

contemporary evidence before Philip, it was Philip who bestowed them on cavalry and phalanx, and that his name has been replaced by Alexander's in Anaximenes.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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> Similarly Cicero could hold that Servius Tullius established the centuriate organisation in the very form it only acquired in the later third century.<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> 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 indications<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>15</sup> 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*.

<sup>16</sup> C. Hignett, *Hist. of Athen. Const.*, Oxford, 1952, 18 f.

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

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

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



Hellenistic times I cannot guess, but it should not be more unacceptable than the Christian halo, of which I expect it is the ancestor. Still it would be worth examining original statues of all periods of Greek art to find out how regularly the *meniskos* was used.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge*

#### Demeter on a Knossian ring-inscription

In a recent issue of this *Journal* (XCV, 1975, pp. 231-2), R. F. Willetts reviews the excellent publication of J. N. Coldstream, *Knossos, the Sanctuary of Demeter* (BSA, Suppl. Pap. 8, 1973). He draws attention to a boustrophedon inscription on a silver ring bezel, which he transcribes, after Coldstream:

→Νοθοκάρτης | ←νικέτας F | →Μάτρι

The reading seems to support Willetts' own views on the cult of Demeter as a Mother-Goddess in Crete.

May I express some doubts about the actual reading of the dedication? I recently had the opportunity of examining the Knossos ring in the Heraklion Museum, by courtesy of the Director, Dr Alexiou, and of his Assistant, A. Lebesi. Magnifying techniques and contrasted lighting were available in the now well-equipped laboratory of the Museum. It appears that the lettering of the inscription is not exactly what Coldstream believed, although his photograph and facsimile are fairly accurate. First, the supposed *digamma* is a true *alpha*, with parallel strokes, as often occurs on archaic stones: the figure is quite similar to the other *alphas* of the text if you read it in the proper sense, i.e. as the first letter of the second direct line. Secondly, the last *sigma* of the retrograde line, with its two short angular strokes at sharp angles at each end of the *hasta*, seems most unlikely. There is actually a kind of cross-hatching on the surface, which is rather deceiving, but upon it you can distinguish the three bars of a *delta*, a very clear, although small and slightly debased one. The *hasta* forms one of these bars, and one other is the upper stroke of the so-called *sigma*.

So we must read the inscription as follows:

→Νοθοκάρτης | ←Νικέτα Δ | →αμάτρι.

*Νικέτα* represents Nothokartes' patronym, a name not previously known in Crete, but quite correct in Ancient Greek. The dedication is a trivial one to Demeter, without any hint of games or contests at her sanctuary. I am sorry to put forward such a plain reading. It does not contradict the value of Coldstream's work about the Knossos sanctuary, nor the interest of Willett's study on *Cretan Cults and Festivals*, even as regards Demeter. But it may be convenient not to allow further speculations upon a misleading transcription of this document.

HENRI VAN EFFENTERRE

*Centre Gustave Glotz,  
La Sorbonne, Paris I*

#### Textual Problems in the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*

In a short paper<sup>1</sup> I have tried to show that passages of the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* which seemed incomprehensible to, and were altered by, critics and editors, are in reality perfectly sound, when examined in the light of the *usus auctoris*, late Greek prose usage or the context. I should like to offer a few more examples here.<sup>2</sup>

At §26 we read:

Εὐδαίμων δὲ ἐπεκλήθη (scil. Εὐδαίμων Ἀραβία), πρότερον οὖσα πόλις, ὅτε, μίῃ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς εἰς τὴν Αἰγύπτου ἐρχομένων μηδὲ ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου τολμώντων εἰς τοὺς ἔσω τόπους διαίρειν ἀλλ' ἄχρι ταύτης

<sup>1</sup> 'On the Text of the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*', *Mnemosyne* 1975, p. 293 ff. The present paper is the result of a *δύτερος πλοῦς* through the same material.

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise stated, the bibliography quoted by me is contained in H. Frisk, *Le périple de la mer Erythrée*, Göteborg 1927 (*Göt. Högsk. Årsskr.* 1927, 1), to which I refer the reader for the sake of brevity.