

A CAVALRY UNIT IN THE ARMY OF ANTIGONUS MONOPHTHALMUS: *ASTHIPPOI**

As the editor of the new Budé edition of Diodorus Siculus 19 has said, R is 'the more often correct' of the two main manuscripts and the other, F, has a number of acceptable variants; and she reckons the division between R and F to have been 'fairly ancient'. All other manuscripts are merely copies, more or less faithful, of R and F.¹ For the passage which I wish to consider I quote the text as given in R:

D.S. 19.29.2, ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τοὺς τε ἀσθίππους ὀνομαζομένους καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν
ἄνω κατοικούντων ὀκτακοσίους.

The word *ἀσθίππους* is read also by V, a copy of R. On the other hand F and one of its copies, X, read *ἀνθίππους*. All editors have rejected the readings of R and F, and they have adopted the conjecture of Wesseling *ἀμφίππους*. In terms of palaeographic principle this is unsound. It is highly improbable that an intelligible word *ἀμφίππους*, 'horsemen with two mounts', in the ancestral manuscript would have become corrupted into *ἀσθίππους* and *ἀνθίππους*. The correct course is to retain *ἀσθίππους* as the *lectio difficilior* and to regard *ἀνθίππους* as a corruption of it. But it is acceptable only if the word *ἀσθίππους* is meaningful, and in my opinion it has become so since the word *ἀσθηταῖροι* in Arrian's *Anabasis* was so convincingly reinstated by A. B. Bosworth in *CQ* 23 (1973), 245 ff. For just as *asthetairoi* meant an élite group of Macedonian infantrymen, so *asthippoi* should mean an élite group of Macedonian cavalrymen. Let us see if this is so in the context where the passage occurs.

In 317 B.C. the names of the regiments which had served with distinction under Philip and Alexander were held in high esteem. Thus Diodorus, whose source was undoubtedly Hieronymus, a contemporary of Antigonos and Eumenes, emphasized the prestigious names of some of the units in the armies of these two generals. Thus a special note was appended to the mention of the *argyraspides* at 28.1. When the Companion Cavalrymen were reported as stationed on each side, the word 'called' was added in the sense of 'renowned': 28.3 τοὺς καλουμένους ἑταῖρους and 29.4 οἱ προσαγορευθέντες ἑταῖροι. The same distinction was accorded to the *asthippoi* and their associates. Thus they were among the most prestigious cavalry units in the field.

How should the passage be translated? If we keep *asthippous*, the translation of R. M. Geer in the Loeb edition of 1947 would be: 'and in addition to all these, the cavalry who are called the *asthippoi* and the eight hundred cavalry from the colonists established in the upper country'. And the translation of F. Bizière in the Budé edition of 1975: 'et, pour finir les cavaliers *asthippoi*, comme on les appelle, ainsi que huit cents colons des régions supérieures'. Both

* I owe a particular debt to G. T. Griffith for his valuable comments and criticisms of this article. Where I disagree with him, it is with hesitation; but as in our forthcoming volume ii of *A History of Macedonia*, we show respect for one another's views but are not tied to them.

I am grateful also to A. B. Bosworth whose re-establishment of the *asthetairoi* in the text of Arrian has made this article possible.

¹ F. Bizière, *Diodore Sicile, Bibliothèque historique, livre XIX* (Paris, 1975), pp.xx–xxii.

apply the number incorrectly. If we look at the context, we see that a number is appended at the end of the description of each element. To take 28.2 as an example analogous to our passage, it is obvious that the number 1,000 goes with *arhippotoxotai*² and *lonchophoroi* together: τοὺς τε ἐκ Μηδίας καὶ Παρθυαίας ἀφιπποτοξότας καὶ λογχοφόρους, ὄντας μὲν χιλίους, πεφυκóτας δὲ εὖ πρὸς ἐκ μεταβολῆς κρίσω. In our passage, then, the number 800 is the sum of the two parts in the element. If a squadron numbered 200 men, as was usual in the Companion Cavalry, this element consisted of four squadrons, but we are not told how they were divided between the two parts. Another point in which the translations may err is in restricting the reference of *ὀνομαζόμενους* to the preceding words. It will be noticed that, whereas in the two quotations above referring to the *ἐταῖροι* the participle is contained between the article and the noun, this is not the case in our passage (which lies between them in the text). To judge from these two quotations, Diodorus would have written τοὺς τε ὀνομαζόμενους ἀσθίππους if he had meant the participle to refer to the *asthippoi* alone. I conclude that the word *ὀνομαζόμενους* was placed where it was, in order that it should be common to both parts of the sentence. Thus I translate as follows: 'and, to crown all, both those who were called *asthippoi* and those who were called "the men from the up-country settlers", being together 800 strong.' The two parts, then, have separate names; but being so closely brigaded together they must have had a close relationship. We may compare troops 'from Media and Parthia', 'from Phrygia and Lydia', and 'Lycians and Pamphylians' in the same context (28.2–3).

What is the derivation and so the meaning of *asthippoi*? That *hippos* can stand for cavalry and *-hippoi* for cavalymen, as in *ἀμφίπποι* 'cavalymen with two mounts', is clear enough. The difficulty is the prefix. Three explanations of the same prefix in *ἀσθῆταιροι* have been advanced. A. B. Bosworth thought it was a contraction of **ἀσισθέταιροι*, which he derived from *ἄσιστα*, meaning 'closest in kin'; and he held that *asthetairoi* meant 'something like "most closely related companions"', and in the context 'closest in kin companions'. Closest to whom? Presumably to the King. However, as I understand it, there was no emphasis on kinship in fourth-century Macedon. In fact the royal house, being of the Temenid line from Argos, was unrelated to the local families of Lower Macedonia, and those families seem to have had no inherited distinctions of tribe or class.⁴ It was different in Upper Macedonia, where ethnic groups persisted and there were indigenous royal houses, as Thucydides pointed out (2.99.2); but their ethnic connections were with the tribes of Epirus,⁵ not with

² This form should be retained in the text, as at 30.3. R has *ἀφιπποτοξότας* and F has *ἐφιπποτοξότας*. The emendation to *ἀμφίπποτοξότας* favoured by L-S-J⁹ s.v., should be rejected, because two mounts is an unnecessary complication for an archer in a major cavalry battle; in the only instance of the word, in Plu. *Mor.* 197 d, the reading of two manuscripts *ἀφιπποτοξότας* should be preferred. For riders with two mounts see Arr. *Tact.* 2.3.

³ Even as the *betairoi* were companions of the King. I doubt whether *asthetairoi* can carry Bosworth's weight of interpretation (his p.251): '“Closest in kin companions” would have encapsulated

nicely both their Macedonian nationality and their previous independence of the central monarchy.'

⁴ See N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia* i (Oxford, 1972) 138, and in ii (forthcoming), 159 and 162 f.

⁵ See N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford, 1967), pp.460 f., citing Hecataeus (*FGrH* i) F 107 'Ορέσται· Μολοσσικὸν ἔθνος and Strabo C 326 and C 434, and *A History of Macedonia* i.439. In taking a different view Bosworth in *CQ* N.S. 21 (1971), 98, seems to confuse kinship with political dependence; Strabo keeps that distinction clear.

the Macedones of Lower Macedonia. For Philip II to have called the men of Upper Macedonia 'closest-in-kin-companions' would have seemed entirely untrue to them, and I cannot see any reason for Philip to stress so fictitious a facet of their relationship. A different explanation which Bosworth mentioned only to reject it was that the prefix is a contracted form of ἄριστος and the word means ἄριστοι ἐταῖροι 'best companions'. This explanation has been developed by G. T. Griffith in one of his chapters in our joint work, *A History of Macedonia II*, which is in the press, and it seems more probable than Bosworth's explanation. Yet here too there is a snag; for it means that the regiments of Upper Macedonia which were quite recently introduced into the army were given this title in preference to the much older regiments of Lower Macedonia.⁶ So too if *asthippoi* means 'best cavalry', they were being rated above the Companion Cavalry of some centuries' standing. The third explanation is one which I suggested to Bosworth and he mentioned in his article, namely that *asthetairoi* is an unambiguous contraction of ἀστοὶ ἐταῖροι, just as *pezhetairoi* is of πεζοὶ ἐταῖροι, and that the meaning is 'townsmen-companions', i.e. companions recruited from the towns of Upper Macedonia. Let me deploy the arguments in favour of this explanation, which will involve a reappraisal of the relationship between the *pezhetairoi* and the *asthetairoi*.

The earliest 'Companions', who were cavalrymen, enjoyed the simple title unadorned, and next came the 'Infantrymen-companions', *pezhetairoi*, who were so entitled probably by Alexander II in 369 or 368 B.C.⁷ These *pezhetairoi*, evidently an élite force, fought under Philip II. We may equate them with 'the best of the Macedones' τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν Μακεδόνων who fought as infantry under his immediate command against Bardylis in 358 B.C. (D.S. 16.4.5). It was with reference to this campaign or to another before the reign of Alexander III that we have a description of them as follows: καὶ τῶν Μακεδόνων τοὺς πεζεταίρους μὲν καλουμένους ὄντας δὲ ἀπολέκτους ἔχων ἐνέβαλεν εἰς τὴν Ἰλλυριῶα.⁸ Speaking in 349 B.C., Demosthenes mentioned the *pezhetairoi* as not worthy of their high reputation (2.17).⁹ Whence were these *pezhetairoi* recruited? In the time of Alexander II, Perdiccas III, and Philip II in his earliest years they can have been recruited only from Lower Macedonia, if we may so name the homeland of the Macedonian state, because Upper Macedonia was in

⁶ For the linking of the *asthetairoi* with the battalions of Upper Macedonia see Bosworth in *CQ* N.S. 23 (1973), 249.

⁷ As in my *History of Greece*, p. 536. The choice is between Alexander I and Alexander II if Anaximenes, a contemporary of Philip and Alexander III, is correct in attributing the invention of the title to an Alexander in Book I of his *Philippica*, which dealt probably with the period before Philip became King (Jacoby on *FGrH* 72 R 4). Alexander I is preferred by J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London, 1976), p. 53.

⁸ This passage is cited in *Et. Magn.* (ed. Gaisford) 699, 47–8, as from Demosthenes Φιλίππικῶν δευτέρῳ, where it is not to be found. As Gaisford suggested, it is probably an error for Anaximenes

Philippica Book II, which would have dealt with the early years of Philip's reign (see Jacoby in *FGrH* ii C 107), and the occasion was probably the campaign against Bardylis, which was introduced by Diodorus as being εἰς τὴν τῶν Ἰλλυριῶν χώραν and was in fact carried to Lake Lychnitis inside Illyris (D. S. 16.4.3 and 16.8.1).

⁹ That they numbered several thousand and yet were élite troops may surprise us if we think on the scale of the Greek city-state, but we may note that Bardylis had 10,000 élite infantry in D.S. 16.4.4. The word *pezhetairoi* was used also for a more select élite, namely the bodyguard of the King (*FGrH* 115 (Theopompus) F 348). For a similar use of the terms 'bodyguard' and 'hypaspists' see P. A. Brunt in his Loeb edition of Arrian, pp. xlii and lxxvii.

those years independent or overrun by Illyrians. When Philip annexed Elimeia, Orestis, and Lyncus and territory up to Lake Lynchitis, reorganized the administration, and planted towns such as Heraclea Lyncestis, he was in a position to recruit and train infantry from these areas, ready for service perhaps by 352 B.C.; and similarly from Tymphaea, annexed probably in 350 B.C., infantry ready for service by 345 B.C. As these new drafts came into the phalanx, he did not give them the title *pezhetairoi* but a new title, peculiar to them, *asthetairoi*, meaning not 'closest-in-kin-companions' or 'best-companions' but 'townsmen-companions', indicating their recruitment from the towns of Upper Macedonia and their honourable status in the service of the King.

Alexander III inherited both *pezhetairoi* and *asthetairoi* on my interpretation, and both organized in phalanx-battalions. In 331 B.C. at Gaugamela he had three battalions of each: the *pezhetairoi* named after their commanders—Meleager, Philip, and Craterus—because they were recruited from Lower Macedonia in general and not district by district,¹⁰ and the *asthetairoi* named not only after their commanders—Coenus, Perdicas, and Polyperchon—but also after the cantons of Upper Macedonia from which they were recruited, i.e. Elimeia, Orestis-Lyncus, and Tymphaea (D.S. 17.57.2–3).¹¹ That the *pezhetairoi* and the *asthetairoi* were different the one from the other is clear also from Arrian 7.11.3, referring to the newly trained and named Persian units: καὶ πεζέταιροι Πέρσαι καὶ ἀσθέτεροι ἄλλοι.¹² In practice too, when Alexander divided his army, he tended to keep one or other group of phalanx-infantry with himself. Thus at 1.28.3 he kept τοὺς πεζεταίρους (D.S. 17.27.6 shows that part of the army was elsewhere¹³); at 4.23.1 τῶν ἀσθεταίων καλουμένων τὰς τάξεις (Hephaestion having the battalions of Meleager, Gorgias, and Cleitus in 4.22.7, evidently *pezhetairoi* as Meleager commanded one battalion of them at D.S. 17.57.2); at 5.22.6 τὰς τῶν ἀσθεταίων τάξεις (Hephaestion having 'two phalanxes' at 5.21.5); and at 6.21.3 τῶν ἀσθεταίων καλουμένων τὰς τάξεις (Hephaestion having the rest of the army). New recruits were drafted by Alexander into one or other group of phalanx-battalions in accordance with their racial affinities, as we see from Arrian 3.16.11.

καὶ τούτων τοὺς μὲν ἱππείας ἐς τὴν ἵππον τὴν ἑταιρικὴν κατέταξεν Ἀλέξανδρος, τοὺς πεζοὺς δὲ προσέθηκεν ταῖς τάξεσι ταῖς ἄλλαις, κατὰ ἔθνη ἐκάστους συντάξας.

¹⁰ Most of the Macedones in Lower Macedonia were described as being from one of the many cities there; e.g. Ptolemy Alorites.

¹¹ See also Quintus Curtius 4.13.28, who describes the battalions on the right of the phalanx at Gaugamela as those of Coenus, Orestae—Lyncestae, and Polyperchon. If we go by the names of the commanders, the earliest mention of *asthetairoi* battalions is in 335 B.C. at 1.6.9, τὴν Περδίκκου τε καὶ Κόινου τάξιν, which is generally taken to involve two battalions.

¹² Here I disagree with Bosworth in CQ N.S. 23 (1973), 247: 'Πεζέταιροι, it seems, designates the whole six phalanx battalions'. If it were so, what need for another name?

The use of the term *ασθέταιροι* for Persians has some bearing on its meaning; for they could hardly be called 'best companions' before their service started, but they could be called 'closest-in-kin companions' if Alexander was claiming to be the Persian monarch, where 'the kindred' was an honorific term (hence his remark in Arr. 7.11.6–7), or 'townsmen-companions' in that they came from Alexander's new cities (7.6.1).

¹³ In this case Arrian did not mention the division of the army, but Diodorus is surely correct, since Alexander was campaigning in the very mountainous country of the Pisidians and had no need of the full phalanx.

Of these Alexander assigned the horsemen to the Companion cavalry, and attached the foot to the other battalions, assigning them in accordance with their national origins:¹⁴ (transl. by P. A. Brunt in the Loeb edition).

How were the cavalry units named? Squadrons of cavalry in the army of Alexander III were named after districts in Lower Macedonia such as Bottiaea and Anthemus,¹⁵ and those from Mygdonia and beyond after a city such as Apollonia and Amphipolis. We hear of cavalry from Upper Macedonia first in 335 B.C., when Alexander attacked the Triballians with two squadrons of cavalry from Bottiaea and Amphipolis on his right and 'the horsemen from Upper Macedonia'—presumably two squadrons in strength—on his left (1.2.5, *τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἄνωθεν Μακεδονίας ἱππέας*); both sets were heavy-armed cavalry as they engaged at close quarters. We may be confident that Philip too had recruited cavalry from Upper Macedonia. There was a long-standing tradition of heavy-armed cavalry there, particularly in Elimeia,¹⁶ and it seems that Philip organized this cavalry in relation to the towns which already existed or were founded by him,¹⁷ just as he organized cavalry from Mygdonia in relation to Apollonia and from the lower Strymon valley in relation to Amphipolis. This at least is what I understand from my interpretation of the meaning of *asthippoi*. The fact that we do not hear of these cavalry in Alexander's army in Asia is not surprising; for they were experienced in the frontier areas of Macedonia and were no doubt left with Antipater to resist any raids from the north.

Were those who were called *asthippoi* and those who were called the men from the up-country settlers in 317 B.C. the Persian counterpart of the Macedonian *asthippoi* and recruits from Alexander's cities in farther Asia, or were they Macedonians from European Macedonia? F. Bizière, following P. Jouguet and others,¹⁸ has derived them from the 'colonies militaires fondées par Alexandre' and she refers the reader to 19.27.5, *οἱ δὲ τοῦτοις ἴσοι Θράκες ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικῶν*; similarly Fischer proposed to add to the phrase in our passage *τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικούντων* the word *Θράκων*. As the two passages relate one to the army of Eumenes and the other to the army of Antigonos, Bizière means that both Eumenes and Antigonos recruited cavalry from these cities in farther Asia. This is hardly credible, as I shall show from a consideration of the campaign to which the confrontation of the two armies

¹⁴ The word *ἔθνη* was used of the peoples of Upper Macedonia by Thucydides at 2.99.2. A more explicit translation would be 'to the other formations', *ράξεις* being used in its general sense of 'a body of troops' (used of cavalry in Arrian 1.15.4); for the contrast inherent in the words *ταῖς ἄλλαις* *ράξεσι* is with the formation in the previous limb of the period, the Companion cavalry. I disagree with the inference made by R. D. Milns in *GRBS* 7.2 (1966), 160 that 'the emphatic position of the words *ταῖς ἄλλαις* strongly implies that there was a battalion or battalions over and above the ones to which additions were made'.

¹⁵ W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, ii (Cambridge, 1948), 154 thought that all

squadrons of the Companion Cavalry came from areas outside 'old Macedonia'; a strange oversight and a most improbable hypothesis. See P. A. Brunt in *JHS* 83 (1963), 42.

¹⁶ e.g. in Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.38–40 Derdas of Elimiotis had 400 superb cavalry.

¹⁷ The populations of the new towns were partly settlers from Lower Macedonia and partly leading local people; for a discussion of these towns see the forthcoming volume II of *A History of Macedonia*, ch. 20.

¹⁸ Bizière in the Budé edition, p.43 n.2 and p.45 n.1; P. Jouguet, *L'Impérialisme macédonien et l'hellénisation de l'Orient* (Paris, 1926), pp.125 f.

was a sequel. But before I do so, let us note that the two Greek phrases are not identical. Now this is significant because Diodorus in this part of book 19 was copying the text either of Hieronymus or of someone who had copied Hieronymus.¹⁹ The phrase ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικιῶν is a normal use of the preposition with a place and normal in this context; we may compare τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἄνω σατραπειῶν (19.12.3) and τοὺς τε ἐκ Μηδίας . . . ἀφιπποτοξότας (19.29.2). But the phrase τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικούντων employs the preposition with persons and in accordance with L-S-J⁹ citing, for example ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ought to mean parentage, i.e. 'those descended from the up-country settlers'.²⁰ In other words Philip and later Antipater had trained the sons of settlers in up-country Macedonia to form cavalry units, just as Alexander trained the sons of settlers in his cities in Asia to be the soldiers of the next generation, the 'epigoni' (Arr. *An.* 7.6.1). We have an analogy in the army of Eumenes in D.S. 19.28.1, where mention is made first of 'the Macedones *argyraspides*' and then of 'those descended from the *hypaspistai*'.²¹ It would seem then that the latter had been trained as a special group of infantry more than 3,000 strong, who were placed with the *argyraspides* under the command of Antigones and Teutamus.

When Antipater crossed from Europe into Asia, he brought an army of '32,500 men, chiefly Macedonians',²² and when he left Asia he gave a part of this army to Antigonus with orders to defeat Eumenes (D.S. 18.39.7 and *FGrH* 156 (Arrian) F 11, 43). In 318 B.C. Antigonus hoped to bring Eumenes to battle in Asia Minor, but Eumenes was too clever for that; for he withdrew eastwards, mopping up supplies and requisitioning what he needed, in order to delay Antigonus' army which had to cover some of the same ground with ever-lengthening lines of communication. Eumenes' only enemies in the east were

¹⁹ F. Bizi re favours the first alternative in the Bud  edition p.xvi: 'L'hypoth se la plus satisfaisante,   notre avis, est que Diodore a utilis  directement Hi ronymos, de tr s pr s jusqu'   la mort d'Eum ne.'

²⁰ L-S-J⁹ s.v.  κ III.2. Compare Hdt. 1.56.1 οἱ  ξ αὐτοῦ. Geer's and Bizi re's translations are cited on p.128 above. If I am correct, we may infer from the absence of any indication of unit-commander, racial origin, or geographical area that these troops were Macedonian.

²¹ οἱ  κ τῶν ὑπασπιστῶν ὄντες πλείους τρισχίλιων. R and F have accusatives in this sentence, and their readings were correct in that they reproduced the original. That being so, Diodorus probably changed into the nominative a sentence of Hieronymus which was in the accusative, doing so in order to add his own note about the *argyraspides*. The meaning 'the descendants of the hypaspists' makes sense when we remember that the hypaspists had been recruited by Philip and inherited by Alexander and were between 60 and 70 to say 75 years of age in the winter of 317/16 B.C. (D.S. 19.41.2)—recruited then mainly between 357 and 347 B.C., if we put the

average age of admission into this *corps d' lite* at 30—and could therefore be expected to have adult sons in the 330s and 320s. We hear of their families in Asia in D.S. 19.43.7, and no doubt they had families in Macedonia too. We know that Philip and Alexander trained the sons of their Companion Cavalry as pages and as horsemen, to enter the Companion Cavalry if suitable; and we may infer from this passage that they had trained the sons of the corresponding infantry corps, 'the royal hypaspists', to become in their turn hypaspists. This has not been suggested, I think, because Tarn and others have thought that οἱ  κ τῶν ὑπασπιστῶν was synonymous with οἱ ὑπασπισταί, which Tarn then took to be 'Eumenes' hypaspists' and M. Launey, *Recherches sur les arm es hell nistiques* (Paris, 1949) i.298 inferred from this passage 'peut- tre tout ou partie des 3,000 hypaspistes' without explaining how the Greek words mean 'tout' or why the 'partie' was according to the text more than the total 3,000. For the association of the *argyraspides* with the hypaspists see note at the end.

²² Tarn in *CAH* 6.468.

Seleucus and Peithon in Babylonia, but he gave them the slip and reached the satrapy of Persia with 15,000 infantry and 3,300 cavalry, where he enlisted the support of 'the satraps and generals in the upper satrapies' (D.S. 18.73.2–4).²³ Meanwhile the army of Antigonus was losing its edge. When Antigonus reached Mesopotamia and Babylonia, he recruited 'soldiers' locally and from Seleucus and Peithon (19.15.6 and 19.17.2). But this was a trifle compared with the accession to Eumenes of 18,700 infantry, 4,600 cavalry, and over 100 elephants, all from the upper satrapies (19.14.8). After losing troops in an attempt to cross the Pasitigris and more troops in a march northwards through mountainous country, Antigonus reached Media and sent out Peithon, nominally satrap of the province, who brought in 1,000 cavalry mounts, many draught animals, and 2,000 horsemen (19.20.3). It is, then obvious, that Antigonus had not been able to get troops from the upper satrapies and in particular from the up-country cities of Alexander; on the contrary these had gone to Eumenes, including 500 Thracian horsemen from the up-country settlements (19.27.5, οἱ . . . Θρᾷκες ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικιῶν). The order of battle on each side reflected this situation. The majority of the named units of Eumenes' army came from the upper satrapies (19.27–28), but of those in Antigonus' army only 1,000 mounted archers from Media and Parthia and 'the 1,500 cavalry with Peithon' were from east of the Euphrates.²⁴ The army of Antigonus was in essence from Europe and Asia Minor. The pick of his infantrymen were 'Macedonians not much less than the 8,000, whom Antipater when appointed regent had given him' (19.29.3).²⁵ The pick of the cavalry on the right wing were the so-called Companions 1,000 strong and Antigonus' own guard, 300 strong; and on the left wing 'those who are called *asthippoi* and those who are called descendants of the up-country settlers, 800 strong.' Thus all his best troops were Macedonians from Europe, and they held the hinge positions in the battle-order.

Did Antipater give Antigonus not only infantry but also cavalry? Now Diodorus never gave the statement to which he made his back-reference about 'the eight thousand' Macedonian infantrymen (19.29.3), but we find them in a fragment of Arrian, who was using the same source as Diodorus. I quote the passage recording Antipater's gift because it has been misunderstood. *FGrH* 156 F 11, 43, πεζοὺς μὲν . . . Μακεδόνας ὀκτακισχιλίου καὶ πεντακοσίου καὶ ἵππας τῶν ἐταίρων ἵσους, ἐλέφαντας δέ . . . W. W. Tarn made this 8,500 Macedonians,²⁶ but this is incorrect because Antipater could not have given the same number of Companion Cavalry. The truth is that he gave 'the 8,000 Macedonians' to which Diodorus referred, and a unit of 500, and the same number of Companion cavalry, namely 500; in other words, we must postulate a lacuna between καὶ πεντακοσίου. Thus Antipater did give cavalry from Macedonia, perhaps 1,000 in all, when he left Asia.

Clare College, Cambridge

N. G. L. HAMMOND

²³ The list of these satrapies is given in *FGrH* 156 (Arrian) F 9, 35 and D.S. 18.39.6.

²⁴ Two thousand of those troops had just been brought in by Peithon in Media.

²⁵ R. M. Geer misses the significance

of the article in 'the 8,000', when he translates 'and finally nearly eight thousand Macedonians whom Antipater etc.'; so too F. Bizière in the Budé translation.

²⁶ In *CAH* 6.470.

NOTE ON ARGYRASPIDES (SILVER SHIELDS) AND HYPASPISTS (SHIELD-BEARERS)

Tarn held that the hypaspists of 321 B.C. in D.S. 18.33.6 and 34.3, whom Perdicas led so disastrously into Egypt, suffering two defeats (*FGrH* 156 (Arrian) F 9, 28 *δὲς ἡττηθεῖς*; Polyæn. 4.19.1; Frontin. 4.7.20) and being killed by his troops, were Alexander's corps of hypaspists, still called 'hypaspistae', and that the glittering title 'argyraspides' was accorded to them sometime after that date. This is unlikely to be correct. In the first place, soon after Perdicas' death and still in 321 B.C., Antipater gave to Antigenes the command of the 'argyraspides' (F 9, 35, *τῶν ἀργυρασπίδων Μακεδόνων*), and it is self-evident that the defeats in Egypt had not earned them the title in the interim. In the second place the glory of the argyraspides was that they were *ἀνίκητοι* (D.S. 19.28.1); so it cannot have been they who were defeated in Egypt. I conclude then that Alexander's corps of hypaspists was renamed argyraspides *before* 321 B.C., and most probably by Alexander himself, and that their old title 'hypaspists' was transferred to their successors, their own descendants. The new hypaspists, if we may so call them, suffered defeat and losses in Egypt in 321 B.C., and there they mutinied along with the other infantry (D.S. 18.36.4). When Antipater reorganized the administration of the empire in 321 B.C., he gave to Antigenes command both of the argyraspides and of the body approximately 3,000 strong which were part of those Macedonians who caused trouble, siding with Eurydice (F 9, 35, *τῶν στασιασάντων Μακεδόνων τοὺς μάλιστα τρισχιλίους*). When we find Antigenes in 317 B.C. in the line of battle commanding both the argyraspides and a body 'more than 3,000 strong', the odds are very high that the same body is involved, namely the hypaspists (as they are simply called at 19.40.3) who were 'the descendants of the hypaspists'.