

of the points at which details of the clepsydra analogy have no parallel in the account of breathing.<sup>3</sup> Finally, under lines 20-1, Dr O'Brien writes '... air enters the clepsydra and ...'; this is all right, provided that we note that 'air enters the clepsydra' is in genitive absolute construction in the Greek, which means that 'water rushes out' is the event, while 'air enters' is the circumstance that gives rise to the event. An interpretation which does not recognize the dependence of clauses in the Greek is not just a wrong interpretation; it is a mistranslation.

Dr O'Brien's interpretation should therefore be rewritten as follows:

1. Lines 8-13. Water cannot enter the clepsydra when it is full of air. . . . (There is nothing in the account of breathing which corresponds to this; I infer that it merely sets up the situation in the clepsydra.)

2. Lines 14-5. When the girl's hand is taken from the top of the clepsydra, then as the air leaves the clepsydra, water enters through the holes in the bottom of the clepsydra. (In just the same way, when the blood rushes back from the upper part of the tubes, immediately behind the nostrils, into the inmost part, a stream of air enters the tubes through the holes at the back of the nostrils. Lines 23-4, supported by 1-8.)

3. Lines 16-9. When water fills the clepsydra and the top of the clepsydra is closed, the air (outside, according to Regenbogen) holds in the water. (There is nothing in the account of breathing which corresponds to this; I infer that it merely fills out the detail of the clepsydra analogy.)

4. Lines 20-1. When the girl's hand is taken from the top of the clepsydra, then as air falls into the clepsydra, water rushes out. (In just the same way, when the blood rushes back up the tubes again, air is breathed out. Line 25, also line 8.)

This interpretation has the advantage that it includes Empedocles's statements, the whole of Empedocles's statements, and nothing but Empedocles's statements. Dr O'Brien and D. J. Furley both depend heavily on the *a priori* argument that it is implausible that Empedocles would have used air in two opposite senses in the two legs of the similitude. This is a typical example of an *a priori* argument which runs counter to all the evidence of the text itself; and even *a priori* it has no necessary truth, since 'implausible' is a matter of opinion (about which I disagree with them, for reasons stated in my earlier article, p. 13 lines 11-23). Their error, like that of so many other scholars before them, has been to prefer unsound *a priori* reasoning to a careful examination of the text.<sup>4</sup>

N. B. BOOTH.

*Department of Mathematics,  
Polytechnic of North London*

<sup>3</sup> See my article in *JHS* (1960) 13, lines 24-35, where I have argued that we are not to expect that *all* details of the clepsydra analogy should be relevant to the comparison. (This argument disposes also of Dr O'Brien's criticism of my interpretation on the grounds that I have got things 'somehow upside down'; see p. 152 of his article.)

<sup>4</sup> I would commend other scholars like Professor W. K. Guthrie, Dr G. Lloyd and Professor G. A. Seck who have not followed this error and who have been kind

### The Scene on the Panagjurishte Amphora: a New Solution

In *JHS* xciv (1974) 38 ff. (with PLATES IV-V), J. G. Griffith discusses the subject-matter of the scene on the late fourth-century amphora discovered in 1949 at Panagjurishte in Bulgaria, in which a group of four determined-looking men armed only with swords attacks a house-door which has just been half-opened by a startled servant of diminutive stature. Connected, apparently, with the assault is a trumpeter, and finally there is another pair (not obviously involved in the action) consisting of a bearded figure, taken to be a seer since he holds 'a liver, lobe and all', which he shows to his more youthful companion.

Griffith has little difficulty in exposing the improbability of earlier attempts to identify a mythological scene—Achilles discovered at Scyros, the Seven against Thebes, or the preliminaries to the murder of Neoptolemus at Delphi, and proposes a novel view that the attackers are *komastai*, whether the occasion is a 'genre-scene' from comedy, or a characteristic scene from real life, in either of which cases help in identifying the individuals would be unnecessary and irrelevant. But I must confess that I find this proposal far-fetched: the attempts to account also for the trumpeter and seer are desperate enough, but he really fails to make a credible case for the use of swords in such escapades, even granted the violence often referred to in literary evidence<sup>1</sup> about the *komos*, whether fisticuffs among rivals for the favours of the courtesan or mistress, or the use of cudgels, levers and torches to break down, or burn, the door by the 'exclusus amator'.

For it seems to me that even the passage he cites from Philostratus (*VS* i 2 p. 485 Olearius) disproves this, *pace* his observation (p. 47) that the remark 'loses all point unless swords might on occasion be used for this purpose'. When Philip attacked Byzantium, the philosopher Leon reproachfully addressed him *τί παθὼν πολέμων ἀρχεῖς; τοῦ δ' εἰπόντος "ἡ πατρις ἢ σὴ καλλίστη πόλεων οὐσα ὑπηγάγετό με ἐρᾶν αὐτῆς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ θύρας τῶν ἐμαντοῦ παιδικῶν ἤκω", ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Λεὼν "οὐ φοιτῶσω", ἔφη, "μετὰ ξιφῶν ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν παιδικῶν θύρας οἱ ἄξιοι τοῦ ἀντερᾶσθαι οὐ γὰρ πολεμικῶν ὀργάνων ἀλλὰ μουσικῶν οἱ ἐρῶντες δέονται."* Surely this reproof assumes a total *inappropriateness* of swords to the occasion of Philip's sardonic comparison, in contrast to the *ὄργανα*<sup>2</sup> enough to give general support to my interpretation; the relevant references are listed in Dr O'Brien's article. See also K. Wilkens in *Hermes* xcv (1967) 138, (n. 3 and relevant text). I would commend Dr O'Brien for his conscientious assembly of material and for a number of sensible comments.

<sup>1</sup> Headlam's note on Herodas ii 34 provides a convenient list of appropriate Greek examples.

<sup>2</sup> The contrast of the equipment of war and the *komos* is made in similar language by Posidonius (*ap. Athen.* 176c) describing a disorganized rabble going to war with *κώμων, οὐ πολέμων, ὄργανα*. The elaborate contrast of the '*komos* of Ares' with a true revel in Eur. *Phoen.* 784 ff. (*σὺν ὀπλοφόροις . . . κῶμον ἀναυλότατον προχορεύεις*) loses much of its piquancy if one does not notice the Greeks' firm recognition of the incongruity. Cf. also Ar. *Ach.* 978 ff.

appropriate to the pursuit, however determined, of the παιδικά. Elsewhere (*VA* vii 42.4) Philostratus describes the circumstances (again quite exceptional) of the tyrant Domitian forcing his attentions on an unwilling lover whom he has actually imprisoned—*πρὸς ἔραστὴν γὰρ ὁ λόγος κωμάζοντα μετὰ ξίφους ἐπὶ τὴν σὴν ὄραν*, where I take it that *κωμάζειν μετὰ ξίφους* expresses an outrageous violation of normality, rather than an acceptable extension of real-life *komos* behaviour. But in any case, surely the grim expression on the faces of all four members of the squad of dagger-wielding warriors on the Panagjurische amphora suggests something more akin to murder than rape, and a *komos* scene might be expected to include some of the traditional accoutrements of torches, auloi and, above all, garlands.<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless it was Griffith's reference to a *komos* theme which served to remind me, not of a mythological, but of a famous historical incident of the fourth century which, as described in a memorably vivid piece of writing by Plutarch, contains all the detail of the activities of the seven (or eight, including the doorkeeper) figures on the amphora to a remarkably faithful degree. This is the attack made by Pelopidas and other conspirators to assassinate Archias, Leontiades and other ringleaders of the pro-Spartan government of Thebes in 379. Plutarch twice recounts this (the other case being of course the *Life* of Pelopidas), but it is from the fuller and more brilliant version<sup>4</sup> of the *de genio Socratis* (*Mor.* 575b–98f) that I cite most of the relevant material.

When the Theban group of dissidents had been joined by the exiles who came secretly over Cithaeron from Athens, and they had all (48 in number) assembled at the house of Charon, Plutarch describes how they split into two groups for the assault on the tyrants. The more unusual of the two was the party which dressed as komasts (some in women's clothes) to kill Archias and others who were known to be eagerly awaiting such additional entertainment over their cups; but the second party, which Pelopidas himself led to Leontiades' house (Plutarch names three others and implies that these were not all)<sup>5</sup> *ἐν ἱματίοις ἐξήρσαν ἔχοντες οὐδὲν ἕτερον τῶν ὄπλων ἢ μάχαιραν*<sup>6</sup> (596c). When they reached the house

<sup>3</sup> It is true that Antiph. *fr.* 199 K, cited by Griffith, envisages the possibility of a *komos* started precipitately without torches and garlands, but note the significance of the surprised reaction to such a proposal of the second speaker in the fragment.

<sup>4</sup> In his recent book on Plutarch (London, 1973), D. A. Russell rightly places this narrative as 'among the best in Plutarch' and showing 'a clear eye for action, a powerful technique of suspense, the natural skill of the born story teller' (p. 37).

<sup>5</sup> The *Life* version (ch. 11) implies not less than four in Pelopidas' party (*οἱ μὲν περὶ Πελοπίδαν καὶ Δαμοκλείδαν*).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Xen. *Hell.* v 4.3 *ξίφidia ἔχοντας καὶ ἄλλο ὄπλον οὐδὲν*. (Note Griffith's comment on the 'scanty un-military attire' of the attackers on the amphora). In the *Life* (ch. 8) the exiles from Athens arrive with only *χλαμύδια* and hunting equipment, and later (ch. 9) they are clad in *ἑσθητάς γεωργῶν*. In Charon's house, as the *other* group chosen to attack Archias sallies forth, they are said to have *θώρακες* (cf. *de genio* 596d *ἡμιθώρακια*) as well as their *μάχαιρα*.

door, they knocked and ordered the slave to open it: *ὡς δὲ ἀπαγγείλας καὶ κελευσθεὶς ἀνοίξει τὸν μοχλὸν ἀρεῖλε καὶ μικρὸν ἐνέδωκε τὴν θύραν, ἐμπέσοντες ἀρροὶ καὶ ἀνατρέφαντες τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἵεντο δρόμῳ διὰ τῆς ἀλλῆς ἐπὶ τὸ θάλαμον* (597d). When first Leontiades, then Hypates were killed (the second as he fled over the roof-top), liberty was proclaimed and crowds with arms gathered in the market-place, among them Hippstheneidas *σαλπυγκτὰς παραλαμβάνων* (598e), who immediately set about blowing their trumpets.

So far, we observe the relevance of the armed men attacking the house door, the startled servant, the trumpeter. What now of the two onlookers, the liver-examining seer and the young man? In the *de genio*, a prominent member of the conspiracy, always busy with encouragement and advice for the hesitant or pessimistic, is the seer Theocritus;<sup>7</sup> at 587c he reassures Hippstheneidas, who is anxious about unfavourable sacrifices and an ominous dream,<sup>8</sup> and mentions the propitious nature of his own inspections, *ἱεροῖς αἰεὶ χρησαμένῳ καλοῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν φηγάδων*; at 594e he retires alone from the conspirators for further consultations (*ἤδη τοῦ Θεοκρίτου καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐν οἰκίσκῳ τινι σφαγιαζομένου*); and at 595f he confirms from his findings the time for decisive action, *ὡς τῶν ἱερῶν σωτηρίων καὶ καλῶν καὶ πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν ἐγγεγῶν αὐτῷ γεγονότων*.

Another memorable scene (which occurs in the *Life* also) is Plutarch's description (594e) of the urgent knocking at Charon's door and the summons from Archias for Charon to attend immediately, which makes the conspirators fear that their secret is already out, or must be so before they can act. When Charon decides he must obey, he brings his fifteen-year-old son into the room and offers him as a hostage to be revenged upon should he subsequently appear to have betrayed them. The others indignantly reject this idea, whereupon Charon goes on *ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ παραμενεῖ καὶ κινδυνεύσει μεθ' ὑμῶν* (595d), and encourages his son. The emotions of the company are memorably evoked, as is the Neoptolemus-like behaviour of the young man as he tests the edge of Pelopidas' sword: *δάκρυα πολλοῖς ἐπήλθεν ἡμῶν, ὃ Ἀρχέδαμει, πρὸς τοὺς λόγους τοῦ ἀνδρός, αὐτὸς δὲ ἄδακρυς καὶ ἀτεγκτος ἐγγχειρίσας Πελοπίδα τὸν νῖον ἐχώρει διὰ θυρῶν δεξιούμενος ἕκαστον ἡμῶν καὶ παραθαρρύνων. ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον ἂν ἠγάσσω τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν φαιδρότητα καὶ τὸ ἀδεὲς πρὸς τὸν κίνδυνον, ὡσπερ τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου, μήτε ὠχριάσαντος μήτε ἐκπλαγέντος, ἀλλ' ἔλκοντος τὸ ξίφος τοῦ Πελοπίδου καὶ καταμανθάνοντος*.

It is not actually stated whether the boy goes out with either of the groups; and the only subsequent mention of Theocritus shows that Plutarch associated the seer with the party of pseudo-komasts, since (597c) he removes the blood-stained sacred spear used in the *melée* to kill the magistrate Cabirichus.

<sup>7</sup> He is mentioned only once in the *Life* (ch. 22) and apparently not elsewhere, and seems to have been ignored in Pauly-Wissowa.

<sup>8</sup> There are other references to omens, oracles and portents in connexion with the dramatic events at 577d, 594e. The briefer version of the *Life* refrains entirely from such detail.

Nevertheless it seems to me (assuming that Plutarch's account highlights the *personae* of the famous action basing his choice, and perhaps embellishment, of themes on some earlier historical tradition) that the artist of the amphora scene could well have intended to contrast the swordsmen in the attack, led by Pelopidas, with these two rather exceptional figures in the conspiracy as 'non-combatants', since in Greek art separate events within a continuous story are frequently juxtaposed; and we have seen how the trumpeter belongs not to the house attack, where surprise was obviously a prerequisite, but to the proclamation in the hour of victory and liberation.

I submit that the details quoted from Plutarch fit our amphora scene with such remarkable fidelity, that, unlike the hypothetical scenes proposed by previous scholars, pure coincidence seems almost incredible. Only the portrayal of *four* armed conspirators (against the five-plus implied in the *de genio*) differs slightly; but, although this is not very important in artistic representation of a small group whose precise number may not have been important or canonical, I should point out that in the *earliest* version of the Theban liberation, that of the *Hellenica*, Xenophon, although making a smaller group of an apparently unified conspiratorial party proceed from the first batch of killings (Archias, etc.) in the revellers' disguise to despatch thereafter Leontiades, and while curiously ignoring entirely the participation of the most famous member, Pelopidas himself, specifies *four* men—*λαβὼν δὲ ὁ Φιλλίδας τρεῖς αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ Λεοντιάδου οἰκίαν, κτλ.* (*Hell.* v 4.7). But it is pointless to speculate further about the possible sources of Plutarch's own two (occasionally conflicting) accounts, or about his own possible contributions to, and elaborations of, the drama of the narrative, presumably derived from some patriotic Theban account,<sup>9</sup> when we can see how the essential highlights before, during, and after Pelopidas' part in the events are all so succinctly combined in the scene on the amphora.

What finally is to be observed in both Xenophon (more grudgingly, of course)<sup>10</sup> and Plutarch is the recognition of this event at Thebes as one of the bravest and most successful liberation movements of Greek history. In the *Life* version, both at the beginning (ch. 7) and end (ch. 13), Plutarch compares Pelopidas' enterprise with the restoration of Athenian democracy by Thrasybulus, adding that the Greeks in general later referred to it as 'the sister' of the Athenian liberation, and one which had even *more* far-reaching results in the Greek world: *οὐ γὰρ ἔστι βραδίως ἐτέρους εἰπεῖν οἱ πλείονων ἐλάττους καὶ δυνατωτέρων ἐρημότεροι τόλμη καὶ δεινότητι κρατήσαντες αἴτιοι μείζονων ἀγαθῶν ταῖς πατρίσι κατέστησαν. ἐνδοξότεραν δὲ ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἢ μεταβολὴ τῶν*

<sup>9</sup> Plutarch's possible sources have been recently assembled and admirably discussed in the introduction to A. Corlu's recent Plutarque, *Le Démon de Socrate* (Paris, 1970).

<sup>10</sup> See, however, his comment on the previous invincibility of the Spartans, and how *τὴν τούτων ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ τὸ μόνον τῶν φηγόντων ἤρκεσαν καταλῦσαι* (*Hell.* v 4.1). Cf. Nepos, *Pel.* 2.

*πραγμάτων. ὁ γὰρ καταλύσας τὸ τῆς Σπάρτης ἀξίωμα καὶ πᾶσας ἀρχοντας αὐτοῦς γῆς τε καὶ θαλάττης πόλεμος ἐξ ἐκείνης ἐγένετο τῆς νυκτὸς ἐν ἣ Πελοπίδας οὐ φρούριον, οὐ τεῖχος, οὐκ ἀκρόπολιν καταλαβὼν, ἀλλ' εἰς οἰκίαν δωδέκατος κατελθὼν, εἰ δεῖ μεταφορᾷ τὸ ἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν, ἔλυσε καὶ διέκοψε τοὺς δεσμούς τῆς Λακεδαιμονίων ἡγεμονίας ἀλύτους καὶ ἀρρήκτους εἶναι δοκοῦντας.*

It is this acknowledgment of notoriety, so respectfully noticed even centuries later,<sup>11</sup> which allows me to anticipate what may seem the most obvious objection to my unusual interpretation of the amphora subject—for it must be admitted that portrayal (and that too without any indication of the identity of the persons) of historical, not mythological, events is a rarity in the Greek artistic tradition, and only really outstanding national events, such as the battles of the Persian wars<sup>12</sup> or the campaigns of Alexander,<sup>13</sup> spring readily to mind. Nevertheless in the traditions of sculpture, if not of vase representations,<sup>14</sup> the Harmodius-Aristogiton conspiracy achieved a like notoriety and patriotic commemoration in Athens,<sup>15</sup> where also in the fourth century a statue of Chabrias apparently was executed representing him in a pose specifically associated with one great moment in his career.<sup>16</sup> Mention might be made of the Mantinea mural at Athens<sup>17</sup> (which included a representation of Epaminondas) by Euphranor, whom Plutarch (*Mor.* 346a) includes in a list of artists to whom he attributes paintings of *στρατηγὸς νικῶντας* and *μάχας*; but, most strikingly of all, in the *Pelopidas* itself (ch. 25), Plutarch recounts a story of how in Thebes, about the very time of the events which form the subject of this article, an unfinished painting of an earlier battle-piece showing

<sup>11</sup> Another minor indication of the celebrity of even minor details of the story in the Greek world at large is the origin of the popular proverb *εἰς αἶθριον τὰ σπουδαῖα* from the fatal negligence of Archias (Plut. *Pel.* 10, *Mor.* 596 f, 619d, Nepos, *Pel.* 3, *Paroem. Gr.* i p. 404).

<sup>12</sup> The celebrated mural in the Stoa Poikile also contained a picture of a lesser-known engagement of Athenians v. Spartans at Oenoe (Paus. i 15), although L. H. Jeffery (*BSA* lx [1965] 41 ff.) thinks that the actual picture was of a mythical subject: see also Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1972), 469–72.

<sup>13</sup> Dr A. M. Snodgrass, to whom I am grateful for much helpful advice and information in compiling this article, draws my attention to Craterus' memorial of Alexander's lion-hunt (Plut. *Alex.* 40) and a similar work, together with a cavalry battle scene, by Lysippus' sons (Plin. *N.H.* xxxiv 66).

<sup>14</sup> On the whole subject, see the recent book by T. Hölscher, *Griechische Historienbilder des 5 und 4 Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Würzburg, 1973), especially p. 112 ff.

<sup>15</sup> I know of no evidence for the liberation of Athens by Thrasybulus having been a theme for the artist, although Paus ix 11.6 refers to Thrasybulus setting up a dedicatory relief in Thebes. The *δωρεά* given to 'the men from Phyle' mentioned in Aeschin. iii 187 was a written record of monies given for various dedications: see Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora* iii 151, no. 466.

<sup>16</sup> See the article by J. K. Anderson in *AJA* lxxvii (1963) 411–3, who, however, denies the common view that Chabrias was represented in a kneeling position as he awaits the foe.

<sup>17</sup> Paus. i 3.4, Plut. *Mor.* 346b, etc.

Thebans and Spartans, by Androcydes of Cyzicus, had been refurbished during the political in-fighting which was conducted by the opponents of Pelopidas and Epaminondas, and was dedicated with the inclusion of the name of Charon, the host of the Theban conspirators. On this occasion, Pelopidas himself is quoted as having observed that the glory belonged to the whole state, and that individuals should not be singled out for special honour in this way.

It is at least tempting to speculate that the remarkable Panagjurische amphora may have been commissioned to commemorate an even more famous event in Theban history when the memory of the dramatic night in 379 was still fresh; and, although of course a Heracles theme is of common international usage in Greek art, I observe finally that on the underside of the amphora is depicted Thebes' most famous citizen of all strangling his snakes in his cradle—an appropriate enough companion for Pelopidas, the liberator of his city. Indeed, the location in Macedonia of this hoard of expensive objects with Theban associations would even suggest the interesting possibility of its having once formed part of the loot in the aftermath of the destruction and pillaging of Thebes by Alexander's troops, were it not for the fact that the slightly later date accepted for their manufacture (which I am of course not competent to dispute or discuss) precludes it.

E. K. BORTHWICK

University of Edinburgh

#### Anaximenes and King Alexander I of Macedonia<sup>1</sup>

Ἄναξιμένης ἐν ᾧ Φιλιππικῶν περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου λέγων φησὶν ἔπειτα τοὺς μὲν ἐνδοξοτάτους ἱππεύειν συνελθίσας ἑταίρους προσηγόρευσε, τοὺς δὲ πλείστους καὶ τοὺς πέζους<sup>2</sup> εἰς λόχους καὶ δεμάδας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς διελὼν πεζεταίρους ἀνόμασεν, ὅπως ἐκάτεροι μετέχοντες τῆς βασιλικῆς ἑταιρίας προθυμότατοι διατελώσων ὄντες<sup>3</sup>.

This fragment of Anaximenes of Lampsacus, a historian contemporary with Philip II and Alexander, cited by Harpocration and the Suda to explain the use of *pezetairoi* in Demosthenes ii 17, alleges that some Alexander not only accustomed the Macedonians of highest repute to serve in the cavalry but also organised the foot in *lochoi*, decads and 'other

commands', apparently those of the writer's own day,<sup>4</sup> and entitled them *pezetairoi*. Since that title already existed, and was known by both Anaximenes and the lexicographers to have existed, in the reign of Philip, the Alexander named cannot be Alexander III. Taking the information offered seriously, most scholars either suppose Alexander I (c. 495–50) or Alexander II (369–8) to be meant, or refer the innovations to Archelaus (c. 413–399) or even to Philip II (359–36). Emendation can of course only be based on the assumption that the excerptors misunderstood the text of Anaximenes before their eyes. Moreover, it is virtually impossible to believe that any one of these kings actually promoted all the reforms mentioned. Geyer therefore conjectured that the first part of the statement related to Alexander I and the second to Archelaus. This implies that two distinct statements made by Anaximenes about different kings have been conflated. But Harpocration here employs the formula he uses for verbatim quotations (*λέγων φησὶν*), and to judge from those taken from Aristotle's (or Pseudo-Aristotle's) *Constitution of Athens*, the only historical work extant from which he happens to quote, he was not guilty of the kind of distortion that Geyer's hypothesis requires; at most and rarely he omits a phrase here or there (to say nothing of minor textual variants), but without any basic alteration of the sense.<sup>5</sup> In my view Anaximenes undoubtedly referred to Alexander I, but his evidence on that king is worthless.

What is known of the Macedonian army before Philip II is little.<sup>6</sup> In 430 Perdiccas II sent 200 cavalry to help Potidaea; the rebels in Macedon, Philip and Dardas, supplied Athens with 600 (Thuc. ii 62). In 429 Perdiccas lacked foot to repel the Thracians, and even after sending for horse from 'his allies up-country', presumably from Upper Macedon, they were too few to withstand the invaders, though 'brave and protected by breastplates' (ii 100.5). In 424, when he was at war, assisted by Brasidas, with the Lyncestians of Upper Macedon, he had almost 1000 cavalry, including some Chalcidians, but his only hoplites were furnished by 'the Greeks living in the country', presumably in Macedonian coastal towns; the main hoplite force from the Greek cities was under Brasidas' command, and Thucydides speaks with contempt of Perdiccas' foot as 'a numerous barbarian rabble'; rather unexpectedly, the

<sup>4</sup> *Lochoi* and decads: Arr. vii 23.3; H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich*, Munich, 1926, i 119–21. As decads were surely the smallest subdivisions, did the author have in mind the *taxeis* (ib. 113 ff.) by τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς, or was he thinking not of units but of officers and NCOs (e.g. the *dimoirites* and *decastateros*)? I assume that ἱππεύειν means 'serve in the cavalry' rather than 'ride'; Anaximenes would hardly have held the quaint belief that Macedonians did not even ride before Alexander I, cf. N. G. L. Hammond, *History of Macedonia* i, Oxford, 1972, index, s.v. 'horses' for early archaeological evidence.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Ath. Pol.* 7.1 and 3; 21.5; 42.4; 43.3 ff.; 47.1, 48.1; 51.4; 53.4; 56.1; 57.1; 58.3; 59.3 (twice in Harp.); I omit the many passages in which Harp. merely alludes to or summarises *Ath. Pol.* without pretending to quote. The texts of Harp. are cited in modern apparatuses of *Ath. Pol.*

<sup>6</sup> F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II*, Munich, 1930, is the best account of this period.

<sup>1</sup> See F. Granier, *Die Makedonische Heeresversammlung*, Munich, 1931, 9 ff., with review by W. S. Ferguson, *Gnomon*, XI, 1935, 520 (which adumbrates the right view); A. Momigliano, *Filippo il Macedone*, Florence, 1934, 8 ff.; F. Geyer, *RE* XIV 713, cf. n. 6; A. B. Bosworth, *CQ* xxiii, 1973, 245 ff. (whose views on *asthetairoi* I accept), all citing earlier literature.

<sup>2</sup> Momigliano secluded the last three words as a gloss on the ground that καί cannot mean in effect 'i.e.'. But cf. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford, 1934, 291.

<sup>3</sup> Jacoby, *FHG* no. 72 F 4. Book I of the *Philippica* no doubt began with introductory matter and not with Philip's assumption of the government in 359, cf. F 5–6, 27.