

## NOTES

### Hoplites and heresies: a note

A. J. Holladay has effectively reasserted the traditional view of the hoplite phalanx—that it was a dense mass of men, relying on the weight and cohesion of the whole rather than on the prowess of individuals in order to break the enemy's line.<sup>1</sup>

Further evidence in his support is provided by Plato's *Laches*,<sup>2</sup> where Nicias is made to praise the art of fighting (that is, single combat) in hoplite armour, as a fitting part of a liberal education. But when it comes to its utility in warfare he is less enthusiastic. 'This science will help somewhat even on the actual battlefield, whenever one has to fight ranged in order with many others. But its chief benefit will be when the ranks are broken, and one has to fight singlehanded against a single adversary, and either, in pursuit, attack someone who is defending himself, or else, in retreat, protect oneself from the attack of another.' Nicias clearly has in mind a situation like that from which Socrates extracted himself so handsomely at the Battle of Delium, as the speakers in the dialogue have just recalled;<sup>3</sup> though Socrates of course made his retreat without benefit of the newfangled art of fencing.

Laches, replying to Nicias, is much less favourable, and, in dismissing the art of single combat altogether, particularly stresses that the Lacedaemonians have no use for it. Clearly neither Nicias nor Laches even envisages the possibility that the battle may *begin* with a series of single combats.

This imaginary conversation does not of course carry the same historical weight as the Thucydidean passage, quoted by Holladay, that describes the advancing hoplites edging to the right to gain the protection of their neighbours' shields. Here are revealed not merely the movements but the feelings of front-rank soldiers going into battle.<sup>4</sup> But Plato, like every Athenian of his class and time, understood the basic facts of hoplite warfare, and he and Thucydides bear one another out. Not only was the front rank too closely packed for individual skill to be of much account as the armies closed, but the following ranks, being made up of files whose duty was to follow their file-leader closely,<sup>5</sup> would have been equally packed. There was certainly no room for front-rank men to fall back between the files (whether by mutual consent or not) after they had had enough.

To conclude, Holladay rightly notes that, after the Athenians had defeated the Syracusans on the Anapus, some of the victorious hoplites did break ranks and run out in pursuit, until they were checked by the enemy's cavalry.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, even Spartan hoplites regularly met attacks of peltasts and other light-armed troops by ordering the younger men to run out against the

enemy.<sup>7</sup> Such actions might certainly explain the description of a fallen hoplite as *promachos*.<sup>8</sup> But it is perhaps as probable that *promachos* is simply a poetic substitute for the technical *protostates*—a front-rank soldier, not one who fights in front of the ranks. In either case, the word lends no support to the suggestion that it was usual for hoplites to break ranks and come forward to individual combat when one phalanx was advancing against another.

J. K. ANDERSON

University of California, Berkeley

<sup>7</sup> Thuc. iv 127; X. *Hell.* iii 4.13–15; iv 4.15–17 and elsewhere; Anderson (n. 5) 117–26.

<sup>8</sup> Holladay (n. 1) 94 n. 4.

### The Lamian War—*stat magni nominis umbra*<sup>1</sup>

For the uprising of 323 and 322 BC by the Greek states against the Macedonian domination, the name 'The Lamian War' has universal currency, identifying the overall conflict through reference to the siege of Lamia in the winter of 323/2. Given the relative insignificance of that particular event in determining the outcome of the war, the name does not seem to be particularly appropriate. Yet there is ample ancient evidence to indicate that the term *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* was used also in antiquity to signify this struggle. The full catalogue, in chronological order, is:

ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος κληθεῖς πόλεμον . . . τὸν ὀνομασθέντα Λαμιακόν	(D.S. xvii 111.1) (D.S. xviii 8.1)
κατὰ τὸν Λαμιακὸν πόλεμον ἐν τῷ Λαμιακῷ πολέμῳ μετὰ τὸν Λαμιακὸν πόλεμον ἐν τῷ Λαμιακῷ πολέμῳ ὁ Λαμιακὸς . . . πόλεμος περὶ τὸν Λαμιακὸν πόλεμον τοῦ Λαμιακοῦ πολέμου	(D.S. xviii 19.1) <sup>2</sup> (D.S. xviii 24.1) (D.S. xviii 66.5) (D.S. xx 46.3) <sup>3</sup> (Strabo ix 5.10) <sup>4</sup> (Plut. <i>Pyrrh.</i> 1.6) ([Plut.] <i>Mor.</i> 849f = X <i>or. vit.</i> 'Hyperides')
κατὰ τὸν Λαμιακὸν πόλεμον ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος	(D.L. iv 9) (Euseb. <i>Chron. Oly.</i> 114.2) (Steph. <i>Byz.</i> s.v. 'Λάμια')

There is also a possible reading of *ἐν τῷ Λαμιακῷ*

<sup>1</sup> Lucan i 135. The argument of this paper formed the basis of a talk to the faculty and graduate students of the Department of Classics at Stanford University on 22nd January, 1981.

<sup>2</sup> A variant reading *Λαλαμιακόν* occurs in MS F.

<sup>3</sup> In the *Argumentum* to D.S. xviii πόλεμον . . . τὸν ὀνομασθέντα Λαμιακόν is found in §vi and τὸν Λαμιακὸν πόλεμον in xiv.

<sup>4</sup> At x 1.6 the text of Strabo reads: κατεστράφη δὲ τὰ Στύρα ἐν τῷ Μαλιακῷ πολέμῳ ὑπὸ Φαίδρου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοῦ. A. Meineke, in his edition (Leipzig 1866), emended Μαλιακῷ to Λαμιακῷ on the basis of a conjecture by Casaubon. A scribal error in transposing the *lambda* and *mu* is not difficult to envisage, and as all extant MSS are descended from the so-called archetype, the one original transposition would explain the constant MS reading Μαλιακῷ. Given what is known of the activities of Phaedrus, the Athenian *strategos*, it is highly probable that the MS reading should be so emended. On the career of Phaedrus see J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford 1971) 524–5 no. 13964.

<sup>1</sup> A. J. Holladay, 'Hoplites and heresies', *JHS* cii (1982) 94–7.

<sup>2</sup> Pl. *Lach.* 181d–182b.

<sup>3</sup> Pl. *Lach.* 181b.

<sup>4</sup> Thuc. v 71.1; Holladay (n. 1) 94.

<sup>5</sup> X. *Cyr.* ii 2.6–9, 3.21; *Lac. Pol.* 11.4–6; J. K. Anderson, *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon* (Berkeley 1970) 94–110 (with further references).

<sup>6</sup> Thuc. vi 70.3; Holladay (n. 1) 96.

[πολέμῳ] in a *scholion* to the text of Aeschines.<sup>5</sup> To the Greek references should be added the Latin term *bellum Lamiacum* in the prologues to the lost *Historiae Philippicae* of Pompeius Trogus.<sup>6</sup> The *Chronicle* of Jerome also contains the term as a translation of the Eusebius passage cited above.<sup>7</sup>

Such then is the complete register of occurrences of the name 'The Lamian War'. In each case the source is a literary one, and no corroborating epigraphical evidence for the title has been found.

The war was also known in antiquity, however, as *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος*. The evidence for this is primarily epigraphical. The inscriptions are firmly datable in the main, and attest contemporary and near-contemporary use of that title.<sup>8</sup> At IG ii<sup>2</sup> 448, in the second of two decrees, which is from the Athenian month Maimacterion in the archonship of Archippus (318/17 BC), lines 43 and 44 read [καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πολέμου] τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ.<sup>9</sup> That this is the Lamian War is certain. Not only is the first of the two decrees from the archonship of Cephisodorus (323/2) but the entire context of both decrees is the advent of Sicyon into the Greek alliance for the war which began in that year.<sup>10</sup>

In IG ii<sup>2</sup> 505, from the Athenian month Scirophorion, in the archonship of Nicocles (302/1), line 17 reads ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ πολέμου.<sup>11</sup> There can be no doubt

that this reference is to the so-called Lamian War. Lines 16 and 17 mention the archonship of Cephisodorus, and 18 and 25 the admiral Euetion.<sup>12</sup>

At lines 9 and 10 of IG ii<sup>2</sup> 506 the restored reading is τοῦ πολέμου γενομένου τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ.<sup>13</sup> There is a reference to naval matters at line 10 and a virtually certain naming of Cleitus, the Macedonian admiral during the war.<sup>14</sup> Further, the date of the inscription is in accord with the above framework. Lacking the full prescript (including the archon year) to this decree, we cannot assign it a precise date. However, the proposer was one Lysicrates, son of Lysistratus, also known from an honorary decree firmly dated 304/3,<sup>15</sup> within the chronological boundaries of the two previously cited inscriptions in which the term *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* is attested. This indicates that a date of c. 302/1 for IG ii<sup>2</sup> 506, as proposed in IG, is to be accepted.

Albeit scanty and fragmentary, the epigraphical evidence is conclusive. In Athens the term *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* was the official name for the war of 323 and 322, at least down to 301.<sup>16</sup>

A single literary reference corroborates the epigraphical evidence. At Plut. *Phoc.* 23.1, in an account of a

<sup>5</sup> There are two *scholia* to Aeschines ii 21, each providing biographical details in elaboration of a textual reference to an Athenian *strategos*, Leosthenes, who had gone into exile in 361 BC. The *scholion* common to MSS L and M confuses this Leosthenes with the one later so prominent in the Lamian War, and includes the comment ὕστερον δὲ κατελθὼν ἐστρατήγησεν ἐν τῷ δηλιακῷ καὶ ἀπέθανε τραυεῖς. Both L and M read δηλιακῷ but in the margin of M another hand has written οἰμαι λαμιακῷ. Despite a conflation of two Leosthenes, this sentence does appear to refer to the Athenian general who commanded the forces at the siege of Lamia, and who died there as a result of a blow. If so, then the reading *Λαμιακῷ* should be preferred, with the supplement [πολέμῳ] understood. For the two *scholia* and the adscript see W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Aeschinē et Isocratē* (Oxford 1852; repr. Hildesheim 1970) 46.

<sup>6</sup> Pompeius Trogus *Prol.* xiii. Although there is a variant MS reading *lansacum* (or *lamsacum*), the context makes it certain that the reading of *Lamiacum* preferred by J. Bongars in his edition of Justin's epitome (Paris 1581) is correct, and it is now accepted without exception. For the text and apparatus see O. Seel, *Pompeii Trogi Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1956) 120.

<sup>7</sup> The parallel passages are *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος ἐκινήθη* (Eusebius) and *Lamiacum bellum motum* (St Jerome).

<sup>8</sup> The *Marmor Parium* apart, I have examined first hand each of the inscriptions cited in this article. My thanks to Mrs D. Peppas-Delmousou and her staff at the National Epigraphical Museum at Athens for their aid and expertise.

<sup>9</sup> The restoration is beyond question, as is evident both from the immediately adjacent context (lines 43–51) and from the subject matter of the whole, on which see below n. 10.

<sup>10</sup> Part a, the first decree, from the archonship of Cephisodorus in 323/2, honours Euphoron of Sicyon for bringing Sicyon into the Greek alliance (lines 8–15). Part b, from the archonship of Archippus in 318/17, comes from the year of the 'restored democracy' and harks back to the Hellenic (i.e. Lamian) War when the above honours were granted, recalling the reasons for the bestowal (lines 43–9). This decree reaffirms the previous honours and orders that new *stelae* recording them be erected (62 ff.).

<sup>11</sup> An Athenian honorary decree in favour of Nicander of Ilium and Polyzelus of Ephesus, metics who had contributed to the Athenian navy during the Lamian War. On their status and rôles at Athens see R. Thomsen, *Eisphora* (Copenhagen 1964) 237–42, and J. Pečírka, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions* (Prague 1966) 80–1 together with his 'A note on Aristotle's

conception of citizenship and the role of foreigners in fourth century Athens', *Eirene* vi (1967) 25.

<sup>12</sup> That Euetion was the Athenian naval commander in this war is known from D.S. xviii 15.9.

<sup>13</sup> The restoration by U. Koehler in IG ii 271. These lines could not be restored as *ον καὶ τοῦ πολέμου γενομένου τοῦ Λαμια* κοῦ as this supplement would account for only 32 of the 33 *stoichoi*.

<sup>14</sup> The text of IG ii<sup>2</sup> 506 is fragmentary. Only the left hand sections can be read with any confidence. The first fourteen letters of line 10 are legible; the line reads: κοῦ καὶ ἐγπλευσαν[σάν των νέων . . . . .]. It is likely that there is a further naval reference at line 12, which survives as follows: [. . .] *ΗΡΕΙΣΚΑΕΙ* [. . . . .]. Although no full restoration of a line is yet possible, from line 10 it is clear that the general context is naval. Koehler therefore proposed that the missing first two letters of line 12 are *PI* and that the final letter of the previous line should be *T*. The problem of the remaining extant letters in line 12 was resolved by A. Wilhelm, 'Ein neues Bruchstück der parischen Marmorchronik', *Ath. Mitt.* xxii (1897) 193, proposing to restore the name of Euetion's opponent *Κλεῖτος*. That Cleitus was the Macedonian *ναύαρχος* in the Lamian War is known from D.S. xviii 15.8. With the final letter of line 11, line 12 would read: τ[ ] *ρ[ι]ήρεις Κλειτ[ ]* . . . .

<sup>15</sup> IG ii<sup>2</sup> 488.6–7. Lysicrates and his genealogy are discussed by Davies (n. 4) 425.

<sup>16</sup> In the summary of the epigraphical evidence for the name *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* I have not included IG ii<sup>2</sup> 546, an Athenian decree concerning the people of Dolopia. Lines 14 and 15 are restored to read as follows in IG ii<sup>2</sup>: [δύνανται ἀγαθὸν κ]αὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν [ταῖς Ἑλληνικῷ πολέμῳ τοῖς στρ]ατευομένοις. . . . Here the entire τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ πολέμῳ is a restoration and one not easily substantiated in view of the extremely fragmentary nature of the inscription and the difficulty in supplying a date for it. (The prescript is deficient, notably in the name of the archon.) In IG ii<sup>2</sup> the inscription is placed in the period 318/17–308/7, but since the publication of IG ii<sup>2</sup> in 1913 it has been shown that references to the *συμπρόεδροι* are not confined to the period after 319/18. Subsequently IG ii<sup>2</sup> 546 has been assigned to the year 321/20—as a possibility by W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt (1940); more positively by Meritt (1961); tentatively by S. Dow (1963). If 321/20 is to be accepted as the date for IG ii<sup>2</sup> 546, then I believe that the acceptability of ἐν τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ πολέμῳ as a supplement for lines 14–15 is greatly reduced. There is no surviving Athenian decree from the years between 322 and 318 which mentions that war—not surprising in view of the degree of control exercised over Athenian affairs in that period by the Macedonians, both by the garrison at Munichia and by the constitution imposed by Antipater.

disagreement between Phocion and Leosthenes, the Lamian War *strategos*, the text reads: *ὡς δὲ φέρων ἐνέσεισεν ὁ Λεωσθένης τὴν πόλιν εἰς τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν πόλεμον*. . . . Following Xylander, editors have generally emended *Ἑλληνικὸν* to *Λαμιακὸν*, thereby excising the sole extant literary evidence for the name's use for this war. That such a drastic revision of the text is unwarranted is demonstrated by its epigraphical occurrences. The original text, retained in the earlier Teubner editions of Plutarch's *Lives* by Sintenis, has been maintained, rightly, by Ziegler.<sup>17</sup>

In the light of contemporary propaganda it should not be a matter of surprise that the title was *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος*. The funeral speech given by Hyperides in honour of the Athenian dead after the siege of Lamia provides ample indication of how the Athenians viewed the war's issues. Not only is it apparent that the primary catchword was *ἐλευθερία*, but on seven of the eight occasions where that noun occurs it is linked with forms of *Ἑλλάς* or *Ἕλληνες*. There is also one occurrence of the verb *ἐλευθερώω*, again directly coupled with *Hellas*.<sup>18</sup> Epigraphy adds to our knowledge of the practice. At lines 7 and 8 of IG ii<sup>2</sup> 467 (306/5), it is recorded that the Athenians had waged the war [*ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλ[ε]υθερίας τῶν [Ἑ]λλή[ν]ων*]. In similar vein, lines 43–5 of IG ii<sup>2</sup> 448 (318/17) read [*καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πολέμου*] *ν τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ, ὃν ἐ[ν]ε[σ]τήσατο ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων ὑ[πὲρ] τῶν Ἑλλήνων*.<sup>19</sup> This concept of an Hellenic War, fought for *ἐλευθερία* and *αὐτονομία*<sup>20</sup> against a foreign foe, was most openly expressed by Hyperides, who likened the struggle to that waged by the Greeks against the Persians in the early fifth century.<sup>21</sup> These slogans, so prominent in the contemporary evidence, are also found in the derivative sources,<sup>22</sup> and demonstrate well the emotional environment in which the name *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* was coined for the war of 323 and 322.

<sup>17</sup> Xylander's edition was printed at Heidelberg in 1561. In the Teubner, C. Sintenis's first edition was in 1839 (4 vols) and the second in 1874 (5 vols). See now K. Ziegler (ed.), *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* ii.1 (Leipzig 1964) 18, and the n. to line 24.

<sup>18</sup> Hyperides, *Epitaphios* col. 5 τοῖς Ἑλλησιν εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν and τῇ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίᾳ, col. 6 ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας and τῇ Ἑλλάδι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, col. 9 τὴν κοινὴν ἐλευθερίαν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν, col. 11 τί γένοιτο ἂν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ᾗδ[ον] ἡ ἔπανος τῶν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν παρασκευασάντων ἀπὸ τῶν Μακεδόνων, col. 13 εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων. The single occasion in this speech when the word is not linked in that way is in col. 7 καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν πᾶσιν κατέθεσαν. At the commencement of col. 13 is οἱ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐλευθερώσαντες.

<sup>19</sup> Above n. 10.

<sup>20</sup> For *αὐτονομία* see *Epitaphios* col. 9.23.

<sup>21</sup> Hyp. *Epit.* cols 12–13.

<sup>22</sup> D.S. xviii 9.5 has both *αὐτονομία* and *ἐλευθερώσαι*, plus references to *ἐλευθερία* at xviii 9.1, 10.2 and 12.3. The *ἐλευθερία* catch-cry is also echoed in Plut. *Phoc.* 26.1 and *Suda* s.v. 'Λαμία'. Justin xiii 5.5 provides the Latin counterpart with *multae civitates libertatem bello vindicandam fremebant*. There is also evidence from a papyrus fragment. *Hibeh Pap.* i (1906) 15 (= *FGrH* 105 F 6) is the second of the literary papyri from Hibeh, being part of a rhetorical composition written between 280 and 240. The editors believe that the occasion depicted is an address by Leosthenes to the Athenians on the Lamian War—an opinion supported by G. Mathieu, 'Notes sur Athènes à la veille de la guerre lamiaque', *RPh* lv (1929) 159–70, who also tentatively posits Anaximenes of Lampsacus as the source (160–1, 167). At line 122 (col. V) of the papyrus the text reads: *ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας*].

Although it has been recognised for some time that 'The Hellenic War' was a contemporary name for the event which is more widely known as 'The Lamian War', there has been no complete tabulation and examination of the evidence for each name. Nor has there been any attempt to determine at what stage the name 'The Lamian War' came into being, or for how long the term 'The Hellenic War' continued to be used.<sup>23</sup>

Epigraphy has preserved only one other method of referring to this conflict. The war was recorded as that *πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον* by the author of the *Marmor Parium*,<sup>24</sup> terminology which was probably employed also in IG ii<sup>2</sup> 467.6–7, where the restored reading is *ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ὃν πεπολέμηκε*] *ν ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον*.<sup>25</sup> Diodorus provides a direct literary parallel with *Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον πόλεμον ἐξήνεγκαν*, and Justin and Orosius supply the Latin equivalent *bellum cum Antipatro*.<sup>26</sup> There are two literary instances in which the war is called that *πρὸς Μακεδόνας*,<sup>27</sup> and one *μισθοφορικὸς πόλεμος*.<sup>28</sup> There is nothing to suggest that any of these three ways of referring to the war attained widespread usage.<sup>29</sup>

All extant literary sources in which the name *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* is found are derivative. The earliest, Diodorus, uses the term on six occasions and is consistent in that there is no instance of the alternative *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* in his references to this war. Scholars all agree that Hieronymus of Cardia is the major source for Bks xviii to xx of Diodorus' history,<sup>30</sup> and it is within the span of these books that five of the six occurrences of the name 'Lamian War' are to be found. In particular the sections of Bk xviii in which the account of the Lamian War is given<sup>31</sup> bear the marks of Hieronymus. T. S. Brown has pointed to the somewhat cynical attitude to Greek attempts at freedom which is prevalent throughout Bks xviii–xx,<sup>32</sup> and which

<sup>23</sup> For example, H. Schaefer, *Der lamische oder hellenische Krieg* (Diss. Giessen 1886), despite his title, virtually ignores the question of the name of the war (only a brief indication at 62 n. 76). The most comprehensive tabulations of the sources for both names are: A. Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* ii (Leipzig 1887) 372 nn. 1–2; H. Bengtson, *Gr. Gesch.* (Munich 1977) 372 n. 3; and F. Staehelin, *RE* xii (1925) 'Lamischer Krieg' 562, but in each case there are omissions and/or inaccuracies. E. Lepore, 'Leostene e le origini della guerra Lamiaica', *PP* x (1955) 161–85 has suggested that the name 'Hellenic War' originated in the climate of the restored democracy of 318 (176 and n. 6), having noted that the first surviving use of the appellation is in an inscription from that year. However, on the absence of such references for the years 322–318 see above n. 16.

<sup>24</sup> *FGrH* 239 B 9.

<sup>25</sup> The supplement [*πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον*] in line 7 is supported by the proposed restoration of line 16 in A. Wilhelm, *Akademischschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde (1895–1951)* ii (Leipzig 1974) 145 as *ἀκεδόνι καὶ ὅτε Ἀντίπατρος ἐκράτησε, οὐδαμῶς*].

<sup>26</sup> D.S. xviii 8.1; Justin xiii 5.8; Orosius iii 23.15.

<sup>27</sup> Paus. iv 28.3 and *Arg.* to D.S. xviii, pt 2 §.lix.

<sup>28</sup> Dexippus, *FGrH* 100 F 33.

<sup>29</sup> Lepore (n. 23) has demonstrated that the account of the origins of the war at D.S. xvii 111.1 ff. presents Leosthenes as the prime mover. There is no suggestion, however, that the conflict was ever termed 'Leosthenes' War'.

<sup>30</sup> See, most recently, Jane Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford 1981) esp. ch. 2.

<sup>31</sup> D.S. xviii 9.1–13.6; 14.4–15.9; 16.4–18.9.

<sup>32</sup> T. S. Brown, 'Hieronymus of Cardia', *AHR* lii (1946–7) 693 and n. 71.

doubtless is a reflection of Hieronymus' opinions, resulting not only from his connections with the Macedonian dynasts but also from his own background in Cardia, whose dependence on Macedonia in the fourth century BC is well attested.<sup>33</sup> This cynicism is especially noticeable in Diodorus' account of the attempt to break from the Macedonian domination in 323 and 322, with the accompanying Greek catch-cries of *ἐλευθερία* and *αὐτονομία*. The attitude is most clearly demonstrated in xviii 10, reporting the public debate at Athens which resulted in an open declaration of war against Antipater. In its entirety the tone of D.S. xviii 10 is pessimistic—not unexpectedly so given that the source is Hieronymus.<sup>34</sup>

The five instances of *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* in D.S. xviii–xx can be attributed with confidence to Hieronymus, but the remaining occurrence is at xvii 111.1, and despite continuing controversy as to Diodorus' major source for Bk xvii, there is no suggestion that Hieronymus was used at all here.<sup>35</sup> On the single occasion where the name 'Lamian War' does occur in xvii the phraseology is interesting. The sentence reads:

ἅμα δὲ τοῦτοις πραττομένοις κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα  
ταραχαὶ συνίσταντο καὶ πραγμάτων καινῶν  
κινήσεις, ἐξ ὧν ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος κληθεὶς ἔλαβε  
τὴν ἀρχήν, ἐκ τοιαύτης τινὸς αἰτίας.

The use of *κληθεὶς* in referring to the name of the war is strange and would suggest that Diodorus might well not be echoing his source at this point. Since *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* is used consistently from Bk xviii to xx when Diodorus' source is Hieronymus, the likely supposition is that in referring to the origins of the Lamian War in xvii 111 the source used by Diodorus did not refer to the forthcoming war by that name at all. Diodorus, who was aware that this was to be the name used in Bk xviii

<sup>33</sup> References to Cardia in the speeches of Demosthenes show clearly that it was only the support of the Macedonian monarchy which prevented Athens from asserting control over Cardia. A full list of the evidence from Demosthenes, together with that from D.S. xvi and Plut. *Eumenes* is given by Brown (n. 32) 690 n. 56. For Cardian animosity towards Athens and inclination towards Macedon see Hornblower (n. 30) 175.

<sup>34</sup> Hornblower (n. 30) observes that 'the account of the Lamian War in (Diodorus) xviii reveals a distinctly Macedonian slant' (60—reiterated at 66, 165 and more fully at 171). Nonetheless it is claimed at 176–7 that in xviii 10 there is a sympathetic analysis of the Greek problems in preparing for this war. Against this proposal see A. B. Bosworth's review of Hornblower's work in *JHS* ciii (1983) 209–10. On Hieronymus' historical perspectives note also K. Rosen, 'Politische Ziele in der frühen hellenistischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Hermes* cvii (1979) 460–77.

<sup>35</sup> The most likely candidate is still Cleitarchus of Alexandria, who is now widely accepted as the source, directly or indirectly, for D.S. xvii. A thorough re-examination of the evidence is in J. R. Hamilton, 'Cleitarchus and Diodorus 17', *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory, Fests. Schachermeyr* (Berlin 1977) 126–46. Tarn's theory of a so-called 'mercenaries' source' on whom Diodorus relied heavily up to the battle of Issus (*Alexander the Great* ii esp. 71–5, 105–6, 128–30) has been laid to rest by P. A. Brunt, *CQ* xii (1962) 141–55. On the contentious subject of the date of Cleitarchus, recent works by J. R. Hamilton, 'Cleitarchus and Aristobulus', *Historia* x (1961) 448–58; E. Badian, 'The date of Cleitarchus', *PACA* viii (1965) 5–11; F. Schachermeyr, *Alexander in Babylon und die Reichsordnung nach seine Tode* (Vienna 1970) 211–24 have argued for c. 310. If Cleitarchus was the source for the reference at D.S. xvii 111.1 a date of c. 310 would accord well with the proposition below that the source which Diodorus used at that point could not have employed the term *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος*.

for the full account of the conflict, employed *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* in xvii to maintain consistency with what followed in xviii. That Diodorus was conscious of the link between these two passages in the successive books is quite clearly attested at xviii 9.1, where specific reference is made to the earlier account *ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης βύβλῳ*. The proposal that *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* (with the addition of *κληθεὶς*) in xvii was a deliberate foreshadowing of the term used by Hieronymus is virtually confirmed by the first use of that name in xviii, where the text reads:

κατὰ δὲ τὴν Εὐρώπην Ῥόδιοι μὲν ἐκβαλόντες τὴν  
Μακεδονικὴν φρουρὰν ἠλευθέρωσαν τὴν πόλιν,  
Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον πόλεμον ἐξήνεγκαν  
τὸν ὀνομασθέντα Λαμιακόν.<sup>36</sup>

Elsewhere in Bks xviii–xx the war is referred to merely as *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος*. Presumably, in first employing the term in xviii where the name is derived from Hieronymus, Diodorus felt it necessary to mirror the terminology of xvii 111.1 in order to form a precise bridge with the earlier account of the origins of the conflict. It therefore appears most likely that Hieronymus used the name *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* in referring to the war of 323 and 322, but that Diodorus' source for Bk xvii did not do so.

Plutarch is the most intriguing of the literary sources for this matter. In the *Lives* he uses both *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* and *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* in referring to the war, and in this he stands alone. *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* is found in the *Pyrrhus*, and there is no doubt that for parts of this Plutarch had as his source either Hieronymus, or perhaps more likely an intermediary Hieronymus-based source.<sup>37</sup> On three separate occasions in *Pyrrhus* Plutarch cites Hieronymus as his authority,<sup>38</sup> and it is known from Pausanias that Hieronymus' history included information as to the death of Pyrrhus.<sup>39</sup> Plutarch's use of *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* in a biography for which the detail was derived to some extent at least from that source adds weight to the proposal that Hieronymus referred to the war by that name.

The only surviving literary reference with the name *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* is in Plutarch's *Phocion*,<sup>40</sup> in which Duris of Samos is twice mentioned as a source.<sup>41</sup> Although the evidence for Duris' life is far from comprehensive, it is certain that his forebears must have been removed from their homeland in the expulsion of the Samians by the Athenians in 366/5, and that Duris was born in exile, possibly in Sicily, c. 330. In the restoration of the Samian exiles by the general recall of 322/1 Duris presumably came to Samos, where both his father Kaios and he are attested as *τύραννοι*. At some

<sup>36</sup> D.S. xviii 8.1.

<sup>37</sup> Plut. *Pyrrh.* 1.6 which is, admittedly, in the prefatory section. On the question of whether Plutarch made use of sources contemporary with the subjects of his *Lives* or relied upon secondary sources, see K. Ziegler, *RE* xxi.1 (1951) 'Plutarchos' no. 2 esp. 911 ff. and the introduction to J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch, Alexander: a Commentary* (Oxford 1969) xliii–xlix. The general belief, following E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* ii (Halle 1899) 65–71, is that Plutarch did use secondary sources in the main, but that for the period of the Diadochi he could have had direct access to the work of Hieronymus.

<sup>38</sup> Plut. *Pyrrh.* 17.7 = *FGrH* 154 F 11 (280 BC); 21.12 = F 12 (279 BC); 27.8 = F 14 (272 BC).

<sup>39</sup> Paus. i 13.9 = *FGrH* 154 F 15.

<sup>40</sup> Above p. 153–4.

<sup>41</sup> Plut. *Phoc.* 4.3–4 = *FGrH* 76 F 50; 17.10 = F 51.

time after 307 Duris, along with his brother Lynceus, went to Athens to study under Theophrastus, and thence seems to have returned to Samos c. 300.<sup>42</sup>

Duris' most renowned work, the *Macedonian History*, began with the events of 370/69 (taking as a starting point the death of Amyntas, father of Philip II)<sup>43</sup> and probably concluded with those of 281/80. The last datable event in the extant fragments is the death of Lysimachus in 281.<sup>44</sup> The year 281/80 would have had particular significance as a concluding point for the *Macedonica* as it marked the annexation of Samos by Ptolemy II and the downfall of Duris' rule.<sup>45</sup> Given both the topic of the *History* and that he was a citizen of Samos, it is to be expected that Duris would have included an account of the Lamian War, the causes of which (from the Athenian viewpoint) were so closely linked with the question of the cleruchies on Samos.<sup>46</sup>

Duris was in Athens during the last decade of the fourth century and had returned to Samos by c. 300. Now this is precisely the period for which we have unequivocal epigraphical evidence that at Athens the war was known as, and officially recorded in public documents as, ὁ Ἑλληνικός πόλεμος. It would not, therefore, be surprising if Duris employed that terminology. That Plutarch uses the name in the *Phocion*, for which Duris is twice attested as a source, raises the possibility that Plutarch derived the name from him.

That possibility is strengthened by an examination of Plutarch's *Demetrius*, as it has been demonstrated conclusively that much of the material for this *Life* was drawn ultimately from Duris.<sup>47</sup> Sweet also proposes that the historical framework for *Demetrius* was derived from an intermediary annalistic history based on Hieronymus.<sup>48</sup> The *Demetrius* contains two references to the Lamian War, the first of which is expressed in a manner significant for this discussion. After recording the overthrow of Demetrius of Phalerum in 307, Plutarch continues:

Ἀθηναῖοι δ' ἀπολαβόντες τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἔτει πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ, τὸν διὰ μέσου χρόνον ἀπὸ τῶν Λαμιακῶν καὶ τῆς περὶ Κραννῶνα μάχης λόγῳ μὲν

<sup>42</sup> For the early life of Duris see R. B. Kebric, *In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos*, Historia Einzeln. xxix (Wiesbaden 1977) 2–4; for the date of their arrival at Athens, *id.*, 'A note on Duris in Athens', *CPh* lxiix (1974) 286–7, with good arguments for between 304 and 302. That Duris had returned to Samos by c. 300 is indicated by the issue of a *hemidrachma* at that time, see J. Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos* (London 1966) 137–8.

<sup>43</sup> D.S. xv 60.6.

<sup>44</sup> Pliny *NH* viii 143 = *FGrH* 76 F 55.

<sup>45</sup> Kebric (n. 42) 51–4.

<sup>46</sup> One extant fragment of the *Macedonica* indicates that the matter was discussed in Bk x, as the *Suda* records that in that section of Duris' work was to be found an account of an harangue by Pytheas against Demosthenes (s.v. 'ῥὸ τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ οὐκ ἔξεστι φυσῆσαι' = *FGrH* 76 F 8). Plutarch, citing Phylarchus as his source, also has a description of that public verbal clash to which the Duris fragment appears to refer (*Dem.* 27.3 = *FGrH* 81 F 75).

<sup>47</sup> W. E. Sweet, 'Sources of Plutarch's *Demetrius*', *Cl. Weekly* xlv (1951) 177–81; Kebric (n. 42) 55–60; Hornblower (n. 30) 68–70; P. de Lacy, 'Biography and Tragedy in Plutarch', *AJP* lxxiii (1952) 159–71. Lynceus of Samos, the brother of Duris, is the only source named in this biography (Plut. *Demetr.* 27.3). Hieronymus is attested at 39.3–7 as having been appointed by Demetrius as *epimelete* and *harmost* over the Boeotians (= *FGrH* 154 T 8).

<sup>48</sup> Sweet (n. 47) 178.

ὀλιγαρχικῆς, ἔργῳ δὲ μοναρχικῆς καταστάσεως γενομένης διὰ τὴν τοῦ Φαληρέως δύναμιν.<sup>49</sup>

The phraseology at first sight appears unnecessarily awkward, viz. ἀπὸ τῶν Λαμιακῶν καὶ τῆς περὶ Κραννῶνα μάχης. 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 Ἑλληνικός πόλεμος—but to have used the name in a statement reviewing the past could have created some ambiguity. Plutarch himself is evidence enough for the fact that the name ὁ Ἑλληνικός πόλεμος had been applied to many military engagements other than that of 323 and 322.<sup>50</sup> It is possible that Plutarch's source avoided the more general ὁ Ἑλληνικός 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, especially as they were reported in Athens. In the surviving passages of Hyperides' *Epitaphios* there are references to a μάχη immediately prior to the besieging of Lamia, and to μάχαι subsequent to the lifting of the siege, but never to an actual μάχη at Lamia itself.<sup>51</sup> The phraseology at Plut. *Demetr.* 10.2 is absolutely accurate, and precise in distinguishing between the type of engagement at Crannon and the events earlier at Lamia. Duris' presence in Athens in the immediate post-war decades would have equipped him with that knowledge, which provided an alternative to the only name current at that time, ὁ Ἑλληνικός πόλεμος.<sup>52</sup>

The relative dates at which Duris and Hieronymus wrote their histories are reasonably well established. Droysen first proposed that Duris wrote before Hieronymus—a theory subsequently attacked by Koehler, but convincingly upheld by Jacoby, and now accepted as established, as has been Jacoby's further proposal that Hieronymus wrote in part in reaction to, and refutation of, Duris.<sup>53</sup> As noted above,<sup>54</sup> the indications are that Duris began his history shortly after 281/80 when his rule in Samos was terminated by Ptolemy II. Hieronymus is recorded as having lived to an age of one hundred and four,<sup>55</sup> which would put his death c. 250.

<sup>49</sup> Plut. *Demetr.* 10.2.

<sup>50</sup> The expression occurs in seven separate *Lives* from the fifth and fourth centuries BC—*Them.* 6.5; *Cim.* 18.6; *Lys.* 27.3; *Ages.* 15.2; *Pel.* 17.11; *Art.* 20.4; *Phoc.* 23.1.

<sup>51</sup> Coll. 5–6. Events περὶ Λαμίας are discussed further in the examination of Plb. ix 29.2 below.

<sup>52</sup> How Hieronymus referred to the same event is demonstrated at D.S. xx 46.3: ὁ μὲν οὖν δῆμος ἐν τῷ Λαμιακῷ πολέμῳ καταλυθεὶς ὑπ' Ἀντιπάτρου μετ' ἑτη πεντεκαίδεκα παραδόξως ἐκομίσατο τὴν πατριον πολιτείαν.

<sup>53</sup> J. G. Droysen, 'Zur Duris und Hieronymos', *Hermes* xi (1876) 465; U. Koehler, 'Über die Diadochengeschichte Arrian's', *Sitz. d. Kön. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Berlin* (1890) 586 ff.; F. Jacoby, *RE* viii.2 (1913) 'Hieronymos' no. 10 1549 and *FGrH* iiii (Comm.) 544.

<sup>54</sup> Above nn. 44 and 45.

<sup>55</sup> [Lucian] *Macrob.* 22 = *FGrH* 154 T 2.

Although that figure is open to question, it is certain that he lived long and that his history included events down to at least 272.<sup>56</sup>

As far as the state of the sources will allow, it appears certain that Hieronymus used the name *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* for the war. On the other hand, it seems likely that Duris, writing within a decade earlier than Hieronymus, referred to it as *ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος* and had no knowledge of an alternative name. What little evidence we do have suggests that Hieronymus might well have been the first to use the name which later became standard for the war. That such a change in terminology could have occurred around the 260s has some support from epigraphy. The *Marmor Parium*, although not having an overall name for the war, does record the struggle at Lamia and the *naumachia* near Amorgos in the entry for 323/2. The reference to the events at Lamia reads:

ἀπὸ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ γενομένου περὶ Λαμίαν  
Ἀθηναίους πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον.<sup>57</sup>

Here, for the first time in the extant evidence, the military engagements at and around Lamia have been labelled a *πόλεμος*, an indication that in some quarters the Lamian events had been elevated in importance to a point from which it was no great step to identify the entire conflict with the '*πόλεμος*' at that location. It is known from the prescript to *fr. A* of the *Marmor Parium* that the chronicle recorded selected events down to the archonship of Diognetus at Athens in 264/3,<sup>58</sup> which is virtually synchronous with Hieronymus' time of writing.

That the name *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* was in circulation in the second century BC seems confirmed by an odd reference to the war by Polybius:

Ἀντίπατρος μὲν ἐν τῇ περὶ Λαμίαν μάχῃ νικήσας τοὺς Ἕλληνας, κάκιστα μὲν ἐχρήσατο τοῖς ταιλαιπύροις Ἀθηναίοις ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις.<sup>59</sup>

As it stands this account of what transpired is nonsense. Not only is it difficult to decide just what is meant by the *μάχῃ περὶ Λαμίαν*, but Polybius also states that Antipater achieved a victory over the Greeks here. In fact, what battles were fought *περὶ Λαμίαν* were certainly in favour of the Greek forces—the first resulting in Antipater being shut up in Lamia, and the later causing him to flee northwards following the death of Leonnatus and defeat of his cavalry. If it was Polybius' intention to refer to a decisive victory on land for Antipater, then only that near Crannon, fought some months later in 322, would fit the bill. Walbank, in his commentary on this passage, observes: 'What P. means by the "battle of Lamia" is not clear; the only

fighting there was like the sally which cost Leosthenes his life. . . . The likelihood is that P. has confused the name of the decisive land battle with that of the town noteworthy for the most memorable incident of the war as a whole. . . .'<sup>60</sup> The confusion in Polybius is explicable if it is understood that by the time this abbreviated account of the war was written, the name *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* was in circulation. Polybius has mistakenly assumed that the decisive land battle must have been near the city which had given its name to the overall conflict of 323 and 322, and by that error supplies the first indication of the time by which the name *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος* had attained widespread recognition.<sup>61</sup>

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.<sup>62</sup> 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 BC as *ὁ Λαμιακὸς πόλεμος*.

N. G. ASHTON

*The University of Western Australia*

<sup>60</sup> F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* ii (Oxford 1967) 167.

<sup>61</sup> A confusion somewhat similar to that in the Polybius passage is evident at Paus. vii 6.5. There it is stated that of the people of Achaia, only the noted wrestler Chilon of Patrae was present *ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς Λαμῖα καλούμενον πόλεμον*. However, in this case it is perfectly clear, both from the context of vii 6.5 and from an additional reference at vi 4.6–7, that Pausanias meant to refer only to the events *περὶ Λαμίαν* and not to the war as a whole.

<sup>62</sup> Hornblower (n. 30) 172 ff.

### Placing *Sectio Canonis* in historical and philosophical contexts

The construction of Pythagorean musical theory rests philosophically on the foundation provided by *Sectio Canonis*. Indeed, the treatise may have performed this role historically too. Andrew Barker has recently contributed to this journal a discussion of the methods and aims of the *Sectio*—*JHS* ci (1981) 1–16. In so doing he has pinpointed lapses in the theoretical reckoning of the treatise, especially in the case of proposition 11 (P11). I should like to reply to Barker's article. My remarks concern the authorship and date of the treatise, the introduction, a few propositions, and ultimately the historical and philosophical settings for the *Sectio*.

Barker chooses to avoid the issue of authorship of the *Sectio*, stating: 'Whether or not they [introduction and twenty propositions] are by Euclid himself, there is no good reason to assign at least the first eighteen propositions to a date later than Euclid's, or to suggest

<sup>56</sup> For Hieronymus' life and the span of his work see Hornblower (n. 30) ch. 1.

<sup>57</sup> *FGrH* 239 B 9. It is recorded in A. Wilhelm, 'Ein neues Bruchstück der parischen Marmorchronik', *Ath. Mitt.* xxii (1897) 193 that there is a space with an erasure between *περὶ* and the *lambda* of *Λαμίαν*, and that the final two letters of *Λαμίαν* are inscribed over an erasure. Jacoby believes the original inscription, erased in part for the correction *ΛΑΜΙΑΝ*, was *ΣΑΛΑΜΙΝΑ* (*FGrH* iib 239 p. 1003 n. to line 8). For the Amorgos naval engagement see N. G. Ashton, 'The *Naumachia* near Amorgos in 322 B.C.', *BSA* lxxii (1977) 1–11.

<sup>58</sup> *FGrH* 239 A lines 2–3.

<sup>59</sup> *Plb.* ix 29.2.