

# THEOPOMPUS' TREATMENT OF PHILIP IN THE *PHILIPPICA*

GORDON SHRIMPTON

THE BEST PLACE to begin a study of Theopompus' treatment of Philip is with the long discussion found in Polybius (T 19).<sup>1</sup> Apart from the extensive treatise by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, which Professor Walbank considers a refutation of Polybius,<sup>2</sup> it is the longest piece of descriptive criticism of the *Philippica* that we have. Indeed, the whole passage is much too long to cite. So a summary with a few key observations will have to suffice.

At first a few maxims are laid down: avoid false praise and blame, and make your argument consistent with what you have already written and with the character of each person. Theopompus is unpardonably at fault here. (Whether he commits one or all of these "crimes" is not yet clear.) The introduction of the *Philippica* is quoted. Theopompus undertook this work "... because Europe had never born such (τοιούτος) a man at all as Philip, son of Amyntas (F 27)." So he tells us how important a subject Philip is, Polybius complains, then immediately sets about maligning him for scurrilous moral behavior and carries on doing so throughout the whole work. To illustrate this point Polybius gives a long quotation from the beginning of book 49 (F 225a), a detailed diatribe on Philip's immorality. The "bitter blabbering" of passages like this contradicts the *πρόθεσις*. It would have been all right to treat Sardanapalus, whose wanton extravagance is well known and documented, this way, but not Philip. Then comes the conclusion:

Although his *prothesis* was about a king very well born and disposed towards *arete*, he has not omitted a single shameful or terrible story. Therefore, of necessity, the historian is shown to be either a liar and flatterer in his beginning and introduction, or, in his remarks scattered through the work, as altogether a brainless simpleton, if he thought he would gain credibility through senseless, irrelevant raillery, and his encomiastic statements about Philip would be thought more worthy of transmission.

There seems to be no reason to doubt that by the term *prothesis* Polybius means the introductory statement. This allows us to conclude that Polybius was outraged by two things. One was the excessive scurrility of the attacks on Philip, and the other was the apparent contradiction between the

<sup>1</sup>The fragments (F) and testimonia (T) are collected in F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 115. T 19 = Polyb. 8.8 (10)–11 (13).<sup>3</sup> Translations are always mine, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>2</sup>F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* 2 (Oxford 1967) 80; T 20 = Dion. Hal., *De Imit.* B 31.3.428, *Ad Pomp.* 6.

encomiastic introduction and the rest of the work. This helps us to clarify the problem. How are we to explain a positive introduction to a negative work?

The explanation that has held the field for a long time now, ever since Momigliano's article on Theopompus appeared in *Rivista di Filologia* of 1931, is neatly summarized by Michael Grant in the following words: "Theopompus exalted the monarch as the man who put Isocrates' pan-Hellenism on the map and put it into practice. However, he criticised Philip's private life, on the grounds that this caused his death and all the confusion it created."<sup>3</sup> So some scholars seem to believe that Theopompus was ambivalent toward Philip, admiring his foreign policy while remaining unable to contain his revulsion toward Philip's debauchery. Their suggestion can be made to look a little more attractive if we suggest that the encomium of Philip mentioned by Aelius Theon in his *Progymnasmata* of the second century A.D. is in fact the eulogy at the start of the *Philippica*. Theon quotes Theopompus in that eulogy as saying "If Philip should wish to remain in the same pursuits (ἐπιτηδεύματα), he will become king over all Europe."<sup>4</sup> This could be taken to suggest that the eulogy concentrated on the policies. There would then, we might argue, be no need to worry when Theopompus attacks Philip's morals in the rest of the work.

We must examine this view carefully in a moment, but first it is necessary to look at another important argument by W. R. Connor. In a recent article he has shown what flimsy support the fragments give to the view that Theopompus admired anything at all about Philip,<sup>5</sup> but, while his conclusions seem generally valid, his treatment of the criticism in Polybius is, in my view, inadequate. It is true that the only surviving fragment certainly identified as being from the part of the introduction that dealt with Philip is the brief remark translated above: "Europe had never born such a man at all as Philip, the son of Amyntas." And it is also true that the word *τοιούτος* by itself is no encomium, as Connor successfully demonstrates, but it is premature to rest one's case

<sup>3</sup>Michael Grant, *The Ancient Historians* (London 1970) 139; A. D. Momigliano, "Studi sulla storiografia greca del IV secolo a.c. 1: Teopompo," *RivFC* n.s. 9 (1931) 230-242 and 335-353 = *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* 1 (Rome 1966) 367-392; J. B. Bury, *The Ancient Greek Historians* (New York 1958, first published 1908) 165 had already advanced the view that Theopompus "... was affected by the national idea of Isocrates; he saw in the Macedonian power a unifying principle, and he made it the pivot of his contemporary history."

<sup>4</sup>F 255 = Theon *Progym.* 2, and especially F 256 = *Progym.* 8.

<sup>5</sup>W. R. Connor, "History without Heroes: Theopompus' Treatment of Philip of Macedon," *GRBS* 8 (1967) 133-154. The present study owes a considerable debt to this article of Connor's. On the passage from Polybius and for more bibliography see especially 133-139.

on this fragment at this point, and conclude, with Connor, that there was no eulogy even at the start of the *Philippica*. If the only encomiastic expression that Polybius could find in the "beginning and introduction of the work" was the ambiguous word *τοιούτος*, then surely we would have to disregard Polybius' ranting about alleged contradictions as the comments of a bombastic fool. It is far better to assume that the fragment beginning "Europe had never born such a man . . ." is a typical ancient citation. Polybius assumes that the informed reader will know, or know how to find, the encomium of Philip that began the *Philippica*. All he need do is cite the first line. So there must have been a eulogistic statement, lengthier than what we have. Nevertheless, in spite of the inadequacy of his argument, I believe that the interpretation of this whole passage that Connor would adopt is the correct one, and that the more usual view, in spite of its apparent strength, is unacceptable.

In our earlier summary of Polybius' argument, we noted that he cites a very long, scathing denunciation of Philip from the beginning of book 49 of the *Philippica*. It is easy to find a reason for Polybius' choice of this diatribe. It stands out among the fragments as the longest and bitterest denunciation of anybody. It is a choice bit of vitriol, known to the critic Demetrius, and to Athenaeus who quotes from it twice at great length. Part of it went as follows:

Truth-telling and keeping promises they [Philip's followers] regarded as no part of their duty, whereas they readily assumed the odium of perjury and cheating in the most august sanctuary. Careless of what they had, they itched for what they had not, though they owned a whole section of Europe. For I believe that though these companions numbered at that time not more than eight hundred, yet they enjoyed the profits of as much land as any ten thousand Greeks possessing the richest and most extensive territory.<sup>6</sup>

It is worth noting the position of book 49. In or about book 45, Theopompus began his account of Philip's war with Thrace. This continued through book 50. In book 47, the final crucial struggle between Athens and Macedonia began, and continued through book 53.<sup>7</sup> So with Philip grappling with Thrace and opening up hostilities against Athens, the reader is treated not only to one of the fiercest denunciations of anybody that survives from this period but especially to the above quoted statement focussing on the greed of Philip and his companions. The timing of this comment, with Philip and his men pushing into the two extremities of the Balkan peninsula, deserves emphasis. It is hard to see it as anything but a denunciation of Philip's foreign policy. He is not aiming to

<sup>6</sup>F 225b = Athen. 6.261a, translated by C. B. Gulick, *Athenaeus, the Deipnosophists* (Loeb Classical Library, London 1967).

<sup>7</sup>FF 210-236 with comment, especially commentary p. 359; and F 217.

fulfil some lofty pan-Hellenic ideal; he seeks only to satisfy the irrational greed of himself and his companions. We may doubt, then, that Theopompus really did approve of Philip's policies.

Now we can return to the proem and the encomium that introduced the work. Earlier, we used Michael Grant's description of a popular theory to explain how a history that began by eulogizing the central figure could produce so many fragments hostile to him. The suggestion was that the encomium must have concentrated on the policies, while the hostile fragments obviously focus on moral corruption. However, everything that Polybius tells us about the introduction suggests that that assumption is false. The first line is actually quoted, and it promises to speak of Philip as "such" a man—no mention of his policies, and the content of the eulogy is apparently described in the longer citation (above, 123). The subject was "a man very well born and disposed toward *arete*." We also considered the possibility that the encomium of Philip mentioned by Aelius Theon might well be this one. When we first introduced this fragment we were considering whether it could be used to support the more usual view. So we translated ἐπιτηδέματα as "pursuits", but an equally good translation would be "habits". Now the fragment would read quite differently: "If Philip should wish to keep to the same habits, he will rule all of Europe." Hard evidence that the encomium concentrated on policies cannot be found. Indeed, we should probably not expect to find it. Let us remind ourselves that Polybius saw flat contradictions between the encomiastic introduction and the critical passages in the rest of the work (μαχόμενα λέγει πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ πρόθεσιν). But if the usual explanation is correct, the contradictions are merely a tonal clash between moments of approval of policy and disapproval of morals. So if we follow Connor, then Polybius is too insensitive to see the ambiguity of τοιοῦτος; and the other view, not much better, makes him incapable of distinguishing between substantive contradictions and tonal contrasts.

There is a third possible explanation that simply involves the relatively safe assumption that Polybius had no sense of humour; or at least that he failed to detect the irony of the opening eulogy. Aelius' citation, "If Philip should choose to remain with the same habits, he will rule all of Europe," is easily interpreted as a cleverly forked pronouncement. F 162 brings out the idea:

Philip knew that the Thessalians were licentious and wanton in their way of life; so he prepared parties for them and in every way he tried to delight them, dancing, revelling, and entering upon every licentious act. He was by nature a coarse fellow, drinking every day and rejoicing in pursuits like that and the sort of people called 'wits' who say and do funny things. He won over most of the Thessalians who sided with him more by parties than bribes.

Here clearly we see Philip's wanton habits debauching the already corrupt Thessalians into further corruption and thence into slavery. If Aelius' quotation really was in our eulogy, it is plain to see how Theopompus fooled Polybius. The "eulogy" was no eulogy at all. It was a cunning show-piece, whose real intent was to defame. Similar observations can be made about Polybius' quotation from, and description of, the introduction. The ambiguity of *τοιούτος παράπαν* was no doubt calculated, and the description of Philip as "very well born and disposed toward *arete*" is laden with sarcasm in the light of his subsequent treatment.

If this view is right, Polybius was not alone in being misled by an apparent eulogy in Theopompus. A similar insensitivity to sarcasm led 'Longinus' to the mistaken conclusion that the following is a badly written eulogy rather than a clever pricking of the king of Persia's pompous bubble:

Similarly, Theopompus first gives a magnificent setting to the descent of the Persian king on Egypt, and then ruins it all with a few words:

'What city or nation in Asia did not send its embassy to the King? What thing of beauty or value, product of the earth or work of art, was not brought him as a gift? There were many precious coverlets and cloaks, purple, embroidered, and white; there were many gold tents fitted out with all necessities; there were many robes and beds of great price. There were silver vessels and worked gold, drinking cups and bowls, some studded with jewels, some elaborately and preciously wrought. Countless myriads of arms were there, Greek and barbarian. There were multitudes of pack animals and victims fattened for slaughter, many bushels of condiments, many bags and sacks and pots of onions and every other necessity. There was so much salt meat of every kind that travellers approaching from a distance mistook the huge heaps for cliffs or hills thrusting up from the plain.'

He passes from the sublime to the mean; the development of the scene should have been the other way round.<sup>8</sup>

Polybius has made a far-reaching misjudgment, simply because he did something that for many is all too natural. He left his sense of humour on a peg outside his study door.<sup>9</sup>

While we are considering the proem and what it tells us about the treatment of Philip, it might be worthwhile to consider what it reveals about Theopompus' approach to the broader question of pan-Hellenism.

<sup>8</sup>Longinus' *On the Sublime* 43.2-3; translation by D. A. Russell and M. Winterbottom, *Ancient Literary Criticism* (Oxford 1972) 500. For more on Theopompus' style, see TT 21-46, and W. Rhys Rhoberts, "Theopompus in the Greek Literary Critics," *CR* 22 (1908) 118-122.

<sup>9</sup>Connor (above, note 5) 139: "The opening is not a tribute to the Macedonian king but a deliberate ambiguity whose significance can only be appreciated after the reader has begun to survey the debaucheries and depravities of Philip's career. An appreciation of irony and a sense of humor were not Polybius' greatest strengths as a writer."

What is the significance of the opening announcement that "Europe had never born such a man at all as Philip, the son of Amyntas" in terms of pan-Hellenism?

The fullest statement of the pan-Hellenic thesis comes from Momigliano's work mentioned above. The basic idea is that the *Hellenica*, which preceded the *Philippica*, was pro-Spartan and dealt with Sparta's ultimately abortive attempt to unify Greece. When that failed Theopompus changed his political allegiance and pinned his hopes for unity on Philip. This view, and subsequent attempts to improve upon it by finding fragments where Theopompus may have spoken well of Philip, have been answered by Connor, and we need not rehearse his arguments. However, temptation lingers. We remember the long-established tradition that Theopompus belonged to the Isocratean rhetorical school,<sup>10</sup> and that Philip had for a time figured centrally in Isocrates' pan-Hellenic dreams. What are we to expect of a pupil of Isocrates writing a *Philippica*?

Pan-Hellenism is a geographical as well as an ideological concept. Geographically, Theopompus opened by promising to study Philip as a creature of European history, and, to judge from the geographical distribution of the fragments, he kept his promise, defining Europe as the Balkan Peninsula, Italy, and (occasionally) Egypt; in other words, the world of Hellenic interest and involvement. In spite of his tendency to ramble, he never seems to have taken an interest in Persia or her history—except for a few of her remarkable magical traditions.<sup>11</sup> A pan-Hellenist writing on Persia would have emphasised the vulnerability of her empire and gone on to suggest how easily it would crumble, if attacked by a united Greece.<sup>12</sup> It appears that Theopompus deliberately avoided this line. Nevertheless, we may safely conclude that Theopompus was interested in the whole Hellenic world and Philip's relationship with it.

Ideologically, Theopompus may well have embraced a pan-Hellenic dream, but in his own way, and for reasons of his own. F 103 is Photius' summary of book 12. Here we learn that the Spartans presumptuously (*ὑπέρογκα φρονούντες*) broke the Peace of Antalcidas of 387/6. It is more likely that this criticism of the Spartans comes from Theopompus than from Photius, because Photius is merely offering a summary of book 12 to prove that he has read it. So if Theopompus condemned the Spartans for breaking the peace, it would follow that he approved of it in some way. A glance at the fragments of book 8, *The Mirabilia*, will provide us with some further useful insights. There Theopompus creates his own Utopia, Saintsbury, a civilized place, free from the evils of war and politics. He

<sup>10</sup>TT 1, 5.

<sup>11</sup>Persia and Persians as such are not mentioned in the fragments, except for the *Mirabilia* (FF 64, 65, 66).

<sup>12</sup>Isoc. 5.83–105.

clarifies his beliefs further by showing us the opposite, Wartown, where life is short and wretched.<sup>13</sup> The obvious conclusion is that Theopompus heartily disapproved of the warmongering of his day, and of most, if not all, of the politicking. Considering his lack of interest in Persia, and dislike for war, he will not have followed Isocrates in preaching the cause of war against Persia as a doctrine for uniting a fragmented and bitter Hellas. The advantage for which he seems to have hoped would have been peace, but not peace at any price. Given the choice between Philip, the aggressive warrior, the cunning politician, the heavy drinker, woman-chaser, and reveller in all the immorality that Theopompus describes, and Demosthenes, the orator, who advocated war only insofar as was necessary to check Philip, who tried to unite Greece and succeeded to some degree by the peaceful means of rhetorical persuasion, a self-proclaimed "water drinking" moralist, which man would Theopompus prefer? The answer that comes most readily is Demosthenes.

It is of crucial importance, then, to turn to what we know with any degree of certainty about Theopompus' treatment of Demosthenes' policies. Let us make it clear from the outset that, at first, we shall not be emphasizing his treatment of Demosthenes the man (the approach taken by others before us);<sup>14</sup> that is irrelevant. As we have already noted, some scholars believe that Theopompus praised Philip's policies, in spite of the abundance of evidence that he detested his morals. In other words, they must insist, Theopompus kept his moral and political judgments clearly

<sup>13</sup>FF 67-69. See Connor (above, note 5) 140, 151-154, and, for a similar sentiment from elsewhere in the *Philippica*, F 380. Discussions of this passage can be found in E. Rohde, "Zum Griechischen Roman," *Kleine Schriften* 2 (Tübingen and Leipzig 1901) 9-25 = *RhMus* 48 (1894) 110 ff., who draws parallels with Plato's *Atlantis*. Italo Lana, "L'utopia di Teopompo," *Paideia* 6 (1951), observes that the story seems to be Theopompus' own invention. After drawing parallels between it and Hesiod's account of the descent of man in the *Works and Days*, he goes on to argue that the story must be allegorical. However, because of his acceptance of Momigliano's thesis, he cannot argue the obvious, that the Wartowners are, allegorically, Philip and his henchmen and the Saintsburgers represent the good that he and warmongers like him are destroying for themselves and their fellow humans. So he concludes that Theopompus is advocating a return to "nature." This sounds like 19th century Romanticism, not a fourth-century B.C. utopia. See also W. E. Brown, "Some Hellenistic Utopias," *CW* 48 (1955) 57-62.

<sup>14</sup>Distinctions like this (i.e., between men, or states, and their policies) may seem rather oversubtle, yet fourth-century orators did exult in them. A good example can be found in Isoc. *Panath.* 108-111, where the orator carefully distinguishes the good constitution of the Spartans and their political discipline from their execrable deeds in history. Michael Grant (above, note 3) uses F 326 (about Demosthenes' inconstancy, discussed below) to show that Theopompus was "very critical of Philip's enemy Demosthenes" (430) and therefore (no further proof offered) "Theopompus exalted the monarch as the man who placed Isocrates' pan-Hellenism on the map and put it into practice" (139). A more careful look at the treatment of these two men in Theopompus' fragments shows that this conclusion does not follow.

separated. If he did not, then the case would be closed. We would be forced to conclude that Philip was in every way the villain of the piece. What can we say of Theopompus' treatment of Demosthenes' policies? There are six fragments dealing with Demosthenes, all from Plutarch's biography. In the first, we find that Demosthenes' father was from the better class, something of considerable significance in view of Theopompus' willingness to attribute base or foreign birth to people he detested.<sup>15</sup> On one occasion, Theopompus attributed the lofty sentiment "Men of Athens, I will serve you as a counsellor, even though you do not wish it, but not as a false accuser, even though you wish it"<sup>16</sup> to Demosthenes, apparently setting him above the average member of the Athenian mob. The Athenians were applauded for choosing him to deliver the funeral oration after the disaster at Chaeronea (F 329). And a reference makes it clear that the Harpalus affair was recorded, though here we do not know if it brought out in him the moralist to condemn Demosthenes' lack of self-control, or the orator, to find a way of white-washing an affair generally recognized as a scandal (F 330). On the whole, these references simply tell us something of the treatment given the man, and, on the whole, for an Athenian political leader, it is not ungenerous; it is almost indulgent. There are two which seem to reflect more on his policies:

Wherefore, says Plutarch, I do not know how it occurred to Theopompus to say that Demosthenes was unstable in his character and unable to remain true for any length of time to the same policies or the same men.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup>F 325 = Plut. *Demosth.* 4.1. The attribution of base or foreign parentage to distinguished Athenians whom the historian wished to malign appears to have been a recurring motif in the digression on the demagogues. Particularly, Thucydides, son of Melesias, is attacked this way, as is Hyperbolus: F 91; Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens* (Cambridge, Mass. 1968) 38–41; F 95; Connor, *op. cit.* 59; on the distinguished parentage of Thucydides see H. T. Wade-Gery, "Thucydides the Son of Melesias, a Study of Periclean Policy," *JHS* 52 (1932) 205–227, also found in his *Essays in Greek History* (Oxford 1958) 239–270. (For more on Theopompus' treatment of Hyperbolus, see A. E. Raubitschek, "Theopompus on Hyperbolus," *Phoenix* 9 [1955] 122–126. Raubitschek's suggestion that the account of the demagogues was "sympathetic" for the period before Cleon must, in my view, be modified. Perhaps "less hostile" would be closer to the truth.) On Thucydides, son of Melesias, Raubitschek, "Menon, Son of Menekleides," *Hesperia* 24 (1955) 288 n. 11, makes the ingenious suggestion that the name Pantaenus may have arisen as the result of a textual corruption. The idea is that Theopompus wrote τὸν παλαιστοῦ ("son of the wrestler"), a reference to Melesias' successes in that sport (see Wade-Gery's article, mentioned above in this note), and this got corrupted into τὸν πανταίνου. (See also Raubitschek's "Theopompus on Thucydides the Son of Melesias," *Phoenix* 14 [1960] 81–95.)

<sup>16</sup>F 327 = Plut. *Demosth.* 14.4, translation by Bernadotte Perrin, *Plutarch's Lives* (Loeb Classical Library, London and Cambridge, Mass. 1971).

<sup>17</sup>F 326 = Plut. *Demosth.* 13.1, Perrin's translation. It should be noted that there is some question as to the authenticity of this fragment. According to some mss it belongs to Theophrastus. See Connor (above, note 5) 140 n. 16 and Jacoby's comment.



Well, then, the Thebans, in their calculations, were not blind to their own interests, but each of them had before his eyes the terrors of war, since their losses in the Phocian War were still fresh; however, the power of the orator, as Theopompus says, fanned up their courage and inflamed their honourable ambition and obscured all other considerations, (ἡ δὲ τοῦ ῥήτορος δύναμις ἐκκριπίζουσα τὸν θυμὸν αὐτῶν καὶ διακαίονσα τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ἐπεσκότῃσε τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν) so that, casting away fear and calculation and feelings of obligation, they were rapt away by his words into the path of honour.<sup>18</sup>

Theopompus' complaint about Demosthenes' inconstancy should not be overrated. If it shows that Theopompus was capable of being critical of the man, what is that? We know that he thoroughly detested Philip's moral behaviour. It is either an insignificant passing comment on a frailty of the orator, or it could be a lament over the failure of his anti-Philip campaign. Hesitation in the hour of great crisis was indeed a "weakness" of Demosthenes,<sup>19</sup> and Theopompus might easily have blamed his ultimate failure on this flaw. If that is so, it would be evidence that Theopompus showed a preference, however mild, for Demosthenes' political aims and methods. The last fragment seems to suggest this very strongly. Unfortunately, it too must be approached with great caution. Apart from the question, how much of the quotation is purely Theopompus', the key word *φιλοτιμία* occurs among the fragments very rarely;<sup>20</sup> so certainty is impossible, but it does not sound like the sort of thing that Theopompus would have always admired.

<sup>18</sup>F 328 = Plut. *Demosth.* 18.2-3, Perrin's translation.

<sup>19</sup>Demosthenes is generally recognized to have started his political career in or near Eubulus' camp, but gradually to have moved away from him. He probably also started out not on unfriendly terms with Aeschines, and in his first statement on northern politics, *Against Aristocrates*, Philip's enemy, Cersobleptes, gets the kind of treatment later reserved for Philip. To call Demosthenes *ἀβέβαιος τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀνδρασι* is therefore neither praise nor blame. Some might call it a bland statement of fact. On the subject of policies (*πράγματα*), however, the adrenalin flows. The charge of inconstancy will certainly disquiet enthusiastic readers of Sir A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom 384-322 B.C.* (London 1914) and W. Jaeger, *Demosthenes. The Origin and Growth of his Policy* (New York 1963). But no one can deny that after 335 and before the Lamian War, Demosthenes seems fairly quietly to have accepted the inevitability of Macedonian rule, something that Theopompus would never have done (see T 2), and he does not seem to have fought at Chaeronea with the same dedication that one feels from the speeches. More significant, whether or not he delivered his speech "On the Peace," his failure to press his apparent advantage in 346 probably puzzled the single-minded historian. It may be that Theopompus made his remark with reference to these facts. If so, it is hardly to be called severe criticism. Indeed, the only time we can be certain that Theopompus criticised Demosthenes was in the description of the preparations for Chaeronea (F 328, concluding sentence). The tone of this comment seems clearly to reflect the historian's disappointment with Greece, and especially with Demosthenes for the failure against Philip in the deciding battle.

<sup>20</sup>See F 66, FF 31 and 292. In FF 323 and 336 the word is Plutarch's. Only in F 66 is it clearly pejorative, but even there it is not certainly Theopompus' expression; see also Connor (above, note 15) 33.

Nevertheless, casting all presuppositions aside, the following can be said quite safely about Theopompus' account of the war between Athens and Macedonia: fairly early in his narrative of the war Theopompus wrote the longest and bitterest recorded denunciation of Philip and his men, also characterizing their foreign policy as rapacious (FF 224–225 and above, 125–126); on the other hand, Philip's most dedicated opponent, Demosthenes, was given very moderate treatment, especially for an Athenian political leader, and the two fragments which reflect on his policies are quite possibly favourable. In view of this, the argument that Theopompus favoured Philip's policy of imposing unity on the Greek states by force of arms must seem strained, especially in view of the historian's general distaste for warmongering. Theopompus was a pan-Hellenist, but only insofar as he wanted Greek squabbling to end. As an orator, he would have admired Demosthenes' successes in bringing many Greek states together simply by delivering speeches.

Two other tests can be applied to help us answer the question, did Theopompus favour Demosthenes' policies more than Philip's? One is the speeches of Demosthenes themselves: can we find any points of agreement between Theopompus and Demosthenes? And the other is Theopompus' treatment of other known friends and enemies of Philip.

Theopompus' attack on Chares, who regularly commanded Athenian forces against Philip, should be compared carefully with Demosthenes' denunciation of the generalship in the *First Philippic*.<sup>21</sup> Theopompus' criticisms ran as follows: Chares was slow and stupid; he spent his campaign monies on the usual sexual indulgences as well as bribing orators to stay home and propose favourable decrees. The Athenian populace loved him for it because they indulged themselves similarly, caring more for women, gambling, and public banquets and handouts than the proper management of the state. Demosthenes' picture of the way the war against Philip was prosecuted bears striking similarities. His

<sup>21</sup>Theopompus F 213, Demosthenes *First Philippic* 46. The passage in Demosthenes is usually referred by editors to Chares. See, e.g., J. E. Sandys, ed., *The First Philippic and The Olynthiacs of Demosthenes* (Cambridge 1897, London 1955) 119–120; and J. R. Ellis and R. D. Milne edd., *The Spectre of Philip, Demosthenes' First Philippic, Olynthiacs, and On the Peace* (Sydney 1970) 31 n. 75. It is less likely that Charidemus is meant. On the subject of Charidemus, both Demosthenes and Theopompus had some choice words (F 143, Demosthenes *Against Aristocrates* 152–155). However, the passage from Demosthenes was set down before he had chosen to oppose Philip, and before Charidemus had become Philip's bitter opponent. At a later time, Demosthenes might possibly have had kinder words for him. F 213 itself comes from book 45, where Philip's operations in central Greece ca 346–343 were apparently described. Why Chares was mentioned in this context is unclear. The reference to his slowness could spring from his arrival too late to save Olynthus in 348, but that was probably described in or around book 23 (F 143). Jacoby, in his comment, simply points out that Chares was general in Thasos in 343/2. So he refers the fragment to that year.

"general" there is forever making promises and accomplishing nothing while the Athenians at home are passing random decrees on the basis of information being fed to them. The charge that the Athenians preferred expending money and effort on public banquets rather than on managing the state well is echoed many times in Demosthenes, particularly in his criticism of what he saw as the abuse of the Theoric Fund.<sup>22</sup> We must remember that Chares was most frequently elected general throughout the whole period of Athens' struggle with Philip, and he was involved in or the leader of just about every major Athenian effort against Philip's forces. In F 213, then, Theopompus is giving us some of his reasons for Athens' failure against Philip, and it is worth noting how much he does agree with Demosthenes, who often argued that Philip was winning his successes not through any ability of his own, but because of Athenian slowness and mismanagement of resources, not to mention excessive enjoyment of public celebrations at the expense of success in war.<sup>23</sup> In addition, the two authors' descriptions of Philip's court should be carefully compared. They agree so closely in points of language and detail that one almost suspects collaboration.<sup>24</sup> In fact, every important judgment of Philip, and nearly every trivial one that can be found among the fragments of Theopompus can be closely paralleled from the speeches of Demosthenes.<sup>25</sup>

When we look at the treatment of Philip's friends and enemies we get similar results. Perhaps we should not make too much of the denunciation of the wily Charidemus. It comes in F 143 from book 23, not long after he had changed sides from being Philip's ally to being his enemy. Much the same might be said of the Byzantines in F 62. Let us establish a kind of

<sup>22</sup>Demosthenes *First Olynth.* 10, 15, 19–20; *Second Olynth.* 10–13; *First Phil.* 37. That Theopompus agreed with Demosthenes on the subject of the Theoric Fund was ably demonstrated long ago by Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History* 236. Wade-Gery sees in FF 99–100 an "unflattering" description of Eubulus' comptrollership of Athens. "He has completed the ruin of Athens' morale by his administration of the Theorikon. So far Theopompus' judgment does not differ materially from Demosthenes' . . ." Wade-Gery suggests that the whole digression on the demagogues was prompted by the abuse of the Theoric Fund. He thinks that the historian undertook to trace the growth of this abuse through fifth-century democracy. Even in the scant remains, we might add, the theme of the use or abuse of private or public money to buy votes or advance policies, to dull or dupe the mob, or simply to become rich is easily discerned. So F 90, questioned by Jacoby, is by no means a misfit. The Theoric Fund would have been the culmination of these evils. This is very heavy support for one of Demosthenes' main arguments.

<sup>23</sup>Demosth. *First Olynth.* 10, 15; *Second Olynth.* 4; *First Phil.* 34–35, 37.

<sup>24</sup>Compare *Second Olynth.* 18–19 especially with F 224, and parts of F 225.

<sup>25</sup>The following list of parallels is not intended to be exhaustive. However, for the sake of convenience I am including all the important ones that I have noticed, whether or not they have been cited in previous footnotes. Compare FF 81, 224 with *Second Olynth.* 18–19; the introduction to F 225a with *Second Olynth.* 5, *Third Phil.* 22; and F 213 with *First Olynth.* 10, 15, 19–20, *Second Olynth.* 4, 10–13, 34–35, 37, 46.

spectrum of known enemies and friends of Philip whose names appear in the fragments, right up to the king himself, and then see what sort of treatment each member of the spectrum receives in the fragments. First there will be Demosthenes, the implacable, water-drinking orator who openly and sometimes very bitterly opposed Philip. Next we find the Illyrians (F 39), who stubbornly opposed Philip, and the Chalcidians, who vacillated too long between friendship and hostility towards Philip before committing themselves completely to full-scale war, and ultimate destruction (F 139). Now we can set down Chares, the Athenian general who is not known to have refused to campaign against him, however ineffectively. This will bring us to the Thessalians (F 49, 162), who probably did not like Philip a great deal, but who gave in to him without a fight. There is one known agent of Philip, Timolaus of Thebes (F 210), and finally Philip and his court.

It is striking how much less vehement the denunciations become the closer we move along the spectrum towards Demosthenes, and how much more impassioned they become the closer we get to Philip. We have already noted that Philip and his courtiers get the worst treatment of anybody in the fragments: Timolaus, his agent in Thebes,<sup>26</sup> comes close: "There are not a few who before this have become wanton in their daily lives and drinking, but I think no other politician was more undisciplined, more gluttonous, or more of a slave to pleasure than Timolaus . . . ." It is noteworthy that he is attacked as a politician. The only political decision he is known to have made was the one that made him famous: to become an agent of Philip. The picture of the Thessalians is slightly different. They neither supported nor resisted Philip actively, according to Theopompus. However, they were so debauched and besotted that Philip could win them over "more by parties than presents" (F 162). Excessive abuse is reserved only for the Pharsalians: "The Pharsalians are of all mankind the laziest and the most extravagant" (F 49). They used Macedonian support in their operations against Halus, Athens' ally, in 347.<sup>27</sup> The attack on Chares has already been noted. It is import-

<sup>26</sup>See Demosthenes *De Corona* 48, 295. See also the treatment of Thrasydaeus, Philip's Thessalian puppet, in F 209, where he is called μικρόν . . . τὴν γνώμην, κόλακα δὲ μέγιστον.

<sup>27</sup>*CAH* 6.235-237; Diod. Sic. 16.14.2 and Jacoby's comment. Whether the Thessalians were or were not active supporters of Philip is beside the point. Theopompus clearly decided they were not, otherwise the business of winning them over with parties is meaningless. However, he will have found it impossible to ignore the Pharsalians and the affair at Halus, where Aeschines was charmed by Philip, and Demosthenes "dried up." Jacoby associates F 162 directly with the war against Halus. We might be tempted then to suggest that he means specifically the Pharsalians in F 162, when naming the Thessalians. However, in view of F 49, where he makes such a clear distinction between the two, that would not seem a safe guess. There is no reason why he should not digress a little on the Thessalians generally in this context.

ant to observe that he, the relatively unsuccessful campaigner against Philip, is attacked for his ineffectiveness and lack of activity, while Timolaus, Philip's friend, is denounced for his political activity. Perhaps the Chalcidians belong with the Byzantines and Charidemus, outside the spectrum, because they vacillated for a long time between support and resistance *vis-à-vis* Philip. However, the description that we have of them does appear to come from the account of their final life-and-death struggle with Philip: "They happened to be scornful of the best pursuits, but were fairly well (moderately? *ἐπιεικῶς*) devoted to drink, laziness, and much licentiousness."<sup>28</sup> The *ἐπιεικῶς* draws most of the sting. Theopompus may not have liked the Olynthians, but he disliked them much less than any of Philip's friends, and less than the weak-minded Thesalians. The Illyrians caused Philip much more trouble than the Olynthians. Despite some crushing defeats inflicted on them at the start of his reign, he was still fighting them at the end, and in 344 he was severely wounded in the leg by them.

In the second book of the *Philippica* he says that the Illyrians dine and drink seated, and bring their wives to their gatherings; and it is perfectly acceptable for the women to drink the health of any man they meet in the company. They take their husbands home from the drinking parties. They all have hard lives, and whenever they drink they gird their bellies with wide belts. At first they do this moderately, but when they get to harder drinking, they draw their belts ever tighter.<sup>29</sup>

The self-inflicted punishment for deep-drinking would have received a nod of approval from Theopompus. One notes also their forethought in bringing their wives to guide them home, and the fact that they keep company with their wives rather than flute-girls and pretty boys. Perhaps the flirting of the wives disturbed him, but on the whole this is a rare picture of very restrained debauchery, if it is debauchery at all.<sup>30</sup> Finally, Demosthenes, as we have already noted, gets better treatment than any other Athenian in the fragments. Indeed, it is fair to say that no politician in the fragments is treated more kindly.

This pattern of steadily decreasing denunciation for lack of moral self-discipline moving across a political spectrum is important. We must conclude from it that there is a positive relationship between Theopompus' political and moral views, and, that in general, the more vehemently he attacks someone's morals, the less will he have approved of their political activities. It would be perverse to conclude otherwise. It is now beyond debate whether he approved of Philip in any way. He obviously did not.

<sup>28</sup>F 139 with comment.

<sup>29</sup>Athen. 10.443 a-b = F 39.

<sup>30</sup>For some real corruption see: FF 49, 62, 81, 90, 114, 121, 134, 139, 143, 162, 185-187, 210, 224-225, 232, 236.

Athens, it might be argued, has been "conveniently" forgotten. The amount of trouble she gave Philip would fit her into the spectrum somewhere between Olynthus and Illyria; yet she gets a Thessalian-level denunciation. This would be embarrassing had we not already noticed that Theopompus took a rather Demosthenic view of the war. Demosthenes' slightly exaggerated claims that the Athenians were too engrossed in the enjoyment of their Theoric Fund to prosecute the war successfully were adopted in deadly earnest by the historian. Without Demosthenes, he believed, Athens would have done much the same as the Thessalians. Theopompus had begun his career as an orator,<sup>31</sup> and it must have thrilled him to be able to report that an orator, single-handedly, nearly stopped the progress of the greatest fiend in history. His deplorable failure was attributed to a lack of sufficient constancy (F 326).

The argument so far presented establishes Connor's conclusion as the right one. An objection has been raised against his view and may now be considered. Iain Bruce rejects Connor's idea on the ground that it tends to reduce the *Philippica* to the level of a moral biography, and this leaves us with the problem of explaining the enormous scale of Theopompus' narrative.<sup>32</sup> Momigliano's idea of pan-Hellenism at least offers us a thread with which we might tie together all 58 books of the work, only 16 of which (T 31) dealt directly with Philip and his activities.

Are we compelled to choose only between the two alternatives, that either the treatment of Philip was political or else it should have taken the form of a brief moral pamphlet hardly more than a book (say a Plutarchean *Vita*) in length? If the fragments that we have examined (and many others) reveal any kind of general preoccupation (apart from a moral one) it is not political but social. Theopompus saw corruption all around him, not just in individuals but in all societies, as a host of fragments shows. He brings the same passionate interest to the Ardiaeans, the Thessalians, the Methymnaeans, as to the Tarentines, the Etruscans and the Athenians.<sup>33</sup> The obvious and vast political gulf between many of these societies is apparently ignored. They are all treated as victims of essentially the same kind of social decay.

<sup>31</sup>T 21, also 22, 24.

<sup>32</sup>I. A. F. Bruce, "Theopompus and Classical Greek Historiography," *History and Theory* 9 (1970) 105, tries to demonstrate "the essentially political and military character of at least some of the books" by quoting summaries of their contents: (book 47) "the beginning of the Athenian war against Philip; the siege of Perinthus and Byzantium; . . . of the Thracians called Tetrachorites; the capture by force of the Thracian city Angissus by Antipater; the things Philip wrote to Antipater and Parmenio who were in the region of the Tetrachorites . . ." But it must be pointed out that, as readers of Ephorus (in Diodorus) know, it is possible to write about military events without being a military historian, and the same is true of political events.

<sup>33</sup>See FF 40; 49, 162; 227; 233; 204; and 213 respectively.

Theopompus would not have lacked paradigms for the socially oriented approach to history. Thucydides' account of the civil strife at Corcyra begins as a political analysis of a political event, but gradually transforms itself into a general discussion of the disastrous effect the war had on Hellenic society as a whole.<sup>34</sup> A closer parallel, in that it concentrates even more on the decline of public and private morals as the result of a terrible epidemic, would be the famous description of the plague. Thucydides introduced the plague with the following words: οὐ μέντοι τοσοῦτός γε λοιμὸς οὐδὲ φθορὰ οὕτως ἀνθρώπων οὐδαμοῦ ἐμνημονεύετο γενέσθαι.<sup>35</sup> Philip is introduced by Theopompus in similar language: παρορμηθῆναι φήσας [*scil.* Theopompus] πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς πραγματείας διὰ τὸ μηδέποτε τὴν Εὐρώπην ἐνηνοχέειν τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα παράπαν οἶον τὸν Ἀμύντου Φίλιππον.<sup>36</sup> If we accept that Philip was treated by Theopompus like the great Athenian plague, with all its implications for social and moral decay, then we do have explanations for most of the fragments, testimonia, and problems that confront us from the *Philippica*. They are meant to be illustrations of two most important presuppositions, one stated and the other implicit. The first is that Philip was the "nonesuch" of all European history. And the second is that the absence of moral and political self-control leads to the loss of all hope of controlling one's destiny. Through the moral fragments the pattern emerges and re-emerges. The debauchees reduce themselves to a state of enervation so that they fall into the hands of scheming Philips, who manipulate or destroy them. Sometimes they simply destroy themselves.<sup>37</sup> Thus the many "digressions" cease to be

<sup>34</sup>Thuc. 3.79–83.

<sup>35</sup>Thuc. 2.47.3. Perhaps we should add the conclusion: τοιοῦτῳ μὲν πάθει οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι περιπεσόντες ἐπιέζοντο . . . (2.54.1).

<sup>36</sup>F 27 = Polyb. 8.11.1.

<sup>37</sup>Many fragments reveal a preoccupation with morality. Drinking and dining to excess, gambling and sexual promiscuity are recurrent themes. From these fragments it is possible to gain a satisfactory view of Theopompus' moral attitudes. Sporting with flute-girls, drinking and dicing are characterized as examples of licentiousness (ἀκολασία, or ἀσελγεία, and more rarely ἀσωτία, FF 49, 62, 121, 134, 139, 143, 162, 185, 210, 236; ἀσωτία, FF 213, 224) or lack of self-control (ἀκρασία, FF 40, 143, 210, 232). (For the meaning of ἀσωτία see the pun in F 401.) For Theopompus, licentiousness was not something to be winked at. It is branded as the opposite to caring about one's affairs and the better life (ἐν ἐπιτηδεύμασι καὶ βίῳ βελτίονι); it destroys men (διαφθείρειν), and changes them from the most prudent and moderate types (ἐκ σωφρονεστάτων καὶ μετριωτάτων) into profligates (πολυτελεῖς, FF 62, 139). People who indulge in activities like this enslave themselves to pleasure (they become or are by nature δοῦλοι τῶν ἡδονῶν, FF 114, 210). The consequences of these indulgences are frequently dire. Freeborn and innocent people (usually women) are corrupted (FF 90, 121, 134, 143, 162, 187, 224, 225), deep reefs may be created in family relationships (F 185), the reveler becomes useless (ἄχρηστος, F 121), a violent end may await the intoxicated debauchee (FF 114, 186). Emphasis is placed on the corrupting power of corruption, as an examination of all the above-quoted fragments will reveal. Evil frequently emanates

pure aberrations. They are studies of other examples of the "Philippic" disease. His introductory statement announces that the geographical scope for the work is the whole of Europe, and the chronological scope is unlimited. His thesis was to show that this "disease" had never been quite so acute in Europe (whether Asia had experienced anything like it is not made clear) until its final outbreak in the form of Philip. On this interpretation, the treatise "On the Demagogues," for example, is far from being a digression;<sup>38</sup> it is a necessary part of the argument. It probably showed (among other things) that Philip was foreshadowed in classical Athens, but never equalled. In other words, this theory could explain the scope and scale of the *Philippica* in terms of the existing fragments better than the assumption either of a moral biography or of an estimate of Philip's political achievement.

It was a commonplace in antiquity that Theopompus was a pupil of Isocrates. As a result, it is customary for modern scholars to try and interpret his historiography in terms of Isocrates' view of history.<sup>39</sup> Some further useful insights have been gained from attempts to estimate how influential Antisthenes the Cynic might have been on Theopompus.<sup>40</sup>

from a central point, the profligate ruler, who attracts the brazen and corrupts them even further (FF 81, 121, 134, 162, 224, 225, 236). All the signs of debauchery that are attributed to all the other sots in the work are attributed to Philip and his men, and a few choice epithets are reserved only for the Macedonians. These include βωμολόχος (FF 81, 162, 236), comparing Philip and his men to the saucy, sacrilegious beggars who got their food from robbing altars. They are further branded as liars, cheats, and sacrilegious swindlers (F 225), who live like highwaymen (παραπλησίως τοῖς λησταῖς, F 224). Other expressions of abuse such as μανικός (F 282), λάσταυρος (F 224), and βδελυρός (F 224, 225) are reserved for them alone, including "murderers" (ἀνδροφόνοι, F 225). They prefer murdering and pillaging to living orderly lives (F 225b). For all the corruption of the Macedonian court Theopompus held Philip alone responsible, as the introduction to F 224 makes plain. This is no picture of a "convivial" court, ruled over by a clever bon-vivant; it is a graphic sketch of desperate corruption done in lurid colours. (C. B. Welles, trans., *Diodorus of Sicily* 8 [Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass. and London 1968] 5, uses the word "convivial" to characterize Theopompus' depiction of Philip's court.) Theopompus probably recorded with relish the story of Arcadion the Achaean. He was a witty man, who had decided to run away from Macedonian rule. However he met Philip once at Delphi: "... having caught sight of him, the Macedonian called to him and said, 'How far will you flee, Arcadion?' and he replied, 'Till I find men who have not heard of Philip.' " (F 280).

<sup>38</sup>This treatise, found in book 10 of the *Philippica*, is studied extensively by Connor (above, note 15) 19–76.

<sup>39</sup>E.g., C. Bradford Welles, "Isocrates' View of History," *The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, L. Wallach, ed., (New York 1966) 3–25.

<sup>40</sup>F 295 = D.L. 6.14. As Italo Lana (above, note 13) seems to realize, the safest conclusion to draw from this fragment is that Theopompus was attracted to Antisthenes by his rhetorical ability. Nevertheless, the fact that Theopompus' moral views are essentially the same as those of Antisthenes was established long ago by R. Hirzel, "Zur Charak-



In view of the fact that Theopompus also attacked Plato and Hermias, the Platonist monarch, it would seem worthwhile to ask what ideas of Plato may have influenced him.<sup>41</sup> The fact that he seems generally hostile to the Platonists must not be taken as proof that he flatly rejected all of Plato's views. In fact it might well support the opposite position. In the *Republic*, books eight and nine, there is a long discussion of the nature of types of individuals, how they develop, and how their nature and development is paralleled by constitutions of city-states. This discussion has been regarded as essentially a first attempt to develop a philosophy of history;<sup>42</sup> and more recently a counter-argument has been advanced, proposing that it would be truer to call it an early example of sociological theory.<sup>43</sup>

Plato's argument runs in the following way. In the normal or theoretical process, the ideal state yields to timocracy, followed eventually by oligarchy, then democracy, and finally it descends to the depths of tyranny. This is a process of gradual decay, each constitution being worse than the last. For each class of constitution there is a typical individual, whose strengths or weaknesses correspond exactly to the strengths or weaknesses of the social order under each constitution. The interesting point is that while Plato is apparently claiming to discuss political institutions, in fact his "constitutions" are really social orders. He does not describe the political features of these orders, nor does he show how any of their political features influence their decline. When we compare his description of how democracy develops from oligarchy<sup>44</sup> with the description in Aristotle's *'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία* of how Athens accumulated one constitutional reform after another in an inexorable march toward fourth-century democracy, we see how unpolitical is Plato's account. He is speaking of the formation of social classes with

---

teristik Theopomps," *RhMus* 47 (1892) 359–389; Gilbert Murray, *Greek Studies* (Oxford 1946) 149–170. Hirzel's thesis was that Theopompus was a Cynic philosopher turned historian. E. Rohde (above, note 13) criticises this view severely. He points out that the similarities of ideas and manner are not proof of the case, because first the testimonia make Theopompus a rhetorician not a philosopher, and second the moral attitudes could just as easily have come from Isocrates. Against this we should point out that making Theopompus a rhetorician does not deprive him of the ability to think philosophical thoughts, and the similarity between the moral views of Antisthenes and Theopompus (wherever he learned them) still remains. Hirzel's arguments, then, like Murray's, who does not consider Rohde's objections, are overstatements of an essentially valid case.

<sup>41</sup>T 7, FF 275, 291.

<sup>42</sup>K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies* 1 (London 1966, first published 1945) 33.

<sup>43</sup>W. H. Walsh, "Plato and the Philosophy of History: History and Theory in the *Republic*," *History and Theory* 2 (1962–1963) 3–16.

<sup>44</sup>Plato *Republic* 555b–557a.

certain general moral dispositions that result in revolutionary constitutional change.

There is good evidence from the fragments that Theopompus probably preferred aristocratic societies to democratic ones.<sup>45</sup> And on moral grounds, at least, Philip seems to have belonged at the bottom of the scale, where Plato put his tyrannical man and constitution. Quite possibly then, Theopompus' ranking of societies (as far as it can be reconstructed safely) was very close to Plato's.

It might validly be objected that such a ranking of social orders was not likely to have been exclusive to Plato and Theopompus. A somewhat more significant parallel between the two can be observed in the following:

Again, of Chares he says in the forty-fifth book: "Chares was sluggish and slow, although he already pursued, to be sure, a life of luxury; for he took about with him on his campaigns flute-girls, harp-girls, and common prostitutes, and of the sums of money contributed for the war he would expend a part on this wantonness, and part he would leave right there in Athens for the public speakers and proponents of decrees, as well as for private individuals against whom suits were pending; for all of which the Athenian people have never yet shown indignation, but rather for these reasons the citizens liked him all the more, and with good reason; for they themselves lived in that manner, so that the young men spent their time among paltry little flute-girls and in the houses of prostitutes, while those who were a little older than they indulged in drinking-bouts and gambling and the like prodigalities, and the populace as a whole squandered more money on the public banquets and distributions of meat than on the administration of the State."<sup>46</sup>

This passage is an excellent illustration of the operation of an analogy between society and individual in the mind of Theopompus. The state,

<sup>45</sup>Democracy is severely attacked on moral grounds in F 62. Kurt von Fritz, however, in his "The Historian Theopompus. His Political Convictions and his Concept of Historiography," *AHR* 46 (1941) 775-776, sees in F 62 a denunciation of democracy not so much on moral grounds as on grounds of social prejudice. According to von Fritz, aristocrats drink in private *symposia*, not in public taverns as did the Byzantines. So, according to von Fritz, an aristocratic or oligarchic prejudice is revealed in this fragment. However, denunciation of drinking habits is formulaic in Theopompus' *ad hominem* attacks, of which this is a sort. And that this fragment is really no exception is suggested by its second half where there is a parallel, and more general denunciation of the Calchedonians after they allowed themselves to be corrupted by democracy. Nevertheless, von Fritz's point is well taken. Theopompus' hatred of democracy may very well reveal an aristocratic prejudice, but I wonder if aristocratic prejudices imply the presence of oligarchic political sympathies. His judgment on Hermias (777-778) is open to a similar objection. The attack on Hermias' base birth (F 134) may not reveal too much about Theopompus' personal feelings, since such a passage is an integral part of the formulaic *ad hominem* attack.

<sup>46</sup>Athen. 12.532 b-d = F 213, Gulick's translation.

or society, suffers from the same moral afflictions as individuals.<sup>47</sup> Plato thought the same way in the *Republic*, building his entire work around the presumed analogy between state and soul, or society and individual.

Apart from the more general fact that Theopompus, like Plato and his followers, quite obviously believed in the importance of controlling the appetites, there still remains a further similarity of detail between what happens to the tyrannical man in Plato, and what happened to Philip, according to Theopompus.

PLATO:

"From all these motives a tyrant is compelled to be always provoking wars?" "Yes, he is compelled to do so." "And by such conduct will he not the more readily incur the hostility of the citizens?" "Of course." "And is it not likely that some of those who helped to establish and now share in his power, voicing their disapproval of the course of events, will speak out frankly to him and to one another—such of them as happen to be the bravest?" "Yes, it is likely." "Then the tyrant must do away with all such if he is to maintain his rule, until he has left no one of any worth, friend or foe." "Obviously." "He must look sharp to see, then, who is brave, who is great-souled, who is wise, who is rich; and such is his good fortune that, whether he wishes it or not, he must be their enemy and plot against them all until he purge the city." "A fine purgation," he said. "Yes," said I, "just the opposite of that which physicians practice on our bodies. For while they remove the worst and leave the best, he does the reverse." "Yes, for apparently he must," he said, "if he is to keep his power."

"Blessed, then, is the necessity that binds him," said I, "which bids him dwell for the most part with base companions who hate him, or else forfeit his life." "Such it is," he said. "And would he not, the more he offends the citizens by such conduct, have the greater need of more and more trustworthy bodyguards?" "Of course." "Whom, then, may he trust, and whence shall he fetch them?" "Unbidden," he said, "they will wing their way to him in great numbers if he furnish their wage." "Drones, by the dog," I said, "I think you are talking of again, an alien and motley crew." "You think rightly," he said.<sup>48</sup>

THEOPOMPUS:

If there was anyone among the Greeks or barbarians of a lewd or brazen temperament, these types all collected in Macedonia at Philip's court, being called "The King's Friends." For, on the whole, Philip spurned men of orderly habits, who controlled their private affairs, but spend-thrifts, boozers and gamblers he honoured and advanced. As a consequence, he not only encouraged them to continue thus, but he made them champions of all other wicked and loathsome sport. Was there a shameful or horrendous deed not in their repertoire? Was there anything good or worthy not left out? Some of them would have their bodies shaved and smooth themselves, although they were men, and some would actually have relations with each other though bearded. They used to lead

<sup>47</sup>Theopompus' attacks on societies or states follow basically the same pattern and use the same formulae as his attacks on individuals. For attacks on individuals see above, note 37; for denunciations of societies see FF 39, 40, 49, 62, 139, 153, 162, 204, 213, 227, 253.

<sup>48</sup>Plato, *Republic* 567b-e, Paul Shorey, trans., *Plato the Republic* (Loeb Classical Library, London 1935).

around two or three "boy-friends," and they themselves would provide the same services to others. So they should not rightly be reckoned Friends, but "Boy-Friends," nor should they be called soldiers but sodomites. Men-killers they were by nature and men-kissers were they by habit. Simply said, so as to avoid lengthy speeches, especially since I am beset with so many important matters, such wild beasts and of such character did the companions and "Friends" of Philip, as they were called, become as I believe, as were not even the Centaurs on Pelium or the Laestrygonians who inhabited the plain of Leontini nor any other similar monsters.<sup>49</sup>

Plato believed that the tyrant must (according to theory) always make wars, be repulsive to the better sort, and attract the dregs of humanity to his side; Theopompus showed how the theory became history in Philip's career.

In summary, Plato and Theopompus held the following similar views. Plato taught, and Theopompus seems to have accepted for practical purposes, the analogy between soul and state; both believed in the necessity of controlling the appetites; their rankings of oligarchic and democratic societies and "tyrannical" men are identical, though that does not necessarily mean that either would have condemned all tyrants out of hand. As a philosopher Plato is most unusual, and as a historian so is Theopompus: both used myth extensively, Plato surely and Theopompus most probably to emphasize, or illustrate his beliefs; there are striking similarities between Plato's description of the tyrannical man and Theopompus' account of Philip and his activities; and finally, when both authors introduce apparently political subjects, their interests prove, on closer scrutiny, to be more social than purely political. Of course, each had his own Utopia, yet the details of each author's ideal state are quite different.<sup>50</sup> Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that Theopompus is alone, among the ancient historians we know, in giving open expression to any sort of utopian vision in a historical work. Therefore, this too is an important similarity between him and Plato. Taken individually, not one of these arguments is likely to convince, but taking this evidence as a cumulative case, we might dare to say that, as a thinker, Theopompus was as close to Plato as to Isocrates.

Before this study, it seemed that there were only two possible adjectives that might be used to describe the history of Theopompus: "biographical" or "political". Now we must add "social"; "biographical," though not entirely incorrect, was inadequate. Considering the size and scope of the work, whatever biographical elements there were must have been considerably subordinated. The argument that it should have been political apart from the manifestly geographical, ethnological and mythological discourses, has been neatly summed up by Stephen Usher:

<sup>49</sup>F 225 = Polyb. 8.9 (11) 2-13.

<sup>50</sup>For a discussion of Theopompus' Utopia see above, note 13.

Most of the fragments of his writings are concerned with the bad moral effects of various forms of luxury, self-indulgence and licence upon peoples and upon persons in high places; and there is every reason to believe that he used his talents and training to shock and exaggerate in order to force home his moral lesson. But the two main works of Theopompus, the *Hellenica*, a history of Greece from 411 to 394 in twelve books, and his *magnum opus*, the *Philippica* in fifty-eight books, must, from their very size, have contained much more than a succession of polemics. The latter, to judge from its name, may be related to the Isocratean concept of a Greek world unified under Macedonian leadership, a broad theme which seems to imply its author's freedom from local partisanship. Moreover, those surviving fragments of the work which are not concerned with moral censure reveal, in their ensemble, a wide but by no means uncritical interest in most of the studies which were considered proper for a historian to pursue in his day—geography, ethnology, mythology and political psychology. But in the latter study he had one serious limitation: a negative approach.<sup>51</sup>

Much of this must be accepted; even the argument about Isocratean influence, in spite of all its difficulties, will stand if we reject *a priori* the third possibility, that while Theopompus may have taken sides on certain key political questions, his interests were not so much political as social. Essentially, our present argument is that this third possibility may well be closest to the truth; that Theopompus' approach to politics was very like Plato's; and that, *mutatis mutandis*, much of what Popper says of Plato in the following lines could well be said of Theopompus:

Plato was one of the first social scientists and undoubtedly by far the most influential. In the sense in which the term 'sociology' was understood by Comte, Mill, and Spencer, he was a sociologist; that is to say, he successfully applied his idealist method to an analysis of the social life of man, and of the laws of its development as well as the laws and conditions of its stability. In spite of Plato's great influence, this side of his teaching has been little noticed.<sup>52</sup>

Throughout this study we have concentrated exclusively on the fragments and testimonia of Theopompus.<sup>53</sup> It remains to summarize the

<sup>51</sup>Stephen Usher, *The Historians of Greece and Rome* (London 1969) 101.

<sup>52</sup>Popper, *Open Society* 1.35.

<sup>53</sup>We have deliberately avoided source-criticism. The attempts to identify what later sources followed Theopompus are fraught with difficulties. So it is generally unsafe to use them as evidence in any argument about the nature of the *Philippica*. Welles (above, note 37) identifies Diodorus' main source for his account of Philip's career in book 16 with Theopompus, but cannot imagine who would be the source of Pompeius Trogus' vindictive account in his *Philippic Histories*. N. G. L. Hammond, "The sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI," *CQ* 31 (1937) 79–91, had already established about as firmly as one has the right to expect that Diodorus' source was really Ephorus. As far as Pompeius Trogus is concerned, since his survey of history was named after Theopompus' *magnum opus*, it would seem a bit surprising if he chose not to use the work when he came to discuss Philip, but so long as we accept Momigliano's thesis we must believe either that he did not or, at least, that he completely reversed Theopompus' argument. If we may be permitted a moment of source-criticism we might point out what a good claim can be made for Theopompus as a source for Justin 7.6–9.4. Compare 8.3 with the

conclusions, which seem to be indicated by the examination of them. Theopompus' approach to history was moral or social, like Thucydides' narrative of the plague, or like Plato's theory of the development of constitutions in the *Republic*. He apparently had pan-Hellenic sympathies, but he does not seem to have followed Isocrates very closely in detail, preferring peace to any proposed campaign against Persia. He had much in common with Demosthenes, but nothing with Philip, whom he detested in every way, representing him as the culmination of all the evils that had been developing in European history down to that time, but even here it seems significant that the historian's political feelings are revealed only through his social and moral judgments.<sup>54</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, B.C.

---

comment about sacrilege, brigandage, and treachery, and the picture of people coming and going to and from Philip's court with FF 224–225; the tone of 8.5 with F 287; the moralizing and sexual scurrility of 8.6 with many fragments but especially F 143; 9.1 on Philip's insatiable greed with similar comments in F 225, and further, see Connor (above, note 5) 141 n. 20.

<sup>54</sup>I should like to thank Professor Lionel Pearson, formerly of Stanford, for much encouragement in the preparation of this paper and for reading and criticising an earlier version. Professor Phillip Harding of the University of British Columbia was also kind enough to read and comment on this study. These scholars are not necessarily in agreement with what I have written. The opening of this essay, wherein the long passage from Polybius is discussed, is the substance of a paper read by me to the Classical Association of Canada in June, 1976.