

To Sogdiana and back: Demodamas, the Branchidae, and Apollo Didymeus

Marc Mendoza

ABSTRACT

The massacre of the Branchidae in Sogdiana still stands as one of the most controversial milestones of Alexander's career. Modern assessments of this event have been highly polarized, but how was it perceived both by contemporary writers and the citizens of Miletus, the Branchidae's homeland? Demodamas, as a writer and as a Milesian, gathers both aspects. Barely known through some inscriptions from Miletus and scattered fragments of his work, Demodamas is attested as a Seleucid officer in Central Asia – erecting an altar to Apollo Didymeus – and India, and he could have participated in Alexander's expedition. It is plausible that he wrote his own version of the massacre and, therefore, he could be regarded as one of the earliest sources about the episode. This paper, first, aims to clarify if his version could be the origin of the extant traditions. Besides this, it seeks to address how the writer's background could have shaped his version, and the place this story took in the history of Miletus and its somehow thorny dealings with Alexander. To sum up, this paper will assess how Demodamas could have conveyed this episode that happened in faraway Sogdiana and how it was incorporated into the Milesian collective memory.

KEY WORDS

Demodamas; Branchidae; Sogdiana; Miletus; Alexander.

INTRODUCTION

The authenticity of the episode of Alexander and the Branchidae has been widely discussed by scholars (e.g., RAWLINSON 1912, 41; TARN 1922; TARN 1948, 272–275; PEARSON 1955, 240, n. 121; PARKE 1985; BOSWORTH 1988, 108–109; FONTENROSE 1988, 12–13; HOLT 1989, 75; KULESZA 1994, 245–246; HAMMOND 1998; FLOWER 2000, 117–118; PANCHENKO 2002; SIERRA 2013; KUBICA 2016, 146–148). The sole detailed, extant version comes from Curtius (VII, 5.28–35); besides this, only some sparse passages from Callisthenes (*FGrHist* 124F 14 *apud* Strabo XVII, 1.43), Strabo (XI, 11.4, XIV, 1.5), Plutarch (*Mor.*, 557b; cf. PARKE 1985b, 65), and Aelian (F 57 Domingo-Forasté *apud* Suda s.v. Βραγχίδαι) have been preserved.¹ The story is well known: Alexander arrived in a town in Sogdiana where the Milesian Branchidae had been dwelling since the Persian Wars. The king delegated the question of what to do with them to the Milesians in the army, but after assessing their disagreement, he took the reins of the situation and decided to kill all the Branchidae.

1 Diodorus also wrote about this episode according to Book XVII's table of contents: 'How the Branchidae, who of old had been settled by the Persians on the borders of their kingdom, were slain by Alexander as traitors to the Greeks' (WELLES 1963, transl.). Unfortunately, this passage is lost, affected by this book's great central *lacuna*. On Arrian/Ptolemy's silence, see PARKE 1985b, 65; PANCHENKO 2002, 245.

The aim of this paper is not to present a detailed discussion about its historicity. After assessing the different aspects of this episode elsewhere (MENDOZA 2019, 71–78; cf. MENDOZA 2016, 90–91 n. 109, 113–115), I think there are no inherent reasons to dismiss it outright. Certainly, some doubts can be cast on certain details, but the core information can be regarded as historical. From the aforementioned passages, it can be deduced that the episode had a more or less widespread circulation in Antiquity. We know that Callisthenes wrote about it, but, besides him, we are ignorant of which other primary authors would have recounted this story. Some historians, like Aristobulus or the ubiquitous Cleitarchus (e.g., TARN 1922; TARN 1948, 272–275; BROWN 1978; HAMMOND 1980, 298, n. 131; HAMMOND 1983, 141–142, 193; PRANDI 1985, 83–87, 95, 107–108; ATKINSON – GARGIULO 2000, 466), have been posited, but there is no compelling argument to unquestionably accept any of them. Curiously enough, an especially close source – both chronologically and geographically – has not been taken into consideration so far: Demodamas of Miletus. Could his account be one of the original sources used by some of the extant versions?

DEMODAMAS OF MILETUS

We have some sparse, but interesting information about Demodamas' life and career. There are clear indications that he would have been in Central Asia and India. He took part in an expedition – or, maybe, several – there, and he erected altars to Apollo Didymus by the river Jaxartes (Pliny *NH* vi, 16(18).49; Solinus 49.5; Martianus Capella vi, 692).² There has been some discussion about the date of that or those expeditions: right before Seleucus' Indian campaign (ca. 306 BC) or during the joint rule of Seleucus and his son Antiochus, when the latter was ruling the easternmost satrapies (293–281 BC).³ He wrote a book containing, at least, some geographical information about Indian towns (Stephanus Byzantinus s.v. Ἀντισσα; *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae* III/1, 268, ll. 19–20). This fragment about India might suggest that Demodamas took part in Seleucus' campaign against Chandragupta too. Therefore, the higher chronology looks more plausible to me, but it does not exclude other expeditions in Central Asia later on. Therefore, his participation in several campaigns in the region is not unlikely – he might have even been temporarily appointed there. This book probably was a military memoir of sorts, containing miscellaneous information about the places he visited as well; he wrote about his own erection of the altars.⁴ He also authored, at least, a book about Halicarnassus (Athenaeus xv, 682e).⁵ Some ancient writers underlined his reliability,⁶ and it has been sug-

2 Robert (1984, 468) conclusively proved that Solinus relied on Pliny for this passage. The accounts are coinciding.

3 Despite their preferred option, nowadays, most scholars have not excluded the possibility of multiple campaigns, especially after ROBERT 1984. See BICKERMAN 1938, 73; GRAINGER 1990, 154; SHERWIN-WHITE – KUHRT 1993, 19, 26; SAVALLI-LESTRADE 1998, 4–5, n° 3; NAWOTKA 2008, 147; NAWOTKA 2019, 272; RAMSEY 2016, 89–90; BEARZOT 2017, 144. Defending only Antiochus' dating, see HAUSSOULIER 1900, 36, 48–49; TARN 1940, 92–94; WOLSKI 1984, 13; KOSMIN 2014, 61–67.

4 Pliny (*NH* vi, 16(18).49) explicitly states that Demodamas was the main source for his description of Central Asia (*quem maxime sequimur in his*), where the passage about the altars is found.

5 This work aroused some confusion among both ancient and modern authors about where he was actually born. Nevertheless, his extensive epigraphical evidence in Miletus (see below) and his exclusion of a list of noteworthy Halicarnassian authors (ISAGER 1998) clearly point to a Milesian origin. See ROBERT 1984, 467–468; ZECCHINI 1999, 60; BEARZOT 2017, 145–146.

6 Solinus (49.5) labelled him as *'satis idoneus vero auctor'*.

gested that he might have been a source for later authors like Pliny, Eratosthenes, Diodorus, or Duris, among others.⁷

Besides the textual information, Demodamas is also attested in some inscriptions from his hometown, which portray him as a distinguished member of Miletus' civic community and show his close connections with the Seleucids, especially with Sogdian Apama (*Didyma* 479–481).⁸ He was one of Seleucus' *philoï* (BEARZOT 1984, 66–67; BEARZOT 2017, 144; PARKE 1985a, 47–48; SAVALLI-LESTRADE 1998, 4–5, n° 3), although we do not know when Demodamas first met him. A date between 316 and 312, when Seleucus patrolled the Ionian coast with the Ptolemaic fleet, has been suggested (SEIBERT 1974, 200–204; BEARZOT 1984, 67, 69; BEARZOT 2017, 144, 149; PARKE 1985a, 45–46; LANDUCCI GATTINONI 2013, 42, n. 37),⁹ but it is merely hypothetical.

These epigraphical documents clearly prove that Demodamas played a key role in earning Seleucid patronage for the reconstruction of Didyma (SHERWIN-WHITE – KUHRT 1993, 25–27; NAWOTKA 2008, 146–149).¹⁰ Therefore, Demodamas is someone who would have had first-hand information about the new shrine and, undoubtedly, he would have praised its magnificence in the way Strabo's passage reflects (see below). Archaeological work, however, revealed no clear traces of the new buildings until 300 BC (PARKE 1985a, 48–52, 1986, 125; NAWOTKA 2008, 148, n. 44; NAWOTKA 2010, 157; NAWOTKA 2019, 273).

The second inscription (*Didyma* 480) is especially interesting because it could bear some references to Demodamas' easternmost deeds. Apama was not only honoured as Didyma's benefactor but also for her support to the Milesians who had fought in Seleucus' army (RAMSEY 2016, 89–90, 94). Therefore, having in mind Apama's Central Asian origin and Demodamas' exploits in Central Asia, it is not far-fetched to regard Seleucus' *anabasis* (ca. 306) as the occasion during which she would have displayed her goodwill towards the Milesian soldiers (ROBERT 1984, 472 – following Rehm; NAWOTKA 2008, 146–147).¹¹

7 See BEARZOT 1984, 62, 79–80 (Duris/Diodorus; cf. TORELLI 1985, 226); BEARZOT 2017, 144–145 (Eratosthenes and Pliny); WOLSKI 1984, 13 (Pliny); LANDUCCI GATTINONI 2005, 170–178; 2013, 34–36 (Duris/Diodorus; *contra* PRIMO 2009, 79–82, 186; OGDEN 2017, 285–286).

8 The identification of the sources' Demodamas and the one in the decrees is well-established since the first publication of the inscriptions by Haussoullier (1900, 245–258; HAUSSOULLIER 1902, 34–51). Robert (1984) rectified Haussoullier's dating (294 BC) and, in turn, he proposed 299 BC as the date of issue. The first inscription is an honorific decree for Antiochus and the second, one for Apama, expressing civic gratitude for her goodwill and contributions to the shrine of Didyma. The last document is the appointment of Demodamas as one of the three commissioners in charge of erecting a statue for Apamea. One of the other appointees is a certain Aristeidēs, son of Minnion, who could be Demodamas' father. However, a certain Aristophon, son of Minnion, is attested elsewhere, so this second possibility appears more likely, see ROBERT 1985, 470. He is also attested as responsible for another statue of a member of the royal family – Seleucus according to ROBERT 1984, 470, n. 23; cf. OGIS 744, 745.

9 Milesians are attested on different sides during the Diadochi period (e.g., Aristodemus with the Antigonids; Athenagoras with Ptolemy; Hippostratus with Lysimachus).

10 Besides the aforementioned inscriptions, there is further evidence for Seleucus' patronage of Didyma. Another epigraphical document attests to a generous donation in 288/287 (*Didyma* 424 = RC 5) and some sources recognize him as the king who returned the bronze statue of Apollo plundered by the Persians: Pausanias I, 16.3, VIII, 46.3; cf. I, 8.5, III, 16.8; Valerius Maximus II, 10, ext. 1.

11 Nevertheless, it cannot be rejected outright that it could refer to a later campaign, after Antiochus was appointed as the viceroy of the eastern part of the Seleucid dominions in 294/293. This is the dating defended by Haussoullier (1900, 256–257; HAUSSOULLIER 1902, 48–49) and Tarn (1940, 92–93). They considered that the campaign was carried out then, after Pliny's mention of the kings Seleucus

Demodamas' erection of the altars to the god of Didyma far away from home,¹² but close to where the last Branchidae were put to death, does not look coincidental and may be related somehow to this event (HAMMOND 1998, 339; PANCHENKO 2002, 48). Apollo Didymeus was a strictly Milesian cult and, therefore, had a primary local/regional significance (BEARZOT 2017, 146–147; NAWOTKA 2019, 272).¹³ Although it cannot be dismissed that Demodamas was following royal orders, given the Milesian's generous patronage of the sanctuary, it appears more likely that the dedication was Demodamas' own initiative, especially if the expedition took place ca. 306 BC (cf. NAWOTKA 2019, 270, 272–273). Even if it were a royal initiative, it would also entail a mainly local, Milesian significance.¹⁴ As already determined, the information found in Latin authors about this episode directly derives from one of his own works. In these accounts, it is inferred that he set up the altars, and his name – not Seleucus, nor Antiochus – is the one added to the list of famous forerunners. In any case, although we do not know for sure, it looks plausible that he would also have mentioned Alexander's massacre of the Branchidae in the same passage, an event that appealed to him directly due to his Milesian origin. Callisthenes' version, at least, was already widespread, and a Milesian author writing about his own deeds in Central Asia could hardly have avoided it.

DEMODAMAS AND THE SOURCE OF THE MASSACRE OF THE BRANCHIDAE

Hammond suggested that two passages from Strabo might come, respectively, from an author familiarised with Bactria-Sogdiana (XI, 11.4) and from another author with good knowledge of the new sanctuary of Didyma (XIV, 1.5) – thus, later than Alexander's earliest historians (HAMMOND 1998, 341–342).¹⁵

Demodamas meets both requirements: he had good knowledge of Central Asia and Didyma. Therefore, there is no need to look for two different authors, given that the details in both passages remain consistent.¹⁶ Moreover, his first-hand information about the new sanctuary

and Antiochus. However, as Robert addressed, this only implied that he served under the orders of both rulers.

- 12 There are some other epigraphical documents attesting to Milesians' dedications to Apollo Didymeus abroad, such as in Cos (*Iscr. di Cos* EV 14, 192; ca. 84–81 BC) or Egypt (*SB* 1530; 2nd century).
- 13 Compare the more universal dedications by Alexander. When he landed in Asia, he set altars to Zeus Apobaterios, Athena, and Heracles (Arrian, *An.* I, 11.7; or, alternatively, to the Twelve Gods according to Justin XI, 5.4). After Issos, he built altars for the same gods by the river Pinarus (Curtius III, 12.27). At the Hyphasis, he dedicated altars to the Twelve Gods (Arrian *An.* V, 29.1–2; Curtius IX, 3.19; Diodorus Siculus XVII, 95.1; Plutarch *Alex.* 62.7–8; *Metz Epitome* 69; Pliny *NH* VI, 62(21); Strabo III, 5.5). Philostratus (*VA* II, 43) wrote that the altars were dedicated to Ammon, Heracles, Athena Pronoia, Olympian Zeus, the Samothracian Cabeiri, the Indian Sun God, and Delphic Apollo. At the Indus' mouth, he erected altars to Tethys and Oceanus (Diodorus Siculus XVII, 104.1; Justin XII, 10.6; Pliny *NH* VI, 25.110). See Mendoza *in print a*.
- 14 On the possible role of Demodamas as promoter of Apollo (Didymeus) as Seleucid patron god, see NAWOTKA 2008; NAWOTKA 2011, 37; NAWOTKA 2019, *passim*; BEARZOT 2017, 149–150. Cf. MUSTI 1966, 148–149; GRAINGER 1990, 164.
- 15 He concluded that the first might be Aristobulus, but he did not posit any name for the second.
- 16 Strabo considered Xerxes as the Achaemenid king who plundered Didyma, contrary to some other traditions that blamed his father Darius (Herodotus VI, 19). If Demodamas is regarded as the source used by Strabo, the version with Xerxes would be the one accepted in Miletus; see HAMMOND 1998, 342. Seleucus also adopted this variant in his propaganda, and he appeared as the rectifier of Xerxes' misdeeds when he brought back the statue of Apollo (see note 10). This gesture had a local/

puts him in a preferential position in front of other writers, such as Aristobulus.¹⁷ Certainly, Aristobulus was widely used by Strabo elsewhere, but that does not exclude the use of other sources (MENDOZA 2019, 72–75), and it has been suggested that some passages might come from Demodamas. For example, Sherwin-White and Kuhrt (1993, 83) proposed that Strabo's chapter on Margiana was based on Demodamas' work. A comparison with the description found in Pliny, who claimed that Demodamas was his principal source for Central Asia (see note 4),¹⁸ is very telling (my emphasis):

Margiana is similar to this country, although *its plain is surrounded by deserts*. Admiring its fertility, Antiochus Soter enclosed a circuit of fifteen hundred stadia with a wall and founded a city Antiocheia. The soil of the country is well suited to the vine; at any rate, they say that a stock of the vine is often found which would require two men to girth it, and that the bunches of grapes are two cubits (Strabo XI, 10.2; JONES 1928, transl.)

Next comes the Margiane country, famous for its sunny climate – it is the only district in region where *the vine is grown*; it is shut in all round by a beautiful ring of mountains, 187 miles [1,500 stadia] in circuit, and is difficult of access on account of sandy deserts stretching for a distance of 120 miles; and it is itself situated opposite to the region of Parthia. In Margiane Alexander had founded a city bearing his name, which was destroyed by the barbarians, but Antiochus son of Seleucus re-established a Syrian city on the same site [...] he had preferred that the city should be named after himself. Its circuit measures 8 ¾ miles [70 stadia]. (Pliny NH VI, 16(18).46–47; RACKHAM 1942, transl.)

The main details remain constant: a fifteen-hundred-stadium region¹⁹ surrounded by deserts, well suited to the vine. Both also write about Antiochus' refoundation of a city named Antiochia, previously an Alexandria.²⁰ It is clear that they shared a common source, and Pliny's comment puts Demodamas in a preferential position.²¹ Moreover, Cohen (2013, 246) even posited that Demodamas was involved in the refoundation. If he actually was, it would

regional impact because Seleucus did not exploit the Panhellenic motif as Alexander did. Therefore, he would have accepted the Milesian tradition, and, in consequence, it could be further evidence of Demodamas' role as an intermediary for this case too.

- 17 However, it is not clear how much of the new shrine Demodamas could have actually seen in his lifetime. But, being a never-ending work under construction, there was some kind of planning, undertaken by the 4th-century Paeonius of Ephesus and Daphnis of Miletus, the architects of the temple (Vitruvius VII, pref. 16). There is also evidence for the actual 'blueprints', see HASELBERG 1980; 1983. Nevertheless, there is also an odd remark in Strabo, when he says that the temple was unrooted due to its great size. In reality, it was intended to be this way, like the archaic Didymeion was. This detail could hardly come from a well-informed author. However, it could be Strabo's personal inference. See FONTENROSE 1988, 18, n. 29.
- 18 The chapter on Margiana is placed almost right before this statement.
- 19 There is some confusion about what these 1,500 stadia refer to. Strabo says that it was the perimeter of a wall to enclose the area where Antiochus refounded a settlement; Pliny explains that this perimeter was surrounded by mountains. For him, the city wall was seventy stadia long. On the possible traces of the walls, see COHEN 2013, 245–250 (especially, note 4).
- 20 Solinus (48.3) and Martianus Capella (VI, 691) call it Seleucia, although both state that it was Antiochus who refounded it.
- 21 Hammond (1998, 341–342) regarded Aristobulus as Strabo's source for Central Asia. Certainly, he is quoted in some passages (Strabo XI, 7.2–3, 11.5), but this does not exclude Strabo's use of other sources; indeed, this is evidenced in this passage from Pliny, because Aristobulus is not attested as Pliny's source, and it is clear that Strabo and Pliny relied on the same author here.

imply that Demodamas might have participated in Antiochus' campaigns, although it does not rule out the possibility that he also took part in Seleucus' expedition (see note 3).

Furthermore, it is possible to posit Demodamas as Aelian's source as well. The fragment from Suda seems to reflect a local source, due to his recurrent emphasis on the Branchidae having escaped from the Milesians' hands and his praising of Apollo Didymeus as an inevitable avenger. These same motifs appear in Strabo's passages in books xi and xiv, but, curiously enough, there is no explicit mention of escaping punishment in the passage from book xvii where it is clearly stated that Callisthenes was his source. Callisthenes' wording is vaguer (συλλάω and περσίζω) than the more formal and legalistic terms shared by the two other passages and Aelian. They were guilty of sacrilege and treason (ιεροσυλία και προδοσία).²² Certainly, the attributed crimes are the same, but the latter terminology is not a mere description, but a formal accusation that entails a legal punishment, something clearly stated in some of the passages. They were not only criminals but 'condemned' runaways. The three passages had a noteworthy intensity in their formulation that differentiates them from Callisthenes' more dispassionate fragment.²³

What about Curtius? His more detailed version preserves unique information about the role carried out by Milesian soldiers in the affair. Although it cannot be confirmed or dismissed, we can consider that Demodamas himself could have been one of those soldiers.²⁴ After Alexander's conquest, the new authorities belonged to the pro-Macedonian party, replacing the previous Medizing leaders (see below). We do not know if Demodamas was part of any of those groups. His name and his father's, Areistides, are not found in older documents from Miletus,²⁵ so there is no way to assess Demodamas' family's status, apart from his own prominence under the Seleucids and after the city had reestablished a democratic system. Therefore, Demodamas could be either a member of a former oligarchic family or someone who benefitted from the change of regime.²⁶ In consequence, his general assessment of Alexander would have drastically changed depending on his family's status when the Macedonians seized Miletus.

Certainly, there is no explicit mention of a levy in Miletus in the Alexander sources, but the case of Aspendus could point to a recurring practice (Arrian *An.* 1, 26.2–27.5; ΝΑΥΟΤΚΑ 2010, 153). The situation in that Pamphylian city shows some parallels with that of Miletus.

22 Aelian's version only explicitly states (twice) the treason (also in Suda s.v. Δινδύμοις). However, it is more precise about what was robbed (ἀναθήματα), which stresses the sacred nature of those objects. Moreover, it is the most insistent account about the broken laws and the temporarily avoided punishment.

23 Plutarch's passing remark (*Mor.* 557b) also speaks of προδοσία. Curtius, in turn, employed more general expressions and verbs, such as *violo* and *injuria*. He also refers to treason (*proditorum, proditio*), but as part of highly rhetorical passages, so it is hard to assess if he was referring to formal accusations. Diodorus' summary says that they were slain because they were 'traitors of the Greeks' (ὡς προδότας τῶν Ἑλλήνων).

24 Parke (1985a, 40; PARKE 1985b, 66–68) concluded that the presence of Milesian soldiers was plausible, and he suggested Demodamas' presence too. See also ΝΑΥΟΤΚΑ 2010, 153.

25 Neither the name of his hypothetical grandfather, Minnion (see note 8).

26 What is more, the conquest and Demodamas' decrees are separated for thirty years, during which he and his family could have perfectly reintegrated themselves into the new system and recovered part of his former position in the social and civic order. In *Didyma* 480, one of Demodamas' decrees, the motion was put by Lycus, son of Apollodotus – he also appears as one of Demodamas' colleagues in *Didyma* 481. A certain Apollodotus, son of Molpeus, is attested as *stephanéphoros* in 336/335 (*Milet* 13, 122, II. l. 79). If he was the son of this same man, it could reflect the reintegration of the former pro-Persian oligarchic families in democratic Miletus. However, if Demodamas had been far away due to his military career, his reintegration would not have been that gradual.

The Aspendians sent a first embassy to Alexander to surrender the city but asked not to have a garrison established there. In return for that privilege, Alexander asked for the delivery of fifty talents and fifty horses bred for the Great King. However, after Alexander had seized Side and was on his way to Sillyon, Aspendus defected from Alexander. They had refused to pay the agreed talents and horses and had started the preparations for enduring a siege. After Alexander's quick arrival and having been confined in the upper city, the Aspendians sent another embassy to Alexander pleading to reestablish the previous agreement. The king did not accept this and hardened the terms. He retained the number of horses to be delivered but increased the talents up to one hundred. In addition, he imposed a Macedonian governor, annual tributes, and meddled in a territorial dispute, favouring a neighbouring city, probably Side (BOSWORTH 1980, 168–169; GRAINGER 2009, 74–75). Finally, he also took the most influential citizens in the city as hostages. In Asia Minor, Alexander also required hostages from Soli (Arrian *An.* II, 12.2) and the Paphlagonians (Curtius III, 1.22–24),²⁷ just like in earlier and later instances in his campaign.²⁸ A close examination of those cases shows that the taking of hostages was applied in territories where control was far from being absolute, and there had been attempts of resistance or possible defections that could be foreseen.

Although it is not mentioned, Miletus fulfilled these same characteristics. Obviously, any levy would have been focused on the social stratum most injured by the conquest and, in consequence, more prone to defection: the pro-Persian oligarchy. Another possibility is that Milesians became part of Alexander's army as mercenaries. Precisely, Miletus' capture ended with the integration of 300 Greek mercenaries into the Macedonian ranks (Arrian, *An.* I, 19.5–6). Arrian, however, explicitly says that these mercenaries were not the only ones to flee and take refuge on a nearby island; Milesian defenders did so too.²⁹ Therefore, those who were affected might have been both mercenaries and citizens of Miletus. They were not the only Greek mercenaries who were integrated into Alexander's army. Several instances are attested during the campaign, both of new recruits and of soldiers previously fighting on the Persian side (Arrian *An.* III, 5.1; Curtius V, 7.12, VI, 5.10, 6.35; Diodorus Siculus XVII, 76.2).³⁰

Other Asia Minor natives participated in Alexander's expedition as well. Some of them even held official appointments. In the list of the Indus' trierarchs, we can read the names of Critobulus of Cos, Thoas and Maeander from Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, and Andron/

27 Curtius III, 1.22–24. In the latter case, even though Curtius affirms that the king entered the region, Arrian (*An.* II, 4.1–2) claims that it was not necessary. The conditions were agreed upon in Ancyra, where he met a Paphlagonian delegation. Bosworth (1980, 188) postulates a previous embassy and a definitive capitulation after a brief campaign, pointing out the parallelisms with the episode of Aspendus. In a complementary manner, the twenty Athenian ships that he retained after disbanding the fleet can be regarded in the same way (Diodorus Siculus, XVII, 22.5).

28 Thrace: Frontinus *Strat.* II, 11.3; Justin XI, 5. 3. Hyrcania: Curtius VI, 5.21; Diodorus Siculus XVII, 76.7–8; cf. Arrian *An.* V, 19. 6. Sisimithres: Curtius VIII, 2.31–33. Chorienes: Curtius VIII, 4.21–22. Andaca: Metz *Epitome* 35. Nysa: Arrian *An.* V, 2.2–4. Porus and Abisares: Metz *Epitome* 55–56. Adrestians: Curtius IX, 1. 14. Near Sangala: Curtius IX, 1.20–23; Polyaeus IV, 3. 30. Malli and Oxydracae: Arrian *An.* VI, 14.2–3; Curtius IX, 7.14, 8. 1. Epigoni: Arrian *An.* VII, 6.1; Curtius VIII, 5.1; Diodorus Siculus XVII, 108.1; Plutarch *Alex.* 47. 6. See MENDOZA 2022; MENDOZA *in print* b.

29 Arrian *An.* I, 19.4: ἔνθα οἱ Μιλήσιοί τε καὶ οἱ μισθοφόροι πανταχόθεν ἤδη προσκειμένων σφίσι τῶν Μακεδόνων οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ῥιπτοῦντες σφᾶς ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσπίδων ὑπτίῳ ἐς νησίδα τινα ἀνώνυμον τῇ πόλει ἐπικειμένην διενήχοντο, [...]

30 There is one explicit mention of soldiers from Asia Minor, but they arrived after the massacre of the Branchidae (Curtius VII, 10.11–12; Arrian *An.* IV, 7.2). Besides the attested arrivals, there is wide evidence of mercenaries serving as garrison forces or being settled in Alexander's foundations.

Hagnon of Teos (Arrian *Ind.* 18.7; HECKEL 2006, 100, 128, 156, 266).³¹ From these names, the physician Critobulus can be discarded, because perhaps he had been in the Macedonian court since Philip's reign. No comparison can be drawn between the cases of their cities and Miletus. Magnesia-on-the-Maeander surrendered to Parmenio (Arrian *An.* 1, 18.1), and there is no word about Teos, which suggests that no prolonged siege occurred. Therefore, they would have taken part in the campaign in a different way than the Milesians would have. Probably, there was no coercion – or security reason – behind their incorporation into the army. Indeed, the lack of a Milesian courtier possibly reflects the unfair disadvantage provoked by their resistance (НАВОТКА 2010, 159). In conclusion, a Milesian – and/or Demodamas' – presence is not unlikely and there are many ways they could have become involved in the campaign.

Returning to Curtius, we see that he is the only one to preserve an accurate account of the episode – Diodorus' version is lost – so there is no way to know how the whole incident was described, if it was, in the sources employed by the rest of the authors (i.e., Aelian, Strabo, and Plutarch). Demodamas' fragments are found in Roman and Byzantine sources, so Diodorus and Curtius could have had access to his books. However, it is possible that they did not read Demodamas directly, but used a common intermediary source. A comparison between Curtius' account and Diodorus' table of contents reflects a certain degree of correspondence, although some minor variations are also attested.

In fact, one of these divergences concerns our episode: Curtius (VII, 5.19–26) placed it *before* Bessus' capture, and Diodorus (XVII, 83.7–9) *after* it. Nevertheless, Curtius (VII, 5.36–40) did place the rebel's handover to Alexander after what happened in the Branchidae's village, so the apparent incongruence may be due to Diodorus' oversimplified account.³² Overall, their respective narratives about Bessus' capture are not excessively different, besides the different details and names of those involved in the plot against Bessus in the Persian camp. These divergences might be caused by different focuses when telling the episode (MENDOZA 2019, 76–77). Basically, Diodorus concentrated on the role played by a certain Bagodaras – not attested in Curtius – as the trigger for the later defection, while Curtius put the focus on the conspiracy of the generals anonymously mentioned by Diodorus. In conclusion, the easiest option is to consider that they relied on a common source, perhaps Cleitarchus.³³

If we consider that Demodamas could also be the source for the Vulgata tradition, this would mean he wrote before this possible intermediary source (i.e., Cleitarchus). The chronological viability of this option depends on which date is assigned to each individual's writing activity. In the case of Demodamas, although the expeditions could have taken place earlier, he might not have written about them before the battle of Ipsus.³⁴ The decrees from Miletus

31 Gorgus of Iasus was one of the king's *hoplophylax*. Besides these officials, other Asia Minor inhabitants are attested in Alexander's court, such as the sophist Anaximenes of Lampsacus, the harpist Athenodorus of Theos, and the poet Choerilus of Iasus.

32 In fact, Diodorus also included Bessus' later execution in the same paragraph.

33 Duris of Samos has been also suggested as the intermediary source between Diodorus and Demodamas, although for some events in book XIX (see note 7). For Duris as a source of Diodorus' book XVII, see FONTANA 1955; PRANDI 2013, XVI–XXX. *Contra* KEBRIC 1977, 45–46, 65–66. His use by Curtius has been discarded; see ATKINSON 1980, 66–67.

34 Obviously, if his book contained information about campaigns during Antiochus' joint rule, the date of the writing would be lower. There is no indication of his dates of birth and death. Tarn (1940, 93–94) placed his death between 286 and 285. However, it is a baseless interpretation. He came to this conclusion because he thought that Demodamas was *strategos* – his own translation of Pliny's *dux* – in Bactria-Sogdiana before Patrocles. Tarn dated Patrocles' service between 286/285 and 280, so he concluded that Demodamas had previously died. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that

date from 299 BC and suggest that Demodamas might have settled down and became an active member in his hometown by then. Therefore, a writing date from 299 onwards appears as the most plausible option. There has been a lot of debate about Cleitarchus' date, and it is far beyond the scope of this paper to answer this controversial question. Most proposals are concentrated on a range between 320 and 260 (e.g., TARN 1948, 5–43; BROWN 1950; PEARSON 1960, 212–242; HAMILTON 1961; BADIAN 1965; GOUKOWSKY 1976, XIX–XXXI; LEVI 1977, 83–92; PRANDI 1996; PARKER 2009), although some later dates have also been suggested.³⁵ However, it is clear that only a low chronology may be realistic, considering Demodamas as one of his sources.³⁶ Therefore, the chapter from Curtius' book cannot be directly linked to Demodamas' account. Nevertheless, there is no reason to reject its details. Curtius' hand can be perceived in his own value judgement of the episode,³⁷ and the somewhat unsteady behaviour of both Alexander and the Milesian soldiers, which could suggest a slightly different earlier version reworked by Curtius to fit his narrative purposes.³⁸ In consequence, given that the presence of soldiers of Miletus is not unlikely, the general details of Curtius' version can be preserved.

ALEXANDER, MILETUS, AND DEMODAMAS

Demodamas' version must have been influenced by his Milesian background. Therefore, local perceptions about the Branchidae and Alexander must have played a key role in the shaping of the episode by Demodamas. The previous passages, some likely reflecting a local source, make clear that the Branchidae were regarded as traitors and sacrilegious. Milesian thoughts on Alexander seem to be more complex, and they were influenced by the king's conquest of the city and its immediate effects.

Alexander did not easily seize Miletus, although its governor, Hegesistratus, initially sent a message to Alexander promising to surrender it. Nevertheless, after learning about the arrival of the Persian fleet, Hegesistratus changed his mind and decided to resist. Alexander besieged the city, but his attacks were repelled by its defenders, time after time.³⁹ The city was probably in the hands of a strong pro-Persian oligarchy, and its inhabitants actively collabo-

they actually held this post – indeed, if it really existed – and, even if so, a replacement of course does not necessarily imply Demodamas' death. Patrocles himself, after this hypothetical position in Bactria, is attested heading an expedition against Heracleia and the Bythinians (*FGrHist* 434F 1. 9. 1–3). Therefore, Demodamas could have been alive and kicking during Antiochus' reign too.

- 35 One of the most recent proposals for a significantly late date has been the one provoked by the papyrus *POxy* LXXI. 4808, which seems to imply that Cleitarchus was Ptolemy IV's tutor. See the arguments against it in PRANDI 2012; LANDUCCI GATTINONI – PRANDI 2013; LANE FOX 2015, 165–166.
- 36 See RAPIN 2017, 51–52, who comes to similar conclusions. Our case shows some affinities with that of Patrocles, another author of the Seleucid sphere, who was in charge of an expedition in the Caspian Sea (see note 34). Tarn (1948, 16–19) considered that Patrocles' work was used by Cleitarchus, and he turned it into one of his main arguments to assign a low date for his book. Nevertheless, this argument has been discussed and refuted by different scholars: BROWN 1950, 138–142; PEARSON 1960, 227–228; PRANDI 2012, 19.
- 37 Influenced by his Roman prejudices, which were completely different from Greek conceptions about hereditary guilt and punishment; see MENDOZA 2019, 68 n. 263, 179–180.
- 38 Parke (1985b, 66, 68) postulates that this previous version could show the Milesians unanimously voting for execution or that they influenced the king to annihilate of the Branchidae. See also NAWOTKA 2010, 157.
- 39 Lanice's sons, for instance, died during these attacks: Curtius VIII, 2.8; Arrian *An.* IV, 9. 4. In addition, a possible Milesian embassy to the Athenians asking for aid is attested: Gellius XI, 9.

rated with mercenaries (Nawotka 2010, 147–150). The Milesians sent an embassy headed by a certain Glaucippus, a member of this oligarchy,⁴⁰ to Alexander to propose to him to keep the city and its ports open both for Persians and Macedonians. Alexander refused and continued his attacks on Miletus. When the city was already facing the final assault, its citizens fell before the king as supplicants, and Alexander did not enslave them and granted their freedom. However, many Milesians were killed along with the mercenaries from the garrison.⁴¹ Finally, he captured and spared a group of Greek mercenaries who had taken refuge on a nearby small island (Diodorus Siculus xvii, 22.4–5; Arrian *An.* i, 18.3–19.6; see above).⁴²

Both in Diodorus' and Arrian's accounts, Alexander appears as a merciful and liberating king. This image contrasts with Strabo's appraisal, who says that, after Alexander had taken it by force (βία ληφθεῖσα), the city was unfortunate (ἀτυχέω) like Halicarnassus (Strabo xiv, 1.7; cf. 2.17; Prandi 2013, 32).⁴³ It shows that there was a tradition different from that represented by Diodorus and Arrian, one that negatively regarded the Macedonian king's demeanour towards the city. Given its specificity, it appears reasonable to suggest a local source.

The few known details about the relationship between Alexander and Miletus suggest a somewhat strained atmosphere at the beginning. The last-minute surrender, and probably its symbolic meaning for anyone raising the flag of Panhellenism, prevented harsher retaliation against the citizens (Mendoza 2019, 83–90). However, it did not dissipate Alexander's displeasure, and an anecdote in Plutarch reflects a badly concealed reproof to the Milesians:

When he [Alexander] saw in Miletus many statues of athletes who had won victories in the Olympic and the Pythian games, he said, 'Where were the men with bodies like these when the barbarians were besieging your city?' (Plutarch, *Mor.*, 180a, Babbit 1931, transl.).⁴⁴

Knowing how the city was seized, it sounds like a cutting remark to underline the difficulties he faced to capturing it, as well as the pro-Persian affinities of some of its citizens – even though

40 Two sons of Glaucippus are attested as *stephanéphoroi* in 340/339 (Leucippus) and 337/336 (Chrysiippus) (*Milet* i 3, 122, ll. 75, 78). If they refer to the same man, it might imply that Glaucippus was part of the pro-Persian oligarchy in Miletus. Arrian also describes him as 'one of the notables of Miletus' (ἀνὴρ τῶν δοκίμων ἐν Μιλήτῳ).

41 There are late sources about a possible plundering of the city: Lactantius *Div. Inst.* ii, 7.19; Valerius Maximus i, ext. 1.5 (*Epit. Paris*). Even if it might be a spurious, late story, it reflects how Alexander's conquest was perceived in Miletus afterwards. The story is similar to that of the Boeotian Cabeiroi, see Pausanias ix, 25.10; Mendoza 2019, 65–67.

42 On Miletus' siege and assault, see Romane 1994, 63–69; Antela-Bernárdez 2012, 90–95. Arrian omits the previous unsuccessful attempts and mainly focuses his account on the final assault. This omission in Arrian corresponds with others found in difficult sieges for Alexander, such as Tyre: Bosworth 1976, 17–23; Bosworth 1980, 138–139. Plutarch's too-simplified version is insubstantial (*Alex.* 17.1).

43 Right after this remark, Strabo quotes Callisthenes about the fine imposed on Phrynichus due to his play about Darius' taking of the city. However, it does not entail his reliance on that author for the whole paragraph. Callisthenes could have hardly written that Miletus was unfortunate (ἀτυχέω) due to Alexander's conquest and additionally drawn a parallel between the two episodes. Callisthenes' comment might be part of a passage emphasizing the importance of Miletus in Panhellenic ideology as leader of the Ionian Revolt and for the brutal repression it suffered later on. Arrian and Diodorus' accounts regarded Alexander's behaviour as humanitarian, which probably reflected official propaganda contrasting his 'philanthropy' with Darius' harshness. See Bosworth 1980, 140.

44 Similar remarks about the former and then lost Milesian bravery are found in Athenaeus xii, 523f and Aristophanes *Plut.* 1003.

a pro-Macedonian democratic party would have been promoted at that time.⁴⁵ Alexander probably still distrusted Miletus' actual affinities after backing out from its offer to surrender and the second proposal to remain neutral both for Persians and Macedonians. Although he granted freedom to its citizens, it is not unlikely that he also imposed tribute and a garrison to the city (BOSWORTH 1980, 140; BOSWORTH 1988, 250–251; WORTHINGTON 2004, 81; *contra* KHOLOD 2010, 252–253, n. 14).⁴⁶ Therefore, this 'freedom' might be understood only as mere non-enslavement or liberation from the Persians (*contra* ΝΑΥΟΤΚΑ 2010, 151–152). Miletus did not claim to have recovered full civic autonomy until Antigonos seized the city from Asander, just as the list of *stephanéphoroi* reveals (*Milet* I 3, 123, ll. 2–4; cf. Diodorus Siculus XIX, 75.1–5).⁴⁷ When Alexander was elected *aisymnêtes/stephanéphoros* the year after his conquest, there was no further commentary on that point, nor for the previous year (*Milet* I 3, 122, II, l. 81). With this honour – probably prompted by the new pro-Macedonian authorities –⁴⁸ the Milesians tried to assure a good relationship with Alexander, aiming to get rid of the tension noticed right after the conquest. Although concealed in the delivery of an oracular response, a later embassy sent to the king at Memphis had a main political purpose: besides looking to calm the waters, perhaps it also tried to have the capitulation terms softened (HAUSSOULLIER 1902, 7; BOFFO 1985, 176, n. 178) and/or to obtain some royal funds for the restoration works on the just reopened Didymaon (PARKE 1985b, 67).⁴⁹ But, as we have seen, there was no noteworthy work in Didyma until the end of the 4th century, so it is clear that the embassy did not get funds for its reconstruction from Alexander.

A close look at the annual list of magistrates reveals that a recurrent practice was established for hard times since its debut in 332/331: the position of *stephanéphoros* was bestowed to the god Apollo, son of Zeus (SHERK 1992, 231).⁵⁰ A *stephanéphoros* also had to fund all the underlying outgoings, so in periods of hardships there were no candidates willing to pay the bill. In that case, the god was designated the eponymous magistrate, and the treasury of Apollo Delphinus funded the expenses (ΝΑΥΟΤΚΑ 2010, 154). In 332/331, the setback was the Persian activity in coastal Asia Minor. Pharnabazus coerced the Milesians and asked them for money, which, added to the Macedonian tribute,⁵¹ undoubtedly implied a shortfall for the Milesians, still recovering from the effects of Alexander's siege. Although it is not clear if the

45 Moreover, it seems to question Miletus' heroic – and martyr – role during the Ionian Revolt, something far from the official Panhellenic rhetoric.

46 On this 'freedom', see BICKERMANN 1934, 370–372; BADIAN 1966 [2012], 134; BOSWORTH 1980, 128–129. See also a similar case in Sardis; cf. Arrian *An.* I, 17.3–8; BADIAN 1966 [2012], 130; DEBORD 1999, 432.

47 It states that the city became free and autonomous, and democracy was restored (ἐπὶ τούτου ἡ πόλις/ἐλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Ἀντιγόνου καὶ ἡ δημοκρατία ἀπεδόθη); cf. IG II² 1129. See ΝΑΥΟΤΚΑ 2011, 30–31. Curiously, other cities recognised both Alexander and Antigonos as freedom-givers: Colophon (SEG XIX, 698), Erythrai (*Erythrai* 31=RC 15, I.*Erythrai* 30); cf. DEBORD 1999, 437. In this case, maybe Aristodemus of Miletus, a close collaborator of Antigonos, played an important role in obtaining Antigonos' goodwill. On Aristodemus, see BILLOWS 1990, 372–374.

48 It must be noted that hated, powerful individuals like Asander – right before his expulsion and the arrival of Antigonos and the liberation – were honoured alike (*Milet* I 3, 122, II, l. 100).

49 The story about the miraculous eruption of the long-dried spring right after Alexander's conquest could have been also told to the king by those ambassadors. Probably, it reflects that some work had already been done and the cleaning of the debris blocking the water source made it flow again (Callisthenes *FGrHist* 124F 14 *apud* Strabo XVII, 1.43).

50 In the Diadochi period, Apollo is also attested in 312/311 (right after Antigonos), 299/298 (about the time of Demodamas' decrees) and 282/281 (see *Milet* I 3, 138).

51 Either regular or for the war effort (*syntaxis*). Nicias was the man in charge of collecting tribute in Asia Minor (Arrian, *An.* I, 17.7).

Persians actually reconquered the city, it would have been a short-lived success, and Miletus was in Macedonian hands shortly after (Curtius IV, 1.37, 5.13).⁵² In the same way, and still as a consequence of those struggles to control the city, Apollo appears as the magistrate only two years later, in 330/329.

Certainly, Miletus suffered badly during Alexander's siege and the subsequent conflict in the region, and some repair work was to be done to its defences. The effort probably burdened its economy for some years (HAUSSOULIER 1902, 5–6).⁵³ Nevertheless, those hectic years did not lead to more permanent effects, and Miletus quickly prospered and became an important centre in Asia Minor once more (DEBORD 1999, 161, 445). Even so, despite this turbulent early period, there is no tangible evidence that Alexander's conquest entailed disastrous consequences for all the citizens in the long term. In any case, a certain continuity from the previous period is attested, only with a nominal change: Persian tributes and garrisons were now Macedonian. Therefore, despite the gravity of its capture, only short-term problems are attested.

Returning to Strabo's source, all the above suggests a contemporary, local author, who could remember what the Macedonian conquest actually meant for Miletus. Moreover, it could reflect the opinion of someone directly affected by it, such as a member of the local pro-Persian oligarchy. On the other hand, the adversity experienced is directly related to the decision to resist Alexander, so it could also hint towards the pro-Persian party, who would have caused its own city disgrace for its stance. In consequence, although Miletus' hardship can be safely confirmed, Strabo passage could reflect two opposing Milesian views on Alexander's reign. However, this passage also contains an important clue that could point to Demodamas again.

As it has been shown, Strabo could have used his passages about Didyma and the Branchidae. Demodamas also wrote a book about Halicarnassus, a city that appears mentioned in this same paragraph, as sharing Miletus' bad fortune after Alexander's seizure.⁵⁴ So, it is plausible that he drew comparisons between Halicarnassus and his hometown in his work. Certainly, Halicarnassus' ill-starred fate is attested elsewhere, and their pairing is not surprising, being consecutive sieges of nearby cities. Miletus' misfortune, nevertheless, is corroborated nowhere else, and it clashes with the rest of the tradition, which highlights Alexander's goodwill towards the city and its free and spared inhabitants. In consequence, a local, critical source is more likely. This author – whether Demodamas or another – was not necessarily stubbornly ill-biased towards Alexander. The passage shows no actual partiality, but only a well-balanced assessment of what the conquest entailed. Even a wholehearted pro-Macedonian Milesian would have admitted the struggles they faced right after the conquest. Moreover, his initial enthusiasm would have probably cooled down after the fiasco of the embassy sent to Memphis.

52 The Persian recapture of Miletus is a controversial issue. For Atkinson (1980, 327–328), it is possible that the Persians won back the city in the spring of 333, and that the Macedonian Balacrus had already recovered it in 332, given the presence of Milesian delegates with an oracle from Didyma in Memphis that same year. However, some others have denied the temporary loss of the city, although there is no need to dismiss the detail about Pharnabazus' demand. See HARRISON 1982, 298–299, n. 71; DEBORD 1999, 445, 461–463; NAWOTKA 2010, 153–154.

53 In Pseudo-Callisthenes (rec. A', III, 33; Julius Valerius III, 59(95)), Alexander's last will included 150 talents to be sent to Miletus for restoration or repair (ἐπισκευή). In the *Liber de Morte* (120), the same number of talents are granted to the Milesians, but there is no indication of what for. Nawotka (2010, 157–158; NAWOTKA 2011, 34; cf. NAWOTKA 2017, 255) considered that this money could have been allocated to the reconstruction of Didyma, but the text indicates that it was for the city (τῆς πόλεως).

54 In Plutarch's brief paragraph (*Alex.* 17.1), they also appear paired, but only due to their successive seizure during Alexander's advance.

The cleaning of the sacred spring and the oracular message itself shows great vigour and hope by the new authorities, who had to scale back their initiative and wait until Seleucus' arrival to actively resume it.

THE MASSACRE OF THE BRANCHIDAE AND MILETUS – RECEPTIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

Therefore, Alexander's image was far from being very popular in Miletus after 331. Only a lukewarm appraisal at the most was to be expected. The citizens' feelings would have progressively embittered after assessing how neighbouring cities had benefitted from the presence of noteworthy fellow countrymen in Alexander's entourage. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that Miletus did not institute a local cult of Alexander, unlike many other surrounding cities (NAWOTKA 2010, 159; NAWOTKA 2011, 35).⁵⁵

Miletus suffered another shock when news about what had happened in a remote village in Sogdiana arrived after 329. Despite being so far away, the histories of Miletus – 'the ornament of Ionia' (Herodotus v, 28.1: ἡ Μίλητος...τῆς Ἰωνίης ἦν πρόσχημα) – and Bactriana – 'the ornament of all Ariana' (Strabo xi, 11.1: τῆς συμπάσης Ἀριανῆς πρόσχημα εἶναι τὴν Βακτριανήν) – became closely entangled because of the Branchidae. Callisthenes' account likely was the first to be known, but perhaps more details and new versions arrived, especially when the likely Milesian soldiers who had witnessed the massacre returned to their hometown. The story was not a mere anecdote, but had important consequences in Miletus.

Cui bono? Callisthenes' account of the episode was probably focused on its meaning as part of the Panhellenic motif in Alexander's propaganda. From a modern perspective, it could appear as a cruel and unfair punishment, but a contemporary Greek hardly could have felt shocked (*contra* KUBICA 2016). Nothing was seen as wrong with hereditary guilty and punishment for serious crimes like sacrilege and treason (MENDOZA 2019, 69–70).⁵⁶ The episode presented Alexander, once more, as the avenger of the Persian – and more precisely, Xerxes' – misdeeds during the Persian Wars. However, nothing suggests that it went beyond and tried to present it as a rapprochement to Miletus. The embassy with the prophecy in 331 did not prompt any significant help or gesture towards the city and, as stated above, it continued to suffer from some restrictions in the following years. Significantly, Alexander neither sent back the statue of Apollo after capturing Susa, although he did return the statues of Aristogeiton and Harmodius' to the Athenians, among others (Arrian *An.* III, 16.7–8, VII, 19.2; Pliny *NH* xxxiv, 21(70); cf. Pausanias I, 8.5, and Valerius Maximus II, 10, ext. 1, who credit Antiochus and Seleucus as the restorers, respectively; cf. BOSWORTH 1980, 317). Therefore, it seems that Alexander made use of the episode for strictly personal reasons and did not fuel the aspirations of the recently reopened oracle.⁵⁷ Therefore, the main goal of early Alexander sources was not to sanction the functioning of the new shrine in Didyma (PARKE 1985b, 67; MENDOZA 2019, 87–88).

55 The epigraphic evidence for such honours is compiled and analysed in DREYER 2009.

56 Even Plutarch's passage, which many have regarded as criticism of Alexander's action, actually justified the massacre. See MENDOZA 2019, 68, n. 264.

57 The controversial *hypomnemata* enacted the (re)construction of six temples: Delos, Delphi, Dodona, Dion, Amphipolis, and Cyrenus (Diodorus Siculus xviii, 4.5). Even if this information must be taken with some caution, it could be another proof of Alexander's lack of interest in Didyma. As we have seen (see note 53), according to Pseudo-Callisthenes, some funds were to be provided for Miletus' reconstruction, but not for the nearby shrine.

Nevertheless, the main beneficiaries of the extinction of the Branchidae were the Milesian authorities who had launched the restoration of the sanctuary. The elimination of the former priestly family left them free from potential opposing legitimacy claims that could have rivalled the new civic priesthood. However, this does not imply that those authorities could have made up the story for their own purposes, as Callisthenes' fragment clearly proves. However, the massacre might have set in motion a series of concomitant processes in Miletus that could have locally reshaped some details of the story and influenced the course of the restored oracle centre.

The Milesian soldiers who witnessed and probably participated in the slaughter would not have been fully conscious of the repercussions of the episode at that very moment. Certainly, they – or some of them – could have 'lobbied' Alexander to proceed with the mass execution, but the motives attested in the sources – their former crimes and, complementarily, the loathing about what they had become – are already reasonable enough (see note 56). There is no need to see concealed goals, especially those relating to the benefit entailed to the new shrine by the elimination of the Branchidae (see note 38). However, these soldiers who became involved in the campaign had been away from home for some time and, at most, had only some vague news of what was going on in Miletus and Didyma. Alexander's denial of funding had plausibly left the project on standby. Thus, Milesian soldiers hardly could have been thinking about the risk for any new priesthood when they dealt with the problem of what to do with the Branchidae.

The elimination of the Branchidae paved the way for the renewed sanctuary, but other transformations had to be undertaken besides the mere change of management. It is interesting to address how the myth of Branchus changed in Hellenistic times. The earliest stories presented Branchus either as a son of Apollo (or perhaps, in origin, an Anatolian Sun God) or as supernaturally gifted before his birth, but the later versions turned him into a descendant of a Delphic priest and 'just' a lover of the god. This change is firstly attested about fifty or sixty years after the reopening of the shrine, but it was likely spread earlier on.⁵⁸ These later versions stripped the Branchidae of their divine descent and uniqueness, which therefore eased the transition to a civic and rotatory priesthood model.⁵⁹ There is not much information about the archaic oracular ritual, but it seems that it changed after the restoration too. The new procedure was inspired by Delphi and, in consequence, it made sense that Branchus was supposed to have Delphic ancestry (PARKE 1985a, 3–5, 8; PARKE 1985b, 60; PARKE 1986, 124–125; FONTENROSE 1988, 106–110).

The Sogdian settlement was not simply a place where the long-gone Branchidae dwelled, but the sources show that they had tried to recreate their former town and sanctuary. It was a new Didyma. The fake nature of the new town and its shrine is explicitly attested in Aelian's account. It details that the town was called Branchidas (Βραγχίδας; cf. Plutarch *Mor.* 557b: τὸ Βραγχιδῶν ἄστυ), almost the same eponymous name that widely appears in Greek authors as equivalent to Didyma (Βραγχίδαί).⁶⁰ The naming of the new town appears here linked with the feeling of impunity that was aroused by their escape. Aelian also states that

58 The first attestation is found in Callimachus' *Aetia* (F 229 Pfeiffer). See PARKE 1986, 125.

59 Some clues suggest that even a Milesian family, the Evangelidae, tried to replace the Branchidae's ancient position in Hellenistic times, claiming their origin from Branchus. The legend also aimed to strengthen the ties between the sanctuary and Miletus; see Conon *FGrHist* 26F 44; PARKE 1985a, 6–7.

60 Usually in feminine. When masculine, the term referred to the priestly family. See Herodotus 1, 46.2, 92.2, 157.3, 159.1, II, 159.3, V, 36.3; Diodorus Siculus XIX, 90.4; Pausanias 1, 16.3, V, 7.5, VII, 5.4, VIII, 46.3; Strabo XIV, 1.5, XVII, 1.43 (thus Callisthenes, cited in this passage, still used the old name when referring to the Milesian embassy); Diogenes Laertius 1, 3.72, VIII, 1.5; Lucian *Alex.* 8. Some Latin authors regarded it as the ancient name of the sanctuary, back then replaced by Didyma, cf.

Alexander razed to the ground the ‘falsely called city’ and made it disappear (ψευδώνυμον πόλιν κατέσκαψε, καὶ ἤφανίσθησαν). Such an adjective clearly indicates that the town aimed to ‘replace’ the ancient Branchidai/Didyma. The exact nature and origins of the Branchidae family remain obscure, but it is clear that they were intrinsically bound to Didyma and its god. Therefore, even though they were removed to the edge of the world, it would have been natural for them to recreate there what they had been doing for generations: devoting their lives to Apollo. There would be nothing intrinsically incoherent or anomalous in moving an oracle from one place to another. For example, some Thessalian authors claimed that Dodona was originally in Thessaly and not in Epirus (Suidas *FGrHist* 602F 11; Cineas *FGrHist* 603F 2 *apud* Strabo VII, 7.12, F 1; Stephanus Byzantinus s. v. Δωδώνη). Although archaeological and historical records dismiss this possibility (PARKE 1967, 38–40), the claim highlights that there was nothing theoretically wrong with such a move. Moreover, these sources claim that Dodona’s prophetesses were also part of this move.⁶¹ After all, the mantic element mainly derived from the Branchidae family heritage (PARKE 1986, 124),⁶² being the descendants of the eponymous Branchus. In this way, they were another of some distinguished clans renowned for their expertise in mantic practices due to their lineage. Probably, the closest parallels are the Iamidae and the Clytiadae, who had run the oracle of Olympia since time immemorial. However, there were branches of these two families around the Greek world, like other wandering mantic families such as the Telliadae or the Melampodidae (PARKE 1967, 172–180; FLOWER 2008, 36–50). However, unlike the others, the Branchidae’s position was so domineering that they gave name to the oracular centre itself (PARKE 1985a, 2–3). So, there was nothing that could prevent the Branchidae from replicating their sanctuary in their new home.⁶³

Moreover, another detail in Curtius’ account backs this assumption up. The Branchidae village’s destruction was systematic and thorough. Among what was included in the destruction, there was a sacred forest.⁶⁴ The sacred forest was part of the original sanctuary in Didyma. In the Ionian shrine of Didyma, there were at least two sacred forests: one outside and the other inside (Strabo XIV, 1.5). The first one was placed between the temples of Apollo and Artemis. The second was an interior forest formed by bay trees, and it was located inside the great roofless

Pliny *NH* V, 29.31 (112); Mela I, 17.86. Obviously, after the definitive extinction of the Branchidae, the former placename was obsolete. See FONTENROSE 1988, 3.

- 61 In turn, the first prophetess had allegedly come from Egypt and, in Herodotus’ words (II, 56.2): ‘[...] she established a shrine of Zeus under an oak that was growing there; for it was reasonable that, as she had been a handmaid of the temple of Zeus at Thebes, she would remember that temple in the land to which she had come’ (GODLEY 1920, transl.). Herodotus also knew another version in which the priestesses’ role was carried out by doves.
- 62 Although the spring, the trees, and other elements might have played a role in the archaic ritual, it is likely that they were not directly involved in the divination itself (see note 68). Moreover, we do not know the exact nature of the ancient (Branchidae) ritual. There is only some sparse information from Hellenistic times, after its reopening and the new mantic proceeding (see above); see PARKE 1985a, 210–219; FONTENROSE 1988, 78–85. Its ritual was clearly different from what was practiced in Delphi. In a well-known myth, Heracles wanted to seize the tripod and move it to a rival oracular shrine. In Delphi, the tripod was the key element in the divination ritual, not the prophetesses, who neither were from a specific clan nor claimed divine ancestry.
- 63 In the site of Dilberdjin (Afghanistan), a couple of amphorae were discovered with the words βροχγιδεες and βροξγεες inscribed, which have been reconstructed as βροαχγιδ(ων) or βραγχιδῶν. However, these amphorae have been dated to the Kushan period. See KRUGLIKOVA 1974, 79–80; BERNARD 1985, 123–125; KULESZA 1994, 245–246; HAMMOND 1998, 339, n. 2; KUBICA 2016, 144.
- 64 As stated elsewhere (MENDOZA 2019, 175–177), Panchenko’s (2002) suggestion that the whole episode was simply caused by Alexander’s need for wood makes no sense.

ádyton both in the Hellenistic temple and in its predecessors from the Archaic period. These woods played a key role in the foundation myths of the sanctuary itself and the eponymous Branchus, as well as in the rituals surrounding the oracular consultation (FONTENROSE 1988, 30–31, 40, 107). Therefore, it could serve as further evidence that the Branchidae tried to recreate Didyma in their new town, with all the details included. The grove and the bay trees – or another local plant as a substitute – would have kept the same role played in the original shrine. Certainly, there is nothing to confirm that it was dedicated to Apollo Didymeus, but the Branchidae hardly could have consecrated it to anyone else.⁶⁵ The forest, in consequence, would have been probably dedicated to Apollo Didymeus.

This aspect (i.e., facing a new Didyma) might explain the doubts of the Milesians about how to proceed with the Branchidae, its town, and the sanctuary, as they risked offending their national god. However, for Alexander, it was possibly another reason for destroying what he regarded as an abomination. On the other hand, it could also allude to what happened a century and a half earlier: it is very likely that the original sacred groves were also burnt down by the fire that destroyed Didyma. Therefore, destroying the new ones would avenge that event, in the same way that the descendants paid for the crimes of the treacherous priests. Curtius' text specifies that there were other groves in the village, in addition to the sacred ones: '*Nemora quoque et lucos sacros*' (Curtius VII, 5.34). This precise terminological distinction can only mean that there was knowledge about the holy nature of those forests and, therefore, they were not collateral victims, but were systematically destroyed.⁶⁶

However, it would not have been exactly a new Didyma. In the Ionian sanctuary, the interior forest preserved a direct memory of the meeting between Branchus and Apollo. The bay laurels there were supposed to come from the original tree planted by the god himself. Its use as boughs or wreaths by the prophets would be a symbol of the continuing oracular connection. The outside grove represented the origins of the shrine, referring to a Golden Age when humans and gods were closer (Callimachus *Aet.* F 229 Pfeiffer; PARKE 1985a, 5; GRAF 1993, 26–27). The Sogdian shrine lacked those links and could not claim any recognised holiness. No actual god was residing there. Moreover, it was created by sacrilegious men and, in consequence, behind the apparent sacredness, both forest and sanctuary were impious and abhorrent to the gods. Actually, the construction of the sanctuary could have even worsened the accusations of sacrilege. Familiar purity was especially important for carrying out religious duties (Plato *Leg.* VI, 759c), but convicted criminals were also banned from entering temples to avoid their pollution, and infringement was punished with death (Demosthenes XX, 158; Plato *Leg.* IX, 868b, 871a; PARKER 1983, 145–149; CHANIOTIS 1996, 72–75; NAIDEN 2006, 134–135). Therefore, in turn, destroying this forest might not be sacrilegious *per se*. Finally, the foundation of the altars to Apollo Didymeus by Demodamas, in a way, could have restored the proper cult of this god in the region, which had been twisted by the wicked cult of the exiled Branchidae.

65 There is another example in Bactria-Sogdiana: an allusion to a grove of Zeus in a dedication found in Kulyab, probably originally coming from Yakh-su valley or lower Qizil-su river. It is a dedication of a certain Heliodotus to Hestia to honour the Graeco-Bactrian king Euthydemus I and his son Demetrius. See BERNARD – PINAULT – ROUGEMONT 2004, 333–356. Zeus was also worshipped at Didyma, and sacred groves could be devoted to different deities at the same time. However, there is no indication of forests consecrated to Zeus in Didyma. See FONTENROSE 1988, 135–144.

66 *Nemus* and *lucus* were, obviously, two words with very similar meanings. Precisely, the main difference was the sacred nature of the second term. On these words and their ancient and modern conceptions, see SCHEID 1993. These Latin terms correspond to the Greek ones ὕλη and ἄλλος – to be found in Curtius' Greek source – respectively; see MONTEPAONE 1993, 70.

The detail of the sacred forest is quite precise, and it especially appealed to Miletus. In turn, it would not be strictly necessary for anyone trying to invent a story only to justify the new system at the reopened Didymaon. Therefore, this suggests that it was either a first-hand account or a superfluous addition to underline the danger the Branchidae would have entailed (for the restored Ionian sanctuary, of course). In this latter case, some Milesian reshaping could be suggested. If there actually were Milesian soldiers among Alexander's ranks, some aspects could have not been blatantly faked, given the existence of first-hand witnesses. Nevertheless, converting a 'normal' forest into a sacred grove would have not been a great challenge.

As stated above, treason and sacrilege were capital crimes, and they were reasonable motives for a Greek to harsh retaliation. Loathing for the Branchidae's degeneration/barbarisation introduces in Curtius' account extra justification about why they felt prompted to wipe them out. It is curious to see how very similar details were considered differently depending on the sources' biases. Here, it is worth taking a look at Philostratus' account of Apollonius' meeting with the Eretrians deported to Cissia (VA I, 23–24).⁶⁷ In the city they built, there was an agora, Greek-style temples, and tombstones with odd Greek letters, some of them even with elegies written on them or depictions of ships.⁶⁸ The image is not far from what they might have found in the Branchidae settlement, but the reaction to it was completely different.

The understanding reception was not just because of Apollonius/Philostratus' nature. In the same way, during Alexander's conquest, the Macedonian army ran into other displaced Greek populations and, even though some of them had already 'bastardised' their language and customs, it did not arouse any irrepressible aversion that 'prompted' the soldiers and the king to annihilate them.⁶⁹ This contrast is easily explained by the different circumstances that had caused the respective displacements. The Eretrians were martyrs, and they paid for their 'heroic' resistance to the Persians, as the Milesians and the Boeotians also had to (Herodotus VI, 94.2, 101.3, 107.2, 119; Plato *Leg.* III, 698c–d; *Menex.* 240a–b).⁷⁰ Therefore, they were innocent victims, so their maintenance of Greek customs – even in a strange way – was praiseworthy.⁷¹ On the other hand, the Branchidae were sacrilegious traitors, so their barbarisation generated repulsion (MENDOZA 2020, 150).⁷² In faraway Sogdiana, their past crimes were enough to lead to their own massacre. The obvious double standards suggest that the motif of the 'bastardised'

67 This late source requires some caution about the reliability and exactitude of its content. However, in this case, what really matters is the attitude towards the long-gone deportees. On the peculiarities of this source, see GROSSO 1958, 357–368; PENELLA 1974.

68 They also erected monuments to some Persian kings – Darius I, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes II (?).

69 Diodorus (xvii, 110.4–5; cf. xix, 19.2) states that the army stayed for some days at Celones by the Zagros, where a group of Boeotians lived. They were bilingual and had been assimilated by the natives, but they still preserved some of their ancestral customs. On this people, see GOUKOWSKY 1976, 268–269; MENDOZA 2016, 73; MENDOZA 2020, 150, n. 34. When Alexander arrived at Persepolis, Greek slaves – many of them with mutilations – swarmed the king. He granted them lands in Asia, feeling sorry for their piteous situation: Curtius v, 5.5–6, 9; Diodorus Siculus xvii, 69.2–4, 6–8. Finally, fighting on the Persian side, there were the Gortuae (see note 72), said to be Euboeans who, like the Branchidae, took up exile when the Persians withdrew from Greece: Curtius iv, 12.11. See MENDOZA 2020, 150, n. 33.

70 The Milesians were deported to Ampe, by the Persian Gulf: Herodotus vi, 19.3–20. The Greek deportees became a *topos* as clearly shown in a passage from Xenophon, evoking the countless countrymen moved due to the Great King's will (Xenophon *Mem.* iv, 2.33).

71 In the case of the Greek slaves of Persepolis, the accounts emphasize their pitiful image and circumstances, after having suffered greatly from their mean Persian overlords.

72 In the same way, the treacherous Gortuae had also degenerated, and their customs had died out (Curtius iv, 12.11: *Post hos ibant Gortuae, gentis quidem Euboicae, Medos quondam secuti, sed iam de-*

nature of the Branchidae was overemphasised to vilify them even more. It is clear that, had they run into the other Milesians deported to Ampe after the Ionian revolt, they would not have been slaughtered, no matter how 'barbarian' they had become. Therefore, it was a further step to eliminate any trace of Hellenicity, and of any potential compassion too. Nevertheless, it is impossible to assess if this ultimate justification for their massacre can be traced back to Callisthenes or any other first-generation Alexander historian, or to Demodamas and/or the Milesian tradition.

What was the real role of the Milesians in the army in this episode? Alexander's choice to delegate certain decisions is not exceptional, and there are clear parallels in the cases of Thebes and Bessus. In both episodes, he did not directly determine their destiny, but those decisions were officially made, respectively, by the League of Corinth (Arrian *An.* I, 9.9; Diodorus Siculus xvii, 14; Plutarch *Alex.*, 11.11; Justin III, 3.8–10) and two Iranian assemblies – one of Bactrians, the other of Medes and Persians.⁷³ In both cases, Alexander did not intervene in the decision-making, but it is clear that he had left some hints about what would have pleased him. In those two instances, the verdicts fitted Alexander's will, so he did not have to meddle in them, but it is obvious that he would have done if necessary. In our episode, a similar pattern can be observed, but with an important difference: the Milesians – or some of them – were not leaning towards what Alexander had preferred. The king, therefore, settled on retaking the reins of the situation and did what was best in his opinion.⁷⁴ This decision, as stated above, would not have been prompted by Milesian interests, but by his own agenda as Panhellenic avenger.

What did the Milesians – either in the army or in the city – feel about the outcome of the story? Did they feel relieved for not having direct responsibility? Or did they feel outraged after having been ignored by Alexander? The disparity of opinions among those in the army probably occurred in Miletus itself too. Despite their treason, it is likely that the Branchidae kept some aura of holiness in the public opinion, being the descendants of Branchus – and, in consequence, of the god himself according to the earliest myths (see above). The sacred forest – and the sanctuary? – they found there strengthened this perception in many of them, who might have thought about wiping the slate clean.⁷⁵ Conveniently, the Macedonian king discharged them of any liability and therefore spared the soldiers from any guilt regarding the final upshot of the affair when they came back to their hometown, easing internal frictions afterwards. As it has been pointed out, all of the above does not imply that the restored Milesian democracy invented the story or that its interests influenced either Alexander or the Milesians in the army. The attempt by the Evangellidae to seize the sanctuary's ownership shows that news about the extinction of the Branchidae prompted different reactions in Miletus, beyond the control of, and independent from, the new authorities (see note 59). Therefore, the Milesian initial reception of what happened in faraway Sogdiana was diverse and not unanimous. However, those who backed a rotatory, civic priestly board pulled it off

generes et patrii moris ignari). Nevertheless, there is no indication that they were slain beyond the battlefield.

73 Alexander even left the role of executioner to Oxathres and other members of Darius' family. The evidence for the 'legal proceedings' is found in Arrian *An.* III, 30.3–5, IV, 7.3; Curtius VII, 5.39–43, 10.10; Metz *Epitome* 6, 14. See also Diodorus Siculus xvii, 83.7–9; Plutarch *Alex.* 43.6; Justin XII, 5.10–11. See MENDOZA 2023, 48–50. On the nature of these assemblies, see BRIANT 1984, 85–86; BRIANT 1994, 286–291; BOSWORTH 1995, 43.

74 Curtius' expression (VII, 5.31) is very transparent: [...] *quid optimum factu esset, ostendit*.

75 This is not illogical, despite their treason. After all, the Greeks did not stop consulting Delphi despite its pro-Persian stance during the Ionian Revolt and the Greco-Persian Wars. See PARKE – WORMELL 1956/I, 141–179.

in the end, and as a result, their interpretation became the 'official' one. Perhaps it was at that moment that the accusations against the Branchidae were more legally and formally defined. Callisthenes' vague wording contrasts with the more precise terminology of later accounts, and it has been suggested that the latter derive from a local tradition. It is likely that it was a *post hoc* verdict rather than a trial *in absentia*.

All the above suggests a certain adaptation of the account – or, at least, the addition of some significant details – from a local Milesian standpoint. What did this possible reworking mean? Was it to praise or to put down Alexander and/or the Milesians in the army? If Demodamas – or any other Milesian author – had wanted to present the slaughter of the Branchidae positively, this episode would have been employed to highlight Alexander's clemency towards the Milesians, as having spared them from enslavement and death. However, it seems that is not the case here.

Although Alexander played a crucial role in the affair and for the new authorities, it does not imply that he was revered for it. As has been already pointed out, no display of special gratitude towards the Macedonian king is attested after 331 (see note 55).⁷⁶ Therefore, his part might be restricted to his snub of the Milesians by the public tradition of Miletus. In consequence, Alexander was neutrally portrayed in the best-case scenario. If the Milesian tradition had aimed for a negative representation, it would have been useful to exemplify the conqueror's tyranny, imposing his own will over that of the Milesians (i.e., forced participants of his expedition after the harsh terms imposed following the city's capture) and cruelly massacring the Branchidae's descendants – a fate avoided by Miletus itself just by Alexander's whim. There is some evidence that might suggest that they drew parallels between what happened in Sogdiana and in Ionia, respectively.

Some reshaping can also be posited after the attested similarities between Curtius' version of the Branchidae massacre and Miletus' surrender, especially in the presence of suppliants. The described scenes are analogous and inverse at the same time. In Miletus, despite initial resistance, Alexander spared the citizens. On the other hand, in the Branchidae village, despite the warm reception, the Macedonian king ultimately punished its inhabitants with extreme severity. However, as noted, Alexander's seizure of Miletus was not that bloodless: many citizens died, and the city might have been looted (see note 41), just like the Branchidae village. The assaults on both towns are similar, with Macedonians troops encircling them and bursting in from all directions. Both the Milesians and the Branchidae decided to supplicate to the king,⁷⁷ feeling overwhelmed by the ubiquitous Macedonian soldiers. Unfortunately, the overlap of lacunae does not allow us to draw good comparisons between authors. In the case of Miletus, Diodorus' account has been preserved but not Curtius'; in contrast, for the Branchidae episode, is the account of Curtius is extant rather than Diodorus'. Therefore, a parallel exists, but it is not possible to assess if it is coincidental or a deliberate contraposition, whether by Curtius, Diodorus, or their (common?) sources. Nevertheless, it is likely that, whether on purpose or not, the assault on the Branchidae town evoked similar bad memories for the Milesians.

The question of Demodamas' opinion about Alexander has been left in the air thus far. It is hard to assess, but there is a minor detail that could shed light on this. As stated above, Demodamas set up altars to Apollo Didymeus in Sogdiana. He arrived at the river Jaxartes, and added his name to a prestigious succession of individuals who reached the edge of the world and erected altars: Heracles, Father Liber (Dionysus), Semiramis, Cyrus, and Alexander (Pliny

76 The last conciliatory approach was the embassy sent to Memphis.

77 Note the typical detail of the olive boughs, found both in Diodorus' chapter of Miletus' fall and Curtius' account of the Branchidae massacre.

NH VI, 16(18).49; Solinus 49.5; Martianus Capella VI, 692).⁷⁸ In fact, Pliny writes that Demodamas not only reached the river, but that he crossed it and set his altars on the other side of it (*transcendit eum amnem Demodamas... arasque apollini didymaeo statuit*).⁷⁹ Therefore, he did not really restore them or set new ones next to the former: he established brand-new monuments. A certain Antiochia in Scythia has been suggested to be Demodamas' foundation – if it was not merely the refoundation of Alexandria Eschate.⁸⁰ Altars or columns were built as boundary markers and, in consequence, if he set them beyond the river Jaxartes, he was making a claim over that territory (Strabo III, 5.5) – so it might imply that Antiochia in Scythia was not just a refoundation, but a settlement on the other shore.⁸¹ Therefore, Demodamas' deed not only emulated his forerunners but surpassed them. Through it, Demodamas brought Apollo and the Milesians further than any other (civilized) human had been before. The construction of those easternmost altars exalted Miletus' national god, Apollo Didymeus, from a local to an ecumenical scope (NAWOTKA 2008, 147–148; BEARZOT 2017, 147, 150–152). This act foreshadowed, or was one of the first signs of, his elevation as the Seleucid patron god, depending on when this linkage is supposed to have been established.⁸² Moreover, Apollo's triumph over Heracles and Dionysus could be an analogy of the Seleucid might over their dynastic rivals: Macedonia – either Argead or Antigonid, because both claimed Heraclid ancestry – and the Ptolemies, who associated themselves both with Heracles and Dionysus. Nevertheless, this latter comparison depends on when this divine ancestry was established, and most of the extant evidence is

-
- 78 Martianus Capella did not include Semiramis and Cyrus in his list; see note 2. Alexander historians wrote about a kind of ivy-covered boundary markers that the Macedonians attributed to Dionysus (Curtius III, 10.5, VII, 9.15; *Metz Epitome* 12; cf. Euripides *Bac.* 15), but with no mention of any of the other people found in the accounts about Demodamas. There is no word either on whether Alexander restored them or set new altars there, just like Pliny and Orosius (I, 2.5) imply. They could have been kurgans, see BOSWORTH 1995, 31. Strabo (III, 5.5) places some other altars in India.
- 79 Alexander did actually cross the river, but it was just a quick raid (Curtius VII, 9.1–16; Arrian *An.* IV, 4.3–9; Plutarch *Alex.* 45.5; *Mor.* 341c; *Metz Epitome* 12). He penetrated between 80 and 150 stadia before turning back, according to the sources. Curtius (VII, 9.15) and the *Metz Epitome* explicitly state that the Macedonian army reached and went beyond Dionysus' boundaries, although they seem to place them beyond the river. The city of Alexandria Eschate was (re)founded by the river, but on the south bank, and it formally was the limit of Alexander's territory in the northeast (Curtius VII, 6.25–27; Arrian *An.* IV, 4.1; Justin XII, 5.12). See FRASER 1996, 151–153; COHEN 2013, 252–255. Pliny clearly places the altars by Alexandria Eschate. Appian (*Syr.* 57) included the city as one of Seleucus' foundations. Perhaps it was refounded in the same expedition in which Demodamas erected the altars. See BOSWORTH 1995, 17; *contra* FRASER 1996, 38, 153, n. 94.
- 80 In the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (XI, 5), two altars can be seen below Alexandria Eschate and Antiochia in Scythia. See TARN 1940, 91–93; FRASER 1996, 33; FRASER 2009, 332; COHEN 2013, 250–252.
- 81 It is worth noting that Pliny (*NH* VI, 62(21)) is the only one to attest that Alexander erected his altars at the opposite shore of the river Hyphasis in India where his expedition ended. The other sources did not preserve such a crossing: Arrian *An.* V, 29.1–2; Curtius IX, 3.19; Justin XII, 8.16; Diodorus Siculus XVII, 95.1–2; Strabo III, 5.5; Plutarch *Alex.* 62.7–8; *Metz Epitome* 69; Philostratus *VA* II, 43. See HAMILTON 1969; BOSWORTH 1995, 356.
- 82 This has been a hot topic in Seleucid historiography. Those suggesting an early date have often brought up a passage from Diodorus (XIX, 90.3–4), in which Seleucus revealed a Didymeian prophecy related to his right to rule over Asia in 312; see also Appian *Syr.* 56; Libanius *Or.* XI, 99. Some have even suggested that Demodamas was behind this episode, and he might be mediated between Seleucus and his hometown sanctuary. See BEARZOT 1984; BEARZOT 2017, 149–150; LANDUCCI GATTINONI 2013, 34–36, 42. *Contra* HAUSSOULIER 1902, 33–34; MUSTI 1966, 148–149; PARKE 1985a, 50–51; FONTENROSE 1988, 215–217; GRAINGER 1990, 164; NAWOTKA 2008, 135, 143–145; PRIMO 2009, 186.

late.⁸³ Nevertheless, Heracles and Dionysus were two gods closely related to Alexander already during his lifetime or, at least, in the Diadochi period.⁸⁴ Thus, once more, it could be another spiteful reference to the Macedonian king and his will to emulate these gods' triumphs in the East. In any case, Demodamas' achievement would have excited Milesian pride and boosted Didyma's reputation. In addition, it may have been felt like getting even with Alexander for his previous slights: his feat came to nothing thanks to Demodamas' greatest triumph. If so, Demodamas' work could have also included a critical bias towards Alexander in line with what seemed to be the main tradition in early Hellenistic Miletus.

CONCLUSIONS

Alexander's conquest of Miletus brought hard times to the city, somehow worsened by the king's distrust toward its citizens. Even though the new authorities tried to strengthen the relationship, it was in vain. However, Didyma was reopened and, even if the prophecy sent to Alexander proved useless, the king's harshness was to do them an unexpected favour. The annihilation of the long-lost Branchidae – and the destruction of their copycat shrine in Sogdiana – cleared the way for a complete change of management, despite attempts by some to seize it for their family, and the operation of the reopened oracular centre. The role of the Milesians in the incident remains doubtful, but conveniently, the official version spared them of any direct responsibility, thus avoiding further unrest in their hometown. This ambiguous role played by Alexander found its way into the local tradition and, in turn, to its writers. Some details of the extant narratives clearly suggest a Milesian origin, and even a certain reworking of some aspects to fit them better in the accepted account. Among the local authors that could have influenced later writers, Demodamas, who had close relations both with Didyma and the Seleucids, clearly stands out. It is very likely that he dealt with the episode in his works, especially when describing his deeds in Central Asia. Although there is no conclusive evidence to determine without doubt that Demodamas' narrative is reflected in the extant versions, the possibility cannot be rejected outright, and it even appears as a probable option. However, his main favour to Miletus and his beloved sanctuary was the setting of the altars of Apollo Didymeus at the edge of the *oikoumene*. With this action, Demodamas surpassed any other Greek mortal man – including Alexander – and bound together the two extremes of Asia under the aegis of his national patron god. Faraway Sogdiana, therefore, became an

83 Antigonid connection with Heracles was, in turn, a consequence of their alleged relationship with the Argeads. Direct attestation is late (Polybius v, 10.10) but Heracles appeared on early Antigonid coins. Antigonus Monophthalmus and Demetrius Poliorcetes issued coins with the hero's head, but the type was widespread in that period, having been already used by Alexander. Ptolemaic association with Heracles seems to be early, because Ptolemy I would have claimed to be Philip II's illegitimate son (Pausanias 1, 6.2; Curtius ix, 8.22; Suda s.v. Λάγος). However, there was an alternative genealogy that claimed descent from both Heracles and Dionysus through Arsinoe, Ptolemy's mother (Satyrus *FGrHist* 631F 1 *apud* Theophilus *Ad Autol.* 11, 7; Theocritus xvii, 26). See also *OGIS* 54. Ptolemaic fondness for Dionysus is clearly proved by Philadelphus' great procession in the early 270s (Callixenus of Rhodes *FGrHist* 627F 2 *apud* Athenaeus v, 197c–203e), which suggests a previous relation. Soter issued coins with Alexander wearing Dionysian elements such as the elephant scalp, an identification also found in his son's *pompé*.

84 In the same way, Alexander is found emulating or surpassing Cyrus and Semiramis elsewhere during his campaign (e.g., his return trip through Gedrosia). Strabo even called him φιλόκυρος ('fond of Cyrus').

unexpected protagonist of early Hellenistic Miletus. The events that happened there prompted a series of deep changes that are crucial to understanding Milesian identity-building in that period. Apollo Didymeus went twice to Sogdiana and back.

SOURCES

- Aelian = Claudii Aeliani *Epistulae et Fragmenta*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: D. Domingo-Forasté. Stuttgart 1994.
- Appian *Syr.* = Appian of Alexandria: *The Syrian Book*. Transl. B. McGing. In: Appian: *Roman History* III. Loeb Classical Library 4. Cambridge, Mass. 2019.
- Aristophanes *Plut.* = Aristophanes of Athens: *Wealth*. Transl. J. Henderson. In: *Aristophanes. Frogs. Assembly-women. Wealth*. Loeb Classical Library 180. Cambridge, Mass. 2002.
- Arrian *An.* = Arrian of Nicomedia: *Anabasis of Alexander* I–II. Transl. P. A. Brunt. Loeb Classical Library 236, 269. Cambridge, Mass. 1976–1983.
- Athenaeus = Athenaeus of Naucratis: *The Learned Banqueters* II, VI, VIII. Transl. S.D. Olson. Loeb Classical Library 208, 327, 512. Cambridge, Mass. 2007, 2010, 2012.
- Callimachus *Aet.* = Callimachus of Cyrene: *Aetia*. In: *Callimachus I: Fragmenta*. Clarendon Press. Editor: R. Pfeiffer. Oxford 1949.
- Curtius = Quintus Curtius Rufus: *History of Alexander* I–II. Transl. J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 368, 369. Cambridge, Mass. 1946.
- Demosthenes = Demosthenes: *Orations* I. *Orations 1–17 and 20*. Transl. J.H. Vince. Loeb Classical Library 238. Cambridge, Mass. 1930.
- Didyma* = McCabe, D.F. 1985: *Didyma Inscriptions. Texts and List*. Princeton.
- Diodorus Siculus = Diodorus of Sicily: *Library of History* VIII, X. Transl. C.B. Welles – R.M. Geer. Loeb Classical Library 390, 422. Cambridge, Mass. 1959, 1963.
- Diogenes Laertius = Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* I–II. Transl. R.D. Hicks. Loeb Classical Library 184, 185. Cambridge, Mass. 1925.
- Erythrai* = D.F. McCabe 1986: *Erythrai Inscriptions. Texts and List*. Princeton.
- Euripides *Bac.* = Euripides: *Bacchae*. Transl. D. Kovacs. In: *Euripides. Bacchae. Iphigenia at Aulis. Rhesus*. Loeb Classical Library 495. Cambridge, Mass. 2003.
- FGrH* = F. Jacoby ed. 1923–1958: *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Berlin – Leiden.
- Frontinus *Strat.* = Sextus Iulius Frontinus: *Stratagems*. In: *Frontinus: Stratagems. Aqueducts of Rome*. Transl. C.E. Bennet. Loeb Classical Library 174. Cambridge, Mass. 1925.
- Gellius = Aulus Gellius: *Attic Nights* II. *Books 6–13*. Transl. J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 200. Cambridge, Mass. 1927.
- Herodiani Technici Reliquiae* = Aelius Herodianus: *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: A. Lentz. Leipzig 1867–1870.
- Herodotus = Herodotus of Halicarnassus: *The Persian Wars* I, III. Transl. A.D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library 117, 119. Cambridge, Mass. 1920, 1922.
- I.Erythrai* = Engelmann, H. – Merkelbach, R. eds. 1972–1973. *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*, 2 vols. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 1–2. Bonn.
- IG II²* = J. Kirchner ed. 1927–1931: *Inscriptiones Graecae* II. *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora*, 2nd edition. Berlin.
- Iscr. di Cos* = M. Segre 1993: *Iscrizioni di Cos*. Monografie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente, 6. Rome.

- Julius Valerius = Iuli Valeri Alexandri Polemi: *Res gestae Alexandri Macedonis*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: B. Kübler. Leipzig 1888.
- Justin = Marcus Junianus Justinus: *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus I. Books 11–12, Alexander the Great*. Transl. J. Yardley – W. Heckel. Oxford 1997.
- Lactantius *Div. Inst.* = Lactantius: *Divine Institutes*. Transl. A. Bowen – P. Garnsey. Translated Texts for Historians 40. Liverpool.
- Libanius *Or.* = Libanius of Antioch: *Oration in Praise of Antioch (Oration XI)*. Transl. G. Downey. In: *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 103, 652–686. 1959.
- Liber de Morte* = Incerti auctoris *Epitoma rerum gestarum Alexandri Magni cum Libro de morte testamentoque Alexandri*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: P. H. Thomas. Leipzig 1966.
- Lucian *Alex.* = Lucian of Samosata: *Alexander the False Prophet*. Transl. A.M. Harmon. In: *Lucian IV. Anacharsis or Athletics. Menippus or The Descent into Hades. On Funerals. A Professor of Public Speaking. Alexander the False Prophet. Essays in Portraiture. Essays in Portraiture Defended. The Goddess of Surrye*. Loeb Classical Library 162. Cambridge, Mass. 1925.
- Martianus Capella = Martianus Capella: *The Seven Liberal Arts II*. Transl. W.H. Stahl – R. Johnson. Records of Civilization. Sources and Studies 84. New York 1977.
- Mela = Pomponius Mela: *Description of the World*. Transl. F.E. Romer. Ann Arbor 1998.
- Metz Epitome* = Incerti auctoris: *Epitoma rerum gestarum Alexandri Magni cum Libro de morte testamentoque Alexandri*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: P. H. Thomas. Leipzig 1966.
- Milet* = G. Kawerau – A. Rehm eds. 1914: *Das Delphinion in Milet*. Milet I, 3. Berlin.
- OGIS = Dittenberger, W. 1903–1905: *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Pausanias = Pausanias: *Description of Greece I–IV*. Transl. W.H.S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 93, 188, 272, 297. Cambridge, Mass. 1918–1935.
- Philostratus *VA* = Philostratus of Athens: *Life of Apollonius of Tyana I: Books 1–4*. Transl. C.P. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 16. Cambridge, Mass. 2005.
- Plato *Menex.* = Plato: *Menexenus*. Transl. R.G. Bury. In: *Plato. Timaeus. Critias. Cleitophon. Menexenus. Epistles*. Loeb Classical Library 234. Cambridge, Mass. 1929.
- Plato *Leg.* = Plato: *Laws I–II*. Transl. R.G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library 187, 192. Cambridge, Mass. 1926.
- Pliny *NH* = Pliny the Elder: *Natural History II, IX*. Transl. H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 352, 394. Cambridge, Mass. 1942, 1952.
- Plutarch *Alex.* = Plutarch of Chaeronea: *Life of Alexander*. In: *Plutarch: Lives VII. Demosthenes and Cicero. Alexander and Caesar*. Transl. B. Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 99. Cambridge, Mass. 1919.
- Plutarch *Mor.* = Plutarch of Chaeronea: *Moralia*. III, IV, VII. Transl. F.C. Babbitt. Loeb Classical Library 245. Loeb Classical Library 245, 305, 405. Cambridge, Mass. 1931, 1936, 1959.
- Polyaenus = Polyaeus, *Stratagemas*. Transl. P. Krentz – E.L. Wheeler. Chicago 1994.
- Polybius = Polybius of Megalopolis: *The Histories III. Books 5–8*. Transl. W.R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library 138. Cambridge, Mass. 2011.
- POxy* = Beresford, A.G. – Parsons, P. J. – Pobjoy, M.P. eds. 2007: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXXI*. Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 91. London.
- Pseudo-Callisthenes = Pseudo-Callisthenes: *The Greek Alexander Romance*. Transl. R. Stoneman. London 1991.
- RC* = C.B. Welles 1934: *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*. New Haven.
- SB* = F. Priesigke ed. 1915: *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten I*. Strassburg.
- SEG* = A.G. Woodhead ed. 1963: *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum XIX*. Amsterdam.
- Solinus = C. Iulii Solini: *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*. Friederici Nicolai. Editor: Th. Mommsen. Berlin 1864.
- Stephanus Byzantinus = Stephani Byzantii *Ethnica I–II*. Transl. M. Billerbeck – C. Zubler. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 43. Berlin 2006–2010.
- Strabo = Strabo: *Geography*. II, III, V, VI, VIII. Transl. H.L. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 50, 182, 211, 223, 267. Cambridge, Mass. 1923, 1924, 1928, 1929, 1932.

- Suda = *Suda* [online]. Accessed on November 12th 2023 from URL: <https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/>
- Tabula Peutingeriana* = K. Miller ed. 1887–1888: *Tabula Peutingeriana* [online]. Accessed on November 13th 2023 from URL: https://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lsposto3/Tabula/tab_peoo.html
- Theocritus = Theocritus: *Idylls*. Transl. Neil Hopkinson. In: *Theocritus. Moschus. Bion*. Loeb Classical Library 28. Cambridge, Mass. 2015.
- Theophilus *Ad Autol.* = Theophilus of Antioch: *Ad Autolycus*. Transl. R.M. Grant. Oxford 1970.
- Valerius Maximus = Valerius Maximus: *Memorable Doings and Sayings I. Books 1–5*. Transl. D.R.S. Bailey. Loeb Classical Library 492. Cambridge, Mass. 2000.
- Vitruvius = Marcus Vitruvius Pollio: *On Architecture II. Books 6–10*. Transl. F. Granger. Loeb Classical Library 280. Cambridge, Mass. 1934.
- Xenophon *Mem.* = Xenophon of Athens: *Memorabilia*. Transl. E.C. Marchant – O.J. Todd. In Xenophon: *Memorabilia. Oeconomicus. Symposium. Apology*. Loeb Classical Library 168. Cambridge, Mass. 2013.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B. 2012: Alejandro Magno, *poliorcetes*. In: J. Vidal – B. Antela-Bernárdez (eds.): *Fortificaciones y Guerra de Asedio en el Mundo Antiguo*. Zaragoza, 77–134.
- ATKINSON, J.E. 1980: *A commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni. Books 3 and 4*. Amsterdam.
- ATKINSON, J.E. – GARGIULO, T. 2000: *Curzio Rufo. Storie di Alessandro Magno Vol 2. Libri VI–X*. Roma.
- BADIAN, E. 1965: The date of Clitarchus. *Proceedings of the African Classical Associations* 8, 5–11.
- BADIAN, E. 1966: Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia. In: *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to V. Ehrenberg*. Oxford, 37–69 = 2012: In: E. Badian (ed.): *Collected papers on Alexander the Great*. New York, 124–152.
- BEARZOT, C. 1984: Il santuario di Apollo Didimeo e la spedizione di Seleuco I a Babilonia (312 a.C.). In: M. Sordi (ed.): *I santuari e la guerra nel mondo classico*. Milano, 51–81.
- BEARZOT, C. 2017: Demodamante di Mileto e l'identità ionica. *Erga-Logoi* 5, 143–154.
- BERNARD, P. 1985: *Les monnaies hors trésors. Questions d'histoire gréco-bactrienne*. Fouilles d'Aï Khanoum 4. Paris.
- BERNARD, P. – PINAULT, G.-J. – ROUGEMONT, G. 2004: Deux nouvelles inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Centrale. *Journal des Savants* 2, 227–356.
- BICKERMANN, E.J. 1934: Alexandre le Grand et les villes d'Asie. *Revue des études grecques* 47, 346–374.
- BICKERMANN, E.J. 1938: *Institutions des Séleucides*. Paris.
- BILLOWS, R.A. 1990: *Antigonos the One-eyed and the creation of the Hellenistic state*. Berkeley.
- BOFFO, L. 1985: *I Re ellenistici e i centri religiosi dell'Asia Minore*. Firenze.
- BOSWORTH, A.B. 1976: Arrian and the Alexander Vulgate. In: E. Badian (ed.): *Alexandre le Grand. Image et Réalité*. Geneva, 1–46.
- BOSWORTH, A.B. 1980: *A historical commentary on Arrian's history of Alexander. Vol. 1. Books I–III*. Oxford.
- BOSWORTH, A.B. 1988: *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge.
- BOSWORTH, A.B. 1995: *A historical commentary on Arrian's history of Alexander. Vol. 2. Books IV–V*. Oxford.
- BRIANT, P. 1984: *L'Asie centrale et les royaumes proche-orientaux du premier millénaire (c. VIII^e–IV^e siècles avant notre ère)*. Paris.
- BRIANT, P. 1994: Sources gréco-hellénistiques, institutions perses et institutions macédoniennes. Continuités, changements et bricolages. In: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg – A. Kuhrt – M. Cool Root (eds.): *Achaemenid History 8. Continuity and Change*. Proceedings of the Last Achaemenid History Workshop, Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 6–8, 1990. Leiden, 283–310.
- BROWN, T.S. 1950: Clitarchus. *American Journal of Philology* 71, 134–155.
- BROWN, T.S. 1978: Aristodicus of Cyme and the Branchidae. *American Journal of Philology* 99, 64–78.

- CHANIOTIS, A. 1996: Conflicting authorities. *Asyilia* between secular and divine law in the Classical and Hellenistic poleis. *Kernos* 9, 65–86.
- COHEN, G.M. 2013: *The Hellenistic settlements in the East from Armenia and Mesopotamia to Bactria and India*. Berkeley.
- DEBORD, P. 1999: *L'Asie Mineure au IV^e siècle (412–323 a.C.). Pouvoirs et jeux politiques*. Paris.
- DE CAZANOVE, O. – SCHEID, J. eds. 1993: *Les bois sacrés*. Actes du colloque international organisé par le Centre Jean Bérard et l'École Pratique des Hautes Études (V^e section), Naples, 23–25 Novembre 1989. Napoli.
- DREYER, B. 2009: Heroes, Cults and Divinity. In: W. Heckel – L. Tritle (eds.): *Alexander the Great. A New History*. Malden, 218–234.
- FLOWER, M.A. 2000: Alexander the Great and Panhellenism. In: A.B. Bosworth – E. Baynham (eds.): *Alexander the Great in fact and fiction*. Oxford, 96–135.
- FLOWER, M.A. 2008: *The seer in ancient Greece*. Berkeley.
- FONTANA, M.J. 1955: Il problema delle fonti per il XVII libro di Diodoro Siculo. *Kokalos* 1, 155–190.
- FONTENROSE, J.E. 1988: *Didyma. Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions*. Berkeley.
- FRASER, P.M. 1996: *Cities of Alexander the Great*. Oxford.
- FRASER, P.M. 2009: *Greek ethnic terminology*. Oxford.
- GOUKOWSKY, P. 1976: *Diodore de Sicile. Bibliothèque historique. Livre XVII*. Paris.
- GRAF, F. 1993: Bois sacrés et oracles en Asie Mineure. In: DE CAZANOVE – SCHEID eds. 1993, 23–29.
- GRAINGER, J.D. 1990: *Seleukos Nikator. Constructing a Hellenistic kingdom*. London.
- GRAINGER, J.D. 2009: *The cities of Pamphylia*. Oxford.
- GROSSO, F. 1958: Gli Eretriesi deportati in Persia. *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 86, 350–375.
- HAMILTON, J.R. 1961: Cleitarchus and Aristobulus. *Historia. Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 10, 448–458.
- HAMILTON, J.R. 1969: *Plutarch, Alexander. A commentary*. Oxford.
- HAMMOND, N.G.L. 1980: *Alexander the Great – King, Commander and Statesman*. Bristol.
- HAMMOND, N.G.L. 1983: *Three historians of Alexander the Great. The so-called Vulgate authors, Diodorus, Justin, and Curtius*. Cambridge.
- HAMMOND, N.G.L. 1998: The Branchidae at Didyma and in Sogdiana. *The Classical Quarterly* 48, 339–344.
- HARRISON, C.M. 1982: *Coins of the Persian Satraps*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia.
- HASELBERGER, L. 1980: Werkzeichnungen am Jüngerem Didymeion-Vorbericht. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 30, 191–215.
- HASELBERGER, L. 1983: Bericht über die Arbeit am Jüngerem Apollotempel von Didyma-Zwischenbericht. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 33, 90–123.
- HAUSSOULLIER, B. 1900: Les Séleucides et le temple d'Apollon Didyméen. *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* 24, 243–271.
- HAUSSOULLIER, B. 1902: *Études sur l'histoire de Milet et du Didymeion*. Paris.
- HOLT, F.L. 1989: *Alexander the Great and Bactria: the formation of a Greek frontier in central Asia*. Leiden.
- ISAGER, S. 1998: The Pride of Halikarnassos. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 123, 5–23.
- KEBRIC, R.B. 1977: *In the shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos*. Wiesbaden.
- KHOLOD, M.M. 2010: The garrisons of Alexander the Great in the Greek cities of Asia Minor. *Eos* 97, 249–258.
- KOSMIN, P. J. 2014: *The land of the elephant kings. Space, territory, and ideology in the Seleucid Empire*. Cambridge.
- KRUGLIKOVA, I.T. 1974: *Dil'berdžin 1. Raskopki 1970–1972 gg*. Moskva.
- KUBICA, O. 2016: The massacre of the Branchidae. A reassessment. The *post-mortem* case in defence of the Branchidae. In: K. Nawotka – A. Wojciechowska (eds.): *Alexander the Great and the East: History, Art, Tradition*. Wiesbaden, 143–150.
- KULESZA, R. 1994: Persian Deportations – Greeks in Persia. *Eos* 82, 221–250.
- LANDUCCI GATTINONI, F. 2013: Seleucus vs. Antigonos. A study on the sources. In: V. Alonso Troncoso – E. Anson (eds.): *After Alexander. The Time of the Diadochoi (323–281 BC)*. Oxford, 30–42.

- LANDUCCI GATTINONI, F. 2005: La tradizione su Seleuco in Diodoro XVIII-XX. In: C. Bearzot – F. Landucci Gattinoni (eds.): *Diodoro e l'altra Grecia. Macedonia, Occidente, Ellenismo nella Biblioteca storica di Diodoro Siculo*. Atti del Convegno, Milano, 15–16 gennaio 2004. Milano, 155–181.
- LANDUCCI GATTINONI, F. – PRANDI, L. 2013: Un nuovo catalogo di storici ellenistici. Dossier. *POxy LXXI 4808*: Contenuto e problema. *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 141, 79–97.
- LANE FOX, R. 2015: King Ptolemy. Centre and periphery. In: P. Wheatley – E.J. Baynham (eds.): *East and West in the World Empire of Alexander. Essays in honour of Brian Bosworth*. Oxford, 163–195.
- LEVI, M.A. 1977: *Introduzione ad Alessandro Magno*. Milano.
- MENDOZA, M. 2016: La Anábasis Forzada. Deportaciones en el Imperio Aqueménida. *POLIS. Revista de ideas y formas políticas de la Antigüedad Clásica* 28, 69–130.
- MENDOZA, M. 2019: *La impiedad de Alejandro*. Alcalá de Henares.
- MENDOZA, M. 2020: Achaemenid Deportations. Greek Perceptions, Persian Realities. *Semitica* 62, 137–162.
- MENDOZA, M. 2022: Powerslave. Rehenes y control político en el reinado de Alejandro. In: F.J. Gómez Espe- losín – J. Gómez de Caso Zuriaga (eds.): *Historia sin fronteras. En torno a las raíces de Europa. Estudios en honor del profesor Luis A. García Moreno*. Sevilla – Alcalá de Henares, 379–402.
- MENDOZA, M. 2023: *Decapitation in sources on Alexander the Great*. Cham.
- MENDOZA, M. *in print a*: When the river runs deep. Rivers and altars in Alexander's empire-building. In: G. Taietti – B. Antela-Bernárdez (eds.): *Liminal Alexander. Alexander from the Borders*.
- MENDOZA, M. *in print b*: To tame a land. Rehenes y mecanismos de control en la campaña india de Alejandro. In: B.X. Currás – I. Sastre (eds.): *As faces do império. Poder, controlo e submissão na Antiguidade*. Actas do 41º Coloquio Internacional do Girea. ISTA.
- MONTEPAONE, C. 1993: *L'alsos/lucus*, forma ideal tipica artemidea. Il caso di Ippolito. In: DE CAZANOVE – SCHEID eds. 1993, 69–75.
- MUSTI, D. 1966: Lo Stato dei Seleucidi. Dinastia popoli città da Seleuco I ad Antioco III. *Studi Classici e Orientali* 15, 61–197.
- NAIDEN, F.S. 2006: *Ancient supplication*. Oxford.
- NAWOTKA, K. 2008: Demodamas of Miletus, Seleucus I and Apollo. *MHEMOH* 7, 135–152.
- NAWOTKA, K. 2010: Miletus and Alexander the Great. In: E. Dąbrowa – M. Dzielska – M. Salamon – S. Sprawski (eds.): *Hortus Historiae. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci profesora Józefa Wolskiego w setną rocznicę urodzin*. Kraków, 143–163.
- NAWOTKA, K. 2011: How to Handle a King. Miletus and the Successors. *Eos* 98, 27–42.
- NAWOTKA, K. 2017: *The Alexander romance by Ps.-Callisthenes. A historical commentary*. Leiden.
- NAWOTKA, K. 2019: Apollo, the Tutelary God of the Seleucids, and Demodamas of Miletus'. In: Z. Archibald – J. Haywood (eds.): *The Power of Individual and Community in Ancient Athens and Beyond. Essays in Honour of John K. Davies*. Swansea, 261–284.
- OGDEN, D. 2017: *The Legend of Seleucus. Kingship, Narrative and Mythmaking in the Ancient World*. Cambridge.
- PANCHENKO, D. 2002: The City of the Branchidae and the question of Greek contribution to the Intellectual History of India and China. *Hyperboreus* 8, 244–255.
- PARKE, H.W. 1967: *The oracles of Zeus. Dodona, Olympia, Ammon*. Cambridge.
- PARKE, H.W. 1985a: *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*. London.
- PARKE, H.W. 1985b: The Massacre of the Branchidae. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105, 59–68.
- PARKE, H.W. 1986: The Temple of Apollo at Didyma. The Building and Its Function. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106, 121–131.
- PARKE, H.W. – WORMELL, D.E.W. 1956: *The Delphic Oracle 1-2*. Oxford.
- PARKER, R. 1983: *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- PARKER, V. 2009: Source-critical reflections on Cleitarchus' work. In: P. Wheatley – R. Hannah (eds.): *Alexander and his Successors. Essays from the Antipodes*. Claremont, 28–55.
- PEARSON, L. 1960: *The lost histories of Alexander the Great*. New York.

- PENELLA, R.J. 1974: Scopelianus and the Eretrians in Cissia. *Athenaeum* 52, 295–300.
- PRANDI, L. 1985: *Callistene. Uno storico tra Aristotele e i re macedoni*. Milano.
- PRANDI, L. 1996: *Fortuna e realtà dell'opera di Clitarco*. Stuttgart.
- PRANDI, L. 2012: New evidence for the dating of Cleitarchus (POxy LXXI. 4808)? *Histos* 6, 15–26
- PRANDI, L. 2013: *Diodoro Siculo: Biblioteca storica, Libro XVII, Commento storico*. Milano.
- PRIMO, A. 2009: *La storiografia sui Seleucidi da Megastene a Eusebio di Cesarea*. Pisa.
- RAMSEY, G.C. 2016: The Diplomacy of Seleukid Women – Apama and Stratonike. In: A. Coşkun – A. McAuley (eds.): *Seleukid Royal Women Creation. Representation and Distortion of Hellenistic Queenship in the Seleukid Empire*. Stuttgart, 87–106.
- RAPIN, C. 2017: Alexandre le Grand en Asie Centrale. Géographie et Stratégie. In: C. Antonetti – P. Biagi (eds.): *With Alexander in India and Central Asia. Moving East and back to West*. Oxford, 37–121.
- RAWLINSON, H.G. 1912: *Bactria. The history of a forgotten empire*. London.
- ROBERT, L. 1984: Documents d'Asie Mineure XXXI. Plin VI 49, Démodamas de Milet et la reine Apamé. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 108, 467–472.
- ROMANE, J.P. 1994: Alexander's Sieges of Miletus and Halicarnassus. *Ancient World* 25, 61–76.
- SAVALLI-LESTRADE, I. 1998: *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique*. Genève.
- SCHEID, J. 1993: *Lucus, nemus*. Qu'est-ce qu'un bois sacré? In: DE CAZANOVE – SCHEID eds. 1993, 13–18.
- SHERK, R.K. 1992: The Eponymous officials of Greek cities IV. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 93, 223–272.
- SHERWIN-WHITE, S.M. – KUHRT, A. 1993: *From Samarkhand to Sardis. A new approach to the Seleucid Empire*. Berkeley.
- SEIBERT, J. 1974: Review: W. Günther, *Das Orakel von Didyma in hellenistischer Zeit. Eine Interpretation von Stein-
-Urkunden*. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 226, 186–212.
- SIERRA, C. 2013: La venganza se sirve fría. Tebanos, bránquidas y el recuerdo de las guerras médicas. In: J. Vidal – B. Antela-Bernárdez (eds.): *Más allá de la batalla. La violencia contra la población en el Mundo Antiguo*. Zaragoza, 55–66.
- TARN, W.W. 1922: The Massacre of the Branchidae. *Classical Review* 36, 63–66.
- TARN, W.W. 1940: Two Notes on Seleucid History: 1. Seleucus' 500 elephants, 2. Tarmita. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 60, 84–94.
- TARN, W.W. 1948: *Alexander the Great 2. Sources and Studies*. Cambridge.
- TORELLI, M.R. 1985: Recensione: M. Sordi (ed.): *I santuari e la guerra nel mondo classico*. *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 113, 225–229.
- WOLSKI, J. 1984: Les Séleucides et l'héritage d'Alexandre le Grand en Iran. *Studi ellenistici* 1, 9–20.
- WORTHINGTON, I. 2004: *Alexander the Great. Man and God*. Harlow.
- ZECCHINI, G. 1999: Nosso di Alicarnasso. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 128, 60–62.

Marc Mendoza

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
 Despatx B7/129
 Facultat de Filosofia i Lletres, Edifici B
 Campus UAB s/n
 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès (Barcelona)
 marc.mendoza@uab.cat