AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

A COMMENTARY ON DEMOSTHENES' *PHILIPPIC* I

With Rhetorical Analyses of *Philippics* II and III

CECIL WOOTEN

A Commentary on Demosthenes' *Philippic* I

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES SERIES

Series Editor
Justina Gregory

Sallust's Bellum Catilinae, Second Edition
J. T. Ramsey

A Commentary on Demosthenes' Philippic *I: With Rhetorical Analyses of* Philippics *II and III*
Cecil Wooten

A Commentary on Demosthenes' *Philippic* I

With Rhetorical Analyses of *Philippics* II and III

Cecil Wooten

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS
2008

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press, Inc., publishes works that further
Oxford University's objective of excellence
in research, scholarship, and education.

Oxford New York
Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in
Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.
198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

www.oup.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Wooten, Cecil W., 1945–
A commentary on Demosthenes' Philippic I:
with rhetorical analyses of Philippics II and III /
Cecil Wooten.
p. cm.
ISBN 978–0–19–533326–8; 978–0–19–533327–5 (pbk.)
1. Demosthenes. Philippicae. I. Title.
PA3950.P6.W66 2008
885′.01—dc22 2007011352

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2
Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

George Alexander Kennedy

magistro atque amico optimo

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

The most recent commentary in English on Demosthenes' *Philippics* appeared in 1907; it has been out of print since the 1960s. In part because of the lack of a modern commentary, what are arguably the finest deliberative speeches from antiquity are not often read these days in American colleges and universities. I hope that the present volume will correct that lack and will encourage more study of Demosthenes. The commentary is aimed at advanced undergraduates and first-year graduate students, and it addresses rhetorical and stylistic matters, historical background, and grammatical issues. In the rhetorical analysis I rely primarily on the theories of ancient rhetoricians, especially Hermogenes, who was particularly interested in Demosthenes. I have prepared a commentary for the *First Philippic* only; for each of the other two speeches I have provided a brief historical introduction, an outline, and an essay emphasizing its differences from *Philippic* I. I have organized the book in this way because it seemed to me that in some courses only one of the speeches, most likely the first, would be read. If students, having already been introduced to Demosthenic language and rhetorical technique and the historical background, then wanted to read the second and third *Philippics*, they could, I felt, manage on their own if provided with some general guidance about structure, argument, and style.

I have chosen not to treat *Philippic* IV. There has always been some controversy about its authenticity, and, in any case, a very thorough commentary appeared in 2002: István Hajdu, *Kommentar zur 4. Philippischen Rede des Demosthenes* (Berlin).

I would like to thank many friends who have unfailingly given me support, encouragement, and sustenance of various sorts during the last few years as I worked on this project: Francis and Helen Barlow, Niko Endres, Allan Gurganus, Jane Holding, Sharon James, Sara Mack, Harriet Horwitz and Rick Meyer, and Daisy Thorp. I would also like to thank Galen Rowe, now deceased, who read my first analysis of *Philippic* I, and in particular Bill Race, who encouraged me from beginning to end, meticulously read many versions of the manuscript, and gave me many invaluable suggestions. Everyone should be so lucky to have such a good colleague and friend. Finally, I want to express my gratitude to Victor Bers and Harvey Yunis, who, like the mythical heroes who made two trips to the underworld, read the manuscript not once but twice and gave me many useful suggestions, to the members of the Publications Committee of the American Philological Association, in particular to the chairman of that committee, Justina

Gregory, who has been encouraging, helpful, and extremely professional throughout the process of submission, to the staff at Oxford University Press, who have been wonderful to work with, and to Mary Bellino, who did a superb job of copyediting the manuscript. I also want to thank the University Research Council at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for their financial assistance in the publication of this book.

George Kennedy has been kind and generous to me since the beginning of my career almost forty years ago. He has been a good mentor and a good friend, and it is to him that I gratefully dedicate this book.

Contents

This page intentionally left blank

Abbreviations and Bibliography

A complete annotated bibliography of work on Demosthenes, arranged topically and by speech, can be found in Donald Jackson and Galen Rowe, "Demosthenes 1915–1965," *Lustrum* 14 (1969): 7–109, and for the period after 1965 in Felipe G. Hernández Muñoz, "Demostenes 1965–1997: Repertorio Bibliográfico," *Tempus* 21 (1999): 37–71. The line numbers in the analysis refer to the Oxford Classical Text by M. R. Dilts (Oxford, 2002).

Aristides	*Aristidis Qui Feruntur Libri Rhetorici II*, ed. W. Schmid (Leipzig, 1926).
Aristotle	*Ars Rhetorica*. ed. W. D. Ross (Oxford, 1959). All translations from this work come from George Kennedy, *Aristotle: On Rhetoric* (Oxford, 1991).
Bers	Victor Bers, *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated "Oratio Recta" in Attic Drama and Oratory* (London, 1997).
Black	E. Black, "The Second Persona," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970): 109–19.
Blass	Friedrich Blass, *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, 2nd ed., vol. 3.1 (Leipzig, 1893).
Borza	Eugene N. Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon* (Princeton, 1990).
Carlier	Pierre Carlier, *Démosthène* (Paris, 1990).
Cawkwell	G. L. Cawkwell, "Eubulus," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 83 (1963): 47–67.
CIA	*Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum* (Berlin, 1873–95)
[Cicero]	*Rhetoric to Herennius*. All quotations from this work come from the translation by H. Caplan in the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).
Davies	Gilbert A. Davies, ed., *Demosthenes: Philippics I, II, and III* (Cambridge, 1907).
Denniston GP	J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954).
Denniston GPS	J. D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford, 1952).
Demetrius	*On Style*. All quotations from this work come from the translation by Doreen Innes, based on that of W. Rhys Roberts, in the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).
Devine and Stephens	A. M. Devine and Laurence Stephens, *Discontinuous Syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek* (Oxford, 2000).

Dik	Helma Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus* (Amsterdam, 1995).
Dilts	M. R. Dilts, ed., *Scholia Demosthenica*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1983).
Dionysius	*Critical Essays*. All quotations from these works come from the translation by S. Usher in the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1974).
Donnet	D. Donnet, "Aspects du rhythme dans la première Philippique de Démosthène," *Les Études Classiques* 43 (1975): 407–17.
Dover	K. J. Dover, *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford, 1997).
Gotoff	Harold C. Gotoff, *Cicero's Caesarian Speeches: A Stylistic Commentary* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1993).
Griffith	G. W. Griffith, "The Reign of Philip the Second," in *A History of Macedonia*, ed. N. G. L. Hammond and G. W. Griffith, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1979): 203–315.
Hammond	N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.* (Oxford, 1967).
Hansen	Mogens Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles, and Ideology*, trans. J. A. Crook (Oxford, 1991).
Hermogenes	*Opera*, ed. Hugo Rabe (Leipzig, 1913). All references to Hermogenes are to page numbers in this edition. All translations from Hermogenes, unless otherwise noted, come from Cecil Wooten, *Hermogenes' On Types of Style* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1987).
Jaeger	Werner Jaeger, *Demosthenes: The Origin and Growth of his Policy*, trans. Edward Robinson (Berkeley, 1938).
Kennedy	George Kennedy, "The Focusing of Arguments in Greek Deliberative Oratory," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 90 (1959): 131–38.
Lausberg	H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, trans. M. Bliss, A. Jansen, and D. Orton (Leiden, 1998).
Longinus	*On the Sublime*. All quotations from this work come from the translation by W. H. Fyfe, revised by Donald Russell, in the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edn. (Oxford, 1940), with revised supplement (1996).
McCabe	D. F. McCabe, *The Prose-Rhythm of Demosthenes* (New York, 1981).
Ober	Josiah Ober, *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People* (Princeton, 1989).
Pearson AD	Lionel Pearson, *The Art of Demosthenes* (Chico, Calif., 1981).
Pearson DD	Lionel Pearson, "The Development of Demosthenes as a Political Orator," *Phoenix* 18 (1964): 95–109.

Pearson H	Lionel Pearson, "Hiatus and Its Purposes in Attic Oratory," *American Journal of Philology* 96 (1975): 138–59.
Pearson HA	Lionel Pearson, "Historical Allusions in the Attic Orators," *Classical Philology* 36 (1941): 209–29.
Pearson VP	Lionel Pearson, "The Virtuoso Passages in Demosthenes' Speeches," *Phoenix* 29 (1975): 214–30.
Quintilian	*The Orator's Education*. All quotations from this work come from the translation by Donald Russell in the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).
Ronnet	Gilberte Ronnet, *Étude sur le style de Démosthène dans les discours politiques* (Paris, 1951).
Rowe SM	Galen Rowe, "Demosthenes' *First Philippic*: The Satiric Mode," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 99 (1968): 361–74.
Rowe UL	Galen Rowe, "Demosthenes' Use of Language," in *Demosthenes' On the Crown*, ed. James Murphy (New York, 1967), 175–99.
Sandys	John Edwin Sandys, ed., *The First Philippic and Olynthiacs of Demosthenes* (London, 1897).
Sandys 2	John Edwin Sandys, ed., *On the Peace, Second Philippic, On the Chersonesus, and Third Philippic* (London, 1900).
Sealey	Raphael Sealey, *Demosthenes and His Time* (Oxford, 1993).
Smyth	H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963).
Tarbell	Frank Bigelow Tarbell, ed., *The Philippics of Demosthenes* (Boston, 1880).
Usher	Stephen Usher, *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality* (Oxford, 1999).
Vince	J. H. Vince, trans., *Demosthenes*, vol. 1, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1930).
Wooten A	Cecil Wooten, "Abruptness in Demetrius, Longinus, and Demosthenes," *American Journal of Philology* 112 (1991): 493–505.
Wooten CP	Cecil Wooten, *Cicero's Philippics and their Demosthenic Model: The Rhetoric of Crisis* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1983).
Wooten DH	Cecil Wooten, "Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Hermogenes on the Style of Demosthenes," *American Journal of Philology* 110 (1989): 576–88.
Wooten FO	Cecil Wooten, "A Few Observations on Form and Content in Demosthenes," *Phoenix* 31 (1977): 258–61.
Wooten TD	Cecil Wooten, "A Triple Division in Demosthenes," *Classical Philology* 94 (1999): 450–54.
Wooten UM	Cecil Wooten, "Unnoticed Medical Language in Demosthenes," *Hermes* 107 (1979): 157–60.
Worthington	Ian Worthington, ed., *Demosthenes: Statesman and Orator* (London, 2000).
Yunis	Harvey Yunis, *Taming Democracy: Models of Political Rhetoric in Classical Athens* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1996).

This page intentionally left blank

A Commentary on Demosthenes' *Philippic* I

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction: *Philippic* I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Philip and Athens Until 351

In 359, Philip succeeded his brother Perdiccas, who had been killed fighting the Illyrians, as king of Macedon. Two years later, when the Athenians were preoccupied with the outbreak of the Social War, Philip attacked Amphipolis and captured it.[1] Athens had established Amphipolis as a colony in 436. In the winter of 424/23, Brasidas had come to the aid of the pro-Spartan faction in the city, freed it of Athenian control, and established a Spartan garrison there. Three years later, according to the terms of the Peace of Nicias, the Spartan garrison was removed and Amphipolis was given back to the Athenians, who, nevertheless, failed to reassert their control over the city, although they never gave up their claim to it (Griffith, 231–33).

The kings of Macedon had been interested in Amphipolis for two reasons. First of all, it enjoyed a very strategic location; it sat on the route from east to west across the Strymon River and gave access to the passage along the river into the interior of Macedon. The city, therefore, could act as a fortress protecting the eastern parts of the kingdom. Second, it was near the gold and silver mines of Mount Pangaeum and thus an important source of income. Perdiccas had put a Macedonian garrison there in 360. Philip had withdrawn it in 359, when he was trying to assert his control over Macedon, in an effort to appease the Athenians and to keep them from interfering in the north. Two years later, when his position was stronger, Athens still had not taken advantage of the opportunity to occupy the city, and Philip took it back. When Amphipolis felt threatened by Philip, the city had appealed to Athens for help; Philip forestalled Athenian intervention, however, by sending Athens a note claiming that he intended to take the city only to return it to its rightful owner, that is, Athens. He never did (Griffith, 233–40).

Soon after the fall of Amphipolis, Philip took Pydna, which, like Methone (see below), had been secured for Athens by Timotheus in 364. It seems that

[1] All dates are B.C. I intend for this historical background to be only a bare outline, giving just enough information to place this speech in its broad historical context. I will explain some of the facts presented here in more detail in the commentary itself when they become relevant to the argument of the speech. To the reader who wants more continuous historical background, I highly recommend Sealey, 3–136, particularly 88–136.

Philip wanted to eliminate any possible base of operations that Athens might use in its attempt to regain Amphipolis (Griffith, 242). The Athenians declared war (Diodorus 16.8.3). Philip realized that an alliance between Athens and the towns of the Chalcidian League, which were beginning to look on Philip as a threat, could be formidable. Therefore, in order to keep the Chalcidians from allying with Athens, Philip offered to give them Potidaea, knowing that as long as this bone of contention existed between them they would never join together against him (Griffith, 244–47). Potidaea, originally a Corinthian colony, had joined the Delian League but revolted in 432. It was destroyed by the Athenians after a long siege of two years, and the area settled by Athenian colonists. At the end of the Peloponnesian War, in 404, it had come under the control of the Chalcidian League but was retaken for Athens by Timotheus in 363 and repopulated with Athenian colonists.

In 356 Philip laid siege to Potidaea. The Athenians voted to send an expedition to relieve the town, but Philip took it before the expedition could be sent out. He let the Athenian settlers there go free, which indicates that he was trying to be conciliatory toward Athens (Diodorus 16.8.3–5).[2] Philip needed to protect himself, but he clearly did not want to provoke Athens unnecessarily. Late in 355, he attacked Methone, Athens' last base on the Macedonian coast, which surrendered the following year. Athens made no attempt to relieve the town (Diodorus 16.31.6, 16.34.4–5).

Preoccupation with the Social War might have dampened the Athenian response to these attacks on their possessions or former possessions in the north. Or they might not have perceived these areas to be vital to their interests. Amphipolis gave access to timber in the Strymon valley, which the Athenians needed for their ships. But although they had not controlled Amphipolis in over fifty years, they still had the largest fleet in the Aegean. It is clear that they had worked out some means of obtaining timber in the north, probably through trade. The loss of Pydna, Potidaea, and Methone seems to have done no harm—except to Athenian prestige (Sealey, 110–12; Griffith, 231).

The factors of undoubted importance to Athenian security and well-being were the defense of Thermopylae, which gave access to central Greece, and the protection of the grain routes from the Black Sea. Philip's actions in the north from 357 to 355 had threatened neither (Sealey, 111). Once Methone had been taken back, however, Macedonia was free from the threat of an attack by a foreign foe from within its own territories. Moreover, Philip's enemies in the north and northwest had been soundly defeated. Philip soon, therefore, began to look south

[2] Philip had acted similarly two years earlier. When he was trying to establish his power, Athens had supported a pretender to the throne named Argaeus and had sent him to Macedonia accompanied by three thousand mercenaries and an Athenian general. Philip handily defeated the force near Methone but returned the prisoners to Athens without ransom (Griffith, 211–12). We do not know exactly who this Argaeus was (cf. Borza, 296–97); however, as Borza notes, "it surely must have stuck in the new king's mind that the first Greeks to oppose him at the moment of his accession were Athenian" (201).

and east. In 353 he moved an army into Thessaly in support of his allies, the cities of the Thessalian League, against Lycophron of Pherae (Diodorus 16.35.1). The kings of Macedon had traditionally been interested in Thessaly for three reasons. First, a strong and united Thessaly could have been a threat to Macedon. Second, Thessaly had the best cavalry in the Greek world. And, third, it could act as a buffer against Thebes, which had occasionally threatened Macedon in the first half of the fourth century. Philip himself, in fact, had been taken to Thebes as a hostage after one of these incursions (Griffith, 205, 219, 226).[3]

When Philip moved into Thessaly, the Pheraeans sought help from Onomarchus and the Phocians, who were engaged in the Sacred War, primarily against Thebes. In the late summer or early fall of 353, Onomarchus and his Thessalian allies defeated Philip, who withdrew from Thessaly (Diodorus 16.35.2). He returned the following year, however, and in 352, at the battle of the Crocus Field, Philip and his Thessalian allies defeated Onomarchus and the Pheraeans (Diodorus 16.35.5–6). It was probably after this battle that Philip was made archon of the Thessalian League (Sealey, 122). He had thus extended his power to the south and was approaching central Greece. After settling affairs in Thessaly, he did, in fact, move toward Thermopylae in pursuit of the Phocians. Athens sent out a force to block the pass, and Philip withdrew to Macedon (Diodorus 16.37.3, 16.38.1–2).

Philip was still at war with the Athenians, although they had inflicted no damage on him. In Thessaly he had found allies against them. Athens supported Phocis in the Sacred War; therefore, Thebes and the cities of the Thessalian League were enemies of Athens. And the search for allies against the Athenians may have been one of the reasons that had taken Philip south in the first place (Griffith, 263).

Meanwhile, in the east, Cersobleptes, an ally of Athens who ruled the eastern part of Thrace, was trying to unify the eastern Thracians; in the process, he sometimes threatened Greek cities (Borza, 215). Late in 352, Byzantium and Perinthus called in Philip to protect them against Cersobleptes. During this campaign Philip laid siege to Heraion Teichos on or near the Propontis. The Athenians voted to send a relief force; however, before the ships could be dispatched, news reached Athens that Philip had fallen ill. This was probably true, for he abandoned the siege and returned to Macedon at the end of the winter (D 3.4–5).

This is the general situation in which D delivered the *First Philippic*, probably in the late spring or summer of 351 (Griffith, 297). Although Philip had begun to show interest in areas that were vital to Athenian security, he had been blocked at Thermopylae in the summer of 352 and had withdrawn from the Propontis in the winter of 351. Most Athenians probably did not perceive a crisis (Sealey, 125–26).

[3] R. M. Errington argues that most of Philip's military activity in the 350s was aimed at the establishment of security for Macedonia; "Review Discussion: Four Interpretations of Philip II," *American Journal of Ancient History* 6 (1981): 82.