

demotic. There are parallels for the entry of an individual of non-Rhodian parentage into a Rhodian deme.⁸ Hestiodoros seems to be the first recorded demesman from the island to have ended his days in the Peraea, but, given the obscurity of his parentage, it is difficult to attach any significance to this.

There remain to be considered the first and last lines of the inscription, which clearly have nothing to do with the main text, and are inscribed on the narrow margin of the upper and lower fasciae. The brothers Chaviaras read: (above) [Δαμ]άτ<ε>ρ[ι]; and (below) ἄρχοντο[ς Εὐ]χαριστία[ς]. Since both lines are clearly in a different, considerably smaller hand than the main inscription, the Chaviaras expressed the opinion (*Arch.Eph.* 1911, 65) that 'on the stele [sic] there was previously another shorter inscription which was erased and the above inscription [i.e. the main text] was subsequently engraved, and for this reason ll. 1, 7 were inscribed, for lack of space, on the mouldings. Perhaps, however, l. 1 is a survival from the older inscription.' This reasoning is not easy to follow, and it will suffice to state (a) that the main surface of the stone, though now very worn, shows no trace of re-engraving, and (b) that the main inscription must have been the original one, since the monument is a characteristic tombstone, of the type of which there are many illustrations in *Rhodian Funerary Monuments*. The natural explanation, if the restoration [Δαμ]άτ<ε>ρ[ι] is correct, is that the funerary monument was re-used at a later date, casually, for a dedication (line 7, which is perfectly legible as far as it goes, may have been followed at the foot of the moulding by [ἐνεκα]). It is possible that, his eye caught by the prominent *Τριπτόλεμος*, the dedicant may have felt the stone particularly appropriate for a dedication to Demeter. But it is useless to speculate further on the purposes of this later addition, and more particularly of the word, or name, ἄρχοντος.

What may, I think, be regarded as certain is that the tombstone is that of a Hestiodoros, the son of Hestiodoros, of the Ialysian deme of the Pontoreis, and of his mother Letodora, and that, at least for the present, the Bosporanoi disappear from the map of the Peraea, the only Bosporanoi known in Rhodian epigraphy being those from S. Russia.⁹

P. M: FRASER

All Souls College, Oxford

⁸ Apart from, e.g., the foreign sculptors (listed *ILind.* cols 51 ff.; cf. *Rh.Fun.Mon.* (n. 1) n. 246), who obtained the title of 'Πόδιος after having passed through the phase of one *ὡι ἄ ἐπιδαμία δέδοται*, there are one or two cases in which actual demesmen seem to have foreign parentage: e.g. *IG* xii.1 1064, where a Kasia married an Ephesian and the children are Kasioi; the inscription is of a late date. The most familiar example is that of Hermogenes of the Lindian deme of the Brasioi, who himself was, like his father Philokrates (*ὡι ἄ ἐπιδαμία δέδοται*) an Ilian by origin: see *IG* xii.1 189; *Cl.Rh.* ii 177 no. 6, line 70.

⁹ For *Βοσπορανοί* see *IG* xii.1 11; *NS* 166, both without patronymics (noted *Rh.Per.* 61). Morelli, *Studi Class. e Orient.* v (1955) 126 ff. in his list of foreigners in Rhodes, includes Hestiodoros as a foreign Bosporanos.

I now note with pleasure that Dr J. Papachristodoulou, Ephor of Antiquities of the Dodecanese, also doubts the interpretation of the monogram in question: see his Ioannian dissertation, *Συμβολή στήν ιστορική και αρχαιολογική έρευνα τών δήμων τής αρχαίας Ροδιακής πολιτείας*, i: *Ίαλυσία* (Athens 1983: shortly to be published in Athens in revised form) 70–1, with n. 305. Previous doubts as to the status of the *Βοσπορανοί* (e.g. Hiller, *RE Suppl.* v 753; Meyer, *ibid.* s.v. 'Peraia' 574; Robert, *Gnomon* xxxi [1959] 19) have not led to a reconsideration of the text of the inscription.

The text and the meaning of Arrian vii 6.2–5

The text of this passage was regarded as correct until recently. Then one sentence was held to be corrupt, and three separate and mutually incompatible emendations were made, of which no one commands general approval. Before emendations proliferate, it seems appropriate to consider whether the text is not sound as it stands. Let us begin with that assumption and come later to the emendations.¹

The context of the passage is the situation at Susa in February 324 BC when 'the satraps from the recently founded cities and from the rest of the conquered territory' arrived with 30,000 young Asiatics whom Alexander (hereafter A.) called the Epigoni. Selected perhaps in 330 BC, they had been trained for war in the Macedonian manner and they were already equipped with Macedonian weapons. So much Arrian states in direct speech, indicating that he is following the agreed versions of Ptolemy and Aristobulus, his preferred authorities and the best in fact for military matters.² Next, he gives a 'hearsay' report, followed by a passage in indirect speech, which means that he is citing from sources other than Ptolemy and Aristobulus.³ Then in the huge sentence beginning with Peucestas Arrian returns to direct statement, i.e. to Ptolemy and Aristobulus.

I give now the text and the translation. One should note that the emphasis lies in the participles in the long sentence. Violent hiatus is used in the words *ἐλύπει αὐτούς, βαρβαρισμῷ αὐτοῦ, ὅσοι αὐτῶν* and *προσγενομένη οὐ βαρβαρική ἢ πάσα*, in order to stress the annoyance of the men, the barbarising of Peucestas, the number of barbarians and the nature of the addition.

(2) καὶ οὗτοι ἀφικόμενοι λέγονται ἀνιάσαι Μακεδόνας, ὡς πάντα δὴ μηχανωμένου Ἀλεξάνδρου ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηκέτι ὡσαύτως δεῖσθαι Μακεδόνων· εἶναι γὰρ οὖν καὶ Μηδικὴν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου στολὴν ἄλγος οὐ σμικρὸν Μακεδόσιν δρωμένην καὶ τοὺς γάμους ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῷ Περσικῷ ποιθέντας οὐ πρὸς θυμοῦ γενέσθαι τοῖς πολλοῖς αὐτῶν, οὐδὲ τῶν γημάτων ἔστιν οἷς, καίτοι τῇ ἰσότητι τῇ ἐς τὸν βασιλέα μεγάλως τετιμημένοις.

(3) Πευκέστας τε ὁ Περσῶν σατράπης τῇ τε σκευῇ καὶ τῇ φωνῇ περιζῶν ἐλύπει αὐτούς, ὅτι τῷ βαρβαρισμῷ αὐτοῦ ἔχαιρεν Ἀλέξανδρος, καὶ οἱ Βακτριῶν δὲ καὶ οἱ Σογδιανῶν καὶ Ἀραχωτῶν

¹ The following abbreviations are used:

Badian: E. Badian, 'Orientals in Alexander's Army', *JHS* lxxxv (1965) 160 f.

Bosworth: A. B. Bosworth, 'Alexander and the Iranians', *JHS* c (1980) 1 ff.

Brunt: P. A. Brunt, 'Alexander's Macedonian cavalry', *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 27 ff.

Griffith: G. T. Griffith, 'A note on the Hippiarchies of Alexander', *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 68 ff.

Hammond: N. G. L. Hammond, 'Some passages in Arrian concerning Alexander', *CQ* xxx (1980) 455 ff.

Hammond *Alex.: id., Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman* (New Jersey 1980).

² See Arrian's proem.

³ Their accounts are given *ὡς λεγόμενα μόνον* according to the proem. Sometimes Arrian has to distinguish between two groups of authors, one of which includes his chosen authors. Then he notes the fact, e.g. at ii 12.3–6 *λέγουσι τινες . . . ταῦτα μὲν Πτολεμαῖος καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος λέγουσι· λόγος δὲ ἔχει . . .*

ἰππεῖς καὶ Ζαραγγῶν δὲ καὶ Ἀρείων καὶ Παρθυαίων καὶ ἐκ Περσῶν οἱ Εὐάκαι καλούμενοι ἰππεῖς καταλοχισθέντες εἰς τὴν ἵππον τὴν ἑταιρικὴν ὅσοι αὐτῶν κατ' ἀξίωσιν καὶ κάλλει τοῦ σώματος ἢ τῇ ἄλλῃ ἀρετῇ ὑπερφέροντες ἐφαίνοντο, καὶ πέμπτη ἐπὶ τούτοις ἵππαρχία προσγενομένη, οὐ βαρβαρική ἢ πάσα, ἀλλὰ ἐπαυξηθέντος γὰρ τοῦ παντὸς ἵππικοῦ κατελέγησαν εἰς αὐτὸ τῶν βαρβάρων, τῷ τε ἀγγήματι προσκαταλεγέντες Κωφῆς τε ὁ Ἀρταβάζου καὶ Ὑδάρνης καὶ Ἀρτιβόλης οἱ Μαζαίου, καὶ Σισίνης καὶ Φραδασμένης [καὶ] οἱ Φραταφέρου τοῦ Παρθυαίου καὶ Ὑρκανίας σατράπου παῖδες, καὶ Ἰτάνης Ὀξυάρτου μὲν παῖς, Ῥωξάνης δὲ τῆς γυναικὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀδελφός, καὶ Αἰγοβάρης καὶ ὁ τούτου ἀδελφός Μιθροβαῖος, καὶ ἡγεμῶν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐπισταθεῖς Ὑστάσπης ὁ Βάκτριος, καὶ τούτοις δόρατα Μακεδονικὰ ἀντὶ τῶν βαρβαρικῶν μεσαγκύλων δοθέντα, — ταῦτα πάντα ἔλπει τοὺς Μακεδόνας, ὡς πάντῃ δὴ βαρβαρίζοντος τῇ γνώμῃ Ἀλεξάνδρου, τὰ δὲ Μακεδονικὰ νόμιμα τε καὶ αὐτοὺς Μακεδόνας ἐν ἀτίμῳ χώρῳ ἄγοντος.

(2) 'And their arrival is said to have grieved the Macedonians, because, as the Macedonians thought, A. was taking every step to dispense with the need to employ the Macedonians any longer as he had done; indeed, it was said, the sight of A. wearing Median dress was no small pain to the Macedonians and the weddings conducted in the Persian rite were not to the mind of most of them and not even to some of the bridegrooms, although greatly honoured by being on the same level as the king.

(3) And they were offended by Peucestas, satrap of Persis, playing the Persian in dress and speech (*περισίζων*), because his barbarian ways pleased A.; and also by the cavalymen of Bactria and those of Sogdiana and Arachosia and of Drangiana and Areia and Parthyaea and the so-called Euaecae of Persis being brigaded into the Companion Cavalry (*καταλοχισθέντες*) at least as many of them as proved outstanding in reputation, physical beauty or the other aspects of excellence;⁴ and as well⁵ by a fifth hipparchy being added (*προσγενομένη*), not barbarian entirely but with the increase of the entire cavalry force a quantity⁶ of the barbarians was enrolled into it (i.e. the force); and by the additional enrolling (*προσκαταλεγέντες*) into the Royal Guard of Cophes . . . Mithrobaeus; and by Hystaspes the Bactrian being appointed over them⁷ as commander; and by Macedonian spears being given (*δοθέντα*) to them in place of

⁴ A. used similar criteria in selecting Asiatics for the feast of reconciliation at Opis (vii 11.8).

⁵ The phrase *ἐπὶ τούτοις* means 'as well as this'; so too at v 25.5, cited in my text. This phrase is not dependent on *προσγενομένη*; for if it were it would be in the simple dative or with *πρός* and not *ἐπὶ*. Yet Brunt 43 translates 'a fifth hipparchy which had been added to these'. A worse defect of this translation is that *τούτοις* refers to the men who had been selected, and it seems senseless to say that a fifth hipparchy was added to them. The tacit understanding in the translation is 'added to these (hipparchies)', but for that one needs not *τούτοις* but *ταύταις*. In any case the word *ἵππαρχία* has not been used in the preceding part of Arrian's text.

⁶ This has to be added as the partitive genitive is alien to us.

⁷ Compare Xen. *Hier.* 9.5 ἀρχοντες ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ μέρει ἐφεστήκααν.

barbarian javelins—all these things offended the Macedonians on the grounds that A. was going utterly barbarian in policy and was bringing the customs and the persons of the Macedonians into a position of dishonour.'

The huge sentence in sections 3–5 is exceptional but designed to give a synoptic view of what offended the Macedonians. There is a similar passage at v 25.4–5 which has the same connections *τε, καὶ* alone, *καὶ* with *δέ*, and *ἐπὶ τούτοις* with a connection.

(4) εἰ δὲ Ἰωνία τε πρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ τούσδε τοὺς πόνους ἔχεται καὶ Ἑλλήσποντος καὶ Φρύγες ἀμφοτέροι καὶ Καππαδόκαι καὶ Παφλαγόνες καὶ Λυδοὶ καὶ Κἄρες καὶ Λύκιοι καὶ Παμφυλία δὲ καὶ Φοινίκη καὶ Αἴγυπτος ξὺν τῇ Λιβύῃ τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ καὶ Ἀραβίας ἔστιν ἃ καὶ Συρία ἢ τε κοίλη καὶ ἡ μέση τῶν ποταμῶν, καὶ Βαβυλῶν δὲ ἔχεται καὶ τὸ Σουσίων ἔθνος καὶ Πέρσαι καὶ Μῆδοι καὶ ὄσων Πέρσαι καὶ Μῆδοι ἐπήρχον, καὶ ὄσων δὲ οὐκ ἦρχον, τὰ ὑπὲρ τὰς Κασπίας πύλας, τὰ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Καυκάσου, ὁ Τανάϊς, τὰ πρόσω ἔτι τοῦ Τανάϊδος, Βακτριανοί, Ὑρκάνιοι, ἡ θάλασσα ἢ Ὑρκανία, Σκύθας τε ἀνεστείλαμεν ἔστε ἐπὶ τὴν ἔρημον, ἐπὶ τούτοις μέντοι καὶ ὁ Ἰνδὸς ποταμὸς διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας ρεῖ, ὁ Ὑδάσπης διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας, ὁ Ἀκεσίνης, ὁ Ὑδραώτης, τί ὀκνεῖτε καὶ τὸν Ὑφασιν καὶ τὰ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Ὑφάσιος γένη προσθεῖναι τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ Μακεδόνων τε ἀρχῇ;

From this we may be confident that the text as we have it of our passage is in Arrian's style, clumsy though we may find it. The two cases of *τε* at the start and near the end of the series are especially instructive.

The phrase *καταλοχισθέντες εἰς τὴν ἵππον τὴν ἑταιρικὴν* has caused some difficulty. One must distinguish the uses of the verb, one absolutely and the other with a dependency, and the use or absence of the definite article with such a dependency.

When it stands by itself, the verb means to organise a mass of men by themselves into coherent units (Arr. *Tact.* 5.2 *παραλαβόντα πλῆθος ἀθρόον καὶ ἄτακτον εἰς τάξιν καὶ κόσμον καταστήσαι* τὸ δ' ἔστιν *καταλοχίσαι*) or to divide a group into sub-units (Arr. *Tact.* 5.4 *τὸ μὲν δὴ καταλοχίσαι ἔστιν εἰς λόχους συντάξαι*; Asclep. *Tact.* 2.1 *τὴν φάλαγγα καταλοχίσαι* τούτο δ' ἔστι *καταμερίσαι εἰς λόχους*). This had been done for the mass of Asiatic cavalymen recruited by A. They had fought as separate ethnic units in 326 BC, being named by peoples (e.g. Arr. v 11.3 *τοὺς ἐξ Ἀραχωτῶν καὶ Παραπαμισαδῶν ἵππεας*, and 12.2 *τοὺς ἐκ Βάκτρων καὶ Σογδιανῶν καὶ τοὺς Σκύθας ἵππεας*). These units had not been any part of 'The Companion Cavalry', which was the Macedonian corps d'élite and consisted of the Royal Squadron (*agema*) and at that time four⁸ hipparchies (Arr. v 12.2 *τῶν τε ἑταίρων το ἀγγήμα καὶ τὴν Ἡφαιστίωνος ἵππαρχίαν* etc.). They were not a cause of resentment to the Companion Cavalymen; indeed it was their courage and loyalty which enabled the Macedonians to defeat Porus at the Hydaspes river.

The use of the verb with a dependency with a definite article is well illustrated by Arr. vii 24.1, where he cites from Aristobulus in the accusative and infinitive: *καταλοχίζειν μὲν αὐτὸν τὴν στρατιάν τὴν ξὺν*

⁸ See n. 12.

Πευκέστα τε ἐκ Περσῶν καὶ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ξὺν Φιλοξένῳ καὶ Μενάνδρῳ ἤκουσαν ἐς τὰς Μακεδονικὰς τάξεις. Aristobulus says that he (Alexander) was brigading the troops which had come from Persis with Peucestas and from the coast with Philoxenus and Menander into the Macedonian units' (the definite article showing that these units already existed). This was a formal parade with A. seated 'on the royal throne on a dais', and each batch of newcomers marched off evidently to join their new unit.⁹ On their first arrival A. had 'enrolled'¹⁰ the more than 20,000 Asiatics with Peucestas 'into the Macedonian units' (vii 23.3 κατέλεγεν αὐτοὺς ἐς τὰς Μακεδονικὰς τάξεις), i.e. he had placed their names on the regimental lists. This enrolment had resulted in Macedonians and Asiatics being allocated to each file of the phalanx (Arrian's δεκάς¹¹ corresponding to the λόχος of the Greek phalanx). The troops from the coast were presumably treated in the same way.

Returning to our passage, we see that certain men previously selected by A. from the ethnic units of Asiatic cavalry were brigaded into the existing units of the Companion Cavalry. For καταλοχισθέντες εἰς τὴν ἵππον τὴν ἑταιρικὴν at vii 6.3 is simply the passive form of καταλοχίζειν . . . ἐς τὰς Μακεδονικὰς τάξεις at vii 24.1. And if the enrolling of these men resembled that of the Asiatic infantrymen, they were allocated individually to the files of the cavalry squadrons of the Companion Cavalry.

As I have argued elsewhere, the Companion Cavalry at this time consisted of the *agema* and four hipparchies.¹² The influx of all the Asiatic cavalrymen selected by A. into these units would have made them unwieldy in size. Thus the need arose to create a fifth hipparchy. In theory, of course, A. could have floated off the surplus Asiatics and created an all-barbarian hipparchy, but that would have defeated A.'s purpose. So he created a fifth mixed hipparchy, οὐ βαρβαρική ἢ πᾶσα. With these changes A. did not alter the total number of cavalrymen in his army. What he did do was diminish the number in the ethnic units and increase the number in the Companion Cavalry. Thus ἐπαυξηθέντος . . . τοῦ παντὸς ἵππικου refers to the increase in the Companion Cavalry,¹³ due both to the enlargement of its existing units and to the creation of the fifth hipparchy.

Because the *agema* already included some Asiatics, Arrian used the compound verb προσκαταλεγύντες to indicate that a further¹⁴ infusion of Asiatics was being

made at this time. Those Asiatics were placed under the command of Hystaspes—perhaps at a parade of incorporation; and Hystaspes was probably kept as a 'commander' ἡγεμῶν in rank. It is not clear from the Greek alone whether only these last eight cavalrymen were given the Macedonian type of spear, or whether τούτοις is used for all cavalrymen who were drafted into the Companion Cavalry from the Asiatic ethnic units. But for the arming to cause a grievance, the latter is to be understood.¹⁵

Next, we may consider how far this passage as interpreted here fits into the tradition of the Alexander-historians, and in particular into the ideas of Arrian. The Macedonians' dislike of the Epigoni is attested especially in Diod. xvii 108.3 (ἀντίταγμα τῆ Μακεδονικῆ φάλαγγι), and Plut. *Alex.* 71.1 (τοῖς δὲ Μακεδόσι δυσθυμία παρέστη καὶ δέος ὡς ἦττον αὐτοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως προσέξοντος). For dislike of A.'s Median dress see Arr. iv 7.4, 8.4 and 14.2, Diod. xvii 77.7 fin., Curt. vi 6.7, 9 and 11; and for references earlier to the weddings and the ways of Peucestas see Arr. vii 4.4–8 and vi 30.2–3. The incorporation of individual Asiatics into Macedonian units is described by Arrian as 'a mixing-up' ἀνάμιξις (vii 8.2), this noun and its verb also being used for the mixing-up of light-armed infantrymen with cavalrymen (e.g. i 16.1 and iv 4.6, where the meaning is beyond doubt). Thus at vii 8.2 he summarised the chief grievances of the Macedonians at Opis as follows: ἡ τε ἐσθῆς ἢ Περσική . . . καὶ τῶν Ἐπιγόνων τῶν βαρβάρων ἢ ἐς τὰ Μακεδονικὰ ἦθη κόσμησις καὶ ἀνάμιξις τῶν ἀλλοφύλων ἵππέων ἐς τὰς τῶν ἑταίρων τάξεις. 'The Persian dress . . . the ordering of the barbarian successors in Macedonian ways and the mixing-up of cavalrymen of alien race into the ranks of the Companions.' He used the verb in his own summary at vii 29.4, ἐγκαταμίξαι . . . ταῖς τάξεσιν αὐτῶν τοὺς Πέρσας τοὺς μηλοφόρους καὶ τοῖς ἀγήμασι τοὺς ὁμοτίμους. 'He mixed in their ranks the apple-bearing Persians and he mixed in the Royal Guards those of equal honour.'¹⁶ The Latin equivalent for this verb is *misceo* or *immisceo*. Both are used by Latin writers in this connection. Justin (summarising Trogus) wrote as follows: 'mille ex his (Persis) iuvenes in numerum satellitum legit, auxiliorum quoque portionem, formatam in disciplinam Macedonum, exercitui suo miscet' (xii 12.3–4). 'Alexander chooses from the Persians 1,000 warriors to join the number of his Companions, and he mixes into his own army also a portion of the auxilia'¹⁷ who had been trained in the

Phrathaphernes and Oxyathres—who were taking this privileged position *pari passu* with the sons of men like Craterus, Coenus and Polyperchon.

¹⁵ The provision of weapons was no problem, since the 30,000 Epigoni had been equipped with Macedonian weapons.

¹⁶ This term, the Greek equivalent of a Persian title (see Xen. *Cyr.* vii 7.85), seems to have been adopted for Asiatics who were admitted to the closest association with A. in the Cavalry Guard and the Infantry Guard. The Persian Apple-Bearers had served as the Royal Infantry Guard of Darius, 1,000 strong. A. did not include them as fighting troops in the infantry *agema*, but he mixed them in the ranks of the Macedonian infantry, i.e. in the phalanx. Arrian here mentions things which he had read in his sources but not included in his narrative.

¹⁷ Justin uses the terms which were significant to the Roman reader. In the Roman army the legionary force of Roman citizens was distinct from the non-Roman troops, the 'auxilia'. Justin here describes a fusion of the two, which did not happen in a Roman army.

⁹ One imagines a scene such as the Trooping of the Colour.

¹⁰ The *katalogos* is, as in Athens, the register for service; this is different from the ceremonial embodiment, which is expressed here by the verb καταλοχίζειν.

¹¹ As in Anaximenes *FGH* 72 F 4.

¹² Hammond 465 ff.

¹³ ἡ ἵππος and τὸ ἵππικόν are the body of Companion Cavalry. It was the admissions to this body which upset the Macedonians. There is no mention of accessions to the other cavalry forces under A.'s command, and if there had been they would have been irrelevant to the matter under consideration, the grievances of the Macedonians.

¹⁴ The significance of *προσ-* seems to have been overlooked by Badian 161 'it was then, after the Gedrosian disaster, that Orientals were first admitted to the *agema*', Bosworth 13 'the list is intended to be exhaustive' and in the argument of Brunt 44. The first mention which implies admission to the *agema* is that of Oxyathres, mentioned later in my text. That was in 330 BC, and the *προσ-* confirms what was clearly probable, that a number of selected Asiatics were admitted between 330 and this year, 324. The significance of this further infusion is that they were young men—sons of Mazaecus, Artabazus,

Macedonian style.' He is describing the infusion of Persians into the Companion Cavalry and of non-Macedonian infantry into the Macedonian army; and in the latter case he refers probably to the Epigoni, who had been trained in the Macedonian style (Arr. vii 6.1 and Plut. *Alex.* 47.6). Curtius, who often includes narrative facts in his fictitious speeches, has A. address the non-Macedonian troops in a special assembly at Opis and say in the course of his speech: 'dilectum e vobis iuniorum habui et vos meorum militum corpori immiscui' (x 3.10). He mentions two things here: the recruiting of the younger men whom A. called the Epigoni (Arrian *loc. cit.* ἡβάσκοντας ἤδη . . . τὴν αὐτὴν ἠλικίαν γεγονότας), and the earlier infusion of Asiatic troops into the body of the Macedonian army.

As regards the granting of Macedonian weapons which annoyed the Macedonians, Curtius has A. say on this occasion to the non-Macedonian troops 'Macedonum vobis arma do' (x 3.13; cf. x 3.10 'eadem arma sunt vobis'),¹⁸ and Plutarch has the Epigoni trained in the use of Macedonian weapons (*Alex.* 47.6).

Of all this what caused most annoyance to the Macedonians at Susa was the infusion of selected cavalrymen from the ethnic units of Asiatic cavalry into the units of the Companion Cavalry. Justin (Trogus) xii 12.3 was, it seems, referring to this, and he supplies the number involved, namely 1,000, which if spread equally would mean 200 to each of the hipparchies.

In case it should be suggested that the mixing took place only after A.'s return to Mesopotamia, we may note that Oxyathres, the brother of Darius, was placed in 330 BC in the cohort of Friends (Curt. vi 2.11) and became a Bodyguard of A. (Curt. vii 5.40 'inter corporis custodes'). A mixing of races in the cavalry units was introduced in 331/0 according to Curtius. Up till then some units had been called by race (e.g. 'The Paeonians' and 'The Thracians'), but after the reform they were called by their commander (e.g. Demetrius). The passage, v 2.6, runs thus: 'nam cum ante equites in suam quisque gentem describerentur seorsus a ceteris, exempto nationum discrimine, praefectis non utique suarum gentium sed delectis attribuit'. 'While cavalrymen in the past were assigned each man to his own racial group apart from all the rest, now he abolished the discrimination by race and he appointed the cavalrymen to commanders who were not necessarily of each man's race but had been chosen', e.g. Paeonian cavalrymen not to Ariston, a prince of the Paeonian royal house, but to any commander chosen by A.¹⁹

The addition of the fifth hipparchy (πέμπτη . . . ἵππαρχία προσγενομένη) indicates the prior existence of four hipparchies, just as the choice of a twelfth man in cricket implies the prior choice of eleven men.

¹⁸ This general statement suggests that it is correct to see the Macedonian weapons at Arr. vii 6.5 as being given to all who were transferred to the Companion Cavalry.

¹⁹ 'The Paeonians' and 'The Thracians', as named cavalry units, had been inherited from Philip by Alexander; they do not appear after 331 BC. This was one of many changes which he made in 'the military system handed down from his ancestors' (Curt. v 2.6). See Hammond *Alex.* 164 f. Arrian iii 16.11 was dealing with a different matter, as Brunt observes in his Loeb edn p. 279 n. 14, namely the enrolling of the newcomers from Macedonia in the phalanx-brigades 'by races', i.e. the men of Old Macedonia into the brigades of *pezhetairoi* and the men of the cantons of Upper Macedonia to their particular brigade of *asthetairoi* (see Hammond *Alex.* 154).

Now the number of hipparchies of Companion Cavalry had varied with the nature of A.'s campaigns. He had eight in Bactria, a land famous for its cavalry; four at the Battle of the Hydaspes; and evidently four after his return from India.²⁰ Even those four hipparchies were no doubt well below strength after losses in the severe fighting in southern Pakistan and in the return which included the crossing of the Gedrosian Desert. It is thus not surprising that A. now drafted chosen Asiatic horsemen into the ranks of these four hipparchies and of the fifth hipparchy which he now created. In addition, of course, he had many other units of cavalry which did not belong to the Companion Cavalry, and among them the ethnic units from Bactria, from Sogdiana and Arachosia, from Drangiana, Areia and Parthyaea, and from Persis,²¹ which had been reduced by the transference of some cavalrymen to the Companion Cavalry but would no doubt be brought up to strength by new recruitment.

Of those who have recently considered our passage and the summary at vii 8.2, G. T. Griffith interpreted *καταλοχισθέντες ἐς τὴν ἵππον* as 'integration', to denote the closeness of the union brought about by this recent reform. "'καταλοχισθέντες'", he wrote, 'ought to mean either that picked Iranians were introduced inside the *λόχος*, two of which made up each *ἴλη* of Companions, or else at the very least that one *λόχος* of each *ἴλη* now became a *λόχος* of picked Iranians.' Here I find his first alternative to be the correct interpretation. In dealing with vii 8.2 he differs from me in his interpretation of one phrase. 'The Macedonians were angered', writes Arrian, 'by words, *κατὰ τὴν στρατιὰν ταύτην πᾶσαν πολλοῖς καὶ ἄλλοις ἀχθεσθέντες ὅτι πολλάκις ἤδη ἐλύπει αὐτοὺς ἢ τε ἐσθῆς ἢ Περσικῆς*.' 'This whole campaign can only refer to the Indian expedition', Griffith maintains; but it seems to me that 'this whole expedition' refers to an expedition still in being, namely the expedition in Asia,²² as in the next section *τῆς στρατιᾶς* and *στρατεύεσθαι*. During that long expedition 'many things' had annoyed them as well as the first special thing which Arrian mentions, the Persian dress which A. adopted long before the beginning of the Indian campaign. In any case Griffith did not mention any difficulty with the text as it stands.

Brunt 43 mistook the context of Arr. vii 6.3 when he wrote of it as 'recounting the causes of the mutiny at Opis'; it refers to the situation at Susa some six months before the mutiny. He finds the Greek of vii 6.3–5 'clumsy and perhaps it is corrupt', and this leads him to offer 'a conjectural textual change'. Yet clumsiness may

²⁰ Not including the *agema*; see Hammond 465 ff. So too Brunt 43 'the mention of the new fifth hipparchy implies that somewhat before its creation there had been only four (presumably excluding the *agema*)', and H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* i 111, 'die Zahl der Hipparchen auf vier zusammenschmolzen war'. Arrian assumed probably that his reader was aware that the Companion Cavalry consisted of these four hipparchies and the *agema*.

²¹ Arrian uses *οἱ* and *δέ* to mark off the units, as I have shown them above, one unit from Bactria, one from Sogdiana–Arachosia, one from Drangiana–Areia–Parthyaea, and one from Persis. If the size of the unit was 500 troopers, as suggested for the unit from Bactria in Hammond *Alex.* 209, these four units matched in numbers the four hipparchies of the Companion Cavalry, before any transferences were made.

²² So too Badian 160: 'it refers not to India . . . but, as the emphatic *πᾶσα* makes clear, to the whole of what we call "Alexander's expedition"'.

be said to be a characteristic of Arrian, e.g. in the third sentence of his Preface or at ii 10.4–5 (to choose at random); so the clumsiness here is no ground for postulating any corruption. And the text is clear in the archetype, the Vienna codex. However, let us consider his textual change. He would read *ἐς αὐτήν* for *ἐς αὐτό* and delete *τῷ τε ἀγῆματι προσκαταλεγέντες* as a gloss. He suspects the *τε* of *τῷ τε ἀγῆματι* as being ‘curiously unemphatic, in contrast to *καί*, joining each other grievance’; but the double *τε* of vii 6.3 init. and *τῷ τε ἀγῆματι* has analogies in Arrian, e.g. at iii 10.3 *αὐτῷ τε . . . εἶτε*, and *δέ* is used as well as *καί* for linking the other grievances. With Brunt’s proposed reading and deletion the sense apparently is that with the increase in the entire cavalry force eight barbarians were enrolled into the fifth hipparchy (*ἐς αὐτήν*). Yet this seems a tiny consequence for such an increase; and it is to me an unexpected sequel to the statement that the fifth hipparchy was ‘not barbarian entirely’, if it consisted of 8 barbarians and, say, 492 Macedonians.²³

Badian’s emendation *μόνον οὐ βαρβαρικῇ ἢ πᾶσα* gives the opposite result. The literal translation is ‘almost barbarian entirely’ (?8 Macedonians and 492 barbarians). Arrian used *μόνον οὐ* only twice in all his works—at *Anab.* i 19.2 and i 21.6—and one would expect *μόνον οὐ* to precede immediately the word it emphasises, i.e. here *μόνον οὐ πᾶσα*. Given this emendation, one loses the proper contrast of *οὐ* and *ἀλλά*,²⁴ and, as Bosworth points out, ‘the parenthesis remains curiously unhelpful’. Badian’s main contention, that the process was ‘no more than the admission of a select few, both for military and for political reasons’, is not much helped by his emendation of the text; but it requires consideration. His main argument is that our passage, vii 6.1–5 concerning Susa, and vii 8.2, concerning Opis, are ‘doublets due to Arrian’s unsuccessful use of scissors and paste’. This is not to use ‘doublets’ in a strict sense; for they should be two accounts of the same event culled from different sources, but these events were some six months apart and Arrian provided the agreed account of his two sources—Ptolemy and Aristobulus—and not excerpts from a variety of sources. Badian attributes the first passage to ‘a long *λεγόμενον* leading nowhere’²⁵ and the latter passage is ‘apparently from Ptolemy’. Thus he obtains two different sources. But it is not so simple as that. For the *λεγόμενον* relates only to vii 6.2; for it alone is in the accusative and infinitive after *λέγονται*. The sentences before and after section 2 are in the indicative, so that they represent the agreed version of Ptolemy and Aristobulus. The same is the case with vii 8.2, again from Ptolemy and Aristobulus. What Arrian has done—and his sources, Ptolemy and Aristobulus—is to indicate that the weddings at Susa (vii 4.4 ff.) and the arrival of the Epigoni there brought Macedonian resentment to a head, and that later at Opis Alexander’s plans for dismissing some Macedonian troops and

retaining others in Asia aroused further annoyance and caused the eruption into mutiny (vii 8).

The background to Bosworth’s emendation is more complex. His general contention is that A. employed mixed units only as a last resort, and with this in mind he stoutly denies Griffith’s interpretation (cited above) of the phrase *ἵππεις καταλοχισθέντες ἐς τὴν ἵππον τὴν ἑταιρικὴν ὅσοι αὐτῶν κτλ.* Instead he declares that ‘what it [i.e. the phrase] does not mean is assignment of extra troops to existing units’. But this declaration does not stand up to examination. For at vii 23.3 extra troops are brought in by Peucestas. Arrian, writing of A. receiving them, says *κατέλεγεν αὐτοὺς ἐς τὰς Μακεδονικὰς τάξεις*; and he enrolled them in such a way that each file had a mixture of Macedonians and ‘Persians’²⁶ (vii 23.3). This is surely an example of what we need to disprove Bosworth’s declaration, namely the assignment of extra troops to existing units, *ἐς τὰς Μακεδονικὰς τάξεις* (noting the definite article). It was from these units that A. had recently dismissed the bulk of the 10,000 veteran Macedonians. When Bosworth comes to the *ἀνάμιξις τῶν ἀλλοφύλων ἵππέων ἐς τὰς τῶν ἑταίρων τάξεις* at vii 8.2, a passage which he regards not as a doublet but as a summary, he does provide at least a paraphrase of the words: ‘an admixture of heterogeneous cavalry into the ranks of the barbarians’. His text has evidently gone astray. What he means, I think, is ‘an admixture of cavalry of other races into the ranks of the Companion Cavalry’. If so, we seem to be in agreement.

Bosworth provides his own theory about the number of hipparchies. We all start from the assumption that there were hipparchies of Companion Cavalry which existed (mainly if not entirely of Macedonians) before A. introduced Asiatic cavalrymen in large numbers. Let us say that there were four such hipparchies.²⁷ Then at vii 6.3 on Bosworth’s theory the Asiatic cavalrymen selected to join the Companion Cavalry were organised as four all-Asiatic Companion Cavalry hipparchies. To these eight hipparchies another was added at vii 6.4 ‘not entirely barbarian (but partially)’. If Bosworth is correct, then this should be the ninth hipparchy. It certainly cannot be the fifth hipparchy. Yet Arrian says *καὶ πέμπτη ἐπὶ τούτοις ἵππαρχία προσγενομένη*.²⁸ Perhaps Bosworth should emend *πέμπτη* as well as emending the next part of the sentence. For he proposes to read *ἀλλὰ ἐπαυξηθέντος γὰρ τοῦ παντὸς ἵππικοῦ κατελέγησαν ἐς ταῦτο τοῖς Μακεδόσι τῶν βαρβάρων*, and to translate ‘(but partially), for when the entire cavalry was expanded some barbarians were assigned to the same unit as Macedonians’. Whereas Brunt brackets words as a gloss, Bosworth brings in *τοῖς Μακεδόσι* on the assumption that the words had fallen out of the text in transmission. It is not clear what substantive is to be supplied with his emended word *ταῦτο*,²⁹ but the

²⁶ Arrian here uses ‘Persians’ to include Cossaeans and Tapurians; such wider meaning of the word should be borne in mind at Arr. vii 11.3 and 9.

²⁷ As in Hammond 465 ff.; Brunt 45 and in his Loeb edn of Arrian p. lxxiii by 324 the number (of hipparchies) had again been reduced to 4 or 5’.

²⁸ One fallacy which has arisen is the idea that these selected men were organised as four hipparchies; this is not what Arrian is saying at vii 6.3 by any stretch of the imagination.

²⁹ Bosworth cites Arr. v 25.3 and *Ind.* 3.9 and 10.9 for Arrian’s use of *ἐς ταῦτο*. In the first two passages one may supply *χωρίον*. In the

²³ The size of a hipparchy is uncertain; for my arguments see Hammond *Alex.* 189, 207 and n. 95.

²⁴ This contrast in Arrian’s unemended text is unexpressed. Literally the passage may be translated ‘not barbarian entirely but (barbarian in part) for with the increase’ etc. Bosworth 21 cites a good example from Arr. v 13.2.

²⁵ That is, not to a mutiny; but this was an important stage in the building up of the indignation which did eventually result in mutiny.

normal expression in Arrian for 'to the same unit' would be *ἐς τὴν αὐτὴν τάξιν*.

In conclusion, I am not convinced that any of the proposed emendations improves the text of Arrian. It seems rather that the passage is sound and that it reveals the progressive steps taken by Alexander in a policy which annoyed the Macedonians at Susa and led ultimately to the mutiny at Opis.³⁰

N. G. L. HAMMOND

Clare College, Cambridge

third passage the meaning seems to be 'this happens to the same extent'.

³⁰ This article owes much to the comments of the Editor's advisers, to whom I express my gratitude. The treatment of Arr. vii 6.3 in W. W. Tarn, *Alexander ii* (Cambridge 1948) 164 f. has not been cited, as it is unhelpful.

**Tabulae Iliacae in the
Collection Froehner, Paris**

(PLATE XI)

*In carissimam memoriam Laurentii Tanner qui his studiis me
adulescentem imbuuit*

When discussing the *Tabulae Iliacae* in *JHS* xcix (1979) 26–48 (hereafter 'Horsfall'), I followed the usual and unchallenged view¹ in stating that the group includes twenty reliefs and that five bear the signature of the artist Theodorus (26). Both statements prove wrong. Prof. F. Jouan (Paris-Nanterre) most kindly informed me in the summer of 1979 that an unpublished Thèse de Maîtrise by one of his students, Mlle F. Legrand, (*Les Tables Iliques* [1976] [hereafter 'Legrand']), contained new material on the *Tabulae* and made a copy of her work available to me. It was immediately apparent (Legrand 160 ff.) that the *Tabula* which I shall call 21 Froehner² was unpublished and when it became clear that no publication in France was intended, I sought and was freely granted access. Examination of *Tabula* 20Par., also in the Froehner collection, revealed that its verso³ carried an hitherto neglected signature by Theodorus. Permission to publish *Tabulae* 20Par. (verso) and 21Fro. was unhesitatingly granted. It is a great pleasure to place on record the enthusiasm and generosity displayed by Prof. Jouan and by the staff at the Cabinet des Médailles.⁴

¹ As in, for example, M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca* (Rome 1974) iii 433.

² viii.148 in Froehner's own inventory; the collection has been housed in the Cabinet des Médailles since 1925.

³ *Tabula* 20Par. recto was apparently first mentioned in print by K. Weitzmann, *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art* (Princeton 1951) 100; partly reproduced, fig. 106. Detailed publication: A. Sadurska, *Mél. Michalowski* (Warsaw 1966) 653 ff. Both Sadurska (656) and Legrand (148) state explicitly and inexplicably that the verso bears no inscription; M. T. Bua, *Mem. Acc. Lincei* viii.16 (1971–2) 4 refers to 20Par. but does not include its verso in her discussion of the Theodorus-inscriptions. It is therefore especially to be regretted that L. Robert only refers to one *Tabula* in the Froehner collection, and that in the list (p. vi) of inscriptions to be excluded from his *Collection Froehner i: Inscriptions Grecques* (Paris 1936). Note that the photograph is enlarged by 50%.

1. 20Par. verso (FIG. 1 and PLATE XIa)

For a discussion (with full bibliography) of the analogues and antecedents of such 'magic squares', the reader may consult Horsfall 29: they work on the principle, as Theodorus himself puts it, that the reader 'shall grasp the middle letter and turn whichever way you want', and suggest very strongly that the craftsman was of Egyptian origin (*ibid.*). The perpendicular right-hand margin suggests that the 'square' was indeed originally square, as were those on 2NY and 3C.⁵ The letters occupy alternate squares on the grid as they do on 2NY, 3C, 5O and 7Ti,⁶ with the result that the reader may proceed not only horizontally and vertically but also, from the centre, diagonally.⁷ It is therefore easy to determine that the central letter lay on line 7 of the surviving fragment.⁸ Furthermore, the surprisingly simple 'rules'⁹ for composing a Theodorean 'square' establish that the first *o* of *Θεοδώρειος*, the last letter of the central line, must be the middle letter of an inscription of an uneven number of letters.

We have on the stone (FIG. 1): [*Θμ*]ήρου Θεοδώρει[ος]. Compare 2NY [*Ιλι*]ᾶς *Θμήρου*, Θεοδώρηος ἢ τέχνη, and 3C, where it is highly likely that the same words constituted the full text (Bua [n. 7] 10), though only Θεοδώρηος ἢ τέχνη are certain. Read here therefore: [*Ιλι*ᾶς *Θμ*]ήρου Θεοδώρει[ος ἢ τέχνη].¹⁰

Two differences are to be noted: the embarrassing and unexplained 'segno verticale' after the definite article (Bua [n. 7] 8 n. 10) is eliminated and to maintain an odd number of letters the form Θεοδώρειος (which is certain) is used in place of Θεοδώρηος. It is very tempting to conclude that 20Par. is therefore later than 2NY and 3C.

On the recto (PLATE XIb), Mme Sadurska, (n. 3) 656, notes that a complete band, illustrating one book of the *Iliad*, is 2.5 cm high, giving just under 10 cm as a likely distance from the bottom of the extant fragment to the lower edge of the complete original (*Il.* xvii–xiii; a very little of xvii is visible). On the verso, the inscription will have continued for another 5 cm or so (8 letters = 16 squares; slightly under 3 to a centimeter), falling, therefore, roughly 5 cm short of where the lower edge of the stone (to judge from Mme Sadurska's calculations) would appear to have been. The 'magic squares' were not centred exactly: on 2NY the margins are 5.2

⁴ I am also most grateful to the British Academy and to the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, who financed a visit to study the *Tabulae* in Paris; also to the Rosa Morison Fund of University College London for the cost of the illustrations.

⁵ 2NY: New York, MMA 24.97.11; 3C: Paris, Bibl. Nat., Cab. des Méd. 3318. Full details: A. Sadurska, *Les Tables Iliques* (Warsaw 1964).

⁶ 5O: Roma, Mus. Cap., Sala delle Colombe 83b; 7Ti. = Thierry in *Mém. Soc. Ant. France* xliii (1882) 17 f.

⁷ The formulation by Bua (n. 3) 15 is not applicable to 4N.

⁸ Cf. Sadurska (n. 3) 654. On the relief, the band dividing *Il.* xviii and xix runs across the centre of the fragment; *Il.* xiii–xviii and xix–xxiv balance evenly.

⁹ Bua (n. 3) 15, an invaluable exegesis.

¹⁰ Froehner, notebooks viii.148, proposed supplementing τᾶξίς (cf. the epigram on 2NY, Horsfall 27) or τέχνη. I am particularly grateful to Mlle M.-Ch. Hellmann for showing me Froehner's own description; cf. Sadurska (n. 3) 653 n. 3, J. Babelon, pref. to L. Robert (n. 3) ii.