Amyntas, Son of Andromenes

Waldemar Heckel

In the mysterious course of events that have come to be known as the 'Philotas Affair', the name Amyntas, son of Andromenes, is of special interest. It is Amyntas who, of the four sons of Andromenes,[1] is singled out for attention by Curtius and Arrian. Yet the curious structure of Curtius' account of the *Philotasprozess*,[2] the paucity of the information supplied by the extant sources (undoubtedly an accurate reflection of the nature and quality of their primary material), and the peculiar interpretations of Helmut Berve[3] have led to considerable confusion.

Amyntas and his brothers are the only individuals who can be said with certainty to have been tried by the Macedonian army in connection with the 'conspiracy of Philotas' and acquitted.[4] Arrian's abbreviated account (3.27.1–2) provides the essential information and does not appear to be suppressing anything of great consequence:[5] Amyntas and his brothers were suspected of complicity in the conspiracy against Alexander because of their friendship with Philotas, while Polemon, one of the brothers, gave more credence to that suspicion through his sudden flight from Alexander's camp. The brothers were, however, cleared of the charges, and Amyntas set out to bring Polemon back to the camp; this he did within one day.[6]

[1] Details can be found in H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* II (München 1926) nos. 181, 644, 704, *s.vv.* *Ἄτταλος, Πολέμων, Σιμμίας* [henceforth Berve II].

[2] Curt. 6.7.1–7.2.38. I prefer to apply the term, however, to the 'judicial' process that begins at 6.8.1.

[3] Berve, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1).

[4] The case of Demetrios the bodyguard is not clear, as will be shown.

[5] It is tempting, as E. Badian ("The Death of Parmenio," *TAPA* 91 [1960] 335) suggests, to seek the reason for their acquittal in Perdikkas' relationship with Attalos. This cannot be dated, but it is not impossible that Perdikkas was again written out of Ptolemy's account. Perdikkas and Amyntas appear together in two campaigns in which Perdikkas is maligned: Arr. 1.8.2 (at Thebes) and Arr. 1.20.5. On this point see R. M. Errington, "Bias in Ptolemy's History of Alexander," *CQ* N.S. 19 [1969] 236–37. C. A. Robinson, Jr (rev. of E. Kornemann's *Die Alexandergeschichte*, *AJP* 58 [1937] 109) charges that this is no longer part of Ptolemy's account, nor does Jacoby include the Amyntas story in *FGrHist* 138 F 13. The words *λέγουσι δὲ καί* seem to me to imply not the use of other sources but rather both Aristoboulos and Ptolemy: "And Ptolemy and Aristoboulos go on to say . . ."

[6] Curtius (7.2.1) says that others brought Polemon back in chains during the trial of Amyntas and his brothers.

On this Arrian (3.27.3) comments: *καὶ ταύτῃ πολὺ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρόσθεν ἔξω αἰτίας ἐφάνη Ἀμύντας*. Curiously, Amyntas' death in battle shortly afterward draws a note of irony from Arrian, but Berve voices his suspicion (unfortunately he does not elucidate the remark further) in the following manner: "Die Wiederherstellung seiner Ehre überlebte A[myntas] *freilich* (my emphasis) nicht lange."[7]

No less than three different individuals named Amyntas find their way from Curtius' version into the pages of Berve's prosopography.[8] The first, in order of appearance in Curtius' text, is Berve's Amyntas 64, who appears in the list of names given by Dimnos to his lover, Nikomachos.[9] Nikomachos, pretending to yield to Dimnos' wishes on account of his love for him,[10] is thanked by him *quod fortissimis iuvenum non dubitasset se adiungere, Demetrio, corporis custodi, Peucolao, Nicanori; adicit his Aphobetum, Iolaum, Theoxenum, Archepolim, Amyntam* (Curt. 6.7.15). Yet Berve claims that this Amyntas cannot be identified with the son of Andromenes (no.57) since the name Amyntas is a common one and, more important, since Curtius (6.11.38) implies that Dimnos' fellow-conspirators were found guilty and stoned to death. All the conspirators, with the exception of Demetrios, the bodyguard, are unknown except for the evidence of Curtius, who mentions them only once and implies that they were executed (*loc.cit.*).[11]

There should be no difficulty in identifying this first Amyntas with the son of Andromenes,[12] since the record of his implied execution together with Philotas is rendered unreliable by the case of Demetrios, certainly the same Demetrios of Arrian's account.[13] Of his fate Curtius relates the following (6.11.37–38): [*sc. Philotas*] . . . *qui ut praefectos regis circumstantes se vidit, Demetrium et semetipsum id facinus cogitasse confessus est. Omnes ergo a Nicomacho nominati, more patrio, dato signo saxis obruti sunt.* It is clear from Arrian, however, that Demetrios was not removed from his office until shortly afterward among the Ariaspians, at which time he may or may not have ended his life; Arrian (Ptolemy?) is unclear, although he was definitely removed on sus-

[7] Berve II 28.

[8] Berve II, nos. 57, 64, 65 *s.v.* *Ἀμύντας*.

[9] Berve II, nos 269, 569 *s.vv.* *Δίμνος, Νικόμαχος*.

[10] Curt. 6.7.13: *sed captum Dymni amore simulabat nihil recusare.*

[11] Berve II, nos. 637, 558, 190, 387, 280 *s.v.* *Διόξενος*, 161; these are listed in order of their appearance in Curtius' text.

[12] See Badian's remark, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 334 n.30.

[13] Arr. 3.27.5. See also Berve II, no.260 *s. v.* *Δημήτριος*.

picion of his involvement in the 'conspiracy'.[14] Berve, at any rate, rejects Curtius' statement concerning Demetrios' execution, allows for the possibility that Demetrios was allowed to live, and suggests that Dimnos may have included him in his list (what Berve calls "Prahlerei"[15]) in order to induce Nikomachos to join him in his design. Certainly the argument could apply equally to Amyntas, son of Andromenes, who was an officer of considerable rank.[16] Whatever the case, it is clear from Demetrios' case that Curtius' remarks provide no sound criterion for assigning a separate number to the Amyntas of Dimnos' list. Berve's Amyntas 64 is the son of Andromenes, whose fate was independent of that of the obscure conspirators (Arrian's *ὅσοι ἄλλοι μετέσχον αὐτῷ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς*, 3.26.3).

Curtius' second Amyntas, Berve's no. 65, presents a more difficult problem. One wonders where Curtius found his information for the details of his version of the 'Philotas Affair' and what was the extent of its reliability. Undoubtedly his main primary source was Kleitarchos, whose version was a composite of existing accounts and 'eyewitness' reports.[17] But the differences in the accounts of Justinus, Diodoros and Curtius (all of which derive from the Kleitarchean tradition) appear to be more than just the result of compression and expansion. That is not to say that Curtius, in his expanded account, was guilty of inventing Amyntas 65; perhaps, however, his presence is due to misunderstanding. Given the nature of the information, one is scarcely wise to be dogmatic; one feels an obligation to speculate nevertheless.

Curtius (6.9.28–29) names an Amyntas who is described as *regius praetor* and who gives a speech condemning Philotas because he had betrayed the Macedonian army to the barbarians and sought to rob them of the joy of homecoming. The speech is of little consequence to the course of events and did little more than displease Alexander, since it reminded the men of their homes and their wives (Curt. 6.9.29). But it appears that the significance of the passage in question is ultimately dependent upon the identity of this Amyntas. If we assume, as Berve did, that he can be identified with no known Amyntas, or

[14] He was replaced as *somatophylax* by Ptolemy, son of Lagos.

[15] Berve II 135.

[16] For complete references see Berve II no.57. Amyntas appeared as a *taxis* commander from the very beginning of the expedition.

[17] F. Schachermeyr, *Alexander in Babylon und die Reichsordnung nach seinem Tode* (Wien 1970) 81–92.

at best with the son of Nikolaos,[18] we are forced to conclude that the story is either the invention of Kleitarchos (or of his informants) or a true story of very little significance; the latter is certainly not impossible. But, if this Amyntas can be identified with the son of Andromenes, the account is either fictitious or, what is more likely, misplaced. There are a number of reasons why the latter may very well be the case.

Berve describes Amyntas 65 as "wohl Führer eines grösseren Kontingentes,"[19] adding that the term *regius praetor* was the equivalent of the Greek στρατηγός, a rank held, for example, by Kleandros.[20] But the rank appears to give little clue about the identity of this Amyntas, for neither the son of Andromenes nor any of his namesakes were ever termed στρατηγός by the Greek writers. But if we are to believe that Curtius 6.9.28–29 is a misplaced passage, with the error ascribable to the author or his source, we find that none of the information presented contradicts what is known about the son of Andromenes; quite to the contrary, it suits him almost perfectly.

The rank of *regius praetor* (=στρατηγός) is more appropriate to the son of Andromenes than to any other Amyntas; he can properly be called "Führer eines grösseren Kontingentes" and was, until his death, a man of no mean reputation. In fact, his rank, functions and career resemble in many strikingly peculiar ways those of Koinos, whom Diodoros terms στρατηγός.[21] It is hardly surprising that Berve chose Koinos' brother, Kleandros, for his example of the rank; Kleandros provides a good parallel for Amyntas, son of Nikolaos, his own candidate should an identification be made.[22] But the parallel that can be drawn between Koinos and the son of Andromenes is even more interesting.

In the early years of the expedition, Amyntas 57 appears in all the major campaigns with the exception of Gaugamela as a τάξις commander, as does Koinos, in association with whom he is found on numerous occasions.[23] Like Koinos, he had been sent to Macedonia on

[18] Berve II 32: "am ehesten mit A. dem Sohne des Nikolaos (nr. 60)."

[19] Berve II 31.

[20] Berve II, no.422 *s.v.* Κλέανδρος.

[21] Diodoros 17.61.3. See Berve II, no.439 *s.v.* Κοῖνος.

[22] Amyntas, son of Nikolaos, replaced Artabazos as satrap of Bactria in 328; Arr. 4.17.3; Curt. 8.2.14. Kleandros, one of Parmenion's murderers, appears to have succeeded to Parmenion's administrative position at Ekbatana. See Berve II 204.

[23] Arr. 1.14.2 (Granikos); Arr. 2.8.4; Curt. 3.9.7 (Issos); Arr. 3.18.6; Curt. 5.4.20, 30; Arr. 3.25.6.

a mission to bring back reinforcements; he did not return until after the battle of Gaugamela.[24] If there was a tradition that an Amyntas who was *regius praetor* spoke against Philotas, the son of Andromenes appears the likely candidate. Moreover, one might expect that an officer who had been to Macedonia during the course of the campaign would speak warmly about the men's wives and homeland (Curt. 6.9.28). Nor should it be surprising that the son of Andromenes should speak harshly against Philotas, to whom he owed much of his prestige (7.1.11). Koinos, who had married Philotas' sister, abused him violently in speech, terming him *parricidam . . . regis, patriae, exercitus* (6.9.30). The speech of the *regius praetor* provides, in essence, the tone of the speech that one would expect from the son of Andromenes; salvation clearly lay in the repudiation of his relationship with Philotas.[25] The suspicion of complicity was to cost Demetrios his command, perhaps even his life. It is not unlikely that the sons of Andromenes were spared through their rejection of Philotas.[26]

We need not be alarmed by the totally different speech given by Amyntas 57 as it is reported by Curtius.[27] This is almost certainly an invention; since he did not understand that the son of Andromenes and the *regius praetor* were the same,[28] he imagined an Amyntas who would speak more dutifully of his relationship with Philotas. The correlation of Amyntas 65 with the son of Andromenes provides, at best, an interesting historical emendation. One would like to express a certain feeling of conviction; the quality of the evidence, however, precludes this. Nevertheless, the primal position allotted to Amyntas in the trial of the sons of Andromenes must be due to more than his seniority. His peculiar death from a wound suffered during the siege of a small town shortly afterward recalls the sudden death of Koinos,

[24] Sent to Macedonia with ten ships, Diod. 17.49.1; Curt. 4.6.30. Berve II 27 "mit 30 dreiruderern" is surely a misprint. He was not at Gaugamela, Curt. 4.13.28; Arr. 3.11.9 with textual difficulties. He returned with reinforcements, Arr. 3.16.10; Curt. 5.1.40. Koinos had taken the *νεόγαμοι* back to their wives (he too had recently married) and returned with reinforcements, Arr. 1.24.1, 1.29.4.

[25] It is not unlikely that Koinos' violent opposition to Philotas was, first and foremost, an act of self-preservation. This was his strongest defense against any suspicion of complicity brought about by his marriage relationship with the house of Parmenion.

[26] The sons of Andromenes did, in fact, keep their ranks, although Amyntas did not live long to enjoy his position. Nothing in the careers of the other brothers arouses suspicion.

[27] Although Curtius assumes (from Amyntas' point of view) the guilt of Philotas (*Utinam Philotas quoque intra verba peccasset*), Amyntas' speech (7.1.21–40) is not an attack on Philotas.

[28] The failure to identify the two may, of course, antecede Curtius, who merely repeated the error.

which followed close on the heels of his opposition to Alexander at the Hyphasis,[29] and suggests that he had been strongly implicated in the 'conspiracy'. Amyntas 64 must certainly have been the son of Andromenes. As to the other conspirators named by Curtius, their existence and identity must remain a mystery, as must so many points related to the 'Philotas Affair'.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
July, 1975

[29] Curt. 9.3.20 (on a bitter note) and Arr. 6.2.1 record Koinos' death from illness. E. Badian voices his suspicions, "Harpalus," *JHS* 81 [1961] 22; wrongly ". . . Coenus . . . died in action soon afterward," in "Alexander the Great and the Loneliness of Power," *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford 1964) 200.