Histos Supplement 5 (2016) 199–242

6

SUBORDINATE OFFICERS IN XENOPHON'S *ANABASIS*[*]

Luuk Huitink and Tim Rood

Abstract: This chapter focuses on Xenophon's treatment of divisions within the command structure presented in the *Anabasis*, and in particular on three military positions that are briefly mentioned—the taxiarch, ὑποστράτηγος, and ὑπολόχαγος. Arguing against the prescriptive military hierarchies proposed in earlier scholarship, it suggests that 'taxiarch' should be understood fluidly and that the appearance of both the ὑποστράτηγος and the ὑπολόχαγος may be due to interpolation. The chapter also includes discussion of two types of comparative material: procedures for replacing dead, absent, or deposed generals at Athens and Sparta in the Classical period, and the lexical development of subordinate positions with the prefix ὑπο-.

Keywords: Xenophon, *Anabasis*, subordinate commanders, taxiarch, ὑποστράτηγος, ὑπολόχαγος.

Xenophon's *Anabasis* has more often been broadly eulogised for its supposed depiction of the democratic spirit of the Greek mercenaries whose adventures are recounted than analysed closely for the details it offers about the command structure of this 'wandering republic'.[1] When Xenophon's presentation of

[*] References are to Xenophon's *Anabasis* unless otherwise specified. Translations are adapted from the Loeb edition of Brownson and Dillery. We are grateful to Peter Rhodes for advice and to Simon Hornblower, Nick Stylianou, David Thomas, the editor, and the anonymous referee of *Histos* for comments on the whole article. Luuk Huitink's work on this paper was made possible by ERC Grant Agreement n. 312321 (AncNar).

[1] Krüger (1826) 154 ('civitatem peregrinantem'). On the command structure see Nussbaum (1967) 22–48; Roy (1967) 287–96; Lee (2007) 44–59, 92–5.

the command structure is discussed in its own right, it tends to be in relation either to the apologetic strains found in the *Anabasis* or to the broader theory of leadership that runs through his diverse corpus and that is sometimes historicised as a prototype of Hellenistic models.[2] The aim of this article is to focus instead on Xenophon's treatment of the divisions within the command structure presented in the *Anabasis*, and in particular the difficulties raised by three military positions that make fleeting appearances in the *Anabasis*—ταξίαρχος, ὑποστράτηγος, and ὑπολόχαγος. The first of these nouns appears in Xenophon's account twice (3.1.37, 4.1.28), while the two ὑπο- forms are found just once (3.1.32 and 5.2.13 respectively—ὑποστράτηγος for the first, and ὑπολόχαγος for the only, time in extant Greek literature; there is also a single use of the verb ὑποστρατηγεῖν (5.6.36)).

Despite the lack of attention paid to these positions by Xenophon, the very fact that they are mentioned at all might seem a pointer to the growing professionalisation in Greek military practice that is often seen as a distinctive feature of the fourth century.[3] But what are their functions? In the case of the ταξίαρχος, its second appearance, as we shall see, has frequently led scholars to assume that it was a formal term for light-armed officers in the Ten Thousand. As for the ὑποστράτηγος, the contexts in which the noun and the cognate verb are used have been taken to suggest that the word denotes an officer who replaces a dead or absent στρατηγός; and by extension, in the absence of other contextual clues, the same model has been applied to the ὑπολόχαγος. In this article, we will point to various problems in current scholarly views about the functions of these positions, propose a new interpretation of the ταξίαρχος, and raise the possibility that the appearances of the ὑποστράτηγος and ὑπολόχαγος are due to interpolation.

[2] Dürrbach (1893) remains the most detailed and hostile discussion of the *Anabasis* as apology; on the leadership theory see most recently Gray (2011); for the Hellenistic link see, e.g., Dillery (2004) 259–76.

[3] See, e.g., Hornblower (2011) 195–203.

Before offering a detailed analysis of the internal evidence provided by the *Anabasis*, however, we will look briefly at two types of comparative material relevant to *ὑποστράτηγοι* and *ὑπολόχαγοι* in particular: firstly, procedures for replacing dead, absent, or deposed generals at Athens and Sparta in the Classical period; secondly, the lexical development of subordinate positions with the prefix *ὑπο-*. Even if the specific textual suggestions that are here proposed are rejected, these subordinate positions deserve more extensive analysis than they have so far received.

1. Suffect Officers

At Athens there is little evidence for procedures when officers were absent or died, even though [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 61 offers an account of how different military offices were elected. This account does mention that *στρατηγοί* and *ἵππαρχοι* faced an *ἐπιχειροτονία* each prytany, but while [Aristotle] specifies that if put on trial they are reappointed if acquitted, he does not state who is appointed in their place if they are found guilty. Nor does he offer evidence for replacement procedures for the lesser officers he mentions, whether they be directly elected, like the tribal *ταξίαρχοι* or *φύλαρχοι*, or chosen by a superior, like the *λοχαγοί*.[4]

Striking evidence for the lack of a formal system in the case of a general's temporary absence is provided by X.'s account of the prelude to the battle of Notium in 406.[5] Alcibiades is described by X. as leaving his pilot (*τὸν αὑτοῦ κυβερνήτην*) Antiochus in charge of the Athenian navy (*HG* 1.5.11)—an appointment described by Krentz as 'exceptional' and explained by the fact that 'no generals were available'.[6] Even in the absence of other generals, it is

[4] See Rhodes (1993) 676–88 on the details of the discussion of 'elective military officials'.

[5] For the rest of this article, 'X.' stands for the author Xenophon, 'Xenophon' for the character.

[6] Krentz (1989) 138. See also Jordan (1975) 138–43, esp. 141.

remarkable that Alcibiades gave the command to his pilot—a professional, unelected position.

As for the death or deposition of a general, the first clear evidence for Athenian procedures comes a few years before Notium.[7] In 414/13 Nicias, the only remaining general of the Athenian force in Sicily after the deposition of Alcibiades and the death of Lamachus, sent to Athens to ask to be replaced himself. The Athenians instead chose two men on the spot, Menander and Euthydemus, as additional *στρατηγοί* (Th. 7.16.1: *προσείλοντο*), until Nicias' new colleagues Demosthenes and Eurymedon (who were already *στρατηγοί*) should arrive. It seems likely that Menander and Euthydemus were made *στρατηγοί* in addition to the regular ten, having previously served as subordinate officers (perhaps *ταξίαρχοι*).[8] Whatever the earlier status of the replacement generals, the example of the Athenian force in Sicily reveals clearly that there was no automatic system for replacing missing *στρατηγοί*.[9] This procedure seems to be confirmed, moreover, by the aftermath of the battle of Arginusae in 406: after two *στρατηγοί* had died and seven had been deposed, the Athenians chose in addition to the single remaining *στρατηγός* (*πρὸς δὲ τούτῳ εἵλοντο*, X. *HG* 1.7.1) two new *στρατηγοί*, evidently leaving a board of only three for the rest of the year.[10]

In Classical Greece, it is Sparta that provides the best evidence for procedures on the deaths of military leaders.

[7] ML 33, a casualty list with two generals from one tribe in the same year, is possible evidence for replacement, but it is also possible that two generals from that tribe were elected initially; see Fornara (1971) 46.

[8] Develin (1989) 152, 154; Alcibiades had been deposed the previous year (415/14), so the new *στρατηγοί* are not a straight replacement. For a different view of the Sicilian command, see Hamel (1998) 196–200.

[9] The expedition was distinctive in that the three initial generals were sent *αὐτοκράτορες* (Th. 6.8.2, 26.1), but this point does not undermine the broader argument.

[10] There is further evidence for the remaining years of the Peloponnesian War: for 406/5 Lysias was probably suffect for Archestratus (Rhodes (1993) 423); in 405/4 Eucrates was chosen after the battle of Aegospotami (Lys. 18.4). For fatalities among generals in the Classical period, see Pritchett (1994) 127–38, Hamel (1998) 204–9.

Some of this evidence concerns the navy. Diodorus presents the *ναύαρχος* Callicratidas learning from a seer before the battle of Arginusae that he will die in the battle (13.98.1). That he proceeds in a speech to proclaim Clearchus as his successor implies that there was no fixed replacement. But Diodorus' narrative is evidently suspect (Callicratidas' foreknowledge matches the dream attributed to one of the Athenian generals (13.97.6)).[11] From the evidence of X.'s *Hellenica* and the lexicographer Pollux, however, it has generally been assumed that there was in fact a 'vice-admiral', the *ἐπιστολεύς*, who would take over in the event of the admiral's death (the only other occurrence of the Spartan position is at Plu. *Lys.* 7.2, evidently drawing from X.). The first evidence for this position is when Hippocrates, *ἐπιστολεύς* for Mindarus, sends a letter to the Spartans explaining that Mindarus is dead (*HG* 1.1.23). The next is when, owing to the rule that a *ναύαρχος* could not serve twice in succession, Lysander is sent as *ἐπιστολεύς* instead (*HG* 2.1.7). The *Hellenica* subsequently offers further evidence of an *ἐπιστολεύς* taking over on the death of the *ναύαρχος* (4.8.11); of an officer called by the *hapax* *ἐπιστολιαφόρος* acting in the same way (6.2.25); and also of an *ἐπιστολεύς* being left in charge of a separate contingent by the *ναύαρχος* (5.1.5–6). This idea of the position is also presented by Pollux (1.96), though with the support of a false etymology: *οὕτω γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ στόλου διάδοχος τοῦ ναυάρχου* ('this was the name for the *nauarch*'s successor in charge of the expedition').

The evidence of the *Hellenica* does nonetheless suggest that the translation 'vice-admiral' presents too simple a picture of the position of *ἐπιστολεύς*.[12] The point of the

[11] Bleckmann (1998) 98 n. 219 suggests that Diodorus' source deliberately blended into one long speech several short speeches delivered by Callicratidas in X.'s *Hellenica.* Roisman (1987) 32, by contrast, speaks of Clearchus as Callicratidas' *ἐπιστολεύς*. X. *HG* 1.6.35–8 and 2.1.1–5 implies rather that Eteonicus took over the command.

[12] *LSJ*, s.v. II. Compare and contrast Kagan (1987) 380: 'Normally the *epistoleus* was the navarch's secretary, as the word implies, and vice-

Lysander story—that his appointment is a cunning ruse on the Spartans' part—is spoiled if he was actually given the regular post of deputy. The primary sense 'secretary' corresponds better with the noun's etymological link with the verb ἐπιστέλλειν and also with the role Hippocrates performs in communicating with Sparta.[13] It is still possible that the responsibilities involved in the position changed over time from 'secretary' to 'vice-admiral'; if so, it is still worth noting that this is a development that X. leaves to be inferred rather than commenting on it directly. But even this assumption is slightly complicated by the fact that the ἐπιστολεύς left in charge of a separate contingent at 5.1.5 was evidently not in a position to take over straightaway if needed.[14]

While the evidence for the Spartan navy is complicated, there is one very clear reference to replacement officers in the Spartan army. This reference comes in Thucydides' account of the fighting on Sphacteria in 425 (4.38.1):

> Στύφων ὁ Φάρακος, τῶν πρότερον ἀρχόντων τοῦ μὲν πρώτου τεθνηκότος Ἐπιτάδου, τοῦ δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν Ἱππαγρέτου ἐφῃρημένου ἐν τοῖς νεκροῖς ἔτι ζῶντος κειμένου ὡς τεθνεῶτος, αὐτὸς τρίτος ἐφῃρημένος ἄρχειν κατὰ νόμον, εἴ τι ἐκεῖνοι πάσχοιεν.

admiral'; Lazenby (2012) 27–8, who first uses the term 'vice-admiral', then glosses ἐπιστολεύς as 'secretary'; and Rusch (2014), who refers to Hippocrates as 'secretary and second-in-command'.

[13] Michell (1952) 279–80, though he makes Hippocrates act as 'vice-admiral' (plausibly enough if he is to be identified with the Hippocrates of Th. 8.35.1, see Hornblower (1991–2008) 3.847); he further argues from Th. 8.99, D.S. 13.97–8 and X. *HG* 4.8.11 that there were junior and senior ἐπιστολεῖς, but (though it fits with the triple command attested in the Spartan army, see below) this seems unwarranted. The development of the role may also be linked with changes in the nauarchy, which probably became an annual office only in the last decade of the Peloponnesian War; see Sealey (1976).

[14] Green (2010) 279 n. 12 rightly complains that *LSJ*, s.v. II 'wrongly rationalizes'. *LSJ* also gives the sense 'secretary', citing an inscription and a Persian position mentioned in Suda, s.v. ἐπιστέλλει.

> From the generals appointed earlier the first in command, Epitadas, was dead, while his chosen successor, Hippagretus, was lying among the corpses taken for dead (though he was actually alive). Styphon had therefore been selected as third in succession, to take command, according to Spartan law, should anything befall the others. (Trans. Mynott)

Here we find a word for 'chosen successor', *ἐφῃρημένου*, whose derivation is clear but which was also rare enough to attract a comment from a scholiast (*ἀντὶ τοῦ μετ' ἐκεῖνον ᾑρημένου καὶ χειροτονηθέντος*).[15] But 'we do not know how extensive were the circumstances in which the law required or allowed the appointment of reserve commanders';[16] indeed, as Hornblower suggests, *κατὰ νόμον* may refer to custom rather than a formal law, so that Thucydides 'may just be saying that the arrangement described in the present passage was typically Spartan and orderly' (he aptly compares Thucydides' detailed description of the chain of command in the Spartan army at 5.66, which seems to imply that this type of hierarchy is distinctively Spartan).[17] One point at least that is clear from this passage is that the choice of two possible replacement leaders was made before the battle (unlike in the Roman examples in Cassius Dio, where replacements are chosen only when needed). This procedure may be paralleled from a campaign earlier in the Peloponnesian War where the Spartan leader Eurylochus is described as accompanied by two Spartiates (*ξυνηκολούθουν*, Th. 3.100.2), one of whom takes over

[15] The verb is found also at D.C. 36.4.1, 49.43.7, who perhaps borrowed it from Thucydides; cf. *ὁ ἐφαιρεθείς* (of a successor in the event of death) in an inscription from Delphi (*SGDI* ii.1832, second century BC).

[16] Rhodes (1998) 232.

[17] Hornblower (1991–2008) 2.193.

command after the deaths of both Eurylochus and the other officer (3.109.1).[18]

Given that Spartan influence is often seen in some other aspects of the army's organisation, the Spartan parallel may be important for understanding the command structure adopted by the Ten Thousand. As we shall see, however, the clearest Spartan link lies in the titles used for lesser officers; in view of this, it should be stressed that there is no evidence for the use of *ὑπο*-terminology in the Spartan army.

2. Subordinate Officers

Since the *Anabasis* offers the first attested use of *ὑποστράτηγος* and the only instance of *ὑπολόχαγος*, it will be helpful at this stage, before turning to the *Anabasis* itself, to gather evidence for other military and civic offices with a *ὑπο*-prefix indicating subordination. In order to show the development of this terminology, we present in an Appendix a list, ordered chronologically, of all such positions that are attested by the third century AD.

Three features of the positions gathered in this list cast some light on X.'s use of *ὑποστράτηγος* and *ὑπολόχαγος*. Firstly, there is the distribution of evidence: many of the positions are attested not in literary texts but in inscriptions and documentary papyri. This distribution points to the comparative lack of detailed attention paid by ancient historians to administrative structures, whether within the polis or within armies, and so adds to the unusualness of the two *ὑπο*-prefixes in the *Anabasis*. Secondly, the list shows that a number of other *ὑπο*-positions are attested by X.'s time; indeed, there is even evidence from X. himself of scholarly exegesis of the Homeric *hapax* *ὑφηνίοχος* (see Appendix). The list also shows, as we might expect, a marked increase in the number of terms used over time;

[18] This link was made by Arnold (1840) 1.479. At *HG* 4.8.19–21, Diphridas takes over after the death of Thibron, but X. does not dwell on the technicalities.

while part of this increase is due to the accidents of survival, the evidence does seem to situate the *ὑπο*-prefixes attested in the *Anabasis* in a pattern of growing professionalisation in the Greek world. Finally, the *ὑπο*-positions gathered in the list display (again as we might expect) a marked lack of uniformity: at times a single *ὑπο*-officer, at times several with the same title, serve a higher officer.[19] Whatever the proportion of subordinates to superiors, however, we have very little evidence in any of these cases for the distribution of responsibilities or for procedures in the event of death or deposition of superiors.

What of the *ὑποστράτηγος* itself? As we have noted, *Anabasis* 3.1.32 is the earliest occurrence of the word in extant Greek. After X., the word is next found in the Hellenistic period as the title of an officer in the Achaean League (Pol. 4.59.2, 5.94.1, 38.18.2), though 'the scope and duties of this office are obscure; nor is it clear whether there were several or only one'.[20] It is also found in inscriptions (for instance from Tenos, Magnesia, and Egypt) from the second century BC. In historiography it is used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus of a position offered by Pyrrhus to a Roman envoy (19.14.6). It is then used more frequently in Josephus, Plutarch, and Appian, before becoming particularly common in Cassius Dio and Byzantine writers. In Roman contexts, it is generally applied, during the Republic, to a high-ranking man such as an ex-consul or ex-praetor sent to offer counsel to a consul, and, after Augustus' reforms, to the *legatus legionis*, the general in command of a legion.[21] Two common features can at least be noted. Firstly, it is often plural rather than singular: Roman consuls would typically have more than one *ὑποστράτηγος*; the word is also used by Appian (*BC* 1.116) of

[19] Contrast, e.g., the *ὑποστρατοφύλαξ* (Strabo 12.5.1: *στρατοφύλακα ἕνα ὑπὸ τῷ τετράρχῃ τεταγμένους*, *ὑποστρατοφύλακας δὲ δύο*) and the *ὑπογυμνασίαρχος*, which regularly on inscriptions matches a single *γυμνασίαρχος*.

[20] Walbank (1957–79) 1.514 (n. on Pol. 4.59.4); also 2.323–4.

[21] Cf. Lyd. *Mag.* (p. 90 Bandy): *δι' ὑποστρατήγων*, *τῶν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις λεγομένων ληγάτων*. See further Vrind (1923) 72–80.

two gladiators used by Spartacus as his seconds-in-command. Secondly, there is no expectation of succession: when Josephus has Moses speak of himself as ὑποστράτηγος of God (*AJ* 4.317; cf. 297), he is not presenting him as a Nietzschean *avant la lettre*.

A similar pattern is shown by the verb ὑποστρατηγεῖν, which is less common than the noun. As noted above, this verb is used once in the *Anabasis*. It is next found in Plutarch (*Per.* 13.15), who uses it of an individual, Menippus, who is said to have been exploited by Pericles. But Plutarch is evidently not using it in a technical sense, given that there was no position of ὑποστράτηγος in Classical Athens; it is quite possible that Menippus was not formally a στρατηγός.[22]

This section suggests, then, that there is no reason to suppose that the rank of ὑποστράτηγος—let alone that of ὑπολόχαγος—would have been in any way familiar to X.'s original audience, but that the ὑποστράτηγος, at least, was much more familiar from the imperial period onwards, during the centuries in which the *Anabasis*, along with X.'s other writings, was being transmitted and used as a school text. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that the relative lack of attention paid by Herodotus and Thucydides to replacement positions could result from the limits of their interests rather than from the lack of more formal systems. With this proviso in mind, it is time now to turn to the evidence for subordinate positions that can be inferred from the *Anabasis* itself. We will first survey the various types of leader mentioned by X.; then we will focus on the ταξίαρχοι in particular; finally, we will explore the problems that result from the inclusion of the ὑποστράτηγος and ὑπολόχαγος.

[22] Menippus is also named as Pericles' accomplice by Plutarch at *Mor.* 812c (Περικλῆς Μενίππῳ μὲν ἐχρῆτο πρὸς τὰς στρατηγίας), without any hint of a formal office. Develin (1989) 103 doubts that Menippus was a στρατηγός at all; contrast Fornara (1971) 50. See also Stadter (1989) 178–9.

3. The Command Structure of the Ten Thousand

X.'s account of Cyrus' gathering of his army at the start of Book 1 stresses his personal ties of xenia with the men who form and lead each separate contingent. After that, the narrative of the march upcountry in Book 1 focuses especially on Cyrus' dealings with two of the *στρατηγοί*, Clearchus and Meno, as well as the rivalry between these two men. The only officers apart from the *στρατηγοί* mentioned in Book 1 are the *λοχαγοί* ('captains'), leaders of subunits called *λόχοι*: they are mentioned once as part of the audience for a speech by Cyrus (1.7.2) and once in a flashback in Cyrus' obituary (1.9.17), both times alongside the *στρατηγοί*.[23]

There is a shift in the narrative following Cyrus' death at the battle of Cunaxa. When the leaders of the various contingents meet, Clearchus takes the role of leader and spokesman from the outset (2.1.4); X. subsequently makes it clear that his authority rests on his perceived personal experience and wisdom rather than on formal election (2.2.5). The *λοχαγοί* as a group also start to become more prominent, though they still always act in concert with the *στρατηγοί* (2.2.3, 5, 8; 3.29; 5.25, 29, 36)—except insofar as the twenty *λοχαγοί* who accompany five *στρατηγοί* on their visit to Tissaphernes are killed outside his tent while the *στρατηγοί* are seized within (2.5.30–2).

A new clarity in the Greeks' command structure emerges at the start of Book 3, when replacements for the five *στρατηγοί* are elected (3.1.47, see below) and the army votes that the Spartan Chirisophus should lead the front of the new square formation while the distribution of *στρατηγοί* to the sides and rear should be determined by age (3.2.37). Further complications emerge later in the retreat, notably when the army briefly elects a single commander. The only salient detail worth noting here is that in the context of negotiations with the Thracian despot Seuthes, X. brings out a pay differential: *στρατηγοί* receive twice the pay of

[23] Also, two *λόχοι* (dis)appear at 1.2.25, while Meno holds up the promise of future *λοχαγίαι* in a speech to his men at 1.4.15.

λοχαγοί, who receive twice the pay of ordinary soldiers (7.2.36, 6.1, 6.7); this ratio is said to be customary (7.3.10), and so presumably operated as well when the army was in Cyrus' pay.

Further precision about the role of the λοχαγοί is added piecemeal in the course of the retreat. At one point X. mentions that the λοχαγοί in the rear have a system of leadership that rotates on a daily basis (4.7.8: τούτου γὰρ ἡ ἡγεμονία ἦν τῶν ὀπισθοφυλάκων λοχαγῶν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, explaining why a Parrhasian λοχαγός acts together with Chirisophus and Xenophon). Besides this, for exceptional tasks, X. notes that officers sometimes command more than one company: at 5.1.17 Cleaenetus leads out his own and another λόχος, conceivably a private mission, while at 6.5.11 units of 200 soldiers in reserve on the left and right and in the centre each have their own leader (Σαμόλας Ἀχαιὸς ταύτης ἦρχε τῆς τάξεως … Πυρρίας Ἀρκὰς ταύτης ἦρχε … Φρασίας Ἀθηναῖος ταύτῃ ἐφειστήκει).

Two types of hoplite officer below the λοχαγοί are instituted when Xenophon modifies the army's march formation: πεντηκοντῆρες and ἐνωμόταρχοι. These terms denote the leaders of two smaller units (probably of fifty and twenty-five men respectively) introduced in six special mobile λόχοι, three at the front, three to the rear (3.4.21). They are both terms found in the Spartan army (Th. 5.66.3, 68.3; X. *Lac.* 11.4), though it is not clear exactly how the positions introduced in the Ten Thousand correspond with the Spartan system.[24]

In addition to these hoplite officers, specific commands are mentioned for the non-hoplites. The cavalry leader, Lycius, is called ἵππαρχος when the post is instituted (3.3.20) and later ὁ τὴν τάξιν ἔχων τῶν ἱππέων (4.3.22). The leaders of the light-armed units, on the other hand, are referenced with the verb ἦρχε (1.10.7: Episthenes the peltast leader; 4.2.28: Stratocles the leader of the Cretan archers); with the same periphrasis used for Lycius the cavalry commander (4.3.22: Aeschines ὁ τὴν τάξιν [sc. ἔχων] τῶν πελταστῶν τῶν

[24] See Gomme–Andrewes–Dover (1945–81) IV.110–17.

ἀμφὶ Χ*ειρίσοφον*); or with the phrases *λοχαγοὺς* … *πελταστάς* (4.1.26) and *τῶν γυμνήτων ταξιάρχων* (4.1.28).

This survey has suggested that X. provides enough detail over the course of the work to enable us to reconstruct a range of different positions in the army, but that he is much more sparing with information on how these positions actually operated. Before turning to *ὑποστράτηγοι* and *ὑπολόχαγοι*, however, we need to consider in more detail the light-armed *ταξίαρχοι* mentioned at 4.1.28 in relation to the *ταξίαρχοι* to whom (along with the *στρατηγοί* and *λοχαγοί*) Xenophon appeals in his speech to the assembled officers at 3.1.37: *ὑμεῖς γάρ ἐστε στρατηγοί, ὑμεῖς ταξίαρχοι καὶ λοχαγοί*.

3.1 *ταξίαρχοι*

Given that *γυμνήτων ταξιάρχων* at 4.1.28 is the only other use of the word in the *Anabasis*, it is most commonly assumed that the *ταξίαρχοι* at 3.1.37 are also the light-armed commanders.[25] This assumption is, however, problematic. A *ταξίαρχος* is simply a leader of a *τάξις*—a term used in the *Anabasis* (and elsewhere) of military units (both temporary and permanent) of cavalry (see above) and hoplites (e.g. 1.5.14: *τάξις … τῶν ὁπλιτῶν*, of a unit following Proxenus, one of the *στρατηγοί*) as well as of light-armed troops.[26] Unsurprisingly, then, a range of possible applications is suggested for *ταξίαρχος* in lexicographers (e.g. Suda, s.v. *ἡγεμών*, *στρατοπεδάρχης*), inscriptions, and literary texts. The word is first attested in a fragment of Aeschylus describing ranks established by Palamedes (*TGrF* fr. 182): *καὶ ταξιάρχας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχας <στρατῶι> / ἔταξα* ('I

[25] E.g. Roy (1967) 295, Lee (2007) 65. The possible objection that *γυμνήτων* at 4.1.28 is on this view otiose has no force if *ταξίαρχοι* denoted leaders of non-hoplite units (a cavalry unit has been formed in the meantime).

[26] Cf. Lee (2007) 95–6. X.'s fluidity militates against the otherwise reasonable assumption that 'the presence of *taxeis* on the anabasis would suggest that *taxis* commanders (*taxiarchoi*) might also be present with the army' (Trundle (2004) 136).

appointed taxiarchs and leaders of hundreds for the army'). This fragment is evidently set in the time of the Trojan War, but it may nonetheless be a first hint of the official Athenian rank of *ταξίαρχος*: commander of one of the ten tribal regiments. Herodotus, by contrast, uses the word three times for subordinate commanders in the Persian army (7.99.1, 8.67, 9.42.1) and once for Spartan officers (9.53.2); the looseness of his use is suggested by the fact that the latter include *λοχαγοί*. Outside Athens, Xenophon in the *Hellenica* combines it with *λοχαγοί* to describe the officers in Spartan armies that include mercenary contingents (including the remnants of the Ten Thousand: 3.1.28, 2.16; 4.1.26; also 6.2.18), while in the *Cyropaedia* it is the most common general term for 'commander', but also inserted in hierarchical lists between *χιλίαρχοι* and *λοχαγοί* (2.1.23, 3.3.11);[27] in neither work is the word used to distinguish between commanders of hoplites and light-armed troops.[28]

The identification of the *ταξίαρχοι* to whom Xenophon appeals at 3.1.37 with light-armed officers is made difficult not just by the vagueness of the term itself but also by the immediate context, where X. has mentioned the summoning only of *στρατηγοί*, *ὑποστράτηγοι* and *λοχαγοί* (3.1.32). The explicit summoning of *λοχαγούς … πελταστάς* to a later meeting (4.1.26: *συγκαλέσαντας λοχαγοὺς καὶ πελταστὰς καὶ τῶν ὁπλιτῶν*) tells, moreover, against the possibility that light-armed troops are subsumed in the narrative within the *λοχαγοί* whenever they hold meetings with the *στρατηγοί*. It also shows that X.'s terminology is

[27] But note its absence from other lists, such as 8.1.14 or the sequence of numerical denominations at Hdt. 7.81. Attempts to map the Persian system attested in the *Cyropaedia* against Spartan practice equate *ταξίαρχοι* with Spartan *πολέμαρχοι* (for references see Tuplin (1994) 170 n. 34).

[28] Michell (1952) 258 tentatively suggests on the basis of *HG* that *ταξίαρχοι* may have been a formal term in Spartan mercenary armies; even if this thesis were true, the later evidence of *HG* does not bear on terminology used in the Ten Thousand, despite the Spartan influence on the army.

inconsistent, since these men must be the same as the *γυμνήτων ταξιάρχων* mentioned soon afterwards (4.1.28).[29] A further objection to the identification of the *ταξίαρχοι* with light-armed officers lies in the rhetorical weight that it gives to the light-armed troops, who are otherwise entirely ignored in the speeches X. records from the meetings of the officers and of the whole army. Any focus on the light-armed troops (many of whom were non-Greek in origin[30]) would detract from the general image that these speeches present of the mercenaries as a collection of Greek hoplites.

Two further possibilities are worth mentioning briefly. One is that the *ταξίαρχοι* are leaders of two *λόχοι*.[31] This identification can be supported by the wording at 6.5.11 (cited above; note *ἦρχε τῆς τάξεως*); it also provides a slightly closer fit with usage at Athens and elsewhere.[32] The problem with this proposal, however, is that all attested combinations of *λόχοι* among the Ten Thousand are merely temporary expedients. Another suggestion is that the *ταξίαρχοι* are commanders of the front *λόχος* in each unit and the same as the *ὑποστράτηγοι* who were invited to the meeting at 3.1.37.[33] The *ὑποστράτηγοι* themselves we analyse in detail below: for now it is enough to note that there is no evidence in the *Anabasis* for a distinct position of leader of the first *λόχος* (corresponding with the Roman *primipilus*).

[29] Cobet (1873) 116 audaciously normalised X.'s usage by printing *ταξιάρχους τῶν πελταστῶν* at 4.1.26. That there was some confusion about the position in the process of transmission may be suggested by the presence of the disjunctive *ἢ* before *ταξιαρχῶν* in the f MSS—one of the two main traditions: the c MSS have often been thought superior, but analysis of papyri and citations in antiquity does not show a preference for c over f readings (see Persson (1915)); there are numerous substantial differences between the two traditions).

[30] Lee (2007) 65.

[31] Krüger (1826) 149.

[32] As Anderson (1970) 97 notes, 'where both words are used, the *lochos* is always a subdivision of the *taxis*'.

[33] Zeune (1785) 168 ('primi ordinis centurio'); similarly (but with no specification of the function of the position) Buzzetti (2014) 126 n. 44.

Given the difficulties with these various suggestions, we propose instead that Xenophon's appeal *ὑμεῖς ταξίαρχοι καὶ λοχαγοί* is not in fact directed at two distinct ranks. Rather, it should be understood as an effective rhetorical amplification after *ὑμεῖς … στρατηγοί*[34] and also in the context of the exhortation that follows (3.1.37): 'while peace lasted, you had the advantage of them alike in pay and in standing; now, therefore, when a state of war exists, it is right to expect that you should be superior to the common soldiers, and that you should plan for them and toil for them whenever there be need.' Xenophon, that is, is not appealing to formal ranks in the Ten Thousand, but using general and flattering terms to evoke the sense of entitlement and responsibilities of an officer class. This interpretation has the advantage of making good sense of Xenophon's rhetoric while also explaining why *ταξίαρχοι* are not mentioned at any of the other meetings in the *Anabasis*. The combination of positions especially prominent at Athens (*ταξίαρχοι*) and Sparta (*λοχαγοί*) can even be seen as a subtle piece of self-positioning on Xenophon's part in his first speech to the assembled officers (the Spartan Chirisophus goes on to comment that all he knew of Xenophon previously was that he was an Athenian (3.1.45)).[35]

[34] Cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1365a10–15 on division into parts. Xenophon balances the social need to name the generals before the captains with the stylistic need to make the second colon more impressive; contrast how the tripartite structure found in the imitation of our passage at Arr. *An.* 7.9.8, *ὑμεῖς σατράπαι*, *ὑμεῖς στρατηγοί*, *ὑμεῖς ταξιάρχαι*, makes for an impressive effect even though there is only a single term in each limb.

[35] Two provisos should be made. Firstly, *λοχαγοί* are attested in Athens (Crowley (2012) 36–9) both in fourth-century literary sources (X. *Mem.* 3.1.5, 4.1; Is. 9.14; Isoc. 15.116; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 61.3, which specifies that they were appointed by *ταξίαρχοι* (with Rhodes (1993) *ad loc.*)) and also as a cadet position in ephebic inscriptions; but in the fifth century at any rate the term (as the use of the Doric form *–αγός* rather than *–ηγός* itself suggests) certainly has strong Spartan connotations (despite the fifth-century context of the two *Mem.* passages; also, Ar. *Ach.* 575 and X. *HG* 1.2.3 are both very uncertain evidence for a formal fifth-century Athenian system of *λόχοι*). Secondly, it has been argued that *ταξίαρχοι*

Our analysis of *ταξίαρχοι* suggests, then, that X. is not only sparing in providing details on the functioning of leadership positions but also flexible in his use of terminology. In particular, the common scholarly usage 'taxiarchs' as a technical term for the light-armed officers of the Ten Thousand is not warranted by the single passage 4.1.28 (especially as 4.1.26 could just as equally justify calling them 'peltast captains'). With these results in mind we now turn to the two *ὑπο-* positions and to X.'s treatment of the methods used for replacing officers.

3.2 ὑποστράτηγοι

The mention of *ὑποστράτηγοι* occurs in X.'s description of the night of despair among the Ten Thousand after the loss of five *στρατηγοί* and twenty *λοχαγοί*. It will be helpful here to outline its broader context. Xenophon, who is said to have joined the expedition at the invitation of Proxenus, one of the *στρατηγοί*, but not as a *στρατηγός*, *λοχαγός*, or *στρατιώτης* (3.1.4), calls together the surviving *λοχαγοί* in Proxenus' contingent. He concludes his speech with a proposal to call a meeting of the surviving officers, at the same time exhorting Proxenus' *λοχαγοί* to show themselves 'the best of captains and more worthy to be generals than the generals themselves' (3.1.24: *φάνητε τῶν λοχαγῶν ἄριστοι καὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν ἀξιοστρατηγότεροι*). After a defeatist objection has been dismissed, this proposal is put into effect (3.1.32):

> *οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι παρὰ τὰς τάξεις ἰόντες, ὅπου μὲν στρατηγὸς σῷος εἴη, τὸν στρατηγὸν παρεκάλουν, ὁπόθεν δὲ οἴχοιτο, τὸν ὑποστράτηγον, ὅπου δ' αὖ λοχαγὸς σῷος εἴη, τὸν λοχαγόν.*

were a position at Sparta at the time of the Persian Wars (van Wees (2004) 244), on the basis of Hdt. 9.53.2 and the mention of a *ταξίαρχος* in the Oath of Plataea (RO 88 l. 25); but it is better to see the presence of the term as a sign of Herodotus' loose terminology (see above) and the oath's inauthenticity.

> The others proceeded to visit the various divisions of the army. Wherever a στρατηγός was left alive, they would invite the στρατηγός; where he was gone, [sc. they would invite] the ὑποστράτηγος; and, again, where a λοχαγός was left alive, [sc. they would invite] the λοχαγός.

The steps that are then taken to replace the dead men are as follows:

1) 3.1.33: gathering of about 100 στρατηγοί καὶ λοχαγοί.

2) 3.1.34: the eldest λοχαγός in Proxenus' contingent speaks, addressing ὦ ἄνδρες στρατηγοὶ καὶ λοχαγοί.

3) 3.1.37–44: Xenophon speaks, at one point offering the exhortation ὑμεῖς γάρ ἐστε στρατηγοί, ὑμεῖς ταξίαρχοι καὶ λοχαγοί (37, discussed above); and then suggesting that 'generals and captains are appointed as speedily as possible to take the places of those who are lost' (ἀντὶ τῶν ἀπολωλότων ὡς τάχιστα στρατηγοὶ καὶ λοχαγοὶ ἀντικατασταθῶσιν, 38) and that they summon all the soldiers after appointing 'all the leaders that are necessary' (τοὺς ἄρχοντας ὅσους δεῖ, 39).

4) 3.1.45–6: Chirisophus speaks, instructing 'those of you who need them to go off and choose leaders' (ἀπελθόντες ἤδη αἱρεῖσθε οἱ δεόμενοι ἄρχοντας, 46).

5) 3.1.47: Five replacement ἄρχοντες, 'leaders', are chosen. As the men they replace were all στρατηγοί, the new ἄρχοντες must all be στρατηγοί. No mention is made of replacement λοχαγοί, though Chirisophus' instruction αἱρεῖσθε … ἄρχοντας could be taken to cover λοχαγοί too. The use of ἄρχοντες at 46–7 picks up Xenophon's speech.

From 3.1.32 alone—and leaving aside for the moment the injunctions of Xenophon and Chirisophus to elect replacements—it would seem that the ὑποστράτηγος takes the place of an absent στρατηγός.[36] But the sequence as a whole leaves it unclear why, if that is the case, the

[36] E.g. Krüger (1826) 148. See above against the interpretation 'primi ordinis centurio'; the further suggestion of Boucher (1913) 147 that only large units had a ὑποστράτηγος also lacks any supporting evidence.

ὑποστράτηγος is not mentioned again (see further below). Confirmation of the function of the ὑποστράτηγος has, however, been sought in the position's only other possible mention in *Anabasis*. This possible mention occurs when the army is at Cotyora on the Black Sea coast and the Spartan στρατηγός Chirisophus has left to try to get ships from the Spartans in the Hellespont (5.6.36):

> They therefore took with them the other generals to whom they had communicated their earlier doings—namely, all the generals except Neon the Asinaean, who was ὑποστράτηγος (ὑπεστρατήγει) for Chirisophus because Chirisophus had not yet returned.

Neon (who was presumably not a Spartiate but a περίοικος, i.e. from one of the outlying regions under Spartan control) is here initially classed among the στρατηγοί, but it is at once clarified that he is deputy (ὑπεστρατήγει) of Chirisophus. X. could presumably have offered the same explanation of Neon's role at his first appearance, when the tithe to be dedicated to Artemis and Apollo is distributed among the στρατηγοί, and Neon receives a portion in Chirisophus' place (5.3.4: ἀντὶ δὲ Χειρισόφου Νέων ὁ Ἀσιναῖος ἔλαβε). At any rate, that Neon is classed as a στρατηγός in Chirisophus' absence seems to confirm the implication of 3.1.32, namely that the ὑποστράτηγος discharges the duties of a στρατηγός in his absence. And this assumption is thought to be further confirmed by the fact that Neon takes over from Chirisophus after his death (6.4.11; cf. 6.4.23).

The problem with using Neon as evidence is that his position as subordinate to Chirisophus is exceptional in a number of ways. While the other στρατηγοί were selected by Cyrus to raise troops on his behalf, Chirisophus was acting to some extent in cooperation with the Spartan state (cf. D.S. 14.19.5, 21.2). Though Cyrus' formal dealings with the Spartans are stressed in the *Anabasis* much less than in the summary of the background at *Hellenica* 3.1.1, X. does at least state that Chirisophus came with thirty-five ships from

the Peloponnese which were under the command of a Spartan *ναύαρχος* (1.4.2). That said, he does allow for some personal interaction between Cyrus and Chirisophus that goes beyond his dealings with the Spartan government (1.4.3): *παρῆν δὲ καὶ Χειρίσοφος Λακεδαιμόνιος ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν, μετάπεμπτος ὑπὸ Κύρου* ('Chirisophus a Spartan was also present on the ships, summoned by Cyrus'). Moreover, if Neon was Chirisophus' officially designated second-in-command, it is odd, as Roy has also acutely noted, that he does not more actively cooperate with the Spartan officials in the Hellespont after Chirisophus' death: even though Neon always acts in the Spartan interest and then stays with the Spartans at 7.3.7 rather than joining Seuthes, he is not presented as having special relations with those officials at 6.6.5–37 or 6.7.1.[37]

Two further differences in Neon's position are more clear-cut. Firstly, while Chirisophus at 5.6.36 was absent on a distant mission, the *ὑποστράτηγοι* mentioned at 3.1.32 appear in a context where their superior officers have left only for a short visit to Tissaphernes' tent. Secondly, while it is true that Neon takes over from Chirisophus after his death (6.4.11), X. does not indicate whether a vote was held. The new generals who replace the men seized by Tissaphernes, by contrast, are explicitly said to be elected (3.1.47).

The use of the verb *ὑπεστρατήγει* in the case of Neon, then, leaves open three possibilities that prevent extrapolation from his case: like Plutarch's use of the same verb, it might not correspond with a formal title *ὑποστράτηγος*; if it does, that might be an *ad hoc* appointment to cover Chirisophus' unexpected absence; and if Neon has from the start been Chirisophus' *ὑποστράτηγος*, that might reflect the sort of distinctively Spartan command structure seen in Thucydides' account of the fighting on Sphacteria.

[37] Roy (1967) 300, concluding that 'Xenophon has probably again suppressed evidence'. The referee also notes that Neon does not act as subordinate for the absent Chirisophus at 2.5.37.

To leave aside the problem of Neon, the necessity of elections for vacant places, despite the survival of some ὑποστράτηγοι, seems to support the claim that there was no automatic right of succession for the ὑποστράτηγος on the death of his στρατηγός. Lee suggests that when Chirisophus instructs 'those of you who need leaders' (οἱ δεόμενοι) to choose them (3.1.46, quoted above), he refers to those units that did not have a ὑποστράτηγος.[38] The problem with this suggestion is that X. implies that each contingent that had lost a στρατηγός would have a ὑποστράτηγος.[39] οἱ δεόμενοι, then, should be taken as referring not to those units which had lost both στρατηγός and ὑποστράτηγος, but to all units which had lost a στρατηγός.

While the function of the position is unclear, the main problem with the mention of the ὑποστράτηγος is its uneasy fit with the rest of the narrative. X. has just depicted the Greeks' despair after the seizure of the five στρατηγοί, portraying the army in a state of disintegration (3.1.2–3). Now, however, it emerges that there have all along been subordinates able to stand in for the missing στρατηγοί. This contradiction exposes, and arguably detracts from, some of the literary artistry of X.'s depiction of the Greeks' despondency. While the ὑποστράτηγος does not sit easily

[38] Lee (2007) 53 n. 64. Lee's treatment of the ὑποστράτηγος is confusing. He writes that 'it is not clear from this passage [3.1.32] whether every contingent originally possessed a *hupostrategos*' (53 n. 64), and later that 'not all contingents had surviving *hupostrategoi*' (83 n. 26). He further argues that 'where a designated second-in-command (*hupostrategos*) survived, the choice was probably straightforward', while 'in other cases, a contingent's senior *lochagos* may have held the post of *hupostrategos*' and also been among the twenty λοχαγοί killed outside Tissaphernes' tent; he then qualifies this rather unclear distinction by claiming that the ὑποστράτηγος might be the senior in service rather than age, given that Hieronymus, explicitly called the oldest of Proxenus' λοχαγοί, 'was apparently not *hupostrategos* and was not chosen as Proxenus' successor' (53 n. 65). But this reasoning is circular: Lee infers his not being ὑποστράτηγος from the fact that he was not chosen.

[39] Against the interpretation that 3.1.32 implies that a λοχαγός was invited only if both στρατηγός and ὑποστράτηγος were missing, see at n. 49 below.

with the immediate context, the problem is increased by its omission from the rest of the narrative of the retreat (with the possible exception noted above). Elsewhere, X. operates with a basic dichotomy of *στρατηγοί* and *λοχαγοί* in his descriptions of the army both in action and in council (notably in the ensuing council when the *στρατηγοί* and *λοχαγοί* gather (3.1.33) and new *στρατηγοί* are chosen (3.1.47)). It might be thought, then, that the *ὑποστράτηγοι* are simply subsumed in the narrative within the *στρατηγοί*[40] or, more plausibly, the *λοχαγοί* (especially if *ὑποστράτηγοι* were always also *λοχαγοί*).[41] But there are still passages where the absence of any mention of *ὑποστράτηγοι* is notable: X. stresses competition among some of the *λοχαγοί* but not with the *ὑποστράτηγοι*; and if the *ὑποστράτηγοι* are also *λοχαγοί*, their existence sits uneasily with the rotation system among the *λοχαγοί* in the rear (4.7.8), which seems predicated on the idea of equality.

Evidence that the omission of the *ὑποστράτηγος* in the rest of the narrative reflects X.'s indifference might be seen in a number of hints of the position that have been detected. We have already seen that some scholars have identified the *ὑποστράτηγοι* with the *ταξίαρχοι* mentioned at 3.1.37. More often, the position of *ὑποστράτηγος* has been used as a way to explain apparent anomalies in X.'s presentation of individual commanders. It has been suggested, for instance, that Pasion of Megara—who arrives with the smallest force of any leader (300 hoplites and 300 peltasts: 1.2.3)—was *ὑποστράτηγος* of Xenias, with whom he is grouped when men from their contingent(s) go over to Clearchus (1.3.7) and when they desert together (1.4.7).[42] Another candidate for the post of *ὑποστράτηγος* is Cleanor. Cleanor speaks as eldest (2.1.10) at a meeting of 'the Greeks'

[40] Thus Krüger (1826) 149 suggested *ὑποστράτηγοι* were to be understood as included in the address to the *στρατηγοί* at 3.1.37 (where Xenophon also addresses *ταξίαρχοι* and *λοχαγοί*).

[41] Either way, this would explain why they are not mentioned when differential pay levels are described (see above).

[42] Lee (2007) 45.

leaders' (*τοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἄρχοντας*, 2.1.8), is then directly called a *στρατηγός* at 2.5.37, but is subsequently elected *στρατηγός* to replace Agias at 3.1.47. To solve this difficulty, it has been suggested that Cleanor was Agias' *ὑποστράτηγος* and that X. was speaking loosely in calling him *στρατηγός* before his formal election.[43] In both of these cases, however, alternative explanations are possible: thus Roy treats Pasion as one of the original *στρατηγοί*, and suggests that Cleanor first took over from either Pasion or Xenias, and that later he also received command of Agias' contingent, which was then combined with his own (i.e. either Pasion's or Xenias' old unit).[44]

Two other proposals for the position involve characters who have not (or not yet) been presented as formal commanders at all. Parke claims on the basis of 5.6.25 (*Θώραξ ὁ Βοιώτιος, ὃς περὶ στρατηγίας Ξενοφῶντι ἐμάχετο* ('Thorax the Boeotian, who was always at odds with Xenophon over the generalship')) that Thorax was Xenophon's *ὑποστράτηγος*.[45] More startlingly Lee has speculated that the introduction of Xenophon at 3.1.4 (*Ξενοφῶν Ἀθηναῖος, ὃς οὔτε στρατηγὸς οὔτε λοχαγὸς οὔτε στρατιώτης ὢν* ('Xenophon, an Athenian, who was neither general nor captain nor common soldier')) conceals the fact that Xenophon himself was *ὑποστράτηγος* of Proxenus.[46] Lee's suggestion, if true, would make even more audaciously false two aspects of X.'s presentation of Xenophon: rather than suggesting that Xenophon was serving for pay, X. incorporates him in a network of elite ties of *philia* and xenia;[47] and rather than suggesting that

[43] Lee (2007) 51 n. 52; Flower (2012) 95. If right, this view would be further evidence of X.'s comparative indifference to the technicalities of the command structure.

[44] Roy (1967) 287, 289; Lee (2007) 45 n. 16 and 51 n. 52 misrepresents Roy as being compatible with his own view. On Roy's view, too, we may note how much work X. leaves to the reader.

[45] Parke (1933) 35. On the same page Timasion seems to be a slip for Neon.

[46] Lee (2007) 54 n. 66.

[47] Azoulay (2004) 289–304.

Xenophon was doing no more than his duty as Proxenus' subordinate, X. presents him as suddenly summoned to greatness by a dream from Zeus (3.1.11–12). These two speculations present a picture of the leadership of the Ten Thousand that is satisfyingly dense—but much denser than X.'s account warrants.

A different approach would be to see the rare appearance of the ὑποστράτηγος as an indication of special circumstances rather than as the result of X.'s indifference. It could have been a temporary position held by a λοχαγός covering the absence of a στρατηγός from the rest of his contingent, whether for a long trip, as with Chirisophus, or for the visit to Tissaphernes (when dinner and perhaps an overnight stay might have been envisaged). Even on this view, however, it is still hard to see why the position needed to be mentioned at all at 3.1.32—given that all the surviving λοχαγοί are summoned to the meeting at the same time as the ὑποστράτηγοι of the dead generals. At most one might speculate that the ὑποστράτηγος based himself in the tent of his στρατηγός when the στρατηγός was absent, while each λοχαγός would be with his own λόχος.

Rather than finding more examples of the ὑποστράτηγος between the lines of X.'s text or explaining the position away as merely temporary, we propose that the difficulties created by the ὑποστράτηγος at 3.1.32 point instead to its being an interpolation.[48] This proposal can be supported

[48] Editors agree that there are numerous interpolations in the MSS of the *Anabasis*, including whole sentences (1.7.15, 1.8.6, 2.2.6, 5.5.4, and 7.8.25–6, in addition to the book summaries at 2.1.1, 3.1.1, 4.1.1–4, 5.1.1, and 7.1.1, which are mentioned by D.L. 2.57, and so must predate the second century AD). Not surprisingly there is much disagreement at the level of clauses and individual words, but several clarifying glosses have been suspected; cf., e.g., 1.7.8, where Weiske (followed by Hude and Dillery) suggested that οἵ τε στρατηγοὶ originated as a clarification of the following words: καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων τινὲς; 1.7.12, where Weiske (followed by Hude, Masqueray, and Dillery) rejected καὶ στρατηγοὶ καὶ ἡγεμόνες as a gloss on ἄρχοντες (καὶ στρατηγοὶ om. E). Such suspicions are reinforced by the fact that some differences between the MSS must be due to interpolations that aim at giving more complete and clearer information; cf., e.g., 5.3.3, where the f MSS add ἐκ τῶν ἀμφὶ τοὺς

not just by the lack of attention to the position elsewhere in the *Anabasis*, but also by a number of lexical, stylistic, and textual problems at 3.1.32. Let us here repeat the relevant sentence:

> οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι παρὰ τὰς τάξεις ἰόντες, ὅπου μὲν στρατηγὸς σῳ̣ος εἴη, τὸν στρατηγὸν παρεκάλουν, ὁπόθεν δὲ οἴχοιτο, τὸν ὑποστράτηγον, ὅπου δ' αὖ λοχαγὸς σῳ̣ος εἴη, τὸν λοχαγόν.

The following points, taken together, may indicate that the words ὁπόθεν δὲ … ὑποστράτηγον were inserted by an interpolator:

1) The fact that the middle limb of the tricolon ὅπου μὲν … ὁπόθεν δὲ … ὅπου δ' αὖ … does not express the subject of οἴχοιτο, (ὁ) στρατηγός, unhinges the strict parallel structure found in other ὅπου μὲν … ὅπου δὲ … (… ὅπου δὲ …) clauses in X. (*Mem.* 4.6.12; *Cyr.* 6.3.2–3, 8.4.4; *Ages.* 2.24; *Eq.* 8.10 *bis*); and such parallelism is a typical feature of X.'s style more generally. The second limb is therefore better analysed as a parenthetical ('wherever a στρατηγός was left alive, they would invite the στρατηγός (and where he was gone, the ὑποστράτηγος) and, again, where a λοχαγός was left alive, the λοχαγός'), with the whole sentence effectively being a bicolon. The insertion could of course be X.'s own, but parentheticals do not disturb the carefully achieved verbal balance in the other passages cited above and its inelegance is untypical of X.

2) The introduction of the final limb with ὅπου δ' αὖ, the reading of the c MSS (the f MSS read ὅπου δέ) is unusual. Elsewhere X. uses μέν … δ' αὖ structures where there exists an opposition between the two clauses pronounced enough to warrant additional marking through αὖ, either because the contrasted entities are in themselves diametrically

μυρίους, presumably to clarify οὗτοι ἐσώθησαν; and, involving officers, 3.5.14: οἱ δὲ στρατηγοὶ c, οἱ δὲ στρατηγοὶ καὶ οἱ λοχαγοὶ f. This kind of early, 'technical' interpolation is discussed for the text of Plato by Jachmann (1942).

opposed (e.g. opponents in war) (cf. *An.* 1.10.5; *HG* 4.3.16, 18 (=*Ages.* 2.9, 11); 5.1.29, 4.19–20; 6.4.6, 24; *Cyr.* 4.5.25; 5.4.5; 8.1.43; *Hier.* 2.18–3.1) or because they are marked as such through their involvement in very different actions (cf. *An.* 6.1.21; *HG* 5.4.29; 6.4.33–4; *Mem.* 1.2.24–6; *Cyr.* 2.4.24; 5.5.23; 7.1.18–19; 8.1.13, 47; 8.3.48); the figurative meaning 'in turn' may also mark temporal progression (a nuance which dominates at *Cyr.* 1.5.5 and 8.5.4). In the present case, however, the parallelisms between both the officers (who are not natural opposites) and the actions expressed in the ὅπου μὲν … ὅπου δ' αὖ … limbs are much greater than the contrasts. And while δ' αὖ has been taken to imply that the λοχαγός was summoned only if there was no surviving στρατηγός or ὑποστράτηγος,[49] this reading is belied by what follows, where it is clear (as we would expect) that all surviving λοχαγοί meet; and it makes no sense in itself, since it does not allow for the possibility (which must have been true in most if not all cases) that there was more than one surviving λοχαγός in contingents with no surviving στρατηγός or ὑποστράτηγος. The sentence effectively means, then, 'they summoned all the surviving officers', and δ' αὖ seems incompatible with such a sense; it is perhaps possible, then, that when the interpolation was made, αὖ was inserted into one branch of the tradition to give relief to what was wrongly interpreted as a three-way opposition, or to make explicit the equally wrong idea that the three actions occur in succession.

3) It may be added that the second σῷος εἴη is omitted in E, one of the c MSS. If in E's source ὁπόθεν δὲ … ὑποστράτηγον still had the status of a marginal gloss, the omission is easily explained and possibly correct, yielding ὅπου μὲν στρατηγὸς σῷος εἴη, τὸν στρατηγὸν παρεκάλουν, ὅπου δὲ (although E, being a c MS, reads δ' αὖ) λοχαγὸς, τὸν

[49] E.g. the Loeb ('or, again, where only a captain was left, the captain') and Ambler (less clearly: 'where, in turn, the captain had survived, they summoned the captain'). Cf. Trundle (2004) 135, citing 3.1.32 to show that 'the *lochagos* was next in line for the generalship after the *hupostratêgos*'.

λοχαγόν—a close parallel to *Mem.* 4.6.12, where the cola following the first are also significantly reduced: καὶ ὅπου μὲν ἐκ τῶν τὰ νόμιμα ἐπιτελούντων αἱ ἀρχαὶ καθίστανται, ταύτην μὲν τὴν πολιτείαν ἀριστοκρατίαν ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι, ὅπου δ' ἐκ τιμημάτων, πλουτοκρατίαν, ὅπου δ' ἐκ πάντων, δημοκρατίαν.[50]

4) οἴχοιτο is variously interpreted by modern translators ('dead' (Watson), 'missing' (Waterfield), 'gone' (Loeb), 'n'était plus là' (Masqueray)); Sturz' lexicon lists it (along with three passages from the *Cyropaedia*) under 'mori', 'die'[51]—a sense that is more common in (but not restricted to) poetry. The antithesis with σῳός does suggest 'dead' as the most likely meaning (the same antithesis is found at *Cyr.* 5.4.11 as well as S. *Aj.* 1128, *Tr.* 83–5). But the *Cyropaedia* passages and other contemporary prose usages (e.g. And. 1.146) seem more emotionally charged than 3.1.32. If, on the other hand, the sense is 'go' or 'be gone' (as with all other uses of οἴχεσθαι in the *Anabasis*), the spatial treatment of the generals' departure is unusual: the verb is normally used of characters who are the centre of the narrative focus as they leave the scene with a definite goal (if the goal is uncertain, it is often accompanied by a participle such as ἀπιών). Furthermore, on neither analysis does οἴχοιτο sit easily with ὁπόθεν. It presumably means 'from those τάξεις from which', and so ill fits the absolute sense 'was dead' (especially since there is no accompanying idea of departing *for* the land of the dead, as at, e.g., Hom. *Il.* 22.213, 23.101; Pl. *Phd.* 115d4). As a verb of movement, on the other hand, οἴχεσθαι is a strongly goal-oriented verb rather than a source-oriented one; that is, when it is used on its own

[50] If the omission of the second σῳός εἴη is the result of haplography, this too would be easier to explain if E's source did not have ὁπόθεν δὲ … ὑποστράτηγον in the text.

[51] Sturz (1801–4) 3.265, citing *Cyr.* 3.1.13 (αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἀναβοήσασαι ἐδρύπτοντο, ὡς οἰχομένου τοῦ πατρὸς), 5.4.11 (τὸ μὲν ἐπ' ἐμοὶ οἴχομαι, τὸ δ' ἐπὶ σοὶ σέσωσμαι), and 7.3.8 (ἐδάκρυσέ τε ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ εἶπε· φεῦ, ὦ ἀγαθὴ καὶ πιστὴ ψυχή, οἴχῃ δὴ ἀπολιπὼν ἡμᾶς;). The word is not used in this sense in Herodotus or Thucydides, according to the lexica of Powell and Bétant.

(without a participle expressing the mode of movement), the destination may be specified (e.g. 1.4.8: *οἶδα γὰρ ὅπῃ οἴχονται* ('I know where they have gone')), but the place from which the subject departs usually is not. This syntactic selection restriction is absolute in Homer,[52] and is only rarely violated in the Classical period;[53] X. adds a participle in the relevant cases.[54] Our sentence is closest in meaning and structure to the much later passages [Hp.] *Ep.* 27.l.276 (*εἰ μὴ πανταχόθεν οἴχεται τὸ χρηστοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἔτι εἶναι* 'unless their still being good people has altogether disappeared') and Plu. *Mor.* 413a (*καὶ πρόνοια θεῶν … πανταχόθεν οἴχεται* 'even the providence of the gods has altogether disappeared')—though both cases involve very figurative language hardly comparable to the dry report at *An.* 3.1.32.

None of these linguistic, stylistic, and textual arguments is decisive in itself, but collectively they lend considerable weight to the possibility that a later editor, familiar with the common use of the term in Roman contexts, inserted the *ὑποστράτηγος* clause through a mistaken inference from the position of Neon at 5.6.36. The clause with the verb at 5.6.36 is also open to suspicion as an explanatory gloss on Neon's position, but defensible as long as it is interpreted loosely.[55] If the clauses are retained, our discussion does at least point to the wider interpretative problems created by

[52] Létoublon (1985) 98; Kölligan (2007) 151. Thus, in a case like *οἴχετ' ἄϊστος ἄπυστος* (*Od.* 1.242, said by Telemachus of Odysseus) 'from here' is implied, but not lexically expressed.

[53] Cf. E. *IT* 1314–5 (*ἔξω χθονὸς / σὺν τοῖς ξένοισιν οἴχεται*), *Ph.* 1744 (*ὃς ἐκ δόμων νέκυς ἄθαπτος οἴχεται*); Hdt. 2.140.1 (*ὡς δ' ἄρα οἴχεσθαι τὸν Αἰθίοπα ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*). Two passages specify both the destination and the source: Th. 1.116.3 (*ᾤχετο γὰρ καὶ ἐκ τῆς Σάμου πέντε ναυσὶ Στησαγόρας καὶ ἄλλοι ἐπὶ τὰς Φοινίσσας*); X. *HG* 1.1.8 (*ἐντεῦθεν πλὴν τετταράκοντα νεῶν ἄλλαι ἄλλῃ ᾤχοντο ἐπ' ἀργυρολογίαν ἔξω τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου*).

[54] *An.* 5.1.15: *ἀποδρὰς ᾤχετο ἔξω τοῦ Πόντου*; 5.7.15: *διενενόητο δέ … ἀποπλέων οἴχεσθαι ἔξω τοῦ Πόντου*.

[55] The fact that this explanation is postponed from 5.3.4 tells neither for nor against the possibility of interpolation.

X.'s decision to focus on the ὑποστράτηγος only in these two contexts—unless, we have suggested, the position is very narrowly conceived as a temporary expedient. As we shall now see, similar problems are created by X.'s apparent indifference in the case of the other subordinate role with which we are here concerned.

3.3 ὑπολόχαγοι

ὑπολόχαγοι make their only appearance in X.'s account after the army's arrival on the Black Sea coast. With half of the Greek army left to guard the camp near Trapezus, Xenophon leads the other half in an attack on a stronghold where a local tribe, the Drilae, has gathered. The site is difficult to approach, surrounded as it is by a deep gully on all sides and a manmade embankment with palisade and wooden towers. The Greek peltasts launch an attack on the site but are unable either to take the fort or to retreat in safety. Xenophon then inspects the gully, decides that the place can be taken, and plans the attack (5.2.11):

> ἐπεὶ δ' ἦκον οἱ ὁπλῖται, ἐκέλευσε τὸν λόχον ἕκαστον ποιῆσαι τῶν λοχαγῶν ὡς ἂν κράτιστα οἴηται ἀγωνιεῖσθαι· ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ λοχαγοὶ πλησίον ἀλλήλων οἳ πάντα τὸν χρόνον ἀλλήλοις περὶ ἀνδραγαθίας ἀντεποιοῦντο.
>
> When the hoplites arrived, Xenophon told every captain to form his company in the way he thought it would compete best; for near one another were the captains who had all the time been vying with one another in valour.

He then gives orders to the peltasts, archers, and slingers to have their missiles ready to fire. Then (5.2.13):

> ἐπεὶ δὲ πάντα παρεσκεύαστο καὶ οἱ λοχαγοὶ καὶ οἱ ὑπολόχαγοι καὶ οἱ ἀξιοῦντες τούτων μὴ χείρους εἶναι πάντες παρατεταγμένοι ἦσαν, καὶ ἀλλήλους μὲν δὴ ξυνεώρων (μηνοειδὴς γὰρ διὰ τὸ χωρίον ἡ τάξις ἦν) …

> When all preparations had been made and the captains, the ὑπολόχαγοι, and those who considered themselves not inferior to these men in bravery were all grouped together in the line, and, moreover, watching one another (for the line was crescent-shaped to conform with the position they were attacking) …

The Greeks attack, with Agasias picked out for particular daring. They then find, however, that there is a strongly held acropolis within the stronghold, and get away with difficulty.

This is a difficult sequence to follow, and, as we shall see, some at least of the difficulties are probably due to the state of the manuscripts. Before considering the role of the ὑπολόχαγοι, we need to understand what the λοχαγοί are doing and who 'those who considered themselves not inferior ... in bravery' might be.

In relation to the λοχαγοί, X. distinguishes between the group as a whole and a subset of particularly competitive members. In picking out this subset, X. is looking back to two earlier scenes. Firstly, at 4.1.27, in a meeting of hoplite and peltast commanders, Aristonymus and Agasias are named as the first hoplite volunteers for a dangerous mission, and then Callimachus, 'in rivalry with them' (ἀντιστασιάζων), said that he was willing to take volunteers from the whole army, 'for I know that many of the young men will follow if I am in the lead'. Secondly, in the attack on the citadel of the Taochians (4.7.11–12), Agasias, here identified explicitly as one of the rearguard λοχαγοί, sees Callimachus run forward from a clump of trees and then rush back for cover so that the defenders waste their stones:

> When Agasias saw what Callimachus was doing, and with the whole army for spectators, he became fearful that he would not be the first to make the run across to the stronghold; so without asking Aristonymus or Eurylochus of Lusi (though the former was close by and both were his friends) or anyone else to join him, he

> dashed forward himself and proceeded to go past everybody. Callimachus, however, when he saw him going past, seized the rim of his shield; and at the moment Aristonymus of Methydrium ran past both of them, and upon his heels Eurylochus of Lusi. For all these four were rivals in valour and continually striving with one another (*πάντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἀντεποιοῦντο ἀρετῆς καὶ διηγωνίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους*); and in thus contending they captured the stronghold.

Here the three volunteers from the earlier scene are joined by a fourth, Eurylochus.

But why does the fact that these four *λοχαγοί* are close to each other explain why Xenophon tells all the captains to form their units as they see fit? In terms of numbers, X. reports soon after the attack on the Drilan stronghold that 8,600 men were counted at Cerasus (5.3.3). And in their final military engagement before reaching Trapezus the hoplites had been formed into eighty *λόχοι*, each of almost 100, together with three groups of about 600 light-armed troops (4.8.15). So, given that half the army went out on the campaign against the Drilae, there should have been over thirty *λόχοι*. It seems, then, that Xenophon expected the competitive spirit shown by the four *λοχαγοί* to impress itself on their peers.

This expectation seems in turn to be confirmed by the following narrative. Helped by the visual opportunities allowed by the terrain,[56] the agonistic spirit spreads to include the men who are drawn up alongside the *λοχαγοί* and *ὑπολόχαγοι*—that is to say, 'the men who considered themselves not inferior to these men in bravery'. The phrase itself tellingly echoes Xenophon's earlier speech to the officers, where he claims that 'you should consider yourselves superior to the common soldiers' (*ἀξιοῦν δεῖ ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἀμείνους τε τοῦ πλήθους εἶναι*, 3.1.37; cf. 5.2.13: *ἀξιοῦντες … μὴ χείρους*). But it still comes as something of a surprise, given that no clue has been given as to the identity

[56] For the role of vision here, see Harman (2013) 84.

of these men—or as to how their own self-evaluation relates to the way in which the λοχαγοί arrange their companies.

While the sequence of events involving the ὑπολόχαγοι is difficult, the men themselves seem to be subordinate officers who enjoy enough prestige at least to rouse the competitive instincts of those beneath them; it also seems that it is precisely the concern with status that explains why they are mentioned at this point. But what is their formal function in the army? As we have noted, it is generally supposed, by analogy with the supposed role of the ὑποστράτηγοι, that they would take over on the death of a λοχαγός (though it is notable that they are not mentioned after the seizure of the στρατηγοί and the killing of twenty λοχαγοί at 2.5.32, unlike the ὑποστράτηγοι, who do appear in our texts in this context[57]). Parke further suggests that X.'s silence does not preclude ὑπολόχαγοι having been present at the meeting of the στρατηγοὶ καὶ λοχαγοί (3.1.33), given that X. does not specify that ὑποστράτηγοι were present either, even though they were expressly summoned (3.1.32).[58]

Another possibility is that there is some overlap with other named officers: Lendle argues that the ὑπολόχαγοι are probably to be identified with the πεντηκοντῆρες—leaders of a subunit introduced in the six special λόχοι at 3.4.21 (see above)—while Lee suggests that the ὑπολόχαγοι included both the πεντηκοντῆρες and the ἐνωμόταρχοι, leaders of the further subdivision.[59] X.'s account seems to imply, however, that there were πεντηκοντῆρες and ἐνωμόταρχοι only in the six special λόχοι; this would allow for a total of either six or eighteen ὑπολόχαγοι, depending on whether we follow Lendle or Lee. These proposals also yield either two or six ὑπολόχαγοι for each λοχαγός, thereby leaving the chain of

[57] This omission could be explained by the fact that X. focuses only on the replacement of the στρατηγοί, not on that of the λοχαγοί.

[58] Parke (1933) 27 n. 2.

[59] Lendle (1995) 304; Lee (2007) 94 n. 94. Lee earlier, in (2004) 297–8, proposed that when two λόχοι combined because of depleted numbers, if their two λοχαγοί were both still alive, one of them would become ὑπολόχαγος.

succession uncertain. Another possibility, then, is that the ὑπολόχαγοι are to be seen as holding a separate office in their own right, with one ὑπολόχαγος in each λόχος; in this case the πεντηκοντῆρες and ἐνωμόταρχοι might be οἱ ἀξιοῦντες τούτων μὴ χείρους εἶναι.[60] If so, their total omission from the rest of the narrative is odd (it would be strange if both ὑπολόχαγοι and ὑποστράτηγοι were normally assimilated in the λοχαγοί). A further possibility that can also probably be ruled out is that the ὑπολόχαγοι were not formally officers:[61] the clause οἱ ἀξιοῦντες τούτων μὴ χείρους εἶναι presupposes some level of public recognition.

The problem of the ὑπολόχαγοι—like that of the ὑποστράτηγοι—can be solved by assuming textual corruption. They appear in a section that is particularly beset by textual problems. At 5.2.11, the c MSS miss out the whole section ἐπεὶ … ἀγωνιεῖσθαι (seventeen words in all). There is another major difference between the main manuscript traditions at 5.2.15: in the string Ἀγασίας Στυμφάλιος καὶ Φιλόξενος Πελληνεὺς, καὶ Φιλόξενος Πελληνεὺς dropped out of the c tradition, and the following plural participle and verb were changed to singulars.[62] There are further textual problems within the key clause of 5.2.13: οἱ λοχαγοὶ καὶ οἱ ὑπολόχαγοι καὶ οἱ ἀξιοῦντες τούτων

[60] Thus Watson (1864) 149 n. 1.

[61] As assumed e.g. by Rehdantz (1867) xii: 'Die sonst noch vorkommenden Offiziere (ὑποστράτηγοι, ταξίαρχοι) scheinen von den Strategen, die Unteroffiziere (ὑπολόχαγοι, πεντηκοντῆρες, ἐνωμόταρχοι) von den Lochagen ernannt zu sein; sie standen nur zu diesen in einem persönlichen Verhältnis und hatten, so zu sagen, eine nur taktische Bedeutung.'

[62] Thus f has Ἀγασίας Στυμφάλιος καὶ Φιλόξενος Πελληνεὺς καταθέμενοι τὰ ὅπλα ἐν χιτῶνι μόνον ἀνέβησαν, καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλον εἵλκε, and c Ἀγασίας Στυμφάλιος καταθέμενος τὰ ὅπλα ἐν χιτῶνι μόνον ἀνέβη, καὶ ἄλλον εἵλκε. It is easier to suppose that Philoxenus was omitted from c than inserted in f, but the sequence in f is hard to follow: ἄλλος ἄλλον εἵλκε is perhaps intended to mean 'the one pulled up the other' (Loeb), but should really mean 'some pulled up some, others pulled up others'; this, however, is difficult to square with the continuation καὶ ἄλλος ἀνεβεβήκει.

μὴ χείρους εἶναι πάντες παρατεταγμένοι ἦσαν. Two main textual variants concern us here: οἱ before ὑπολόχαγοι is omitted in f, while the c MSS read not ὑπολόχαγοι but ὑπόλοχοι.[63] Given that ὑπόλοχοι is unattested and hard to construe in this context, the reading of c is probably not in itself an objection to ὑπολόχαγοι.[64] More to the point is whether οἱ should be included or excluded before ὑπολόχαγοι. If it is included, it is unclear whether the comparative genitive τούτων goes with both the preceding nouns or just with ὑπολόχαγοι. This ambiguity can be avoided by omitting οἱ (and thereby binding the two nouns together), but this move is equally unsatisfactory: in a passage where there is so much stress on competition within and between ranks, it elides the difference between the status of a λοχαγός and that of a ὑπολόχαγος.[65]

The problems can be solved by suggesting that ὑπολόχαγοι entered the text as a gloss on οἱ ἀξιοῦντες τούτων μὴ χείρους εἶναι.[66] Though there is no Roman use of ὑπολόχαγος to explain the interpolation, as with ὑποστράτηγος, it is still possible that the coinage of the word was due to the same sort of interest in ranks and formal

[63] Note also that for πάντες CE have πάντας; that M has τούτου; that μηνοειδὴς is an emendation for μονοειδὴς (c) or ἐνειδὴς (f); and that for τάξις, the reading of E, CBA have τάραξις and f παράταξις. There is also disagreement among editors over the structure and punctuation of the whole sentence (e.g. Marchant suspects καί or else a lacuna after either πάντες or ἦσαν), but this problem does not concern us here.

[64] Buzzetti (2014) 86–7 n. 19 accepts ὑπόλοχοι as a 'playful neologism', interpreting it as 'the under-troops', 'the troops that hide'. But the former meaning is impossible and the latter (while it could be supported by the verb ὑπολοχάω, 'lie in ambush', which is used twice by Josephus) makes no sense here.

[65] For a single article with two nouns producing 'the effect of a single notion', while the repetition of the article 'lays stress on each word', see Smyth (1956) 291.

[66] When this paper was almost complete, we found this suggestion was already made in the 'Kritischer Anhang' at the end of the school edition of Matthiä (1852) 435; it does not seem to have attracted any attention since. It might be thought that πάντες is more emphatic with three preceding terms, but this is not a strong objection.

procedures that may have prompted the earlier interpolation; if ὑπολόχαγος is genuinely Xenophontic, on the other hand, its disappearance from (what survives of) subsequent Greek literature and lexicography is perhaps unexpected. It is also worth speculating that the clause καὶ οἱ ὑπολόχαγοι has replaced a clause qualifying οἱ λοχαγοί and specifying the particularly competitive λοχαγοί mentioned in the earlier narrative; if this were right, οἱ ἀξιοῦντες τούτων μὴ χείρους εἶναι would be much clearer, as it would be a second clause qualifying οἱ λοχαγοί, parallel to the missing clause about the competitive men. With this solution, X. would be pointing to rivalry amongst the λοχαγοί rather than between ranks. This solution would also support the reading of πάντας for πάντες in CE (a corruption otherwise hard to explain), which can be understood as the object of παρατεταγμένοι ἦσαν, interpreted as an indirect-reflexive middle.[67] The overall sense would then be: 'when … the captains, <those who competed with each other> and those who considered themselves not inferior to these men in bravery, had drawn everyone up'. This reconstruction also gives much more point to παρατεταγμένοι, which with the MSS reading does not adequately express the required idea that the λοχαγοί and their rivals within their company were drawn up together *at the front* (hence Hug's attractive emendation προτεταγμένοι).

4. Conclusion

Our exploration of subordinate commanders in the *Anabasis* has suggested that scholars have been overconfident in the granularity with which they have attempted to reconstruct the command structure of the Ten Thousand. The treatment of the ταξίαρχοι pointed to X.'s flexibility and the

[67] For indirect-reflexive παρατάττειν, cf. *HG* 7.5.23; Th. 1.52.2 (of ships). In our passage the verb would express the idea that the captains arrange their λόχοι as they see fit, and in the interest of their rivalry.

need to understand terminology in its wider rhetorical contexts. And with regard to the ὑποστράτηγοι and ὑπολόχαγοι in particular, our analysis has opened up four main possibilities. One possibility is that their presence in the text is a reflection of increasing professionalisation after the Peloponnesian War; on this view, we might see the Ten Thousand placed somewhere in between Athens and Sparta in terms of their adherence to a specialised military hierarchy. Another possibility is that the accidents of evidence explain why the ὑποστράτηγοι and ὑπολόχαγοι first appear in our sources in the *Anabasis*. If this is right, then the increased visibility of military professionalisation results from the narrative choices of X., who shows more interest in the phenomenon than his predecessors, but still leaves much obscure (as do many of his successors, who similarly show much more interest in the psychological effects of the loss of leaders than in the formalities of replacement). As far as X.'s ideas about leadership are concerned, the muted presence of these subordinate roles suggests that he is more concerned in the *Anabasis* with the relation of individual leaders and the soldiers they led, and again with competition and interaction within the army's leadership, than with presenting a granular picture of the workings of the army's command structure in practice. A third option is to see the position of at least ὑποστράτηγος as temporary rather than permanent; on this view, the silence about the position apart from its two appearances could be explained by assuming that it existed only at exceptional times. Finally, we have proposed that the presence of both terms resulted from interpolator(s) displaying the sort of concern for military minutiae typical of the imperial or Byzantine eras. The arguments about the two positions are in many ways distinct, but it would still be fair to claim that the stronger the case against one of the positions, the more likely are the chances that the other position too is interpolated. Even if the specific arguments for

interpolation are dismissed, our analysis has at least highlighted some of the textual and interpretative difficulties that, for all its deceptive ease, are all too typical of the *Anabasis*.

University of Heidelberg luuk.huitink@skph.uni-heidelberg.de
University of Oxford timothy.rood@st-hughs.ox.ac.uk

Appendix: Subordinate Posts with the *ὑπο*-Prefix

We exclude cases where the *ὑπο*-prefix does not indicate subordination to a distinct higher office, as in the two Homeric *hapaxes* *ὑποδμώς* (*Od.* 4.386) and *ὑποδρηστῆρες* (*Od.* 15.330), which mean 'servant under' and 'labourers under', rather than 'under-servant' and 'under-labourers'.[68] By the same token, since there is no attested class of *μείονες* (a word which itself denotes inferiors), we exclude *ὑπομείονες*, which is first attested at X. *HG* 3.3.6, where it seems to refer to a class of people at Sparta rather than to an office; subsequently it is found only in Cassius Dio, who uses it of a military office (*LSJ*, s.v.: 'subaltern officers').

Homer

ὑφηνίοχος is a Homeric *hapax* (*Il.* 6.18–19: *αὐτὸν καὶ θεράποντα Καλήσιον, ὅς ῥα τόθ' ἵππων / ἔσκεν ὑφηνίοχος*). The word attracted attention from lexicographers and commentators, who were evidently perplexed by the coinage, given that the *ἡνίοχος* is itself presented in epic as subordinate to the warrior who rides on the chariot. The solutions proposed in antiquity were to see the position as either the same as the *ἡνίοχος* (Σ *Il.* 6.19 bT, citing *ὑποδμώς* as parallel;[69] Hesychius *υ*.898 *ὑφηνίοχος· ἡνίοχος*; Eustathius 2.235 van der Valk *τὸν ἡνίοχον ὑφηνίοχον λέγει πλεοναζούσης καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῆς προθέσεως*) or as a second *ἡνίοχος* (Eustathius continues: *ἴσως δὲ καὶ ταὐτόν ἐστι τὸ ὑφηνίοχος τῷ δεύτερος ἡνίοχος*); or else to cite the use of *ἡνίοχος* of Hector (*Il.* 8.89) as explaining why the charioteer should receive the *ὑπο*-prefix (Σ *Il.* 6.19 bT, cf. Σ *Il.* 8.89 A:

[68] Thus we exclude *ὑπασπιστής* (found in Herodotus and X. in the sense 'squire', 'shield bearer') since *ἀσπιστής* is exclusively an epic word for 'warrior'; and also *ὑπογραφεύς* (attested on a papyrus in the third century BC and then in literary authors) even though there is also a word *γραφεύς*, 'secretary', since *ὑπογραφεύς* seems to mean 'one who writes under another's orders' rather than 'vice-*γραφεύς*'.

[69] The same parallel is used by Stoevesandt (2008) *ad loc.*; if right, then *ὑφηνίοχος* should be excluded from this list.

ὅτι τὸν παραιβάτην Ἕκτορα ἡνίοχον εἶπεν). After Homer, the only literary author to use the word is X., in *Cyropaedia* of a servant who hands over the reins of a chariot to Abradatas (6.4.4: λαβὼν δὲ παρὰ τοῦ ὑφηνιόχου τὰς ἡνίας), shuts the carriage after him (6.4.10), and later receives the reins back (7.1.15: παραδοὺς τῷ ὑφηνιόχῳ τὰς ἡνίας). X.'s use is presumably evidence for scholarly exegesis of the word by the fourth century BC: Abradatas and his servant hold the reins at different times, but one is superior to the other.

Fifth Century BC

ὕπαρχος is frequently used in historiography in Persian contexts, either for the satrap (who is subordinate to the king) or for a subordinate of the satrap (e.g. Th. 8.16); it is used by X. at *An.* 4.4.4 (where it is not certain whether Tizibazus is satrap or subordinate to Orontas). The same word is also found twice in extant tragedy, firstly of Menelaus, i.e. in a Spartan context (S. *Aj.* 1105–6: ὕπαρχος ἄλλων δεῦρ' ἔπλευσας, οὐχ ὅλων / στρατηγός, though most editors reject these lines as an interpolation); secondly of the subordinates of Theoclymenus, ruler of Egypt (E. *Hel.* 1432), where the word is presumably modelled on the use of the term in Persian settings. ὕπαρχος is not strictly analogous to ὑποστράτηγος and ὑπολόχαγος in that there is no corresponding position ἄρχος (at least until the Byzantine period).

ὑπογραμματεύς (found at Antiphon 6.35, and restored at Ar. *Ra.* 1084) is the term for a professional, paid under-secretary, an assistant to the elected γραμματεύς of the council or assembly or of a board of officials. References to the position in comedy and oratory are generally derogatory, and sometimes there seems to be a deliberate blurring of γραμματεύς and ὑπογραμματεύς. There is no supposition that a ὑπογραμματεύς would succeed to the position of γραμματεύς.[70]

[70] For discussion, see Rhodes (1972) 134–41; MacDowell (2000) 307–8.

ὑποζάκορος is used at Hdt. 6.134–5 of a temple attendant. Though in literary texts ζάκορος is attested first in Menander (and earlier as a personal name at Lys. 6.54), it is found in an early fifth-century inscription (*IG* 1^3.4).

Fourth Century BC

ὑπαρχιτέκτων, attested on an Attic inscription (*IG* 2^2.1678) as well as inscriptions from Delos and Delphi.

ὑπογυμνασίαρχος, first attested at *IG* 4.753, from Troizen.

ὑποδιδάσκαλος is attested first in Plato (*Ion* 536a5): ὥσπερ ἐκ τῆς λίθου ἐκείνης ὁρμαθὸς πάμπολυς ἐξήρτηται χορευτῶν τε καὶ διδασκάλων καὶ ὑποδιδασκάλων. Subsequently it is found only in lexicographers, who were probably guessing as to its function.[71] The appearance of the word in Plato is explained by his use of the image of a magnetic chain for the spread of the power of poetry. The placement of ὑποδιδασκάλων after διδασκάλων serves a lexical enactment of this image, as the power of poetry extends from διδάσκαλος to ὑποδιδάσκαλος (the presumed function of the ὑποδιδάσκαλος would more naturally lead to its being placed between χορευτής and διδάσκαλος).

*

For positions attested after the fourth century BC, we simply present a chronological list without further references (which can be gathered from *LSJ*, including the 1996 supplement, and the Hewlett-Packard database of Greek inscriptions), but using 'I' for those words attested in inscriptions, 'P' for those attested in documentary papyri:

[71] Hesychius υ.609: χοροδιδάσκαλος; Photius υ.195 Theodoridis: ὁ τῷ χορῷ καταλέγων· διδάσκαλος γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ ποιητής, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης (*Ach.* 628). For speculation as to the position's function, see Wilson (2000) 83–4, 341 n. 144.

Third Century BC: ὑπεπιστάτης (I, P); ὑποδιάκονος (Posidippus, Philo, common in Christian authors); ὑποδιοικητής (P); ὑποτριήραρχος (P); ὑφιέρεια (I).

Second Century BC: ὑπαρχιφυλακίτης (P); ὑποοπλομάχος (I); ὑποπρύτανις (I).

First Century BC: ὑπονακόρος (I); ὑποπαιδοτρίβης (I); ὑποστρατοφύλαξ (Strabo); ὑποχρήστης (I).

First Century AD: ὑπογεωργός (P); ὑποκορυφαῖος (P); ὑποχειριστής (P); ὑφιππαρχής (I).

Second Century AD: ὑποβιβλιοφύλαξ (P); ὑποκῆρυξ (I, restored); ὑποκιθαριστής (P); ὑποκοσμήτης (I; not in *LSJ*); ὑπομισθωτής (P); ὑποσωφρονιστής (I); ὑπότροφος (I).

Third Century AD: ὑπαγωνοθετέω (I); ὑποτιμητής (= Latin *subcensor*; Cassius Dio).

'Roman era': ὑπαγορανόμος (I); ὑπεστιοῦχος (I); ὑποδημιουργός (I); ὑποεργεπιστάτης (I); ὑποκαλαθηφόρος (I); ὑποφύλαξ (I).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, J. K. (1970) *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon* (Berkeley).

Arnold, T., ed. (1840) *The History of the Peloponnesian War by Thucydides*[2], 3 vols. (Oxford).

Azoulay, V. (2004) 'Exchange as Entrapment: Mercenary Xenophon?', in R. Lane Fox, ed., *The Long March: Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven) 289–304.

Bleckmann, B. (1998) *Athens Weg in die Niederlage: Die letzten Jahre des Peloponneischen Kriegs* (Stuttgart).

Boucher, A. (1913) *L'Anabase de Xénophon (retraite des dix mille) avec un commentaire historique et militaire* (Paris).

Buzzetti, E. (2014) *Xenophon the Socratic Prince: The Argument of the Anabasis of Cyrus* (New York).

Cobet, C. G., ed. (1873) Ξενοφῶντος Ἀνάβασις Κύρου[2] (Leiden).

Crowley, J. (2012) *The Psychology of the Athenian Hoplite: The Culture of Combat in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).

Develin, R. (1989) *Athenian Officials: 684–321 BC* (Cambridge).

Dillery, J. (2004) 'Xenophon, the Military Review and Hellenistic *Pompai*', in Tuplin (2004) 259–76.

Dürrbach, F. (1893) 'L'apologie de Xénophon dans l'*Anabase*', *Revue des études grecques* 6: 343–86.

Flower, M. A. (2012) *Xenophon's Anabasis or The Expedition of Cyrus* (Oxford).

Fornara, C. W. (1971) *The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 404*. *Historia* Einzelschriften 16 (Wiesbaden).

Gomme, A. W., A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover (1945–81) *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, 5 vols. (Oxford).

Gray, V. J. (2011) *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes: Reading the Reflections* (Oxford).

Green, P., trans. and ed. (2010) *Diodorus Siculus: The Persian Wars to the Fall of Athens: Books 11–14.34 (480–401 BCE)* (Austin).

Hamel, D. (1998) *Athenian Generals: Military Authority in the Classical Period* (Leiden).

Harman, R. (2013) 'Looking at the Other: Visual Mediation and Greek Identity in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in E. Almagor and J. Skinner, edd., *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches* (London) 79–96.

Hornblower, S. (1991–2008) *A Commentary on Thucydides*, 3 vols. (Oxford).

—— (2011) *The Greek World: 479–323 BC*[4] (London).

Jachmann, G. (1942) *Der Platontext* (Göttingen).

Jordan, B. (1975) *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period: A Study of Athenian Naval Administration and Military Organization in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC* (Berkeley).

Kagan, D. (1987) *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Ithaca).

Kölligan, D. (2007) *Suppletion und Defektivität im griechischen Verbum* (Bremen).

Krentz, P. (1989) *Xenophon: Hellenika I–II.3.10* (Warminster).

Krüger, K. W., ed. (1826) Ξενοφῶντος Κύρου Ἀνάβασις (Halle).

Lazenby, J. F. (2012) *The Spartan Army*, rev. ed. (Barnsley).

Lee, J. W. I. (2004) 'The *lochos* in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in Tuplin (2004) 289–317.

—— (2007) *A Greek Army on the March: Soldiers and Survival in Xenophon's Anabasis* (Cambridge).

Lendle, O. (1995) *Kommentar zu Xenophons Anabasis (Bücher 1–7)* (Darmstadt).

Létoublon, F. (1985) *Il allait, pareil à la nuit. Les verbes de mouvement en grec: supplétisme et aspect verbal* (Paris).

MacDowell, D. M. (2000) *Demosthenes: On the False Embassy (Oration 19)* (Oxford).

Matthiä, K., ed. (1852) *Xenophons Anabasis* (Quedlinburg).

Michell, H. (1952) *Sparta* (Cambridge).

Nussbaum, G. B. (1967) *The Ten Thousand: A Study in Social Organization and Action in Xenophon's Anabasis* (Leiden).

Parke, H. W. (1933) *Greek Mercenary Soldiers: From the Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus* (Oxford).

Persson, A. W. (1915) *Zur Textgeschichte Xenophons* (Lund).

Pritchett, W. K. (1994) *Essays in Greek History* (Amsterdam).

Rehdantz, C., ed. (1867) *Xenophons Anabasis*[2] (Berlin).

Rhodes, P. J. (1972) *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford).

—— (1993) *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, rev. ed. (Oxford).
—— (1998) *Thucydides: History IV.1–V.24* (Warminster).
Roisman, J. (1987) 'Kallikratidas: A Greek Patriot?', *CJ* 83: 21–33.
Roy, J. (1967) 'The Mercenaries of Cyrus', *Historia* 16: 287–323.
Rusch, S. M. (2014) *Sparta at War: Strategy, Tactics, and Campaigns, 550–362 BC* (London).
Sealey, R. (1976) 'Die Spartanische Nauarchie', *Klio* 58: 335–58.
Smyth, H. W. (1956) *Greek Grammar*² (Cambridge, Mass.).
Stadter, P. A. (1989) *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles* (Chapel Hill).
Stoevesandt, M. (2008) *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Herausgegeben von Anton Bierl und Joachim Latacz*, vol. VI.2 (Berlin and New York).
Sturz, F. W. (1801–4) *Lexicon Xenophonteum*, 4 vols. (Leipzig).
Trundle, M. (2004) *Greek Mercenaries: From the Late Archaic Period to Alexander* (London).
Tuplin, C. J. (1994) 'Xenophon, Sparta and the *Cyropaedia*', in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell, edd., *The Shadow of Sparta* (London) 127–81.
——, ed. (2004) *Xenophon and His World* (Stuttgart).
Vrind, G. (1923) *De Cassii Dionis vocabulis quae ad ius publicum pertinent* (The Hague).
Walbank, F. W. (1957–79) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
Watson, J. S., trans. (1864) *The Anabasis, or, Expedition of Cyrus, and the Memorabilia of Socrates literally translated from the Greek of Xenophon* (London).
van Wees, H. (2004) *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities* (London).
Wilson, P. J. (2000) *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage* (Cambridge).
Zeune, J. C., ed. (1785) Ξενοφῶντος Ἀνάβασις Κύρου (Leipzig).