'ASTHIPPOI' AGAIN

In his article 'A Cavalry Unit in the Army of Antigonus Monophthalmus: Asthippoi',[1]
N. G. L. Hammond argues that the reading of the manuscript R (Parisinus gr. 1665)
at Diodorus 19. 29. 2 should be retained and that we should read ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ
τούς τε ἀσθίππους ὀνομαζομένους καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικούντων ὀκτακοσιούς.
The readings of F (Laurentianus 70, 12) and its copy X, ἀνθίππους, and the commonly
accepted conjecture of Wesseling ἀμφίππους (accepted by F. Bizière in her Budé
edition of Diodorus 19), should both be abandoned. Hammond's arguments for
retaining this reading are (i) that between the variant readings of R and F, R 'is the
more often correct' (he here quotes Bizière); (ii) ἀσθίππους, the reading of R, is
preferable to F's ἀνθίππους on the principle of 'lectio difficilior'; (iii) the 'difficulty'
of his *lectio difficilior* is made less by the arguments presented by A. B. Bosworth (*CQ*
n.s. 23 (1973), 245 ff.), for the restoration at several places in the text of Arrian's
Anabasis of the word ἀσθέταιροι, in place of the editorial emendation of πεζέταιροι. 'For
just as *asthetairoi* meant an élite group of Macedonian infantrymen,' says Hammond,
'so *asthippoi* should mean an élite group of Macedonian cavalrymen.' He then
proceeds to examine the passage and its context in an attempt to find confirmation
of this proposition and comes to the conclusion that Diodorus' text says that there
were 800 cavalrymen, broken into two groups, the *asthippoi* and 'the men from the
up-country settlers'; these, though having different names, had a close relationship
to each other, as is shown by their being brigaded together (p. 129). Following his
derivation of *asthetairoi* as meaning 'townsmen-companions', i.e. companions
recruited from the towns of Upper Macedonia (i.e. ἀστοὶ ἑταῖροι), he argues that
asthippoi were cavalry recruited (originally by Philip II) from the towns of Upper
Macedonia (i.e. the cavalry equivalent of *asthetairoi*) and that τοὺς ἐκ τῶν
ἄνω κατοικούντων means 'the sons of settlers in up-country Macedonia'.[2] These 800,
says Hammond, were both among Antigonus' best troops and 'were Macedonians
from Europe' (p. 134). We thus appear, on Hammond's interpretation, to have here
a group of 800 Macedonian élite cavalrymen, all of whom were recruited in Upper
Macedonia's townships, but of whom some were chosen to be the cavalry-equivalent
of the élite 'townsmen-companions' by their title of 'townsmen-cavalry', whilst the
others, similarly recruited – but perhaps of a younger generation? – had no particular
distinguishing title beyond 'sons of settlers in up-country Macedonia'.

  Now, while it would be exciting to be able to add another one, possibly two
Macedonian cavalry units to the Macedonian army of Philip, Alexander and the
Successors, there are several aspects of Hammond's arguments that, it seems to me,
are less than convincing. Thus, whilst it seems beyond reasonable doubt that
ἀσθέταιροι (or ἀσθέτεροι) should be retained in the text of Arrian, appearing, as it
does, six times, this is not an argument that ἀσθίππους should be read in Diodorus'
text. Both it and F's reading of ἀνθίππους are *hapax legomena* and it is possible that
both readings are wrong. But even if we retain ἀσθίππους as the correct reading,
Hammond's explanation of its meaning is open to objection on several counts. Firstly,

[1] *CQ* n.s. 28 (1978), 128–35.

[2] p. 133: 'Philip and later Antipater had trained sons of settlers in up-country Macedonia to
form cavalry units, just as Alexander trained the sons of settlers in his cities of Asia to be soldiers
of the next generation.'

his explanation of the ἀσθ- part of the word is dependent on his interpretation of the same part in ἀσθέταιροι, viz. ἀστοὶ ἑταῖροι = 'townsmen-companions'; and this I find no more convincing than Bosworth's derivation from ἄσιστα, giving 'closest-in-kin companions', or Griffith's ἀριστο-, giving 'best companions'.[3] Purely on morphological grounds, a Greek compound noun meaning 'townsmen-companions' is more likely to be formed from the adjective ἀστικός + ἑταῖρος, giving ἀστιχέταιρος, than from the noun ἀστὸς + ἑταῖρος. Again, it seems strange that Philip, who was eager to get rid of local loyalties, which encouraged separatist tendencies, should risk either inflaming or offending local sentiments by so distinguishing them from their 'lowland' comrades, known as infantry companions. If these 'townsmen-companions' were natives of Elimea, Orestis and Lyncestis, their 'apartness' from the rest of the king's Macedonian infantry would be before them all the time in their title; if they were not natives, but settlers brought in from lowland Macedonia and elsewhere by Philip and planted in towns, they would, if recruited and organized as the king's 'townsmen-companions', be a permanent affront to the local population and its hereditary dynasts. The famous fragment 4 (Jacoby) of Anaximenes may well be open to dispute as to the identity of the King Alexander and may well raise eyebrows at the statement that this king 'taught the most renowned people to be cavalrymen' and then called them Hetairoi; but Anaximenes is surely correct when he says that the naming of the Macedonian cavalry as Hetairoi and the infantry as Pezhetairoi was so that both the cavalry and the infantry, by having a share in the royal companionship (μετέχοντες τῆς βασιλικῆς ἑταιρίας), 'might continue being most zealous' (sc. to the king). Whether the extension of the royal companionship to all the Macedonian mounted gentry and all the Macedonian infantry-levy was the work of Alexander II, Philip II or, as I argued in my Fondation Hardt paper, Alexander III, the crucial point is the attempt by the monarch to get rid of local loyalties and to foster a united loyalty to the central authority by making all the *Macedonian* army 'Companions of the King'.

If this argument be accepted, then Hammond's thesis immediately runs into a serious difficulty. Following his arguments, and remembering that he regards the ἄσθιπποι and 'the men from the up-country settlers' as being both Macedonians and élite cavalry, we would have the following groups of Macedonian soldiers in the army of Philip II and Alexander III:

(i)   ἑταῖροι, or ἡ ἵππος τῶν ἑταίρων (including the ἴλη βασιλική) – from Lower Macedonia – cavalry

(ii)   πεζέταιροι – from Lower Macedonia – infantry

(iii) ἄσθιπποι – from Upper Macedonia – cavalry

(iv)   ἀσθέταιροι – from Upper Macedonia – infantry

(v)   ὑπασπισταὶ (τῶν ἑταίρων) – specially picked? – infantry

(vi)   οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικούντων – from Upper Macedonia – cavalry.

The essential factor about the names of all the Macedonian units attested by Arrian is that they all have the designation ἑταῖροι, indicating their close relationship with the king; and it is obvious that, with the possible exception of the hypaspists, the priority of receiving this title belongs to the cavalry. For they are called simply ἑταῖροι, whilst the infantry have the prefixes πεζ- and ἀσθ-. It would appear remarkably strange, then, if the cavalry of Upper Macedonia, unlike their counterparts from Lower Macedonia and their infantry-counterparts from Upper Macedonia, were excluded, by the absence of the word in their names, from the ἑταιρία of the king. This would

have been as insulting to these supposedly élite Macedonians as Bosworth's suggested meaning of ἀσθέταιροι – 'closest-of-kin companions' – would have been to the infantry of Lower Macedonia. Moreover, given the certain social and the probable organizational priority of the cavalry over the infantry, if Philip or Alexander had wished to show and maintain a distinction between the cavalry and infantry of Lower and Upper Macedonia – a distinction that was manifested by referring to the latter's 'townly' origin – we would surely expect it would be the *cavalry* who would be called ἀσθέταιροι, while the infantry would be called something like οἱ ἀσθέταιροι τῶν πεζῶν.

Nor again is Hammond's argument very convincing when he states (p. 128) with reference to the addition of the participle ὀνομαζομένους to τούς τε ἀσθίππους...καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικούντων in Diodorus' text, that '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 ἑταίρους 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.' Now, I am quite willing to accept that ὀνομαζομένους, as applied to τοὺς ἀσθίππους, has the same or a similar meaning as καλουμένους and προσαγορευθέντες, as applied to the ἑταῖροι. But I am unable to find examples of these participles being used unambiguously in the sense of 'renowned', nor does *LSJ* give them in other than a neutral sense (cf. s.v. καλέω II: ὁ καλούμενος, the so-called; s.v. προσαγορεύω...Passive: to be called). Two examples are given by *LSJ* s.v. ὀνομάζω of passive participles of this verb having the sense of 'made famous' and one of these, Isocrates 20. 19, is a variant reading for διωνομασμένων, whilst the other, Xenophon, *Agesilaus* 1. 2, need mean no more than 'by his ancestors' being mentioned by name'. Apart from these two dubious examples, ὀνομάζω seems to have no significance beyond the neutral 'name' or 'call by name'. I cannot claim – nor, I suspect, would Hammond make such a claim – to have carried out an exhaustive study of Diodorus' use of epithets such as καλούμενος, προσαγορευθείς, ὀνομαζόμενος, or ὀνομασθείς. I have, however, not found any instance in my reading of Diodorus, and especially Books 17, 18, and 19, where these words obviously should mean 'famous'. The natural interpretation is invariably the straightforward 'so-called' (e.g. 17. 31. 7: τὸ καλούμενον βασιλικόν (sc. ὄρος) – 'the so-called royal hill'; 17. 75. 3: μέχρι τῆς Κασπίας καλουμένης θαλάττης, ἣν Ὑρκανίαν τινὲς ὀνομάζουσιν = 'the so-called Caspian sea, which some call "Hyrcanian"'; 17. 57. 1: Κλεῖτος ὁ μέλας ὀνομαζόμενος = 'Cleitus, named "the Black"'; 18. 2. 2: τὸ τῶν ἱππέων τῶν ἑταίρων ὀνομαζομένων σύστημα = the formation of the cavalry who are named 'the Companions'; 18. 3. 1: τὴν μεγάλην καλουμένην Φρυγίαν = Phrygia known as, or called, 'the Great'; 18. 7. 1: ἐν ταῖς ἄνω καλουμέναις σατραπείαις = in the so-called Upper Satrapies; 18. 44. 2: εἰς τὴν ὀνομαζομένην Κρητῶν πόλιν = to the city which is named 'the Cretans'; 19. 12. 1: ἐν ταῖς ὀνομαζομέναις Καρῶν κώμαις = in the villages which are named 'the Carians'; 19. 21. 2: ἕως τῆς καλουμένης Κλίμακος = as far as the so-called Ladder); and this, I believe, is how the words should be translated here: 'the so-called companions', 'those who were called "companions"' and 'those who were named "Asthippoi"', etc. Why Diodorus should add these epithets to these units can only be guesswork. But it is perhaps worthy of note that the epithets, especially καλούμενος, are frequently used by writers when they wish to indicate that the subject of the epithet is something that is out of the ordinary knowledge and experience of either the writer himself or, as he believes, his readers. This is frequently so in Arrian's *Anabasis* where καλούμενος occurs 35 times, 29 of

which refer to places, people or institutions (including ἀσθέτεροι), where Arrian seems
to feel that he cannot assume knowledge in his reader. Diodorus, it should be noted,
is not well versed in Macedonian technical terminology, even in Book 17, the
'Alexander-book'. As I have shown in a forthcoming article, Diodorus' normal
expression for the king's 'companions' (i.e. the close circle of intimates) is not ἑταῖροι,
but φίλοι; and the companion cavalry is usually represented by a phrase such as
οἱ ἄριστοι τῶν ἱππέων. Indeed, on the only certain occasion in Book 17 in which ἑταῖρος
– or rather its derivate ἑταιρικός – is applied to the Macedonian cavalry (17. 37. 2),
Diodorus is clearly confused and incorrect. The word ἑταῖροι (= companion cavalry)
does occur twice at the beginning of Book 18, where Diodorus is commonly supposed
to have changed his source from whoever it was for Book 17 to Hieronymus of Cardia,
generally regarded as a reliable, contemporary authority. The word is used twice in
consecutive chapters, both dealing with the events immediately after Alexander's death
(18. 2. 2: τὸ τῶν ἱππέων τῶν ἑταίρων ὀνομαζομένων σύστημα; 3. 4: Σέλευκον
δ᾽ ἔταξε [sc. Πέρδικκας] ἐπὶ τὴν ἱππαρχίαν τῶν ἑταίρων, οὖσαν ἐπιφανεστάτην). It will
be noticed that Diodorus feels it necessary to add the epithet ὀνομαζομένην
on the first occasion, but not the second, which occurs only one chapter later. After
this, the word does not appear again in Book 18, but reappears in Book 19 at 22.
2 (Peucestas' banquet at Persepolis in 316/15). The second (from the outside) of the
concentric circles was formed of οἵ τε ἀργυράσπιδες Μακεδόνες καὶ τῶν
ἑταίρων οἱ μετ᾽ Ἀλεξάνδρου στρατεύσαντες and the third circle was made up of
τῶν τε δευτέρων ἡγεμόνων καὶ τῶν ἔξω τάξεως καὶ φίλων καὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ
τῶν ἱππέων. I agree with Bizière (notes 1 and 4, p. 36) that the ἑταῖροι of the second
circle were not the cavalry, but the pezhetairoi, and that the ἱππεῖς in the third circle
were 'Les cavaliers macédoniens', though I disagree with her further comment,
'c'est-à-dire la noblesse'. For it is clear that in φίλων we have Diodorus' usual term
for the king's companions, in the 'limited' sense, and in ἱππέων we have the
companion cavalry. The third circle was composed of: second rank officers, king's
companions and commanders with no fixed appointment (ἔξω τάξεως) and the
companion cavalry. Thus the appropriate order of priority was preserved in the
concentric circles: the outermost consisted of the mercenaries and allied troops; then
the Macedonian infantry soldiers; then the socially higher companion cavalry, officers
of second rank and companions of the king; then the divisional or top commanders
of both the infantry and the cavalry (οἵ τε στρατηγοὶ καὶ οἱ τὰς ἱππαρχίας ἔχοντες),
together with the most distinguished Persians. Diodorus, then, is not here using ἑταῖροι
of the companion cavalry.

The next occasion where the word ἑταῖροι occurs is at 19. 28. 3 and here there is
no doubt that Diodorus is referring to the companion cavalry, as is also the case at
29. 4 (28. 3: ...ἐξέταξε τοὺς ἵππους...τοὺς καλουμένους ἑταίρους ἐννα-
κοσίους κτλ.; 29. 4: τῶν δὲ ἱππέων κτλ...ἐχόμενοι δὲ τούτων οἱ προσαγορευ-
θέντες ἑταῖροι χίλιοι). The word does not then recur in Book 19 until 82. 3 (the battle
fought in 312/11 by Demetrius against the forces of Ptolemy and Seleucus), where once
again it certainly refers to the companion cavalry (ἑξῆς δ᾽ ἔταξε τῶν ἱππέων
τοὺς καλουμένους μὲν ἑταίρους, ὄντας δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὀκτακοσίους). There is no
further occurrence in Book 19.

I would suggest that the reason why epithets such as καλούμενοι, ὀνομαζόμενοι
and προσαγορευθέντες are attached to ἑταῖροι, in the sense of companion cavalry,
in Books 18 and 19 of Diodorus is that Diodorus, in changing his source to
Hieronymus, who was acquainted with Macedonian military terminology, for the first
time found the word used in its correct military sense; and that, wishing to draw the

attention of his readers to what was both to them and to himself a novel and 'foreign'
institution, he distinguished the companion cavalry on their rare appearances in these
books by means of these epithets. The words are, I suggest, Diodorus' own addition,
not his source's, and, like Arrian's use of καλούμενοι with the strange ἀσθέταιροι,
indicate an institution of which the author believes he cannot assume knowledge in
his reader. It is dangerous to argue along the lines pursued by Hammond in this matter,
which seem to assume that because *we* know that the ἐταῖροι had been a prestigious
cavalry unit in Alexander's army (our knowledge coming mainly from Arrian) and
because Diodorus appends epithets such as καλούμενοι to the word when it appears
in his text, the epithet must mean 'famous'; and that the attachment of one of these
epithets to an otherwise unknown cavalry unit, the ἄσθιπποι, which *might* have been
Macedonian, indicates that they, like the ἐταῖροι, 'were among the most prestigious
cavalry units in the field'. I would argue that the use of the epithet by Diodorus may
well be an indication that these ἄσθιπποι were the least known unit in the field.

Another difficulty arising from Hammond's thesis that the ἄσθιπποι were an élite
Macedonian cavalry unit can be seen if we examine the question of what sort of cavalry
they were. The companion cavalry are generally agreed to have been 'heavy' cavalry,
whose massed charge was the decisive factor in Alexander's battles.[4] The existence
of native Macedonian light cavalry is a matter of dispute and turns on the question
of whether the Prodromoi/Sarissophoroi were Macedonians[5] or Balkan troops,
probably Thracians.[6] There is, however, no disagreement that these Sarissophoroi
were more lightly armed than the companions; and this difference probably indicated
a lower social status than the companions, if they were Macedonians.[7] This inference
would be further supported by the fact that they are never mentioned as sharing in
the king's ἐταιρία. The Sarissophoroi, as is well known, disappear from our sources
from 329 B.C. onwards; they may, as Brunt argued in his article on Alexander's
Macedonian cavalry,[8] have been incorporated in the companions' new hipparchies,
but there is no proof of this. If they were Thracian troops, it is quite possible that
they were left as garrison-troops in the Eastern satrapies.[9] It would, from what has
just been said, be not unreasonable to argue that for a Macedonian cavalry-unit to
be regarded as 'élite' and comparable with the companions as 'the best troops'[10] that
Antigonus possessed, it should have the same 'Ansehen' as the companions; and this
would be manifested by its being armed and equipped like them and in their
participating in the royal ἐταιρία; which participation would be made clear in their
title. Now, we have already seen that, on the basis of their name, the ἄσθιπποι do
not appear to have been ἐταῖροι τοῦ βασιλέως; and an examination of Diodorus'
narrative of the battle will show that they were very different from the companions in
their equipment. For Diodorus makes it very clear that Antigonus made up his left
wing of light-armed, mobile cavalry units, whose task was to neutralize Eumenes'
heavy cavalry by keeping a loose, open formation, avoiding direct frontal engagement
and harassing the enemy by wheeling round and attacking them from the flank or

---

[4] cf. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, I, p. 11: '...the use of a mass of heavy cavalry, acting in small
tactical units, as the striking force; Alexander always struck with the companions from the
right...'; Berve, *Alexanderreich*, I, p. 110: 'mit den schwerbewaffneten Makedonen'.

[5] As Tarn, Brunt and Berve all believe – Tarn II, pp. 157–8; Brunt, *JHS* 83 (1963), 27 ff.; Berve,
I, pp. 129 ff.   [6] See, for example, J. R. Hamilton, *Alexander the Great*, p. 55.

[7] cf. Berve, I, p. 129, who believes that they differ from the companions in both organization
and 'Ansehen'.   [8] *JHS* 83 (1963), 27 ff.

[9] cf. Berve, I, p. 135: 'Es scheint, dass Al. die thrakischen Reiter für die innerasiatischen Kriege
als Feldtruppe nicht für geeignet hielt und sie lieber im Besatzungsdienst verwandte...'.

[10] Hammond, art. cit., p. 134.

as they retreated. This, at any rate, is how I interpret Diodorus' κατὰ στόμα μὲν ἤμελλον φυγομαχήσειν ἀραιοὶ διαστάντες, ἐκ μεταβολῆς δὲ διαγωνιεῖσθαι καὶ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ ποιήσειν ἄπρακτον τῶν ἐναντίων τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ᾧ μάλιστα ἐπίστευον. These manoeuvres are similar to the tactics of the Parthians and the Scythians; and the cavalry, to be able successfully to avoid direct contact with the enemy and themselves to harm the enemy, should be missile-throwers or lancers, rather than swordsmen or men relying on the thrusting-spear. Diodorus' narrative bears this out completely. The cavalry of the left-wing are called τοὺς ἐλαφροτάτους τῶν ἱππέων (29. 1); and ἐλαφρός means both 'light in weight' and 'light in moving, nimble';[11] and they consist of ἀφιπποτόξοται, λογχόφοροι, 'Tarentine' specialists ἐν ἐνέδραις, ξυστόφοροι and our ἄσθιπποι. A final proof of the 'light-armed' nature of the left-wing cavalry comes at 30. 1, where Diodorus states that the cavalry with Pithon, who (29. 3) had been put in command of all the cavalry on this wing, had στερεὸν μὲν οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἀξιόλογον... πρόφραγμα περὶ αὐτούς ('qui n'avaient pas de dispositif compact, ni même important, de couverture autour d'eux', as Bizière translates). To have stationed 'heavy' Macedonian cavalry with these troops and for the purpose stated by Diodorus would have made no sense whatever.

The ἄσθιπποι, then, would appear to have been neither 'heavy' cavalry nor ἑταῖροι of the Macedonian king; and since the only possibly known native Macedonian light cavalry were the Sarissophoroi who, as we have seen, did not share in the royal ἑταιρία and who disappear from our knowledge c. 329 B.C., it would seem extremely dubious to call the ἄσθιπποι either an élite body of cavalry or even a body of *Macedonian* cavalry; and similar arguments must obtain for the equally shadowy οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικούντων. We might also note that, for an allegedly élite body of cavalry, the ἄσθιπποι apparently played an undistinguished part in the battle: at 30.4 Eudamus easily routs Pithon's cavalry, who flee to the nearby mountains and are only brought back into line at the end of the engagement. In the second battle, which occurred in the winter months of 317/16 B.C., and is described by Diodorus in chapters 40–3, Pithon again commanded Antigonus' left-wing cavalry (40. 1) and Demetrius was put in command of the right-wing cavalry, which is described (40. 2) as οἱ ἄριστοι ἱππεῖς and are obviously the same as οἱ προσαγορευθέντες ἑταῖροι χίλιοι, Δημήτριον ἔχοντες ἡγεμόνα... of the first battle (29. 4), together with τὸ ἄγημα τῶν ἱππέων τριακοσίων, μεθ᾽ ὧν καὶ αὐτὸς [sc. 'Αντίγονος] ἐκινδύνευε (29. 5). There is no mention at all of ἄσθιπποι in Antigonus' cavalry or even of the participation in the battle of the left-wing cavalry. But if the ἄσθιπποι were present at the battle and if they were indeed an élite unit, it must have been a decided blow to their personal pride to see that Eumenes had ranged opposite them τῶν ἱππέων καὶ τῶν ἐλεφάντων τοὺς ἀσθενεστέρους (40. 4).

Nor, again, are Hammond's arguments convincing when he tries to show that the ἄσθιπποι and the οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικούντων cannot be from the military colonies founded by Alexander or, more generally, from the 'upper' satrapies of the Far East (art. cit., pp. 133–4). It is certainly true that the aggressive activities of Pithon, satrap of Media, had caused the satraps of the Upper satrapies to come together and join forces with Eumenes; these 'Upper' satrapies being Persis, Carmania, Arachosia, Paropanisus, Drangiana, Bactria and India.[12] But it is misleading to imply that Antigonus could not have recruited or obtained cavalry from the 'Upper' satrapies or to imply that the presence in Eumenes' army of 4,600 cavalry from these satrapies

---

[11] See *LSJ* s.v.; cf. Xenophon, *Anabasis* 4. 2. 27, for οἱ ἐλαφροί = 'the light-armed troops'. Bizière, in my view correctly, translates the Diodorus passage as 'ce qu'il avait de plus légers comme cavaliers'.   [12] Diodorus, 19. 14. 1–8.

exhausted their resources (Hammond, p. 134). Firstly, it could be argued that a total of 4,600 cavalry from these seven satrapies, whose main arm was traditionally cavalry, was a very insignificant effort. Secondly, Antigonus had no need of extensive recruitment from the eastern satrapies; even without the 2,500 cavalry of the Medians, Parthyaeans and 'those with Pithon', he still had an equal number to Eumenes.[13] To have increased the number of his cavalry further would have brought problems of provisioning and supply, not to mention control in battle. Again, though Diodorus does not say this, it is quite possible that Pithon, having made himself στρατηγὸς ... τῶν ἄνω σατραπειῶν ἁπασῶν (14. 1), had availed himself of the opportunity of recruiting from these areas and, after his defeat by the other satraps, had taken at least some cavalry from the 'Upper' satrapies back with him to Media; these may well have included the Parthyaean *hippotoxotai* and *lonchophoroi* (29. 2). But if we assume that of the 1,000 Medians and Parthyaeans mentioned at 29. 2 approximately half were Parthyaeans, we are left with only 500 specifically mentioned Median cavalry, which is both a very small number for Pithon to have recruited in his own satrapy and also conflicts with the statement of Diodorus at 20. 3 that Pithon gathered from all of Media 2,000 cavalry, which Antigonus organized into τάξεις or units. If, however, we assume that the '1,500 with Pithon' of 29. 2 were Pithon's Median cavalry, then we will have 2,000 Median cavalry altogether on Antigonus' side, which agrees exactly with Diodorus' figures at 20. 3. Now Hammond himself seems to believe[14] that Antigonus did have some cavalry in his army from the 'Upper' satrapies; indeed, he specifies 'the 1,500 cavalry with Pithon' as being 'from the east of the Euphrates'. I too believe, in the light of the earlier discussion, that this is highly likely; but I would suggest that this cavalry from the 'Upper' satrapies did not consist of Pithon's 1,500 cavalry, but the so-called ἄσθιπποι and οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικούντων. I have argued that these two units cannot have been 'élite', 'heavy' cavalry and that in all likelihood they cannot have been Macedonians. Their stationing on the left wing with the more specialized 'missile' troops, together with their lightness of equipment, together with the scant regard in which they were obviously held by Eumenes in the second battle – if, indeed, they were still attached to Antigonus' army in this battle – makes it clear that they were in all probability local troops, not particularly well trained or equipped, who on my argument had chosen to join up with Pithon during the time that he had gained some predominance, no matter how tenuous or short-lived, as στρατηγὸς τῶν ἄνω σατραπειῶν ἁπασῶν. It is not, then, as Hammond says (art. cit., p. 134), 'obvious, that Antigonus had not been able to get troops from the upper satrapies and in particular from the up-country cities of Alexander'. Nor is the presence in Eumenes' army of Thracian colonists from these settlements, 500 in number (27. 5), an impediment to there being Thracian colonists in Antigonus' army; for in the confused political and military situation of these years it is quite possible that some of these settlers, at least, may have decided to throw in their lot with Pithon and then with Antigonus. Nor, indeed, do we need to assume that the phrase οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω κατοικούντων refers to colonial settlers (or, with Hammond, 'those descended from the up-country settlers'), whether Thracian or Macedonian. For the expression, especially when coupled with the ἄσθιπποι by means of τε, is perfectly good Greek for 'those from the up-country dwellers'; that is, Diodorus' phrase may mean 'the so-called *asthippoi* and those who were from the inhabitants of the "up-country", 800

---

[13] This is according to Diodorus' totals for the two armies, given at 27. 1 and 28. 4: 27. 1, Antigonus, in the battle, has 8,500 cavalry; 28. 4, Eumenes has 6,100. In fact, if we add up the individual units, Eumenes has nearer to 7,000 and Antigonus more than 13,000.

[14] art. cit., p. 134.

in number'. (I do not, it should be noted, accept Hammond's argument that
ὀνομαζομένους is to be taken with both phrases because of its position after, not
before, ἀσθίππους. In his use of these participles meaning 'so-called', Diodorus does
indeed tend to place them before their noun, but a post-positive use is quite regular,
as can be seen from, for example, 17. 75. 3, 18. 2. 2, 18. 43. 1. For the frequent use of
κατοικέω in the straightforward sense of 'dwell in', 'inhabit', see *LSJ*, s.v.)

Finally, what are we to make of the word ἀσθίππους? Hammond, citing Bizière's
statement that of the two main manuscripts of Diodorus 19, R is 'the more often
correct' and the other, F, has a number of acceptable variants (art. cit., p. 128),
rejects Wesseling's conjecture of ἀμφίππους on the ground that it is highly improbable
that this word 'in the ancestral manuscript would have become corrupted into
ἀσθίππους and ἀνθίππους (the reading of F). The correct course is to retain
ἀσθίππους as the *lectio difficilior* and to regard ἀνθίππους as a corruption of it.' But
Bizière (p. xxi) also notes that R 'présente cependant un certain nombre de passages
corrompus que le copiste n'a manifestement pas voulu corriger'; and it might well
be argued that this present passage is one of those occasions when F's variant is
acceptable, and R's reading is the corruption. Equally, it is possible that the readings
of both R and F are corrupt.[15] Hammond argues, in rejecting Wesseling's ἀμφίππους
and F's ἀνθίππους, from the principle of 'lectio difficilior', but concedes that this is
'acceptable only if the word ἀσθίππους is meaningful' (p. 134). He then adduces the
reinstatement of ἀσθεταῖροι in the text of Arrian as the ground for making ἀσθίππους
meaningful and proceeds to develop his argument on the nature and origin of these
cavalrymen by analogy with the conjectural nature and origin of the ἀσθεταῖροι. Apart
from the fact that ἀσθεταῖροι (or a recognizable variant of it) is found six times in
the manuscript of Arrian's *Anabasis*, whilst this word is a *hapax legomenon*, I have
tried to show throughout this article that Hammond's arguments on the nature and
origin of this unit are untenable and that therefore the word is not meaningful in the
way that Hammond wishes it to be. It is possible that there was a word ἄσθιπποι,
in which the prefix ἀσθ- had the same connotation as in ἀσθεταῖροι, whatever that may
have been; but it is also possible that we have here the result of pure chance and the
word is as inexplicable, both in its meaning and in the origin of its corruption, as the
παρθυαῖος ὅς of 19. 14. 1. It may be that the manuscript originally had a word such
as ἀστίππους (see Hesychius, s.v. ἄστιππος, meaning ἱππέων ἑβδομήκοντα), corrected
by a zealous copyist, remembering the aspirate at the beginning of ἵππος, into
ἀσθίππους; but the reading of F still has to be explained. Perhaps, in the circumstances,
the safest course is to admit that the readings of both R and F are corrupt and to
stay with Wesseling's conjectural ἀμφίππους, which does have the virtue of being found
in other writers[16] and of fitting in with the nimble, mobile function which Diodorus
sees these cavalrymen as having. It would have been exciting to have been able to add
another élite cavalry unit to our knowledge of the Macedonian army in the late fourth
century B.C.; unfortunately, the evidence does not exist for us to do this.

University of Queensland   R. D. MILNS

[15] cf. Bizière's comment in her 'Notes Complementaires', p. 157: 'Ni la leçon de R ni celle
de F ne sont attestées ailleurs et il est difficile de leur donner un sens satisfaisant. Du point de
vue paléographique, en écriture minuscule, la meilleure correction est ἄμφιπποι etc.'
[16] Aelian, *Tact.* 2. 4 and Arrian, *Tact.* 2. 3.