

CHAPTER FIVE

Theopompus's *Philippica*



Theopompus of Chios (*FGrHist* 115) was widely renowned in antiquity for the severity with which he condemned the moral faults of the characters peopling his *Philippica*. Few indeed escaped the scathing vigor of his pen. Despite his family's exile from Chios, Theopompus seems to have had the necessary funds to carry out thorough research (TT 20 and 28, FF 25, 26 and 181) and did not have to work for a living, but was able to devote himself wholly to his writing.<sup>1</sup> Because he was in no need of either patronage or an income, he had the freedom to write whatever he pleased without risk of losing his livelihood by causing offense. It is perhaps for this reason that he was known in antiquity as “a lover of the truth” (φιλαλήθης) (T 28). We must now determine whether or not this epithet was justified in Theopompus's use of the past in the *Philippica*.

In addition to his numerous epideictic speeches, Theopompus wrote three known historical works: an epitome of Herodotus, a *Hellenica*, and a *Philippica*.<sup>2</sup> It is likely the epitome of Herodotus was Theopompus's earliest

---

1. A recent discussion of the (very vague and contradictory) evidence for Theopompus's life can be found in Michael Attyah Flower, *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 11–25.

2. *Suda*, s.v. Θεόπομπος Χίος ῥήτωρ (= T 1).

historical work,<sup>3</sup> but all that remains of it is an entry in the *Suda* stating it contained two books (T 1) and four attributed fragments from ancient lexica giving it as the authority for the use of specific words (FF 1–4), although the possibility exists that some other, unattributed fragments may belong to it also. The *Hellenica* is the earlier of Theopompus's two major historical works and on a smaller scale than the massive *Philippica*. Diodorus (13.42.5 and 14.84.7 = TT 13 and 14) informs us that Theopompus's *Hellenica* contained twelve books, beginning with the Battle of Cynossema in 411, where Thucydides left off, and continuing until the Battle of Cnidus in 394. Speusippus's *Letter to Philip*, which mentions the *Hellenica* as already published (T 7), shows that it (or at least part of it) was completed no later than 343/2.<sup>4</sup> Because only nineteen of the fragments in Jacoby's collection (FF 5–23) can definitely be attributed to the *Hellenica*, however, it is difficult to ascertain the contents or the tone of the work. For this reason, I shall concentrate upon the historical work for which Theopompus was best known, his *Philippica*, because it is the most fully surviving representative of his approach to the past.

Indeed, the bulk of the extant fragments of Theopompus is taken from his *magnum opus*, the title of which is given as *Philippica* (Φιλίππικὰ) by most of our sources in antiquity, with the exception of various periphrases.<sup>5</sup> It was an enormous work in fifty-eight books, beginning with Philip's accession to the throne in 360/59, according to Diodorus (16.3.8 = T 17), and ending (presumably) with that king's death in 336. Despite its title, Theopompus's *Philippica* clearly ranged far more widely than the life and works of Philip II. Over a century later, Philip V of Macedon excerpted from it for his own use all the material on Philip II, the total coming to only sixteen books out of fifty-eight (T 31). Today, Jacoby's compilation contains

3. See I. A. F. Bruce, "Theopompus and Classical Greek Historiography," *History and Theory* 9 (1970): 86–109, at 88–92; *pace* Arnaldo Momigliano, "Studi sulla storiografia greca del IV secolo a.C. I: Teopompo," *RFIC* 59 (1931): 230–42 and 335–54; reprinted in *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, vol. 1 (Rome: Edizione di storia e letteratura, 1966), 367–92, at 377–80. Recently, M. R. Christ ("Theopompus and Herodotus: A Reassessment," *CQn.s.*, 43 [1993]: 47–52) has argued that the epitome was not an independent work, but formed part of the *Philippica*.

4. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 20 and 28–29.

5. E.g., Περὶ Φίλιππον ἱστορίαι (Diodorus 16.3.8 = T 17); ἡ Φιλίππου σύνταξις (Polybius 8.10.7 = T 19, 8.11.1 = F 27); Περὶ Φίλιππον (Photius, s.v. Ζωπύρου τάλαντα = F 66; Didymus, *Demosthenes* 8.58 and 9.43 = FF 166 and 222); Τῶν περὶ Φιλίππου (Porphyry = F 102); Φιλίππικῶν ἱστορίαι (Diodorus 16.71.3 = F 184); and ἱστορίαι (Athenaeus FF 117, 121, 124, 126a, 162, 163, 171, 176, 179, 181a, 188, 204, 209, 216, 224, 233, 237a, and 240).

223 fragments that were attributed by ancient authorities to specific books of *Philippica* (FF 24–246), representing forty-eight of the original fifty-eight books,<sup>6</sup> and most of the approximately 150 unattributed fragments can with some degree of certainty be assigned to the *Philippica*.

Before turning to an examination of Theopompus's *Philippica*, it is necessary to determine (insofar as it is possible) whether the later writers who cite Theopompus are reliable and representative in their citations of him. Then, with these limitations in mind, we shall determine the moral virtues with which Theopompus was chiefly concerned in his *Philippica*, his methods of instructing the reader in them, what political program, if any, he advocated, and what he thought of Philip II himself. We shall then conclude with an examination of the extent to which Theopompus's desire to provide moral instruction led him to misrepresent the past.

Of the more substantial fragments, the largest percentage come from the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus. Where Athenaeus's citations of surviving historians can be checked against the original, P. A. Brunt has found them on the whole to be more or less verbatim, with a few substantially accurate paraphrases.<sup>7</sup> As Jacoby makes clear, F 225b (= Athenaeus 6.260d–261a) is very important for an assessment of Athenaeus's accuracy of citation, because F 225a (= Polybius 8.9.5–13) is clearly derived from the same section of Theopompus but contains minor stylistic changes.<sup>8</sup> Despite Polybius's greater insistence that he is providing Theopompus's own words,<sup>9</sup> the two citations begin with a near verbatim correspondence, which continues for six sentences. At this point, Polybius and Athenaeus diverge completely, although both preserve a Theopompan tone of moral indignation. R. D. Milns suggests a small alteration in the punctuation of the Polybius text is an easy solution to the problem.<sup>10</sup> If this change is made, both authors preserve what appear, from their similarity, to be very close paraphrases of Theopompus, but Polybius has omitted a section of

6. For these figures, see Gordon S. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991), 58.

7. P. A. Brunt, "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes," *CQ* n.s., 30 (1980): 477–94. Less optimistic on the reliability of Athenaeus in citing lost works are R. W. Sharples and D. W. Minter, "Theophrastus on Fungi: Inaccurate Citations in Athenaeus," *JHS* 103 (1983): 154–56; and Adrian Tronson, "Satyrus and Philip II," *JHS* 104 (1984): 124–25.

8. *FGrHist* IIC, 387.

9. Polybius 8.11.5 (= F 225a): "... for I have set down this passage with the very words that he used" (ἀπταῖς γὰρ λέξεσιν αἷς ἐκεῖνος κέχρηται κατατετάχαμεν). Athenaeus 6.260d (= F 225b): "writing thus" (γράφων οὕτως).

10. R. D. Milns, "Theopompus, Fragment 225A and B Jacoby," *PP* 23 (1968): 361–64.

the text and proceeded straight to the general summing-up portion. This appears a convincing solution to the dilemma of choosing between the citations provided by Polybius and Athenaeus. Even when Polybius and Athenaeus are working from the same original, FF 225a and b reveal that both introduced minor stylistic variations into their citations. It seems, therefore, the substance of what Athenaeus cites is likely to be genuinely Theopompan, but because he based his choice of material on its appropriateness for a learned dinner party, the overall tone of the *Philippica* was probably not as sensual, luxurious, or licentious as Athenaeus's citations might imply.

Another writer highly represented in the longer fragments is Plutarch, who evidently used Theopompus as a source for some of his *Lives*. As I have indicated in my discussion of Ephorus, Plutarch appears usually to have retained the general meaning of his source, but given his methods of work, he is unlikely to have preserved the actual wording of the original. Where Plutarch can be checked against another citation of Theopompus, he appears to have reproduced accurately the point of the original, although he rewrites the passage in his own words. A case in point in Plutarch's *Apothegmata Laconica* (*Moralia* 210d), because it can be checked against Athenaeus's direct quotation of Theopompus (14.657b–c = F 22) for the same incident. Here, while making a free paraphrase of the original, Plutarch has not altered any of the essential details.<sup>11</sup> Although this specific incident is from the *Hellenica*, there is no reason to think Plutarch would be any less accurate in his quotations from the *Philippica*.

Whereas Athenaeus appears to have cited long passages of Theopompus, retaining the substance of the original, and Plutarch to have put sections of Theopompus in his own words, Photius, the ninth-century Byzantine scholar and patriarch of Constantinople, epitomized over 270 prose works of all sorts for the benefit of his absent brother in a compilation known as the *Bibliotheca*.<sup>12</sup> In this work, for example, Photius gives an invaluable summary of the contents of the twelfth book of Theopompus's *Philippica* (F 103), in order to correct the mistaken assumption that it had been lost (T 18). In general (and F 103 is true to character), Photius is fond of the exotic and the sensational, but recommends works that are

11. Michael A. Flower, "Agesilaus of Sparta and the Origins of the Ruler Cult," *CQ* n.s., 38 (1988): 123–34.

12. This is not, it should be noted, Photius's own title; see Warren T. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1980), 4–5 (who is also instructive on the intended purpose of the *Bibliotheca*).

morally edifying as well as entertaining.<sup>13</sup> Studies of the method of composition of the *Bibliotheca* have concluded that Photius's claim in the letter of dedication to his brother that he was relying on memory is likely, at least for the shorter epitomes, to be true.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, Photius has probably not provided us with Theopompus's own words, although the actual information contained in his summary, if its accuracy is on a par with his other summaries, can be accepted as correct.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, however accurate it may be, a summary can give only a brief description of the contents of a work and sheds very little light on the length or character of the original.

To sum up, it seems Athenaeus, Plutarch, and Photius can be trusted to reproduce accurately the contents of Theopompus's *Philippica*, but not necessarily the original wording (in the cases of Plutarch and Photius, the difficulties associated with frequent working from memory prevent verbatim quotation much of the time). Furthermore, the extant fragments, although numerous, may have been skewed in some cases to fit the particular interests of Athenaeus, Plutarch, or Photius. It is necessary, therefore, to study the *testimonia* along with the fragments in order to examine the tone of Theopompus's *Philippica*.

The outstanding characteristic by unanimous consent is his severity in judgment. Pausanias (6.18.5 = *FGrHist* 72 T 6) tells us that when Anaximenes, the fourth-century author of a *Hellenica*, a *Philippica*, and a work on Alexander, wrote, as a result of a personal feud with Theopompus, a malicious pamphlet against the Athenians, Spartans, and Thebans (the *Tricaranus*) in Theopompus's name, everyone believed it was by him and resented him accordingly. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Epistula ad Pompeium* 6.7 = T 20) remarks that Theopompus's most unique accomplishment was the ability not only to see what was obvious to most (τὰ φανερά τοῖς πολλοῖς) but to examine even the hidden causes (τὰς ἀφανεῖς αἰτίας) of actions and those who do them and the feelings of their souls (τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς), and to reveal all the mysteries of apparent virtue and undetected vice. He then goes on to compare the searching criticism contained in the writing of

13. See Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*, 100–102.

14. Nigel G. Wilson, "The Composition of Photius' *Bibliotheca*," *GRBS* 9 (1968): 451–55; Tomas Hägg, "Photius at Work: Evidence from the Text of the *Bibliotheca*," *GRBS* 14 (1973): 213–22; and Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*, esp. 14–15 and 81–96.

15. See the study of the summary of Philostratus's *Vita Apollonii* made by Hägg ("Photius at Work," 218–20), that of Ctesias's *Persica* by J. M. Bigwood ("Ctesias' Account of the Revolt of Inarus," *Phoenix* 30 [1976]: 1–25), and that of Ctesias's *Indica* by J. M. Bigwood ("Ctesias' *Indica* and Photius," *Phoenix* 43 [1989]: 302–16).

Theopompus to the legendary judgment of the souls of the dead in Hades and adds, in reply to those who criticized Theopompus for his excessive severity, that he was acting like doctors who cut away the rotten parts of the body but do not touch the healthy parts. Lucian (*Quomodo historia conscribenda sit* 59 = T 25a) says Theopompus condemns most people; Nepos (*Alcibiades* 11 = F 288) adds simply that Theopompus is “most abusive” (*maledicentissimus*). From these *testimonia*, it is not difficult to see how the remark attributed to Isocrates arose that Ephorus needed the spur but Theopompus the rein (*FGrHist* 70 T 28). Plutarch (*Lysander* 30.2 = F 333) states that Theopompus is more to be trusted when he praises than when he blames, for he prefers blaming to praising. This comment is borne out by the fragments, where the proportion of blaming to praising is exceedingly high. We see, therefore, that the *testimonia* and the fragments, despite the individual interests of the authorities who cite them, contain no discrepancy as to the overall nature of Theopompus’s *Philippica*, that the work contained much condemnation on moral grounds.

As might be expected from the *testimonia*, instances of moral praise are much less fully represented than those of blame. In view of the fact that so much less of the *Hellenica* is extant, it is ironic the passage containing the most explicit praise of a historical figure comes from it, rather than from the *Philippica*. It is a citation preserved by Athenaeus on Lysander (12.543b–c = F 20) that well illustrates the moral qualities of which Theopompus approved:

He was industrious and able to court both individuals and kings, being moderate and able to master all the pleasures. At any rate, although he gained control of nearly all of Greece, he cannot be shown in any of the cities to have been driven to sexual pleasure or to have engaged in drunkenness or inopportune drinking.<sup>16</sup>

In a passage appearing to be a continuation of this one,<sup>17</sup> Plutarch (*Lysander* 30.2 = F 333) remarks that the poverty of Lysander at his death made his excellence (ἀρετή) apparent, since he did not seek to enrich his household out of the wealth which came to him (Plutarch’s comment that

16. φιλόπονός τε ἦν καὶ θεραπεύειν δυνάμενος καὶ ιδιώτας καὶ βασιλεῖς, σώφρων ὢν καὶ τῶν ἡδονῶν ἀπάσων κρείττων. γενομένος γοῦν τῆς Ἑλλάδος σκέδον ἀπάσης κύριος ἐν οὐδεμιᾷ φανήσεται τῶν πόλεων οὔτε πρὸς τὰς ἀφροδισίους ἡδονὰς ὀρμήσας οὔτε μέθαις καὶ πότοις ἀκαίροις χρησάμενος.

17. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 45–46 and 142.

Theopompus is more to be trusted when praising than blaming follows). The qualities Theopompus approves in Lysander are industry, ability to form friendships and alliances, moderation, self-control over all pleasures (especially sexual license and intoxication), and honesty in handling the (huge) sums of money over which he had control. In the *Philippica*, Theopompus praises Agesilaus on similar grounds for his ability to abstain from gastronomic pleasures (Plutarch, *Agesilaus* 36.6 = F 107; cf. 10.9–10 = F 321).<sup>18</sup> Other virtues lauded by Theopompus include refusal to yield to flattery,<sup>19</sup> and piety.<sup>20</sup>

Despite the dearth of explicit praise in the *Philippica*, we can learn a great deal about the moral virtues with which Theopompus was chiefly concerned by examining the moral vices he condemns. A good point of departure is Polybius's summary of Theopompus's treatment of Philip throughout the *Philippica* (Polybius 8.11.2–4 = F 27):

. . . he shows him to be most intemperate towards women, so as even to have caused the undoing of his own household, as far as his own affairs were concerned, through his impulsive attention to this subject, and also most unjust and most injurious in his manipulations of friends and allies, and as having enslaved and taken by treachery very many cities through trickery and force, and finally as so passionate in the drinking of unmixed wine, that even in the day he often appeared in front of his friends manifestly drunk.<sup>21</sup>

All of these reprehensible qualities are mentioned in plenty of fragments, in reference not only to Philip himself but also to many others. Incontinence in sexual pleasures with women meets with Theopompus's evident disapproval,<sup>22</sup> but he applies even stronger censure to those who

18. The Plutarch fragment lists Theophrastus as its source, but its obvious connection with Theopompus FF 106 and 108 and its similarity to F 22 (from the *Hellenica*) make the emendation to "Theopompus" virtually certain (Jacoby accepts the emendation).

19. Arcadion the Achaean (F 280).

20. The inhabitants of the mythical town of Pietyville (Εὐσεβίης) (F 75c), Clearchus the Arcadian (F 344), Alexander of Pherae (F 352), and, perhaps, Pelops (F 350).

21. . . ἀκρατέστατον μὲν αὐτὸν ἀποδείκνυσι πρὸς γυναῖκας, ὥστε καὶ τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον ἐσφαλκέναι τὸ καθ' αὐτὸν διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ὀρμὴν καὶ προστασίαν, ἀδικώτατον δὲ καὶ κακοπραγμονέστατον περὶ τὰς τῶν φίλων καὶ συμμάχων κατασκευάς, πλείστας δὲ πόλεις ἐξηνδραποδισμένον καὶ πεπραξικοπηκότα μετὰ δόλου καὶ βίας, ἐκπαθὴ δὲ γεγονότα καὶ πρὸς πᾶς ἀκρατοποσίαν, ὥστε καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν πλεονάκις μεθύοντα καταφανῆ γενέσθαι τοῖς φίλοις.

22. E.g., Evagoras and Pnytagoras (F 103), Straton of Sidon (F 114), and Chares and the Athenians (F 213).

indulge their lusts also with boys or even men.<sup>23</sup> He denounces others for wickedness in forming friendships in language similar to that which he uses for Philip.<sup>24</sup> Likewise, Philip is not the only one Theopompus criticizes for enslaving and capturing cities by force or by fraud (e.g., FF 30, 292, and 396).<sup>25</sup> Censure for addiction to drinking is a common Theopompan refrain,<sup>26</sup> and stands in strong contrast to the often indulgent attitude toward drink-loving in comedy.<sup>27</sup>

The list of moral qualities Theopompus disapproves, however, cannot be confined to the list provided by F 27. In the *Philippica*, Theopompus denounces various people for flattery,<sup>28</sup> love of luxury,<sup>29</sup> love of money,<sup>30</sup> spendthriftiness,<sup>31</sup> gambling,<sup>32</sup> gluttony,<sup>33</sup> and ambition.<sup>34</sup> Sacrilege also

23. E.g., Hegesilochus of Rhodes (F 121), Charidemus of Oreus (F 143), Nysaeus of Syracuse (F 187), and Philip and his men (FF 225a, 225b, and 225c).

24. The Byzantines (F 62), Dionysius of Syracuse (F 134), and Apollocrates of Syracuse (F 185). For Philip, see, e.g., FF 81, F 110, 162, 224, 225a, 225b, and 236.

25. Zopyrus (F 66), Cillicon (F 111), Hermeas of Atarneus (F 291), and the inhabitants of the mythical Wartown (Μάχμιος) (F 75c).

26. The Illyrians (F 39), the Ardiaeans (F 40), the Thessalians (F 49), the Byzantines and Chalcedonians (F 62), Agathocles of Thessaly (F 81), Hegesilochus of Rhodes (F 121), the people of Chalcidice (F 139), Charidemus of Oreus (F 143), Apollocrates of Syracuse (FF 185 and 188), Hipparinus of Syracuse (F 186), Nysaeus of Syracuse (FF 187 and 188), Timolaus of Thebes (F 210), the Athenians of a certain age (F 213), the people of Methymna (F 227), the people of Tarentum (F 233), and Dionysius the Younger of Syracuse (FF 283a and 283b), as well as the ubiquitous Philip (e.g., FF 162, 163, 236, and 282).

27. See the discussion of James N. Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), esp. 147–59.

28. In addition to the notorious companions of Philip (FF 224, 225a, and 225b), Theopompus censures Zopyrus (F 66), Nicostratus of Argos (F 121), the Melieis who dwelt in the town of Flattery (Κολακεία) (F 170), and Thrasydaeus of Thessaly (F 209).

29. Cotys (F 31), the people of his day who have at least moderate means (F 36), the people of Datus (F 43), the Chalcedonians (F 62), Straton of Sidon and Nicocles of Cyprus (F 114), the Colophonians (F 117), Thys of Paphlagonia (F 179), Nysaeus of Syracuse (F 187), Chares and the Athenians (F 213), the Tarentines (F 233), and the Persian king (F 263).

30. E.g., the mythical inhabitants of Wartown (Μάχμιος) (F 75c), Hermeas of Atarneus (F 291), Mausolus (F 299), and human beings in general (F 380).

31. E.g., the Pharsalians (F 49), the Chalcedonians (F 62), Eubulus (F 100), Chabrias (F 105), the Persian king (F 113), Straton of Sidon and Nicocles of Cyprus (F 114), Chares and the Athenians (F 213), Philip and his companions (FF 224, 225a, and 225b), and the people of Methymna (F 227).

32. E.g., the Thessalians (F 49), Hegesilochus of Rhodes (F 121), the Athenians (F 213), Philip's companions (FF 225a and 225b), and the people of Scirus (F 228).

33. His contemporaries who have at least moderate means (F 36), the Ardiaeans (F 40), the Thessalians (F 49), the Persian king (F 113), Thys of Paphlagonia (F 179), Nysaeus of Syracuse (FF 187 and 188), Timolaus of Thebes (F 210), and the people of Methymna (F 227).

34. E.g., Zopyrus (F 66), Straton and Nicocles (F 114), and perhaps Agesilaus (F 323).

meets with due criticism,<sup>35</sup> as one would expect from the author of a treatise entitled *On the Funds Plundered from Delphi* (FF 247–49).

From the vices Theopompus explicitly condemns in the *Philippica*, we can infer that he considered their opposites to be moral virtues. Thus, justice, piety, trustworthiness and loyalty toward one's friends and allies, moderation, and self-control are important moral virtues for Theopompus. Moreover, despite the dearth of positive moral statements extant from the *Philippica*, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Epistula ad Pompeium* 6.6 = T 20a) makes it clear that some did exist (perhaps Theopompus's general reputation for severity led later authorities to quote his criticisms, rather than his praise), for he says that Theopompus reflected at length on justice, piety, and the other virtues.<sup>36</sup> Such a statement suggests Theopompus's conception of moral virtue is typical of the fourth-century intellectual elite. In fact, his moral viewpoint shares some similarities with that of his contemporary, Ephorus, in that a simple (and hardworking) lifestyle, free from the desire for excess wealth and luxury, brings both success and security, although Theopompus seems more concerned with the moral behavior of individuals and Ephorus with that of societies.

Theopompus has various methods of instructing the reader in the moral virtues he considers important. Unlike both Xenophon and Ephorus, Theopompus used blame far more frequently than praise and, as we have seen, was best known in antiquity for his often violent condemnation of moral vice. Usually, his denunciation is direct and explicit, as we have seen. Sometimes, probably for effect, Theopompus adds verbal excesses, such as superlatives (FF 49, 114, 124, and 210), or bestial imagery (F 225a).<sup>37</sup> In the extended denunciation of Philip and his companions from book forty-nine (F 225), Polybius and Athenaeus quote Theopompus as asking the rhetorical question: "What shameful or terrible conduct was not present among them, or what noble and excellent conduct was not absent?" (τί γὰρ τῶν αἰσχρῶν ἢ δεινῶν αὐτοῖς οὐ προσῆν, ἢ τί τῶν καλῶν

35. E.g., Cotys (F 31), Philip and his companions (F 225b), Hermeas of Atarneus (F 291), and Archidamus (F 312).

36. "And moreover in addition to these things also [are worthy of imitation] all the philosophical remarks he makes throughout the whole of his history, because he narrates in full many fine words on justice, piety, and the other virtues" (καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ὅσα φιλοσοφεῖ παρ' ὅλην τὴν <συγγραφὴν περὶ> δικαιοσύνης καὶ εὐσεβείας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν πολλοὺς καὶ καλοὺς διεξερχόμενος λόγους).

37. As Davidson (*Courtesans and Fishcakes*, 301–8) notes, it is the mark of a civilized society to contain animal passions; of course, Theopompus's point is precisely that Philip and his companions are savage and barbarous.

καὶ σπουδαίων οὐκ ἀπῆν;). It has been noted that this sentence echoes the beginning of the longest fragment of Gorgias' *Epitaphios*: "For what quality was absent from these men of those which ought to be present among men? And what was indeed present of those which ought not to be present?" (τί γὰρ ἀπῆν τοῖς ἀνδράσι τούτοις ὧν δεῖ ἀνδράσι παρῆναι; τί δὲ καὶ προσῆν ὧν οὐ δεῖ παρῆναι;).<sup>38</sup> Presumably Theopompus thought that by his use of sometimes excessive and sensationalist language, including the occasional Gorgianic trick, he would apply greater force to his denunciations and thus enshrine them for the good of posterity.

A second way in which Theopompus expresses censure is less direct, through the use of negative exempla. If he is able to show in a concrete fashion how the quality of his disapproval causes the downfall of its perpetrators, his moral point is vividly driven home to the reader, with no need for direct denunciation. A good example of this method of censure is the fate of the Ardiaeans (Athenaeus 10.443b–c = F 40),<sup>39</sup> who get drunk every day, have parties, and are uncontrolled in their eating and drinking. Their enemies, the Celts, aware of their lack of self-control, prepare a sumptuous meal for them, putting in the food an herb that had the effect of purging the bowels. As a result, some of the Ardiaeans are killed by the Celts, while others throw themselves into a river, unable to control their stomachs. Thus, as a direct result of their lack of self-control, the Ardiaeans are destroyed by their enemies in a very shameful way. The moral lesson meant for the reader is obvious. This fragment, set early in the *Philippica* (book 2), may even be programmatic, to introduce the moral vocabulary of self-control.<sup>40</sup>

Sometimes, Theopompus does not pass an explicit judgment, nor does a clearly bad person incur immediate destruction as the result of a moral vice. The lack of explicit judgment may be due to the deficiency of the extant fragments or, in some cases, Theopompus may leave it up to the reader to come to the conclusion that the wicked are indeed wicked and are about to be destroyed. For example, he describes the drinking habits of the Illyrians in the second book of the *Philippica* (Athenaeus 10.443a–b = F 39). He does not use the language of high denunciation, nor does anything evil strike down the Illyrians at the end of the passage. From its position at the

38. F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 82 (citing E. Norden).

39. Ardiaeans is the standard emendation (and is printed as such in Jacoby) for the "Ariaeans" of the manuscript. Shrimpton (*Theopompus the Historian*, 289 nn. 11–12), however, leans toward Amócsy's proposal of "Auriatae."

40. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 109 and 136.

beginning of the *Philippica*, however, we know the context for this fragment is the subjugation of the Illyrians by Philip upon his accession to the throne.<sup>41</sup> Thus, the reader is free to infer that Philip was able to conquer the Illyrians as a result of their lack of control over their drinking habits. Theopompus, however, as far as the extant fragments indicate, did not draw the connection explicitly, and it seems likely that Athenaeus would have been only too happy to include remarks of this sort had they existed in the original context. Occasionally, Theopompus offers a combination of two of these methods of censure, as in the case of Dionysius the Younger, whom Theopompus, according to Athenaeus (10.435d = F 283), characterizes as a lover of drink and a sot, ruining his eyesight through drink.

In addition to censure, both direct and through negative exempla, Theopompus uses various literary devices to instruct the reader in his moral values. It is possible that, like Ephorus, he used the preface to his work to give some indication of the moral purpose of his history. There is no evidence for a separate preface for each book, but F 27 indicates that in the preface to the *Philippica* as a whole, Theopompus did elaborate upon the moral reasons for which he condemned Philip, the subject of his work. Possibly the preface was also one of the places in which Theopompus reflected on justice, piety, and the other virtues, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus tells us (T 20a).

The literary device for which Theopompus was best known in antiquity was his use of digressions (TT 20, 29–31, and F 28). Theon of Alexandria complains (*Progymnasmata* 4 = T 30) of the excessive length of the digressions in the *Philippica*, claiming that two or three or more whole histories can be found in the form of digressions, in which there is not only not the name of Philip, but not even that of any Macedonian. Similar to this claim is that of Photius (T 31), as noted above. When Philip V of Macedon subtracted the digressions from the *Philippica*, leaving behind only the affairs of Philip II, he was left with a mere sixteen books out of the original fifty-eight. I shall demonstrate, however, that Theopompus did in fact intend his digressions to be an integral part of the moral instruction offered in the *Philippica*.<sup>42</sup>

41. For a detailed account of Philip's success over the Illyrians upon his accession to the throne, see Griffith (N. G. L. Hammond, G. T. Griffith, and F. W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 2 [Oxford: Clarendon, 1979], 210–15).

42. Pace Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 153–65, who argues that Theopompus's digressions are only very loosely connected to the main narrative and contribute little to the thematic unity of the work.

At least two of these digressions in the *Philippica* appear to have been circulated separately under their own titles in antiquity. The first, the *Thaumasias*, found in book 8 (FF 64–76), was a collection of “marvels,” which included an account of Zoroastrianism (FF 64 and 65); the gruesome story of the Persian Zopyrus’s self-mutilation, which led to the capture of Babylon (F 66);<sup>43</sup> the exploits of Epimenides the Cretan, “the Greek Rip Van Winkle” (FF 67–69);<sup>44</sup> the prophetic powers of Pherecydes of Syros (FF 70–71); some derogatory remarks about Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism (FF 72–73); and a miraculous incident at the Olympic Games (F 76). It is worth noting that Pythagoras and Epimenides (along with Orpheus) are identified by Deborah Tarn Steiner as quietests who reject the institutions of the *polis* and “show marked aristocratic leanings in their search for a suitable audience for their instruction.”<sup>45</sup>

The most famous (and therefore most quoted) section of this digression is the encounter between Midas and Silenus (FF 74–75). In the course of their conversation, Silenus describes to Midas a continent that lies beyond the boundaries of our *kosmos*, of which Aelian (*Varia Historia* 3.18 = F 75c) preserves for us the details. This mythical continent contains two cities of very different character, Wartown (Μάχημος) and Pietyville (Εὐσεβής). Theopompus describes the inhabitants of the latter town as living their lives peacefully gathering fruits from the earth without plow or oxen, for they do not need to plow or sow. They are so indisputably just that not even the gods disdain to wander among them. The inhabitants of Wartown, on the other hand, are very warlike, and unlike the citizens of Pietyville, who die laughing, they die sometimes from illness but more often in war, from the blows of either stones or clubs. Certain people called Meropes also live there, and at the remote edge of their land is a place called No Return (Ἄνοστος), where there are two rivers, one of pleasure and the other of sorrow. If people eat fruit from the trees by the river of sorrow, they waste away their life in lamentation, while if they eat from the trees by the river of pleasure, they gradually grow younger until they eventually cease to exist. This anecdote has certain similarities with the Cleobis and Biton story in Herodotus (1.31) and with Aristotle’s lost *Eudemus* (F 44 Rose), in which Silenus tells Midas that it is best for humans not to be born, or failing that, to die as

43. Cf. Herodotus 3.153–60.

44. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 17.

45. Deborah Tarn Steiner, *The Tyrant’s Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 193–204 (quotation from 201).

quickly as possible.<sup>46</sup> It is likely Theopompus derived the No Return part of the tale from the traditional rendering of the Silenus and Midas story but added in the contrast between the two cities for moral and didactic purposes.<sup>47</sup> By means of his utopic portrayal of Pietyville, Theopompus gives a concrete example of the kind of happy and peaceful lifestyle that would be possible if people were to live justly and piously.

Judging from this longest extant fragment, the digression as a whole seems to have had some sort of moralizing intent. The various material contained in it may have loosely been linked together by the general theme of piety, particularly with respect to portents and prophecies, and so the digression may have been joined to the bulk of the *Philippica* by means of the Delphic oracle.<sup>48</sup> The pretext for an excursus on Delphi and other oracular material is likely to have been Philip's entry into the so-called Third Sacred War, because a fragment from another context in book 8 (F 63) discusses the composition of the Amphictyonic League. Theopompus was interested in the events of this conflict, not only because it provided an avenue for Philip to enter into the affairs of southern Greece, but also because of its moral implications. In a work entitled *On the Funds Plundered from Delphi* (FF 247–49), which may, like the *Thaumasias*, be another digression from the *Philippica* sold under a separate title, Theopompus details the fitting retributions meted out to those guilty of receiving the treasures plundered by the Phocians from the sanctuary at Delphi (F 248). Given Philip's claim to have entered the so-called Sacred War as Apollo's avenger,<sup>49</sup> Theopompus's starting point for the *Thaumasias* is likely to have been to show how Philip was using piety as a political tool,<sup>50</sup> perhaps by contrast with those who are truly pious.

46. G. J. D. Aalders, "Die Meropes des Theopomp," *Historia* 27 (1978): 317–27.

47. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 144. For a summary of modern scholars' views on the meaning of this myth, see Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 214–17, to which can be added Bernhard Kytzler, "Zum utopischen Roman der klassischen Antike," in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, ed. H. Hofmann, vol. 1 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1988), 7–16.

48. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 15–20.

49. The most obvious example of Philip's self-proclaimed role of Delphic avenger is Justin's statement (8.2.3) that he ordered his soldiers to don laurel wreaths before the Battle of the Crocus Field. The nomenclature given to this war by our sources also indicates clearly the extent to which Philip capitalized upon the fact that he had entered the war to dislodge the Phocians from their occupation of Delphi; see my "What Makes a War a Sacred War?" *EMC/CV* 17 (1998): 35–55.

50. See Slobodan Dušanić ("On Theopompus's *Philippica* VI–VIII," *Aevum* 51 [1977]: 27–36), who reaches the (slightly different) conclusion that Theopompus's interests in the *Thaumasias* are primarily political.

The other digression, which like the *Thaumasia*, was sold separately in antiquity, comes in the tenth book of the *Philippica* (FF 85–100) and was known by the title *On the Athenian Demagogues* (Athenaeus 4.166d = F 100). It discusses Athenian political figures from the fifth century to the middle of the fourth century. Harpocration (s.v. Εὐβουλος = F 99) provides a clue as to the motivation of this excursus, for he gives Theopompus as a source for the claim that Eubulus’s “misuse” of the Theoric Fund made Athens both less courageous and more slack.<sup>51</sup> We may thus speculate that Theopompus traced the roots of Athens’s state of enervation in the middle of the fourth century to the maladministration of financial affairs by the political leaders of the previous century. Eubulus thus represents the culmination of a long succession of demagogues who had progressively weakened Athens through their corruption of the people.<sup>52</sup> This explanation fits in well with the context for this digression of ca. 351 (FF 83 and 110), when Athens slowly began to be aware of Philip’s potential menace. Theopompus attributes Athens’s inability to take decisive steps against Philip in his early years to the enervating policies adopted by the politicians of Athens.

The tenor of this digression is its most enlightening feature. Theopompus adopts a tone almost uniformly hostile to the politicians whom he discusses, punctuated by glimpses of charity (i.e., the diligence of Callistratus [F 97] and Eubulus [F 99]). Furthermore, it has been noted that Theopompus, in cases where more than one version of events, names, or motives exists, without exception gives the more hostile alternative in his desire to discredit the Athenian politicians.<sup>53</sup> In two cases, he cites patronymics differing from those given by other authorities. The first case is found in a scholion to Aristophanes (*Vespae* 947 = F 91), which claims Theopompus said Thucydides, the rival of Pericles, was the son of Pantaeus, and not of Melesias, as Androtion (*FGrHist* 324 F 37) stated. Ostraca found in Athens bearing the name “Thucydides son of Melesias” clearly indicate that this patronymic was the commonly accepted one.

51. Flower (*Theopompus of Chios*, 93 n. 85) draws attention to the striking similarity between Plato’s criticism of Pericles in the *Gorgias* (515e) and Theopompus’s criticism of Eubulus on the deleterious effects of the distribution of public funds by Athenian demagogues.

52. See H. T. Wade-Gery, “Two Notes on Theopompus, *Philippika*, X,” *AJP* 59 (1938): 129–34, at 132–33; A. E. Raubitschek, “Meeresnähe und Volksherrschaft,” *WS* 71 (1958): 112–15; and W. Robert Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1968), esp. 67–69 and 74–76 (with the review by M. B. Wallace in *Phoenix* 23 [1969]: 397–99).

53. Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, esp. 121.

Therefore, it seems Theopompus was attempting to cast a slur upon Thucydides' parentage by implying that, contrary to the accepted tradition, Melesias was his father, he was in fact an illegitimate son of Pantaenus.<sup>54</sup> Although an alternative patronymic was available to him, Theopompus selected the more hostile alternative.

He casts a similar slur upon the legitimacy of the politician Hyperbolus, according to a scholion on Lucian (*Timon* 30 = F 95). The scholiast favors Theopompus's statement that Hyperbolus was the son of a certain Chremes over that of Androtion (F 42) who said he was the son of Antiphanes of the *deme* Perithoidae, while citing the (mutually contradictory) testimony of Andocides (F 5 Blass) and two comic poets that he was a foreigner. Again, ostraca indicate the commonly accepted patronymic for Hyperbolus was "son of Antiphanes."<sup>55</sup> Just as in the case of Thucydides the son of Melesias, Theopompus casts doubt upon Hyperbolus's legitimacy by replacing the accepted patronymic, with another. As has been noted, the technique of an attack on the ancestry of a rival or a public figure of whom one disapproves is common in Old Comedy or political oratory.<sup>56</sup> Although Theopompus undoubtedly gave Hyperbolus's father a fictional name, probably taken from comedy,<sup>57</sup> ironically it is his version that became the accepted one, rather than the true patronymic preserved by Androtion.<sup>58</sup>

Not only with names but also with motives is it Theopompus's habit to give the more questionable. Thus, Cimon's apparent generosity is viewed as an attempt to curry popular favor (FF 89–90). According to Athenaeus (12.532f–533a = F 135), Theopompus praises the generosity of Peisistratus, and the passage following this one (12.533a–c = F 89) attributes the same personal generosity to Cimon. At first sight, it seems to contradict Theopompus's assessment of Cimon as reported by Cyril of Alexandria (F 90) as the first of the Athenian leaders to learn the lesson of bribery. Nevertheless, both H. T. Wade-Gery and W. R. Connor have shown that

54. Because the point of Theopompus's substitution of patronymic is to cast in doubt Thucydides' legitimacy, it does not matter whether one accepts the manuscript reading of Pantaenus (as does Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 40) or the emendation of Pantaenetus (Kirchner, as printed in Jacoby).

55. J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), no. 13910.

56. Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 40–41.

57. As Phillip Harding (*Androtion and the Atthis* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1994], 153) notes, the name Chremes appears in Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae* and is common also in New Comedy.

58. See P. Harding, "Rhetoric and Politics in Fourth-Century Athens," *Phoenix* 41 (1987): 25–39, at 29–31, and *Androtion and the Atthis*, 153.

according to Theopompus, Cimon's alleged generosity of F 89 was not motivated by pure altruism but rather as a form of gaining popularity.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, Theopompus is clearly guilty of exaggeration, for Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 27.3), who appears to be using a common source, mentions that Cimon's lands were open only to his fellow demesmen, rather than the entire population of Athens.<sup>60</sup> With similar prejudice, Theopompus presents Cleon's decision to seek political power as the result of a personal feud with the Knights (scholiast on Aristophanes, *Equites* 226 = F 93),<sup>61</sup> and Eubulus's distribution of the Theoric Fund as due to extravagance and intemperance (Harpocration, s.v. Εὐβουλος = F 99 and Athenaeus 4.166de = F 100), key Theopompan vices. Thus, throughout this digression, Theopompus uniformly attributes to the Athenian politicians personal motives for political actions, in order to reveal the demagogic nature of their apparently altruistic acts.

The politicians whom Theopompus singles out for discussion also give some indication of the line of argumentation he takes, for he clearly sees a link between imperialism and corruption. The subjects of the extant fragments are Themistocles, Cimon, Thucydides, Cleon, Hyperbolus, Callistratus, and Eubulus. In F 86, Theopompus refers to Themistocles' rebuilding of the walls of Athens; it is a natural inference that he also discussed Themistocles' fortification of the Piraeus, which, as Thucydides recognized (1.93.4), laid the foundations of the fifty-century empire. As both Wade-Gery and Connor have demonstrated, Cimon's purchasing of political power through his personal fortune led to Pericles' policy of using state funds to the same end.<sup>62</sup> It is likely, as first noted by A. E. Raubitschek, that Theopompus criticized Cimon and Pericles for having turned away from their aristocratic friends to curry favor from the demos.<sup>63</sup> Even though Pericles only appears in a glancing reference (F 91) as Thucydides' rival, it is clear he must have been one of Theopompus's main targets and Cimon and Thucydides were included as foils.<sup>64</sup> As for Cleon, in the extant

59. H. W. Wade-Gery, "Two Notes on Theopompus," 131–34; and W. Robert Connor, "Theopompus' Treatment of Cimon," *GRBS* 4 (1963): 107–14 and *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 30–38.

60. Connor, "Theopompus' Treatment of Cimon," 110.

61. See Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 50–53.

62. Wade-Gery, "Two Notes on Theopompus," 133–34; and Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 33.

63. A. E. Raubitschek, "Theopompos on Thucydides the Son of Melesias," *Phoenix* 14 (1960): 81–95 at 86; see also Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 33 and 37.

64. So Wade-Gery, "Two Notes on Theopompus," 133.

fragments Theopompus emphasizes his demagogy and his attack upon the cavalry, presumably as part of his populist agenda, and accuses him of corruption in the assessment of tribute (FF 92–94).<sup>65</sup> In addition to the criticism of the leaders of Athens's fifth-century empire, Theopompus also turns to the fourth-century empire, the Second Athenian Confederacy, and notes how Callistratus ephemerically gave the name “contributions” to the tribute payments, in order not to invite any comparisons with resented fifth-century practices (F 98). Thus, the figures most prominently singled out for attack are not only Athenian politicians with demagogic tendencies, but those who were most associated with the promotion of Athenian empire, both fifth and fourth century.<sup>66</sup>

Theopompus's portrayal of another Athenian demagogue that has usually not been recognized as such is that of Demosthenes.<sup>67</sup> Five fragments remain from the *Philippica* that mention Demosthenes by name (FF 325 to 329), all preserved by Plutarch in his *Life of Demosthenes*. As we have seen, Plutarch can be trusted to have reproduced accurately the substance, but not necessarily the wording, of the original. It is also important to note that in all these passages Plutarch cites Theopompus only to disagree with him; the fact that Plutarch is generally favorable to Demosthenes indicates immediately that Theopompus is not.<sup>68</sup>

In our first fragment (*Demosthenes* 4.1 = F 325), Plutarch cites Theopompus for the fact that Demosthenes' father was an aristocrat (καλὸς κἀγαθός) and was surnamed Sword-Maker (μαχαιροποιός) because he owned a sword-making factory, in which he employed many slaves. Here, Theopompus differs from Aeschines, who tries to cast discredit upon the ancestry of his rival by calling him the illegitimate son of Demosthenes the Sword-Maker (μαχαιροποιός) (2.93). Theopompus does not employ

65. Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 48–59; and Edwin M. Carawan, “The Five Talents Cleon Coughed Up (Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 6),” *CQ* n.s., 40 (1990): 137–47.

66. I thank one of the referees for bringing this important point to my attention.

67. Pace Shrimpton (*Theopompus the Historian*, 171–80), who argues that Theopompus approved of Demosthenes' policy of resistance to Philip and so treated him sympathetically until Chareonea; Flower (*Theopompus of Chios*, 136–47), who concludes that Theopompus thought highly of Demosthenes' oratorical talent but had a low opinion of his political ability; and Brad L. Cook (“Theopompus Not Theophrastus: Correcting an Attribution in Plutarch *Demosthenes* 14.4,” *AJP* 121 [2000]: 537–47), who suggests (537) that “Theopompus' opinion of the orator remains complex and not simply negative.” Portions of the following section were previously published as “Theopompus' View of Demosthenes,” in *In Altum: Seventy-Five Years of Classical Studies in Newfoundland*, ed. Mark Joyal (St. John's, NF: Memorial University of Newfoundland, 2001), 63–71; I reproduce them here by kind permission of the editor.

68. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 137.

the technique of attributing a false, less respectable ancestry to a political figure. Nevertheless, it is difficult to determine precisely what his refusal in the case of Demosthenes signifies, much less that it is favorable; all we can deduce from this fragment is that Theopompus provides correct information about Demosthenes' parentage.

Another fragment that has sometimes been construed as favorable<sup>69</sup> occurs in the context of the Athenian demos's choice of Demosthenes to deliver the funeral oration after Chaeronea (*Demosthenes* 21.1–2 = F 329). The only part of this passage attributed to Theopompus, however, is the assertion toward the end that the Athenians bore their misfortune basely and ignobly, a statement, it should be noted, Plutarch contradicts.<sup>70</sup> Thus, the rest of the passage is almost certainly not derived from Theopompus, and all we learn is that he did not think much of the Athenians,<sup>71</sup> a sentiment entirely in keeping with his negative portrayal of Athens and the Athenians elsewhere in the *Philippica*.

A third fragment that is usually considered favorable<sup>72</sup> is Plutarch's citation of Theopompus for Demosthenes' rhetorical refusal to undertake a certain prosecution, despite the clamoring of the mob for him to do so (*Demosthenes* 14.4 = F 327).<sup>73</sup> In this passage, we once again find Theopompus's disdain for the Athenian democracy, hardly a surprise. But what does it tell us about Theopompus's opinion of Demosthenes?<sup>74</sup> All

69. E.g., by Shrimpton ("Theopompus' Treatment of Philip," 130), but not mentioned in his *Theopompus the Historian*.

70. "... they did not bear their misfortune basely and ignobly, as Theopompus writes in his dramatic style . . ." (οὐ ταπεινῶς οὐδ' ἀγεννῶς φέρων τὸ συμβεβηκός, ὡς γράφει καὶ τραγωιδεὶ Θεόπομπος . . .).

71. As noted also by Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 140–41.

72. Even Michael Flower, who argues that Theopompus disapproved of Demosthenes, considers this fragment to be "unequivocally favourable" (*Theopompus of Chios*, 139).

73. "Theopompus also records that when the Athenians were proposing him for a certain prosecution and clamoring for him, when he did not comply, he got up and said: 'Gentlemen, you will use me as a counsellor, even if you do not wish to, but not as a false accuser, even if you wish to.'" (ἰστορεῖ δὲ καὶ Θεόπομπος ὅτι τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ τινα προβαλλομένων αὐτὸν κατηγορίαν, εἶθ' ὡς οὐχ ὑπήκουε, θορυβούντων, ἀναστάς εἰπεῖν: 'ὑμεῖς ἐμοί, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, συμβούλω μὲν, ἂν μὴ θέλητε, χρῆσεσθε, συκοφάντη δ' οὐδ' ἂν θέλητε.'). One manuscript tradition assigns this fragment to Theophrastus, but, as Brad Cook ("Theopompus Not Theophrastus," 537–47) demonstrates, the attribution of most manuscripts to Theopompus should be accepted.

74. Flower (*Theopompus of Chios*, 139) reads too much into the fact that Plutarch begins this passage with the phrase δὲ καὶ Θεόπομπος, which does not have to mean "even Theopompus," with the implication that the Chian is favourable to Demosthenes here, whereas he is hostile elsewhere. As Brad Cook notes ("Theopompus Not Theophrastus," 538 n. 4), the meaning can be merely additive.

that we learn from this citation is that Theopompus brings out Demosthenes' ability to turn a neat phrase, something no one could deny.

A fourth fragment, however, contains a clear condemnation, for Plutarch attributes to Theopompus (again contradicting him) the opinion that Demosthenes was inconstant in character and unable to remain faithful to the same policies or people for very long (*Demosthenes* 13.1 = F 326). Because trustworthiness and loyalty toward one's friends and allies are important virtues for Theopompus,<sup>75</sup> clearly he believes Demosthenes does not measure up in this regard.<sup>76</sup>

The fifth and final fragment (*Dem.* 18.2–3 = F 328) contains two separate citations from Theopompus. In the first, he comments on the power of Demosthenes' oratory and tells of its effect upon the Thebans. Whether Theopompus considered this effect to have been positive or negative has been a matter of some debate, complicated by the fact that it is difficult to tell how much of this passage is Theopompus and how much is Plutarch, who, as we have seen, holds the opposite opinion of Demosthenes' character. The portion from Jacoby's rather larger citation that Plutarch specifically attributes to Theopompus reads as follows.

Their own advantage did not escape the reasoning of the Thebans . . . but the power of the orator, as Theopompus says, stirring up their spirit and inflaming their ambition threw a shadow over all other things, so that they cast aside fear, reasoning, and gratitude under his inspiration . . .<sup>77</sup>

As Flower correctly points out,<sup>78</sup> the passage indicates Theopompus thought that the Thebans had made this alliance with the Athenians contrary to their

75. Theopompus praises Lysander for his ability to cultivate both private citizens and kings (F 20) and criticizes Philip for his mistreatment of friends and allies (F 27).

76. Pace Shrimpton, "Theopompus' Treatment of Philip," 131, and *Theopompus the Historian*, 173–74.

77. τὸ μὲν οὖν συμφέρον οὐ διέφευγε τοὺς τῶν Θηβαίων λογισμοὺς . . . , ἡ δὲ τοῦ ῥήτορος δύναμις, ὡς φησι Θεόπομπος, ἐκρηπίζουσα τὸν θυμὸν αὐτῶν καὶ διακαίουσα τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ἐπεσκότησε τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν, ὥστε καὶ φόβον καὶ λογισμὸν καὶ χάριν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐνθουσιῶντας . . .

Jacoby does not include in his citation the concluding words of the last clause, "by his speech toward the good" (ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὸ καλόν), presumably because they do not fit the otherwise negative portrayal of Demosthenes in this citation. Shrimpton (*Theopompus the Historian*, 176) suggests that these words could have been added by Plutarch but concludes that these words do come from Theopompus. Flower (*Theopompus of Chios*, 143–44), however, offers compelling arguments for the attribution of this phrase to Plutarch rather than Theopompus.

78. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 144–45.

own interests, and said explicitly that they did so through ambition (φιλοτιμία), a quality which he expresses profound disapproval elsewhere (FF 66 and 114). Moreover, the reference to gratitude (χάρις) reminds us that the Thebans were nominally still allies of Philip, an alliance they repudiate as a result of the power of Demosthenes' oratory, proving themselves faithless in friendship, another quality, of which Theopompus profoundly disapproves, as we have already seen. Here, clearly, Theopompus does not present Demosthenes' oratorical talent as a good quality, as it induced the Thebans into a course of action that was both immoral and contrary to their own interests.

In the second citation from this passage, after demonstrating how great Demosthenes' influence became among both the Thebans and the Athenians, Plutarch defends Demosthenes against Theopompus's assertion that he held absolute power among the Thebans and the Athenians unjustly and unworthily (οὐκ ἀδίκως οὐδὲ παρ' ἀξίαν). The obvious inference to be drawn from this passage is that Theopompus considered Demosthenes guilty of abuse of power, a key offense throughout the *Philippica*. Furthermore, if we put these two citations of Theopompus together, it is evident he considers Demosthenes to have acquired this absolute power through his persuasive oratory.

The investigation of these fragments reveals that none of Theopompus's comments about Demosthenes can be construed as clearly favorable, and two of them explicitly denigrate him, for his political instability (F 326) and for his abuse of power (F 328). Furthermore, two of the fragments (FF 327 and 328, and possibly F 329 by implication) emphasize Demosthenes' oratorical skill, one in close juxtaposition to his abuse of power. These fragments suggest that Theopompus did not in fact approve of Demosthenes' oratorical skill but instead portrayed him as a demagogue. Whether or not this material formed part of the digression in book 10,<sup>79</sup> like the other demagogues, despite apparently altruistic actions, Demosthenes was motivated only by the desire for political power, which he achieved through his moral corruption of the people.

In the twenty-fifth book of the *Philippica*, Theopompus turns his attention from the Athenian demagogues to the Athenians themselves in another well-known digression (FF 153–56). His narrative has reached the early 340s by this time (FF 152 and 157), but it is unclear what exactly gave him the impetus to expound upon the claims of international achievement of

---

79. As tentatively suggested by Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIC, 396.

fifth-century Athens.<sup>80</sup> Three of the surviving passages concern the Athenian's achievements against the Persians, but the fourth (F 156) refers to their role in the fifth-century Sacred War, a minor incident of saber-rattling between Athens and Sparta that took place just after Cimon's expedition to Cyprus and his death (cf. Thucydides 1.112.5). From its tenor, it is clear that this digression was polemical in nature and was intended to debunk grandiose Athenian claims.

A citation from Theon (*Progymnasmata* 2 = F 153) is the largest of the fragments that remain from this digression. In it, Theon apparently summarizes Theopompus's view that the oath of Plataea and the treaty with the Persian king against the Hellenes<sup>81</sup> were falsified and the Battle of Marathon did not happen in the way the poets all write and "all the other things that the city of Athens boasts about and uses to deceive the Greeks" (this last phrase is apparently verbatim). Whether or not Theopompus is correct in his allegations cannot be determined from the present state of our evidence (the oath at Plataea and a fifth-century peace with Persia in particular are notorious *cruces* in the study of Greek history).<sup>82</sup> Furthermore, only one argument of Theopompus survives directed against the alleged peace with Persia. He objects to public documentation of this peace on the grounds that it was inscribed in the Ionic alphabet introduced to Athens in 403/2 and not in the older Attic script (FF 154 and 155). This evidence is inconclusive, however, because occasional examples of the use of Ionic script on Athenian public documents have been found before 403/2, and furthermore, we do not even know to which putative fifth-century peace with Persia Theopompus is referring. What seems more important, however, is the fact the language of these fragments does not allow us to infer that he denied outright the existence of any of these events.<sup>83</sup> Rather, the inference to be drawn from Theon's apparent direct quotation in F 153 is that Theopompus objects to the glorious claims

80. Jacoby (*FGH Hist* IIC, 380), citing Schwartz, suggests that perhaps claims similar to those in this digression were made in the Athenian speeches about Olynthus.

81. The *πρὸς Ἑλληνας* of the manuscript has been emended since Spengel (see the discussion of the emendations to this passage in Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 78–81).

82. The bibliography on these topics is enormous. For a convenient reference to the ancient evidence, see Russell Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 155–56 and 504–7 (Plataea), and 129–51 and 487–95 (Callias). See now also E. Badian, "The Peace of Callias," *JHS* 107 (1987): 1–39; reprinted with additional material in *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 1–72; and G. L. Cawkwell, "The Peace between Athens and Persia," *Phoenix* 51 (1997): 115–30.

83. See Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 81–94.

which Athens makes about these events in particular. This is not surprising in view of the heavy emphasis laid upon the oath at Plataea, peace with Persia, and the Battle of Marathon in the panegyric tradition of the Athens of Theopompus's day, which he was undoubtedly familiar.

Similarly, it is possible, as Connor suggests,<sup>84</sup> that Theopompus included a discussion of the fifth-century Sacred War in this digression to deflate Athenian claims to piety in this conflict (scholiast on Aristophanes, *Aves* 556 = F 156). If so, then his criticism of Athens's entry in the so-called Second Sacred War is similar to that of Philip's in the Third. This fragment is significant, because it indicates this digression was not limited to Athens's role against the Persians but also, like the digression on the demagogues, contained criticism of Athenian imperialism.

Another historical digression renowned for its tone of condemnation is Theopompus's substantial excursus on the tyrants of Syracuse in books 39 and 40 (FF 185, 188–94). It seems the digression began with a mention of Dionysius the Elder (Diodorus 16.71.3 = F 184) but was chiefly concerned with his successors, as is indicated by the fact that Dionysius the Elder himself does not appear in any of the extant fragments, except as the father of Hipparinus and Nysaeus (FF 186–88).<sup>85</sup> Furthermore, Theopompus appears to have reached Dionysius the Younger's accession by book 39 (F 185). The reason Theopompus appears not to have included Dionysius the Elder (and if he had, it seems likely Athenaeus would have reported at least one spicy anecdote concerning him) may be because he had already found an opportunity to criticize him in book 21 (Athenaeus 6.261a–b = F 134). In this passage (following the long citation from Theopompus denouncing Philip and his companions = F 225b), Athenaeus comments upon the similarity between Theopompus's treatments of Philip and of Dionysius the Elder and gives a citation censuring Dionysius's method of choosing *his* depraved companions to prove it. Or (and this seems the more probable explanation for Dionysius the Elder's apparent absence) his purpose in this digression was to explain the collapse of the Syracusan dynasty with the final overthrow of Dionysius the Younger.<sup>86</sup>

The content of the extant fragments makes it probable that this is in

84. *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, 96 and 175 n. 52.

85. See L. J. Sanders, *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny* (London: Croom Helm, 1987), 77–78.

86. H. D. Westlake, "The Sicilian Books of Theopompus's *Philippica*," *Historia* 2 (1954): 288–307; reprinted in *Greek Historians and Greek History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969), 226–50, at 233–36. See now also L. J. Sanders, "Theopompus and the Dionysian Empire," *EMC/CV* n.s., 14 (1995): 337–53.

fact was the aim of the digression. Apart from some highly uninformative place references from Stephanus of Byzantium, all the extant fragments from this digression are derived from Athenaeus (FF 185–88, 192–93), who, as we have seen, is generally accurate in the substance of his citations. The first four fragments describe the decline and fall of various members of the dynasty of Dionysius the Elder through their dissoluteness.<sup>87</sup> This subject would have given Theopompus the opportunity to show concretely the consequences of moral misbehavior, for by indulging in a series of vices, including drunkenness, gluttony, promiscuity, and general licentiousness, these members of the Syracusan dynasty brought about their own downfall. It is likely Theopompus reached much the same conclusion about Dionysius the Younger as he did about the other members of his family. In the same context as his remarks about the other Syracusan tyrants, Athenaeus (10.435d = F 283a) comments that Theopompus lists Dionysius the Younger among the lovers of wine and drunkards and says that he ruined his eyesight through drink. Aelian (*Varia Historia* 6.12 = F 283b), clearly drawing from the same passage as Athenaeus, preserves Theopompus's comment that Dionysius the Younger destroyed his eyesight through the drinking of unmixed wine (ἀκρατοποσία).<sup>88</sup> Jacoby is surely right in suggesting these fragments belong with the digression on the Syracusan tyrants, although no book numbers are preserved. If so, it seems Theopompus depicted Dionysius the Younger as the same sort of dissolute tyrant as his relatives, and we can infer that his downfall was fully deserved as a result of his moral failures.

As is the case with the other historical digressions, Theopompus's digression on the Sicilian tyrants is closely connected to the rest of the *Philippica*, especially in its link between imperialism and corruption.<sup>89</sup> In

87. If it could be established with certainty that Theopompus served as a source either for Diodorus's Sicilian narrative in book 16 or for Pompeius Trogus/Justin, we would have a fuller picture of the Sicilian digression in the *Philippica*; see N. G. L. Hammond, "The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI, II," *CQ* 32 (1938): 137–51. Along with the more conservative approach of Westlake, "The Sicilian Books of Theopompus' *Philippica*," 241–50; see Robert Develin, "Pompeius Trogus and Philippic History," *SStor* 8 (1985): 110–15; and N. G. L. Hammond, "The Sources of Justin on Macedonia to the Death of Philip," *CQ* n.s., 41 (1991): 496–508.

88. Cf. Aristotle, *EN* 1114a25–28, who comments that those who lose their eyesight through drunkenness or some other form of debauchery are blameworthy (as opposed to those who suffer some sort of natural defect, who are not).

89. On the thematic unity of the Sicilian digression with the rest of the *Philippica*, see Sanders, "Theopompus and the Dionysian Empire," 337–53; *pace* Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 42 and 92; and Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 153, 161, 163.

addition to the general observation (common in the *Philippica*) that moral incontinence eventually brings about destruction, it is likely Theopompus intended a contrast between the dissolute Dionysius the Younger and the Elder Dionysius, who, like the Athenian demagogues and Philip himself, exercised political control through his corruption of others (F 134). This distinction between those who maintain power through their corruption of others and those who are rendered ineffectual by their own indulgence is present throughout the *Philippica*.<sup>90</sup>

As the preceding discussion has shown, Theopompus did not intend his digressions to be merely entertaining diversions but rather an integral part of the moral and political thread running through the *Philippica*. A passage in Dionysius of Halicarnassus offers some support for this view, for he tells us (*Epistula ad Pompeium* 6.4 = T 20a) Theopompus included in his work anything wondrous or incredible that happened on land or sea, not just for entertainment (ψυχαγωγία), but to encompass all practical benefit (ὄφελεία). Like Herodotus before him, Theopompus realized the most effective method of offering instruction was through a colorful anecdote.

Therefore, he also uses anecdotes on a smaller scale to expand and illuminate the important themes of the *Philippica*. On the authority of Strabo (1.2.35 = F 381), Theopompus says he will tell stories better than Herodotus, Ctesias, Hellanicus, and the authors of *Indica*.<sup>91</sup> This judgment is borne out by the testimonies of later writers, such as Cicero (*De legibus* 1.5 = T 26a), who refers to Theopompus's countless stories (*innumerabiles fabulae*), and Aelian (*Varia Historia* 3.18 = T 26b), who calls Theopompus a wonderful storyteller (δεινὸς μυθολόγος). An example of Theopompus's skill in storytelling is to be found in a long paraphrase by Prophyry (*De Abstemtia* 2.16 = F 344). It concerns a certain rich Magnesian who was accustomed to making large sacrifices to the

90. H. D. Westlake (review of Shrimpton's *Theopompus the Historian* in *CR* n.s., 42 [1992]: 32–34) comments (33): “A distinction seems to be detectable between cads, who merely lacked self-control, and supercads, like Philip, who were aggressively vicious and corrupted others.”

91. “Theopompus fully acknowledges it (the inclusion of myths in histories), saying that he would tell stories better than Herodotus, Ctesias, Hellanicus, and the authors of *Indica*” (Θεόπομπος δὲ ἐξομολογεῖται φήσας, ὅτι καὶ μύθους ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις ἐρεῖ κρεῖττον ἢ ὡς Ἡρόδοτος καὶ Κτησίας καὶ Ἑλλάνικος καὶ οἱ τὰ Ἰνδικὰ συγγράψαντες). Flower (*Theopompus of Chios*, 34–35), however, takes the antecedent of κρεῖττον as ἐξομολογεῖται rather than ἐρεῖ, and suggests that Strabo praises Theopompus's express acknowledgment of the inclusion of stories in his work rather than his storytelling ability. Although the translators of both the Loeb and the Budé edition offer similar translations, this does seem a rather strained rendering of the Greek.

gods. He went to consult the Delphic oracle (and this may be the hook to connect this fragment, which is without book number, to the rest of the *Philippica*—it may even come from the *Thaumasias* digression to illustrate the behavior of those who are truly pious) and asked who honored the god the best (expecting to be named himself, naturally). He was dumbfounded when the Pythia replied it was a certain Clearchus, an Arcadian, and he made a journey to Arcadia to find out what exactly this man did to please the gods so. Clearchus, a man of humble means, explained he took special care to honor the gods with what he had. The moral lesson Theopompus wished to drive home in this story is clear: the gods prefer sincere piety to an ostentatious display. As far as can be ascertained from Porphyry's paraphrase, his narrative in both nature and theme had a Herodotean ring.<sup>92</sup> Like Herodotus, many of whose anecdotes contain profound insight, often with a cautionary overtone, into the human condition, Theopompus uses anecdotes to shed light on some of the key themes of his *Philippica*, but with a more overtly moralizing agenda.

Another way Theopompus could draw attention to a particular moral point was by the use of rhetorical devices, which is not surprising in view of his oratorical training and expertise.<sup>93</sup> One of the ways in which this rhetorical tendency manifests itself is in wordplay. The most famous example of Theopompus's use of wordplay is his long invective against Philip (F 225) in book 49 of the *Philippica*, which occurs on the eve of Philip's final struggle against the Greek city-states. Demetrius (*De elocutione* 247 = T 44) criticizes Theopompus for his use of forced antithesis and cites the following portion of the passage for an example of how stylistic artificiality can destroy the intended force of a statement: "Although they were man-slayers by nature, they were man-fornicators by habit" (ἀνδροφόνοι δὲ τὴν φύσιν ὄντες ἀνδρόπορνοὶ τὴν τρόπον ἦσαν). Demetrius proceeds to explain how attention is forced upon the affectation of the passage, so that the readers' ire is not aroused against Philip and his followers. He must have considered this particular example of wordplay exceptionally grotesque, because he cites it in another section of the *De elocutione* (27 = F 225bc) along with a second example from the same diatribe against Philip:

92. Cf. Croesus's questioning of Solon (1.30–37) and similar disappointment in the answer he receives.

93. A (still) useful review of the ancient literary critics on Theopompus's style remains that of W. Rhys Roberts ("Theopompus in the Greek Literary Critics," *CR* 22 [1908]: 118–22), the ostensible purpose of which was to show (which it does very successfully) that the somewhat dry *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* cannot be from the pen of the moralizing and rhetorical Theopompus.

“And they were called companions, but they were actually harlots” (καὶ ἐκαλοῦντο μὲν ἑταῖροι, ἦσαν δὲ ἑταῖραι). Although Demetrius believes such artifices impair the vigor of the sentiment, nevertheless it is clear that Theopompus’s use of wordplay to call attention to the degeneracy of Philip and his followers had its desired effect, for two other authorities cite these two “puns” in their fuller passages of invective against Philip derived from Theopompus (Polybius 8.11.11–12 = F 225a and Athenaeus 6.26of = F 225b). Further wordplay on *hetairoi* is to be found elsewhere in the *Philippica*, for in book 45 Theopompus censures the Athenian Chares for bringing with him on campaign flute girls, harp girls, and foot-soldier girlfriends (πεζαὶ ἑταῖραι) (Athenaeus 12.532b = F 213), which seems a satirical jibe against Philip and his *pezhetairoi*.<sup>94</sup> Such wordplay is of course reminiscent of Gorgias, as is Theopompus’s use of antithesis, which occurs not only in these passages but also in the rhetorical question in F 225 a and b (very similar to a passage in Gorgias’s *Epitaphios*, as we have just seen). Moreover, Demetrius (*De elocutione* 250) criticizes Demosthenes, in close association with Theopompus, for the same fault of excessive antithesis in the famous “you performed initiations; I received them” (ἐτέλεις, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐτελούμην) passage of the *De corona* (18.265). This indicates that this was an aspect of his rhetoric for which Theopompus was renowned.

Another rhetorical feature of Theopompus’s work is irony, some of which has been taken at face value by ancient and modern scholars alike. For example, Longinus (περὶ ὕψους 43.1–2 = T 42 and F 263) does not recognize the irony contained in Theopompus’s description of the Persian king’s invasion of Egypt and criticizes it for the contrast of its hyperbolic praise with its meager conclusion. He complains that Theopompus failed to produce a tribute to the enormous wealth and power of the Persian king; instead of going from the humble to the sublime, he made the reverse progression. Following an impressive description of the beautiful and expensive goods of the Persian king, Theopompus proceeded to list the enormous numbers of sacks of onions and other condiments, concluding with a hyperbolic portrayal of the heaps of salt meat that stood so high travelers mistook them for cliffs or hills. Instead of being meant as a serious tribute, this passage is an ironic attempt to deflate the pomp and circumstance of the Persian king.<sup>95</sup>

94. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 2, 705 n. 4 (in an appendix that helpfully traces the origin of the *pezhetairoi* 705–9).

95. Theopompus’s use of irony in this passage was first recognized by Gilbert Murray, “Theopompus, or the Cynic as Historian,” *Greek Studies* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946), 149–70, at 164–65.

A more problematic passage is Polybius's criticism of Theopompus for contradicting himself (8.12.1 = T 19). According to Polybius (8.11.1 = F 27), Theopompus states in his proemium that he undertook to write the *Philippica* because Europe had never before brought forth such a man as Philip, the son of Amyntas (διὰ τὸ μηδέποτε τὴν Εὐρώπην ἐνηνοχέειν τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα παράπαν οἷον τὸν Ἀμύντου Φίλιππον). Despite this claim, Theopompus immediately after this statement proceeds to censure Philip for his dissolute life at every possible opportunity. This apparent discrepancy, however, exists only as the result of Polybius's misunderstanding of the word "such" (τοιοῦτος). It is not praise but rather an ironical tribute to Philip in view of the invective that is to follow, covering the whole of the *Philippica* and the entirety of Philip's career. Indeed Europe had never brought forth such a man as Philip—that is to say, never one who was unprincipled and dissolute on this scale!<sup>96</sup> Irony is the only way to reconcile Theopompus's presentation of Philip's brilliant career (after all, Philip V of Macedon found enough material to excerpt sixteen books worth) with the condemnation of his character. Furthermore, as we have seen, Theopompus was fond of puns and double entendres.<sup>97</sup>

Unlike Theopompus's use of other literary devices, the role of speeches in his historical works is not well documented in either the *testimonia* or the fragments. Therefore, it is not easy to determine what use Theopompus made of them for moral purposes, although his rhetorical training and experience indicate they played at least some role in his histories. Fortunately, however, Didymus in his commentary on Demosthenes (14.52 = F 164 and 8.58 = F 166) has preserved portions of two speeches from the *Philippica*, concerning events around the time of the Peace of Philocrates. The first quotation (F 164) is attributed to book 26 of the *Philippica* and puts words into the mouth of Philocrates himself. Philocrates argues for peace on the grounds that Athens can expect no help against Philip from outside; indeed many of the other city-states are hostile. The second fragment (F 166),

96. This interpretation of τοιοῦτος was first suggested by Murray ("Theopompus, or the Cynic as Historian," 164–65) and developed by W. Robert Connor ("History without Heroes," *GRBS* 8 [1967]: 133–54, at 137–39), and has proven extremely influential (see, e.g., Gordon Shrimpton, "Theopompus' Treatment of Philip in the *Philippica*," *Phoenix* 31 [1977]: 123–44 [with some reservations]; R. Lane Fox, "Theopompus of Chios and the Greek World 411–322 B.C." in *Chios*, ed. John Boardman and C. E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson [Oxford: Clarendon, 1986], 105–20, at 114–15; and Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, esp. 98–104). Nevertheless, it is not universally accepted; see, e.g., Bruce, "Theopompus and Greek Historiography," 94–96; and Hammond, "The Sources of Justin," 503 and n. 24.

97. Cf. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 115–20.

which Didymus places in book 27, appears to be a reply to Philocrates given by Aristophon, who objects to the proposed peace in highly rhetorical terms. Athens would be cowardly to accept the peace and abandon Amphipolis, given her strength in allies, triremes, and annual revenue. The style of these speeches is un-Thucydidean, flowing with an easy grace, unlike the convoluted expression of Thucydides in his speeches.<sup>98</sup> Their function, however, is Thucydidean,<sup>99</sup> as these speeches serve to reinforce the sentiments expressed in the diatribe against Athenian foreign policy in book 25.<sup>100</sup> The digression debunking Athens's glorious claims in the preceding chapter of the *Philippica* gives the reasons for Athens's unpopularity as understood (correctly) by Philocrates and shows up Aristophon's grandiose braggadocio as no more than empty words. Thus, it seems, Theopompus uses the speeches of Philocrates and Aristophon to reinforce his own moral and political opinions.

Plutarch (*Præcepta rei publicæ gerendæ* 803a–b = T 33) comments that oratory is appropriate in historical writings for politicians and generals when they must persuade the citizens or exhort their armies, but criticizes Theopompus (along with Ephorus and Anaximenes) for the unsuitability of sentiments he places in the mouths of generals addressing their armies. As was the case with Ephorus, it is likely Plutarch did not consider the commanders' harangues in Theopompus's historical work to be good fictive oratory because they contained mostly trite moral sentiments.

The question of whether or not Theopompus propounds a specific political program in the *Philippica* is one that has long been under debate, especially given the problematic question of his view of Philip. Some have argued Theopompus approved of Sparta's actions at the beginning of the fourth century and then, after the collapse of the Spartan attempt at empire, turned to Philip as the object of his admiration, either through panhellenism, a concept he had inherited from Isocrates,<sup>101</sup> or through a desire to return to strict order and a hierarchical society.<sup>102</sup>

There is little support, however, for the suggestion that Theopompus was favorable toward fourth-century Sparta. One rather tenuous piece of evidence is Photius's statement that Theopompus's father was exiled from

98. Cicero (*Brutus* 66 = T 36) says that this ease of expression was characteristic of Theopompus's speeches in general.

99. See Bruce, "Theopompus and Greek Historiography," 106.

100. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 84–85.

101. Kurt von Fritz, "The Historian Theopompus," *AHR* 46 (1941): 765–87.

102. Momigliano, "Teopompo," 230–42 and 335–53.

Chios for “laconizing” (T 2), although it is an inappropriate conclusion to infer that the son held the same beliefs as the father. Second, and more important, is the fact that Theopompus’s approval of Lysander (FF 20 and 333) and Agesilaus (FF 22 and 106–7) extends only to their personal virtues, without reference to their politics. In the former’s case, the only extant reference in the *Hellenica* to the Spartan empire uses the word *tyranny* (τυραννίς) to describe the regime of the Thirty at Athens, instituted by Lysander (F 5). Plutarch (*Lysander* 13.5) attributes to Theopompus “the comic poet” the comparison of Spartans to tavern-women because they gave the Greeks a taste of freedom and then dashed the wine with vinegar since Lysander would not allow the people to govern their affairs but put the cities into the hands of oligarchs. Given the close resemblance between this passage and the one from the *Miscellanies* of the Byzantine scholar Theodorus Metochites attributed to Theopompus the historian, it is possible that this is a genuine fragment of the historian.<sup>103</sup> Even if this statement cannot be definitely attributed to our Theopompus, the *Hellenica* passage (F 5) reveals that he did not approve of Lysander’s political actions, even if he did admire his personal virtues. Similarly, the only passage that could be construed to imply approval of Agesilaus’s political actions is quoted by Plutarch (*Agesilaus* 10.9–10 = F 321) in which the Spartan king is described as “the greatest and most illustrious living man,” although he prided himself more (φρονεῖν μείζον) on his virtue than on his leadership. Two more quotations from Plutarch (*Agesilaus* 31.1 and 32.13 = FF 322 and 323), however, show the progressive decline of Agesilaus from this summit to bribing his enemies to do what they had intended all along.<sup>104</sup> Thus, Theopompus may have approved of some of the personal qualities of Lysander and Agesilaus, especially their self-control over temptation, but there is no evidence for approval of their political policies.

It is important to note that Theopompus’s references to individual Spartans of the mid-fourth century are less than complimentary. He censures two Spartan leaders, Pharax and Archidamus, for their un-Spartan and immoral conduct (Athenaeus 12.536b–c and c–d = FF 192 and 232). Pharax, Theopompus remarks, behaved in so depraved a manner that he was mistaken for a Sicilian (F 192)! Theopompus is not entirely

103. I. A. F. Bruce, “Theopompus, Lysander and the Spartan Empire,” *AHB* 1 (1987): 1–5.

104. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 51.

favorable toward the fourth-century Spartans as a whole, either. Photius, in his summary of the twelfth book of the *Philippica* (F 103), describes the behavior of the Spartans just after the King's Peace as presumptuous (ὑπέρογκα φρονεῖν). Therefore, it is clear that Theopompus does not approve of the Sparta of his day. Nevertheless, he does praise individual Spartans, such as Lysander and Agesilaus, when they adhere to the traditional, simple, austere Spartan way of life. It seems likely that Theopompus approved of the earlier Spartan system, before the Spartans began actively to seek empire at the end of the fifth century, when the corruption engendered by imperialism manifested itself in the introduction of coined money (F 332). Such a viewpoint would certainly put him in good company among fourth-century intellectuals, for, as we have seen, both Xenophon and Ephorus also held this view.

As for Theopompus's alleged panhellenism, there is no expression of any approval of the concept in the extant portions of his historical works.<sup>105</sup> Furthermore, even if Theopompus was a pupil of Isocrates, it does not necessarily follow that he parroted all of his views, especially inasmuch as the ancient authorities attribute to Isocrates an influence on Theopompus's style (TT 5a, 20a and b, 37, and 38) but say nothing of content. Like Ephorus, Theopompus likely derived the moral basis of his history from Isocrates but distanced himself from some of the Athenian's political statements, as we see especially in his condemnation of Athens's imperial past (FF 153–55), which Isocrates so roundly praises throughout his *Panegyricus*.

Given Theopompus's approval of the traditional Spartan system of government and his disapproval of the fifth-century Athenian democracy, it is not surprising that he appears to dislike democracy as a whole. Notably, he denounces the democratic Byzantines for their dissolute lifestyle and corruption of the Chalcedonians by bringing them into the democratic government (F 62). As Theopompus indicates both here and elsewhere (FF 85–100 and 213), the chief weakness of the democratic system of government is that it is liable to corruption by demagogues, which results in the indolence and dissipation of the citizen body, a view similar to Plato in the *Gorgias* (515a–519c).

Nevertheless, Theopompus did not reserve his disapproval for democracy alone. He has nothing but censure for the equally corrupt lifestyles flourishing under monarchy (see the many fragments relating to Philip),

---

105. See now Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 83–90.

tyranny (see the many fragments relating to the Sicilian tyrant house, among others), and even oligarchy (see, for example, Hegesilochus of Rhodes of F 121), despite his apparent approval of the traditional Spartan system of government. For Theopompus, it seems, the central political problem is that power corrupts. Monarchy, tyranny, and other forms of autocratic rule are only too open to abuse of power, as are democracies, for it is terribly easy to corrupt the masses. Although of course there are exceptions, oligarchy seems the system of government least liable to corruption in Theopompus's *Philippica*.<sup>106</sup> It is clear, therefore, that Theopompus did indeed have a political program,<sup>107</sup> although it is somewhat difficult to discern, as he tends to denounce the way in which certain people or states abuse the power they hold as the result of any given political system, instead of offering criticism of the system itself.

The central question is what Theopompus thought of Philip himself. As we have seen above, the only way to reconcile Theopompus's juxtaposition of the military success of the Macedonian king, arguably the single most important political figure of his lifetime, with his emphasis on his corrupt morals is to understand the reference to Philip as "such a man" (τοιούτου) in the opening section of the work as ironic. Interestingly, Theopompus and Demosthenes, both of whom spent time at the Macedonian court,<sup>108</sup> portray Philip as dissolute and licentious, and as encouraging those around him to join in his debauchery.<sup>109</sup> The similarity of the portraits of Philip in Theopompus and Demosthenes does not mean they are not exaggerated, for both contain many of the standard *topoi* of invective.<sup>110</sup> Nevertheless, the Macedonian court was in fact notorious for heavy drinking and unrestrained behavior,<sup>111</sup> and so there is the ring of truth behind the accounts of both the historian and the orator. It is important to

106. See also Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 63–97.

107. Pace Murray, "Theopompus of Chios, or the Cynic as Historian," 149–70; Connor, "History without Heroes," 133–54; and Lane Fox, "Theopompus of Chios," 105–20.

108. Demosthenes was on the infamous peace embassy of 346. Speusippus's *Letter to Philip* (T 7) tells us that Theopompus slandered Plato to the Macedonian court. Minor M. Markle III ("Support of Athenian Intellectuals for Philip: A Study of Isocrates' *Philippus* and Speusippus' *Letter to Philip*," *JHS* 96 [1976]: 80–99, at 93 and n. 42) dates his visit to 343/2, when Philip was considering the choice of tutor for Alexander; possibly Theopompus was a candidate for the position (Lane Fox, "Theopompus of Chios," 112, and Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian*, 6–10).

109. Cf. FF 27, 224, 225, 236 with Demosthenes, 2.18–19.

110. As enumerated by Wilhelm Süß, *Ethos: Studien zur älteren griechischen Rhetorik* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1910), 247–54.

111. As noted by Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 109–11.

note that there is a clear distinction in the *Philippica* between those who exert political control by their corruption of others, and those who are rendered ineffectual by their own indulgence. Michael Flower has recently suggested that Theopompus looked for an explanation of Philip's remarkable success in the decadence of contemporary Greece.<sup>112</sup> Certainly Philip's enervation of his opponents plays a role in his success; yet it is not a sufficient explanation, because he shares in the same vices.<sup>113</sup>

The key to the matter may lie in a comment surviving from one of the final books of the *Hellenica*, where Theopompus states that Philip was lucky in every respect (καὶ εὐτυχῆσαι πάντα Φίλιππον) (F 237a).<sup>114</sup> Plutarch (*Moralia* 856b–c) notes that a common method for historians to detract from success was to attribute it to good luck rather than the subject's own virtue. It certainly seems as though Theopompus went out of his way to deny that Philip's astounding success arose out of any positive character traits. Rather, Theopompus is interested in the link between imperialism and corruption, of which Philip represented the culmination, although parallel examples could be found in the fifth- and fourth-century Athenian demagogues and the Syracusan tyrants, which is the device that anchors the historical digressions to the treatment of Philip himself. It is even possible that Theopompus considered military success to be the evidence of depravity, rather than the outcome of moral superiority.

The question remains of the extent to which Theopompus misrepresented the past for moralizing purposes in his *Philippica*. In general, the *Philippica* was a work that was highly personal in nature, designed to interpret contemporary history in the light of Theopompus's own moral and political viewpoint. Influenced by his background in oratory, Theopompus often uses excessive language and emphasizes, perhaps even exaggerates, the more sensational elements of that of which he disapproved. His unwillingness to respect accepted tradition as fact and his tendency to choose the more disreputable alternative to point a moral lesson may detract from the accuracy of his interpretation of the events of his time. Furthermore, he often subordinates the true political motivations of historical figures to their alleged desire to corrupt others, as is evident from his discussion of the Athenian demagogues, the Syracusan tyrants, and, of

112. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios*, 66, 98, 116–35.

113. Paul Pédech, *Trois historiens méconnus: Théopompe—Duris—Phylarche* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1989), 249.

114. I am grateful to one of the referees for drawing this passage to my attention and focusing my thought in this direction.

course, Philip himself. In his desire to present a non-panegyric version of Philip's reign (perhaps in conscious opposition to writers such as Callisthenes, who wrote with the purpose of glorifying their Macedonian patrons), Theopompus appears to have emphasized the more debauched side of life at the Macedonian court. Furthermore, his often violently expressed disapproval is not directed at Philip because of any lack of political or military ability (at least in our extant fragments), but rather on the moral grounds of his corrupting influence. In spite of the ways in which he misrepresents history to provide moral instruction, Theopompus's *Philippica* would have provided a salutary counterbalance to contemporary writers glorifying the Macedonian court, for he did have a gift for discerning ulterior motives behind apparently generous gestures, and he was not afraid to speak his mind.

Like Ephorus, Theopompus was a product of his time. His insistence on piety and self-control in particular throughout the extant fragments reflects the importance of these moral virtues among the literate elite in the fourth century, although others, such as justice and valor, although more prominent in Ephorus, are less evident in Theopompus. He seems even more influenced than Ephorus by the techniques of rhetoric, and we have seen several specific instances where a nod is made to Gorgias, particularly in the use of antithesis and wordplay. It is also no coincidence that his techniques on occasion are similar to those of his contemporary Demosthenes. Like Ephorus, it is probable that Theopompus derived his use of paradeigmata for moral improvement from Isocrates. Of course, Theopompus's political views differ from those of the Athenian. In his opinion of the corruption of the Athenian democracy, Theopompus is closer to Plato, while his apparent approval of pre-imperialistic Sparta appears similar to that of Xenophon and Ephorus. In spite of these intellectual influences, Theopompus's *Philippica* was unique (not least in its apparent inversion of the traditional equation of moral virtue with military success), coming as it did at the end of an era when individuals could speak their minds.