

Antipater and Early Hellenistic Literature*

John Walsh

INTRODUCTION

It is well known that there was a flowering of Greek literature under Alexander and in the period after his death – at least in terms of the quantity of works, even if some may dispute the quality. A vast array of histories, memoirs, pamphlets, geographical literature, philosophical treatises, and poetry was written during this period, and the political fate of the Greek world in its domination by Macedon and the Successor kingdoms was tied to an increasing tendency for kings to be patrons of literature. Many works were now produced at royal courts, under the patronage of the Successors or by partisan individuals who had served under various kings.¹

Antipater, Alexander's regent in Macedonia, has a neglected but interesting connection with literature in the early Hellenistic era. Antipater was certainly overshadowed by both Philip and Alexander, and the other Diadochs, and his place in the development of Hellenistic intellectualism and literature has been overlooked in modern scholarship.

First, in Sections I and II below, I show that Antipater, as Philip had done before him, had a role in the development of Hellenistic literature and was himself an author. There were also intriguing, if speculative, connections between Antipater's court and the emerging tradition of historical epic. Secondly, in Section III, I trace how Antipater suffered unduly from hostile historiographical traditions directed at him by the propaganda of rival Diadochs, particularly those produced under Ptolemy and the Antigoniid partisan Hieronymus of Cardia.

I. ANTIPATER'S WORKS²

A passage in the *Suda* provides some tantalising evidence of Antipater as a writer of history and letters:

Antipater was the son of Iolaus, of the city Paliura in Macedonia. He was general of Philip II and of Alexander, and their successor in the kingship. Antipater was a pupil of Aristotle. He left a compilation of letters in two books and a history called the *Illyrian Deeds of Perdiccas*. He served as guardian to the son of Alexander known as Heracles. He alone of the Successors did not choose to call Alexander a god, judging this impious ... (*Suda*, s.v. 'Αντίπατρος, A 2703).³

* I wish to thank Waldemar Heckel and Pádraig O'Cleirigh for their able editorial assistance and suggestions during the preparation of this paper.

¹ For the historians and other writers, see Pearson (1983); for the poets, see Tarn (1948) 55–62. See in general de Romilly (1985) 166–90; Gutzwiller 2007, 1–8; Erskine 2010, 17–29.

² See *FGrH* 114 and C. Müller, *FHG* II (Paris 1878), 338.

³ I base this translation on the Greek textual edition of Adler 1971.

Certainly the *Suda* is not always a reliable source, and it is clearly incorrect in its statement about Heracles. It has also been suggested that the entry is partially in error, and the *Suda* ascribed to the Diadoch Antipater works actually by Antipater of Magnesia (*FGrH* 69), the latter also being the author of a *Hellenika*.⁴ However, A. F. Natoli has argued that the *Suda* did not confuse the two men, and J. Buckler and J. Engels have also accepted the likelihood that the works were authentic.⁵ Notably, F. Jacoby held the same view that these writings were genuine,⁶ and there seems no compelling reason to doubt their authenticity.

The *Suda* states that Antipater is supposed to have written a collection of letters in two books. Hamilton suggested that this collection may have been published under Antigonus Gonatas, but in view of the hostility towards Antipater at that time, this seems unlikely.⁷ C. Bearzot argues, more reasonably, that it is possible the collection of letters was published by Antipater himself or by his son Cassander.⁸

Antipater's letters are historically attested. We are told by Plutarch in passing of a letter of Antipater to Alexander in which Antipater had denounced Olympias (*Alex.* 39.7). Moreover, a number of letters of Antipater are cited by Cicero, Aelian and Plutarch.⁹ Cicero, in *De Officiis*, tells of a large number of Antipater's letters to which he had access. These discuss in detail issues of statesmanship, political oratory and military discipline and conduct: a kind of political survival manual apparently intended for Cassander. Amidst Plutarch's comparison of Alcibiades and Coriolanus we read of Antipater writing on the death of his friend Aristotle. Antipater had been a friend of Aristotle and probably a follower of the Aristotelian school of philosophy, although he was not a student of Aristotle (μαθητῆς Ἀριστοτέλους) in the sense of having learned his philosophy while a young man, as reported in the *Suda*. Rather, Antipater's link with Aristotle must have been developed while the former was an adult.

Aristotle's connection with Macedonia had been strong. Nicomachus, Aristotle's father, was a court doctor of Amyntas III¹⁰ and Aristotle had resided at the Macedonian court in the reign of Philip II, so we can surmise that Antipater forged his friendship with the philosopher during this period.¹¹

⁴ Bearzot and Landucci Gattinoni (2002) 25–47. See also Bearzot (2011) 44–45.

⁵ Natoli (2004) 110; Buckler and Engels (2013). Greenwalt (2010) 289, n. 30 also accepts the attribution to Antipater of the *Illyrian Deeds of Perdiccas*.

⁶ See Jacoby's commentary to *FGrH* 114.

⁷ Hamilton (1961) 10–11. See Bearzot (2011) 46.

⁸ Bearzot (2011) 45–46.

⁹ Cic. *Off.* 2.48; Plut. *Comp. Alc. et Cor.* 3; Ael. *VH* 14.1. Aelian's reference may be to an authentic letter concerning honours bestowed upon Aristotle by Athens (*SIG*³ 275). See Düring (1957) 339.

¹⁰ Diog. Laert. 5.1.

¹¹ Barnes (1995) 4–7.

Later writers quoted Aristotle's correspondence with Antipater.¹² Aelian's *Varia Historia* refers to a letter in which Aristotle discusses honours bestowed upon him by Athens at Delphi and then subsequently withdrawn. Furthermore, Aristotle appointed Antipater the executor of his will (Diog. Laert. 5.11–16).¹³ It may well be that Antipater supported the emerging Lyceum as a school for Aristotelian philosophy. In this fashion, then, his impact upon the intellectual life of Greece and Europe extends well beyond his own lifetime.

The second work mentioned by the *Suda* was a history called the *Illyrian Deeds of Perdiccas*. Although Philip is often credited with starting a Greek cultural awakening in Macedonia, he was following in the tradition of his predecessor and brother Perdiccas III and father Amyntas III. Plato's distinguished student Euphraeus became resident at court and exerted significant influence over Perdiccas III (Athen. 11.509d–e). Perdiccas, in particular, appears to have gathered around him an intellectual court of sorts, and it was at this court, immersed in Greek influence, that Antipater would have begun his career.¹⁴

Born in 399/8 BC, Antipater would have been in his 30s during the reign of Perdiccas III.¹⁵ Antipater was, however, likely to have been somewhat older than the king, who was born possibly as late as 383. This suggests that he was active during the latter's reign, both at court and militarily abroad. He may well have participated in the Illyrian war of Perdiccas.¹⁶

At a later date, exactly when we cannot be certain, Antipater composed some kind of literary work concerning this campaign. F. Jacoby contended that the work was a history and the precursor to the type of history revolving around Philip called the *Philippika*.¹⁷ But that seems unlikely in view of the specific reference to the *Illyrian Deeds of Perdiccas* in the *Suda*. By contrast, J. Buckler has suggested that this work was a war memoir by Antipater,¹⁸ and surely the most plausible view is that it was a history of the campaign in the style of a war monograph.¹⁹

The events of the Illyrian war, scant as they are, are known to us chiefly from Diodorus, Book 16.2.4–5.20 The war was a complete disaster for Perdiccas, costing him his life. He fell in battle along

¹² Ael. *VH*3.36. For the letters, see Rose (1967) fr. 663–69.

¹³ Diog. Laert. 5.11–16. See also O'Sullivan (2009) 25.

¹⁴ See Markle (1976) 80–99.

¹⁵ *Suda*, s.v. 'Αντίπατρος, A 2704. On Antipater, see Kaerst (1894) 2501–9; Kanatsulis (1942); Kanatsulis (1958–1959) 14–64; Baynham (1994) 331–56; Heckel (1992) 38–49; Heckel (2006) 35–38.

¹⁶ On Perdiccas III, see Borza (1990) 194–97; Hammond and Griffith (1979) 185–88.

¹⁷ See Jacoby's commentary to *FGRH* 114.

¹⁸ Buckler and Engels (2013).

¹⁹ On this genre of historical writing, see Rood (2007) 147–58.

²⁰ Bardylis, the Illyrian king, had been encroaching upon the northern border for some time (Callisthenes, *FGRH* 124 F 27), and Polyaeus records an earlier conflict (4.10.1). In the early part of 359, Perdiccas set out to confront the Illyrian king.

with 4000 Macedonians. On the nature of Antipater's work on the war or its literary quality, we can only speculate. Antipater had many previous works on which to model his history, and perhaps it recounted not only the disastrous expedition, but also the accession of Philip II.

A further, though admittedly speculative, observation on this work can be made, to which I turn in the next section.

II. POETRY

During the early Hellenistic period, encomiastic poetry became popular, and when historical epic began to treat the deeds and wars of contemporary kings it quickly came to resemble panegyric or encomiastic verse as well.²¹

We know of a certain Hermodotus who wrote poetry for Antigonus Monophthalmus,²² and, although the precise date of Antigonus of Carystus is disputed, he appears to have written an encomiastic poem dedicated to Antipater.²³

Now the *Illyrian Deeds of Perdiccas*, as mentioned in the *Suda*, must have treated Perdiccas' war, perhaps in depth. A suggestive reference to a conflict involving Illyrians does survive. A papyrus fragment excavated at Oxyrhynchus and first published in 1964²⁴ appears to record the details of a war with the Illyrians. This fragment is part of a substantial but terribly lacunose group that records a series of wars. Of the eight papyri (913–921), 913 is the best preserved and appears to contain the partial name Philip. This, in part, may have influenced the interpretation that the group as a whole, and 917 in particular, describes Philip's wars. Although a definitive identification of this fragment is still not possible, Feeney regards the group *SH* 913–921 as historical epic or panegyric on Philip II and this view is followed by A. Kerkhecker who himself regards *SH* 913–921 as epic poems on Philip II.²⁵

We can be certain at least that the fragment treats some war or conflict involving Illyrians. Perhaps the fragment might preserve a Hellenistic epic poem on the Illyrian Wars of Perdiccas, in which narrative Philip II may have appeared. Antipater and many of the other Successor kings were in the habit of surrounding themselves with poets and writers, and it is conceivable that Antipater's history may have been adapted, at some time, into verse. The war against Bardylis, the untimely heroic death of Perdiccas, and the defeat of the Macedonians were tragic subjects fit for treatment

²¹ Feeney (1991) 266. Cf. the reservations of Cameron (1995) 277–78.

²² *SH* 491, 492; Plut. *Mor.* 182b.

²³ *SH* 47. Kerkhecker (2001) 59, n. 77; Susemihl (1891–1892) 408. See von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1881) 169–74.

²⁴ This papyrus is 917 in Lloyd-Jones' *Supplementum Hellenisticum*.

²⁵ Kerkhecker (2001) 59. Cf. Cameron (1995) 263–302, who suggests the fragment relates to Philip V instead of Philip II.

in verse. We need only see that similar events are a thematic backdrop for the *Iliad*.²⁶ The post-Classical and Hellenistic age saw a flourishing of historical epic,²⁷ such as Hegemon of Alexandria's epic poem on the Leuctrian War,²⁸ and Rhianus of Crete's epic on the *Messenika* in the 3rd century BC.²⁹ Taking into account the volume of fragmentary papyri composed in hexameters that continues to be published, we should not underestimate the level of poetic energy during the early Hellenistic period, and it remains a possibility that *SH* 913–921 may have some connection to Antipater's war monograph.

But this may not be the only epic poem composed during Antipater's reign, and possibly under his patronage.

Choerilus of Iasos had been a court poet of Alexander, and wrote an epic poem called the *Lamiaka*, and it is very likely that this work dealt with the Lamian war during the Greek revolt of 323 to 322 BC.³⁰ It is possible that, following Alexander's death, Antipater may have become Choerilus' patron.³¹ 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. Nothing definite can be said about the nature of the *Lamiaka* and how the events therein were treated. But Choerilus, having found himself a new Macedonian patron after Alexander's death, may have written his *Lamiaka* from a pro-Macedonian perspective by presenting the Lamian War as a doomed and tragic enterprise.³² Thus Antipater's patronage may well have influenced the contemporary view of the war to reflect positively upon his involvement.

In another interesting work, Antipater appears along with Olympias and Cassander in a fragmentary dialogue preserved on papyrus (*FGrH* 153 F 7). This consists of two papyrus fragments found in the collection of Freiburg, first published in 1914 by W. Aly.³³ The two papyri date to the 2nd century AD. But the work from which it was quoted might have been older, and perhaps much older. There are two views about the genre and original nature of *FGrH* 153 F 7.

²⁶ Horace's definition of epic (*Ars Poet.* 73) can be noted here: *res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella*. See also *Ov. Am.* 1.1.

²⁷ See Kroll (1916) 1–14; Ziegler (1966) with the criticisms of Otis (1963) 396–98; Kerkhecker (2001) 59. Cf. Cameron (1995) 263–302.

²⁸ *FGrH* 110. See Stephanus of Byzantium (*Ethnika*, s.v. 'Αλεξάνδρεια, 71.5–8): 'Ηγήμων έποποιός, δς έγραψε τόν Λευκτρικόν πόλεμον τών Θηβαίων καί Λακεδαιμονίων. For commentary, see Billerbeck (2006).

²⁹ Bulloch (1989) 67.

³⁰ Walsh (2011) 538–44.

³¹ Walsh (2011) 543–44.

³² Diodorus presents the conflict in a similar way (*Diod.* 18.10.4; 19.61–62).

³³ Aly (1914) 22–49. There is a translation in Robinson (1953) 271–73.

Deubner and Croenert argued originally that this is an historical dialogue,³⁴ while Reitzenstein thought that it was an early Hellenistic historical tragedy.³⁵ Deubner later emended the two papyri as published by Aly and explained the two handwritings as due to dictation from a single MS, which contained a dialogue, where two minor characters open a scene, which itself introduces Antipater as the principal character. Such an introduction is especially common, he noted, in ancient comedies. The end of the second fragment announces the appearance of Olympias, and Antipater derides Olympias' stories of Alexander's divine birth and even accuses her of high and mighty thoughts because of the myths she invented about her son.³⁶ Thus Reitzenstein's idea of an early Hellenistic historical tragedy is very attractive given the clear hostility to Olympias in the text which fits very well the court of Antipater and his son Cassander.

Unfortunately for this view, Aly called attention to the resemblance of the text to the dialogues of Lucian, and Deubner improved the text and revised his view, by relating the dialogue to Lucian's *Egkomion Demosthenous* (26, 29), where a reference to just such a Macedonian dialogue of Antipater is mentioned.³⁷ More recently, Pearson has argued that the fragment of this dialogue, representing a scene after Alexander's death, while of great interest in itself, is unlikely to be a composition that dates back to Hellenistic times.³⁸ Rather, the text conforms to the stylistic norms of the 2nd century AD and Lucian in particular, and so it may be difficult to reverse this view. However, as new evidence continues to emerge pointing to, and highlighting, the creative and diverse nature of Hellenistic writing, this view may again be revised, and Reitzenstein's idea that the work was an early Hellenistic tragedy could still have some merit. In that case, one must ask whether the work had a relationship to the court of Antipater, who, we know, was deeply hostile to Olympias.

III. BIAS AGAINST ANTIPATER IN HELLENISTIC PROPAGANDA AND HIERONYMUS

The negative view of Antipater that persists today is largely the product of the early Hellenistic propaganda and the historian Hieronymus.

The political invective against Antipater can be traced to the *Liber de Morte Testamentumque Alexandri Magni*. This document in its various versions appears to derive ultimately from a work of Ptolemaic propaganda, perhaps written by one Holcias, from c. 309/8 BC, and was already hostile to Antipater, given Ptolemy's opposition to Antipater's son Cassander.³⁹ The fact that Cassander later

³⁴ Deubner (1921) 314–19 and (1921) 445; Crönert (1922) 1–46

³⁵ Reitzenstein (1922) 189–96.

³⁶ *FGrH* 153 F 7. See also Collins (2012) 14 on the content of the dialogue.

³⁷ Deubner (1921) 445.

³⁸ Pearson (1983) 259–60.

³⁹ On the *Liber de Morte*, see Bosworth (2000) 207–41. The alternative view is that the document was created by someone in the party of Perdiccas: thus Ausfeld (1895), Ausfeld (1901), Merkelbach (1977). For the time of

murdered Alexander IV and Rhoisane was also exploited ruthlessly by his political enemies, and the event cannot but have reflected badly on Cassander's father Antipater.⁴⁰

While rumours that Alexander had been poisoned probably appeared soon after the king's death, our earliest source Onesicritus apparently did not name any of the alleged conspirators (*FGrH* 135 F 37). The early rumours may well have been due to Olympias, who had blamed Antipater for her son's death in an act of invective inspired by her bitter opposition to him.⁴¹ According to the later *Liber de Morte*, letters from Olympias denouncing the "crimes" of Antipater reached Alexander, and he sent Craterus to replace Antipater (*Liber de Morte* 87).⁴² Antipater was terrified by these events and so was the prime mover in a plot to murder Alexander by poison (*Liber de Morte* 88). This poison was conveyed by Antipater's son Cassander to Babylon, and delivered to his brother Iollas (*Liber de Morte* 89, 96). Alexander's cup was then poisoned and he died in a wider conspiracy involving number of other generals (*Liber de Morte* 97–99).

The real or perceived tensions between Alexander and Antipater,⁴³ the latter's quarrel with Olympias (Diod. 18.49.4; Paus. 1.11.3; Plut. *Alex.* 68.4–5), and the sudden death of the king may well have fueled rumours of Antipater's involvement in some kind of plot to poison Alexander, but the source behind the *Liber de Morte* could also have simply invented the idea that Antipater was a principal instigator of the conspiracy for political purposes. Later Alexander historians who wrote in Egypt, such as Cleitarchus, adhered to the anti-Antipater propaganda of Ptolemy, and via Cleitarchus himself this informed the Alexander Vulgate.⁴⁴ It can be readily seen that Antipater was damned by the early propaganda of his Diadoch enemies as the murderer of the king, and this was highly successful invective that has left its mark on the historiographical tradition, which has arguably extended also to Antipater's son Cassander.⁴⁵

A second, and highly influential, hostile tradition against Antipater stems from Hieronymus of Cardia. The latter had a strong impact upon the numerous other historians who used his work.

Poliperchon, see Heckel (1988); Heckel (2007) 265–75. See also Zambrini (2007) 212–13; Bosworth (1971) 112–36.

⁴⁰ Bosworth (2000) 227.

⁴¹ Goukowsky (1978) 105: "Très tôt, sans doute dès ses premières tractations avec Léonnat, Olympias s'était efforcée de ruiner l'autorité d'Antipatros en lui faisant porter la responsabilité de la mort subite d'Alexandre. Le vieillard, murmurait-on, avait chargé son fils aîné Cassandros de remettre au cadet, Iolaos, le poison versé dans la coupe royale." For Leonnatus' negotiations with Cleopatra, see Plut. *Eum.* 3.9.

⁴² On the role of Olympias in the *Liber de Morte*, see Carney (2006) 109–10.

⁴³ There is reason to think that Alexander's hostility to Antipater was exaggerated by later sources, see Griffith (1965) 12–17; Ashton (1991) 125–31; Baynham (1994) 343–46; Meeus (2009) 249–50.

⁴⁴ Cleitarchus seems to have even alleged that Antipater and Cassander suppressed the story of Alexander's murder when they ruled Macedonia and that many historians did not dare write of the poison (Diod. 17.118.1–2; Curt. 10.10.14–19), which, as Goukowsky (1978) 109 argues, presumably refers to Aristoboulus of Cassandrea.

⁴⁵ On the latter point, see now Meeus (2009) 249–50.

Amongst these was our surviving source Diodorus, who employed Hieronymus extensively and so has reproduced a number of Hieronymus' biases.⁴⁶ An illustrative case in point relating to Antipater is Diodorus' transmitted history of the Lamian War – and also of our perception of Antipater.

Hieronymus, a one-time client of Antigonus, who had pardoned him after his war with Eumenes,⁴⁷ later lived under the protection of Antigonus' son Demetrius the Besieger, and finally under Antigonus Gonatas. Hieronymus managed to survive until the age of 104 under their patronage, and seems to have been particularly adept at flattering his benefactors while, at the same time, suppressing the role of the other Diadochs. In the case of Antipater, we must also weigh the effect of the personal animosity between Antigonus' offspring and Antipater's descendants.⁴⁸ It is now generally acknowledged that Diodorus' accustomed method was to use a major source for each book of his history, with occasional reference to minor sources.⁴⁹ In Books 18–20, Hieronymus of Cardia was Diodorus' main source and the core of the content of the narrative—and indeed, with the exception of the Sicilian sections, the only source he used.⁵⁰ Moreover, as Diodorus reproduced many of Hieronymus' attitudes and statements, it is almost certainly true the same applies to his biases.⁵¹

After Alexander's death and the establishment of his position as a client of the Antigonids, Hieronymus had every reason to diminish Antipater's ability and military skill. There were presumably varying traditions about Antipater in antiquity, and the Hellenic- and Athenocentric version we find in Diodorus (the product of Hieronymus' biased narrative), on the surface at least, does not appear to have been questioned by Diodorus. The tradition subordinates Antipater to the role of accessory and overly influences our modern perception of him.

There are two forces at work on the narrative that have produced this final result: the voice of Hieronymus suppressing the role of Antipater, and also Diodorus' own ambition to write a compelling history. Diodorus took what Dionysius tells us was Hieronymus' notoriously boring history and finally made it readable.⁵² He took up the challenge to write history which not only educated and

⁴⁶ See Hornblower (1981) 263–81, with the criticisms of Bosworth (1983) 209–10.

⁴⁷ Lucian, *Macrobii*, 22; Plut. *Demetr.* 39; Diod. Sic. 18.42.1, 50.4, 19.44.3, 100.1–3 09; Dion. Halic. *Antiq. Rom.* 1.6.1, 7.1.

⁴⁸ Plut. *Demetr.* 35–7; *Pyrrh.* 6–8.

⁴⁹ Schwartz (1903) 663–704; Drews (1960); Drews (1962), 383–92.

⁵⁰ Schwartz (1903) 684–85; Simpson (1959) 370–9; Merker (1988) 90–93; Seibert (1983) 27–36; Hornblower (1981) 18–39. Some have argued that Diodorus used an intermediary source, which Beloch (*Griechische Geschichte* IV² 2.4–5) thought was Agatharchides of Cnidus, but see Merker (1988) 90–93 and Hornblower (1981) 62–63 for a convincing refutation of this thesis.

⁵¹ Hornblower (1981) 263–81.

⁵² Dion. Halic. *De compositione verborum* 4.108–112 = *FGrH* 154 T 12: τοιγάρτοι τοιαύτας συντάξεις κατέλιπον οἷας οὐδεὶς ὑπομένει μέχρι κορωνίδος διελθεῖν, Φύλαρχον λέγω καὶ Δοῦριν καὶ Πολύβιον καὶ Ψάωνα καὶ τὸν Καλλατιανὸν Δημήτριον Ἰερώνυμόν τε καὶ Ἀντίγονον καὶ Ἡρακλείδην καὶ Ἠγησιάνακτα καὶ ἄλλους

inspired, but which was alive with characters that embodied heroic and moral excellence. His narrative needed a noble leader for the Athenian revolt—and so he accepted a heroic version of Leosthenes that diminished and marginalised Antipater. Diodorus was perfectly content to take liberties with the truth in the interest of writing a compelling account. He was comfortable with embellishment, and his source Hieronymus had naturally suppressed the military role of one of the key figures. Hieronymus may well have done this by emphasising the Lamian siege in order to draw attention to what he hoped would highlight the least successful aspect of Antipater's military campaign.⁵³

The result of this editorial process is Diodorus' Lamian narrative, in which it appears that Leosthenes got the better of Antipater, and that Athens was very close to securing its freedom. Diodorus' moral narrative suggests that there was a greater power—Fortune—that was punishing the Athenians.⁵⁴ There is the dominant sense of divine retribution or justice, and that the Athenians, not having heeded the lesson of Thebes, were punished for their transgressions. Needless to say, modern historians should proceed carefully when dealing with a narrative so heavily interspersed with moral criticism.

Under closer scrutiny, once Diodorus' layer of editing, with its moralising and rhetorical themes, has been removed from the narrative, we are left with the core of the work. Pausanias tells us that Hieronymus—the generally accepted source for Diodorus' sections on Diadoch history—was biased against all the kings except his patron.⁵⁵ "... Hieronymus has a reputation generally of being biased against all the kings except Antigonus, and of being unfairly partial towards to him."

Pausanias continues and even suggests that Hieronymus' personal grievances against Lysimachus may have influenced his work: "Possibly Hieronymus had grudges against Lysimachus, particularly his destruction of the city of Cardia and the foundation in its place of Lysimachea on the isthmus of the Thracian Chersonese."⁵⁶

μυρίους. Not only Hieronymus, but also Duris of Samos, another important source for Diodorus, is criticised for his inaccessible style.

⁵³ Although the Lamian War was certainly a crucial event in the history of Athens, Dexippus' decision to avoid characterising the war as a Hellenic struggle for freedom forces us to call into question Hieronymus' motives. Where Diodorus may have later found the perfect canvas for moral rhetoric, Hieronymus certainly exploited the war in order to best slander Antipater. See Martin (2005) 301–5.

⁵⁴ See Sacks (1990) 36–41, 132–37 for discussion of the role of Fortune in the *Bibliothèque* and the attempts of scholars to definitively link Diodorus' narrative use of τύχη with a particular school of philosophy.

⁵⁵ See also Landucci (1981–82) 13–26; Panichi (2001) 155–66.

⁵⁶ Plutarch notes (*Demetr.* 20; 25; 31; 44) Lysimachus' hatred of Demetrius. Lysimachus attempted to procure the death of Demetrius in 284 after he had been captured by Seleucus (Plut. *Demetr.* 51; Diod. 21.20.1–2). We should assume that this would exacerbate Hieronymus' hostility and bias. Hauben (1974) 105–19 illustrates that Demetrius' relationships with his contemporaries were frequently strained and dominated by rivalry and jealousy.

It is my thesis that the same influence is at work in Hieronymus' treatment of Antipater. In particular, Hieronymus may have had personal reasons for his bias against Antipater. Hieronymus shared Eumenes' experience of the siege of Nora in 320. After the serious defeat that Eumenes suffered at the hands of Antigonus, he fled to Nora and endured a harsh siege which saw around 100 of the 600 men who accompanied him perish (Diod. 18.53.7). In summer 319, Eumenes sent Hieronymus to Antipater to attempt to negotiate the surrender (Diod. 18.42.1). As a result, his treatment of Antipater may be in part influenced by the tone of the negotiations in which Hieronymus participated.⁵⁷ Diodorus notes also that these negotiations were referred to Antipater.⁵⁸ Eumenes himself had a hatred of Antipater (Plut. *Eum.* 5.7).⁵⁹ Thus Eumenes' personal hostility to Antipater may have coloured Hieronymus' narrative, and the latter could have seized on the events at Lamia in order to present them, and Antipater, in the worst possible light.

It is instructive to compare the two sieges and their treatment by Diodorus, who relies on Hieronymus. Even though Eumenes was in a desperate condition, Diodorus' account of his occupation of Nora (18.41.1) preserves none of the sense of urgency that overshadows Antipater's arrival at Lamia.⁶⁰ Similarly, Antipater's offer to negotiate while besieged at Lamia (Diod. 18.18.3) emphasises his weakness, while Eumenes' hard line position at Nora (Diod. 18.41.7) portrays the Greek in a manner far more flattering. Perhaps Hieronymus' experience here significantly influenced his treatment of the Lamian siege, by modelling his account of Antipater on the actual events of Eumenes' flight to Nora after his defeat in Cappadocia. Eumenes was comprehensively beaten by Antigonus and genuinely on the run for his life in 320. The desertion of Eumenes' soldiers to Antigonus (18.41.1) has its parallel in the departure of the Thessalians from Antipater. The food shortages Diodorus' account suggests (18.42.5) were prevalent at Nora (which contributed to the death of one hundred men) may have provided the basis for his unfavourable interpretation of Antipater's position at Lamia (18.13.4). This is borne out by an analysis of Diodorus' text in passages where he appears to have negative and unnecessarily critical remarks about Antipater and his

⁵⁷ Anson (2004) 134–35 argues that Hieronymus never reached Antipater, but was probably captured by Antigonus after he left Nora. At Diod. 18.50.4, Hieronymus is found in the entourage of Antigonus after the death of Antipater. Nevertheless being sent to Antipater to seek terms would surely have cemented his resentment of Antipater. On Diodorus' narrative of the events at Nora, Eumenes and the mutability of Fate, see Hadley (1996) 140–41. Hadley similarly advances the thesis that given the opportunity for moralising the work may represent Diodorus' own voice more than that of his source.

⁵⁸ It may also be the case that Diodorus' frequent reference to Fortune in reference to Nora and Eumenes (18.41.7, 42.1, 53.1, 53.3, 53.7) is designed to provoke the comparison by the reader.

⁵⁹ The statement of Justin (14.2.4), that Antipater did in fact send aid to Eumenes, is no doubt an error: Anson (2004) 134, n. 62.

⁶⁰ Compare the use of κατελάβετο χωρίον ὄχυρόν ὃ προσηγορεύτο Νῶρα (18.41.1) with κατέφυγεν εἰς πόλιν Λαμίαν (Diod. 18.12.4).

strategy. The most economic thesis is that these attacks on Antipater came from Hieronymus, who attempted to diminish his role in the war, despite his outstanding career under Philip and Alexander.

CONCLUSION

On many levels, Antipater's influence on early Hellenistic literature can be seen. He himself wrote a war monograph and was a man of letters. Antipater emerges as one of the more learned of the Diadochs, and the connection with Aristotle is notable. There is suggestive evidence that epic poetry was written at his court, and that he himself inspired later literature. Finally, the bias displayed against Antipater by the *Liber de Morte* and by Hieronymus has directly affected our entire view of the period, and of the crucial struggle that played out in Greece during the Lamian War.

JOHN WALSH
UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, A. (1971). *Suidae Lexicon*. Stuttgart.
- Aly, W. (1914). "Zwei Dialoge über die Göttlichkeit Alexanders nebst einem lateinischen Inventar," *Sitzungsberichten der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1.5: 22–49.
- Anson, E.M. (2004). *Eumenes of Cardia: A Greek among Macedonians*. Boston.
- Ashton, N.G. (1991). "Craterus from 324 to 321 B.C.," *Ancient Macedonia* 5: 125–131.
- Ausfeld, A. (1895). "Das angebliche Testament Alexanders des Grossen." *RhM* 50: 357–366.
- Ausfeld, A. (1901). "Das angebliche Testament Alexanders des Grossen." *RhM* 56: 517–542.
- Barnes, J. (1995). "Life and Work," in J. Barnes (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*. Cambridge. 1–27.
- Baynham, E. (1994). "Antipater: Manager of Kings," in I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History*. Oxford. 331–356.
- Bearzot, C. (2011). "Royal Autobiography in the Hellenistic Age," in Gabriele Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity*. Leiden. 37–86.
- Bearzot, C. and F. Landucci Gattinoni. (2002). "I Diadochi e la Suda," *Aevum* 76.1, 25–47.
- Billerbeck, M. et al. (2006). *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica, Bd.1: Alpha–Gamma: 1A*. de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Borza, E.N. (1990). *In the Shadow of Olympus: the Emergence of Macedon*. Princeton, N.J.
- Bosworth, A.B. (1971). "The Death of Alexander the Great: Rumour and Propaganda," *CQ* 21, 112–136.
- Bosworth, A.B. (1983). Review of Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, *JHS* 103, 209–210.

- Bosworth, A.B. (1988a). *Conquest and Empire. The reign of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge.
- Bosworth, A. B. (1988b). *From Arrian to Alexander. Studies in Historical Interpretation*. Oxford.
- Bosworth, A.B. (2000). "Ptolemy and the Will of Alexander," in A.B. Bosworth and E.J. Baynham (eds.), *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Oxford and New York. 207–241.
- Buckler, John and Engels, Johannes. 2013. "Antipatros (114)," *Brill's New Jacoby* (ed. by Ian Worthington), Brill Online (accessed 24 September).
- Bulloch, A.W. (1989). "Hellenistic Poetry," in P.E. Easterling, E.J. Kenney, B.M.W. Knox (eds), *Cambridge History of Classical Literature: The Hellenistic Period and the Empire*. Cambridge. 1–81.
- Cameron, A. (1995). *Callimachus and his Critics*. Princeton.
- Carney, E.D. (2006). *Olympias: Mother of Alexander the Great*. New York.
- Collins, A.W. (2012). "Callisthenes on Olympias and Alexander's Divine Birth," *AHB* 26.1/2, 1–14.
- Crönert, W. (1922). "Griechische literarische papyri aus Straßburg, Freiburg und Berlin," *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse*. 1–46.
- de Romilly, J. (1985). *A Short History of Greek Literature* (trans. L. Doherty). Chicago. 166–190.
- Deubner, L. (1921). "Zum Freiburger Makedonierdialog," *Hermes* 56.3, 314–319.
- Deubner, L. (1921). "Nachtrag zu S. 314ff," *Hermes* 56, 445.
- Drews, R.H. (1960). *Historiographical Objectives and Procedures of Diodorus Siculus*. Dissert. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
- Drews, R.H. (1962). "Diodorus and His Sources," *AJPh* 81, 383–392.
- Düring, I. (1957). *Aristotle in the Ancient Bibliographical Tradition*. Gothenburg.
- Erskine, A. (2010). "From Alexander to Augustus," in J.J. Clauss and M. Cuypers (eds), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. Chichester, UK. 17–29.
- Feeney, D.C. (1991). *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford.
- Greenwalt, W.S. (2010). "Macedonia, Illyria and Epirus," in J. Roisman and I. Worthington (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*. Malden, MA. 279–305.
- Goukowsky, P. (1978). *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre (336–270 av. J.-C.), I: Les origines politiques*. Nancy.
- Griffith, G.T. (1965). "Alexander and Antipater in 323 BC," *PACA* 8, 12–17.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. (2007). *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*. Oxford and Malden, Mass.
- Hadley, R.A. (1996). "Diodoros 18.60.1–3: A Case of Remodelled Source Materials," *AHB* 10.3–4, 131–147.

- Hammond, N.G.L. and G.T. Griffith. (1979). *A History of Macedonia, Volume II, 550 B.C.-336 B.C.* Oxford.
- Hauben, H. (1974). "A Royal Toast in 302 B.C.," *AncSoc* 5, 105-119.
- Heckel, W. (1992). *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*. London.
- Heckel, W. (1988). *The Last Days and Testament of Alexander the Great: A Prosopographic Study*. Stuttgart.
- Heckel, W. (2007). "The Earliest Evidence for the Plot to Poison Alexander," in W. Heckel, L. Tritle and P. Wheatley (eds.), *Alexander's Empire. Formulation to Decay*. Claremont, CA. 265-275.
- Hornblower, J. (1981). *Hieronymus of Cardia*. Oxford
- Kaerst, A.J. (1894). *RE* 1.2, s.v. "Antipatros," 2501-2509.
- Kanatsulis, D. (1942). *Antipatros. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Makedoniens in der Zeit Philipps, Alexanders und der Diadochen*. Thessaloniki.
- Kanatsulis, D. (1958-1959). "Antipatros als Feldherr und Staatsmann in der Zeit Philipps und Alexanders des Grossen," *Hellenika* 16, 14-64.
- Kerkhecker, A. (2001). "Zur internen Gattungsgeschichte der römischen Epik: Das Beispiel Ennius," in E.A. Schmidt (ed.), *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine*. Geneva. 39-88.
- Kroll, W. (1916). "Das historische Epos," *Sokrates: Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 4, 1-14.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. (1981-1982). "Ieronimo e la storia dei Diadochi," *InvLuc* 3-4, 13-26.
- Markle, M.M. (1976). "Support of Athenian Intellectuals for Philip: A Study of Isocrates' Philippus and Speusippus' *Letter to Philip*," *JHS* 96, 80-99.
- Martin, G. (2005). "Antipater After the Lamian War: New Readings in Vat. Gr. 73 (Dexippus Fr. 33)," *CQ* 55.1, 301-305.
- Meeus, A. (2009). "Alexander's Image in the Age of the Successors," in W. Heckel and L.A. Tritle (eds.), *Alexander the Great: A New History*. Chichester, UK and Malden, Mass. 235-250.
- Merkelbach, R. (1977). *Die Quellen des griechischen Alexanderromans*. Munich.
- Merker, I.L. (1988). "Diodorus Siculus and Hieronymus of Cardia," *AHB* 2.4, 90-93.
- Natoli, Anthony Francis. (2004). *The Letter of Speusippus to Philip II: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Stuttgart.
- O'Sullivan, L. (2009). *The Regime of Demetrius of Phalerum in Athens, 317-307 BCE: A Philosopher in Politics*. Leiden and Boston.
- Otis, B. (1963). *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford.
- Panichi, S. (2001). "Ieronimo di Cardia, Alessandro e gli Antigonidi," *Studi ellenistici* 13, 155-166.

- Pearson, L. (1983). *The Lost Historians of Alexander the Great*. Chico, California.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1922). "Zu dem Freiburger Alexander-Papyrus," *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*: 189–196.
- Robinson, C. A. (1953). *The History of Alexander the Great, Volume I, Part I. An Index to the Extant Historians. Part II. The Fragments*. Providence.
- Rood, T. (2007). "The Development of the War Monograph," in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (vol. 1). Oxford. 147–158.
- Rose, V. (1967). *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*. Stuttgart.
- Sacks, K. (1990). *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*. Princeton, N.J.
- Schwartz, E. (1903). *RE* 5.1, s.v. "Diodorus," 663–704.
- Seibert, J. (1983). *Das Zeitalter der Diadochen*. Darmstadt.
- Simpson, R.H. (1959). "The Abbreviation of Hieronymus in Diodorus," *AJP* 80, 370–379.
- Susemihl, F. (1891–1892). *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit* (vol. 1). Leipzig.
- Tarn, W.W. (1948). *Alexander the Great* (2 vols). Cambridge.
- Vatai, F.L. (1984). *Intellectuals in Politics in the Greek world: From Early Times to the Hellenistic Age*. London.
- Walsh, J. (2011). "The *Lamiaka* of Choerilus of Iasos and the Genesis of the Term "Lamian War"," *CQ* 61.2, 538–544.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. (1881). *Antigonos von Karystos*. Weidmann.
- Zambrini, A. (2007). "The Historians of Alexander the Great," in J. Marincola (ed.), *Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Oxford. 210–220.
- Ziegler, K. (1966). *Das hellenistische Epos: ein vergessenes Kapitel griechischer Dichtung* (2nd edn.). Leipzig.