

## THE ACTIONS OF PHILIP II IN 347 AND 346 B.C.: A REPLY TO N. G. L. HAMMOND

Professor N. G. L. Hammond has of late published some of his thoughts on the activities of Philip II in 347 and 346 B.C.<sup>1</sup> In addition he has treated aspects of Philip's earlier involvement in Thessalian, Thracian, and Phokian affairs. In the process he has in many instances disagreed with a number of current findings. Among those challenged are some of mine.<sup>2</sup> Healthy scholarly debate is always desirable, and in this spirit I should welcome an opportunity to contest Professor Hammond's views on several points, the most important being the basic factor of methodology and the interpretation of various factual details.

To begin, Hammond finds my interpretation of the chronology of this entire period from 356 to 346 'unconvincing', a view that he had earlier aired in his book on Philip: 'Buckler 148ff. has dated the Amphiktyonic declaration [of war] a year earlier, on grounds which are to me unconvincing'.<sup>3</sup> Lapidary statements of opinion are unacceptable substitutes for reasoned arguments based on a proper understanding of the evidence. If Hammond is unpersuaded by my conclusions, he owes the reader his reasons for having rejected them. Instead of doing anything of the sort, he seeks support for his position by referring to G. T. Griffith: 'I am here following the chronology used in *HM* 2, which is based mainly on Hammond, *DSW*'. A literal translation of this sentence means that Hammond relies upon Griffith's acceptance of Hammond's own chronology.<sup>4</sup> To complicate matters Griffith shows no sign of having independently explored the topic. This line of thought does not even amount to circular argument. It is rather an expression of an out-dated conclusion. Two examples prove the point. In 1949 J. Pouilloux published a Delphian inscription relating to the outbreak of the Sacred War.<sup>5</sup> In 1979 G. Roux published his magisterial book on the Delphic Amphiktyony, which demonstrated, among other things, the significance of contemporary inscriptions for the proper understanding of these events.<sup>6</sup> No citations of these works appear in the writings of Hammond and Griffith, even though they have long been easily available. Both scholars have evidently ignored or overlooked recent publications in order to repeat views introduced fifty-nine years ago. Repetition of an opinion does not transform it into fact. For these obvious reasons, certain aspects of the topic must be re-opened, specifically the testimony about the outbreak of the Sacred War and the later activities of Philip.

### I. THE OUTBREAK OF THE SACRED WAR

The patience of even the most indulgent reader would be tried by a full account of these events. Regarding the Sacred War, nothing of the sort is necessary. Many Delphian inscriptions easily clarify the historical record and eliminate the need for

<sup>1</sup> 'Philip's Actions in 347 and Early 346 B.C.', *CQ* 44 (1994), 367–74.

<sup>2</sup> *Philip II and the Sacred War* (Leiden, 1989), 148–95.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. (n. 1 above), 368 n. 2; *Philip of Macedon* (Baltimore, 1994), 200 n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> The references are to N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II* (Oxford, 1979), and N. G. L. Hammond, 'Diodorus' Narrative of the Sacred War', *JHS* 57 (1937), 44–77.

<sup>5</sup> 'Ο ΕΠΙΚΕΦΑΛΟΣ ΟΒΟΛΟΣ', *BCH* 73 (1949), 177–200.

<sup>6</sup> *L'Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Lyon, 1979).

any elaborate dependence upon later literary sources. The first inscription, found only in 1947, was erected by the Amphiktyons in the spring-pylaia of the archonship of Herakleios (357/6 B.C.).<sup>7</sup> The inscription records the decisions made at the regular meeting of the pylaia, which began on 1 Bysios (roughly February/March), the eighth month of the Delphian year. The pylaia ended on the last day of Apellaios, which began with the first new moon after the summer solstice.<sup>8</sup> The inscription is noteworthy because it lists the names of three *prostatauontes*, a Theban and two Thessalians. Aristagoras of Delphoi is also mentioned as one of three *argurologeontes*, or collector of funds for the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo. This securely dated inscription proves that the situation at the sanctuary was unsettled in July 356 B.C. The very creation of the office of *argurologeontes* readily proves it. Roux has suggested that these officials assembled at Delphoi because *stasis* there prevented the meeting of the full board of *naopoioi*. Normal activities at Delphoi had clearly been disrupted at this time, and only the Phokian seizure of the sanctuary can explain the need to create this unusual and unprecedented board to handle sacred funds.<sup>9</sup>

Further supporting evidence comes from another Delphic inscription that dates from the spring-pylaia of Herakleios, which corresponded with the month of Apollaios in the Delphic archonship of Aristoxenos.<sup>10</sup> It records a payment for the building of the temple. It also testifies that before the end of the spring-pylaia, Aristagoras resigned his position as *naopoios*, or was forcibly removed from it, with Nikomachos of Delphoi assuming his duties. The very archonship of Aristoxenos at this point further indicates disturbed conditions at Delphoi. Aristoxenos had been exiled in 363/2 B.C., and his lands confiscated.<sup>11</sup> His return at this time surely proves that the government that had banished him had itself been replaced; hence, this is precisely when one must posit Philomelos' seizure of Apollo's sanctuary.<sup>12</sup> Aristoxenos' archonship was itself fraught with problems. Within four months of its beginning only five *naopoioi*, all of them supporters of the Phokians, served at their posts. The others refused to render their accounts in person.<sup>13</sup> Nor did the *naopoioi* meet in the spring-pylaia of Aristoxenos.<sup>14</sup> In fact, a full board of *naopoioi* did not meet again until the archonship of Damoxenos (346 B.C.) after the war.<sup>15</sup> Those who in the meantime received funds were called 'the *naopoioi* in the time of war'.<sup>16</sup>

Still another Delphic inscription, found in 1896 and thus long available to scholars, further substantiates these conclusions.<sup>17</sup> Lines 12–13 state that Aristoxenos was archon in 356/5 B.C., and that three other Delphians, Kallikrates, Euphrantos, and Maimalos, served as *bouleutai* with him. Other inscriptions also prove that all of these men served together during the spring-pylaia of 355 B.C.<sup>18</sup> They are not, however, known to have served together at any other time. Epigraphy thus proves beyond doubt the accuracy of the chronology that I had earlier proposed.

<sup>7</sup> Op. cit. (n. 5 above), lines 1–3 of the inscription.

<sup>8</sup> Op. cit. (n. 6 above), 39–50.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 105–11, 114.

<sup>10</sup> E. Bourguet, *Fouilles de Delphes* III.5 (Paris, 1932), no. 19, lines 3–5; [hereafter cited as *FdD*].

<sup>11</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 109; *FdD* III.5, nos. 15–18. J. Buckler, 'Thebes, Delphoi, and the Outbreak of the Third Sacred War', in P. Roesch and G. Argoud (eds.), *La Béotie Antique* (Paris, 1985), 237–46; Buckler (op. cit., n. 2 above), 202 n. 24.

<sup>12</sup> Diod. 16.14.3, 30.1; Pouilloux, op. cit. (n. 5 above), 198; Buckler, op. cit. (n. 2 above), 153.

<sup>13</sup> *FdD* III.5, no. 19 lines 8–30, especially 10–11.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. line 31.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. line 71: ἐπεὶ ἡ εἰρήνη ἐγένετο.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. lines 37, 66, 68–70: τοῖς ναοποιοῖς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ.

<sup>17</sup> E. Bourguet, *FdD* III.1 (Paris, 1929), no. 392; see also J. Buckler, 'Delphi und die Söhne des Kersebleptes', *Klio* 68 (1986), 348–50.

<sup>18</sup> Buckler (n. 2 above), 202–3.

The compelling conclusions to be drawn from these facts are that Philomelos seized the sanctuary in summer 356 B.C. and that the Amphiktyons declared war on the Phokians in the fourth month of the Delphian year, or in other words in the late autumn or early winter of 356 B.C. This is the testimony of contemporary epigraphy, which further implicates Philomelos by announcing the destruction of the statue of him that was erected during the era.<sup>19</sup> If this evidence be unpersuasive, one can reasonably expect Hammond to explain why he rejects it in favour of Diodoros' later, derivative, and confused narrative.<sup>20</sup>

## II. PHILIP IN THE NORTH

A major part of Hammond's most recent piece involves Philip's ambitions in Thessaly and Thrace. According to his interpretation, after the destruction of Olynthos, Philip seized gold mines in Thessaly, silver mines in Thrace, and began to practise piracy. He intervened in Thrace, where he took advantage of the weakness of two kings to rob them of their realms. Next he sent envoys to Athens seeking peace terms, which were duly accepted.<sup>21</sup>

Hammond claims that Philip used the destruction of Olynthos to intimidate Athens, Thessaly, and the rest of Greece into submission. This tidy interpretation suffers from some serious defects in detail. In the first place, Philip could not have seized any gold mines in Thessaly because none existed, as even he admits. Moreover, Philip's treatment of Olynthos had nothing to do with Thessaly. Philip had gained control of Thessaly when he defeated Onomarchos at the battle of the Crocus Plain in 353 B.C., at which time the Thessalians recognized him as the archon of their confederacy.<sup>22</sup> Philip nonetheless faced some unrest in Thessaly for years to come, and did not bring the region fully under his control until shortly before the battle of Chaironeia. Polybios (9.28.2-4) states as much in a speech that he attributes to Chlaineas in 211 B.C. Chlaineas avers that Philip intimidated the Thessalians shortly before he defeated the Athenians in battle (μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ μάχῃ νικήσας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐχρήσατο). Most scholars, notably F. W. Walbank, date this episode to 344 B.C.<sup>23</sup> Hammond flatly rejects this dating without offering a reason. He says only: 'That this terror was fresh in 347 rather than in 344 is obvious'.<sup>24</sup> Hammond cannot be right, for Polybios' words argue decisively to the contrary. Philip had fought no major battle with the Athenians until 338 B.C.—even at the Crocus Plain, Chares' Athenian contingent arrived too late to participate in the fighting.<sup>25</sup> Thus, a date shortly before Chaironeia more closely fits Polybios' testimony than one some ten years earlier.

Contemporary observers likewise refute Hammond's view. Demosthenes (1.22) states that in 349 B.C. the Thessalians were angry with Philip because he still held

<sup>19</sup> *FdD* III.5. no. 23, line 114.

<sup>20</sup> Similarly, Hammond *op. cit.* (n. 4 above), prefers Demophilos' account of the Sacred War to the actual documents of the period, even though virtually nothing in the literary source corresponds to the epigraphical evidence.

<sup>21</sup> Hammond *op. cit.* (n. 1 above), 371-3. Throughout the article he is conveniently vague as to whether Trogus or his epitomizer is responsible for the extant text of Justin. On this question, see n. 40 below.

<sup>22</sup> Diod. 16.35.2, 38.1; Justin 8.3.2; 11.3.2. Buckler, *op. cit.* (n. 2 above), 78-80; R. M. Errington, *A History of Macedonia*, Eng. trans. (Berkeley, 1990), 62-6.

<sup>23</sup> *A Historical Commentary on Polybios II* (Oxford, 1967), 165.

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.* (n. 1 above), 368.

<sup>25</sup> Dem. 4.35; 19.319; Diod. 16.35.5-6, 61.2. Buckler, *op. cit.* (n. 2 above), with full bibliography.

Pagasai, and was then fortifying Magnesia. Moreover, they refused to pay Philip the federal taxes on income derived from harbour and market dues. Philip's response to these complaints was anything but bellicose. He promised (Dem. 2.7) to return Magnesia to the Thessalians and to pursue the Sacred War to its conclusion. Philip could hardly have been milder or more conciliatory in this situation. The picture painted by Demosthenes, certainly no friend of Philip's, is significantly different from Hammond's. Isokrates also states that the Thessalians in 346 B.C. were loyal to Philip.<sup>26</sup> As the situation at Halos attests, some places in Thessaly were still restive, which is not surprising in view of Demosthenes' generous remark (1.2) that the Thessalians were by nature traitors. Even at Halos Philip merely intervened in its own dispute with Pharsalos, but nothing suggests that he had anything to do with the origin of the disagreement. The important point is that nothing in the contemporary sources indicates that in 347 B.C. the region was rebellious. Hammond's thesis that Philip needed terror to govern Thessaly at this time is baseless.<sup>27</sup>

Hammond next links Philip's seizure of the silver mines in Thrace to the career of Ketriporis, an episode that he places in 347 B.C.<sup>28</sup> The connection is startling at the very least. Philip had dabbled in Thracian affairs virtually from the beginning of his reign. Theopompos (FF 31–2, both from the first book of the *Philippika*) mentions his early adventures there, when Kōtys still ruled as king. Although he had not always enjoyed success, he had absorbed Ketriporis' kingdom by 356 B.C.<sup>29</sup> By 347 B.C. Ketriporis was ancient history, and it is impossible to see how he could possibly be relevant to later events. Hammond's bald statement that Philip 'reduced Cetriporis to the state of a subordinate king at that time [347 B.C.]' flies in the face of all the ancient evidence.

Equally inexplicable is Hammond's use of Demosthenes 23 (*Against Aristokrates*) and Theopompos (F 101) for events in 347 B.C. Demosthenes published his speech against Aristokrates in 352 B.C., and Theopompos records only that there were two men named Amadokos and that the son fought with Philip against Kersebleptes.<sup>30</sup> The fragment lacks any chronological context. F. Jacoby dates it to 349 B.C. on the basis of Demosthenes 3.4–5, but that is anything but certain.<sup>31</sup> Harpokration attributes this information to Book 11, which is ostensibly much too early for the events of 347 B.C. This argument of itself is admittedly weak, given the discursive nature of Theopompos' writing. Although Jacoby questions the accuracy of the book-number, the manuscripts show no sign of corruption. The elder Amadokos died sometime at the turn of the fifth century B.C., after which the younger acceded to the throne. A third Amadokos did fight against Philip, but he was Philip V and the year 184 B.C., which obviously eliminates the youngest from this discussion.<sup>32</sup> Nor is there

<sup>26</sup> 6.20, 74; *Letter to Philip* 1.20. Although Hammond opines (n. 1 above, 368) that Isokrates sent a copy of his tract to Philip with the second Athenian peace delegation, which Hammond places in May 346 B.C., Isokrates (6.7) states quite plainly that Philip and the Athenians had already made peace before he had finished his essay. So also Kallisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F 44.

<sup>27</sup> Dem. 19.36, 163, 174.

<sup>28</sup> Op. cit. (n. 1 above), 368–9; G. Cawkwell, *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1978), 92.

<sup>29</sup> Dem. 23.179–80, 189; Diod. 16.22.3. Kahrstedt, 'Ketriporis', *RE* 11 (1921), 372; Errington, op. cit. (n. 22 above), 47–8.

<sup>30</sup> For the date of Demosthenes' speech, see A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*, Eng. trans., 2nd. ed. (New York, 1963), 601.

<sup>31</sup> *FGrH* IIIB, 371.

<sup>32</sup> Judeich, 'Amadokos', *RE* 1 (1894), 1713; A. Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* I<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig, 1885), 446; Griffith, op. cit. (n. 4 above), 282–5. Amadokos III: Polyb. 22.14.12; Livy 39.35.4. F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* III (Oxford, 1979), 199; Errington, op. cit. (n. 22 above), 209.

any obvious reason why Theopompos would have introduced the second Amadokos in Book 23 or 24, when the king had already been prominent for a generation and presumably dead in 347 B.C.

Although the scholiast to Aischines 2.81 mentions Amadokos and Kersebleptes in connection with Philip's Thracian affairs, these events are normally dated to 352 B.C. Demosthenes (1.12) testifies that Philip's invasion of Thrace at that time resulted in his expulsion of some kings there and the installation of others. Nothing is heard of Amadokos after this point. None of this links Ketriporis to anything that happened in Thrace in 347 B.C. or to Kersebleptes' vain attempt to remain free of Philip. Hammond's arguments on this entire issue are irrelevant and misleading.

Thessalian gold and Thracian silver set Philip on the road to piracy. Here again it is difficult to understand Hammond's argument. Hammond cites Aischines 2.72 to support a date of 355/4 B.C. for Philip's ventures against Lemnos, Imbros, and Skyros, and does so on the flimsiest of grounds.<sup>33</sup> A major weakness of this argument is that no distinction is made between piracy and legitimate naval operations. Hammond's own example undermines his interpretation of the size and function of the Macedonian navy. In addition, Hammond applies Aischines' testimony to an early episode in Philip's career, one noted by Polyainos.<sup>34</sup> In 355 B.C. Philip deployed his large fleet (*ναὺς ἔχων πολλάς*) to cover the march of his army and that of the Theban Pammenes through Thrace. When Philip's plans failed, he retreated to Macedonia, only to find Chares' fleet of twenty triremes barring his path. Philip used a stratagem to enable the Macedonian fleet to escape. If this large Macedonian navy was too weak to challenge Chares' twenty ships, it was obviously incapable of threatening the Athenian-held islands. In this incident Philip's fleet at no time acted as a piratical force, but instead performed its task of protecting the flank of the Macedonian army. It never even came in sight of Lemnos, Imbros, and Skyros.

Piracy was as endemic in the northern Aegean as it was elsewhere on that sea. Yet despite Athenian allegations, Philip was generally the victim of it, not the culprit. Though prevalent, it never seriously interrupted his plans. It troubled him in 343 B.C., when he cleaned out the particularly annoying nest at Halonnesos.<sup>35</sup> Having suppressed the pirates there, he offered to give the island back to Athens, which refused it out of fear of the growth of Macedonian seapower. Piracy was again an issue in 340 B.C., when Philip complained that the Athenians were raiding his harbours and interfering with his shipping.<sup>36</sup> In this case Athenian piracy provoked Philip to war. Although Hammond calls the situation 'a cold war', Philip's words prove that he considered himself the aggrieved party, and accused the Athenians of having broken the Peace of Philokrates. He declared war, and promised to pursue it, when the circumstances suited him: *καὶ μάρτυρας τοὺς θεοὺς ποιησάμενος διαλήψομαι περὶ τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς*.<sup>37</sup> All that Philip did in this instance was to defend himself against Athenian aggression. That hardly amounts to piracy.

<sup>33</sup> 'The Macedonian Navies of Philip and Alexander until 330 B.C.', *Antichthon* 26 (1992), 30–41.

<sup>34</sup> Polyain. 4.2.22. E. Badian, 'Philip II and Thrace', *Pulpuveda* 4 (1983), 57–60; J. Buckler, 'Pammenes, die Perser und der Heilige Krieg', in H. Beister and J. Buckler (eds.), *BOIOTIKA* (Munich, 1989), 157–60.

<sup>35</sup> Ps.-Dem. 7 *passim*, especially 2–16, for Philip's alleged reasons for suppressing piracy.

<sup>36</sup> Ps.-Dem. 12.2, 16.

<sup>37</sup> Both Griffith, *op. cit.* (n. 4 above), 567, and Errington, *op. cit.* (n. 22 above), 80, have mistranslated the aorists in the passage as presents. Hammond, *op. cit.* (n. 33 above), 34, also misinterprets the meaning of the passage. For a fuller discussion of the episode, see my 'Philip's Designs on Greece', in R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire in the Greco-Roman World*, 360–146 B.C. (Norman, Okla., forthcoming in 1997).

Piracy plays only one dubious part in the events of 347/6 B.C. Demosthenes (19.315) states that in 346 B.C. Philip's land was overrun and his ports blockaded, resulting in the loss of revenues. Once again, Philip is the victim of piracy, not its perpetrator. Since Macedonia and Athens were then formally at war, any Athenian naval operations against Macedonia cannot legitimately be called piracy, yet the word is Demosthenes', not Philip's: *διαφορουμένης αὐτοῦ τῆς χώρας ὑπὸ τῶν ληστῶν*. Yet at this very time the impoverished Philip launched a massive invasion of Thrace that successfully eliminated Kersebleptes as an impediment to Macedonian ambitions.<sup>38</sup> Philip was not so embattled as to be paralysed, as Demosthenes claims, nor did he raid his own ports. Instead, the king excluded Kersebleptes from the Peace of Philokrates, imposed his terms on the Athenians, and ended the Sacred War, as even Demosthenes (5.13–14) admitted at the time. Contrary to Hammond's conclusions, nothing points to Philip the pirate.

### III. THEOPOMPOS AND TROGUS

Hammond bases his interpretation of all these events on the supposition that Trogus' history, as reflected in Justin's epitome of it (8.3.12–4.2), was directly and accurately dependent upon Theopompos' *Philippika*.<sup>39</sup> Hammond rightly points out the importance of source-criticism to any accurate reconstruction of the past. That makes a proper understanding of the historiographical relationship between Theopompos and Trogus all the more important. The problems surrounding the pedigree of Justin's epitome of Trogus are legion. A brief survey of earlier scholarship at least demonstrates the nature and the difficulty of the problem. No evidence suggests that Justin added anything new to Trogus' work, but rather that he epitomized selectively according to his interests.<sup>40</sup> Although some scholars admit that Trogus probably consulted Theopompos, many others have concluded that he relied primarily on Timagenes.<sup>41</sup> Timagenes himself relied upon a number of earlier histories for his work.<sup>42</sup> Yet even the conclusion that Trogus drew primarily upon Timagenes has been called into question. O. Seel argues that Trogus also consulted a variety of sources in the composition of his work.<sup>43</sup> There was doubtless some coverage of the same early material by Theopompos and Timagenes, but that is all that one can reasonably say.<sup>44</sup> The truth is simply that no one knows very much about the sources and composition of Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*.

<sup>38</sup> Buckler, *op. cit.* (n. 2 above), 127–8, with earlier bibliography.

<sup>39</sup> *Op. cit.* (n. 1 above), 370–71.

<sup>40</sup> Kroll, 'Iunianus', *RE* 10 (1918), 956–8; R. Syme, 'The Date of Justin and the Discovery of Trogus', *Historia* 37 (1988), 358–71.

<sup>41</sup> A. Klotz, 'Pompeius Trogus', *RE* 21 (1952), 2300–13, where direct knowledge of Theopompos is assumed. Jacoby, *FGrH* IIC, 220–2, takes a more cautious position. For Trogus' use of Timagenes, see R. Laquer, 'Timagenes', *RE* 6A (1936), 1063–71, especially 1065–6.

<sup>42</sup> Jacoby, *FGrH* 88 T7; F 1, prove that Timagenes had used a variety of sources, and had also treated Greek prehistory (see F 1 and Hdt. 1.173). Theopompos had likewise known his Herodotus quite well, as proven by his epitome of *The Histories* in two books: Jacoby, *FGrH* 115 FF 1–4.

<sup>43</sup> *De Praefatio des Pompeius Trogus* (Erlangen, 1955), 18–23; G. Forni, *Valore storico e fonti di Pompeo Trogo* (Urbino, 1958), 45–9; J. C. Yardley, trans., *Justin, Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus* (Atlanta, 1994).

<sup>44</sup> M. A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios* (Oxford, 1994), 5, 133 n. 44, 148–9, also points out that Hammond himself in 'Sources of Justin on Macedonia to the death of Philip', *CQ* 41 (1991), 496–508, prefers Marsyas as Trogus' source for early Macedonian history. Pertinent also is J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford, 1981), 66 n. 160.

The matter becomes somewhat clearer, when one compares this part of Justin's epitome of Trogus with the extant fragments of Theopompos. Hammond cites F 152 as evidence for Theopompos' account of the destruction of Olynthos and the settlement of the political situation in the Chalkidike. In fact, the fragment refers only to the Chalkidic city of Milkoros. Nowhere in Book 25 of the *Philippika* is there any mention of these events. A survey of the fragments of Books 21 to 24 reveals that Theopompos discusses places in the Adriatic (FF 128–32), the Athens of Peisistratos (FF 137–8), various cities in Thessaly, Thrace, Macedonia, Euboia (FF 139–42), and Olynthos in connection with a war with Derdas the Macedonian (F 143). As usual, Theopompos paints upon a broad canvas. Hammond also attributes FF 162–3 to 347 B.C., both fragments describing Philip's raucous behaviour among the Thessalians.<sup>45</sup> Both unquestionably come from Book 26, but there is something odd about Theopompos' statement that Philip got the Thessalians into his power more by his conviviality than by his personal ability. Textual corruption further complicates the problem. At any rate, by 347 B.C. Philip had no need to win Thessalian loyalty by lavish parties or bribes. As archon of the Thessalian Confederacy, he could officially command obedience. Given Theopompos' proclivity to digressions, these fragments could possibly refer even to Philip's entry in Thessalian affairs in 358 B.C., during which he ingratiated himself there to the point of marrying two Thessalian women.<sup>46</sup> Added weight to this suggestion comes from FF 49–50, both from Book 4 of the *Philippika*, in which Theopompos criticizes the Thessalians for their dissipation. If Philip humoured the Thessalians in 347 B.C., his pleasantry had nothing to do with the basis of his power in the area.

A review of FF 160–70 proves only that Theopompos narrated the events preceding the Peace of Philokrates.<sup>47</sup> So did the sources of Polybios (9.28.2–3) and Diodoros (16.55.1–74.2). That is not in question. It remains instead to determine whether in fact Trogus based his account directly on that of Theopompos. Here the conclusion that he did not is incontestable. Hammond places great emphasis on Justin 8.3.14–15, in which two unnamed brothers, both Thracian kings, invited Philip to arbitrate their differences. Philip decided the issue by assuming control of their kingdoms. The most likely occasion for this event is 352 B.C., as noted above (p. 384). There is no mention of it in any fragment of Theopompos. This bald fact is the fatal argument against Hammond's thesis. Trogus could not have read what Theopompos did not write. Hammond's reliance on Trogus as a source for these events and his insistence that Theopompos is the direct source for them is misplaced and erroneous. Once one realizes that Trogus is an unreliable source for these events, the problem is solved. His removal further vindicates the credibility of earlier and generally far better evidence, which is largely consistent. The inescapable conclusion is that Hammond has unnecessarily confused the chronology of an already difficult period. Virtually none of his conclusions are valid, and nothing compels others to accept them.

JOHN BUCKLER

<sup>45</sup> Op. cit. (n. 1 above), 370.

<sup>46</sup> A. Tronson, 'Satyrus the Peripatetic and the Marriages of Philip II', *JHS* 104 (1984), 116–26; Buckler, op. cit. (n. 2 above), 59–63.

<sup>47</sup> Although Hammond, op. cit. (n. 3 above), 206 n. 15, rejects my interpretation of the peace treaties of 346 B.C., a detailed exposition of my views can be found in 'Philip II, the Greeks, and the King, 346–336 B.C.', *ICS* 19 (1994), 99–122. See also the excellent article of G. Dobesch, 'Phokion und der Korinthische Bund Philipps II', in *Vita e Pensiero* (Milan, 1994), 231–55.