

Notes and Documents

The New Greek Historical Fragment

Attributed to Theopompus or Cratippus

It may be taken as granted that the papyrus recently published by Drs. Grenfell and Hunt¹ does not contain a portion of the universal history written by Ephorus, and that the question for discussion in connexion with its authorship is whether or not the work should be attributed to the pen of Theopompus. This question has been answered, according to the editors, in the affirmative by Professors Eduard Meyer and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, and others, as well as by the editors themselves; but in the negative by other scholars, among them Friedrich Blass, Professor Bury, and Mr. E. M. Walker. In the present paper I desire to set forth the grounds on which the affirmative answer seems to me to be erroneous.

The unanimous verdict of antiquity upon Theopompus has been brilliantly worded by Lucian² as follows:

Praise and censure should be sparing, cautious, avoiding hyper-criticism, and producing proofs, always brief, and never intrusive, historical characters are not prisoners on trial. Without these precautions you will share the ill name of Theopompus, who delights in flinging accusations broadcast, makes a business of the thing in fact, and of himself rather a public prosecutor than an historian.

Nothing could be more unlike the procedure of our author (whom, following the example of the editors, I shall call P); despite the opportunities for pungent criticism presented by the behaviour of the extreme democrats at Athens, the democratic conspirators at Rhodes, the anti-Spartan party at Thebes, he pursues the even tenor of his way with an almost inhuman calm. For instance, he describes the murders which accompanied the suppression of the Rhodian oligarchy without adding a line of comment, and permits his own sympathies—for he has sympathies, and they are anything but democratic—to find no expression except in the incidental reference to the conspirators *αἱ οἱ τὴν σφαγὴν ἐξεργασάμενοι*.

¹ *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, v. 110-242.

² Πῶς δεῖ λέτ. *συγγ.* 50, tr. H. Fowler.

This is surely not Theopompus, who, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus,

διαλλάττει τῆς Ἰσοκράτειου (λέξεως) κατὰ τὴν πικρότητα καὶ τὸν τόνον ἐπ' ἐνέων, ὅταν ἐπιτρέψῃ τοῖς πάθουσι, μάλιστα δ' ὅταν δουδίῃ πόλεις ἢ στρατηγοῖς πονηρὰ βουλευόμενα καὶ πράξεις ἀδίκους· πολλὰ γὰρ ἐν τοῦτοις.²

It is true that Boeckh, Riese, and others have defended Theopompus with great energy, and shown that he, as a rule, censures where censure is deserved; but the point is that he does censure, and censure with bitterness, whereas P does not.

Nor is this the only leading characteristic of Theopompus which receives no illustration from our papyrus. Dionysius tells us⁴ that philosophic reflexions permeated his whole composition and produced beautiful disquisitions on justice, piety, and the other virtues; but not the faintest trace of such a tendency appears in P. Again, we are told⁵ that the most characteristic feature of his work, in which he surpasses all other historians, is that in connexion with every event he not only sees and relates τὰ φανερά τοῖς πολλοῖς, but he also investigates τὰ ἀφανεῖς αἰτίας of the events and τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς of the doers, and reveals τὰ μυστήρια τῆς τε δοκούσης ἀρετῆς καὶ τῆς ἀγνοουμένης κακίας: in fact the critic declares that his scrutiny of men's souls is quite on a par with that of the judges in hell. But it is precisely in this respect that P falls short of greatness as an historian, for each of his attempts at analysis of motive is superficial and unconvincing. Nothing, for instance, could be feebler than his effort to explain the dislike of Sparta which came so quickly to a head in the other states after the downfall of Athens. Consider the poverty of such an explanation as--

ἔμυσον γὰρ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τοῖς ἐναντίοις τῶν πολιτῶν αὐτοῖς ἐχρῶντο φίλοι.

This lack of insight is particularly striking when he comes to deal with the change in the attitude of Thebes towards Sparta and Athens; he thinks that he has made all clear by informing us that the anti-Spartan party gained the upper hand, which in fact is no better than telling us that Thebes became anti-Spartan because she became anti-Spartan; and, not content with this, he adds another bit of profound political wisdom, to the effect that the philo-Athenian party at Thebes were not animated in their measures by a disinterested love of the Athenian democracy. Finally, our author's lack of penetration is also illustrated by his attempt to explain the outbreak of the Boeotian war in 395 B.C., which I hope to discuss on another occasion.

² *Ad Pomp.* p. 786.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 786.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 784.

A third striking point of difference between P and Theopompus emerges in regard to their digressions. Speaking of the latter writer, Dionysius says—

ἴσθι δὲ ἃ καὶ κατὰ τὸν πραγματικὸν τόπον ἀμαρτάνει, καὶ μάλιστα κατὰ τὰς παρεμβολάς· ὅτε γὰρ ἀναγκαῖαί τινες αὐτῶν οὐτ' ἐν καιρῷ γεινόμεναι, πολὺ δὲ τὸ παιδιῶδες ἐμφαίνουσαι· ἐν αἷς ἴσθι καὶ τὰ περὶ Σιληνοῦ τοῦ φαίετος ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ δράκοντος τοῦ ἱεραυμαχίσσαντος πρὸς τὴν τρέψη καὶ ἄλλα τοῖσι οὐκ ὀλίγα ὄμοια.⁶

The extent of the digressions thus characterised is shown by the story, preserved in Photius,⁷ that Philip V reduced the fifty-eight books of the *Philippica* to sixteen by the simple expedient of omitting them. The digressions in P however are of a totally different character, being eminently brief and apposite. The first, which describes the exploits of Timolaus the Corinthian against Athens in the Decesean war, occupies only ten lines of the papyrus, and is given in the compass of a single sentence; while it is emphatically ἐν καιρῷ as illustrating the change in men's tempers towards Sparta by the case of this prominent statesman, who was once her active friend. Those other digressions, again, which deal with the constitution and prosperity of Boeotia at the beginning of the fourth century hardly even deserve the name. I should describe them rather as passages inserted at the behest of a true historic genius which saw how indispensable they were for a perfect comprehension of the trend of events and the interaction of parties. Hence I take a view precisely the opposite to that held by the editors, who declare these passages to be 'seldom very relevant' and 'serious interruptions to the narrative.'⁸

We come now to the question of style. It is acknowledged that P cannot be Theopompus, if the style of the latter's *Hellenica* resembled that of his *Philippica*; and, as the editors admit, 'the ancient critics draw no distinction between the characteristics of the *Hell.* and *Phil.*'⁹ Hence it is necessary to maintain that the ancient critics overlooked the fact that the two great historical works of Theopompus were written in two totally different styles, and were marked by two totally different sets of characteristics. This amazing contention involves another—namely, that there was between the composition of the two works an appreciable lapse of time, during which the development from the one style to the other took place. And this raises the question of date, to which I proceed.

A work narrating the events of the year 395 B.C. with such a wealth of detail and such an intimate acquaintance with party politics as our papyrus displays can only, I suggest, have been composed by one who was a contemporary, and a contemporary possessing

⁶ *Op. cit.* p. 787.

⁷ P. 121.

⁸ *Cod.* 176, p. 121.

⁹ P. 129.

mature powers of observation. Furthermore, the inability of our author to go behind the strife of parties and grasp the true causes of events, to which allusion has already been made, can best be explained, in an historian of P's calibre, by the consideration that the nearness of the events prohibited him from attaining to a right perspective. Now, Theopompus was not born before 380 (and this indeed by itself, I venture to think, is fatal to his identification with P), nor did he take up the composition of historical works at a remarkably early age; cf. Quintilian, x. i. 74:

Theopompus his proximus ut in historia praedictis minor, its oratori magis similis, ut qui, antequam est ad hoc opus sollicitatus, diu fuerit orator.

We find him in 350 competing for the prize offered by Queen Artemisia for the finest speech delivered in honour of her dead husband; he himself informs us that he had visited and displayed his power as an orator in every city of importance, and that his published speeches amounted to 20,000 lines. Furthermore, both Dionysius¹⁰ and Athenaeus¹¹ state that he spent a large amount of money in collecting material, and this in turn implies a considerable space of time. Unless we are prepared to ignore all these statements we cannot assign an earlier date for his period of historical activity than 346, when he was thirty-four—perhaps, indeed, only thirty—years of age. But, on the other hand, it is certain that he had published at least a portion of the *Hellenica* before 342, for about that date Speusippus wrote a letter to King Philip, in which these words occurred:

Ἰν' οὗν Θεόπομπος παύσῃται τραχὺς ὢν, κέλευσον Ἀντίπατρον (another historian of the day) παραναγγῶσαι τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν πράξεων αὐτῆ, καὶ γνώσεται Θεόπομπος δικαίως μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων ἐξαλειφόμενος, ἀδίκως δὲ τῆς παρὰ σοῦ χορηγίας τυγχάνων.

This yields us another very important piece of information. It lets us know that Theopompus was not merely at the Macedonian court in 342, but also that he was in receipt of support from the king. There must have been some reason, and I am convinced that the explanation is to be found in the fact that Theopompus had already commenced the composition of the *Philippica*, and had published the preface in which, as it first appeared, he declared that Europe had never produced such a man as Philip son of Amyntas. The assumption of a marked interval, in which Theopompus changed from a cold, impartial, laborious investigator and dry narrator of facts to a furious and fiery *ensor morum* with a special *penchant* for the fabulous, becomes impossible of acceptance, and we are compelled to assume in its place a *saltus*, if my theory

¹⁰ *Ad Pomp.* p. 788.

¹¹ *Deipnos.* lii. 65 n.

be correct. It receives strong support from no less an authority than Polybius, who says—

Having undertaken to write a Greek history from the point at which Thucydides left off, when he got near the period of the battle of Leuctra (371 B.C.) and the most splendid exploits of the Greeks, he threw aside Greece and its achievements in the middle of his story, and changing his purpose undertook to write the history of Philip. . . . The aim of his original history was honour, that of his history of Philip was expediency.¹²

I have now given the reasons why I think that it is impossible to attribute our fragment to Theopompus, but before proceeding further I wish to consider the minor arguments on the other side mentioned by the editors. They refer to various linguistic coincidences between the papyrus and the fragments of Theopompus, such as the use of ἀνάγεσθαι, στρίτευμα, μετά for σύν, the historic present, ἔθνος, διακίσθαι, τὸ καλούμενον, παροξύνην, and κατὰροι for δλθειν. Of these only the last is even worth mentioning, and is quite sufficiently explained by the theory that Theopompus pillaged P for his *Hellenica*, just as we know he did Xenophon. As to the others, παροξύνην, for example, occurs five times in Thucydides, eleven times in Isocrates, sixteen times in Demosthenes, four times in Aeschines, and twice in Dinarchus. The editors lay great stress on the fact that, according to Stephanus of Byzantium, the form Καρπασεύς was used by Theopompus (instead of Καρπασιώτης) 'in his 10th book' to denote a citizen of Carpasus, in Cyprus—a form which occurs in P. But apart from the possibility that we have here merely another case of copying there is the important point that Stephanus gives the number of the book but not the work, as he does more than once when referring to the *Philippica*, and again, that Theopompus might have had occasion to mention the Carpasians in the 10th book of that work; besides, Stephanus neither says nor means that Theopompus alone used the form Καρπασεύς. The editors themselves mention the fact that Stephanus quotes Theopompus for another form (*Ἀκραίφνια*), which however was also used by Ephorus.

Blass rejected the view that the author of the fragment was Theopompus, and suggested in his place Cratippus. There is much to be said in favour of this theory. Dionysius tells us¹³ that Cratippus, ὁ συνακμήσας αὐτῷ, wrote a continuation of Thucydides, which, according to Plutarch,¹⁴ went down to the restoration of the Athenian sea power by Conon. In this passage Plutarch is proving the thesis, ἀν ἀνάλης τοὺς πρᾶττοντας οὐχ ἔξει τοὺς γράφοντας, and does so by enumerating the men of action who figure in the pages first of Thucydides, then of Cratippus,

¹² viii 18.

¹³ *De Thuc.* 16.

¹⁴ *De Glor. Ath.* p. 345 x.

then of Xenophon. It is evident that Cratippus was an historian for whom Plutarch felt a great respect; and I conceive that it would be a serious obstacle to his identification with P if the editors were correct in stating that Plutarch 'ignores the divergences between P and Xenophon with regard to Agesilaus's campaigns in 395, and shows practically no trace of connexion with P anywhere' (p. 188). But this is not so. In *Ages.* 10 Plutarch agrees almost verbally with Xenophon in a few points, but follows P against him in two of real importance. These are the description of the tactics employed by Agesilaus, and the statement that Tissaphernes was present at the battle (whereas Xenophon lays stress on his absence). Compare also the words of P: οἱ δὲ (sc. the Persians) κατὰ τὸ πεδῖον ἀτάκτως ἀπηκολούθουν, with those of Plutarch, διέφθειρε (sc. Tissaphernes) πολλοὺς τῶν ἀτάκτως τὸ πεδῖον πορθούντων. Again, Dionysius¹³ tells us that Cratippus objected strongly to the speeches inserted by Thucydides in his history. It is significant that no speeches occur in the papyrus, although it describes a meeting of the Athenian *ecclesia*, embassies from Phocis to Sparta and Sparta to Thebes, and an important battle which indirectly resulted in the downfall and death of Tissaphernes—a battle, by the way, being an occasion on which Theopompus was especially prone to aid generals with his own powers of rhetorical composition.¹⁴

The date of Cratippus is fixed beyond question by the references in Dionysius and Plutarch, which show that he was junior to Thucydides and senior to Xenophon. I have indicated above the reason why I believe that P was a man of mature powers in 395 B.C.; nor is there any reason whatever for supposing that his work was published at any great distance from the battle of Cnidus in 394. I am unable even to guess why the editors say that 'the style of P hardly suggests so early a date as 375-350.' To me it suggests, in its bald simplicity and freedom from rhetorical colouring, the earliest possible date that the events with which it deals will permit us to assign. As to the expression *συνακμάσας*, which may seem to contradict Plutarch, I need only quote the words of Theopompus as given by Photius—*συνακμάσαι δὲ λέγει αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν Ἰσοκράτει*—though he was at least fifty-six years the younger of the two. If this view of the date be correct it removes two difficulties which might be felt in identifying P with Cratippus. One is the ignorance of Xenophon's work displayed throughout the fragment. This of course vanishes if the history of Cratippus had been published before that of Xenophon. The other is the circumstance that Cratippus is so little heard of afterwards. This difficulty disappears when we reflect that within two generations two

¹³ *Loc. cit.*¹⁴ *Plut. Mor.* p. 803 x.

new histories were published, covering the same period, and written with an attractiveness of style to which Cratippus, if he be P, could make no claim. The work is in no sense literature; to readers sufficiently familiar with the facts related it would not even be interesting, for its sole merit is its painstaking investigation of detail, and that by itself has never been popular in any age or country. P is an historian of whom it was certain that little would be heard, and the little we should expect to hear of him is precisely what we have heard of Cratippus.

W. A. GOLIGHER.

The Domesday 'Ora.'

THERE would seem to be still considerable doubt felt as to the number of pence in the Domesday *ora* when that term is used without qualification. My attention was called to the matter when Mr. Charles Johnson, of the Public Record Office, was writing the introduction to the Norfolk portion of Domesday for the *Victoria County History* and consulted me on the subject. His own leaning was towards the *ora* of 20 pence, but eventually he adopted the 16 pence unit, giving in a footnote my reasons for its adoption.¹

Just recently Professor Tait, in his valuable introduction to the Shropshire portion of Domesday for the same work, has written—

It may be mentioned, that the frequent appearance both in the 'valets' of manors and the 'renders' of mills and fisheries of sums of 1s. 4d., 2s. 8d., 5s. 4d., 10s. 8d., &c., clearly shows the prevalence alongside the Old English reckoning by pounds of the Danish reckoning by the ounce (*ora*) of 16d. and the mark of 10s. 8d. The *ora*, indeed, is three times mentioned by name, though without indication as to whether it was an ounce of 20d., such as was customary in Worcestershire and elsewhere, or one of 16d.²

It may, therefore, be useful to put together some pieces of evidence which have led me to the belief that the Domesday *ora* (where the term is unqualified) was a customary *ora* of 16d., and was well understood to be such. The *locus classicus* for this usage is the entry on Ickleton, Cambridgeshire, where Domesday Book has *valet xxvii den.*, which the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis* equates by *Haec terra valet ii horas.*³ This equation may doubtless 'be applied to the entry that the 'landgable' of Cambridge was *vii. lib. et ii. oras et duo den.*⁴

When writing on Domesday in *Feudal England* I laid great stress on the equations in these texts as proof that where terms or phrases were used indifferently the scribes can have been in no

¹ *Victoria County Hist. Norfolk*, II. 85. There are several entries of two *oras* in this county.

² *Victoria County Hist. Shropshire*, I.

³ *Inq. Com. Cant.* p. 41.

⁴ D.B. i. 189.