

Theopompos' Treatment of Cimon

W. Robert Connor

ALMOST A CENTURY AGO F. Rühl¹ first called attention to a curious and difficult fragment of Theopompos² in the *Contra Iulianum* of St. Cyril of Alexandria. The fragment, now printed as number 90 in Jacoby's collection, is an attack on the integrity of Cimon, the fifth-century Athenian general. Since Rühl's discovery the fragment has received little serious discussion: it was omitted in the collections of Theopompos made by Schranz and by Grenfell and Hunt,³ only briefly discussed by Jacoby,⁴ applied to other Athenians by Meyer and Wade-Gery,⁵ and dismissed by Rühl himself as part of a "vollständiges Lügensystem"⁶ developed by the Christian authors to denigrate paganism.

More disconcerting is the failure of two important studies of Theopompos to consider the fragment. Both K. von Fritz and A. Momigliano accept the view that Theopompos gave his "permanent approval" to Cimon, "the old-time gentleman, brilliant in war as well as in society, a perfect aristocrat . . . who was finally defeated . . .

¹ F. Rühl, *Die Quellen Plutarchs im Leben des Kimon* (Marburg dissertation 1867).

² *FGrHist* 115 F 90. It has been suggested to me that the large number of iambic feet in the fragment (*infra* page 108) may indicate that the fragment belongs to Theopompos the comic poet, not Theopompos the historian. The fragment, however, accords well with what is known of the digression on the demagogues in the *Philippica*, and has no obvious parallel among the fragments of the comedian.

³ W. Schranz, *Theopomps Philippika* (Frieburg i. B. dissertation 1912); B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia cum Theopompi . . . fragmentis* (Oxford 1909). Both collections are largely based on Müller *FHG*, which appeared before Rühl's work.

⁴ Jacoby's principal objections are that the fragment agrees poorly with fragments 88 and 89 (for which see *infra*, pp. 111–113) and that the context of the fragment contains a few gross errors. Presumably Jacoby had in mind the mention of Cleon as a persecutor of Cimon in the sentence preceding the fragment. Elsewhere it is Pericles who is named as Cimon's persecutor (e.g. Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia* 27.1; Plutarch, *Cimon* 14.5). Κλέωνος for Περικλέους is an easy slip, whether made by Cyril, his source, or his copyist. In any event the preceding sentence reports a separate tradition concerning Cimon and should not prejudice our treatment of the fragment of Theopompos.

⁵ E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* II (Halle 1899) 33 applied it to Themistocles and Anytos; H. T. Wade-Gery, "Two Notes on Theopompos 'Philippika', X" *AJP* 59 (1938) 133 n.9 (*Essays in Greek History* [Oxford 1958] 236 n.3) applies it to Cleon. Such suggestions are appropriate only as a last resort. They can, I believe, be shown to be unnecessary.

⁶ Rühl (*supra* n.1) 22.

because he was not fit for demagogy.”⁷ Theopompos' attitude towards Cimon is not crucial to these studies, but it is important for a proper assessment of the digression on the demagogues in book ten of Theopompos' *Philippica* and of the development of the literary tradition concerning Cimon.

The text of the fragment as printed in Jacoby (*FGrHist* 115 F 90) reads:

γράφει δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ Θεόπομπος, ὡς καὶ
κλεπτίστατος γένοιτό τις καὶ λημμάτων
αἰσχροῦν ἠττώμενος οὐχ ἅπαξ ἐξήλεγκται,
καὶ τὸ τῆς δωροδοκίας μάθημα παρ' αὐτοῦ
5 καὶ πρώτου τοῖς Ἀθήνησι στρατηγοῖς ὄραται
ἐνσκήψαι.

3. ἐλήλεγκται Marcianus 123 6. ἐνσκήψαν Mar-
cianus 123.⁸

It may be translated:

But Theopompos writes concerning him that he both was a most thievish sort of person and was convicted more than once of yielding to opportunities for shameful profit making. And the lesson of bribery from him first of all seems to have dawned on the generals at Athens.

There has been no disagreement over the translation of the fragment. Meyer's version is substantially the same as that

⁷ The quotation is from page 774 of "The Historian Theopompos," *American Historical Review* 46 (1941) 765-787 by K. von Fritz. A similar view is held by A. Momigliano, "La Storia di Eforo e le Elleniche di Teopompo," *Rivista di Filologia* 59 (1931) 350; compare G. Murray, "Theopompos; or, The Cynic as Historian," *Greek Studies* (Oxford 1947) 149-170. The following pages seek to challenge this consensus, but not to obscure the importance of these three works for the understanding of Theopompos. Theopompos' treatment of Cimon plays only a small part in these discussions.

⁸ I have been unable to parallel ὄραω in the medio-passive with an infinitive. The participle ἐνσκήψαν offered by M 123 is perhaps an improvement, since the use of the participle can be paralleled, e.g. by the fourth-century A.D. document in U. Wilcken, *Chrestomathie* (Leipzig 1912) 281 (page 333, lines 36-39):

γίνωσκε ὡς εἴ τι παραλελοιπὼς ὀφθείης . . .
λίτραν χρυσοῦ ταῖς ταμακαῖς ψήφοις δοῦναι
προσταχθήσει.

Compare also POxy 1101 line 22. Nevertheless, ἐνσκήψαι may be defended as an intrusion of a Latin idiom into Cyril's Greek. For Cyril's knowledge of Latin see G. Jouassard's comments and bibliography, s.v. Cyril, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* III 500. The reading does not affect the sense of the fragment.

offered above.⁹ The real difficulty has been that most scholars have not been prepared to believe that Theopompos would have said that Cimon was a most thievish sort and often convicted of financial malpractice. Since most of the traditions of antiquity presented Cimon as an honorable and faithful servant of his country, it seems strange that this charge should be directed against him. There is, however, a strain of criticism among the ancient authors which may help to explain this attack. In chapter 14 of his life of Cimon Plutarch tells of a trial around 463 B.C. in which it was charged that King Alexander had bribed Cimon not to invade Macedon. The facts concerning this trial have recently been clarified by A. E. Raubitschek.¹⁰ In Raubitschek's view, Cimon was in fact pronounced guilty but avoided the death penalty by a counter-proposal for a fine of fifty talents. This version of the trial was perhaps in Theopompos' mind when he imputed a somewhat dishonorable nature to Cimon. Among the "opportunities for shameful profit making" Theopompos may also have included the story that in order to pay a fine that kept him in prison, Cimon gave his sister in marriage to a rich but basely born man.¹¹ There is even the slander that he allowed Elpinice's honor to be the payment of Pericles' political support.¹² Since antiquity's judgment of Cimon was by no means unanimously favorable, there is no *a priori* reason for insisting that Theopompos must have praised him.¹³ In fact, Theopompos' reputation as a severe and bitter critic would suggest the very opposite.

Rühl's principal objection to the fragment is based on his belief that Cyril violently distorted Theopompos' words. Indeed, Rühl would have it believed that Cyril reversed the sense of what Theo-

⁹ Meyer (*supra* n.5) II 33.

¹⁰ A. E. Raubitschek, "Theophrastos on Ostracism," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 19 (1958) 91, n.7. Contrast G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* III.I (Gotha 1897) 255 n.1.

¹¹ Dio Chrysostom 73.6; compare the scholion on Aelius Aristides 46.151, 9. (Dindorf III 515) and George Syncellus, *Chron.* I 478 (ed. Dindorf [Bonn 1829]).

¹² This story goes back to Antisthenes; see Athenaeus 13.589 e. For Antisthenes' importance in Theopompos' work see G. Murray (*supra* n.7) 156 and Diogenes Laertius 6.14.

¹³ In Eupolis' day criticisms were voiced (Eupolis fr. 208 Edmonds), with which Critias apparently agreed (Plutarch, *Cimon* 16.9, fr. 49 in the collection of D. Stephans, *Critias* [Cincinnati dissertation 1939]). Compare, however, *Cimon* 10.5, fr. 7 Stephans. See also the fourth oration ascribed to Andocides, section 33. The hostile tradition continues into late antiquity, indeed into the section immediately preceding fragment 90 in Cyril's *Contra Iulianum*. With this passage compare Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 1.582ff. Theopompos' judgments are normally very severe, as von Fritz (*supra* n.7) 768 observes, "It was the unanimous opinion of antiquity that the most striking feature of his works was the bitterness of his judgments."

pompos wrote.¹⁴ As justification for this surprising assertion, Rühl alleges a proof by Luzac in his *Lectiones Atticae* that in the same book of the *Contra Iulianum* Cyril “geht . . . so weit, den Porphyrios als Autorität für Thatsachen zu citiren, welche dieser nur anführt um sie zu widerlegen.”¹⁵ Luzac, however, neither proves nor professes to prove this. He does indeed attack Cyril and show that he is misleading and self-contradictory in implying that Aristoxenos was an admirer of Socrates. Luzac further argues that in citing Porphyry Cyril leaves out a phrase that many of the tales about Socrates in Porphyry were *πρὸς ἔπαινον αὐτοῦ καὶ ψόγον . . . μεμυθευμένα*.¹⁶ The omission of this important warning about the reliability of Porphyry's stories is unfortunate, but it has not been proven that the omission is a deliberate falsification. It may simply be the result of haplography.¹⁷ Luzac's warnings about Cyril are important, but neither he nor Rühl proves that Cyril drastically misrepresented the sources he quoted. Cyril is an apologist and an ancient; since he is an apologist, he naturally, if not commendably, uses great care in selecting from the authors he quotes; since he is an ancient, he often quotes from memory or a handbook, and often summarizes or adapts his source. However, once these qualifications have been made, it is clear that Cyril correctly represents the sense of most of the passages he quotes. This is confirmed by an examination of the other citations of pagan writers in book six of the *Contra Iulianum*. The passages that can be checked indicate that Cyril quoted with substantial accuracy.¹⁸

¹⁴ “Nichts hindert demnach anzunehmen, dass auch Theopomp an jener Stelle das gerade Gegenheil von dem gesagt habe, was der heilige Mann ihn sagen lässt.” F. Rühl (*supra* n.1) 23.

¹⁵ Rühl (*supra* n.1) 22 referring to J. Luzac, *Lectiones Atticae* (ed. J. O. Sluiter [Leiden 1809]) 287ff.

¹⁶ Cyril, *Contra Iulianum* VI (Migne PG 76, 818c). The full text may be found in St. Theodoret of Cyr, *Graec. aff. cur.* 1.27 (= *FGrHist* 260 F 8):

τούτων δὲ οὕτω σαφημισθέντων, λέγωμεν περὶ τοῦ
Σωκράτους, τὰ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις μνήμης
κατηξιωμένα τὰ μὲν πρὸς ἔπαινον αὐτοῦ καὶ ψόγον
πολλαχῶς ὑπὸ τῶν λογίων ἀνδρῶν μεμυθευμένα
ἐπ' ὀλίγον φυλοκρινούσας.

¹⁷ Cyril's version, which omits *πρὸς ἔπαινον . . . μεμυθευμένα*, could be the result of haplography after *κατηξιωμένα*.

¹⁸ In book 6 there are 17 places where pagan authors whose work is known from other sources are cited. Of these one (Migne PG 76, 785c= Plato, *Symposium* 183b) is taken out of context and used somewhat unfairly. Another (Migne PG 76, 796b) is only partially paralleled in the stated source, Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Ant. Rom.* 2.63 seems to be the source for the first part of the statement, but the last part (*βρέτας δὲ ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδέν*) and the discussion of Pythagoreanism which follows is more closely related to Plutarch, *Numa* 8,

There is, then, no good reason for doubting that Cyril correctly cited Theopompos. On the contrary, if the fragment were the only reference to Cimon among the remains of Theopompos' works, there would probably be little hesitation about according it a place within the digression on the demagogues in the tenth book of the *Philippica*. Its tone accords well with Theopompos' frequent belittling of the great figures and accomplishments of fifth-century Athens.¹⁹ The severity of judgment, the interest in financial matters, especially bribery, agree nicely with what is known about this wide-ranging excursus on the financial recklessness of Euboulos.²⁰ No other figure in the section on the demagogues appears in as favorable a light as, according to Rühl, Cimon did; nothing warrants making Cimon the only exception.²¹

Fragment 90, however, is not Theopompos' only extant discussion of Cimon. The two preceding fragments in Jacoby's collection also deal with him and have been thought inconsistent with fragment 90.²² Even if this charge were true, it would not justify rejecting fragment 90, for it has often been noted that Theopompos' judgments were frequently inconsistent.²³ There is, however, no inconsistency among these fragments. Fragment 88 states that the Athenians recalled Cimon to make a peace with Sparta. For the interpretation of this fragment, especially for the understanding of the chronology it has been thought to imply,²⁴ one would like to have more of the context. The fragment does not explicitly praise Cimon; it does not discuss the means by which the peace was achieved, nor its terms, nor its

and to Varro as quoted in Augustine, *Civ. Dei*. 4.31. In the other 15 cases, Cyril's quotations are close to the sense of the received texts of the authors. To be sure, not all the passages are polemical, but they serve, nonetheless, to indicate the accuracy with which Cyril cited his classical authorities.

¹⁹ For example, fragment 85 states that Themistocles won time for the building of the Athenian city walls by bribing the ephors rather than by a bold and courageous stratagem. Note also in book 25 of the *Philippica* the attacks on the covenant of Plataea (fr. 153) and the famous peace with Persia (fr. 154), on which see now R. Sealey, "Theopompos and Athenian Lies," *JHS* 80 (1960) 194-195.

²⁰ See Wade-Gery (*supra* n.5) especially 131-133 (*Essays* 234-236).

²¹ The comment in fr. 97 that Callicrates was *ἐπιμελής* is not real praise; compare the treatment of Euboulos in frs. 99 and 100. Thucydides, the son of Melesias, is also presented as a demagogue and is said to have fallen from power under suspicion of financial misdealing. See A. E. Raubitschek, "Theopompos on Thucydides the Son of Melesias," *Phoenix* 14 (1960) 81-95.

²² A. W. Gomme attacked this notion in his *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* I 36 n.2.

²³ Polybius 8.1-2. Compare von Fritz (*supra* n.7) 768ff.

²⁴ See A. E. Raubitschek, "Kimon's Zurückberufung," *Historia* 3 (1955) 379-380.

endurance.²⁵ Until one can be more confident about the context from which this fragment comes, it would be rash to insist that it contradicts fragment 90. Theopompos, to be sure, seems to have been an admirer of many features of Spartan life, but the admiration did not necessarily extend to Cimon and every other Lacedaemonian *proxenos*.

Fragment 89 reports that Cimon opened his fields and gardens to the public and gave assistance to the needy. At first one is tempted to conclude that Cimon is being presented as a paragon of altruism and that, therefore, this fragment is inconsistent with fragment 90. However, it has long been recognized that the anecdote is no tribute to a disinterested benevolence²⁶ but rather a characterization of a shrewd and ambitious politician. The crucial part of the fragment is the last sentence—*ἐκ δὴ τούτων ἀπάντων ἠὲδοκίμει καὶ πρῶτος ἦν τῶν πολιτῶν*—which emphasizes the importance of this generosity to Cimon's political success. Although many have seen the correct interpretation of the fragment, it remained for Wade-Gery²⁷ to point out its role in the development of the excursus on the demagogues. Wade-Gery's work has made it clear that Theopompos dated Pericles' introduction of jurymen's pay to the period of his political rivalry with Cimon. In Theopompos' view it was part of Pericles' attempt to match largesses from Cimon's personal fortune with payments from the public purse. Wade-Gery remarks that the "bearing [of fragment 89] on the thesis is clear. What Kimon achieved by personal liberality, his successors had to achieve by *misthos*."²⁸ This need not be a complete condemnation, but it is far from praise of Cimon's altruism.²⁹ Cimon, without doubt, was not the worst of all the demagogues that Theo-

²⁵ Theopompos often shows great skill in transforming an apparently favorable story into an attack on a character with whom he is not in sympathy. Compare *supra* n.19. Perhaps Theopompos may have agreed with Critias' comment that Cimon put Athens' interests behind those of Sparta (Plutarch, *Cimon* 16.9=fr. 49 Stephans). For Theopompos' debt to Critias see Wade-Gery's comment (*supra* n.5) 133 n.9 (*Essays* 236 n.3).

²⁶ This latter view is maintained by T. B. L. Webster in his *Art and Literature in Fourth Century Athens* (London 1956) 97.

²⁷ Wade-Gery (*supra* n.5) 131-134 (*Essays* 235-238). Among those who saw that the fragment emphasized Cimon's demagoguery are L. Holzapfel, *Untersuchungen über die Darstellung der Griechischen Geschichte* (Leipzig 1879) 133; G. Busolt (*supra* n.10) III.1 239 n.4; 255 n.3; G. Lombardo, *Cimone* (Rome 1934) 42. Cf. also *Ath. Pol.* 27.3.

²⁸ Wade-Gery (*supra* n.5) 133 (*Essays* 237).

²⁹ In the *Cimon* Plutarch presents the story as a tribute to Cimon's humane generosity but *Pericles* 9 indicates the importance of the story in the political rivalry between Cimon and Pericles. Wade-Gery (*supra* n.5) 134 (*Essays* 238) rightly points out that the version of the *Pericles* is to be preferred. Plutarch was aware that Cimon's actions had been variously interpreted and in 10.8 stops to criticize: *οἱ δὲ τὰτα κολακείαν ὄχλου καὶ δημαγωγίαν εἶναι διαβάλλοντες*. One might suspect that Theopompos was among this group. Chapter 2

pompos discussed, but fragments 89 and 90 agree in describing him as a demagogue, surely not as “der panhellenische und aristokratische Held des Theopomp.”³⁰

Nor is Theopompos the only one to have treated Cimon as a typical leader of the *demos*. Callicles and Socrates in the *Gorgias* (503c ff; 515d ff) regard him and his father as essentially the same type of politician as Themistocles and Pericles. Even in Plutarch (e.g. *Cimon* 5.4) and Nepos (*Cimon* 2.1) there are traces of a Cimon who was a democrat.³¹ Indeed everything which has been noted about fragment 90 is consistent with the curious version of Athenian political history given in the scholia to Aelius Aristides 46 (Dindorf III 446; new text by Raubitschek in *Phoenix* 14 [1960] 86), in which the influence of Theopompos has been detected.³² In this passage Pericles is said originally to have been the leader of the *oligarchikoi* and Cimon of the *demotikoi*. Although the account is compressed and difficult, it may well preserve the outline of Theopompos' ideas about the politics of the period.

There is, of course, one further objection: if the fragment even approximately indicates Theopompos' views, then Plutarch's attitude to Cimon diverged sharply from Theopompos'. This is the very opposite of Rühl's view, who argued that Plutarch followed Theopompos very closely in the *Cimon*. Rühl's thesis, however, has frequently been attacked, most cogently in L. Holzapfel's *Untersuchungen*.³³ In the form in which it was stated, it can no longer be maintained. For, although there are similarities between Theopompos' account and Plutarch's biography, Rühl's basic premise—that Plutarch followed one and only one main source in each life—is unproven and over-simplified, and has led him to underemphasize the diversity and richness of Plutarch's investigations and the independence of his judgments. That Theopompos was an important source for Plutarch few will deny,³⁴ but that Plutarch followed him slavishly and uncritically is unproven and unlikely.

of the same life indicates that Plutarch may have found many of his sources for the *Cimon* and the *Lucullus* excessively severe.

³⁰ Rühl (*supra* n.1) 19. Compare von Fritz (*supra* n.7) 774; Momigliano (*supra* n.7) 350.

³¹ Compare the comments of A. E. Raubitschek (*supra* n.21) 86.

³² See Raubitschek's discussion (*supra* n.21) 86.

³³ Holzapfel (*supra* n.27) 94f.

³⁴ For Plutarch's direct use of Theopompos see P. von der Muehll, “Direkte Benützung des Ephoros und des Theopomp bei Plutarch,” *MH* 11 (1954) 243-244.

Fragment 90 deserves, then, its place among the fragments of Theopompos. And, with its acceptance, one must be prepared to revise the usual views about Theopompos' attitude towards Cimon. In Theopompos' view Cimon may have been a cut above other demagogues, but he was far from a "Lieblingsheld."³⁵ One need not, however, accept Theopompos' treatment as the full historical truth. Theopompos' attack on Cimon may be a healthy corrective to those who regard Cimon as an oligarch, aristocrat or reactionary, but it need not be thought a balanced assessment. In antiquity Theopompos had a reputation as a *maledicentissimus* and his attacks on Plato (fr. 259) and Themistocles (fr. 85) are as irresponsible as they are well known. The refusal of Plutarch and Nepos to follow every interpretation of Theopompos was probably well justified, and their accounts, despite their late dates, may well give a fairer picture of an honorable and patriotic leader. Theopompos' treatment, on the other hand, fits neatly into the pattern of much of his other work—bitter attacks against all fame and reputation. The words of Dionysius of Halicarnassus accord exactly with what we know of his treatment of Cimon. He had, Dionysius says, the "gift of seeing and stating in each case not only what is obvious to the multitude, but of examining even the hidden motives of actions and actors, and the feelings of the soul . . . and of laying bare all the mysteries of seeming virtue and undiscovered vice."³⁶

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

January, 1963

³⁵ Holzapfel (*supra* n.27) 102.

³⁶ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ad Pompeium* 6, translated and quoted by W. R. Roberts, "Theopompos in the Greek Literary Critics," *CR* 22 (1908) 120.

I owe to the Rev. William J. Malley, S.J., author of a *Preliminary Specimen of a Critical Edition of the Contra Julianum of St. Cyril of Alexandria* (Manila 1959), a number of helpful suggestions as well as the readings of Marcianus 123. A. E. Raubitschek and H. C. Youtie have read and criticized drafts of this paper. Naturally, it should not be assumed that they agree with the views here set forth.