

THE OFFICE OF CHILIARCH UNDER ALEXANDER AND THE SUCCESSORS

ANDREW W. COLLINS

I. INTRODUCTION

THE SUBJECT OF THE PERSIAN COURT OFFICE OF CHILIARCH under Alexander and the Successors has proved to be unusually troublesome in modern scholarship.¹ The problems that have caused the most contention include what the functions of the original Achaemenid office and the chiliarchy of Alexander were, and what political significance the office had in the early years of the Successors. The following is an attempt to answer these questions, and the discussion will examine the nomenclature of the office, the chiliarchy's place among the other changes in Alexander's court that occurred from 330, the functions of the chiliarch under the Achaemenids and Alexander, and the history of the office under the Successors. In particular, the general theme of which the introduction of the chiliarchy was indicative, the transformation of Alexander's court as he came to act as the new King of Asia and successor to the Persian kings,² deserves special emphasis and treatment.

II. NOMENCLATURE

Amongst its other meanings, the Greek word *χiliάρχος* or *χiliάρχης* referred to an Achaemenid court official who was known in Old Persian as the **hazarapatiš*.

¹For important modern discussions of the chiliarchy under the Achaemenids, see Justi 1896; Marquart 1896; Junge 1940; Benveniste 1966: 64–65; Hinz 1969: 68, 78; Frye 1972: 88; Lewis 1977: 16–19; Cook 1983: 143–144; Cook 1985: 230–233; Sekunda 1988: 70–71; Briant 1994: 291–298; 1996: 269–270. For the chiliarchy under Alexander, see Berve 1926: 1.112, 320; Badian 1965: 176; Goukowsky 1978: 30–34, 176–178; Heckel 1992a: 366–370; Briant 1994: 291–298. For the office under the Successors, see Ensslin 1925: 298–307; Schachermeyr 1925: 443–450, 456–457; Schwahn 1931; Schur 1934: 134–141; Bengtson 1937: 63–72, 94–97; Rosen 1967: 106–109; Errington 1970: 56, 67; Schachermeyr 1970: 31–37; Bosworth 1971: 131–133; Seibert 1983: 84–89; Frye 1984: 144–145; Hammond 1985: 157. A similar office under the Sassanids has been studied by Christensen (1944: 113–116) and Chaumont (1973), but its functions probably differed from those of the Achaemenid chiliarchy.

²Alexander was proclaimed King of Asia after the victory at Gaugamela (Plut. *Alex.* 34.1), but the view that he therefore saw himself as the new King of Persia—from this point or after the death of Darius (see Beloch 1925: 19; Schachermeyr 1949: 247; Hamilton 1999: 90)—has been questioned by Hammond (1986: 73–85; 1989: 180–181). While some of Hammond's criticisms of the traditional view are valid, he fails to consider Alexander's use of Persian court offices and courtiers, his attempt to introduce *proskynesis*, and his marriages at Susa in 324. Although it can be said that Alexander probably did not regard himself as a local Persian king and never assumed the title "King of Kings" (see Plut. *Demetr.* 25.3), this is not incompatible with the view that he saw himself as the Achaemenids' legitimate successor and heir, and that, consequently, he appropriated the ceremonial, apparel, and personnel of the Persian court and—in certain instances—acted in the manner of a traditional Persian king.

Both words meant "commander of a thousand,"³ and we even find the Persian term transliterated into Greek on two occasions. First, it is found in Hesychius' *Lexicon* (1441), where the ἄζαραπατεῖς⁴ are defined as Persian messengers (εἰσαγγελεῖς); secondly, it appears in a fragment of Ctesias, but in a slightly different form (*FGrH* 688 F 46). This fragment describes the appointment of a Persian called Menostanes as ἄζαβαρίτης to the usurper Secundianus, and the former is without question the type of court chiliarch described by later Greek and Roman writers.⁵ The term χιλίαρχος was, of course, used to describe various military commanders. The reformed hipparchies of Alexander's Companion cavalry after 329, for instance, were commanded by chiliarchs.⁶ In general, too, many other kinds of Greek or Persian military commanders carried the same title.⁷ This use of the term sometimes causes confusion, particularly in relation to those who held the court chiliarchy under the Achaemenid kings.⁸ But, in the period from 330 to 319, there were only three Macedonians explicitly named as court chiliarchs by the ancient sources, *viz.*, Hephaestion, Perdicas, and Cassander. All of them, however, were also commanders of the Macedonian cavalry, and this "equestrian chiliarchy" needs to be distinguished carefully from the court office, since—in contrast to some modern interpretations—the ancient evidence shows that the two were clearly separate in the early years of the Successors, and that they were very probably distinct in the time of Alexander.

III. PERSIAN COURT CEREMONIAL: CHRONOLOGY, ORIGIN, AND ANCIENT SOURCES

In the years from 330 to 327 following the death of Darius III, there was a transformation of the Macedonian court which the ancient sources saw as part of Alexander's adoption of Persian νόμιμα (Diod. Sic. 18.48.5; cf. Arr. *Anab.* 4.7.4), and which German scholarship has called the introduction of Persian

³ See Justi 1896: 661; Marquart 1896: 227; Junge 1940: 14–15; Benveniste 1966: 67; Hinz 1969: 68; Frye 1972: 88; Sekunda 1988: 70–71.

⁴ On the loss of the aspirate, see Sekunda 1988: 73.

⁵ See Plut. *Them.* 27.2 and 29.2; Nepos *Conon* 3.2; Ael. *VH* 1.21; Diod. Sic. 17.3.3. See also Lewis 1977: 18.

⁶ See Griffith 1963: 74, n. 17 *contra* Berve 1926: 1.112.

⁷ Heckel 1992a: 367; for examples of Persian military chiliarchs, see Xen. *Cyr.* 2.1.23; 3.3.11; 4.1.4; 7.5.17; 8.1.14, 6.1, 6.9 (see also Sekunda 1988: 70–71). For military chiliarchs and chiliarchies in Alexander's army, see Curt. 5.2.3; Arr. *Anab.* 1.22.7; 3.29.7; 4.24.10, 30.5–6; 5.23.7; 7.14.10, 25.6. In Roman times, *chiliarchos* became a synonym for the Latin term *tribunus militum* (Mason 1974: 99–100). See Brandis 1899: 2275–76.

⁸ For instance, in Aeschylus' *Persae* (302–305) we have a reference to a chiliarch of Xerxes, but is he merely a military official or the court chiliarch? Ultimately, scholars can only speculate (cf. Heckel 1992a: 367 with Briant 1994: 295) when confronted with such ambiguous passages (see also Lewis 1977: 17–18); for a critical list of those who were court chiliarchs under the Achaemenids, see Briant 1994: 295–296.

Hofzeremoniell (court ceremonial).⁹ The most well-known manifestations of this were Alexander's assumption of the diadem; his use of some of the Persian royal costume, on certain occasions;¹⁰ and the unsuccessful attempt to introduce *proskynesis*.¹¹ But these were part of a larger policy initiated during Alexander's progress through Hyrcania in the summer of 330, when many Persians surrendered and the king began to welcome new foreign nobles into the Macedonian court. At some point after Alexander's return to Zadracarta in Hyrcania (he left the city ca August) but before his move against the rebellious satrap of Aria later in the year (ca September),¹² the king started his so-called "orientalising" policies that came to alienate many Macedonians, and that became the principal attributes of that later literary *topos*, the moral degeneration of the king.¹³ Diodorus (17.77.4) dates the beginning of Alexander's emulation of the luxury and extravagance of the Persian kings within this period, and Plutarch places his assumption of oriental dress during his march through Parthia (*Alex.* 45.1–4). Quintus Curtius' account of the king's adoption of the splendour of the Persian court agrees in its chronology with that of Diodorus,¹⁴ and similar statements are made by Justin (*Epit.* 12.3.8–12) and the Metz Epitome (1) with consistent dating. Admittedly, Arrian has no precise reference to these events in his description of Alexander in Hyrcania and Parthia, but he refers to some details of the changes at other points in his narrative (e.g., *Anab.* 4.8.4, 9.9; 7.29.4).

Bosworth has argued that these policies were a response to the proclamation of Bessus as king in Bactria; this was announced to Alexander in Susia, after he

⁹ Beloch 1925: 19; Berve 1926: 1.19–20; 2.405; see also Jacoby's commentary on Chares of Mytilene (*FGrH* 125).

¹⁰ See Ehippippus of Olynthus *FGrH* 126 F 5.26–28 = Ath. 12.537e–538b; Plut. *Alex.* 45.2–4; Diod. Sic. 17.77.5 (cf. Ehippippus *FGrH* 126 F 5.29 = Ath. 12.537f); Eratosthenes of Cyrene *FGrH* 241 F 30 = Plut. *Mor.* 329f–330d; Curt. 6.6.4; Just. *Epit.* 12.3.8; Metz Epitome 1.1–2; Duris of Samos *FGrH* 76 F 14 = Ath. 12.535f; Arr. *Anab.* 4.7.4, 9.9. See Berve 1926: 1.15–18; Neuffer 1929: 35–40; Ritter 1965: 31–55 (whose views are to be preferred to those of Berve and Neuffer); Hamilton 1999: 120–121; and Hammond 1989: 181. On the diadem, see Mau 1903; Ritter 1965: 31–55; Fredricksmeier 1997. Smith (1988: 34–38) has challenged the view that the diadem was Persian in origin, and Fredricksmeier (1997: 100–101) dates the assumption of the diadem to 331. See Ritter 1987 for a defence of the traditional view. Note also that Alexander is said to have distributed the purple robes of Achaemenid courtiers to his own *ἐταῖροι* (Diod. Sic. 17.77.5–6) or to his friends and cavalry (Curt. 6.6.7; Metz Epitome 1.2). See also Ath. 12.540a and Plut. *Mor.* 329f–330d.

¹¹ This occurred in 327: see Plut. *Alex.* 54.5–6; Arr. *Anab.* 4.12.3–5 = *FGrH* 125 F 14; cf. Curt. 6.6.3. For modern discussions, see Brown 1949: 240–246; Balsdon 1950: 371–382; Hamilton 1999: 150–153; Seibert 1972: 202–204; Lane Fox 1973: 320–325; Badian 1981: 48–54; Bosworth 1988: 117–118, 284–287.

¹² For the chronology, see Brunt 1976: 497–499.

¹³ See Badian 1958: 154–157; Bosworth 1988: 144–145; 1995: 49; other traditions saw the changes as a political gesture (see Plut. *Mor.* 330a, which refers to Alexander's adoption of Persian dress) or as the result of Alexander's beliefs about his divine paternity (see Arr. *Anab.* 4.9.9 for an example that refers to *proskynesis*).

¹⁴ Curt. 6.6.1–9: *Persicae regiae par deorum potentiae fastigium aemulabatur.*

received the submission of the satrap of Aria,¹⁵ but must have been expected after the murder of the Great King.¹⁶ No doubt this was part of Alexander's motive, but the genesis and significance of his policies were also intimately linked to his position as the new King of Asia—a claim he had made since 332, and a title that he assumed by acclamation after the battle at Gaugamela.¹⁷

For this aspect of Alexander's reign, the historian must rely largely on sources from the so-called "Vulgate tradition." It has often been argued that the similar accounts of Alexander's reign found in Diodorus, Quintus Curtius, and Justin were derived from an earlier source, possibly Clitarchus.¹⁸ Consequently, some have questioned the historicity of the traditions relating to the changes in Alexander's court, since Clitarchus' history is generally thought to have been tainted by romantic embellishment.¹⁹ Although one detail may be fictitious,²⁰ the major items are mentioned by both Arrian and Plutarch, and there is no reason to dismiss them without an examination of the other supporting evidence.

IV. ACHAEMENID COURT PERSONNEL AND OFFICES UNDER ALEXANDER

Alexander's adoption of Persian protocol and apparel has received much attention from modern scholars, yet a neglected part of the king's new arrangement of the royal retinue was the introduction of Persian court personnel and offices. The chiliarchy was one of these offices, and needs to be discussed in the context of the other changes that occurred at approximately the same time.

To begin with the use of Persians and other orientals as attendants and bodyguards: Diodorus holds that Alexander introduced Asian staff-bearers (ῥαβδοῦχοις Ἀσιαγενεῖς) into his court (Diod. Sic. 17.77.4), to whom Plutarch seems to refer in the speech he attributes to Clitus the Black. Here we find listed the grievances the older or more conservative Macedonians had against Alexander by 328, and, in what must be rhetorical embellishment by Plutarch to a certain extent, Clitus is made to complain that those Macedonians who had died were fortunate not to see their fellows beaten with Median rods and forced to beg Persians in order to see their king.²¹ Even though Clitus' speech as

¹⁵ Arr. *Anab.* 3.25.3; Curt. 6.6.12–13.

¹⁶ Bosworth 1980a: 5–6. Cf. Hamilton 1987: 472–474; Goukowsky 1978: 30–31.

¹⁷ Plut. *Alex.* 34.1; see above, n. 2.

¹⁸ Hamilton 1977: 126–146; Heckel 1980: 173–174; Hammond 1983: 136.

¹⁹ Hammond 1986: 83: "Our distrust of the three accounts [*viz.*, Diod. Sic. 17.77.4; Just. *Epit.* 12.3.8; Curt. 6.6.4] from a common source is heightened by the fact that in each case they were immediately preceded by the absurd story of the Amazon queen . . . it and the items which followed it are worthless for historical reconstruction."

²⁰ Hammond (1995: 199–203) argues that Alexander did not use Darius' seal as Curtius (6.6.6) reports. But cf. Baldus 1987.

²¹ Plut. *Alex.* 51.1–2: μακαρίζομεν δὲ τοὺς ἤδη τεθνηκότας πρὶν ἐπιθεῖν Μηδικαῖς ῥάβδοις ξαινομένους Μακεδόνας, καὶ Περσῶν δεομένους ἵνα τῷ βασιλεῖ προσέλθωμεν; see also Arr. *Anab.* 4.8.4–7. Pearson (1960: 60) argues that this passage was derived from Chares of Mytilene, but see Hamilton 1999: 142.

reported by Plutarch may not be historical, nevertheless if there is substance to the traditions he used, then the Persians alluded to here are probably Diodorus' ῥαβδούχοι, who would therefore have acted as ushers who controlled access to the king.²² Importantly, Plutarch, in a later passage of the *Alexander*, explicitly refers to the introduction of ῥαβδούχοι, though he uses the variant form ῥαβδοφόροϛ.²³ According to him, during the king's reaction to the mutiny at Opis, he excluded the Macedonians, entrusted his guard-watches to Persians, and selected from them his spear-bearers and staff-bearers.²⁴ *Prima facie* this is a discrepant tradition. However, the implication of this passage is probably not that Alexander's staff-bearers had all been Macedonians before this date, but rather that the king excluded the Macedonians completely, and that, previously, both Macedonians and orientals had acted as staff-bearers together. There would then be no contradiction here and nothing to suggest that Diodorus is incorrect. Finally, there are very probably allusions to these functionaries in Arrian as well, who speaks of the new arrangement of Alexander's retinue (ca 328) that was linked to the attempt to introduce *proskynesis*.²⁵ Arrian also reports that Alexander was more quick-tempered by 324, and, because of his barbarian manner, no longer as kind towards the Macedonians as he had been in the past.²⁶ Although there are no direct references to Alexander's oriental retinue or ῥαβδούχοι in the *Anabasis*, there is nevertheless compelling support in Arrian for the tradition that major changes occurred in the Macedonian court from ca 330. In all probability, the use of Asian ῥαβδούχοι was earlier and more significant than the brief occasion in 324, and so, too, was Alexander's use of oriental bodyguards, the evidence for which is as follows.

Diodorus relates that Alexander ordered the most distinguished Persian nobles to act as his δορυφόροι ("spear-bearers"), including Oxyathres, Darius' brother, whom Curtius (7.5.40) describes as *inter corporis custodes* of Alexander at the time of the capture of Bessus in 329.²⁷ It is possible that Oxyathres and the other high-ranking Persians served Alexander as members of the special bodyguard of the

²² The ῥαβδούχοι may be identical with the Persian officials called σκηπτούχοι (Justi 1896: 660). Cf. Lewis 1977: 16.

²³ See *TLG* 7 2317, s.v. ῥαβδούχοϛ.

²⁴ Plut. *Alex.* 71.3: ἀπελάσας δὲ τὰς φυλακάς παρέδωκε Πέρσαις καὶ κατέστησεν ἐκ τούτων δορυφόρους καὶ ῥαβδοφόρους. Arrian (*Anab.* 7.11.3) reveals that Alexander also planned to introduce a Persian ἄγλημα, a τάξις ἀργυρασπίδων, Persian πεζέταιροι, and a new ἄγλημα βασιλικόν for the Companion cavalry; cf. Diod. Sic. 17.109.3.

²⁵ Arr. *Anab.* 4.9.9: καὶ τῆς ἄλλης θεραπείας τῇ μετακοσμήσει.

²⁶ Arr. *Anab.* 7.8.3: ἦν γὰρ δὴ δεύτερός τε ἐν τῷ τότε καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς βαρβαρικῆς θεραπείας οὐκέτι ὡς πάλαι ἐπιεικῆς ἐς τοὺς Μακεδόνας.

²⁷ For the appointment of Persian bodyguards, see Diod. Sic. 17.77.4 (ἐπειτα τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους τῶν ἀνδρῶν δορυφορεῖν ἔταξεν, ἐν οἷς ἦν καὶ ὁ Δαρείου ἀδελφὸς Ὁξάθρης) and the Metz Epitome 1.2 (*deinde corporis sui custodes multos instituit, itemque Darii fratrem Oxyathrem instituit*). Oxyathres had already been made one of the ἐταῖροι of Alexander in the aftermath of the murder of the Great King: see Plut. *Alex.* 43.3 (who uses the form Exathres): [ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος] τὸν δὲ ἀδελφὸν [*sc. τοῦ*

Achaemenid kings, called the “apple-bearers” or *μηλοφόροι*.²⁸ This bodyguard was also brought into Alexander’s court, and, although there is no evidence for the date when they were introduced, the *μηλοφόροι* appear in a number of sources, Arrian included. Athenaeus describes the bodyguards present inside Alexander’s large and imposing tent and his account is perhaps derived from the lost history of Chares through Phylarchus:²⁹

The tent of Alexander had one hundred couches and was supported by fifty golden pillars; gilded canopies, stretched out and wrought with very costly embroidery, covered the upper area of the tent. Inside, around it, stood, first of all, the five hundred Persians called the “apple-bearers,” adorned with purple and quince-yellow costumes. After them, there were archers to the number of a thousand: some wore flame-coloured garments, others ones of scarlet, and many also had dark-blue mantles. At the head of these were five hundred Macedonians, the Silvershields. A golden throne was placed in the middle of the tent, upon which Alexander used to seat himself and hold court, with his bodyguards standing close on all sides.³⁰ (Ath. 12.539e = Phylarchus *FGrH* 81 F 41.20).

The same tent is described by Aelian and Polyaeus, and the latter adds the detail that this was the way Alexander held his court of justice whilst he was amongst the Bactrians, Hyrcanians, and Indians—i.e., in the period after 330.³¹ After Alexander’s death, the *μηλοφόροι* were even represented on the king’s sarcophagus next to the Macedonian bodyguard (Diod. Sic. 18.27.1). Arrian (*Anab.* 7.29.4) attributed the king’s use of the apple-bearers and his other “orientalising” policies to his desire to conciliate the Persians; he also relates that the *μηλοφόροι* were introduced into the Macedonian battalions (τάξεις). Perhaps this is to be related to the evidence of Diodorus, who reveals that, after the discharge of Macedonian veterans in 324, one thousand Persians were admitted into the hypaspists attached to the court.³² This detail is confirmed by Justin: *atque ita mille ex his iuvenes* [i.e., the Persians] *in numerum satellitum legit*

Δαρείου] Ἐξάθρην εἰς τοὺς ἑταίρους ἀνέλαβεν; see also Curt. 6.2.11: *fratremque Darei recepit in cohortem amicorum*. On Oxyathres, see Berve 1926: 2.291–292 (no. 586).

²⁸ Arr. *Anab.* 7.29.4; Phylarchus *FGrH* 81 F 41.20 = Ath. 12.539e; Goukowsky 1978: 33. On the *μηλοφόροι*, see Briant 1996: 272–273.

²⁹ Since Chares described the same tent, in the context of his description of the banquet following the mass marriages at Susa (*FGrH* 125 F 4 = Ath. 12.539d–f), it seems likely that he is the source of Phylarchus’ description (see Jacoby’s commentary to *FGrH* 125 F 4; see also Hammond 1996: 48).

³⁰ Bosworth (1980a: 8) sees this passage as evidence that the Macedonian and Persian bodyguards were kept separate, and that the Macedonians were clearly in positions of precedence.

³¹ Polyaeus *Strat.* 4.3.24. Cf. Ael. *VH* 9.3. Although it is probable that this tent was only used towards the end of Alexander’s reign, it should be remembered that as early as 333 the king had captured and used Darius’ royal tent in the aftermath of the battle at Issus: see Arr. *Anab.* 2.12.3 and Bosworth 1980b: 220; see also Plut. *Alex.* 20.11–12; Curt. 3.11.23; Diod. Sic. 17.36.5; Just. *Epit.* 11.10.1–5. It is regrettable that there is no further evidence concerning its subsequent use by Alexander.

³² Diod. Sic. 17.110.1: ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων Ἀλέξανδρος εἰς τὸν τῶν ἀπολελυμένων ἀριθμὸν ἀνεπλήρωσεν ἐκ τῶν Περσῶν καὶ χιλιῶς αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς περὶ τὴν αὐλὴν ἔταξεν ὑπασπιστάς; see Goukowsky 1978: 33. Cf. Arr. *Anab.* 7.11.3, who speaks of a τάξις ἀργυρασπίδων; this, if it refers to the same

(12.12.4). Conveniently, there were one thousand *μηλοφόροι* under the Persian kings, and the evidence for their presence in Alexander's court is impressive, even if the king used only half as Athenaeus reports. Significantly, Alexander's introduction of the *μηλοφόροι* may be related to his appointment of a chiliarch, since this official was their commander under the Achaemenids—a point which will be discussed in full below.

The second part of this transformation of Alexander's retinue was the introduction of Persian court offices or titles that were given not to easterners, but to Macedonians or Greeks. Three appointments are known, and, although they cannot be dated precisely, there is compelling evidence for them.

First, Chares of Mytilene became Alexander's *εἰσαγγελεύς* (Plut. *Alex.* 46.2), a type of functionary well-attested in the Persian court. The term *εἰσαγγελεύς* means literally "one who announces,"³³ and describes the courtiers who introduced visitors to the Great King.³⁴ Herodotus, for instance, records that one of the privileges accorded to the Persian noblemen who conspired with Darius was to be able to see their king without an *εἰσαγγελέος* (Hdt. 3.84). Diodorus' description of Artaxerxes' expedition to Egypt (in 351) describes a general called Aristazanes, who was an *εἰσαγγελεύς* τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ πιστότατος τῶν φίλων μετὰ Βαγῶαν (Diod. Sic. 16.47.3).³⁵ Herodotus' evidence suggests that there were a number of such officials in the Persian court, and perhaps Chares was but one of a larger number of chamberlains whom Alexander employed. On the other hand, since the king also had staff-bearers who acted as ushers, it may be that Chares simply directed the other *ῥαβδοῦχοι* as a chief chamberlain. Jacoby dated Chares' appointment as *εἰσαγγελεύς* to the time at which Persian *Hofzeremoniell* was introduced (ca 330); he also rightly noted that Chares' intimate position next to Alexander is reflected in the fragments of the history that the chamberlain wrote, which preserved vivid stories of the court life of the king.³⁶

detail in Diodorus, would add weight to Bosworth's argument that the Persians were not "intermingled in the guard" but kept separate (Bosworth 1980a: 9). On the Macedonian bodyguards of Alexander, see Berve 1926: 1.26, 122; Tarn 1948: 148–153; Hammond 1991. For the hypaspists and the *ἄγημα* (or Royal hypaspists) who formed the king's bodyguard (Diod. Sic. 17.110.1), see Milns 1971: 186–187; 1983: 47–50; Anson 1985: 246–248; Heckel 1986: 279–294.

³³ *Ἐσαγγελέος* (the word used by Herodotus) is a rare Ionic form: see *TLG* 4 299, s.v. *εἰσαγγελεύς*.

³⁴ On the *εἰσαγγελεύς*, see Berve 1926: 1.19–20; Briant 1996: 270.

³⁵ Interestingly, the Bagoas described here was Artaxerxes' chiliarch (Diod. Sic. 17.5.3), which demonstrates the importance of the *εἰσαγγελεύς* in Achaemenid court hierarchy. Officials of this type are also found in the Ptolemaic court (the evidence is epigraphic, see Mooren 1975: 177–178).

³⁶ See the introduction to Jacoby's commentary on the fragments of Chares (*FGH* 125) and the commentary to *FGH* 125 F 1. For Chares' stories of court life under Alexander, see the fragments concerning Bucephalus (F 18); the marriage celebrations at Susa (F 4); the death of Calanus, the Indian philosopher (F 19a); and the story of the private symposium at which Callisthenes refused to perform *proskynesis* (F 14). This last account was later used by Plutarch and is very probably an apologetic fiction (Badian 1981: 48–51). On Chares and his history, see also Pearson 1960: 50–61; Berve 1926: 2.405–406 (no. 820); Badian 1964: 252–253; Seibert 1972: 12–14; Meister 1990: 107–108; Lendle 1992: 160–162.

The second court office to be examined here was given to Ptolemy, the royal bodyguard and the future King of Egypt. He was appointed taster (ἐδέατρος) to Alexander,³⁷ a position which was remembered by the later lexicographers for its Persian provenance.³⁸ The evidence for Ptolemy's appointment is in fact derived from a fragment of Book 3 of the lost Alexander history of Chares; since this history dealt with the marriages at Susa (in 324) in Book 10, an earlier date ca 330 for Ptolemy's appointment is consistent with the meagre data known about the chronological narrative of the work.³⁹

Now we come to the chiliarchy itself. Unfortunately, it is frustrating that there is no explicit statement in the extant sources about Hephaestion's appointment to the office. Diodorus described the chiliarchy of Cassander in the following terms:

[ὁ Ἀντίπατρος] ἀπέδειξεν ... τὸν δ' υἱὸν Κάσανδρον χιλιάρχον καὶ δευτερεύοντα κατὰ τὴν ἐξουσίαν. ἡ δὲ τοῦ χιλιάρχου τάξις καὶ προαγωγή τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὑπὸ τῶν Περσικῶν βασιλέων εἰς ὄνομα καὶ δόξαν προήχθη, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πάλιν ὑπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου μεγάλης ἔτυχεν ἐξουσίας καὶ τιμῆς, ὅτε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Περσικῶν νομίων ζηλωτὴς ἐγένετο. (Diod. Sic. 18.48.4–5)

[Antipater] appointed ... his son Cassander chiliarch and second in authority. The post and rank of chiliarch had been brought to fame and glory under the Persian kings. Afterwards, under Alexander, it again gained great power and honour when he became an admirer of all other Persian customs.

This forms the only evidence for Alexander's introduction of the office, and Photius' epitome of Arrian's *Affairs after Alexander* proves that Hephaestion held the position during the king's lifetime (Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 1.3; see below, 275). Furthermore, Diodorus provides evidence for the date Alexander introduced the chiliarchy: it was "when he became an admirer of all other Persian customs." The most probable interpretation is that this refers to the summer of 330: the

³⁷ Chares *FGrH* 125 F 1 = Ath. 4.171b–c: Χάρης γοῦν ἐν τῇ γ' τῶν Ἱστοριῶν Πτολεμαῖόν φησι τὸν Σωτήρα ἐδέατρον ἀποδειχθῆναι Ἀλεξάνδρου.

³⁸ Aelius Dionysius *apud* Eust. *Od.* 1403.40: καὶ ὁ παρὰ Αἰλίου Διονυσίου ἐδέατρος. περὶ οὗ λέγει ἐκεῖνος ὅτι τὸ μὲν ὄνομα Ἑλληνικόν. ἡ δὲ χρεια Περσική. ἦν δὲ φησι προγεύστης. προεσθίων τοῦ βασιλέως, εἰς ἀσφάλειαν. ὕστερον δὲ ἐνομήσθη, ἐδέατρον καλεῖν τὸν ἐπιστάτην τῆς ὅλης διακονίας καὶ παρασκευῆς. Cf. *Etymologicum Magnum* (s.v. ἐδέατρος); Suda (s.v. ἐδέατρος); Hesychius (*Lexicon* ε 413.1). Bosworth (1988: 157) accepts the ancient evidence that the post of ἐδέατρος was Persian in origin, but Berve (1926: 1.39–40) and Kallérís (1988: 162–169) deny the Persian provenance and argue that the office was originally Macedonian. Although the term ἐδέατρος has a Greek or Macedonian etymology (compare the derivation given by Kallérís [1988: 162–169] with that of Hoffmann [1906: 77–79]; see also Chantraine 1968: 312) and Kallérís (1988: 162–169) makes a case for the office's pre-existence in Macedonia, it is likely that an ἐδέατρος also existed in the Persian court (Briant 1996: 274) and it remains a possibility that Ptolemy's appointment subsumed the old Persian post and was thus remembered by the ancient lexicographers as a χρεια Περσική. Cf. Briant 1994: 284, n. 2.

³⁹ See Jacoby's commentary to Chares *FGrH* 125 F 1. Here Jacoby argued cogently against Berve's (1926: 2.333) dating of Ptolemy's appointment as ἐδέατρος to 324 at Susa.

alternative view that the appointment occurred late in Hephaestion's career—in 324 at Susa—seems unlikely.⁴⁰

The obvious problem is the relationship between the court chiliarchy and the equestrian chiliarchy, the latter of which involved the command of the first hipparchy of the Companion cavalry and was, without question, also held by Hephaestion. According to Arrian, it was after the execution of Philotas that Hephaestion and Clitus the Black were appointed hipparchs (Arr. *Anab.* 3.27.4); the murder of Clitus at Maracanda in 328 left Hephaestion as the sole hipparch, but a reorganisation of the cavalry seems to have occurred before this date, in which new units called hipparchies or chiliarchies replaced the old squadrons (ἵλαι).⁴¹ Hephaestion was appointed commander of the first hipparchy (later known as Hephaestion's chiliarchy)⁴² and this gave him an authority over the rest of the Companion cavalry. This is confirmed by the evidence of Arrian:

οὐκ οὐδὲ ἄλλον τινὰ ἔταξεν ἀντὶ Ἡφαιστίωνος χιλιάρχον ἐπὶ τῇ ἵππῳ τῇ ἑταιρικῇ Ἀλέξανδρος, ὥς μὴ ἀπόλοιτο τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἡφαιστίωνος ἐκ τῆς τάξεως, ἀλλὰ Ἡφαιστίωνός τε ἡ χιλιαρχία ἐκαλεῖτο καὶ τὸ σημεῖον αὐτῆς ἡγεῖτο <τὸ> ἐξ Ἡφαιστίωνος πεποιημένον. (Arr. *Anab.* 7.14.10)

So that the name of Hephaestion would not be lost to the unit, Alexander did not appoint anyone in place of him as chiliarch over the Companion cavalry; it used to be called the "Chiliarchy of Hephaestion," and the standard that he had made still went before it.

Appian, too, reports that Hephaestion was commander of the cavalry for Alexander (*Syr.* 57: ἡγεμὼν τῆς ἵππου τῆς ἑταιρικῆς). Many scholars have simply followed the weighty authority of Berve and assumed that the court office and this equestrian chiliarchy were identical, and that the command of the first hipparchy was a fundamental part of the court chiliarch's functions.⁴³ But this assumption, which is unsupported by any convincing evidence,⁴⁴ is made untenable by puzzling contradictions in the primary sources.⁴⁵ We should, therefore, accept the

⁴⁰ Berve (1926: 2.173 [no. 357]), Schachermeyr (1970: 34), Badian (1985: 485), and Bosworth (1994: 840) all place it at this time, but the view of Goukowsky (1978: 33–34) should be followed here.

⁴¹ See Heckel 1992a: 368; Brunt 1963; Griffith 1963: 68.

⁴² As Griffith (1963: 74, n. 17) has pointed out, the name "Hephaestion's chiliarchy" must have been used to "distinguish it from the other chiliarchies": the expression is not evidence that this military command was identical with the court office; cf. Berve 1926: 1.112; Heckel 1992a: 368.

⁴³ See Berve 1926: 2.173 (no. 357); Schur 1934: 130; Bengtson 1937: 66; Bosworth 1971: 132–133; Lane Fox 1973: 318; Lewis 1977: 17, n. 92; and Heckel 1992a: 366–369; but cf. Junge 1940: 38, n. 8; Rosen 1967: 107.

⁴⁴ See Goukowsky 1978: 176–178; Briant 1994: 297.

⁴⁵ On these contradictions, see below for the discussion of the chiliarchy after Alexander's death. Bevan (1900: 396–398; 1902: 322) was among the first to notice the problems in the primary sources in this respect. Tarn (1921: 6–7) correctly saw that the positions were different, and Bengtson (1937: 66–67)—although he argued that the court chiliarchy included the command of the first hipparchy under Hephaestion—also realised that the evidence of the early period of the Successors showed the

alternative view that the equestrian and court chiliarchies were distinct offices: it is the identical name that has led some scholars to conflate them.⁴⁶

V. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE CHILIARCHY UNDER THE
ACHAEMENIDS AND ALEXANDER

From the evidence of the sources, the primary function of chiliarchy was—as its name in Greek and Persian (literally “commander of a thousand”) suggests—the command of the one thousand Royal bodyguards selected from the Immortals and called the “apple-bearers” (μηλοφόροι).⁴⁷ Diodorus, for instance, described Artabanus, a chiliarch of Xerxes (Plut. *Them.* 27.2), as δυνάμενος . . . πλείστον παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ Ξέρξῃ καὶ τῶν δορυφόρων ἀφηγούμενος.⁴⁸ Since the μηλοφόροι were, of course, spear-bearers (δορυφόροι), this must refer to the Royal bodyguards. The evidence of Athenaeus suggests that the μηλοφόροι had their own court, through which visitors would pass,⁴⁹ and perhaps it was this that contributed to the development of the chiliarch’s role as usher at the Persian court

existence of separate equestrian and court chiliarchies: his solution was that the functions of the office were split after the death of Hephæstion. Goukowsky (1978: 32, 176–178) first resolved this problem and presented the evidence in full. See also Briant 1994: 297.

⁴⁶ Briant 1994: 292.

⁴⁷ Thus Briant 1996: 273. See also Tuplin’s useful discussion (1990: 22). The “apple-bearers” are described by Herodotus (7.41) in his list of the infantry guards of Xerxes; Athenaeus (12.514b–c; see also 12.414d), citing Heraclides of Cyme, describes them as a special group of spear-bearers selected from the ten thousand Immortals; Hesychius (μ 1200.1) defines the μηλοφόροι as a θεραπεία Περσική τοῦ βασιλέως. For the μηλοφόροι under Darius III, see Arr. *Anab.* 3.11.5, 13.1, 16.2; Diod. Sic. 17.59.3. The term *doryphoroe* that appears in Curtius (3.3.15) is probably a later scribal miscorrection of an original *dorophorae* (itself a Latin transcription of the Greek δωροφόροι) that referred to the Persian “gift-bearers” (see Ael. *VH* 1.22; Xen. *An.* 1.8.28–29) rather than to the Royal bodyguards (Heckel 1992b). This is confirmed by the unusual function Curtius assigns them (*doryphoroe* . . . *soliti vestem excipere regalem*), which is otherwise unattested for the μηλοφόροι. There is little evidence to support the view that the chiliarch was commander of the ten thousand Immortals (cf. Schachermeyr 1970: 32). The case made by Cook (1983: 144) for Hydarnes (commander of the ten thousand during the Persian war) is interesting, but, even if he was chiliarch under Xerxes I, there is no reason to think that the command of the Immortals was a regular function of the chiliarch, since there is no supporting evidence relating to the later Achaemenid period.

⁴⁸ Diod. Sic. 11.69.1; see also Ctesias *FGrH* 688 F 14.30; Just. *Epit.* 3.1. See also Lewis 1977: 19, n. 96. Artabanus’ power as chiliarch is well illustrated by his assassination of Xerxes and his selection of Artaxerxes as the new king (Diod. Sic. 11.69.1–6; Arist. *Pol.* 1311b; Just. *Epit.* 3.1). It emerges from Diodorus that Artabanus’ role as commander of the royal bodyguard was instrumental in these events. According to Plutarch, it was also the chiliarch Artabanus who received Themistocles, but there are contradictions about the identity of the king whom Themistocles met (Plut. *Them.* 27.2; see also Frost 1980: 213–215). Some have favoured Xerxes (Cook 1983: 127), others Artaxerxes (Dandamaev 1989: 235). Either king is possible since the evidence of Ctesias suggests that Artabanus was chiliarch for some time after Xerxes’ murder, before his own execution (Ctesias *FGrH* 688 F 14.30; later chronographers even turn Artabanus into a Persian king who ruled for seven months: see Manetho, *FGrH* 609 F 2, line 17 [p. 50]; Dandamaev 1989: 234).

⁴⁹ Ath. 12.514b–c = Heraclides of Cyme *FGrH* 689 F 1. In Athenaeus’ description, there is a small lacuna at the beginning of the relevant sentence, but, from the context and the remaining words of the

(Briant 1996: 273). As noted above, Alexander inherited and used the *μηλοφόροι*, and, although there is no direct evidence to prove that Hephaestion acted as their commander, if he continued to perform any of the functions of his Achaemenid predecessor, then this indeed would be one of the most obvious (Goukowsky 1978: 31). One passage which might support this interpretation is Justin's troublesome description of the position Cassander attained in 323 at Babylon: *stipatoribus regis satellitibusque . . . praeficitur* (Just. *Epit.* 13.4.18). One interpretation is that this refers to the command of the royal hypaspists;⁵⁰ Goukowsky (1978: 308), however, has questioned this and convincingly argued that Justin has described, in his sections on the settlement at Babylon, the functions that Cassander later performed as court chiliarch.⁵¹ This, then, would provide important evidence for one function of the chiliarch as commander of the *μηλοφόροι*, who could easily be described as Justin's *stipatores* or *satellites*.

The second major function of the Persian chiliarch was the introduction of those whom the king wished to see—this involved the supervision of admission and the concomitant act of *proskynesis*. This is described on two occasions in the ancient sources, in the context of prominent Greeks and their interviews with Persian monarchs (Lewis 1977: 18). First, there is the evidence of Cornelius Nepos:

Conon a Pharnabazo ad regem missus, posteaquam venit, primum ex more Persarum ad chiliarchum, qui secundum gradum imperii tenebat, Tithrausten accessit seque ostendit cum rege conloqui velle. Nemo enim sine hoc admittitur. (Conon 3.2–3)

After Conon, sent by Pharnabazus to the king, arrived, he, according to the custom of the Persians, first approached the chiliarch Tithraustes, who held a position of second rank in the empire. After approaching him, Conon informed the chiliarch that he wished to speak with the king, for nobody is admitted without this protocol.

Secondly, Aelian, in his description of Ismenias the Theban's interview with the Persian king, relates that the chiliarch was the official who took messages to the king and presented petitioners.⁵² Interestingly, Hesychius the lexicographer defines the *ἄζαραπατεῖς* as οἱ εἰσαγγελεῖς παρὰ Πέρσαις (*Lexicon* 1441); but the term is a Greek transcription of the Persian name of the *χιλίαρχος*, not the *εἰσαγγελεύς* (see above, 265). This discrepancy has not gone unnoticed, and Junge (1940: 18–19) went so far as to identify the Persian chiliarchs with the

sentence, it probably referred to the admission of the royal concubines described earlier in the passage (514b) by the *μηλοφόροι* (Briant 1996: 294): διὰ τῆς τῶν *μηλοφόρων* αὐλῆς, ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι [*sc. οἱ* *μηλοφόροι*] τῶν *δορυφόρων*, καὶ τῷ γένει πάντες Πέρσαι, ἐπὶ τῶν *στυράκων* *μήλα χρυσὰ ἔχοντες*, *χιλίοι* τὸν ἀριθμόν, ἀριστίνδην ἐκλεγόμενοι ἐκ τῶν *μυρίων* *Περσῶν* τῶν Ἀθανάτων καλουμένων.

⁵⁰ See Strähelin 1919: 2293–94 with citation of earlier literature. Cf. Schachermeyr 1970: 146.

⁵¹ Goukowsky 1978: 308: "il semble plus probable que Justin (qui ignore le partage de Triparadeisos) attribue à Cassandros dès 323 des fonctions qu'il n'exerça qu'en 319, quand les rois furent confiés temporairement à Antigonus."

⁵² *IH* 1.21: ἔφατο οὖν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ *χιλίαρχος* ὁ καὶ τὰς ἀγγελίας εἰσκομίζων τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τοὺς δεομένους.

εἰσαγγελεῖς, although it is clear that they were different officials.⁵³ The difficulty is resolved if Hesychius used the word εἰσαγγελεῖς literally, without specific reference to the officials of the same name, since Aelian records that the chiliarch did in fact deliver messages to the king (*VH* 1.21).⁵⁴ That the chiliarch performed much the same function as other courtiers should not be a problem, because there were often a number of functionaries in the Persian court who were used for similar tasks (Briant 1994: 296). Bosworth (1971: 132) sees Hephæstion's role in Alexander's famous *proskynesis* symposium (Plut. *Alex.* 54.5–6) as an example of him performing his duties as chiliarch in the Persian tradition.⁵⁵ Indeed, Alexander's plans to introduce obeisance might have been an important reason for his appointment of a chiliarch, since Arrian explicitly links the changes in the king's court to the *proskynesis* experiment (*Anab.* 4.9.9). Although this failed with the Greeks and Macedonians, it no doubt continued for his barbarian subjects,⁵⁶ perhaps the supervision of *proskynesis* for orientals was an important function that Hephæstion continued to fulfil.

Under the Achaemenids, the chiliarch accompanied the king on military campaigns (Briant 1994: 297): Nabarzanes was in the field with Darius III in the time of Alexander (Curt. 3.9.1), and, if the chiliarchs described by Polyænus and Clement of Alexandria are not simply military commanders, we also have Rhanosbates (Polyænus *Strat.* 7.12) and Orontopatas (Clem. Al. *FGrH* 3 F 174), both court chiliarchs of Darius I during his Scythian expedition.⁵⁷ Persian chiliarchs were also entrusted with *ad hoc* responsibilities: Tithraustes, for instance, was sent by his king to execute Tissaphernes in Caria (Plut. *Agæ.* 10.4) and also

⁵³ See Lewis 1977: 18–19, n. 95 for a useful critique of Junge's view. A further problem is Hesychius' use of the plural, which implies that there was more than one chiliarch in the Persian court, if it is to be interpreted as a concurrent and not a sequential plurality (see Lewis 1977: 17, n. 84; Briant 1994: 296, n. 34). Note that the chiliarchs mentioned by Plutarch in his description of Themistocles' visit to the Persian court (*Them.* 27.2 and 29.2) are probably the result of Plutarch's use of different traditions about the identity of the king Themistocles saw (Cook 1983: 143), rather than evidence for two court chiliarchs under one king. Cf. above, n. 48.

⁵⁴ See also Herodotus' (3.34) description of an official of Cambyses called Prexaspes, who brought messages to the king; some have thought that Prexaspes was a court chiliarch (Junge 1940: 27, n. 1; Cook 1983: 144), but see Briant (1994: 296, n. 33) for the problems with this identification.

⁵⁵ Badian (1981: 48–51), however, argues that this story of Plutarch is an apologetic fiction of Chares of Mytilene.

⁵⁶ See Plut. *Alex.* 74.2 for evidence of barbarians performing *proskynesis* to Alexander in the last year of his life. Arrian (*Anab.* 4.12.1) reports that it was only the Macedonians who were excused from the performance of *proskynesis*, not the orientals who did in fact offer it to Alexander (Arr. *Anab.* 4.12.2; Curt. 8.5.22). See also Curt. 8.5.21: *igitur* [sc. *Alexander*] *ad Agin et Cleonem misit, ut, sermone finito, barbaros tantum, cum intrasset, procumbere suo more paterentur*. It is likely that orientals had been performing *proskynesis* before 328: see Badian 1996: 21–22, Bosworth 1988: 286; 1996: 111.

⁵⁷ It must be admitted that the evidence of Clement of Alexandria is problematic, since he cites Pherecydes of Syros for his information: this is an impossibility chronologically (see Jacoby's commentary to *FGrH* 3 F 174). Justi (1896: 664) argued that Rhanosbates and Orontopatas were only military chiliarchs.

provided money for the fleet commanded by Conon (*Hell. Oxy.* 19.3).⁵⁸ Bagoas, the chiliarch of Artaxerxes III, commanded a division of the Persian army during the king's attempt to reconquer Egypt (*Diod. Sic.* 16.47.3); later he administered the king's affairs in the upper satrapies of the empire (*Diod. Sic.* 16.50.8). Although Diodorus (16.47.4) refers to Bagoas as chiliarch only at the time of Artaxerxes' assassination in 343, there is reason to think that he was chiliarch for much of the reign, given his extraordinary power.

A final function is suggested by evidence concerning Nabarzanes, whom Arrian refers to as ὁ Δαρείου χιλιάρχης (*Anab.* 3.23.4).⁵⁹ Arrian also describes him as χιλιάρχης τῶν ξὺν Δαρείῳ φευγόντων ἱππέων (i.e., after the battle of Gaugamela: *Anab.* 3.21.1) and Quintus Curtius names him as the commander of the Persian cavalry on the right wing at the battle of Issus (3.9.1).⁶⁰ Lewis (1977: 17) has argued that, by the later Achaemenid period, the chiliarch had become the commander of the one thousand élite Persian cavalry known as the "kinsmen" of the king.⁶¹ Although Nabarzanes is described as a cavalry commander, there is no evidence that he or any other chiliarch regularly commanded the royal "kinsmen"⁶² (indeed Darius himself is said to have commanded them at Gaugamela: *Diod. Sic.* 17.59.2; *Arr. Anab.* 3.11.5); however, we need not doubt that the chiliarch could sometimes hold military positions in times of war as Nabarzanes did.⁶³

This constitutes all the ancient evidence for the role of the Achaemenid chiliarch, who consequently appears as a high officer of the court, commander of the king's bodyguard, and chief usher; he was also a special functionary who could perform important political or military duties when the need arose. The similarity of these functions to those exercised by Hephaestion in the court of Alexander is striking. Hephaestion was Alexander's closest and most trusted friend; he acted as commander of the royal hypaspists, the élite Macedonian infantry corps that also provided a bodyguard for the king; he was also one of the seven highest σωματοφύλακες who protected the king and acted as royal ushers; and, after 330, he was used by Alexander for many special military and

⁵⁸ See Bosworth 1971: 132–133.

⁵⁹ Berve (1926: 2.268 [no. 543], reprinted in Berve 1935: 1451–52) describes Nabarzanes as "unter Dareios III Chiliarch . . . bekleidete also das höchste persische Amt und zog infolgedessen 333 mit dem Grosskönig ins Feld." See Bosworth 1980b: 341–342; Briant 1994: 296, n. 32.

⁶⁰ Curtius calls him a *praetor Darei* (3.7.12).

⁶¹ See *Arr. Anab.* 3.11.5 (where they are called the συγγενεῖς οἱ βασιλέως); *Diod. Sic.* 17.59.2–3 (there termed the συγγενεῖς ἱππεῖς). See also *Hdt.* 7.41.1. The kinsmen are probably identical with the Persian εὐάκαι mentioned by Arrian, whom Alexander introduced into his Companion cavalry (*Anab.* 7.6.3). Their enigmatic name is probably a Greek transliteration of the Old Persian word **huvaka* (meaning "kinsmen"; see Sekunda 1988: 76 for the linguistic evidence).

⁶² See Briant 1994: 295, n. 31.

⁶³ Briant 1994: 297. See also Sekunda (1988: 71), who argues that the chiliarch was the "premier officer" of the Achaemenid army.

political tasks.⁶⁴ Moreover, as we have seen, the chiliarch Nabarzanes had held cavalry commands for his king, and so too did Hephaestion, who became the joint-commander of Companion cavalry in 330 and sole commander after the death of his colleague Clitus. The analogous positions held by Hephaestion and Nabarzanes in their respective courts make Alexander's conferral of the chiliarchy on his friend an understandable part of his introduction of Persian court offices. Nabarzanes surrendered to Alexander in 330 in Hyrcania and was pardoned (Arr. *Anab.* 3.23.4; Curt. 6.5.22–23). When the evidence of Diodorus (18.48.4–5) is considered, it was very probably in the summer of 330 that Hephaestion became the new chiliarch.

The following conclusions can be drawn about the functions of Hephaestion's chiliarchy. It is likely that the office was, to some extent, a recognition of the fundamental role Hephaestion had come to play in Alexander's court and army,⁶⁵ as a title of great honour, the chiliarchy accentuated the already established power of a friend of the king who was a second-in-command and who embraced the new policies of his monarch. Two passages add weight to this view. First, Diodorus relates that Cassander's court chiliarchy of 319 made him "second in authority" (see above, 266). This, surely, was also the significance of Hephaestion's chiliarchy, as it describes well the position he attained in the court of Alexander.⁶⁶ Secondly, Plutarch reports that Hephaestion approved of and imitated Alexander's adoption of Persian customs, and was used by the king in his business with barbarians.⁶⁷ Such a role may have been performed in his capacity as chiliarch and could have included the command of a ceremonial Persian court guard, supervision of *proskynesis*, and the admission of barbarian visitors. But does this mean that Hephaestion also had well-defined administrative responsibilities as chiliarch, as some have thought?

There are three passages in the ancient sources that indicate that the chiliarch was an important and powerful courtier. As we have seen (above, 269), Cornelius Nepos speaks of the chiliarch Tithraustes as one who *secundum gradum imperii*

⁶⁴ According to Diodorus (17.61.3), Hephaestion was "commander of the bodyguards" (τῶν σωματοφυλάκων ἡγούμενος) at Gaugamela; as Heckel (1992a: 70–71) has argued, this must mean "commander of the *agema* of the royal hypaspists." Hephaestion probably replaced Ptolemy to become one of the seven highest bodyguards of Alexander (Heckel 1992a: 71; see Arr. *Anab.* 7.5.6); for the role of these bodyguards as ushers of the king, see Berve 1926: 1.19. For the military commands and other duties Hephaestion had after 330, see Heckel 1992a: 74–86.

⁶⁵ Briant 1994: 297.

⁶⁶ Alexander's well-known *mimesis* of Homeric heroic traditions (Edmunds 1971: 372–391) might also lie behind Hephaestion's political prominence, of which his chiliarchy was a part, since the Homeric hero generally had an unofficial second-in-command—e.g., Diomedes and Sthenelus (Hom. *Il.* 2.563–564), Idomeneus and Meriones (*Il.* 2.650–651), Sarpedon and Glaucus (*Il.* 2.876–877), but, above all, Achilles and Patroclus. Alexander undoubtedly had himself and Hephaestion portrayed as this latter heroic pair: see Ael. *VH* 7.8, 9.38, 12.3; Plut. *Alex.* 15.4–5, 72.2–3; Arr. *Anab.* 7.14.1–7; Diod. Sic. 17.97.3. See also Stewart 1993: 80–86.

⁶⁷ *Alex.* 47.5. See Briant 1994: 297 with n. 37.

tenebat (Conon 3.2–3), and this is almost identical with Diodorus' description of Cassander's chiliarchy (Diod. Sic. 18.48.4–5, quoted above, 266). Finally, there is the gloss concerning Perdiccas' chiliarchy that appears in Photius' epitome of Arrian's *Affairs after Alexander*: τὸ δὲ ἦν ἐπιτροπὴ τῆς ξυμπάσης βασιλείας (FGrH 156 F 1.3 = Phot. Bibl. 92). These three sources, particularly the problematic and late gloss of Arrian (which may be the work of Photius: see below, 275), have provided the evidence for all manner of remarkably contradictory speculations about the functions of the chiliarch under the Achaemenids and Alexander.⁶⁸ This embarrassing lack of consensus has manifested itself most recently in studies of the Successors.⁶⁹ It is the view of traditional scholarship that the chiliarchy was a kind of Grand Vizierate comparable to those of medieval Islamic states, with wide-ranging military, administrative, and even financial duties.⁷⁰ This interpretation was first presented in detail by Junge (1940: 13–38), but is perhaps best represented by the sweeping view of Schachermeyr (1970: 32):

In regard to the responsibilities of the Persian court official, he was without doubt originally the commander of the thousand men who constituted the palace-guard; but, in addition, he was also the commander of the Persian field army of ten thousand men; furthermore, according to Junge, he was the general Chief-of-Staff of the Imperial Army and, with that, the Imperial Executive, and certainly the head of the Royal Chancellery; and, above all, he occupied the important post of εἰσαγγελεύς, who was in effect a Chief of Audiences. But he was also apparently the highest administrator of royal revenue, and presumably the commander of the Royal pages; he was probably also the convener of the council of nobles.

Such interpretations have been rightly criticised.⁷¹ The views of Junge and Schachermeyr are founded on an excessively modern view of the administration and institutions of ancient Persia. There is in fact no evidence to show that the chiliarch had any great administrative role or that he was the regular commander of the ten thousand immortals; that he was a "general chief of staff of the imperial army," "imperial-executive," "chief of the royal chancellery," or "commander of the royal pages" is also unlikely.⁷² Although it may be that the chiliarch commanded the εἰσαγγελεῖς in his capacity as chief usher (or that he became the chief εἰσαγγελεύς in the course of Achaemenid history), the attested responsibilities

⁶⁸ For bibliography, see the works cited above, n. 1.

⁶⁹ Cf. Grainger 1990: 19 and Billows 1990: 54–55 with Heckel 1992a: 366–370.

⁷⁰ See Junge 1940: 13–38. See also Bengtson 1937: 66; Badian 1965: 176.

⁷¹ See Bosworth 1971: 132, n. 3; Lewis 1977: 17–18; Goukowsky 1978: 32; Briant 1994: 293–297.

⁷² See also Borza 1990: 236–248 on the informality and absence of institutionalization that characterised ancient Macedonian kingship and administration, which is relevant here. Although there is some evidence that the Sassanid *hazarbadh* (a word derived from the Old Persian **hazarapatiš*) had administrative functions (Christensen 1944: 113–116), it is unwise to base reconstructions of the Persian chiliarch's functions on an office that existed hundreds of years later in the Sassanid court.

of the post hardly justify the facile "vizier" designation so frequently employed in modern studies.⁷³

In all probability, the Persian chiliarchy developed over more than two hundred years of Achaemenid history, and it is possible that, apart from its attested functions, the office's other responsibilities were not precise and institutionalised, but malleable and likely to change with the preferences of each king and the personality of each incumbent; the latter may have usurped or lost functions with changing political circumstances (Goukowsky 1978: 32–33). For example, one might well believe that the Persian chiliarch Tithraustes was the most powerful person in the state after his king (Nepos *Conon* 3.2–3), but this notional position as second in authority was probably dependent upon the favour of the king and his political success in the court (Briant 1994: 293). A similar contention can be made about Diodorus' description of the chiliarchy under Alexander (18.48.4–5): it was no doubt correct with respect to Hephaestion, but the latter's great power was primarily the result of his success at court, his relationship to his king, and his tenure of court and military positions other than the chiliarchy. The Macedonian chiliarchy was, by itself, probably not much more than a title of honour,⁷⁴ and, far from being a vital functionary of Alexander's new Asian empire, the chiliarch was surely unnecessary from an administrative point of view: his *raison d'être* was essentially political. Hephaestion as chiliarch was both an agent and an expression of Alexander's unpopular policy of imitating Persian customs, and perhaps this is why the office quickly disappeared in the early years of the Successors. Without Alexander, the chiliarchy failed to confer on its holder a significant political or military authority, and it is this later period that remains to be discussed.

VI. THE CHILIARCHY UNDER THE SUCCESSORS

When Hephaestion died, his position as commander of the first hipparchy of the Companion cavalry (the Chiliarchy of Hephaestion) was taken by Perdiccas (Heckel 1992a: 143). This view is, of course, at variance with Arrian's statement that Alexander did not appoint anyone to replace Hephaestion as chiliarch of the cavalry (Arr. *Anab.* 7.14.10); but Arrian has probably used an example of the anti-

⁷³ This has been expressed cogently by Briant (1996: 296): "[tout] compte fait, il ne reste pratiquement rien dans la documentation existante pour faire du chiliarque un Grand Vizir, qui contrôlerait l'ensemble des appareils de l'Etat central. Nous sommes trop peu au fait de l'organisation de la cour centrale pour affirmer que le chiliarque était bien le plus haut personnage." See also Frye 1972: 88 and Briant 1994: 270 and 291. The use of the term "vizier" to describe the chiliarch started early and has persisted: e.g., Tarn 1921: 5; Berve 1926: 1.112; Schur 1934: 130; Hamilton 1973: 145–146; Green 1974: 446; Bosworth 1980a: 5; O'Brien 1992: 112; Stewart 1993: 215. Scholars who have not followed this trend include Lane Fox (1973: 318: "Hephaestion . . . became Alexander's official second-in-command. His title was Chiliarch, his job had military responsibilities. But both job and title had been created by the Persian kings"), Lewis (1977: 17–18), Frye (1964: 145), and Heckel (1992a: 366–368).

⁷⁴ Briant 1994: 298. See also Heckel 1992a: 143.

Perdiccan bias of Ptolemy's history, and, in any case, it is certainly a falsehood.⁷⁵ This passage in Arrian, however, refers only to the equestrian chiliarchy and must not be used to argue that Perdiccas also succeeded Hephaestion as court chiliarch.⁷⁶ Rather, the court chiliarchy was left vacant until Perdiccas was appointed to this position in 323 at the compromise settlement in Babylon.⁷⁷ The evidence for this is found in Photius' epitome of Arrian's *Affairs after Alexander* (Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 1.3): Περδίκκαν δὲ χιλιαρχεῖν χιλιαρχίας ἧς ἦρχεν Ἡφαιστίων, τὸ δὲ ἦν ἐπιτροπή τῆς ξυμπάσης βασιλείας ("Perdiccas was to be chiliarch of the chiliarchy which Hephaestion had held, and this was an ἐπιτροπή of the entire kingdom"). Photius' summary of Dexippus also reports this, but in less specific terms (*FGrH* 100 F 8.4: Περδίκκας δὲ τὴν Ἡφαιστίωνος χιλιαρχίαν). The purpose of the explanatory gloss was obviously to note that Perdiccas was not given a simple cavalry command, but the court title of chiliarch; if he had already held this since 324, it seems unlikely that he would have been reappointed to it a year later.⁷⁸ It must be admitted, however, that the meaning of the gloss concerning the chiliarchy is problematic. Although Arrian probably used Hieronymus of Cardia's history as a source,⁷⁹ his work has been summarised by Photius, and we cannot be sure whether this gloss is his work or that of his epitomator.⁸⁰ Many modern scholars use the gloss to argue that the chiliarch's responsibilities involved administrative functions or that the chiliarch was a "regent",⁸¹ but the extant evidence does not provide support for the view that the chiliarch was an administrative official, and it was, of course, the ἐπιμελητής⁸² who held the ἐπιτροπή (the "guardianship" or "regency") of the kingdom in the period

⁷⁵ See Plut. *Eum.* 1.2; App. *Syr.* 57. See also Errington 1969: 239–240 (cf. Roisman 1984: 378–379).

⁷⁶ See Badian 1965: 176; Bosworth 1971: 132–133.

⁷⁷ On Perdiccas' appointment to the court chiliarchy, see Geyer 1937: 607; Schachermeyr 1970: 31–37; Grainger 1990: 19.

⁷⁸ Tarn (1921: 7) was one of the first to see this. See also Schachermeyr 1970: 31–39.

⁷⁹ See Jacoby's commentary to *FGrH* 156 F 1.

⁸⁰ For the problems with Photius' epitomes of Arrian and Dexippus, see Schwahn 1930: 230–233; Badian 1964: 269. See also Bosworth 1971: 130. There are interesting parallels here with the gloss in Photius' epitome of Dexippus' *Affairs after Alexander* (also largely based on Arrian) concerning the controversial προστασία of Craterus. Here the position Craterus received is described as δὴ πρῶτιστον τιμῆς τέλος παρὰ Μακεδόσι (Dexippus *FGrH* 100 F 8.4). But the προστασία is not attested by our other main sources, and the way it is described in this gloss has often been thought wrong or seriously distorted (Schwahn 1930: 232; 1931: 225, calling it an "Erfindung des Duris"; Badian 1964: 266; Errington 1970: 55, n. 48). That Arrian used Hieronymus is no guarantee of the accuracy of this gloss because Diodorus also depended on Hieronymus directly or indirectly, but fails to mention the chiliarchy or the προστασία. On Hieronymus as a source of Diodorus, see Simpson 1959: 370–379 (with earlier references cited 370, n. 1); Hornblower 1981: 18–75.

⁸¹ See above, n. 73.

⁸² The term ἐπιμελητής should, perhaps, be rendered as "manager" or "supervisor": see Hammond 1985: 157–159. Cf. Justin (*Epit.* 7.5.9–10), who relates that Philip acted as *tutor* of Amyntas, son of Perdiccas; it is difficult to know if this position was identical with the ἐπιμελητής known from Diodorus, but possibly the ἐπιμεληταί should be distinguished from the *tutores* or "guardians" of

after Alexander's death.⁸³ If we bear in mind that Photius' epitome of Arrian contains at least two egregious errors,⁸⁴ and that the definition of the chiliarchy as a "guardianship/administration of the whole kingdom" is not attested by other sources, there is a strong possibility that the gloss may be a confused description by Photius of the functions of Perdiccas' ἐπιμέλεια rather than of those of his chiliarchy.

What, then, did Perdiccas' court chiliarchy represent? Fundamentally, it was a position he attained in the compromise settlement that was separate from the final one when the satrapies were distributed.⁸⁵ In this compromise agreement, Craterus was to be προστάτης of the kingdom of Arrhidaeus (or control the προστασία of the kingdom)⁸⁶ and Meleager was to be Perdiccas' ὑπαρχος (Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 1). No office has been more problematic in studies of the Successors than Craterus' προστασία.⁸⁷ The view that it represented an executive power or regency higher than that later held by Perdiccas is untenable.⁸⁸ That it was a position in Macedonia and distinct from the ἐπιμέλεια is possible and has found proponents.⁸⁹ Still another view is that it was identical with the ἐπιμέλεια held by Perdiccas.⁹⁰ Whatever significance the προστασία had, the arrangements made at the compromise probably sought to limit Perdiccas' powers (Heckel

Alexander IV, mentioned by Justin (*Epit.* 13.2.14) and Curtius (10.7.8–9). See Hammond 1985: 159 on this point.

⁸³ The Heidelberg Epitome places the word ἐπιτροπή alongside ἐπιμέλεια to describe the position Polyperchon assumed in 319 (*FGrH* 155 F 1.5; see also F 1.2 and F 1.4). Hammond (1985: 158) argues cogently that ἐπιτροπή/ἐπιμέλεια and ἐπίτροπος/ἐπιμελητής are used as synonyms in the Heidelberg Epitome in a tautologous style. Anson (1992: 40–42) also thinks that προστασία, ἐπιμέλεια, and ἐπιτροπή were synonymous and referred to the same office that he believes was the regency. On the word ἐπίτροπος, see the discussion of Cook 1985: 233.

⁸⁴ The epitome has Lysimachus killed in a campaign against the Thracian Seuthes in 323 (*FGrH* 156 F 1.10), although he died in the battle of Corupedium in 281; in F 9.35, the epitome incorrectly names Amphimachus, the satrap of Mesopotamia and Arbela, as the brother of the king.

⁸⁵ On the need to distinguish the compromise from the definitive agreement, see Errington 1970: 53–59.

⁸⁶ Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 1.3: Κρατερὸν δὲ προστάτην τῆς Ἀρριδαίου βασιλείας; Dexippus *FGrH* 100 F 8.4: τὴν δὲ κηδεμονίαν καὶ ὄσην προστασία τῆς βασιλείας Κρατερὸς ἐπετρέπη, ὃ δὴ πρῶτιστον τιμῆς τέλος παρὰ Μακεδόσι.

⁸⁷ For discussions of the προστασία, see Laqueur 1919: 295–300 (with citation of earlier literature); Ensslin 1925; Schur 1934: 138–141; Bengtson 1937: 74–81; Fontana 1959: 140–145; Rosen 1967: 101–106; Errington 1970: 55–56; Schachermeyr 1970: 164–171; Bosworth 1971: 133–134; Goukowsky 1978: 195–197; Seibert 1983: 84–89; Hammond 1985: 156–60; Anson 1992: 38–43; Heckel 1992a: 127–129.

⁸⁸ Badian 1964: 266.

⁸⁹ Schwahn 1931: 324–328; Badian 1964: 266. Hammond (1985: 156–157) sees the προστασία as an office Craterus exercised in Macedonia during the absence of the king, comprising "civil duties involved in the maintenance of the kingship."

⁹⁰ Anson (1992: 38–43) argues that Craterus' προστασία was the same office as the ἐπιμέλεια, since, in some ancient sources, the two terms are used as synonyms (e.g., Diod. Sic. 18.23.2; App. *Syr.* 52 [Appian uses the participle προστατεύσαντος]). But cf. Bosworth (1971: 133), who doubts the existence of the προστασία of Craterus.

1992a: 369). Now Cassander's court chiliarchy of 319 came with a position of second in authority to the ἐπιμελητής Polyperchon (Diod. Sic. 18.48.4–5). If we can extrapolate from the evidence of Diodorus to interpret the chiliarchy of Perdiccas, then it was an attempt, during the compromise settlement, to define the power of Perdiccas and make him "second in authority" to the king or to Craterus,⁹¹ in much the same way that Hephæstion had been second to Alexander. No doubt the chiliarchy continued to have functions in the court, and it conferred an illustrious title of honour on an individual who already held positions of great military and political power.

But the agreement made with the infantry and Meleager was brief. Perdiccas moved quickly to assert greater authority and to define his power. He purged the army of the soldiers who had led the insurrection after Alexander's death, executed Meleager, and distributed the satrapies; he then had himself declared commander of the royal army⁹² and ἐπιμελητής of the kingdom.⁹³ If this latter position had been given to Craterus during the compromise agreement, then, in the final settlement, the ἐπιμέλεια was transferred to Perdiccas, and Craterus was merely appointed joint-commander of Macedonia with Antipater (Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 1.7).⁹⁴ If, on the other hand, the προστασία represented a position in Macedonia distinct from that of the ἐπιμέλεια, then Perdiccas did not need to claim from Craterus the "regency" or "supervision" of the kings that he assumed. In either case, Perdiccas' actions indicated that the court chiliarchy was little more than an honour without power, since the offices he patently aspired to were στρατηγός of the army and ἐπιμελητής of the kingdom. His authority was certainly based on these positions, and it was not the office of chiliarch that gave hegemony to

⁹¹ For the view that Craterus was made ἐπιμελητής at the compromise settlement, see Anson 1992: 38–43.

⁹² See Curt. 10.10.4: *Perdicca ut cum rege esset copiisque praeesset quae regem sequebantur* (placed by Curtius after the distribution of satrapies); Just. *Epit.* 13.3.1: *adeo movit [sc. Perdicca] pedites ut . . . dux ab omnibus legeretur*; Just. *Epit.* 13.4.1: *castrorum et exercitus et rerum cura Meleagro et Perdiccae adsignatur*; Diod. Sic. 18.3.1, 23.2 (τῶν δλων ἡγεμονία); Nepos *Eum.* 2.1–2: *summa tradita esset tuenda eidem cui Alexander moriens anulum suum dederat, Perdiccae*; see also Plut. *Eum.* 3.6. See also Badian 1964: 265; Hammond 1985: 157.

⁹³ Diodorus (18.2.4) has incorrectly placed this during the compromise agreement, rather than during the final settlement (Errington 1970: 54, n. 42). Cf. Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 1; Curt. 10.8–10; Just. *Epit.* 13.3.1, 4.1. See also the Heidelberg Epitome (*FGrH* 155 F 1.2), which correctly places Perdiccas' appointment as ἐπιμελητής after the distribution of satrapies: ἡρέθη ἐπίτροπος καὶ ἐπιμελητής τῶν βασιλικῶν πραγμάτων ὁ Περδίκκας. The evidence of Diodorus shows that the ἐπιμέλεια was undoubtedly the supreme position in the early period of the Successors: Pithon and Arrhidaeus became ἐπιμεληταί after Perdiccas' death (18.39.1); Antipater was made ἐπιμελητής αὐτοκράτωρ at Triparadisi (Diod. Sic. 18.39.2–3) and had supreme command over the army (Diod. Sic. 18.39.6); Polyperchon was appointed ἐπιμελητής and στρατηγός αὐτοκράτωρ by Antipater (18.48.4; 18.55.1); and Antigonos assumed the ἐπιμέλεια of the kings in 315 (Diod. Sic. 19.61.3).

⁹⁴ Errington 1970: 55; Heckel 1992a: 128 *contra* Hammond 1985: 156–160. Jacoby explained away the joint command of Craterus and Antipater as a marginal gloss absorbed into the text of Photius, but see Bosworth 1971: 131.

the so-called “regents” or “supervisors” of the kings.⁹⁵ That the chiliarchy was not held by the “regents” who followed Perdiccas shows that it was evidently dispensable and perhaps not even desirable (Heckel 1992a: 370).

The period after Alexander’s death also demonstrates that the court chiliarchy was distinct from the equestrian chiliarchy. Perdiccas, as commander of the first hipparchy, was already leader of the Macedonian cavalry at the time of Alexander’s death.⁹⁶ But, after he became commander of the army and ἐπιμελητής, it is certain that his onerous command of the Companion cavalry would have been delegated to another officer. That this did occur is proved by Diodorus’ statement at 18.3.4–5 (Heckel 1992a: 369):

[Περδίκκας] Σέλευκον δ’ ἔταξεν ἐπὶ τὴν ἵππαρχίαν τῶν ἐταίρων, οὓσαν ἐπιφανεσ-
τάτην· ταύτης γὰρ Ἡφαιστίων πρῶτος μὲν ἡγήσατο, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Περδίκκας, τρίτος
δ’ ὁ . . . Σέλευκος

[Perdiccas] appointed Seleucus to the command of the Companion cavalry, a most distinguished appointment; for Hephaestion commanded them first, then Perdiccas, and third . . . Seleucus.⁹⁷

This is confirmed by Appian.⁹⁸ Perdiccas, therefore, transferred his equestrian chiliarchy to Seleucus during the definitive settlement, but retained the court title of chiliarch (Goukowsky 1978: 177).

The subsequent history of the chiliarchies is straightforward. On the death of Perdiccas, Pithon and Arrhidaeus assumed the ἐπιμέλεια of the empire, but this was soon relinquished to Antipater at the conference of Triparadisus (Diod. Sic. 18.39.2–3). Diodorus (18.39.7) relates the following about Antipater’s appointments at this time: [ὁ Ἀντίπατρος] παρέξευξε δὲ τῷ Ἀντιγόνῳ χιλιάρχον τὸν υἱὸν Κάσσανδρον, ὅπως μὴ δύνηται διαλαθεῖν ἰδιοπραγῶν (“[Antipater] set his son Cassander beside Antigonus as chiliarch, so that it would not escape his notice if Antigonus acted independently”). Photius’ epitome of Arrian records that Antipater’s son, Cassander, became a χιλιάρχης τῆς ἵππου (*FGrH* 156 F 9.38). This expression surely refers to the commander of the Companion cavalry known to Diodorus (18.3.4–5) and Appian (*Syr.* 57).⁹⁹ Cassander’s appointment at Triparadisus, therefore, was a mere equestrian chiliarchy: most probably he assumed the command of the cavalry forces under Seleucus that had been with Perdiccas but were then given to Antigonus,¹⁰⁰ since Seleucus received the satrapy

⁹⁵ *Pace* Grainger 1990: 19; Will 1979: 22–23. The ἐπιμελητής was, without question, distinct from the court chiliarch, since, in 319, Polyperchon became ἐπιμελητής and Cassander his chiliarch (Diod. Sic. 18.48.4–5). See Heckel 1992a: 366–370.

⁹⁶ See Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 1.2; Curt. 10.7.20, 8.11, 8.23.

⁹⁷ Justin describes the appointment as the *summus castrorum tribunatus Seleuco* (*Epit.* 13.4.17).

⁹⁸ App. *Syr.* 57: γίγνεται δ’ εὐθὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου μεταστάντος ἡμεῶν τῆς ἵππου τῆς ἐταιρικῆς.

⁹⁹ Cf. Arr. *Anab.* 7.14.10.

¹⁰⁰ See Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 9.38. Diodorus (18.40.7) reports that Antigonus had two thousand cavalry in the army he commanded after Triparadisus. See also Goukowsky 1978: 93, n. 84.

of Babylonia in 320, and this left the command of the Companion cavalry and the first hipparchy vacant. The Heidelberg epitome adds weight to this interpretation.¹⁰¹ Here Cassander is also described as “chiliarch of the horse” and this immediately follows Seleucus’ appointment as satrap of Babylonia (*FGrH* 155 F 1.38.5–6; App. *Syr.* 57). The vacancy left by Seleucus was undoubtedly filled by Cassander, and it was a position distinct from the court office of chiliarch that Hephaestion and Perdiccas had held. Diodorus explicitly states that it was later in 319, shortly before the death of Antipater, that Cassander obtained the court chiliarchy that was modelled on the Persian office (Diod. Sic. 18.48.4–5; Plut. *Phoc.* 31.1).¹⁰² From this evidence, the view that the court and equestrian chiliarchies were identical is untenable: it has resulted in nothing but confusion.¹⁰³

Cassander’s chiliarchy is the last time the office appears after Alexander’s death. It was unmistakably, in its final form, a subordinate position for Cassander under Polyperchon because Antipater thought his son too young to exercise supreme power (Diod. Sic. 18.48.5). Although Diodorus relates that Cassander’s chiliarchy made him second in authority to Polyperchon (*ibid.*), we may conclude that the political power in this period was not to be found in an empty court title created by Alexander the Great,¹⁰⁴ since Cassander was soon dissatisfied with the arrangements his father had made and fled to Antigonus in Asia (Diod. Sic. 18.54.3).¹⁰⁵

VII. CONCLUSION

To conclude, the introduction of the chiliarchy was part of a trend towards the transformation of Alexander’s court from ca 330. In the short term, Alexander’s need to legitimise his conquest of the Persian empire (particularly after the usurpation of Bessus) caused the changes, but, in the long term, he needed a new way to express his position as King of Asia and heir to the Achaemenids. We can discern two important and neglected aspects of these changes in Alexander’s court: the use of oriental courtiers (e.g., the ῥάβδοῦχοι and μηλοφόροι), and the introduction of three Persian court offices, *viz.*, the εἰσαγγελεύς, the ἐδέατρος, and the χιλίαρχος.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Heckel 1992a: 369.

¹⁰² Bengtson (1937: 65–67) and Hammond (1985: 157) restrict the authority of the court chiliarchy to the old Persian Empire, but this is unacceptable. Antipater would not have appointed his son chiliarch in Macedonia for Polyperchon if the position had no power there. The return of the kings to Macedonia before Antipater’s death (Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 11.44) implies strongly that the chiliarch had some function in the court. Goukowsky (1978: 94) argues that Cassander became court chiliarch earlier when the kings returned to Europe; this is possible, but there is no evidence for it, and Diodorus (18.48.4–5) implies that the chiliarchy had lapsed after the death of Perdiccas until its revival in 319.

¹⁰³ Cf., for instance, Bevan 1900: 396–398 (see also Bevan 1902: 322) with Bosworth 1971: 132–133.

¹⁰⁴ See Heckel 1992a: 370: “The office of chiliarch was unquestionably one of second rank, desired by none of Hephaestion’s successors.”

¹⁰⁵ Briant 1994: 293, 298.

It seems likely, however, that the chiliarchy was not integral to the administrative functioning of the empire, for the evidence reviewed above militates against the view that it was a fundamental office of state. As Briant has perspicaciously seen, it was probably not much more than a title of honour after the death of Hephaestion. It is notable that no court chiliarch was appointed in the period from 324 to 323 and again from 320 to 319. After the death of Hephaestion, whose power was more the result of his personal friendship with Alexander than the tenure of any office, the king did not appoint a replacement and the reappearance of the chiliarchy after 323 was the result of exceptional circumstances (Briant 1994: 298). In the crisis following Alexander's death at Babylon, Perdikkas emerged as the new chiliarch. Yet, as Heckel (1992a: 366–370) has shown, his power from 323 to 320 was clearly not based on the tenure of this position; instead, his authority (and that of his successors) was based on the positions of ἐπιμελητής and στρατηγός. Antipater did not bother to appoint a new chiliarch at Triparadisus after Perdikkas' death, but revived the post in 319 for his son. Briefly, this title of honour played a role in the politics of the Successors, but, as with much of Alexander's Persian *Hofzeremoniell*, it proved of ephemeral importance.¹⁰⁶

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND
ST LUCIA 4072
BRISBANE, AUSTRALIA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anson, E. M. 1985. "The Hypaspists: Macedonia's Professional Citizen-Soldiers," *Historia* 34: 246–248.
 — 1992. "Craterus and the prostasia," *CP* 87: 38–43.
 Badian, E. 1958. "The Eunuch Bagoas: A Study in Method," *CQ* n.s. 8: 144–157.
 — 1964. *Studies in Greek and Roman History*. Oxford.
 — 1965. "Administration of the Empire," *G&R* 12: 166–182.
 — 1967. "A King's Notebooks," *HSCP* 72: 183–204.
 — 1981. "The Deification of Alexander the Great," in H. J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*. Thessaloniki. 27–71.
 — 1985. "Alexander in Iran," in I. Gershevitch (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran 2: The Median and Achaemenid Periods*. Cambridge. 420–501.
 — 1996. "Alexander the Great between Two Thrones and Heaven: Variations on an Old Theme," in A. Small (ed.), *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*. Ann Arbor. 11–26.
 Baldus, H. R. 1987. "Die Siegel Alexanders des Grossen: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion auf literarischer und numismatischer Grundlage," *Chiron* 17: 395–449.
 Baldson, J. P. V. D. 1950. "The Divinity of Alexander," *Historia* 1: 363–388.
 Beloch, K. J. 1925. *Griechische Geschichte*² 4.1. Berlin and Leipzig.

¹⁰⁶ I wish to express my sincere thanks to R. D. Milns, B. W. Jones, and M. J. Apthorp for reading, correcting, and commenting on this paper; needless to say, any errors that remain are entirely my own.

- Bengtson, H. 1937. *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit: Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht* 1. Munich.
- Benveniste, E. 1966. *Titres et noms propres en Iranien ancien*. Paris.
- Berve, H. 1926. *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*. 2 vols. Munich.
- 1935. "Nabarzanes," *RE* 16.2: 1451–52.
- Bevan, E. R. 1900. "Note on the Command Held by Seleucus, 323–321 B.C.," *CR* 14: 396–398.
- 1902. *The House of Seleucus*. London.
- Billows, R. A. 1990. *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*. Berkeley.
- Borza, E. N. 1990. *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon*. Princeton.
- Bosworth, A. B. 1971. "The Death of Alexander the Great," *CQ* N.S. 21: 112–136.
- 1980a. "Alexander and the Iranians," *JHS* 100: 1–21.
- 1980b. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* 1. Oxford.
- 1988. *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge.
- 1994. "Alexander the Great Part 1: The Events of the Reign," in D. M. Lewis *et al.* (eds.), *CAH*² 6. Cambridge. 791–834.
- 1995. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* 2. Oxford.
- 1996. *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph*. Oxford.
- Brandis, C. G. 1899. "Chiliarchos," *RE* 3: 2275–76.
- Briant, P. 1991. "Le roi est mort: Vive le roi! Remarques sur les rites et rituels de succession chez les Achéménides," in J. Kellens (ed.), *La religion iranienne à l'époque achéménide*. Gent. 1–11.
- 1994. "Sources gréco-hellénistiques, institutions perses et institutions macédoniennes: Continuités, changements et bricolages," in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A. Kuhrt, and M. C. Root (eds.), *Achaemenid History* 8. Leiden. 283–310.
- 1996. *Histoire de l'empire perse: De Cyrus à Alexandre*. Paris.
- Brown, T. S. 1949. "Callisthenes and Alexander," *AJP* 70: 225–248.
- Brunt, P. A. 1963. "Alexander's Macedonian Cavalry," *JHS* 83: 27–46.
- 1976. *Arrian: History of Alexander and Indica* 1. Cambridge, Mass.
- Chantraine, P. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque* 1. Paris.
- Chaumont, M. L. 1973. "Chiliarque et curopalate à la cour des Sassanides," *IrAnt* 10: 139–161.
- Christensen, A. 1944. *L'Iran sous les sassanides*². Copenhagen.
- Cook, J. M. 1983. *The Persian Empire*. London.
- 1985. "The Rise of the Achaemenids and the Establishment of Their Empire," in I. Gershevitch (ed.), *Cambridge History of Iran* 2: *The Median and Achaemenian Periods*. Cambridge. 200–291.
- Dandamaev, M. A. 1989. *A Political History of the Achaemenid Empire*. Leiden.
- Edmunds, L. 1971. "The Religiosity of Alexander," *GRBS* 12: 363–391.
- Ellis, W. M. 1994. *Ptolemy of Egypt*. London.
- Ensslin, W. 1925. "Die Gewaltenteilung im Reichsregiment nach Alexanders Tod," *RbM* 74: 293–307.
- Errington, R. M. 1969. "Bias in Ptolemy's History of Alexander," *CQ* N.S. 19: 233–242.
- 1970. "From Babylon to Triparadeisos: 323–320 B.C.," *JHS* 90: 49–77.
- 1990. *A History of Macedonia*. Tr. C. Errington. Berkeley.

- Fontana, M. J. 1959. *Le lotte per la successione di Alessandro Magno dal 323 al 315*. Palermo.
- Fredricksmeyer, E. A. 1986. "Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Kausia," *TAPA* 116: 215–227.
- 1994. "The Kausia: Macedonian or Indian?," in I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History*. Oxford. 135–158.
- 1997. "The Origin of Alexander's Royal Insignia," *TAPA* 127: 97–109.
- Frost, F. J. 1980. *Plutarch's Themistocles: A Historical Commentary*. Princeton.
- Frye, R. N. 1972. "The Institutions," in G. Walser (ed.), *Beiträge zur Achämenidengeschichte*. Wiesbaden. 83–93.
- 1984. *The History of Ancient Iran*. Munich. 83–93.
- Geyer, F. 1937. "Perdikkas," *RE* 19.1: 604–614.
- Goukowsky, P. 1978. *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre (336–270 av. J.C.)* 1. Nancy.
- Grainger, J. D. 1990. *Seleukos Nikator: Constructing a Hellenistic Kingdom*. London.
- Green, P. 1974. *Alexander of Macedon 356–323 B.C.: A Historical Biography*. Harmondsworth.
- Griffith, G. T. 1963. "A Note on the Hipparchies of Alexander," *JHS* 83: 68–74.
- Hamilton, J. R. 1973. *Alexander the Great*. London.
- 1977. "Cleitarichus and Diodorus 17," in K. H. Kinzl (ed.), *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory*. Berlin and New York. 126–146.
- 1987. "Alexander's Iranian Policy," in W. Will (ed.), *Zu Alexander der Grosse: Festschrift G. Wirth zum 60. Geburtstag am 9.12.86*. Amsterdam. 467–486.
- 1999. *Plutarch: Alexander*² (with addenda by P. A. Stadter). London.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1983. *Three Historians of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge.
- 1985. "Some Macedonian Offices c. 336–309 B.C.," *JHS* 105: 156–160.
- 1986. "The Kingdom of Asia and the Persian Throne," *Antichthon* 20: 73–85.
- 1989. *Alexander the Great, King, Commander and Statesman*². Bristol.
- 1991. "The Various Guards of Philip II and Alexander III," *Historia* 40: 396–417.
- 1995. "Did Alexander Use One or Two Seals?," *Chiron* 25: 199–203.
- 1996. "Some Passages in Polyaeus' Stratagems Concerning Alexander," *GRBS* 37: 23–53.
- Heckel, W. 1980. "Alexander at the Persian Gates," *Athenaeum* 58: 168–174.
- 1986. "Somatophylakia: A Macedonian Cursus Honorum," *Phoenix* 40: 279–294.
- 1992a. *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*. London.
- 1992b. "Doryphorae in Curtius 3.1.15 Again," *RhM* 135.2: 191–192.
- Hinz, W. 1969. *Altiranische Funde und Forschungen*. Berlin.
- Hoffmann, O. 1906. *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum*. Göttingen.
- Hornblower, J. 1981. *Hieronymus of Cardia*. Oxford.
- Junge, P. J. 1940. "Hazarapatiš," *Klio* 34: 13–33.
- Justi, F. 1896. "Der Chiliarch des Dareios," *ZDMG* 50: 659–664.
- Kallérís, J. N. 1988. *Les anciens macédoniens: Étude linguistique et historique* 1. Athens (orig. publ. Athens 1954).
- Lane Fox, R. 1973. *Alexander the Great*. London.
- Laqueur, R. 1919. "Zur Geschichte des Krateros," *Hermes* 54: 295–300.
- Lauffer, S. 1978. *Alexander der Grosse*. Munich.
- Lendle, O. 1992. *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung: Von Hekataios bis Zosimos*. Darmstadt.

- Lewis, D. M. 1977. *Sparta and Persia*. Leiden.
- Lund, H. S. 1992. *Lysimachus: A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*. London.
- Marquart, J. 1896. "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran 6: Hazarapet," *Philologus* 55: 227–234.
- Mason, H. J. 1974. *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: A Lexicon and Analysis*. Toronto.
- Mau, A. 1903. "Diadema," *RE* 5.1: 303–305.
- Meister, K. 1990. *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus*. Stuttgart, Berlin, and Cologne.
- Milns, R. D. 1971. "The Hypaspists of Alexander III: Some Problems," *Historia* 20: 186–195.
- 1983. "A Note on Arrian's Anabasis 5.13.1," *CP* 78: 47–50.
- Mooren, L. 1975. *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Brussels.
- Neuffer, E. 1929. *Das Kostüm Alexanders des Grossen*. Diss., Giessen.
- O'Brien, J. M. 1992. *Alexander the Great: The Invisible Enemy*. London.
- Pearson, L. 1960. *The Lost Historians of Alexander the Great*. New York.
- Ritter, H. W. 1965. *Diadem und Königsherrschaft: Untersuchungen zu Zeremonien und Rechtsgrundlagen des Herrschaftsantritts bei den Persern, bei Alexander dem Grossen und in Hellenismus*. Munich and Berlin.
- 1987. "Die Bedeutung des Diadems," *Historia* 36: 290–301.
- Roisman, J. 1984. "Ptolemy and His Rivals in His History of Alexander," *CQ* n.s. 34: 373–385.
- Rosen, K. 1967. "Die Reichsordnung von Babylon (323 v. Chr.)," *Acta Classica* 10: 95–110.
- Schachermeyr, F. 1925. "Zu Geschichte und Staatsrecht der frühen Diadochenzeit," *Klio* 18: 435–461.
- 1949. *Alexander der Grosse: Ingenium und Macht*. Graz.
- 1970. *Alexander in Babylon und die Reichsordnung nach seinem Tode*. Vienna.
- 1973. *Alexander der Grosse*. Vienna.
- Schur, W. 1934. "Das Alexanderreich nach Alexanders Tode," *RhM* 83: 129–156.
- Schwahn, W. 1930. "Die Nachfolge Alexanders des Grossen," *Klio* 23: 211–238.
- 1931. "Die Nachfolge Alexanders des Grossen," *Klio* 24: 306–332.
- Seibert, J. 1972. *Alexander der Grosse*. Darmstadt.
- 1983. *Das Zeitalter der Diadochen*. Darmstadt.
- Sekunda, N. 1988. "Achaemenid Military Terminology," *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 21: 69–79.
- Simpson, R. H. 1959. "Abbreviation of Hieronymus in Diodorus," *AJP* 80: 370–379.
- Smith, R. R. 1988. *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*. Oxford.
- Stähelin, F. 1919. "Kassandros," *RE* 10.2: 2293–2313.
- Stewart, A. 1993. *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*. Berkeley.
- Tarn, W. W. 1921. "Alexander's ὑπομνήματα and the World Kingdom," *JHS* 41: 1–17.
- 1948. *Alexander the Great*. Cambridge.
- Tuplin, C. 1990. "Persian Decor in *Cyropaedia*: Some Observations," in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and J. W. Drijvers (eds.), *Achaemenid History* 5. Leiden. 17–29.
- Will, E. 1979. *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique* 1. Nancy.