

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 Macedonia¹

Ἄναξιμένης ἐν ᾧ Φιλιππικῶν περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου λέγων φησὶν ἔπειτα τοὺς μὲν ἐνδοξοτάτους ἱππεύειν συνελθίσας ἑταίρους προσηγόρευσε, τοὺς δὲ πλείστους καὶ τοὺς πέζους² εἰς λόχους καὶ δεμάδας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς διελὼν πεζεταίρους ἀνόμασεν, ὅπως ἑκάτεροι μετέχοντες τῆς βασιλικῆς ἑταιρίας προθυμότατοι διατελώσιν ὄντες³.

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,⁴ 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.⁵ 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.⁶ In 430 Perdiccas II sent 200 cavalry to help Potidaea; the rebels in Macedon, Philip and Derdas, 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

⁴ *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.

⁵ 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.*

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

¹ 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.

² 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.

³ 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.

Lyncestians already had hoplites as well as cavalry (iv 124).⁷ At this time then the Macedonian kings had cavalry of good quality, though not very numerous, but virtually no hoplites. It is reasonable to suppose that the army of Alexander I had been of the same kind, and that it was by cavalry strength that he had expanded his kingdom.⁸ Perdiccas was not so strong as his father, obviously because of internal revolts and the adjacent power of Athens.

In commenting on the weakness of Macedon in 429, when there were also few forts in existence, Thucydides explains, evidently for the benefit of contemporary readers who knew that it was stronger when he was writing, that it was Archelaus who 'built the forts that now exist in the country, made straight roads and improved military strength in other ways, with horses, arms and other equipment better than all the eight preceding kings' (ii 100.2). It is on this statement that those scholars rely who suppose that in the fragment of Anaximenes the name of Alexander has been substituted for that of Archelaus. But Thucydides does not refer specifically to any reorganization of either cavalry or foot. His allusion to horses, especially when taken with his remark that in 429 the Macedonian cavalry were not numerous, suggests only that Archelaus encouraged horse-breeding and thereby augmented the number of the cavalry. What Thucydides himself tells us of Perdiccas shows that no king later than he could be supposed to have taught the Macedonians to serve on horse. The reference to 'arms' may also be to the increased manufacture of arms for an enlarged cavalry force. It would be rather odd if Thucydides called attention to the building of forts and roads and not more explicitly to the creation of a hoplite army, which Perdiccas had lacked.⁹

So far as I am aware, there is no allusion to heavy armed infantry in Lower Macedon before the time of Philip II,¹⁰ who had over 10,000 foot capable of confronting 10,000 'picked' Illyrians in 358 according to Diodorus (xvi 4). However, this need not be significant, since our total evidence for Macedonian affairs is very small. After 424 the growth of Hellenic influence, mediated in part through 'the Greeks living in the country', may have led to the gradual adoption of better armament and more disciplined tactics by the Macedonian foot, in the first place perhaps by those recruited in the towns, some of which were developing before Philip's

accession.¹¹ Diodorus indeed tells that, soon after coming to power in 359, Philip 'reformed the regimental units, provided the men with the necessary arms (*ὄπλοις*) and instituted continuous reviews and competitive forms of training; he also designed the solid formation and organisation¹² of the phalanx, imitating the close fighting order of the heroes at Troy, and he was the first to organise the Macedonian phalanx'. Since that phalanx was not exactly like a Greek hoplite formation, this does not imply that none of Philip's predecessors had had any well-armed foot-soldiers. It is perhaps of some significance that Diodorus' source thought that Philip was imitating the Greeks at Troy; false as this was, it may indicate that he claimed that his innovations were justified by ancient practice. (I owe this suggestion to Dr J. K. Davies.) Diodorus himself, though he mentions Philip's blandishments of his soldiers (xvi 3.1; 4.3), does not suggest that he first gave them the honourable title of *pezetairoi*.

It is from his reign indeed that we have the first mention of this term to denote the phalanx regiments, or, on Bosworth's view (n. 1), some of them. The appellation was certainly flattering, as Anaximenes saw, assimilating them to the *hetairoi*. That term of course has a double usage in Alexander the Great's time, referring either to a select body of *philoï* who, whether or not in actual attendance on the king, furnished his principal officers, or to the Macedonian cavalry, the *prodromoi* excepted (n. 15). Under Philip Aeschines (ii 34 and 137) uses it in the former sense, of the king's councillors or courtiers, while Theopompus appears to use it in the latter;¹³ in any event it must be assumed that the cavalry were designated as *hetairoi* before the foot were styled *pezetairoi*; they were naturally men of greater wealth and higher social status, and they continued to form the chief striking force in the army.¹⁴ But it cannot be concluded that because neither title is recorded in

⁷ For early Lyncestis see Hammond (n. 4) 102 ff. Upper Macedon was to furnish Alexander with 3 of the 6 phalanx regiments he took to Asia (Diod. xvii 57.2).

⁸ Hdt. ix 31.5 says that the Macedonians and Thessalians were among the Persian troops facing the Athenians at the battle of Plataea, but does not specifically mention their conduct in the fighting (67 f.), and we cannot tell if they served on horse or foot, cf. also vii 185; viii 34.

⁹ *Contra* Geyer (n. 6) 85 ff.

¹⁰ In 382 the Spartan general, Teleutias, bade his ally, King Amyntas, hire mercenaries (Xen., *Hell.* v. 2.38). Both Amyntas and the Elimian prince, Derdas, were able to supply cavalry (*ib.* 40). In 381 we hear again only of Derdas' cavalry (*ib.* 3.1). This evidence doubtless indicates that the Macedonians still specialised in cavalry fighting, but does not prove that they still lacked heavy infantry.

¹¹ The revolt of Pydna under Archelaus (Xen., *Hell.* i 1.12; Diod. xiii 49), and again in 364-56—it offered strenuous resistance to Philip (Diod. xvi 8; Dem. i 5 and 9)—betokens, like its issue of coins in the 380s, that it sought the status of an autonomous Greek city; some scholars in fact regard it as a Greek colony (Danoff, *RE, Suppl.* ix 833 ff.). Yet Xen., *Hell.* v 2.13, calls Pella the greatest of the Macedonian *poleis*, and though that term sometimes refers to mere fortified places of refuge (as in Diod. xvi 4.4 and 7), Pella at least is likely to have been subject to Hellenic influence and, as the capital, to have become a genuine town, even before Philip enlarged it (Strabo vii 330 *fr.* 20). Some urbanisation might be conjectured at Dion and Therme. The increase in trade, reflected in the doubling of revenue from harbour dues in 361/0 (Ps-Arist., *Oec.* 1350a 16 ff., cf. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* 2 iii 1.327) should have had an effect of this kind. Arrian vii 9.2 is rhetoric, at best applicable to Upper Macedon.

¹² *κατασκευήν*, perhaps 'equipment'.

¹³ *FHG* no. 115 F 225 = Athen. 261 A. The number of 800 is at once too large for councillors and probably too small at any date for Philip's Companion cavalry; I suspect that it relates to the Greeks and others whom Philip enfeoffed in return for cavalry service, cf. *SIG*³ 332, including these who served in the squadrons recruited from newly won Greek lands, Arr. i 2.5; 12.7; ii 9.3.

¹⁴ So already in 358, Diod. xvi 4.

contemporary evidence before Philip, it was Philip who bestowed them on cavalry and phalanx, and that his name has been replaced by Alexander's in Anaximenes. As a contemporary, that historian cannot have been unaware that it was not Philip who taught the Macedonians *ἱππεύειν*. He must be referring to some earlier king. And it therefore follows that it was not Philip who invented the titles or organised the army in *lochoi*, decads, etc. Nor for the very same reason can Anaximenes have alluded to Alexander II, who in any case reigned barely a year, and to whom any great military reorganisation cannot plausibly be ascribed.

We come back to Alexander I. Now the evidence of Thucydides seems to demonstrate that no good hoplite force can have existed in his reign. If Anaximenes attributed its creation to Alexander I, his statement was quite unhistorical. But the very text of the fragment ought to suggest that it is a piece of fiction. It is not at all plausible that any single man taught the Macedonians *ἱππεύειν* or devised the whole of the later Macedonian military system. The *hetairoi*, as the term implies and as the parallel of Achilles' Myrmidons suggests, ought at one time to have been the king's personal *comitatus*; the application of the word to the cavalry as such (and equally in the other sense to men of rank who were not all in the royal entourage) should be a later development, but it should also precede the invention of the title *pezetairoi* for the foot, which was probably due to a king who wished to extend the basis of his political support from the 'barons' and 'knights' to the peasantry and the burghers of the few towns.¹⁵ But the ancients were always prone to assign institutions, which had really taken shape over a period, to one moment of time and to a single genius. Thus on some views Lycurgus had devised the whole system of historic Sparta, and Solon was made responsible for laws, some at least of which were undoubtedly of much later date.¹⁶ Similarly Cicero could hold that Servius Tullius established the centuriate organisation in the very form it only acquired in the later third century.¹⁷ Alexander I was the first powerful king of Macedon, and the first familiar to Greeks like Anaximenes who could learn from the pages of Herodotus of his services to their cause in 480-79 and of his admission as a Heraclid to the Olympic games.¹⁸ Macedonians too may have wished to

believe that this heroic figure was the true author of their entire army system, or it may have been a natural assumption on the part of Anaximenes himself, supplying with plausible invention a deficiency in evidence, and accounting for Alexander's extension of Macedonian power. We should not in my view even suppose that his testimony has some unidentifiable substratum of truth. All that it permits us to infer is that the institutions he mentions are earlier than the time of Philip II, of whose innovations he could not have been ignorant, and perhaps somewhat remote.

P. A. BRUNT

Brasenose College, Oxford

A Supplementary Note on *Meniskoi*

The casts of Greek and Roman sculpture in the Museum of Classical Archaeology at Cambridge were treated and repaired recently by M. B. Laymann, now of Heidelberg. During his final visit, in 1975, he also restored a cast of the Peplos kore (FIG. 1), supplying the missing parts by analogy, colouring it according to published indications¹ and adding a *meniskos*, which is conjectural in form, size and height. As for its height, the *meniskos* cannot have been much lower, to judge by what remains of the spike of other korai (Acropolis 670, 673, 682); and if it had been much higher, it would have given less protection against bird droppings and from experiment my impression is that the effect, particularly of the longer spike, is more disturbing. The size decided on was that just large enough to protect the head; though Aristophanes (*Birds*, 1114-7) may imply that it protected the whole of a statue, such an extension seems to me awkward visually and in practice would have made the contraption liable to damage in a high wind. The form of the *meniskos* has been discussed with good sense by J. Maxmin (*JHS* 1975, 175-80). In spite of its name it should not have had the shape of a crescent, which—whether horizontal or vertical—would have given little protection to a statue; but a circular sheet of bronze, set horizontally, is not only practical but also in foreshortened view shows some resemblance to a crescent, and this resemblance is increased a little if, to shed rain more easily, the sheet is made slightly convex. On one point I disagree with Maxmin. She supposes, if I have understood her rightly, that the *meniskos* was thought of as an umbrella: but if so, *skiadeion* would be a likelier name (and especially if it was of comparable size as well as shape). Most students have been repelled by the idea of any excrescence above the head of a statue, but the restoration proposed here does not look to me very discordant on our coloured cast of the Peplos kore (though it is more noticeable on an uncoloured one) and I have found it easy to get used to it. What such a *meniskos* would look like on the more naturalistic statues of later Classical and

¹⁵ For *hetairoi* in Alexander's time cf. Berve (n. 4) 30 ff.; 104 ff.; W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, ii, Cambridge, 1948, 137 ff. Berve supposes that the term first denoted the *philoi* and was extended to the cavalry, Granier (n. 1) 7, that it was originally used of all the knights and then used in a more pregnant sense of the *philoi*. For Homeric *hetairoi* see M. P. Nilsson, *SB Berlin* 1927, 28 ff. Aelian, *VH* xiii 4 (Archelaus), and Plut., *Pelop.* 27 (368 B.C.), mention *hetairoi* before Philip, probably *philoi*. Arrian vii 11.7 gives us a certain instance of an honorific title (*syngeneis*) being extended by a Macedonian king from a small circle (courtiers) to all the soldiers. F. Carrata, *Il problema degli heteri nella monarchia di Alessandro Magno*, Turin, 1955, has re-examined all the evidence on *hetairoi*.

¹⁶ C. Hignett, *Hist. of Athen. Const.*, Oxford, 1952, 18 f.

¹⁷ *Rep.* ii 39 f. It is immaterial if the centuriate organisation in its first form did go back to Servius.

¹⁸ v 17-22; vii 173; viii 121; 136-9; ix 44-6.

¹ Drawing by Gilliéron, *AE* 1887, pl. 9; W. Lermann, *Altgr. Plastik*, pl. 18; H. Schrader, *Arch. Marmorbildwerke*, 46-7, col. pl. I.