

THE HISTORIANS OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT on occasions applied the term *σωματοφύλακες* to members of any one of three units: the Royal Pages (normally the *παῖδες βασιλικοί*), the infantry bodyguard (the *ἄγημα* of the hypaspists) or the seven-man elite bodyguard (always known as the *σωματοφύλακες*). The term is most frequent in Arrian, usually denoting a member of the last group. Not surprisingly, for one of Arrian's sources belonged to the seven-man bodyguard.¹ But Arrian uses the word *σωματοφύλακες* of the hypaspists on four, perhaps five, occasions,² and Diodoros speaks of the institution of the Pages as the *σωματοφυλακία*.³ Yet, despite a need for clarification, little attention has been given to these three units in the light of their common function, *σωματοφυλακία* or *custodia corporis*. All were responsible for guarding the Macedonian King, whether in battle, during the hunt, or at the Court, and they shared also the adjective *βασιλικός* ("the King's own;" the Latin *regius* is used, as far as I can see, only of the Pages). Four units were organised specifically for the King's protection: the Pages, the hypaspists, the seven-man elite bodyguard and the cavalry-guard (or *ἰλη βασιλική*). I shall say little about the last of these, however, since the term *σωματοφύλακες* was never applied to them.

I

The institution of the Pages dates from the reign of Philip II, according to Arrian (4.13.1; cf. Aelian *VH* 14.48) who describes some of their duties as resembling those of Persian aristocratic youths (below, note 7). But Curtius (8.8.3) and Valerius Maximus (3.3 ext. 1) give rhetorical accounts that emphasise the antiquity of the practice in Macedonia, and it appears that

The following are cited by author's name: H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, 2 vols. (Munich 1926); A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* 1 (Oxford 1980); N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *History of Macedonia* (Oxford 1979) (= author, *HistMac*); W. Heckel, "The *Somatophylakes* of Alexander the Great: Some Thoughts," *Historia* 27 (1978) 224–228 (= Heckel 1978); "The early career of Lysimachos," *Klio* 64 (1982) 373–381 (written in 1976) (= Heckel 1982); O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen: ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum* (Göttingen 1906).

¹I note twenty-three passages in Arrian where *somatophylakes* are named. Twelve of these name Ptolemy, son of Lagos: Arr. 3.6.6; 3.27.5; 4.8.9; 4.13.7; 4.15.8; 4.16.2; 4.21.4; 4.29.1; 5.13.1; 6.28.4; 7.3.2; 7.4.6.

²Arr. 1.6.5; 1.24.1; 3.17.2; 4.3.2 and 4.30.3 (distinguishing between the *ἄγημα*, i.e., the *σωματοφύλακες*, and the rest of the hypaspists).

³Diod. 17.65.1: ἐκ δὲ τῆς Μακεδονίας τῶν φίλων τοῦ βασιλέως υἱοὶ πενήτην πρὸς τὴν *σωματοφυλακίαν* ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων ἀπεσταλμένοι . . .

Dekamnichos and Krateuas ("Krataios," Arist. *Politics* 1311b; "Krateros," Diod. 14.37.6) were Pages of Archelaos.⁴ About the Pages of Philip II we are ill informed. Only two are known for certain by name: Aphthonetos and Archedamos, both punished for disobedience (Aelian *ibid.*). Diodoros gives a sensational account of Pausanias of Orestis, τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως σωματοφύλαξ, who, because of his beauty, had been the lover of Philip II but was supplanted by another Pausanias, who perished fighting by the King's side in early 336 B.C. (16.93.4–6). Pausanias of Orestis appears to have been a hypaspist, but his alleged relationship with Philip probably dates back to his younger days, when he served as one of the King's Pages (cf. Berve 1.39); for it seems that homosexuality was common, if not encouraged at the Court. Justin provides a similar picture of Olympias' younger brother, Alexandros of Epeiros: brought up at Philip's court in the late 350s and early 340s, presumably as a Page, he was reputedly the King's lover (8.6.4–6). Other young aristocrats were clearly brought up at the Court as σύντροφοι of Amyntas Perdikka, Arrhidaios, and Alexander the Great, just as later Alexander IV was surrounded by young men of the nobility.⁵

There is general agreement that the παῖδες βασιλικοί were a body of young men, the sons of prominent Macedonians,⁶ whose function in general was θεραπεία τοῦ βασιλέως. This involved guarding the King while he slept (*custodia corporis*, σωματοφυλακία), bringing his horse to him, and accompanying him in the hunt and in battle.⁷ Often their tasks were menial (*munia haud multum servilibus ministeriis abhorrentia*, Curt. 8.6.2). And it was the King's prerogative to order punishment, which, in the few recorded instances, was severe (Curt. 8.6.5; Aelian *VH* 14.48); thus a type of Laconic

⁴Cf. Hammond, *HistMac* 2.167; E. D. Carney, "Regicide in Macedonia," *PP* 211 (1983) 271–272.

⁵The *syntrophoi* of Amyntas Perdikka may have included Philotas, son of Parmenion (Curt. 6.10.24), Hegelochos, son of Hippostratos (Curt. 6.11.22–29; for his identity see W. Heckel, "Who was Hegelochos?," *RhM* 125 [1982] 78–87), Amyntas, son of Antiochos (see J. R. Ellis, "Amyntas Perdikka, Philip II and Alexander the Great," *JHS* 91 [1971] 15–24), and perhaps the two eldest sons of Andromenes, Amyntas and Simmias (Curt. 7.1.11). Amongst Alexander's *syntrophoi* we find Hephaistion (Curt. 3.12.16: *is longe omnium amicorum carissimus erat regi, cum ipso pariter eductus, secretorum omnium arbiter* . . .), Marsyas, son of Periandros, historian and half-brother of Antigonos the One-Eyed (Suda s.v. Μαρυσίας. Cf. W. Heckel, "Marsyas of Pella, Historian of Macedon," *Hermes* 108 [1980] 444–462, at 446–447), and Leonnatos (Arr. *Succ.* fr. 12 = Suda s.v. Λεοννάτος). For Alexander IV's *syntrophoi* see Diod. 19.52.4: τοὺς ἐιωθότας παῖδας συντρέφεσθαι.

⁶τῶν ἐν τέλει Μακεδόνων τοὺς παῖδας, Arr. 4.13.1; τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ δοκιμωτάτων τοὺς υἱεῖς, Aelian *VH* 14.48; *principum Macedoniae liberos adultos*, Curt. 5.1.42, cf. 8.6.2; *pueri regii apud Macedonas vocabantur principum liberi*, Livy 45.6; cf. also Diod. 17.65.1; Justin 12.7.2.

⁷Arr. 4.13.1: καὶ ὅποτε ἐξελαύνει βασιλεὺς, τοὺς ἵππους παρὰ τῶν ἵπποκόμων δεχόμενοι ἐκείνοι προσήγον καὶ ἀνέβαλλον οὕτοι βασιλέα τὸν Περσικὸν τρόπον καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ θήρᾳ φιλοτιμίας βασιλεῖ κοινωνοὶ ἦσαν.

endurance was fostered among these young men (cf. Val. Max. 3.3 ext. 1).⁸ Ultimately they provided the Macedonians with generals and governors (Curt. 5.1.42; 8.6.6).

Dietmar Kienast has shown, with varying degrees of success, that Philip II used Persian models for the organisation of the Court and the army.⁹ Whether the Royal Pages were established by Philip himself or whether the practice dates from the time of Persian rule in Macedonia cannot be determined. The positions of Dekamnichos and Krateuas vis-à-vis Archelaos suggest an early date, but we cannot identify them with certainty as Pages. That the Macedonians took the Persian Court as their model is generally accepted, and we have Xenophon's description of the sons of Persian nobles raised at the Court of the Great King and learning by example ἀρχειν τε καὶ ἀρχεσθαι (*Anab.* 1.9.3–4). And, whether this institution was intended to unite the aristocratic families of Macedon amicably or whether these sons served as hostages for the good conduct of their fathers, it seems certain that Philip's primary aim was stability within the kingdom and at the Court (so Kienast *op. cit.* 30). For, if the practice did not originate with Philip, it was undoubtedly he who extended the membership of the corps to Upper Macedonia.¹⁰

We are not told how large the corps of the Pages was, or whether its number was fixed. In 330 Amyntas, son of Andromenes, brought fifty young men from Macedonia to serve as Alexander's Pages (Curt. 5.1.42; cf. Diod. 17.65.1), and Berve (1.37, n. 3) estimates that the entire unit numbered in excess of one hundred. This remains a guess. Other figures are of limited value: sixteen Pages accompanied Perdikkas, son of Orontes, in 323 B.C. (Curt. 10.8.3); they were numerous enough to allow the nine conspirators named by Curtius (8.6.7–9) to be on guard-duty on the same night in 327; but Berve identifies only thirteen individuals as Pages, Hoffmann fourteen, two of these from Philip's time.¹¹ On the other hand, Spindel

⁸A Page attending Alexander as he sacrificed endured in silence as a hot coal fell on his arm and burned his skin, fearing to cry out and disrupt the religious ceremony.

⁹D. Keinast, *Philip II. von Makedonien und das Reich der Achaimeniden* (Munich 1973).

¹⁰Of the σωματοφύλακες named by Arrian at 6.28.4, Leonnatos (Πελλαῖος in this passage and in Arr. *Ind.* 18.3) came originally from Lynkestis, Perdikkas from Orestis; the *somatophylax* Attalos (Diod. 16.94.4), whether Page or hypaspist, was from Tymphaia, as was Alexandros, son of Polyperchon, a *somatophylax* of Philip III Arrhidaïos (Arr. *Succ.* 1.38). The hypaspist commanders (Curt. 5.2.5) include a certain Lyncestes Amyntas, but it is not certain that he belonged to the aristocracy. The *somatophylax* Arybbas (Arr. 3.5.5) appears to have come from Epeiros, and Neoptolemos, who is called ἀρχωπασπιστής by Plutarch (*Eum.* 1.6), belonged to the Aiakidai and was Epeiroi in origin. Cf. also R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London 1973) 51; Griffith, *HistMac* 2.402–403.

¹¹Berve 2: Antikles (no. 88), Antipatros (no. 93), Aretis (no. 110), Elaptonius (no. 296), Epimenes (no. 300), Hermolaos (no. 305), Eurylochos (no. 332), Metron (no. 520), Nikostratos (no. 570, probably a corruption of the name Sostratos, though Berve treats them as

adduces two hundred Pages, who he believes were infantrymen in the time of the *Diadochoi*, and several *ilai* (i.e., cavalry-squadrons) of Pages.¹² These παῖδες appear, however, to have been slaves, not Pages.

Which brings us to the matter of basic terminology. In the Alexander-historians, the Pages are called παῖδες (Plut. *Alex.* 55.6–7; Diod. 17.66.3; 17.76.5; 19.52.4; Arr. 4.12.7; 4.13.1–2) or παῖδες βασιλικοί (Diod. 17.79.4; Arr. 4.16.6; cf. Diod. 17.36.5: οἱ δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως παῖδες). In Latin they are *pueri* (Curt. 8.6.24; 8.7.8; 10.7.16; 10.8.3–4), *pueri regii* (Curt. 5.2.13; Livy 45.6) or *pueri nobiles* (Curt. 8.6.7; 10.5.8; cf. Val. Max. 3.3 ext. 1: *nobilissimi pueri*), though in the last case the “term” is always further explained; hence it might be unwise to speak of a “term” at all. As a unit, they are the *regia cohors* or *puerorum regia cohors* (Curt. 8.6.7; 9.10.26; 10.8.3), sometimes merely the *cohors* (Curt. 8.6.6; 8.6.18; 8.8.20). Clearly they were meant to be the King’s bodyguards (Diod. 17.65.1; Curt. 5.1.42; 10.5.8), but, while they appear to have been called σωματοφύλακες (though never δορύφοροι) by the Greeks, Roman writers did not apply to them the terms *custodes corporis* or *armigeri*.¹³ The rather vague *satellites* is never used, as far as I am aware, to refer to the Pages.¹⁴

Pages are often described in less-precise phrases or in specific terms hitherto disregarded. Some of this terminology will involve descriptions of their functions, age-group, aristocratic affiliations, or any combination of the aforementioned. Hence the *cohors . . . quae excubabat ad tabernaculum regis*¹⁵ will, by analogy with Curtius 8.6.18 (*iam alii ex cohorte in stationem successerant, ante cubiculi fores excubituri*), refer to the Pages. To which group one may add an individual *qui ministrare regi solebat*,¹⁶ if he belongs to one of the noble families of Macedonia: that is, not a slave but a boy of

separate individuals; see Curt. 8.6.9, a particularly corrupt passage, and W. Heckel, “Some Speculations on the Prosopography of the *Alexanderreich*,” LCM 6.3 [1981] 63–70, at 63–64), Sostratos (no. 738), Philippos (no. 777), Philotas (no. 801), and Charikles (no. 824). Hoffmann 179–180: Apththonetos, Archedamos, Aretis, Hermolaos, Sostratos, Antipatros, Epimenes, Antikles, Philotas, Charikles, Eurylochos, Nikostratos, Elaptonius, Excipinus.

¹²Plut. *Eum.* 3.11; Diod. 19.28.3, 29.5. A. Spendel, *Untersuchungen zum Heerwesen der Diadochen* (Breslau 1915) 27.

¹³*custos (custodes) corporis*: Curt. 4.13.19; 5.11.6; 6.7.15; 6.11.8; 7.5.40; 7.10.9; 8.2.11; 8.6.21; 8.11.11; 9.6.4; 9.8.23; 10.2.30; 10.6.1; Justin 9.6.3–4; 12.12; Epit. Mett. 2; cf. Curt. 7.7.9. *armiger(i)*: Curt. 3.12.7; 4.7.21; 4.15.29; 5.4.21; 6.1.5; 6.8.17; 6.8.19; 6.8.24; 7.1.14; 7.1.18; 7.2.13; 7.2.28; 8.1.45; 8.2.11.

¹⁴Curt. 3.12.10; 4.7.21; 6.7.24; 6.7.29; 6.8.19; 10.5.14; 10.7.14; 10.7.17; 10.8.3; 10.8.8; Justin 12.6.3; 12.8.4; 12.12.4.

¹⁵Curt. 3.12.3; cf. 8.13.20; 8.6.3: *excubabant servatis noctium vicibus proximi foribus eius aedis, in qua rex adquiescebat*. Cf. also Arr. 4.13.11: κοιμώμενον [sc. βασιλέα] φυλάσσειν τούτους ἐπετέτραπτο.

¹⁶Justin 12.14.6; cf. Curt. 5.1.42; 8.6.2; Epit. Mett. 89: *cum Iolla . . . praeministro Alexandri*. Cf. Justin 12.14.9; Livy 45.6; Curt. 5.2.13; Diod. 17.36.5.

aristocratic descent engaged in *θεραπεία τοῦ βασιλέως*. By contrast, other functions similar to those of the Pages were handled by slaves, and although the Pages were entrusted with the King's horses on occasions, they are not to be identified with the grooms (*ἵπποκόμοι*); for Curtius makes a clear distinction between Pages and *agasones* (8.6.4).¹⁷

Most important is the terminology that involves age-limits for membership in the unit. Berve (1.37) assumes that a youth entered the ranks of the Pages sometime between the ages of 13 and 15, a "boy" by ancient and modern standards. But this training must have continued for several years, perhaps until shortly before the age of twenty. Hence the Pages belonged to that group that included *pueri*, *μειράκια* (Plut. *Alex.* 55.2; Arr. 4.13.1) and presumably *νεανίσκοι* (Plut. *Alex.* 10.5). They are *adulti liberi* and *iuvenes* (Curt. 5.1.42; 8.2.35; 8.6.2): for example, Hermolaos, who calls himself a *puer* (Curt. 8.7.8), is referred to by Curtius (8.6.8) as a *iuvenis*, and the Pages in general are called *iuvenes* at 8.6.25. Similarly, the Page Metron (cf. Diod. 17.79.4), who received the news of Dimnos' conspiracy against Alexander in 330, is called *iuvenis nobilis* (Curt. 8.7.22). But again the difficulty is this: if *iuvenis nobilis* is used regularly as a substitute for *puer regius*, and even if every instance of a Macedonian *iuvenis nobilis* involves an individual who could be a Page, this does not mean that every *iuvenis nobilis* is by definition a Page. We must rule out, however, Berve's claim that Philippos, the brother of Lysimachos, could not have been a Page because Curtius calls him *iuvenis* instead of *puer*.¹⁸

But, if Philippos was not one of the Pages, then we have a group of young men, described in similar terms, who are apparently hypaspists, but not clearly distinguished from the Pages because of the ambiguity of the words that indicate age. Alexandros, Charos, and their colleagues, *iuvenes promptissimi ex sua cohorte* (Curt. 8.11.9–10), belong to this group. Berve originally identified them as Pages (*RE* Supp. 4 [1924] 15, 215), but promoted them to the hypaspists in his prosopography (2.21, no. 40; 2.408, no. 826). By the same token, we cannot be sure about the status of Pausanias of Orestis, the assassin of Philip II, whom Diodoros calls *σωματοφύλαξ* and whom Justin describes as *nobilis ex Macedonibus adulescens* (9.6.3–4).¹⁹ But, whatever we decide about the status of Pausanias, it must apply equally to Leonnatos,

¹⁷Cf. Arr. 4.13.1. The *hypaspistai basilikoi* found together with the *hippokomoi* at Gaugamela (Arr. 3.13.6) are probably an error for *paides basilikoi*.

¹⁸Curt. 8.2.35: *Nobiles iuvenes comitari eum soliti defecerant praeter Philippum. Lysimachi erat frater, tum primum adultus et, quod facile adpareret, indolis rarae*. Berve 2.382: "Als Page würde er als puer bezeichnet und vermutlich beritten gewesen sein." Cf. the description of Polemon, son of Andromenes: *iuvenis . . . primo aetatis flore pubescens* (Curt. 7.2.4).

¹⁹Pausanias had very recently been sexually abused by Attalos (or his muleteers); at that time his age is given as *primis pubertatis annis* (cf. Polemon, n. 18 above).

Perdikkas, and Attalos, who were his fellow-*somatophylakes* in 336 B.C. (Diod. 16.94.4).²⁰

Now perhaps it appears that I have spent a disproportionate amount of time on the Royal Pages. But it is clear that the institution marked the beginning of the careers of most, if not all, Macedonian aristocrats (Curt. 5.1.42: *magnorumque praefectorum et ducum haec incrementa sunt et rudimenta*). This institution had two restrictions: age and birth. On the latter point, it is important to note that Philip II had opened up the "Macedonian aristocracy" to highlanders and Greeks (Griffith, *HistMac* 2.402–403). I assume that those who were the sons of Philip's newly-created non-lowland *betairoi* were raised at Pella and enrolled as Pages. Thus we find Leonnatos, who was undoubtedly of Lynkestian origin, referred to as Πελλαῖος in Arrian's only complete list of the σωματοφύλακες (Arr. 6.28.4). Similarly, Lysimachos, whose father appears to have been Thessalian, was raised at Pella along with his brothers.²¹ The most notable of Philip's highland *betairoi*, whose sons were raised at the Court, will have included Andromenes and Polyperchon of Tymphaia,²² Derdas and Machatas of Elimeia,²³ Aëropos of Lynkestis, Orontes, Alexandros, and Antiochos of Orestis. Of

²⁰Pausanias could not have been one of the seven-man elite (*pace* Hammond, "Philip's Tomb in Historical Context," *GRBS* 19 [1978] 331–350, at 347). Diodoros and Justin emphasise his youth, and it is difficult to imagine that Attalos and his friends could have, with impunity, degraded a man of such high standing. Hammond also identifies the Attalos of Diod. 16.94.4 with the uncle of Kleopatra-Eurydike. This Attalos could not have been one of the seven since he was absent from the Court in 336 (at the time of Philip's assassination); the identification also implies that Perdikkas and Leonnatos were members of the seven-man Bodyguard. See W. Heckel, "The *somatophylax* Attalos: Diodoros 16.94.4," *LCM* 4.10 (1979) 215–216.

²¹For the opposite view, see I. L. Merker, "Lysimachus—Thessalian or Macedonian?," *Chiron* 9 (1979) 31–36 and Heckel 1982, 374, but I now feel that Lysimachos' father was a Thessalian from Krannon, and that Theopompos chose to represent Greeks who cooperated with Philip II as slaves and flatterers. See Theopompos, *FGrHist* 115 F 81, and cf. F 209 on Daochos and Thrasydaos. Perhaps Lysimachos' appointment indicates that Philip sought regional representation amongst his *somatophylakes* (Arybbas was Epeiroi). Lysimachos was, however, regarded as Macedonian: Arr. *Ind.* 18.3; *Anab.* 6.28.4; Plut. *Demetr.* 44; Justin 15.3.1; Paus. 1.9.5.

²²Berve (2.440) assumes that Andromenes and Polyperchon were brothers and that Simmias was their father, but their relationship might not be quite so close. It is possible that Andromenes married a sister of Polyperchon, and that their second (?) child, Simmias, bears the name of the maternal grandfather. That Amyntas, son of Andromenes, took the name of his paternal grandfather (i.e., that Andromenes was the son of an Amyntas) is consistent with Greek and Macedonian practice, but we know too little about the occurrence of the names of maternal grandfathers to establish any rules. If Polyperchon was related to the sons of Andromenes by marriage, then it would be easier to explain their political differences in the late 320s.

²³Derdas (Berve no. 250; Curt. 7.6.12; 8.1.7), whom Alexander sent to the Scythians, was probably a member of this family, but we do not know in what capacity he accompanied Alexander. Kalas, son of Harpalos, was the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia; Tauron, son of Machatas, commanded the archers, and his brother Philippos is an Indian satrap at the time of his death in 324; Harpalos the treasurer may have been their brother as well. But we know

the Eordaian nobility we know little, though men like Krateuas (and perhaps Lagos) must have been among the most prominent.²⁴

II

The greatest difficulty is presented by the hypaspists, or rather by the unit of hypaspists that formed Alexander's personal footguard, Berve's *Hypaspistenleibwache*. We know very little indeed about the composition of this group and its relationship to the Pages and the seven-man elite. Yet it is precisely this unit which may hold the key to our understanding of the organisation of Alexander's *σωματοφύλακες*. The connection between the Pages and the seven-man Bodyguard is obvious: (i) Both were exclusive to the Macedonian aristocracy, or, as I have stated above, to the sons of Philip's *ἑταῖροι*, and presumably a man who became a member of the Bodyguard had at one time been a Page. (ii) The Pages and the Bodyguards shared the function of *σωματοφυλακία* at the Court, guarding the King while he slept; for the Pages guarded the outside of the bed-chamber, the Bodyguards the inside. Thus we find Eurylochos divulging the details of Hermolaos' conspiracy to Ptolemy and Leonnatos, who were that night on guard within the doors.²⁵ (iii) At the King's banquets, we find in his immediate vicinity, his *ἑταῖροι*, some Pages (who attended him), the Bodyguards, who were high in the King's esteem but also protected him, and some of the hypaspists.²⁶ The accounts of the Kleitos-affair name five of the seven *σωματοφύλακες*, and Hephaistion and Leonnatos appear at the banquet that saw the introduction of *proskynesis*.²⁷

nothing about their early lives. The assumption that Harpalos was one of Alexander's "boyhood friends" is mistaken. He was probably one of Alexander's advisors. See my comments in "The 'Boyhood Friends' of Alexander the Great," *Emerita* 53 (1985) 285–289.

²⁴We know very little about Peithon, son of Krateuas (Berve 2.311, no. 621) before 323; Ptolemy, son of Lagos, was rumoured to have been a bastard son of Philip of Macedon by Arsinoë. For Ptolemy's alleged humble origins see Justin 13.4.10: *ex gregario milite Alexander virtutis causa provexerat*. Since Ptolemy's birthdate, according to Ps.-Lucian (*Macrob.* 12), was 367/6, it is difficult to determine whether Ptolemy's failure to appear as a Page or hypaspist is due to age or ineligibility for such offices. It is possible that Ptolemy came from a good family, but that suspicions of illegitimacy may have hindered his promotion. Later in his career, Ptolemy made political hay out of this disadvantage and promulgated the view that he was Philip's bastard son. We know nothing of importance about the early career of his brother Menelaos (perhaps identical with Berve, no. 505).

²⁵Curt. 8.6.22: *Ptolemaeum ac Leonnatum excubantes ad cubiculi limen*. Cf. A. Giacone, *Storie di Alessandro Magno di Quinto Curzio Rufo* (Turin 1977) 514, n. 14.

²⁶Curt. 8.1.45 ff.; Arr. 4.8.8; 4.8.9; Plut. *Alex.* 51.6.

²⁷Kleitos-affair: Aristonous (Plut. *Alex.* 51.6; cf. K. Ziegler, "Plutarchstudien," *RhM* 84 [1935] 369–390, at 379–380); Perdikkas, Ptolemy, Lysimachos, and Leonnatos (Curt. 8.1.45–46, 48). *Proskynesis*: Hephaistion (Plut. *Alex.* 55.1; the Lysimachos at 55.2 is the Akarnanian); Leonnatos (Arr. 4.12.2); for the story that substitutes Polyperchon for Leonnatos (Curt. 8.5.22), see W. Heckel, "Leonnatos, Polyperchon and the Introduction of Proskynesis," *AJP* 99 (1978) 458–461.

Now, since the number of the Bodyguard was fixed at seven, it was not possible for more than a very few ever to attain that rank. Apparently, a Bodyguard held the office for life (or, at least, until retirement) unless appointment to another post—such as a governorship²⁸—or removal from office on a charge or suspicion of some misconduct led to his replacement.²⁹ We are told that the institution of the Pages served as a training-school for future officers and governors (*Haec cohors velut seminarium ducum praefectorumque apud Macedonas fuit*, Curt. 8.6.6; cf. 5.1.42). Yet, it is inconceivable that every Page, upon “graduation,” advanced directly to a high military or administrative post. Nor is it likely that he fought in the ranks with the common soldiers, amongst the πεζέταιροι (or ἄσθέταιροι), slingers, or archers. There must have been a half-way house, an intermediate stage in what we might call the Macedonian *cursus honorum*. Possibly, the ex-Page was enrolled in the *ile basilike*, though there is not one piece of evidence for this; what evidence we have suggests instead that he joined the *agema* of the hypaspists.

To identify and define the *agema* of the hypaspists is, however, no easy task. Berve (1.122–126) argued that the hypaspists were divided into the regular hypaspists—part of which was the *agema*, which corresponded to the *ile basilike* of the cavalry—and the “Royal Hypaspists,” who formed the personal guard of the King (the *Hypaspistenleibwache*). Tarn (2.148–154) rejected Berve’s arguments, claiming all hypaspists were “royal” (βασιλικοί) but that the original *agema* continued to form the King’s personal guard. Recently, Milns has modified that view further, suggesting that one of the three chiliarchies of the hypaspists (formed in late 331; cf. Curt. 5.2.5)³⁰ was the so-called *agema*, and that it was sub-divided into 8 tetrarchies (125 per unit, as in the tetrarchies of Philip V). He proposed “that each day a ‘tetrarchia’ from the *agema* of the hypaspists was detailed to act as Alexander’s personal bodyguards. . . .” Thus, when Arrian says (5.13.1) that Alexander embarked Ptolemy, Lysimachos, Perdikkas (roughly half of the σωματοφύλακες), and Seleukos, with half of the hypaspists, on board a triakonter, Milns takes this to mean about 65 men or half of one tetrarchy of the *agema* (49).³¹

I suspect that Milns is missing the mark, and that there is an easier solution. The *agema* of the hypaspists was the infantry equivalent of the *ile basilike*, which itself later became known as the *agema* of the cavalry—

²⁸Arr. 2.12.2 (Balakros); Arr. 3.16.9 (Menes). Peukestas, upon accepting the satrapy of Persis (Arr. 6.30.2), ceased to be a σωματοφύλαξ. His appointment was both honorary and temporary.

²⁹Arr. 3.27.5: in 330 B.C. Ptolemy replaced Demetrios, who was found guilty of complicity in the Dimnos/Philotas conspiracy.

³⁰Bosworth argues for four chiliarchies of hypaspists (148–149).

³¹R. D. Milns, “A Note on Arrian’s *Anabasis* 5.13.1,” *CP* 78 [1983] 47–50, at 49.

references to the cavalry *agema* as early as 331/0 are probably anachronistic (Curt. 4.13.26; 5.4.21),³² and we do not know exactly what happened to the *ile basilike* after the division of the Companions between Hephaistion and Kleitos (Arr. 3.27.4). Like the Companion cavalry (ἡ ἔππος ἡ ἑταιρική), which had an ἰλη βασιλική (= ἄγγμα in later times), the hypaspists of the Companions (οἱ ὑπασπισταὶ τῶν ἑταίρων)³³ had an ἄγγμα βασιλικόν. These *agemata* were both part of and yet distinct from their respective units: the distinction is clearly made between “the King’s own” troops (βασιλική, βασιλικόν) and the Companions in general (ἑταῖροι). Thus we find that the Macedonian troops are normally called the King’s Companions, whereas only troops specifically organised for the King’s protection and under his personal leadership were given the adjective βασιλικός. When Arrian 5.13.3 speaks of ὑπασπισταὶ βασιλικοί, the ἄγγμα βασιλικόν, and οἱ ἄλλοι ὑπασπισταί, it is because he does not realise that the “Royal Hypaspists” and the “Royal *agema*” are one and the same.³⁴

The *agema*, then, was regarded as separate from the main troop of the hypaspists, which was under the command of Nikanor, son of Parmenion, until his death in 330 B.C., and it was virtually always with the King (cf. Arr. 1.1.11; 1.5.10; 1.6.9; 3.1.4; 3.17.2; 3.18.5 etc.). The very name ἄγγμα points to the fact that they were, in theory, led by the King (τὸ ἡγούμενον or, in the Macedonian dialect, τὸ ἀγούμενον, Hoffmann 35). When Diodoros says that Hephaistion was wounded at Gaugamela while leading the *somatophylakes* (τῶν δὲ σωματοφυλάκων ἡγούμενος, 17.61.3), he must mean that he was the nominal commander of the *agema*.³⁵ In the following year,

³²The mss. of Arr. 1.8.3 read τὰ δὲ ἀγήματα καὶ τοὺς ὑπασπιστάς, which Schmieder emended to τὸ δὲ ἄγγμα τε καὶ τοὺς ὑπασπιστάς. See Bosworth 81–82.

³³Arr. 1.14.2. Bosworth thinks τῶν ἑταίρων is an error which originated as a scribal gloss (117).

³⁴The term “Royal Hypaspists” comes up only three times in Arrian (1.8.4; 3.13.6; 5.13.4). In the first instance, a distinction is made between “Royal Hypaspists” and the *agema* (but the *agema* could be the *ile basilike*); in the second (3.13.6) we do not know which group of hypaspists is meant, though this could be an error for the παῖδες βασιλικοί (cf. above, n. 17); and, in the third, Arrian himself has made a mistake, for there we find three separate groups—hypaspists, “Royal Hypaspists,” and “Royal *agema*.” The use of the adjective βασιλικός to designate an elite unit is more likely than its use for a larger one (3000–4000 men). It is worth noting that the Companion Cavalry never appears as the “Royal Companion Cavalry” but only the elite squadron receives the adjective “Royal” (Arr. 3.11.8 wrongly separates the ἰλη βασιλική from the “other Royal Ilai,” which is impossible since the adjective βασιλική is the only thing which can distinguish it from the other *ilai*).

³⁵So Berve 1.124. Berve, however, thinks that Hephaistion held this office until around 328/7, when he was appointed to the Seven and replaced by Seleukos. I have argued for 334 as the year of Hephaistion’s promotion to the Seven (Heckel 1978, 227) though I have since changed my mind about the meaning of Diod. 17.61.3: that he was both *somatophylax* and commander of the *agema* poses no difficulties, but I do not see how Hephaistion could have commanded both his half of the Companion Cavalry (Arr. 3.27.4) and the hypaspists. Thus, I would place Seleukos’ appointment in 330 B.C.

Hephaistion was promoted to commander of one-half the Companion Cavalry and replaced as leader of the *agema* by Seleukos, son of Antiochos; he in turn may have been succeeded by Kassandros.³⁶

The education of aristocratic youths led them through stages of both real and mock servitude. As *παῖδες/pueri* (a term that implies both boys and slaves), as hypaspists, and as *σωματοφύλακες*, they performed duties reserved in other societies for slaves and eunuchs. Like the Persian youths described in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, they learned "both to rule and to be ruled" (1.9.4). The *agema* was the second stage of mock servitude, the King's "Shield-bearers" or, to use the same medieval analogy from which we adopted the term Pages, "the King's Squires." Always at the King's side in battle and under his watchful eye, they were young, vigorous, fast troops. And what better bodyguard for the King than young men eager to exhibit their bravery in the hope of winning a promotion? It was in this capacity, as a member of the *ἄγημα* of the hypaspists, that Pausanias died in Philip's defence in the battle with the Illyrians; thus Peukestas protected Alexander in the town of the Mallians.³⁷ Best explained as members of the *ἄγημα* are the *promptissimi iuvenes* of Curtius' account: Charos and Alexandros (8.11.9 ff.), Nikanor and Hegesimachos (8.13.13–16),³⁸ Philippos, son of Agathokles (8.2.35–39; cf. Justin 15.3.12)—all men *ex sua cohorte*, but not Pages. If *ex sua cohorte* does not, in fact, refer to the Pages, then we have the words *σωματοφύλακες* and *cohors* used of young men in different age-classes, i.e., at successive stages of their careers.

III

The Bodyguard, or the Seven, create fewer problems and have been much discussed. In the reign of Philip II their sole purpose may have been to guard

³⁶While Alexander lived, the *chiliarchos* was Hephaistion (until 324) and then Perdikkas; Seleukos commanded the *agema*. After Alexander's death, when Perdikkas became *epimeletes* of the Kings, Seleukos became the new *chiliarchos* and the *agema* appears to have passed on to Kassandros (if this is how we are to understand Justin 13.4.18). Note that Seleukos was not Perdikkas' successor in the hipparchies (as one might wrongly deduce from Diod. 18.3.4) during Alexander's lifetime. From Plut. *Eum.* 1.5 we learn that the order of the hipparchies was (i) Hephaistion, (ii) Perdikkas, and (iii) Eumenes. When Perdikkas was advanced to the first hipparchy, he became *chiliarchos*, and Eumenes replaced him in the second hipparchy. By contrast, Seleukos, who was still commander of the *agema* of the hypaspists at Alexander's death, was promoted to command the first hipparchy (which was *ἐπιφανεστάτην* = Hephaistion's chiliarchy) over the head of Eumenes, who as a Greek was perhaps ineligible to hold the rank of *chiliarchos*—he was, however, made satrap of Kappadokia and Paphlagonia, and thus ceased to be a hipparch.

³⁷Diod. 16.93.6 (Pausanias); Arr. 6.10.2; Diod. 17.99.4; Curt. 9.5.14–17 (Peukestas). Curtius adds Timaeus (= Limnaios), possibly also one of the hypaspists. Diodoros calls Peukestas "one of the hypaspists;" Arr. 6.10.2 says he held the sacred shield from Ilion, which was carried by a member of the hypaspists (Arr. 1.11.8).

the King at the Court, but it must be pointed out that we know so little about the office under Philip that even this is only an inference drawn from the evidence of the Alexander-historians. I have discussed the membership of the *somatophylakes* in some detail elsewhere (Heckel 1978), and I repeat here the main conclusions, with a few minor changes. The number of *somatophylakes* was fixed, already in Philip's time, at seven and he may have aimed at some kind of regional representation. Arybbas, Balakros, and Demetrios appear to have members of the unit in 336, when Alexander came to the throne. Balakros, a son-in-law of Antipatros,³⁹ became satrap of Kilikia and was replaced first by Menes, after the battle of Issos (Arr. 2.12.2), then by Perdikkas in late 331 (Arr. 3.16.9: Menes becomes *hyparchos* of Syria, Phoinikia, Kilikia; cf. Curt. 6.8.17, calling Perdikkas an *armiger* in 330, which can only mean one of the Seven⁴⁰). Arybbas died of illness in Egypt and was replaced by Leonnatos (Arr. 3.5.5), one of Alexander's *syntrophoi*. Demetrios was believed to have been involved in the Dimnos-conspiracy and was removed from office in the land of the Ariasprians and replaced with Ptolemaios, son of Lagos (Arr. 3.27.5), one of Alexander's *betairoi*. Hephaistion, it seems, replaced Ptolemaios ὁ σωματοφύλαξ ὁ βασιλικός (Arr. 1.22.4; cf. 1.22.7), who was killed at Halikarnassos and had probably been one of Philip's Bodyguards. Alexander's appointments to the Seven show that he was concerned to replace Philip's men with his own *syntrophoi* or with others whom he felt he could trust: hence we recognise among the newly-appointed *somatophylakes* three men who were raised with the Crown Prince (Hephaistion, Leonnatos, Perdikkas) and another who, as an *ἐταῖρος* of Alexander, was banished in 336 (Ptolemaios; cf. Arr. 3.6.5–6). If it was, indeed, Alexander's policy to bring his own men into the Seven, then it is not surprising to find Hephaistion as the first to be admitted to that number.⁴¹ The Ptolemaios whom Hephaistion replaced was the first attested member of the Seven to command a division of the army,⁴² and we should have no difficulty in seeing Hephaistion as both σωματοφύλαξ and commander of the σωματοφύλακες (sc. βασιλικοί), that is, of the ἄγημα τῶν ὑπασπιστῶν (thus Diod. 17.61.3). About Menes we know too little to reach

³⁸Or Symmachos. The mss. have *simachus*.

³⁹He had married Phila, later the wife of Krateros and Demetrios Poliorketes; see Antonius Diogenes *ap. Phot.* 111b. Cf. also Berve 2.100, no. 200, s.v. Βάλακρος.

⁴⁰Perdikkas, as a taxiarch from at least 335 onwards, could not have been a hypaspist in 330 B.C. The last reference to the infantry-*taxis* of Perdikkas comes in the account of the battle at the Persian Gates (Arr. 3.18.5), and it may be that Alexander delayed replacing Menes, whom he sent to the coast from Sousa, until he reached Persepolis.

⁴¹I was wrong to be sceptical about Hephaistion's early relationship with Alexander (1978, 227); cf. above, n. 5.

⁴²Τοῖς δὲ κατὰ τὸ Τρίπυλον ἐκδραμοῦσιν ἀπήντα Πτολεμαῖος ὁ σωματοφύλαξ ὁ βασιλικός, τήν τε Ἀδαίου καὶ Τιμάνδρου ἅμα οἱ τάξιν ἄγων καὶ ἔστιν οὗς τῶν ψιλῶν (Arr. 1.22.4).

any firm conclusions. His appointment in late 333, falling between the promotions of Hephaistion and Leonnatos, may have been political: like Alexander's decision to split the command of the Companion Cavalry between Hephaistion and the more senior Kleitos, Menes' appointment suggests that Alexander could not move too quickly in transforming the hierarchy of command, or, at least, that he did not want to be perceived as doing so.

The remaining three *somatophylakes*, before the creation of an exceptional eighth (Peukestas), were Aristonous, Peithon, and Lysimachos, the last perhaps also the youngest. Since we do not know whom they replaced, it may well be that they were originally appointed by Philip II. Lysimachos was born in 362/1 B.C.,⁴³ certainly old enough for appointment before 336, and he was reputedly a man of conspicuous strength and courage, which might have recommended him to Philip in the first place (cf. Justin 15.3.7–8). Certainly we know of no personal connections between any of these three and Alexander, nor did they distinguish themselves in such a way as to warrant promotion during Alexander's reign.

Late in Alexander's reign, the importance of the unit begins to decline. Already in October 324 the position left vacant by Hephaistion's death was not filled. Peukestas' exceptional appointment was honorary, and he soon departed to the satrapy of Persis. And, of the *somatophylakes* who survived Alexander, only Aristonous remained in Babylon with Perdikkas and the "Kings." There were no *somatophylakes* of the "Kings" until the settlement at Triparadeisos (May 320), when Antipatros assigned four of them to Philip III Arrhidaios: Autodikos, a brother of Lysimachos; Amyntas, Peukestas' brother; Alexandros, son of Polyperchon; Ptolemaios, son of Ptolemaios (Arr. *Succ.* 1.38). *IG* 2² 561, an Athenian decree of Stratokles honouring Philippos, Iolaos, and (possibly) a third individual, whose name has been lost, suggests that Alexander IV had been assigned three *somatophylakes* to bring the combined total to seven.⁴⁴

IV

The stages of the *σωματοφυλακία*, the Macedonian *cursus honorum*, can be seen also in the careers of some prominent Macedonians. The following six are perhaps the best examples:

1. Ptolemaios, son of Seleukos (Berve no. 670). He was probably from Tymphaia (so Berve 2.335) or from Orestis and a relative of Seleukos, son of Antiochos (Hoffmann 174). Arrian calls him *ἐνὰ τῶν σωματοφυλάκων τῶν*

⁴³ Assuming that Ps.-Lucian *Macrob.* 11 is correct in calling him an octogenarian at the time of his death; Justin (17.1.10) says he was seventy-four; Appian (*Syr.* 64) seventy.

⁴⁴ See W. Heckel, "IG 2² 562 and the Status of Alexander IV," *ZPE* 40 (1980) 249–250.

βασιλικῶν (1.24.1), leading some scholars to believe that he was one of the Seven. This presents problems. In late 334 Ptolemaios led the newly-weds back to Macedonia for the winter (Arr. 1.24.1; cf. 1.29.4), and he re-appeared in 333 as a *taxis*-commander at Issos, where he fell in battle; Polyperchon was his replacement (Arr. 2.12.2). Thus it has been suggested that Ptolemaios gave up his office when he left Asia and received another when he returned.⁴⁵ But we do not know who replaced him as *somato-phylax*, and it is hard to imagine that a man would have been willing to give up his high rank for a belated honeymoon. It makes more sense that Ptolemaios was educated as a Page, served as a member of the *agema* (ἐνὰ τῶν σωματοφυλάκων τῶν βασιλικῶν), where he distinguished himself, and, on his return from Macedonia, was promoted to battalion-commander.

2. Peukestas, son of Alexandros (Berve no. 634). He came from Mieza (Arr. *Ind.* 18.6), where Alexander and the Pages were educated by Aristotle. His own training should have included serving as a Page. As a member of the hypaspists (Diod. 17.99.4; Peukestas was said to have carried the sacred shield from Ilion, Arr. 6.9.3)⁴⁶ and together with the *somatophylakes* Leonatos and Aristonous, he displayed remarkable bravery in the town of the Mallians. As a result, he was appointed an exceptional, eighth, bodyguard—because there was no opening in the group of Seven. Soon afterwards he was appointed satrap of Persis (Arr. 6.30.2). His brother, Amyntas, was appointed *somatophylax* of Philip III at Triparadeisos (Arr. *Succ.* 1.38).

3. Lysimachos, son of Agathokles (Berve no. 480), and his brothers. I have argued above (cf. also Heckel 1978, 224–228; Heckel 1982, 373 ff.) that Lysimachos was appointed to the Seven by Philip II (cf. Arr. 6.28.4). His brother Autodikos appears in 320 as a *somatophylax* of Philip III (Arr. *Succ.* 1.38), and another brother, Philippos, distinguished himself as a member of the *agema* (Curt. 7.2.35). An elder brother, Alkimachos, served as an ambassador, but too little is known of his career. The family appears to have been well represented in various stages of the Macedonian *cursus honorum*.

4. Perdikkas, son of Orontes (Berve no. 627). This man came from Orestis and was related to the royal family (Curt. 10.7.8—perhaps only distantly, since this connection was never used to great advantage). Although he was proba-

⁴⁵Berve 2.336. That he was wrongly called *somatophylax* by confusion with the Ptolemaios who fell at Halikarnassos (Beloch, *GG*² 3.2.327) seems unlikely.

⁴⁶R. D. Milns, "A Note on Diodorus and Macedonian Military Terminology in Book XVII," *Historia* 31 (1982) 123, argues that Diodorus here wrongly calls Peukestas ὑπασπιστής, since he could not have been one of the three thousand regular hypaspists and he was not one of the chiliarchs or pentakosiarchs (the latter being "a quite junior post, certainly not held by Alexander's intimate friends and senior advisers"). But this problem is overcome, if we accept the view that the *agema* was an elite unit, made up of young men of the aristocracy.

bly raised at the Court in Pella, he is first mentioned in Diodoros' account (16.94.4) of Philip's death in 336 as one of his *σωματοφύλακες*, together with Leonnatos and Attalos (presumably the son of Andromenes). Probably these *somatophylakes* are members of the *agema*; for Perdikkas and Leonnatos were enrolled in the Seven much later, and Attalos never was. Perdikkas soon rose to the rank of battalion-commander (already at Thebes in 335) and, by 330, became a member of the Seven; in 323, he was the most powerful man in Babylon. We do not know where his brother, Alketas (Berve 2.22, no. 45), served before succeeding to the command of Perdikkas' battalion in 327, but nothing rules out the *agema*.

5. Hephaistion, son of Amyntor (Berve no. 357). When Curtius (3.12.16) describes Hephaistion as *cum ipso [sc. Alexandro] pariter eductus*, this means that he was a *σύντροφος* of the Crown Prince, a student of Aristotle (cf. Diog. Laert. 5.1.12) and a Page of Philip II. If he became a member of the Seven already in 334, as I suggest above, he was at the same time the nominal commander of the ἄγημα (Diod. 17.61.3). In 330, he took over one-half of the Companion cavalry (Arr. 3.27.4). As chiliarchos, he was effectively Alexander's second-in-command when he died at Ekbatana in late 324 B.C. (cf. Arr. 7.14.10).

6. Leonnatos, son of Anteias (Berve no. 466). The most interesting career is that of Leonnatos. Of royal descent—he was related to the Lynkestian Eurydike, mother of Philip II—Leonnatos was brought up at the Court in Pella as a *σύντροφος* of Alexander (Suda s.v. Λεοννάτος). Presumably, this meant that with Hephaistion, Marsyas, and others he was a Page of Philip II. On the day of Philip's assassination, Leonnatos was one of the *σωματοφύλακες* (cf. no. 4 above) who pursued and killed Pausanias of Orestis, also a member of that body (Diod. 16.94.4). In 333 he is referred to as an *ἐταῖρος* of Alexander (Arr. 2.12.5; *ex purpuratis*, Curt. 3.12.7), which indicates nobility rather than military standing, and in Egypt, when Arybbas died of illness, he was appointed to the Seven (Arr. 3.5.5). He remained a *somatophylax* until Alexander's death in 323, holding various independent commands in Baktria, Sogdiana, and India, and on the return to the West (Arr. Book 6 *passim*). In 323, he was allotted the satrapy of Hellenes Pontine Phrygia. When he died in his early thirties in 322, he had already completed the Macedonian *cursus honorum*. But for a stroke of fate, he might even have become King of Macedon (Plut. *Eum.* 3.8–9; cf. Justin 13.5.14–15).

Leonnatos' is the best illustration of the kind of career a member of the Macedonian aristocracy could have. Unfortunately, his is the only fully-

documented example: often an individual is encountered at one stage of his career or mentioned on the occasion of his death. It would have been interesting to follow the career-progress of the Alexander's Pages, but, of those known for certain by name, all except Metron, Aretis, Philippos, and Iolaos (and Excipinos?) were executed or fell into disgrace. Metron may be identical with the trierarch at the Hydaspes (Arr. *Ind.* 18.5; cf. Berve no. 520), but this would demonstrate only that he was a man of means who continued to prosper under Alexander. Aretis, on the other hand, if Alexander's ἀναβολεὺς (Arr. 1.15.6; cf. 4.13.1: τοὺς ἵππους παρὰ τῶν ἵπποκόμων δεχόμενοι ἐκεῖνοι προσήγον καὶ ἀνέβαλλον οὗτοι βασιλέα) was in fact one of the Pages, may be identical with the commander of the ἵππεῖς πρόδρομοι at Gaugamela (Arr. 3.12.3; cf. Berve no. 109, s.v. Ἀρέτης), though we know nothing about the intermediate stages of his career. Iolaos was involved in the negotiations between Perdikkas and Antipatros in 323/2 (Arr. *Succ.* 1.21), but by 317 B.C. he was already dead (Diod. 19.11.8); Philippos (probably also a Page of Alexander) served as *strategos* of his brother Kassandros against Aiakides of Epeiros and the Aitolians in 313 (Diod. 19.74.3–6). Olympias' brother Alexandros was brought up as a Page at Philip's Court, but he soon returned to Epeiros. Nevertheless we do find other Aiakids in higher positions: Neoptolemos as ἀρχυπασιπιστής (Plut. *Eum.* 1.6) and Arybbas as one of the Seven (Arr. 3.5.5).

Amongst the Royal Hypaspists, apart from Perdikkas, Peukestas, and Leonnatos, who have already been discussed, we have Pausanias and his namesake, both of whom were probably Pages of Philip II shortly before 336 B.C. Both died in that year. Philippos, son of Agathokles, and Limnaios (cf. Charos, Alexandros, Hegesimachos, Nikanor, and others) perished during the performance of exceptional deeds and we know nothing of their earlier careers. Attalos, son of Andromenes, appears to have been a member of the *agema* and later a commander of *pezhetairoi*.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the best examples of career-progress among the Macedonian aristocrats involve the young men who were Alexander's σύντροφοι: Hephaistion, Leonnatos, Marsyas (brother of Antigonos the One-Eyed), Perdikkas, Ptolemaios, son of Seleukos, and Seleukos, son of Antiochos (perhaps relatives), Attalos, son of Andromenes, and others. In 336, when Philip II died, they were still in the very early stages of their careers, and they found that some of the major positions in the Macedonian army were in the hands of slightly older (8–9 years older?) men, many of them the σύντροφοι of Amyntas Perdikka (born ca 365). Some of this latter group died in battle or were promoted to administrative positions (the final stage of the Macedonian *cursus honorum*), others were eliminated on genuine or trumped-up charges of conspiracy. Alexandros Lynkestes, Philotas, Demetrios the Bodyguard, all were part of this system, but we know only

what rank each man held at the time of his arrest or execution. And it is only an exceptional man like Leonnatos, who distinguished himself at every stage of his political and military career (when speaking of Alexander's Macedonians, a tautologous expression), who gives us a clear insight into the matter of career-progress and the concept of σωματοφυλακία.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS,
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY,
2500 UNIVERSITY DRIVE N.W.,
CALGARY, ALBERTA T2N 1N4.