

ANDOCIDES, AESCHINES, AND THE THREE HUNDRED ATHENIAN CAVALRYMEN

GLENN R. BUGH

IN HIS SPEECH *On the Peace with the Lacedaemonians* (392/1 B.C.) Andocides included a short historical excursus on Athenian achievements during periods of peace with Sparta (sections 3–9). In 343 B.C. Aeschines in his speech *On the False Embassy* sought to defend his role in the ill-fated Peace of Philocrates. Wanting, like Andocides, to bolster his arguments for peace by means of historical precedents, he took them from Andocides, substituting vocabulary, rearranging the order of some words and sentences, and inserting information omitted by Andocides. In at least one passage (174), Aeschines is accused of either unintelligent condensing¹ or hurried and therefore faulty copying.² His account has generally been dismissed, with the emphasis of study being directed instead at unravelling the confused digression in Andocides.³ I think however, that a new look at some of the differences between the two accounts is warranted, especially with respect to the information on the Athenian cavalry.

I

During the truce negotiated by Cimon between Athens and Sparta in the mid-fifth century B.C.,⁴ according to Andocides (5), we the Athenians *καὶ πρῶτον τότε τριακοσίους ἰππέας κατεστησάμεθα*. The parallel passage in the Teubner edition of Aeschines (173) reads *τριακοσίους δ' ἰππέας προσκατεσκευάσαμεθα*.⁵

Although *κατασκευάζω* can at times be synonymous with *καθίστημι* (e.g., Dem. 52.2), the former *normally* implies a manipulation of existing

¹R. C. Jebb, *The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus* 2 (London 1876; repr. ed., New York 1962) 133.

²U. Albini, *Andocide: De Pace* (Florence 1964) 64.

³Notably, W. Thompson, "Andocides and Hellanicus," *TAPA* 98 (1967) 483–490.

⁴See Thuc. 1.112 and Diod. 11.86.1. On the problem of the exact dates of the truce, see R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1973) 124–128 and Appendix 2, 456–458. The mss of Andocides surprisingly name Miltiades, son of Cimon, as the negotiator and this mistake is followed by Aeschines (172).

⁵U. Schindel in his new edition (1978) of the F. Blass Teubner edition preserves this reading, printed also by C. D. Adams, *The Speeches of Aeschines* (London 1919, Loeb). Although the Budé and Schultze editions of Aeschines read *κατεσκευασάμεθα* in place of *προσκατεσκευασάμεθα*, the fuller form is to be preferred. As the more difficult reading it is more likely to have suffered simplification, or even emendation to bring it into closer harmony with the verb in Andocides. We know that the scholiast recognized that at least in section 175 most of Aeschines' information was drawn from Andocides.

matériel or personnel, the latter the institution of something new or significantly different.⁶ We do not have enough examples of the two verbs in the works of Aeschines to make stronger and more direct claims. But I suggest that the terms are not interchangeable here and that Aeschines deliberately chose *προσκατασκευάζω* as a corrective substitution for *καθίστημι*.⁷

According to LSJ, *προσκατασκευάζω* ordinarily means "to furnish or prepare besides;" so here C. D. Adams translated "we *also* equipped⁸ three hundred cavalrymen." But I suggest that in this case the *προσ*-prefix carries the force of an adjective, not an adverb: "we equipped three hundred *more* cavalrymen." For example, in a third century B.C. inscription, the hipparchs and phylarchs are praised for having added one hundred cavalrymen to the corps, *προσκατέστησαν ἰπ(π)εῖς ἑκατόν . . .*⁹ And Xenophon talks about a hipparch's responsibility to recruit additional horsemen—*προσαναβήσονται ἰππεῖς* (*Hipparchikos* 1.2).

Of course to say that the language of Aeschines implies three hundred *additional* cavalrymen is to depart significantly from the historical information contained in the parallel sentence in Andocides. For Andocides, the Athenians "established" three hundred cavalrymen—no more, no less. Yet, Aeschines has corrected Andocides on a similar point in the immediately preceding passage. In *De pace* 5, referring again to the period of the Truce of Cimon, Andocides writes: ἀντὶ δὲ τῶν τριήρων αἱ τότε ἡμῖν ἦσαν παλαιαὶ καὶ ἄπλοι, αἷς βασιλεῖα καὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους καταναυμαχῆσαντες ἤλευθερώσαμεν τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἀντὶ τούτων τῶν νεῶν ἑκατόν τριήρεις ἐναυπηγησάμεθα. The parallel passage in *De fals. leg.* 173, however, reads ἑκατόν δὲ τριήρεις πρὸς ταῖς ὑπαρχούσαις ἐναυπηγησάμεθα.

Now no scholar has defended the position implied by Andocides that Athens did not replace the ships which had participated in the battle of Salamis until the 450s.¹⁰ Certainly Athens did replace her ships continu-

⁶For example, Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 7.1 (πολιτείαν), 21.3 (τὴν βουλὴν πεντακοσίου ἀντὶ τετρακοσίων), or 29.3 (δημοκρατίαν).

⁷Interestingly enough, the scholion to Aeschin. *De fals. leg.* 173 found fault with the substitution. The scholion reads: *κατεσκευασάμεθα: καταχρηστικῶς, ὥς καὶ ἐν τοῖς Φιλιππικοῖς* [*I Olyn.* 20]: "στρατιώτας κατασκευασθῆναι" φησὶν ὁ Δημοσθένης. What the scholiast disapproved of in Demosthenes' choice of words is unclear; Demosthenes uses the verb frequently in similar military contexts, e.g., 10.19: *κατασκευαζόμενοι στράτευμα, τριήρεις ταχείας, ἵππους, ἰππαγωγούς, τᾶλλ' ὅσ' εἰς πόλεμον*.

⁸For *κατασκευάζω* with horses and horsemen cf. Thuc. 6.94.4; Xen. *Anab.* 3.3.19, *Cyr.* 7.1.46; *IG* 2² 1303 = L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche* 1 (Florence 1967) 31 lines 14–17.

⁹J. Threpsiades and E. Vanderpool, "Πρὸς τοῖς Ἑρμαῖς," *Δελτιον* 18 (1963) 104, line 7.

¹⁰I follow Thompson (above, n. 3) 486, in assuming that the construction of these hundred ships belongs to the period of the 450s. Besides, Andocides' use of *παλαιαὶ* and *ἄπλοι* when describing the ships makes more sense if he were thinking of total replacement decades after Salamis, not after just a few years.

ally.¹¹ Aeschines knew this and corrected the line to read “we built one hundred ships in addition to those already existing”—a perfectly reasonable piece of historical information.

Aeschines’ correction of Andocides’ comments on ship-building should, then, be read together with his correction of Andocides’ statement on the three hundred Athenian cavalrymen. The false impression left by Andocides regarding these one hundred ships alerted Aeschines to the possibility of further mistakes. So cued, Aeschines read *πρώτον τότε τριακοσίων ἱππέας κατεστησάμεθα* and thought that Andocides had again left a false impression, namely that Athens had had no cavalry before the 450s. By deliberately omitting the *πρώτον τότε*¹² and by replacing the strong creating verb *καθίστημι*, Aeschines succeeded in leaving the impression that Athenian cavalrymen had in fact existed prior to the organization of the three hundred.¹³

II

Ironically, I believe that Aeschines misunderstood the real meaning of Andocides’ (or rather his source’s) statement. The statement *πρώτον τότε τριακοσίων ἱππέας κατεστησάμεθα* does not deny the existence of cavalry pre-

¹¹Diod. 11.43.3 tells us explicitly that Themistocles recommended that twenty ships be built each year: *ἔπεισε δὲ τὸν δῆμον καθ’ ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν πρὸς ταῖς ὑπαρχούσαις ναυσὶν εἴκοσι τριήρεις προσκατασκευάζειν*. For discussion, see B. Jordan, *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period* (Berkeley 1975) 28 and H. T. Wade-Gery and B. Meritt, “Athenian Resources in 449 and 431 B.C.,” *Hesperia* 26 (1957) 187.

¹²It is difficult to believe that this omission resulted from stylistic preference and/or a feeling on Aeschines’ part of their superfluity. *Πρώτον τότε* are not words to be lightly discarded; they speak of the beginnings, the creation of something new. Their use by other writers and in different contexts, e.g., the date of the introduction of ostracism, has also elicited discussion; see M. Chambers, “Androton F 6: *τότε πρώτον*,” *JHS* 99 (1979) 151–152.

¹³In support of Aeschines, see Pollux 8.108 which claims that two horsemen (*δύο ἱππέας*) were expected of each of the forty-eight naucraries in the Archaic period. In addition, the cavalry procedure known as *dokimasia*, scrutiny of cavalrymen and their mounts (see Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 49.1–2 for the fourth-century practice) is depicted on two vases, one dated to ca 500 B.C. and the other to ca 470 B.C.: H. Cahn, “Dokimasia,” *Revue archéologique* 7th ser. (1973) 3–22 and G. Körte, “Dokimasia der attischen Reiterei,” *Archaeologische Zeitung* 38 (1880) 177–181 respectively. Also, P. A. L. Greenhalgh, *Early Greek Warfare: Horsemen and Chariots in the Homeric and Archaic Ages* (Cambridge 1973) 111–136 provides sufficient ceramic evidence to support the claim that Athenian cavalrymen were deployed in combat in the sixth century B.C. M. Albert Martin, *Les cavaliers athéniens* (Paris 1886) 71–78, attributed the creation of an Athenian cavalry to Solon in 594 B.C. Contra Ch. Fornara, *The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 404 B.C.* (Wiesbaden 1971, *Historia Einzelschriften* 16) 1, there is no guarantee that phylarchs in the Archaic period were military officers. The familiar explanation of Athens’ apparent failure to deploy cavalry during the Persian wars (the 300 *λογάδες* of Hdt. 9.21.3 need not be horsemen *pace* W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* 2 [Berkeley 1974] 224) is surely the right one: she did not field cavalry because it was hopelessly outnumbered.

vously, but rather attests the creation of a different kind of cavalry organization. Various scholars have interpreted *De pace* 5 as attesting the first regular cavalry corps in contrast to a disorganized band of aristocratic horsemen.¹⁴

What has failed to receive sufficient attention is the close connection between Andocides' verb *καθίστημι* and its substantive *κατάστασις*, a *terminus technicus* when employed in the context of the Athenian cavalry.¹⁵

The gloss of the lexicographer Harpocration on the Lysianic oration *In Defence of Mantisheus* 6–7¹⁶ clearly shows the close relationship—not at all surprising—between *κατάστασις* and *καθίστημι*. *καθίστημι* has the technical meaning of “to appoint” with trierarchs or choregoi;¹⁷ with the Athenian cavalry it embodies both the technical sense of “enrollment”

¹⁴B. Keil, *Anonymus Argentinensis: Fragmente zur Geschichte des perikleischen Athen aus einem Strasburger Papyrus* (Strasburg 1902) 144–145; G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* 2 (Munich 1926) 1128 and n. 5; A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford 1945) 328 and n. 1; and J. K. Anderson, *Ancient Greek Horsemanship* (Berkeley 1961) 130–131. This interpretation has received additional support from the inscription, *IG* 1² 400, dated to the mid-fifth century B.C., which records the existence of three hipparchs in one year, thereby offering the arithmetical possibility of one hipparch per one hundred cavalrymen: A. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis* (Camb., Mass. 1949) 151 and Anderson *ibid.* 131. The number of hipparchs for the canonical one thousand-man Athenian cavalry of the Classical period was two.

¹⁵K. F. Hermann, *de equitibus Atticis* (Marburg 1835) 33 recognized the obvious linguistic connection: “*καθίσταται* enim verbum solemne est de ipso equitum delectu, sicut et de magistratibus, liturgis, aliisque eius generis hominibus, qui ad aliquod munus non tam nascuntur quam instituuntur: quod si *κατάστασις* ab ipsa instituendi actione per metonymiam ad aliam rem transfertur, certe nihil aliud significare poterit, nisi quod cum institutionis et tempore et ratione arctissime conjunctum est,” as quoted by Martin (above, n. 13) 335, n. 1.

¹⁶Mantisheus had been accused of serving in the cavalry under the Thirty Tyrants (404/403 B.C.). To punish these cavalrymen the Athenians voted that the phylarchs were to make an accounting of those who had served in the cavalry in order to exact the *katastasis* from them (underlined Greek words in the following sections for emphasis): τοὺς φυλάρχους ἀπενεγκεῖν τοὺς ἰππεύσαντας, ἵνα τὰς καταστάσεις ἀναπράξῃτε παρ’ αὐτῶν. Mantisheus boldly declares his innocence: ἐμὲ τοίνυν οὐδεὶς ἀν’ ἀποδείξειεν οὐτ’ ἀπενεχθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν φυλάρχων οὔτε παραδοθέντα τοῖς συνδίκους οὔτε κατάστασιν καταβαλόντα. καίτοι πᾶσι ῥάδιον τοῦτο γινῶναι, ὅτι ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τοῖς φυλάρχοις, εἰ μὴ ἀποδείξειαν τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰς καταστάσεις, αὐτοῖς ζημιουῖσθαι. Harpocration s.v. *κατάστασις* explains this passage as follows: εἰκεν ἀργύριον εἶναι ὅπερ οἱ κατασταθέντες ἰππεῖς ἐλάμβανον ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου ἐπὶ τῇ καταστάσει, ὥσπερ αὐτὸς ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς ὑποσημαίνει. παρεμφαίνει τοῦτο καὶ Εὐπολὶς Φίλοις.

οὐκ ἐσωφρόνησας, ὧ πρεσβύτα, τὴν κατάστασιν
τὴνδε λαμβάνων ἄφνω πρὶν καὶ μαθεῖν τὴν ἱππικὴν.

ἐτι δὲ σαφέστερον λέγεται ἐν τῷ Σύρφακι Πλάτωνος. ἀπεδίδοτο δὲ τὸ ἀργύριον ὑπὸ τῶν ἰππευσάντων ὅτε ἀντ’ αὐτῶν ἑτέροι καθίσταντο. ἀπῆθον δὲ αὐτὸ οἱ φύλαρχοι.

¹⁷For example, Dem. *I Boeotius* 1.8: τριήραρχον καθιστῶσιν, [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 3.4: τριήραρχοι καθίστανται τετρακόσιοι ἐκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ, Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.8: χορηγοὺς καθιστᾶσιν, Lys. 24.9, etc.

and the corresponding grant of *κατάστασις*, a loan made by the State to each recruit when he was formally enrolled (= established) in the cavalry primarily to assist him in the purchase of his mount or to replace his mount lost in war.¹⁸ This same twofold sense is probably also implied in Hesychius s.v. *ἱππῆς*, noting that Philochorus discussed when the canonical “one-thousand-man cavalry was established” (*πότε κατεστάθησαν χίλιοι*), and certainly in the third century B.C. cavalry inscription reading *προσκατέστησαν ἱπ(π)εῖς ἑκατόν* (line 7) and *ὅπως ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ ἀεὶ καθιστάμενοι φιλοτιμῶνται ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν ἱππέων* (above, note 9, lines 37–39).

In addition, this technical meaning for *καθίστημι* is confirmed by two passages of Xenophon *Hipparchikos* 1.9: *τοὺς μὲν τοίνυν ἱππέας δῆλον ὅτι καθιστάναί δεῖ κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοὺς δυνατωτάτους καὶ χρήμασι καὶ σώμασιν ἢ εἰσάγοντα εἰς δικαστήριον ἢ πείθοντα* and 9.3: *Φημὶ δ' ἐγὼ [ταῦτα] καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἱππικὸν ὧδ' ἂν πολὺ θάττον ἐκπληρωθῆναι εἰς τοὺς χιλίους ἱππεῖς καὶ πολὺν ῥῆον τοῖς πολίταις, εἰ διακοσίους ἱππέας ξένους καταστήσαιντο* (3). In section 5 of the same passage, Xenophon suggests ways of defraying the cost of the horses of these two hundred foreign horsemen (*εἰς δὲ τιμὴν τῶν ἵππων*): (a) by securing money (*χρήματα*) from those existing cavalrymen who wish to relinquish their military obligations (*τοῖς καθίστησι τὸ ἱππικὸν ἐθέλουσι τελεῖν ἀργύριον ὥς μὴ ἱππεύειν*); (b) from rich men physically unfit; and (c) from orphans holding large estates. The Loeb editor E. C. Marchant concluded from the passage that mercenaries were not to receive “establishment money” (291, n. 1).

Hundreds of thin lead strips, mostly of the third century B.C., recently recovered from the Ceramicus and the Agora may, however, suggest a close connection between *τιμὴ τῶν ἵππων* and *κατάστασις*. These strips offer information relating to the ownership of a horse, e.g., an amount of money prefaced by the term *τίμημα*, “evaluation” (sometimes abbreviated). J. H. Kroll has argued convincingly (above, note 18) that the *τίμημα* represents the result of the “evaluations of the horses” (*τιμήσεις τῶν ἵππων*) attested in two cavalry-related inscriptions which read *ἐπιμεμέληνται* [i.e., the phylarchs and hipparchs] *δὲ καὶ τῶν [τι]μήσεων καὶ τῶν δοκιμασιῶν . . .* and *καὶ τὰς τιμήσεις τῶν ἵππων*.¹⁹

This process, then, may be what Xenophon had in mind by his use of *καταστήσαιντο* and *τιμὴ τῶν ἵππων*. In order to pay for the *katastasis* of the foreign cavalrymen, existing Athenian horsemen would not only have to pay back their *katastasis* (see Harpocration s.v. *κατάστασις*), but presumably an additional amount (*ἀργύριον*?) as a penalty for shirking their

¹⁸So the grant of *katastasis* is explained by J. H. Kroll, “An Archive of the Athenian Cavalry,” *Hesperia* 46 (1977) 83–140 at 97–98.

¹⁹J. Threpsiades and E. Vanderpool (above, n. 9) 104, lines 14–15, and *SEG* 21.435, line 28. (Discussed by Ch. Habicht, “Neue Inschriften aus dem Kerameikos,” *AthMitt* 76 [1961] 127–136 [48]).

responsibility. I think that Xenophon assumed that the number of cavalrymen who wished to leave the service would not generate enough money to pay the mercenary *katastasis*, and that, therefore, the State would need to draw upon other sources, i.e., upon unfit wealthy citizens and well-to-do orphans.

In section 6 (cf. *Poroi* 2.5), Xenophon suggests that some of the metics might also wish to join the ranks of the cavalry: νομίζω δὲ καὶ μετοίκων φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἂν τινὰς εἰς ἵππικὸν καθισταμένους. Surely "establishment money" would have had to be provided for these metics also. I closely join this suggestion regarding the metics with that offered regarding the foreign horsemen and contend that here also Xenophon is thinking of a similar process of establishment.

In summary, the impact of And. *De pace* 5 (πρῶτον τότε τριακοσίους ἵππείας κατεστησάμεθα) lies in the fact that the grant of *katastasis* was instituted for the first time with this new cavalry force.²⁰ I suggest that at the same time the three hundred Athenian horsemen were "established," the state grant was introduced to finance the new system and logically named after the "establishing" verb καθίστημι.²¹ In turn, the natural bond between κατάστασις and καθίστημι created a new technical meaning for καθίστημι when used in conjunction with the Athenian cavalry, that of "to enroll."²²

A word of caution is in order. The use of καθίστημι in the context of cavalry other than Athenian, e.g., Spartan (παρὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς ἵππείας τετρακοσίους κατεστήσαντο καὶ τοξότας . . . Thuc. 4.55.2) or Persian (ἄρ' οὖν σκεψώμεθα, εἰ βουλοίμεθα καθιστάναι ἵππικόν, τί ἡμῖν ὑπάρχει καὶ τίνος ἐνδεῖ: Xen. *Cyr.* 4.3.8, cf. 8.6.10), should not be assumed to imply the same technical meaning. Furthermore, when And. *De pace* 7 (= Aeschin. *De*

²⁰Kroll (above, n. 18) 99, on the other hand, connects the introduction of *katastasis* with the creation of the canonical 1000-man Athenian cavalry (sometime around the middle of the fifth century B.C.), the purpose being to make "it financially possible for a greater number of young Athenians to participate." The earliest secure date that can be linked with *katastasis* falls between 429 and 425 B.C. when Eupolis' comedy *Philoï* was produced; see Harpocration s.v. κατάστασις for reference and J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* 1 (Leiden 1957), F 268, p. 407, n. e for dates.

²¹The inscription, IG I² 400 (see above), may celebrate this establishment.

²²This is to be distinguished from the preliminary procedure of enrolling *potential* recruits for cavalry service, for which the term καταλέγω was used (*AthPol* 49.2); see my "Introduction of the *Katalogeis* of the Athenian Cavalry," *TAPA* 112 (1982) 23–32. The verb καθίστημι encompassed the *complete* procedure of initial enrollment, scrutiny (*dokimasia*) before the Council of Five Hundred, and *katastasis*. Also, I think we can, understand the scholiast's comment that Aeschines employed κατεσκευασάμεθα incorrectly (above, n. 7). The lexicographers had defined the technical meaning of καθίστημι when used with the cavalry. Aware of this precise terminology, and perhaps borrowing directly from one of the lexicographical sources, the scholiast meant to point out that Aeschines had used the wrong verb.

fals. leg. 174) reports that during the Thirty Year Peace Athens “established” 1200 horsemen and additional bowmen of like number (χιλίους τε καὶ διακοσίους ἱππέας καὶ τοξότας τοσούτους ἐτέρους κατεστήσαμεν), I suggest that here the multi-purpose nature of the verb allows two senses of “enrolling.” The Athenians would have known that the horsemen received *katastasis* whereas the bowman did not.²³

²³I wish to express my appreciation to Malcolm Wallace, University of Toronto, for his valuable corrections and suggestions on several drafts of this article and also to the referees for their constructive remarks. I bear sole responsibility for any errors yet remaining.

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY,
BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA