. 60). Over a second he might have been right (see Appendix 2), but these items should not deceive us as to the general quality of his account of Salamis.

reduce the glory of the Greek victory?⁴⁹ Of the Persian fleet of more than 1,000, one half (500) according to Ctesias were destroyed. We do not know the Persian losses at Salamis; Herodotus does not record them. But it is significant that apparently Ephorus found Ctesias' numeral implausible. In Diodorus (11.19.3) the losses are more than 200 not counting those captured with their crews.

With the name of the Persian commanding officer we must have yet another error. According to Herodotus (7.97) there were four admirals—Ariabignes, Prexaspes, Megabazus, and Achaemenes, each commanding one of the four territorial units of the fleet. Herodotus was not particularly interested in the Persian command structure; little is said of these admirals in the later narrative. His statements about the organization of the fleet have been doubted. But as a recent study has emphasized, there is no evidence of any weight to prove him wrong.⁵⁰

The fact that Photius names only one naval officer, Onophas, suggests simplification in Ctesias' account (and this may have influenced the later tradition which also reduces Herodotus' four admirals to one).⁵¹ Allusions earlier in his history to members of this family are muddled.⁵² Is the admiral Onophas at Salamis a confused memory of an admiral Otanes of previous times?⁵³ Or has the father of Xerxes' fiendish queen, Amestris, migrated to the fleet? Otanes commanded an infantry division,

⁴⁹Aeschylus' total is 310 (*Persae* 338 ff.). The figures of Herodotus 8.43–47 add up to 366 triremes although Herodotus gives 378 as the sum (8.48, on the problem of these numbers see Hignett 209 ff.). Hammond 271 believes that the total (including auxiliary craft) might have been around 700. Labarbe, *Chiffres* (above, n. 2) 426, notes that 700 is approximately the combined total for the Greek fleet at Artemisium and that at Salamis, as given by Herodotus, i.e., 324 (Hdt. 8.2 and 8.14) plus 380 (8.82). The figure would not appear to suggest the popular Greek tradition postulated by Momigliano 203 ff., which surely would not have inflated the size of the Greek fleet. Nor does it seem necessary to assume with Momigliano that Ctesias' whole account of the wars derives from a single source.

⁵⁰H. Hauben, "The Chief Commanders of the Persian Fleet in 480 B.C.," *Ancient Society* 4 (1973) 24–37.

⁵¹In Diod. 11.12.2 he is Megabates (cf. Strabo 9.2.9). In Plutarch *Them.* 14.3 (cf. *Moralia* 488f.) he is Xerxes' older brother Ariamenes (cf. *Mor.* 173b–c). Despite A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire* (Chicago 1948) 232, the direct source for Plutarch is not Ctesias.

⁵²Amestris' father Otanes (Hdt. 7.61) is erroneously named Onophas by Ctesias (F 13.24), a confusion perhaps of father with son (cf. Hauben [above, n. 50] 27) and a type of error which Ctesias makes elsewhere: cf. *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 6 f. Another Otanes, the Conspirator, is also wrongly named Onophas (F 13.16) and Ctesias may have thought erroneously that the Conspirator and Amestris' father were one and the same man. On the family see Hauben (above, n. 50) 26 ff. and Th. Lenschau, "Otanés," *RE* 18 (1942) 1866 ff.

⁵³Otanés the Conspirator commanded the forces sent against Samos (Hdt. 3.141–149). Otanes the son of Sisamnes captured Lemnos and Imbros after Darius' Scythian expedition (Hdt. 5.26).

the Persians (Hdt. 7.61): a son of Otanes, Anaphes (= Onophas), presumably son of the Otanes just mentioned, led the Cissian contingent (Hdt. 7.62).

There remain Ctesias' two final corrections of Herodotus—in a single story which will be artificially divided to permit closer scrutiny. First Xerxes' mole. According to Herodotus (8.97), Xerxes after the defeat at Salamis embarked on the construction of a mole in the direction of Salamis, a ruse designed to conceal his departure. In Ctesias this is transformed into a serious manoeuvre attempted *before* the battle. Herodotus' story attributes to Xerxes an inexplicably laborious means of disguising his retreat. Some have found Ctesias' version more attractive.⁵⁴ Are they correct?

Naturally we cannot invoke Aristodemus (104 F 1.1.2) and Strabo (9.1.13), both perhaps drawing on Ephorus, in order to prove Ctesias right. Their allusions to Xerxes' mole-building prior to the battle most probably derive ultimately from Ctesias himself.⁵⁵ Then there are the technical difficulties. These are sometimes exaggerated, but so long as the Greek fleet lay undefeated would still be formidable.⁵⁶ Ctesias' account of the Persian Wars as a whole presents us with little more than a string of absurdities. Can this contradiction of Herodotus' chronology be correct? Other chronological innovations are outrageous. The reversal of the order of Salamis and Plataea is the most famous, not the only example.⁵⁷

⁵⁴E.g. K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² 2.2 (Strassburg 1916) 122; H. D. Broadhead, *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1960) 324 f.; Burn 437 ff. (with some reservations). Hammond 273 f. and 300 f. believes both Herodotus and Ctesias and has two attempts at mole-building. Hignett 415 ff. rejects Ctesias' story.

⁵⁵For Aristodemus' source see Jacoby *ad loc.*

⁵⁶The most obvious line for any mole would be from Perama to St. George island and from that island to Kamatero (Hammond 256). While the second section is quite short, the channel between Perama and St. George Island is 1200 metres wide (W. K. Pritchett, "Salamis Revisited," *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography* 1 [Berkeley and Los Angeles 1965] 101), and between the reef off Perama and St. George Island reaches a depth of 7–8 metres (Pritchett fig. 6 records the soundings of 1958). However, if there has been a general rise of about 5 ft. in the level of the sea (Pritchett 97 ff.), the reef would presumably have been an island in the 5th century B.C., and this section of the channel would have been significantly shorter and less deep. These physical considerations do not suggest that the enterprise was considerably more difficult than the construction of Alexander's mole at Tyre, despite How and Wells on Hdt. 8.97 and Hignett 416. There the channel is claimed to have been some 800 metres wide and up to 5 and a half metres deep; see J. Kromayer and G. Veith, *Hoerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer* (München 1928) 218. On the other hand it should be stressed that Alexander did not succeed until he acquired overwhelming naval superiority.

⁵⁷Ctesias dated the destruction of the sanctuary at Didyma to Xerxes' reign instead of Darius' reign (see Appendix I). But it should be noted that when he alters Herodotus' chronology he is not invariably wrong. There is an element of truth in his account of events in Babylon in Xerxes' reign (F 13.26), as I hope to show elsewhere.

We cannot be certain of the origin of Ctesias' tale. Perhaps an informant invented a literal explanation of the words of the famous prophecy of Bacis—ἀλλ' ὅταν Ἀρτέμιδος χρυσαύρου ἱερὸν ἀκτὴν/νηυσὶ γεφυρώσῃσι καὶ εἰναλίην Κυνόσουραν—which inspired such faith in Herodotus (8.77).⁵⁸ But a further aspect of the story is significant. If Herodotus' Greeks, cooped up on the island of Salamis, had cause for alarm, Ctesias gives them much greater reason for trepidation. This novelty adds to the drama and suspense. It should be firmly rejected.

The second item in Ctesias' account of Salamis to find a fairly secure place in the works of modern scholars is the exploit of the Cretan archers.⁵⁹ Photius tells us that before the battle archers were summoned from Crete in accordance with the advice of Themistocles and Aristides. Presumably they were instrumental in foiling Xerxes' attempt to cross to Salamis on foot, although Photius merely records their arrival and does not further enlighten us on their activities.⁶⁰

There is no evidence to support Ctesias' claim that *Cretans* participated in the Persian Wars, although on the Greek side archery seemingly played a role—a minor one. Aeschylus' description of the action on Psyttaeia (*Persae* 460 ff.) suggests that some Greeks were armed with the bow, although not all the details of this passage can be accepted as literally correct.⁶¹ Even better evidence is provided by Herodotus' account of Plataea (9.22; 9.60). Possibly these archers were Athenian citizens, although Herodotus does not explicitly say so. Surely they were not Cretans? At least it seems to be unsound procedure to equate all the

⁵⁸Cf. A. Milchhöfer, *Karten von Attika* (ed. E. Curtius and J. A. Kaupert) 7 (Berlin 1895) 31. Herodotus' version of the tale might have a similar origin. For other modern explanations see Hignett 416 f.

⁵⁹Hignett 101 and 415 is sceptical: cf. H. van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grecque de Platon à Polybe* (Paris 1948) 36 and 53 f. Hammond 273 accepts these archers and Burn 439 f. seems to be tempted by them.

⁶⁰If Cretan archers were present at Salamis, they must have been summoned well in advance of the actual battle. Evidently Ctesias' account of the activities of Aristides differed from that of Herodotus 8.79 ff., where he arrives at Salamis, seemingly for the first time, on the night before the battle, a tale often doubted (e.g., by Hignett 408 ff.). On the controversy over the date of the recall of those who had been ostracized (*Ath. Pol.* 22.8 and the Themistocles Decree lines 45–47) see most recently A. J. Podlecki (above, n. 46) 157; S. M. Burstein, "The Recall of the Ostracised and the Themistocles Decree," *CSCA* 4 (1971) 93–110; J. de Romilly, "Vocabulaire et propagande ou les premiers emplois du mot ὁμόνοια," in *Mélanges . . . offerts à P. Chantraine* (Paris 1972) 199–209.

⁶¹*Pace* C. W. Fornara, "The Hoplite Achievement at Psyttaeia," *JHS* 86 (1966) 51–54. On the poetic licence of the lines see Broadhead (above, n. 54) *ad loc.* Herodotus describes Aristides' troops as hoplites and Athenians (8.95). For archers in the Persian Wars cf. also *Anth. Pal.* 6.2, attributed to Simonides (Diehl 144); Plut. *Them.* 14.1; the Themistocles Decree, R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford 1969) no. 23 lines 25–26 (difficult to accept as genuine 5th-century information). For the evidence for citizen-archers at Athens in the mid-fifth century and later see A. Plassart, "Les archers d'Athènes," *REG* 26 (1913) 151–213.

references to archers and to assume without a closer look that all our sources refer to the identical brand.⁶²

Indeed 480 would be a surprisingly early date for Cretans to be active in mainland battles. Although Crete was of course from very early times famous for her archers,⁶³ these do not achieve prominence for their activities outside Crete before the last third of the fifth century, when Greece discovered the value of light-armed mercenary forces, which thereafter became increasingly popular.

One source, it is true, gives evidence to the contrary, but it is distinctly unpromising testimony.⁶⁴ Pausanias, in his account of the First and Second Messenian wars, records the presence of Cretan archers (4.8.3: 4.10.1) and also the fact (a significant one) that they do not participate in the fighting (4.8.12). Equally suspect are the Cretan archers who are tricked and deprived of their captive Aristomenes by a nameless and fatherless Messenian maiden (4.19.4 ff.). Much of what Pausanias reports of these wars derives ultimately from the untrustworthy tales of the poet Rhianus, interestingly a Cretan poet, and the historian Myron of Priene, i.e., it derives from the third century, a period in which Cretan archers were involved in almost every major battle.⁶⁵ Surely these Cretans in Messenia are a fiction?

The fact that Cretan archers outside Crete prior to the Peloponnesian War are unusual casts doubt on Ctesias' Cretans at Salamis. Even greater doubts are raised by the fact that Herodotus denies emphatically that Crete sent any aid during Xerxes' invasion (7.169 ff.).⁶⁶ If theirs was a genuine exploit, Herodotus should have heard of it. There is no reason to

⁶²The equation is made by J. Labarbe, *Loi Navale* (above, n. 2) 180–181; M. F. Vos, *Scythian Archers in Archaic Vase-painting* (Groningen 1963) 60, 86, 88; A. M. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks* (London 1967) 98, and others.

⁶³See most recently Snodgrass (above, n. 62), W. McLeod, "The Ancient Cretan Bow," *Journal of the Society of Archer-Antiquaries* 11 (1968) 30–31, which the author kindly lent me, and W. McLeod, *Phoenix* 22 (1968) 180–181.

⁶⁴Snodgrass (above, n. 62) 81 among others is inclined to accept Pausanias' evidence.

⁶⁵Jacoby believed that the archers originated with Rhianus, *FGH Hist* IIIa 164 f. ad 265 F 38–46. Even if one does not accept in its entirety Jacoby's analysis of the sources of the Messenian history in Pausanias (a notoriously difficult problem), it is clear that much comes from Rhianus and Myron (Paus. 4.6.2 ff.), whose value for the historian is very slight; see L. Pearson, "The Pseudo-history of Messenia and its Authors," *Historia* 11 (1962) especially 410 ff. and Jacoby IIIa especially 126 f. and 165 ff. If Rhianus dated Aristomenes' exploits to the early fifth century (Jacoby IIIa 109 ff.), as is widely but not universally believed, this is still too early for Cretan archers in Messenia.

⁶⁶Van Effenterre (above, n. 59) 36 believes that the tale of Delphi's negative response to the Cretans and Ctesias' story of the archers were Cretan fictions designed to disguise their failure to aid the Greeks. And he suggests (53 f.) that Plato's comment (*Laws* 707b–c) on the Cretan belief that Salamis saved Greece mocks a Cretan belief that Crete played a role in this battle. The allusion could of course be merely a literary one: for reminiscences of Ctesias in the *Laws* see Jacoby 2067 and R. Weil, *L'Archéologie de Platon* (Paris 1959) 45 and 97.

accept the story, occurring as it does in the particularly suspect context of Xerxes' mole. Ctesias might easily have imagined that any Greek archers who fought in the Persian Wars were those archers who were so famous in his own day, a body of whom were commanded by Clearchus on the march to Cunaxa (Xen. *Anab.* 1.2.9 etc.).⁶⁷ Anachronisms are all too frequent in his history.⁶⁸ However, it is just possible that the tale is genuine oral tradition and furthermore that it is a Cretan invention. We recall that with Ctesias at the court was the Cretan dancer Zeno (F 31). Could this be his contribution?

Whatever Ctesias' sources were, and whatever Photius' methods of summarizing, there is exceedingly little in this whole account of the Wars which could be right and nothing which suggests concern for the truth or careful investigation. Instead we have all the ingredients which one associates with Ctesias—reckless army statistics, misidentified characters, simplifications, astounding confusions, chronology which is muddled, some degree of anachronism, and a certain amount of bias. Finally there is the quality which is such a marked feature of the late accounts of the Persian Wars, sensationalism, which did not begin with Ephorus. It is already present in Ctesias. Hignett's low opinion of the post-Herodotean versions is, in the case of this one, amply justified.

APPENDIX I: THE DESTRUCTION OF THE SANCTUARY AT DIDYMA

Ctesias' account of the Persian Wars ended with what is on first appearances a very puzzling story. According to Photius' summary (F 13.31) Xerxes, on his return to Asia Minor, instructed Megabyzus to sack the temple at Delphi. Megabyzus refused. In his place the eunuch Matakas was sent "to insult Apollo and to pillage everything."

Now Ctesias, as we saw above (28 f.), reported that the Persians made an attempt on Delphi prior to Xerxes' invasion of Attica. A second attempt, and one at this stage in the war, makes little sense. Xerxes was on his way to Sardis. Plataea had been fought and lost. There would have been no army left in Greece. A sack of Delphi at this point would require a major force and an entirely new expedition to Greece, but there is no hint of this in the summary.

Reuss⁶⁹ solved the problem by arguing that the sanctuary which

⁶⁷Ctesias presumably knew the composition of the Greek mercenary army. He described the recruiting campaign of Cyrus the Younger (F 16.63) and would have us believe that he had a considerable amount of contact with the imprisoned Clearchus (F 27.29 and F 28—Plut. *Art.* 18.1–4).

⁶⁸For the influence of the contemporary scene on his account of the reigns of Artaxerxes I and Cambyses see *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 19 ff.

⁶⁹"Ktesias' Bericht über die Angriffe der Perser auf Delphi," *RhM* 60 (1905) 144–148. W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* 2 (Cambridge 1948) 272, who has forgotten the sequence of events in Ctesias, is quite unjustified in his criticism of Reuss. In this passage appar-

Matakas pillaged was not Delphi, but the famous oracular sanctuary of Apollo controlled by the priestly clan of the Branchidae at Didyma in Milesian territory; Ctesias, he suggested, might have written not τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱερόν, but τὸ τοῦ Ἀπολλῶνος ἱερόν. As Reuss correctly pointed out, two versions of the fate of Didyma were current in antiquity. One is the well-known account of Herodotus which states simply and unequivocally that Didyma was pillaged and set on fire at the time of the capture of Miletus at the end of the Ionian Revolt (6.19). Callisthenes, however, gives us a different tradition. Callisthenes' Didyma must have remained unscathed in the assault on Miletus in 494 (124 F 30). The Branchidae, he tells us in his description of the Milesian ambassadors who brought oracles predicting future successes to Alexander at Memphis, betrayed the temple treasures to Xerxes and at that point Apollo deserted his shrine (124 F 142—Strabo 17.1.43).⁷⁰ Others too dealt with the catastrophe which befell Didyma in Xerxes' reign, among them Quintus Curtius (7.5.28 ff.), in a tale which perhaps derives from Cleitarchus (it was also related apparently by Diodorus—Book 17 Table of Contents κ). In this story the Branchidae after betraying the temple and its treasures to Xerxes were settled in Sogdiana. There, it is alleged, Alexander massacred their descendants.⁷¹

ently we have a mistake of Photius: cf. A. Solari, "Per la presunta fedeltà storica della *Bibliotheca* di Fozio," *Riv. di Storia Ant.* 9 (1905) 456 ff. (his other examples of Photius' alleged infidelity to the texts before him are not at all convincing). Has Photius here subconsciously substituted one shrine of Apollo for the other?

⁷⁰The oracles brought to Alexander (they could have been invented after the events) are presumably a fiction of Callisthenes, although W. Günther, *Das Orakel von Didyma im hellenistischen Zeit* (Tübingen 1971) 21 and H. Bellen, "Der Rachgedanke in der griechisch-persischen Auseinandersetzung," *Chiron* 4 (1974) 64 believe in them. K. Tuchelt, *Vorarbeiten zu einer Topographie von Didyma* (Tübingen 1973) 100 ff. and W. Voigtlander, "Quellhaus und Naiskos im Didymaion nach den Perserkriegen," *IstMitt* 22 (1972) 93–112 discuss what is known of Didyma in the 5th and 4th centuries. The latter (95 f.) doubts the complete silence of the oracle after the destruction.

⁷¹The treachery of the Branchidae is dated explicitly to the period of Xerxes' return from Greece by Q. Curtius and by Strabo 14.1.5 (who also mentions that Xerxes fired "the other temples except that at Ephesus"). For the story cf. also Strabo 11.11.4; Plut. *Mor.* 557b; Suidas s.v. Branchidae. The tale must have involved the firing of the sanctuary, although this is stated specifically only by Strabo 14.1.5. Pausanias' version of the events (8.46.3: cf. 1.16.3) is somewhat different. Here Xerxes removes the statue of Apollo from Didyma to punish the Milesians for their cowardice at Salamis; on these particular fictions and the supposed restoration of the statue by Seleucus see M. Moggi, "I furti di statue attribuite a Serse," *AnnPisa* 3.3 (1973) 1 ff.

Alexander's alleged massacre is discussed briefly by L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (New York 1960) 240, who believes that Cleitarchus related the story, but is appropriately cautious about accepting Tarn's argument (above, n. 69) 272 ff. that it was an invention of Callisthenes. The tale is usually and rightly deemed a fiction, although it has been defended recently by A. K. Narain, *The Indo-Greeks* (Oxford 1962) 3; F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, *Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum* (Berlin 1970) 158 ff., and H. Bellen (above, n. 70) 63 ff.

Ctesias' history (and his book on India) was an influential work and it must have been well known to a number of the historians of Alexander.⁷² There can be little doubt that the dating of the destruction of Didyma to Xerxes' reign originated with Ctesias and that our passage describes the sack of this shrine.⁷³

Once more, then, Ctesias has flatly contradicted Herodotus, and, since it is improbable that the sanctuary was sacked twice, one of the dates must be wrong. Most modern scholars prefer Herodotus' version. Some infelicitously combine the two accounts.⁷⁴ Reuss, believing that a historian who had spent so much time at the Persian court must have known the facts, suggests that Ctesias must be right.

One piece of evidence favours Herodotus. A massive bronze knuckle-bone found on the Acropolis at Susa, with the archaic Greek inscription which proclaims it a dedication to Apollo,⁷⁵ lends some confirmation to Herodotus' story of the Milesians deported first to Susa and then to Ampe on the Persian Gulf (6.20). But strictly speaking it does not prove that he is correct over the date of the destruction of the sanctuary, and his account is not entirely free from difficulty. The description of the disaster which befell Miletus (6.19–20) is clearly exaggerated. The city was not totally depopulated as stated in 6.22, at least for long. According to Herodotus himself Milesians played a role at Mycale (9.104) and one can infer from his account that they were quite numerous.⁷⁶

However, Ctesias' story is much more difficult to accept. We may note Megabyzus' virtuous refusal to have anything to do with the atrocity. Megabyzus was a particular hero of the historian. This tale, like others in the history, has a pro-Megabyzus slant.⁷⁷ Nothing is known about Mata-

⁷²See Jacoby 2069 f. and S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* 2.1 (Bari 1966) 14 ff.

⁷³It is possible that Ctesias provided later historians with details about the treachery of the Branchidae and the settling of them in the East.

⁷⁴Günther (above, n. 70) 19 f., K. Tuchelt, *Die archaischen Skulpturen von Didyma* (Berlin 1970) 131, and Moggi (above, n. 71) 32 ff. have most recently argued for 494. G. Gruben, "Das archaische Didymaion," *JDArchInst* 78 (1963) 177 and W. Zchietzchmann, "Didyma," *Der Kleine Pauly* 2 (1967) 11 do not decide. W. Hahland, "Didyma im 5 Jahrhundert v. chr.," *JDArchInst* 79 (1964) 142 f., Altheim and Stiehl (above, n. 71) 158 ff., and Bellen (above, n. 70) 63 ff. combine the two traditions without noticing all the difficulties.

⁷⁵It is dated to the sixth century and was first published by B. Hausoullier, "Offrande à Apollo Didyméen," *Mém. Délégation franç. en Perse* 7 (1905) 155 ff. For bibliography see Günther (above, n. 70) 19.

⁷⁶According to Hdt. 6.22 some Milesians went to Sicily with the Samians. Others may have fled before the final Persian assault and returned soon after. There is no break in the Hellenistic list of Stephanephoroi, Milesian priestly officials, which begins in 525/4 and continues without interruption to 260/59 (*Milet* 1.3 [Berlin 1914] no. 122, ed. A. Rehm).

⁷⁷On the prominent role accorded in the history to Megabyzus and to members of his family and on the apparent pro-Megabyzus slant of the account of the Egyptian ex-

kas, the actual perpetrator of the sacrilege. Even the correct form of his name is uncertain.⁷⁸ But that a eunuch should be charged with the mission is at least an oddity. Moreover, the very contradiction of Herodotus' chronology, although not in itself conclusive, raises doubts.⁷⁹ All in all, Herodotus' account cannot be rejected in favour of Ctesias' version. A sack of Didyma just before Mycale, which would surely alienate Xerxes' Ionian forces, is unthinkable. That the sanctuary should be deliberately destroyed just after Mycale has nothing to recommend it. It makes very good sense, given Miletus' role in the Ionian Revolt, to date the catastrophe to 494.

APPENDIX II: THE HERACLEIUM NEAR SALAMIS

Several of our literary sources allude to a shrine of Heracles, located somewhere on that part of the coast of Attica which faces Salamis, a detail which is not mentioned in Herodotus' account.⁸⁰ There is no reason to doubt the existence of this sanctuary. Shrines of Heracles were very common in Attica,⁸¹ and, if Diodorus (11.18.2) and Aristodemus (104 F 1.1.2) are deemed to be unsatisfactory witnesses, the testimony of a third authority, the Atthidographer Phanodemus (325 F 24—Plut. *Them.* 13),

pedition see *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 15 f. and 19. In the present passage Megabyzus seems to have been depicted as a phil-Hellene; cf. the later narrative—he begs the king for the safety of Inarus and the Greeks captured in Egypt (F 14.38); their fate is the cause of his revolt and he secretly sends some Greeks who survived to Syria (F 14.40). As is well known, his son Zopyrus took refuge in Athens (F 14.45 and Hdt. 3.160), perhaps shortly before 430 (R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* [Oxford 1972] 436 f.). Photius at this point mentions the good services of Megabyzus' wife to the Athenians (a reference to those captured in Egypt?).

⁷⁸In F 13.24 the most powerful of the eunuchs is Natakas. J. Gilmore, *The Fragments of the Persika of Ctesias* (London 1888) 153, suggested Mordecai (*Esther* 10.3), but this is clutching at straws. Gottlieb (above, n. 4) 110 thinks that Natakas and Arnakes (above, 31) might be the same man, but he does not comment on the fact that Arnakes was a captive in Greek hands.

⁷⁹Herodotus' dating might have been altered to make the events fit Megabyzus' career, or because such barbarity was felt to befit Xerxes rather than Darius. But we do not have nearly enough of Ctesias' history for satisfactory theorizing about the origin of the story. If Ctesias is behind the later tradition of the settlement of the Branchidae in Sogdiana, the tale of Alexander's alleged massacre (above, n. 71) has even weaker foundations than is usually supposed.

⁸⁰J. Keil, "Die Schlacht bei Salamis," *Hermes* 73 (1938) 340 suggests not very plausibly that the troublesome τῇν Κέον of Hdt. 8.76 might conceal τὸ Ἡράκλειον.

⁸¹They are listed by S. Woodford, "Cults of Heracles in Attica," in *Studies presented to G. M. A. Hanfmann* (Mainz 1971) 211–225. Most but not all of them have a secure location. For some information about those which were in the city see J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (New York 1971) 274 and 278 etc.

a man deeply interested in questions of cult, deserves to be taken seriously.

It is assumed by those who discuss this Heracleium that Ctesias also mentioned the shrine, and possibly he did, although this is not absolutely certain. The relevant words of Photius' summary are—Ξέρξης . . . ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ στενότατον τῆς Ἀττικῆς (Ἡράκλειον καλεῖται) . . . F 13.30, i.e., "Xerxes came to the narrowest part of Attica, which is called Heracleium." If Photius gives us (and this is not completely impossible) a literal rendering of what Ctesias reported, Ctesias' account was little other than non-sensical. But an alternative explanation is perhaps preferable. "The narrowest part of Attica" might be Photius' misleadingly abbreviated version of "the narrowest part of the channel which separates Salamis and Attica" and Photius might have incorrectly understood Heracleium to be the name of the area, not a shrine.⁸²

If we accept that Ctesias alluded to the shrine, one of his innovations in the account of Salamis (was it perhaps derived from Hellanicus?) is correct. However, we do not know where Ctesias located the sanctuary, if indeed he gave it a precise location.

Nor, despite Hammond's confident assertion (256), is the site known.⁸³ Our literary sources are hopelessly vague. Diodorus (11.18.2) merely tells us that it was somewhere near the strait between Attica and Salamis. Phanodemus (325 F 24) has a similar report, although he adds that it was below Xerxes' seat, wherever he conceived that to be.⁸⁴ Aristodemus (104 F 1.1.2) put the shrine in the vicinity of Xerxes' alleged mole and also (as makes no sense) of Mt. Parnes.

⁸²It is of course also possible that Ctesias applied the name both to the shrine and to the area and that Photius reports only the latter. That Heracleium was a name for the area seems unlikely, although Keil (above, n. 80) 340 and others, on the basis of this passage of Photius, have thought so.

⁸³This is the conclusion of W. K. Pritchett, "Towards a Restudy of the Battle of Salamis," *AJA* 63 (1959) 261, and much earlier of A. Milchhöfer, *Karten von Attika* 7 (Berlin 1895) 30.

⁸⁴Its location varies—high up commanding a view of the battle according to Aesch. *Pers.* 466/7; below Mt. Aegaleos in Hdt. 8.90; Mt. Parnes in Aristodemus' version (104 F 1.1.2); and west of Eleusis above the Kerata on the borders of Attica and Megara in Acestorodorus (Plut. *Them.* 13). Modern scholars sometimes suggest the Pyrgos hill (or Keratopyrgos) just west of Keratsini Bay, most recently P. W. Wallace, "Psyttaleia and the Trophies of the Battle of Salamis," *AJA* 73 (1969) 299 n. 30, who gives no reasons. He has perhaps been influenced by the hypothesis that part of Aegaleos near Keratsini Bay bore the name Kerata in antiquity and that Acestorodorus confused this with the famous Kerata, a tenuous theory, rejected by Milchhöfer, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 83). In any case clearly the ancient descriptions do not give us one location for Xerxes (F. J. Frost, "A Note on Xerxes at Salamis," *Historia* 22 [1973] 118–119, has in fact suggested that Xerxes might not have been confined to one location, although it is doubtful whether our literary authorities would have agreed with him). And clearly they do not provide solid evidence for the site of the Heracleium.

One of the locations favoured by scholars, the one near or at Perama, is based solely on these very unsatisfactory ancient descriptions. Hammond (256) and others have noted the connection in some accounts between Xerxes' mole and the shrine. However, the testimony which links the two is merely what Ctesias is assumed to have said and the report of that sorry compiler Aristodemus.⁸⁵ This is hardly persuasive evidence.

A different location was proposed by W. M. Leake, who equated the Heracleium near Salamis with the sanctuary of Heracles Tetracomus (Steph. Byz., s.v. 'Εχελίδαι), a shrine common to the demes Thymaetadae, Piraeus, Phalerum, and Xypete, which he identified with the foundations of a temple and other remains near the Church of Hagios Georgios at Keratsini Bay in the territory of the deme Thymaetadae.⁸⁶ The temple-foundations were not visible to Milchhöfer, although he reported traces of an ancient site,⁸⁷ and there is no further evidence which confirms this location.

Neither of the proposed sites is satisfactory. The shrine could have been anywhere along the coast of Attica which faces Salamis. There is no other evidence for it.

VICTORIA COLLEGE, TORONTO

⁸⁵For Jacoby's assessment see *FGrHist* II C 320. Strabo's description of the area (9.1.13-14) has no reference to the shrine.

⁸⁶*The Demi of Attica*, Vol. 2 of *The Topography of Athens*² (London 1841) 33 f. This location was accepted by W. W. Goodwin, "The Battle of Salamis," *HSCP* 17 (1906) 95 f., although in his earlier discussion, "The Battle of Salamis," *Papers of the American School of Class. Stud. at Athens* 1 (1882-83) 255 ff., he argued for the Perama location. There is of course nothing which compels us to equate the Heracleium near Salamis with the shrine of Heracles Tetracomus. The latter has now been securely identified by inscriptional evidence. It lay in the present-day quarter of Vary-Kaminia, part of Piraeus (E. Meyer, "Xypete," *RE* 9A [1967] 2179).

⁸⁷*Karten von Attika* 2 (Berlin 1881) 10. I am very grateful to Professor J. R. Grant for criticising an earlier draft of this article.