The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Massacre of the Branchidae

W. W. Tarn

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 3-4 / May 1922, pp 63 - 66

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00016103, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00016103

How to cite this article:

W. W. Tarn (1922). The Massacre of the Branchidae. The Classical Review, 36, pp 63-66
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00016103

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

κατεργάσασθαι αὐτήν. Terminations are incessantly confused in the MSS. of this treatise (e.g. αὐτῆς for ἑαυτοῦ, xiii. 4). If τούτῳ might be expected, see c. ii. 2 μηδεὶς αὐτὰ φαῦλα νομισάτω εἶναι, v. 8 ὑπὸ παντί, ἐπ' αὐτῶν, ἐν αὐτοῖς, παρ' αὐτά, and vi. 1 οὐ γὰρ καλῶς τηροῦσι τὰς κύνας οἱ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἰργασμένοι τὰ δέραια, where αὐτῶν has been suspected unnecessarily. The incessant use of αὐτός amounts to a mannerism in the author.

C. xiii. 5 ὃν δὲ δεόνται εἰς ἀρετὴν οἱ καλῶς πεπαιδευμένοι ὀρθῶς ἐγνωσμένα ζητῶ λέγειν. A better emendation of πεπαιδευμένοι than those suggested by Richards would be πεπαιδευσόμενοι. The perfect cannot be right.

C. xiii. 10 μὴ ζηλοῦν δὲ μηδὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ πλεονεξίας εἰκὴ ἰόντας, μήτ' ἐπὶ τὰς ἰδιὰς μήτ' ἐπὶ τὰς δημοσίας, ἐνθυμηθέντα ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἄριστοι αὐτῶν γινώσκονται μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ βελτίω ἐπίπνουι τέ (read δέ' with Kaibel) εἰσιν, οἱ δὲ κακοὶ πάσχουσι τε κακῶς καὶ γινώσκονται ἐπὶ τὰ χεῖρω. A much discussed passage. The sequel shows that πλεονεξίαι δημόσιαι does not mean 'advantages for the state,' as Richards thought; cf. especially ἀφαιρούμενοι τὰ τῆς πόλεως in § 11. I do not think that we must seek the clue to οἱ ἄριστοι and οἱ κακοὶ in xii. 9 and 15. By οἱ ἄριστοι the best of the self-seekers in business and politics are meant. But I feel pretty sure ἐπίπνουι is an error for ἐπίφθοι, due, in part at least, to § 15 μαθήσεις καὶ μελέτας ἐπιπόνους and διὰ τὸ ἐπίπνον. In the

following section, εἰς τὰς κοινὰς σωτηρίας ἀνωφλέστεροί εἰσι, Kaibel proposed τὰ τῆς κοινῆς, but we need not scruple to read τὴν κοινὴν σωτηρίαν.

C. xiii. 16 φωνὴν δὲ οἱ μὲν εὐεπῇ ἰᾶσιν, οἱ δ' αἰσχροῖν, πρὸς δὲ τὰ θεῖα τοῖς μὲν οὐδὲν ἐμποδὼν ἀσεβεῖν, οἱ δ' εὐσεβεῖσται. Hartman says: 'Quivis alius scriptor sic scripsisset: ὥσπερ φωνὴν οἱ μὲν εὐεπῇ ἰᾶσιν, οἱ δὲ αἰσχροῖν, eaque verba post εὐσεβεῖσται posuisset.' This is not so. In § 15 the writer has mentioned three points in which the practice of hunting contrasts favourably with the pursuit of politics. In § 16 he enumerates three good qualities that distinguish the daily life and conduct of the hunter: freedom from malice and avarice, courtesy and kindness in conversation, and piety. As Sturz says εὐεπῆς might mean 'pulchra et bona' or 'grata et bona.' The latter is certainly the meaning here. The language of a gentleman, not the language of an Isocrates. The αἰσχρὰ φωνή is the reckless language of the politician—νῦν μοι θράσος καὶ γλῶτταν εὖστομον δότε | φωνὴν τ' ἀναιδῆ. The language of the hunting-field is not without its influence on the life and conversation of the hunter, who goes out in silence, pays his vows to the deities of the chase, and says nothing that is not kindly and pleasant.¹ E. C. MARCHANT.

¹ In vi. 17 ἰὼ κύνες, ἰὼ κακός, etc., A omits ἰὼ κακός. Lenz's ἰὼ κακῶς is not right: we must read either ἰὼ κύνες again with Dindorf, or ἰὼ καλῶς.

THE MASSACRE OF THE BRANCHIDAE.

THIS story, which is of considerable importance for Alexander's character, is given by Curtius 7, 5, 28; Strabo 11, 518, and 14, 634; Plutarch, *de ser. num. vind.* 557B; and came in the lost part of Diodorus, book 17 (table of contents). Though many have believed it, it is quite certainly untrue.

Curtius (the fullest version) says that Xerxes, on his return from Greece, had settled the Branchidae in Bactria, because to please him they had violated (*violaverant*) the Didymeion (Strabo says, had betrayed the temple treasure); they greeted Alexander with joy; he

summoned the Milesians in his army, and bade them pass judgment on the Branchidae for their *treachery*, but they could not agree; so he massacred the whole population.—Now the temple and oracle of Didyma had been sacked and burnt to the ground by the Persians in the Ionian revolt, after the capture of Miletus,¹ and therefore in Xerxes' day there were neither priests nor temple nor treasure—i.e., the whole of the presupposition on which Curtius'

¹ Herod. 6, 19; ἱeron δὲ τὸ ἐν Διδύμοισι, ὃ νηὶς τε καὶ τὸ χρηστήριον, συληθέντα ἐνεπίμπρατο.

story rests is simply untrue. It was once the fashion to 'reconcile' Herodotus and Strabo-Curtius;¹ but you cannot 'reconcile' good early and bad late evidence when they flatly contradict each other, and Herodotus cannot well be wrong about such a simple event near his own city. Didyma lay waste till the Milesians began to rebuild it, some time after 334; it was anyhow building *circa* 306-293.² —Xerxes was never at Didyma at all; Herodotus says that he returned from Greece by the Hellespont to Sardis, passed the winter there in an intrigue with Masistes' wife, and in pursuance of the same intrigue returned straight from Sardis to Susa.—There was no Milesian contingent in Alexander's army in Bactria. Probably there never had been one, for no contingents from the Greek towns of Asia are known, and doubtless (like Chios) they supplied ships, as they had done for Persia; but in any case Alexander had sent all his Greek allies home from Ecbatana. The judgment of the Milesians was probably copied from that of the Boeotians at Thebes.—The supposed Branchidae settlement made by Xerxes in Bactria (really Sogdiana according to Curtius' itinerary, but it was the Bactrian *satrapy*) is merely a confusion of two real settlements made by Darius; Herod. 4, 204, he settles the captive Barcaeans in Bactria, and 6, 20 he settles the captive Milesians at Ampe, at the mouth of the Tigris. Note that Alexander never meets with any of the real settlements made by Darius; presumably they had become merged in the native population.

The internal evidence, then, disposes of the story quite conclusively. It is a peculiarly naïve and clumsy fabrication.

The external evidence is no less conclusive. The most important matter

here is the silence of Ptolemy and Aristobulus; and unfortunately many writers have adopted Grote's extraordinary contention that the silence of these two does not 'impeach the credibility of the narrative' (XII. 26, n. 1), because they merely wished to save Alexander's reputation. Grote really constructs a critical canon to the following effect (see XI. 364, n. 2): whatever is not in Ptolemy is true, provided it be damaging to Alexander. Before coming to Ptolemy's real attitude, I may notice the other cases where he (Ptolemy) passes over an alleged 'atrocities.' One is the torture of Batis at Gaza (Curt. 4, 6, 29). This can be traced; it is from Hegesias (fr. 3), a sufficient guarantee that it is a rhetorical invention designed to parallel the Achilles story. The other is the crucifixion of Arimazes, Oxyartes' supposed commander on the Sogdian rock, after his surrender (Curt. 7, 11, 28; Curtius has the story of the siege hopelessly misplaced and confused). This is certainly untrue, though the source cannot be traced.³ For the result of this atrocity is supposed to have been that Oxyartes came in himself and proceeded to procure the surrender of Chorienes by persuading him of Alexander's justice and good faith (Arr. 4, 21, 7); even in Curtius Oxyartes persuades Sysimithres (Chorienes) by parading Alexander's *fides* (8, 2, 27), for Curtius had not even the wit to see that his two statements are mutually exclusive. It was the fashion of his time to discredit Alexander; anything did.

Somewhat different is Arr. 1, 8, 1, with which Grote (XI. 264, n. 1) made great play; even Niese, generally sensible, has followed him (1, 57, n. 2). Ptolemy says Perdikkas attacked Thebes without orders; this is supposed to be Ptolemy trying to save Alexander's reputation again by representing that he did not wish to storm Thebes. (Why he should not storm Thebes, if

¹ References in F. Cauer, *Branchidae* in Pauly-Wissowa.

² See generally B. Haussoullier, *Études sur l'Histoire de Milet et du Didymeion* (1902); and notes to *O.G.I.S.* 472. It was waste in 332/1; Callisthenes ap. Strabo. 17, 814. Haussoullier suggests that Callisthenes' story of the spring gushing forth again means that the Milesians had already begun to clear the site. But see *post*.

³ To Arrian, Arimazes is unknown; while Diodorus is lost. But Polyæn. 4, 3, 29, which differs considerably from Curtius' version of the siege, probably represents the Cleitarchean tradition; it knows nothing of the supposed crucifixion.

at war with her, is not explained.) Unfortunately the vulgate also represents that Alexander would have spared Thebes if he could;¹ and he also desired to spare Halicarnassus (Arr. 1, 22, 7). The attack on Thebes agrees with Perdiccas' headstrong character, and is no doubt true; but the point is, that the matter is not one which can possibly affect Alexander's reputation one way or the other; that is a question, not of the taking of Thebes, but of the subsequent destruction of the city.

Now, what was Ptolemy's real attitude in the matter of saving Alexander's reputation? (I am not concerned with Aristobulus, who is hardly in the same class.) It is quite simple. He never does try to save Alexander's reputation. He probably would hardly have understood what the phrase meant. He belonged, not to the nineteenth century A.D., but to the Macedonia of the fourth century B.C., to a place and a time in which you could not be a king in kid gloves. Kings as he knew them had to do certain things; and if Alexander did the sort of things that he, Ptolemy, afterwards did himself, he probably thought it very natural, and certainly related it quite simply; his great merit is, that he does not garble his facts. Four instances of this may suffice here. He gives the death of Parmenion as simple murder; while the vulgate knows of a treasonable letter of Parmenion's (Curt. 6, 9, 13), and says that the army condemned him (Diod. 17, 80, 1). He alone relates that Alexander tortured Callisthenes and put him to death, as against the legend (Chares, Aristobulus) that he died in prison. He relates that Alexander scourged, pilloried, and mutilated Bessus (precisely as Darius I. had treated *his* rebels); while in the vulgate Bessus is handed over to Darius' relatives for torture (Diod. 17, 83, 9; Just. 12, 5, 11) or simply put to death (Curt. 7, 10, 10). Above all, he not only gives quite frankly, with the vulgate, the Massaga massacre, but adds (as the vulgate does not) the unsatisfactory official explanation (prob-

ably from the Ephemerides), an explanation which, by the addition of a couple of words, he could have made perfectly good, according to the standard of the time; he had only to say, as he does *not* say, that the Indian mercenaries had taken the oath to Alexander.

If historical criticism has any meaning, Ptolemy's silence about the Branchidae massacre would be conclusive, even if the internal evidence were not.

It remains to ask how such a baseless story arose.

It will be noticed that in Strabo the Branchidae *betray* the temple treasure, while Curtius has joined the betrayal story to another version in which they *sack* the temple themselves (*violaverant*). Where the betrayal version comes from is unknown; it is sufficiently foolish, for had there been a temple and had Xerxes been there he needed no 'betrayal'; his guards had only to walk in and take. The other story comes from Callisthenes, who relates (Strabo 17, 814) that Apollo deserted the place because in Xerxes' time the Branchidae medised and sacked the temple. Further back than Callisthenes it cannot be traced; but whether he invented it himself or not is immaterial, for as we have seen it is untrue (Herod. 6, 19). But the oracle which Callisthenes based on this untrue story (Strabo *ib.*) is untrue also; this is shown, not by Strabo's (? Eratosthenes') comments, but by the fact that the oracle 'fore-told' the battle of 'Arbela' and the death of Darius, *i.e.* it was composed by Callisthenes himself after 330. The whole of Callisthenes' story about Didyma, the point of which is that the deserted oracle had in 332/1 hailed Alexander as son of Zeus, is then simply an invention; and it was from this invention that there arose the story of the massacre of the Branchidae.

How it arose is quite obvious, and can be seen from the story of the massacre as given in Curtius. The Branchidae had wronged Apollo, and Apollo had done Alexander a good turn (so far Callisthenes); clearly therefore Alexander must do something for Apollo, and what better than to avenge him on the Branchidae. Who it was who took this up and actually invented

¹ Just. 11, 3, 6, 'eadem indulgentia usurus,' etc., which is certainly not Ptolemy.

the massacre, whether Cleitarchus, Hegesias, or another, is as immaterial as it would be to enquire whether it was Onesicritus or somebody else who actually invented the equally baseless Queen of the Amazons story. Certainly the inventor of the massacre knew little of the relevant facts. For the *motif* of the story, as often noticed, is Alexander's piety towards Apollo of Didyma; and unfortunately in actual fact Alexander had no piety towards Apollo of Didyma at all. Didyma was not among the temples which, it was alleged, he was going to rebuild when he died (Diod. 18, 4, 5); he had passed the deserted site without notice, though he had found time to plan a temple to Zeus at Sardis (Arr. 1, 17, 5); and though he sent back to Athens the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, he did not send back to Miletus the bronze temple statute carried off from Didyma by Darius; it was left to Seleucus, whom legend made Apollo's son, to restore the statue¹ and favour the rebuilding. That Alexander should think nothing of Didyma was natural enough, seeing its very small importance till after his time.² Sogdiana was of course the natural place to locate the massacre, as appears again in Theoplylact's story

of Alexander burning 120,000 Sogdians alive; for Darius *had* settled Greeks on the Oxus, and Alexander *had* treated the revolted Sogdian fortresses, Cyropolis, etc., with unusual severity. One thing about the massacre story can be said with fair certainty. Justin's silence shows that it formed no part of the anti-Alexander tradition common to Trogus and Curtius; and there can therefore be little doubt that, as E. Meyer has suggested,³ the inventor of the story thought that he was glorifying Alexander, just as Hegesias thought that his story of the torture of Batis made Alexander a second Achilles. This relieves Callisthenes of the odium of the invention. True, we do not know exactly where his history ceased, and he was not put to death till early in 327; but after the proskynesis affair he became Alexander's enemy, and we may safely ascribe the massacre story to some writer of a subsequent generation. This is the more certain because the same writer (Diod. 17, 110, 4) relates that Alexander in 324—*i.e.*, long after Callisthenes' death—encountered in Kelonai a similar bilingual community, Boeotians this time, of course also settled by Xerxes.

W. W. TARN.

¹ Paus. 1, 16, 3; cf. *O.G.I.S.* 213, 214.

² Wilamowitz, *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1914, p. 72.

³ *Kleine Schriften* (1910), p. 286, n. 1.

A NEW FRAGMENT OF THEOPHRASTUS.

IN a papyrus (*Pap.* 2242, 24.5 × 11 cm.) recently presented to the British Museum by Professor F. W. Kelsey, of Michigan, is preserved a fragment relating to the natural history of the dog, and apparently belonging to the lost work of Theophrastus, *περὶ ζῴων*. Reasons for this ascription are given below in the notes. The correspondence with Aristotle's *H. A.* VI. 20 is in many places almost verbal, and one statement (see l. 17) seems to be the result of too brief a compression of Aristotle's words. Theophrastus was regarded by antiquity as second only to Aristotle in authority. Aelian, for example, quotes them by name in the proportion of fifteen times to forty-nine in

his *Natural History*, and also borrows on occasion without acknowledgments (see ll. 20, 27). Theophrastus has been already represented in papyri, *P. Oxy.* 699 giving a scrap from the *Characters* and *P. Hib.* 16 fragments attributed by Blass to the *περὶ ὕδατος*.

Palaeographically the papyrus is interesting from its resemblance to the script of the famous *Bacchylides MS.*, especially in the small *o*, the narrow *ε* and *σ*, the broad and shallow *μ* and the *τ* with long cross stroke to the left. The documents which accompanied the papyrus and belonged presumably to the same find ranged in date from the end of Augustus to the second half of Claudius, and derived chiefly from the