

## THE *LAMIAKA* OF CHOERILUS OF IASOS AND THE GENESIS OF THE TERM ‘LAMIAN WAR’\*

The origin of the name ‘Lamian War’ as a description of the revolt by the Athenians and their allies (from 323–322 B.C.) against Macedonian rule remains problematic.<sup>1</sup> The most widely cited view of its origins is that of N.G. Ashton, who has argued that Hieronymus of Cardia – the source of Book 18 of Diodorus Siculus’ universal history – was the first to use the expression ‘Lamian War’ as a description of the conflict in place of the previous name ‘Hellenic War’.<sup>2</sup> Ashton concluded that the pro-Macedonian writer Hieronymus adopted the term because he wished to avoid the weighted name ‘Hellenic War’ at a time when his patron Antigonos Gonatas had recently fought the Chremonidean War against the Greek city-states.<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, all other histories covering the Lamian War before that of Hieronymus have been lost,<sup>4</sup> but a hint of an earlier tradition has survived in Plutarch’s life of Demetrius

\* An earlier version of this article was presented at the University of Calgary in October 2009 to the conference, ‘The many faces of war’. I am grateful to Waldemar Heckel, John Yardley, Pat Wheatley, Andrew Sherwood and Ruediger Mueller for some very useful comments and corrections to its content.

<sup>1</sup> For fundamental bibliography on the Lamian War, see J. Seibert, *Das Zeitalter der Diadochen* (Darmstadt, 1983), 92–7. See in general H. Schaeffer, ‘Der lamische oder hellenistische Krieg nach den Quellen dargestellt’ (Diss., University of Giessen, 1886); F. Staehelin, *RE* 12.1 (1924), s.v. ‘Lamischer Krieg’, 562–4; E. Lepore, ‘Leostene e le origini della guerra lamiaca’, *PP* 10 (1955), 161–85; O. Schmitt, *Der Lamische Krieg* (Bonn, 1992); C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, trans. D.L. Schneider (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1999); C.W. Blackwell, *In the Absence of Alexander: Harpalus and the Failure of Macedonian Authority* (New York, 1999); A.B. Bosworth, ‘Why did Athens lose the Lamian War?’, in O. Palagia and S.V. Tracy (edd.), *The Macedonians in Athens 322–229 B.C.* (Oxford, 2003). On the settlement at Babylon and affairs in Asia, see most recently A. Meeus, ‘The power struggle of the Diadochoi in Babylon, 323 B.C.’, *AncSoc* 38 (2008), 39–82.

<sup>2</sup> N.G. Ashton, ‘The Lamian War: *stat magni nominis umbra*’, *JHS* 104 (1984), 152–7. See also O. Veh, G. Wirth and M. Rathmann, *Griechische Weltgeschichte: Buch 18.–20.: Diodoros* (Stuttgart, 2005), 332; Schmitt (n. 1), 163–4. On Hieronymus and Diodorus’ use of him, see E. Schwartz, *RE* 5.1 (1903), s.v. ‘Diodorus’, 684–5; R.H. Simpson, ‘Abbreviation of Hieronymus in Diodorus’, *AJPh* 80 (1959), 370–9; I.L. Merker, ‘Diodorus Siculus and Hieronymus of Cardia’, *AHB* 2.4 (1988), 90–3; Seibert (n. 1), 27–36; J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford, 1981) 18–39.

<sup>3</sup> Ashton (n. 2), 157: ‘Hieronymus might well have been the first to use the name which later became standard for the war. ... If Hieronymus was the first literary figure to use the name *Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος*, it remains to ask why. Hornblower has argued that Hieronymus’ final revision of the early sections of his work was undertaken in the 260s, after Athens had capitulated to Antigonos Gonatas in the Chremonidean War. Not only were there parallels to be drawn between the “Hellenic War” of the 320s and the Greek struggle for freedom from Macedon in the 260s, but for a contemporary historian (with pro-Macedonian tendencies) the recording of the former revolt needed careful rewriting in view of the current developments. In particular the traditional name of *Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* would have presented problems – both emotive and in the matter of precision. It is in that light, I would suggest, that Hieronymus decided to refer to the war of 323 and 322 as *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος*.’

<sup>4</sup> Other historians who wrote accounts of the Lamian War before Hieronymus whose works are not extant include Nymphis of Heraclea (*FGrH* 432), Euphantus of Olynthus (*FGrH* 74), Diyllus

Poliorcetes. In a passage referring to politics in Athens, Plutarch has the following remark:

Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἀπολαβόντες τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἔτει πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ, τὸν δὲ μέσον χρόνον ἀπὸ τῶν Λαμιακῶν καὶ τῆς περὶ Κραννῶνα μάχης λόγῳ μὲν ὀλιγαρχικῆς, ἔργῳ δὲ μοναρχικῆς καταστάσεως γενομένης διὰ τὴν τοῦ Φαληρέως δύναμιν  
(Plut. *Vit. Demetr.* 10.2)

In this way the Athenians recovered their democracy, in the fifteenth year from the time of the Lamian War and the Battle of Crannon, and during the intervening period they had been theoretically governed by an oligarchy, but, in reality, were ruled by a single man, owing to Demetrius the Phalerian's power.

Although Plutarch's source here is not identifiable,<sup>5</sup> it is likely that the expressions *Λαμιακά* and *ἡ περὶ Κραννῶνα μάχη* were used in his source to refer to salient episodes in the Lamian War.<sup>6</sup> Apart from this fascinating sliver of evidence, hitherto no other sources have been adduced to support or evaluate Ashton's theory.

However, one crucial piece of evidence has been overlooked. The notoriously bad poet Choerilus of Iasos – a courtier of Alexander the Great – most probably wrote an epic poem called the *Lamiaka* about events during the Greek revolt of 323–322 B.C., and he obviously adopted Lamia as the defining event of his poem by coining a title based on the city's name.<sup>7</sup>

of Athens (*FGrH* 73, written c. 300), Demochares of Athens (*FGrH* 75, written before 271/270) and Duris of Samos (*FGrH* 76, whose history ended in 281 B.C.). There is, however, evidence that Duris of Samos used the expression *Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* in his history (see Ashton [n. 2], 156). How these other historians referred to the Lamian War is unknown. The late *Heidelberg Epitome* may have used Agatharchides of Cnidos and Timagenes of Alexandria, two universal historians, as its sources, but even these historians may ultimately have relied on Hieronymus of Cardia (G. Bauer, 'Die *Heidelberger Epitome*: eine Quelle zur Diadochengeschichte [Diss. University of Leipzig, 1914]), and there is unfortunately no reference to the Lamian War in the *Heidelberg Epitome*.

<sup>5</sup> On the sources of the *Demetrius*, see W.E. Sweet, 'Sources of Plutarch's *Demetrius*', *CW* 44 (1951), 177–81; Hornblower (n. 2), 68–70.

<sup>6</sup> See Ashton (n. 2), 156: 'Had Plutarch's source at this point used the name "Lamian War" for the conflict, then a simple ἀπὸ τοῦ Λαμιακοῦ πολέμου would have sufficed and been more explicit. It would seem more likely that the source was one to whom the term ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος was unknown, so that even if Sweet is correct in positing an Hieronymus-based source for some sections of *Demetrius*, this is not one which can be attributed to that source. Duris apparently knew this war as ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος ... It is possible that Plutarch's source avoided the more general ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος in favour of the more descriptive and completely unambiguous references to τὰ Λαμιακά and ἡ περὶ Κραννῶνα μάχη, the only two theatres of the war on land where major Greek and Macedonian forces met. Such a description of the Lamian War is consistent with one who had a near contemporary knowledge of the events.'

<sup>7</sup> See *Suppl. Hell.* 154. For the fragments, see *Suppl. Hell.* 154–8; Davies, *EGF*, 92. On Choerilus of Iasos, see O. Crusius, *RE* 3.2 (1899), s.v. 'Choirilos', 2361–3; H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf Prosopo-graphischer Grundlage*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1926), 408–9; W.W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1948) 57–8; and W. Heckel, *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great* (Malden, MA, 2006), 85. For his ethnic, see Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethnica*, s.v. Ἰασος, 322.18–20. On Choerilus of Iasos' reputation as a bad poet, see Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.232–4; *Ars P.* 357–8. For commentary, see C.O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry: The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge, 1971) 365–7; and idem, *Horace on Poetry: Epistles Book II* (Cambridge, 1982), 244–7. Pomponius Porphyrio, in his *Commentary to Horace's Ars Poetica* (357.5), reports the judgement of Alexander the Great (although probably apocryphal) on Choerilus of Iasos:

The title of Choerilus' work is preserved in the *Suda*'s entry on the earlier poet Choerilus of Samos (*Suda*, s.v. *Χοίριλος*, X, 595), but has been plausibly explained as an anachronistic addition to the entry. The full entry in the *Suda* is as follows:

*Χοίριλος, Σάμιος, τινὲς δὲ Ἰασέα, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἀλικαρνασέα ἱστοροῦσι. γενέσθαι δὲ κατὰ Πανύασιν τοῖς χρόνοις, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν Περσικῶν, ὀλυμπιάδι οὐκ, νεανίσκον ἤδη εἶναι δοῦλόν τε Σαμίου τινὸς αὐτὸν γενέσθαι, εὐειδῆ πάντῃ τὴν ὥραν φυγεῖν τε ἐκ Σάμου καὶ Ἡροδότῳ τῷ ἱστορικῷ παρεδρεύσαντα λόγων ἐρασθῆναι οὐτινος αὐτὸν καὶ παιδικὰ γεγονέναι φασίν. ἐπιθέσθαι δὲ ποιητικῇ καὶ τελευτῆσαι ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ παρὰ Ἀρχελάῳ, τῷ τότε αὐτῆς βασιλεῖ. ἔγραψε δὲ ταῦτα τὴν Ἀθηναίων νίκην κατὰ Ξέρξου· ἐφ' οὗ ποιήματος κατὰ στίχον στατήρα χρυσοῦν ἔλαβε καὶ σὺν τοῖς Ὀμήρου ἀναγινώσκεσθαι ἐψηφίσθη· Λαμιακά· καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ποιήματα αὐτοῦ φέρεται.<sup>8</sup>*

Choerilus of Samos, but some say of Iasos, and others record that he was a citizen of Halicarnassus. It is reported that he was born in the time of Panyassis, and that at the time of the Persian wars, in the 75th Olympiad, he was already a young man; and also that he became the slave of a certain Samian, and was very handsome in his prime; he fled from Samos, and after spending time with Herodotus the historian he fell in love with stories; and they say he became Herodotus' beloved. He devoted himself to poetry and died in Macedonia under Archelaus, the Macedonian king at that time. He wrote the following works: *The Victory of the Athenians over Xerxes*, for which poem he received a gold stater per line and was voted a public recitation alongside the works of Homer; the *Lamiaka*; and certain other poems by him are mentioned.

First, it is important to note that the entry begins with a lemma (*Χοίριλος, Σάμιος, τινὲς δὲ Ἰασέα*) in which the author was certainly confused about the correct ethnic for his Choerilus, apparently conflating Choerilus of Samos, the famous earlier poet, with Choerilus of Iasos, a later namesake under Alexander the Great. Since Choerilus of Samos wrote in the fifth century B.C., he cannot have written a poem about the Lamian War. Hence, we should conclude that the *Lamiaka* mentioned in the entry is, in fact, properly to be ascribed to Choerilus of Iasos, the contemporary of Alexander.

Although this seems straightforward, some scholars have objected to the foregoing analysis of the *Suda* entry. One longstanding problem has been the textual emendation advocated by A. Daub. This holds that the word *Λαμιακά* should be emended to *Σαμιακά*. Daub and others argue that the word was originally *Σαμιακά*, a title of a mythological epic poem by Choerilus of Samos concerning his native island.<sup>9</sup> However, no variant reading exists in any manuscripts of the

Alexander preferred to be 'the Thersites of Homer than the Achilles of Choerilus' (*Alexander dixisse fertur, multum malle se Thersiten iam Homeri esse quam Choerili Achillen*).

<sup>8</sup> The text follows the edition of A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols (Stuttgart 1967–71).

<sup>9</sup> A. Daub, *De Suidae biographicorum origine, Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, suppl. 11 (1880), 416; followed by F. Michelazzo, 'Un frammento dei *Samiaka* di Cherilo di Samo', *Prometheus* 8 (1982), 31–42, and D. Müller, 'Choirilos von Samos: ein poetische Quelle Herodots', *Klio* 7 (1907), 42–3. This emendation had been suggested but rejected by A.F. Näke, *Choerili Samii quae supersunt collegit et illustravit, de Choerili Samii aetate vita et poesi aliisque Choerilis disseruit Augustus Ferdinandus Naekius* (Leipzig, 1817), 101. See also F. Schoell, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur, von der frühesten mythischen Zeit bis zur Einnahme Constantinopels durch die Türken*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1828), 305: 'Suidas schreibt dem Choerilus ein Gedicht unter dem Titel *Λαμιακά*, Lamiaka, zu. Soll dieses Wort den *Lamischen* Krieg bedeuten, so hat er offenbar unsern Dichter mit dem unter Alexander dem Grossen lebenden Choerilus verwechselt. Aus einem ähnlichen Irrthum verwechselte Eudocia ihn mit dem Komiker Choerilus'; and Crusius (n. 7): 'Problematisch bleibt es, ob die in der contaminirten Suidas-Vita erwach-

*Suda* to support this theory,<sup>10</sup> and an analysis of the entry shows that it is quite unnecessary. It is clear that the *Suda*'s author conflated the two poets in the same entry. The following arguments can be adduced to support this view:

- (1) A capital sigma in Greek (Σ) would not easily be mistaken for a capital lambda (Λ) by a scribe;
- (2) there is the direct and erroneous reference to Iasos in the lemma;
- (3) the statement that Choerilus of Samos received a gold stater for every verse of his poem (ποιήματος κατὰ στίχον στατήρα χρυσοῦν ἔλαβε) was probably a tradition about *Choerilus of Iasos*, as can be seen from Horace's version of the story (*Epist.* 2.1.232–4),<sup>11</sup> and
- (4) the absence of an entry for Choerilus of Iasos in the *Suda* strongly supports this conclusion.

Therefore, we can confidently conclude that the *Lamiaka* – a work by Choerilus of Iasos – was ascribed to his well-known and earlier namesake by the *Suda*'s author, who was probably working with information on both Choerilus of Samos and Choerilus of Iasos and confused the two.

Two other objections have been made. First, A. Cameron argued that the Lamian War was an unlikely subject for treatment in epic, and that the word *Lamiaka* was an unusual form of title.<sup>12</sup> However, the siege of Lamia, the untimely death of Leosthenes and the defeat of the Greeks seem to be remarkably apposite subjects for treatment in verse, and undoubtedly with tragic connotations themselves. The theme of Greek armies at war or in sieges while tragic deaths unfold is, after all, reminiscent of the *Iliad* – and a poem that evoked Homer may have been precisely what Choerilus had in mind<sup>13</sup> (although this, of course, tells us nothing about the quality of Choerilus' work, which by all accounts was notoriously bad<sup>14</sup>). Furthermore, there had already been a noticeable trend towards the treatment of historical events in poetry, and the titles of these works – just like earlier epic poems dealing with mythology – were sometimes derived from neuter plural forms of geographical or ethnic adjectives.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, it is now recognised that this treat-

nten *Λαμιακά* von diesem Ch. herruehren, wie Näke will ...; Daub ... hat wieder die Correctur *Samiaka* empfohlen. Von den Dichtungen in grossem Stil ist kein Wort erhalten; dagegen ist ein viel citiertes, nachgeahmtes und (schon von Chrysippos) parodiirtes *παίγνιον* des Ch. auf uns gekommen, das nach Näkes einleuchtender Hypothese ... Porphyrio im Sinne hat'.

<sup>10</sup> Adler (n. 8), 4.834, with apparatus.

<sup>11</sup> See *Suppl. Hell.* 154 (fr. 334), which cites Näke (n. 9). The error had already been made by Hesychius Illustrius in the sixth century A.D.: *Χοιρίλος, Σάμιος, ποιητής, ἔγραψε τὴν Ἀθηναίων νίκην κατὰ Ξέρξου, ἐφ' οὗ | ποιήματος κατὰ στίχον στατήρα χρυσοῦν ἔλαβε, καὶ σὺν τοῖς Ὀμήρου ἀναγινώσκεσθαι ἐψηφίσθη*: 'Choerilus, of Samos, a poet, wrote *The Victory of the Athenians against Xerxes*, for which poem he received a gold stater per line, and was voted to be acknowledged with Homer' (fr. 7.1039–42).

<sup>12</sup> A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, NJ, 1995), 278.

<sup>13</sup> It is well to note here Horace's definition of epic (*Ars Poet.* 73): *res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella*. See also *Ov. Am.* 1.1.

<sup>14</sup> See Curt. 8.5.7–8.

<sup>15</sup> This type of title was used both in epic or mythological poetry and in ethnographical histories (F. Jacoby, 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* 9 [1909], 26–34). For a useful list of authors of 'historical' poetry from the seventh to the fifth century B.C., see J. Marincola, 'Herodotus and the poetry of the past', in C. Dewald and J. Marincola (edd.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge 2006), 13–28, at 25.

ment of history in verse influenced the origins of Greek historiography.<sup>16</sup> As early as the late seventh century B.C., Mimnermus of Colophon had dealt with some historical events in his elegiac poem *Smyrneis*.<sup>17</sup> Later, from the fifth century onwards, specific historical or contemporary wars were increasingly treated in epic poems.<sup>18</sup> Simonides of Ceos dealt with the battles of Plataea and Salamis in verse.<sup>19</sup> Choerilus of Samos, who died before 399 B.C., wrote an epic poem about the Persian wars called the *Persika*,<sup>20</sup> a title whose form is similar to the name *Lamiaka* (and he himself had famously complained that mythical subjects for epic had been exhausted by his own time<sup>21</sup>). Hegemon of Alexandria (in the Troad) produced an epic poem on the Leuctrian War.<sup>22</sup> Rhianus of Crete composed an epic about the Second Messenian War, called the *Messenika*, in the third century B.C.<sup>23</sup> Fragments of epic poems survive possibly celebrating the deeds of Philip II,<sup>24</sup> and, needless to say, Choerilus of Iasos wrote an epic poem on Alexander's expedition to Asia. Moreover, the lost poem of the epic cycle called the *Thebais* dealt with the disastrous war of the Seven against Thebes,<sup>25</sup> so an epic told from the perspective of the losing side in a war – as in the case of the *Lamiaka* – was not unprecedented. In the Hellenistic period, general historical epic became a popular genre.<sup>26</sup> We can, in this regard, conclude that an epic poem on the Lamian War by Choerilus of Iasos was by no means an unusual subject.

<sup>16</sup> E.L. Bowie, 'Ancestors of historiography in early Greek elegiac and iambic poetry', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2001), 45–66; Marincola (n. 15).

<sup>17</sup> A. Allen, *The Fragments of Mimnermus: Text and Commentary* (Stuttgart, 1993).

<sup>18</sup> T. Rood, 'The development of the war monograph', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 2007), 147–58, at 150–1.

<sup>19</sup> See D. Boedeker and D. Sider (edd.), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (Oxford and New York, 2001). See also D. Boedeker, 'Simonides on Plataea: Narrative elegy, mythic history', *ZPE* 107 (1995), 217–29; idem, 'Heroic historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea', *Arethusa* 2 (1996), 223–42.

<sup>20</sup> On Choerilus of Samos, see E. Bethe, *RE* 3.2 (1899), s.v. 'Choirilos (2)', 2359–61; G. Huxley, 'Choerilus of Samos', *GRBS* 10 (1969), 12–29; R. Häussler, *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil* (Heidelberg, 1976), 70–8; F. Michelazzo, 'Per la cronologia di Cherilo di Samo, II', in *Sileno*, XI: *Studi in onore di Adelmo Barigazzi*, II (Rome, 1985), 61–9; A.S. Hollis, 'The reputation and influence of Choerilus of Samos', *ZPE* 130 (2000), 13–15; K.A. MacFarlane, 'Choerilus of Samos and Darius' bridge: the scope and content of the *Persica* (SH 316–323)', *Mouseion* 6 (2006), 15–26; idem, 'Choerilus of Samos' *Lament* (SH 317) and the revitalization of epic', *AJP* (forthcoming). For the fragments of Choerilus of Samos, see P. Radici Colace, *Choerili Samii reliquiae, introduzione, testo critico e commento a cura P. Radici Colace* (Rome, 1979); *Suppl. Hell.* 146–53; Bernabé, *PEG*, 1, 187–208; Davies, *EGF*, 92.

<sup>21</sup> Arist. *Rhet.* 1415a.

<sup>22</sup> *FGH* 110. See Stephanus of Byzantium (*Ethnica*, s.v. *Ἀλεξάνδρεια*, 71.5–8): *Ἐγγύμων ἐμπουός, ὃς ἔγραψε τὸν Θηβαίων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων*. For commentary, see M. Billerbeck et al., *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica, Bd.1: Alpha–Gamma: 1A* (Berlin, 2006).

<sup>23</sup> A.W. Bulloch, 'Hellenistic poetry', in P.E. Easterling, E.J. Kenney and B.M.W. Knox (edd.), *Cambridge History of Classical Literature: The Hellenistic Period and the Empire* (Cambridge, 1989), 67.

<sup>24</sup> *Suppl. Hell.* 913–21. It is possible that *Suppl. Hell.* 491 preserves epic lines on the Diadoch Antigonos Monophthalmus.

<sup>25</sup> M. Davies, *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol, 1989), 23–9.

<sup>26</sup> See W. Kroll, 'Das historische Epos', *Sokrates: Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 4 (1916), 1–14; K. Ziegler, *Das hellenistische Epos: Ein vergessenes Kapitel griechischer Dichtung* (Leipzig, 1966<sup>2</sup>), with criticisms of B. Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1963), 396–8; A. Kerkhecker, 'Zur internen Gattungsgeschichte der römischen Epik: das Beispiel

There is no compelling reason, then, to reject the historicity of a poem by Choerilus of Iasos on some events of the Lamian War, either from a textual or literary perspective. Whether the *Lamiaka* dealt with the entire war or merely the siege of Lamia is unknown, but, as A.F. Nāke argued long ago, it seems likely that Choerilus could well have treated the larger events of the war in such a poem.<sup>27</sup>

We are led by this analysis to two important conclusions. First, it suggests a revision of Ashton's widely accepted thesis about the origin of the term 'Lamian War'. Hieronymus no doubt had a significant role in popularising the expression in his history, but Lamia had been a central part of the conflict. The siege lasted nearly four months (from November 323 to February 322) and its end brought the decisive turning point in the land war between the Macedonians and the Greeks.<sup>28</sup> It should not be seen as surprising that Choerilus of Iasos wrote an epic poem called the *Lamiaka* based on the name of the city and the events surrounding its siege. This in turn suggests that, long before Hieronymus wrote his history, the word *Lamiaka* was used as a name for those events of the war around the city of Lamia, and the expression 'Lamian War' in prose histories and in popular usage could easily have developed from its poetic use. Hieronymus of Cardia may therefore have adopted a phrase already in circulation.

On the nature of the *Lamiaka* and how the events therein were treated we can only speculate. Although Choerilus of Iasos was a court poet of Alexander the Great, his work was poorly received by later critics. Perhaps he turned to a patriotic pro-Greek treatment of the Lamian War after the king's death, with a tragic hero in Leosthenes. Alternatively, he may have found himself a new Macedonian patron after Alexander's death; thus he may have written his *Lamiaka* from a pro-Macedonian perspective by presenting the Lamian War as a doomed and tragic enterprise, in much the same way as Diodorus (Diod. Sic. 18.10.4, 19.61–2). It is an intriguing possibility that Antipater, himself the author of a number of literary works,<sup>29</sup> may have become Choerilus' patron. According to the *Suda*, Antipater produced a history called the *Illyrian Deeds of Perdiccas* (FGrH 114) and a collection of letters in two books. He was a friend of Aristotle and probably a follower of the Aristotelian school of philosophy (*Suda*, s.v. Ἀντίπατρος, A, 2703). Although the precise date of Antigonos of Carystus is disputed, he appears to have written an encomiastic poem dedicated to Antipater (SH 47).<sup>30</sup> Thus Choerilus could have joined a court circle around Antipater in Macedonia that was the perfect location for an epic poem on the Lamian War. However, that Choerilus was still remembered as

Ennius', in E.A. Schmidt (ed.), *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine* (Geneva, 2001), 59. Cf. Cameron (n. 12), 263–302. For the influence of Hellenistic historical epic at Rome, see A. Dihle, *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire: From Augustus to Justinian*, trans. M. Malzahn (London and New York, 1994), 270–1; and M. von Albrecht, *A History of Roman Literature: From Livius Andronicus to Boethius*, rev. G. Schmeling (Leiden and New York, 1997), 65.

<sup>27</sup> Nāke (n. 9), 101.

<sup>28</sup> See Schmitt (n. 1), 163–4; Habicht (n. 1), 38.

<sup>29</sup> See FGrH 114, with commentary. On this genre of historical writing, see T. Rood (n. 18). Later writers could even quote Aristotle's correspondence with Antipater (Ael. VH 3.36) and Aristotle appointed Antipater the executor of his will (Diog. Laert. 5.11–16).

<sup>30</sup> Kerkhecker (n. 26), 59, n. 77; F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1891), 408. See U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Berlin, 1881), 169–74.

an abysmal poet suggests that he was as unsuccessful in this attempt at a Lamian epic as he had been in his treatment of Alexander the Great.

The siege itself, punctuated by the death of Leosthenes, presents a thematic subject so impregnated with epic overtones that Choerilus' attention would readily have been drawn to the literary possibilities. A tragedy that revolved around Greek armies besieging a city could hardly avoid allusion to epic. At the very least, the choice of title indicates that the war appears to have become identified with the siege almost immediately.<sup>31</sup> The significance of the siege may even have been apparent before the *coup de grâce* was delivered at Crannon. And if, as seems likely, Choerilus continued to write poetry designed to flatter we would hardly expect him to choose as his subject an event that he believed would be critical of the Macedonian Antipater. The significance of the expression 'Lamian War' and an appreciation of its importance allow a shift in the entire perspective of the war, and the philological question of the war's name takes on much broader historical significance, which, in turn, bears directly on Antipater's role in the war.

*University of Guelph*

JOHN WALSH  
waljo@uoguelph.ca

<sup>31</sup> As possible alternative titles, *Hellenika* or *Hellenikos Polemos* were perhaps themselves too vague to have been seriously considered by the poet. Nonetheless, we see that the epigraphic record attests to their use at Athens. See Ashton (n. 2), 153–4, for a catalogue of the epigraphic evidence.