THE MYTH OF THE FIRST SACRED WAR

I

In the history of Archaic Greece no event stands out so clearly as the First Sacred War.[1] The War took place in the years round 590 B.C., and ended with the capture and destruction of the great city of Crisa at the hands of a coalition of powers which included Sicyon, Athens, and Thessaly. Our sources provide a wealth of detail—the causes of the War, the names of half-a-dozen commanders and champions, the stages of the fighting, the victory celebrations and dedications which ensued, certain Delphic oracles and Amphictyonic decrees. Some details have been scouted as later embroidery by modern sceptics, but we have it on the authority of Wilamowitz that the First Sacred War forms 'pretty well the most extensive piece of well-attested military history from such an early time'.[2]

The trouble is that however we pick and patch the details, the 'First Sacred War' remains a bizarre and puzzling episode.[3] The great city of Crisa appears

[1] Besides the familiar abbreviations I use the following: W. Aly (1950) = 'Zum neuen Strabon-Text', *PP* 5 (1950), 228–63; E. Bickermann and J. Sykutris (1928) = 'Speusippos' Brief an König Philipp', *BSAW* lxxx, no. 3; J. Bousquet (1956) = 'Inscriptions de Delphes, 7: Delphes et les Asclépiades', *BCH* 80 (1956), 579–93; J. Defradas (1954) = *Les Thèmes de la propagande delphique*; L. Dor, J. Jannoray, and H. and M. van Effenterre (1960) = *Kirrha: Étude de préhistoire phocidienne*; I. Düring (1957) = *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*; G. Forrest (1956) = 'The First Sacred War', *BCH* 80. 33–52; P. Guillon (1963) = *Études béotiennes: La Bouclier d'Héracles et l'histoire de la Grèce centrale dans la période de la première guerre sacrée*; F. Jacoby (1902) = *Apollodors Chronik*; id. (1904) = *Das Marmor Parium*; J. Jannoray (1937) = 'Krisa-Kirrha et la première guerre sacrée', *BCH* 61 (1937), 33–43; H. W. Parke and J. Boardman (1957) = 'The Struggle for the Tripod and the First Sacred War', *JHS* 77 (1957), 276–82; H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell (1956) = *The Delphic Oracle*; H. Pomtow (1918) = 'Delphische Neufunde III: Hippokrates und die Asklepiaden in Delphi', *Klio* 15 (1918), 303–38; J. Roger and H. van Effenterre (1944) = 'Krisa-Kirrha', *RA* ser. 6, no. 21; M. Sordi (1953) = 'La prima guerra sacra', *RFIC* 81 (1953), 320–46; H. T. Wade-Gery (1936) = 'Kynaithos', in *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Pres. to G. Murray*, pp.56–78; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1893) = *Aristoteles und Athen*; id. (1922) = *Pindaros*.

[2] Wilamowitz (1893), i. 20.

[3] 'The First Sacred War' is a modern term; modern too is the numbered series of Sacred Wars—the Second of the mid-fifth century, the Third of 356–346, and the Fourth of 339–338. I adopt this usage for convenience, even though it has no warrant in the ancient sources, which apply the term ἱερὸς πόλεμος only to wars of the fifth and fourth centuries, though not to the war of 339–338. The Spartan offensive of the mid-fifth century which ousted the Phocians from Delphi (until Athens brought them back again two years later) is referred to by Th. i. 112.5 as 'the so-called Sacred War'; sch. Ar. *Av.* 556 distinguishes the Spartan campaign and the Athenian riposte as two successive 'sacred wars', though it is not clear whether this duplication was authorized by any of the writers cited, namely (besides Th.) Theopomp. *FGH* 115 F 156, Philoch. *FGH* 328 F 34, and Eratosth. *FGH* 241 F 38. The conflict of 356–346 is often called 'the Sacred War', e.g. in the title of Callisthenes' contemporary account, *FGH* 124 F 1. By contrast the 'First Sacred War' is called ὁ Κρισαῖος πόλεμος at Str. 9.3.4, 3.10 (though at 9.3.8 we hear of 'the Phocian or Sacred War' of 356–346); ὁ Κρισαϊκὸς δὲ πόλεμος ὀνομαζόμενος at Ath. 13.10, 560B (where a detail concerning 'the Crisaean War' is cited from Callisthenes' book on 'the Sacred War' of 356–346); and τὰ Κρισαῖα in [Thessalus] *presb.* (Hp. ix 422 Littré: beside τὰ Περσικά). Likewise the Fourth Sacred War is called 'the war at Amphissa' at D. 18. 143 (where the orator also deplores the danger of an 'Amphictyonic war' directed against Athens).

nowhere but as the exemplary target and victim of this crusade. The victorious allies are very oddly assorted. As for the causes of the war, little warrant can be found for the notion of commercial rivalry, favoured by some recent critics; the dominant theme in our sources is the impiety of Crisa. Yet what motive will have induced Athens in the time of Solon, Sicyon under Cleisthenes, and the Thessalian federation to co-operate for several years in the siege of a maritime state in the Corinthian Gulf? Modern reconstructions differ widely; all seem remote from the ancient evidence. Nor is it easy to discern the subsequent effects of this convulsive struggle. The Thessalians held the presidency and a preponderance of votes in the Amphictyonic Council as we know it later, and in the fullest accounts of the Sacred War they did most of the fighting. They ought to have gained in corresponding measure from the successful issue. True, in the eyes of many scholars Thessaly now acquired the hegemony of central Greece and kept it until her reverses in Phocis and Boeotia (whenever these reverses occurred). The difficulty in such a view is that for most of the sixth century the Delphic oracle was demonstrably not dictated to by Thessaly.[1]

Since the tradition of the Sacred War contains so many oddities, we ought to ask how this tradition reaches us. The answer is disconcerting. Down to the third quarter of the fourth century Greek literature is completely silent about the War. Although Delphi was at the centre of Greek history from the colonizing period onward, the Sacred War is never alluded to by any writer before *c.* 345, even in contexts where mention would seem unavoidable. But suddenly—in a flurry of notices which can all be dated to the space of about fifteen years, beginning in the late 340s—the Sacred War comes into view as a moral paradigm and as a topic of research. Not only do we have clear and striking contemporary references, but nearly all the significant details of the War which we hear of in later sources can be securely traced to works produced during this brief period.

I shall argue that the First Sacred War never happened, and that Crisa as a great Archaic city never existed. They are figments arising from later conditions and preoccupations, above all from the Third Sacred War of the mid-fourth century, in which Philip of Macedon, acting as overlord of Thessaly, intervened at Delphi to subdue and punish the Phocians. The story of the First Sacred War was elaborated by partisans of Philip and figures in the political controversy which broke out at Athens after the untoward conclusion of the Third Sacred War. Before this time Greek history knew nothing of a great war fought over Delphi in the Archaic period, a war authorized by the Amphictyons and waged by the leading powers of the day. But Delphi itself had a picturesque local legend of a struggle against a lair of bandits, wicked oppressors of the sanctuary; the legend was inspired in the first instance by the neighbouring ruins (still conspicuous) of a Mycenaean fortress and by the hero-cult of the Delphic hippodrome, which lay in the plain directly beneath the ruins; the tale of the water-supply poisoned by hellebore clearly reflects the situation of the fortress. From this beginning the literary friends of Philip excogitated a holy war of Panhellenic scope; they were able to furnish a circumstantial narrative and exact dates by

[1] In the eyes of Parke and Wormell (1956), i. 109, the early Amphictyons were disinterested patrons of the sanctuary and the Games, who also pondered 'general questions' about the welfare of Greece, but never mixed in the working of the oracle, 'except in so far as the Delphians chose to adopt the general Amphictyonic policy'. This is not the tone of *h. Ap.* 540–3, if these lines refer to the Amphictyons (of which more below).

drawing on other Delphic practices and traditions, including Solon's acknowledged ties with Delphi. In calling the First Sacred War a 'myth' I follow the example of Speusippus, *Letter to Philip* 8, and Demosthenes, *On the Crown* 149.

II. CRISA/CIRRHA

The First Sacred War was waged against a single enemy, the city called Crisa or Cirrha: modern scholars sometimes differentiate the two forms, reserving the first for the Archaic city destroyed in the Sacred War and the second for the harbour town of Delphi,[1] but as we shall see, the forms were interchangeable. Blockaded by sea, invested by land, Crisa/Cirrha sustained a long siege until it was captured by a ruse and utterly destroyed. Yet it is a fact—plainly disclosed by ancient sources, and confirmed by archaeologists beyond all cavil or contradiction—that there was never, in the vicinity of Delphi, an Archaic city capable of defying a coalition of powerful enemies and of withstanding siege for a period of years.

First the archaeological evidence. Some trace of such a city ought to be left on the ground, especially if it was suddenly and permanently cut off; for nothing is more welcome to the archaeologist than violent destruction. For many years the French archaeologists at Delphi made it their particular endeavour to find the Archaic city of 'Crisa'. They scoured the coast around Itea, the plain behind it, the rocky outcrops of Parnassus and Cirphis, and they uncovered settlements dating from M. H. down to Roman and Byzantine times. But no Archaic remains. The Mycenaean period is well represented, above all by a great fortress which stands a few kilometres west of Delphi on a southward-jutting spur of Parnassus, called Ayios Georghios after a chapel on the site; this fortress was sacked at or near the end of L. H. IIIB, i.e. towards 1200 B.C., and the place was never occupied again until Byzantine times.[2] So much was definitely established by the French excavations of 1935–6, which exploded the view then prevailing that Ay. Georghios and the adjacent shelf of Parnassus formed the site of the Archaic city of 'Crisa'.[3] In historical times a small harbour town grew up on the coast south-east of Itea, succeeding (but not continuing) a prehistoric occupation; this town is familiar from literary and epigraphic sources of the fourth century onward, which call it Cirrha. The actual remains of the historical settlement are too meagre to give much help, but we may assume, without begging the question of what 'Crisa' means in the *Catalogue of Ships* and the *Hymn to Apollo*, that the harbour town goes as far back as the celebrity of Delphi, i.e. to the seventh

[1] Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*[2] i. 690–2; Pieske, *RE* xi. 2 (1922), 1887–9, s.v. Krisa; Wilamowitz (1922), p.71; Aly (1950), p.251; Parke and Wormell (1956), i. 99–100, cf. 62, 92. Others distinguish between Crisa as a Mycenaean and Homeric city, supposedly occupying an acropolis site, and Cirrha as the harbour town *and* the target of the Sacred War: so Jannoray (1937); Sordi (1953), p.320; and Dor, Jannoray, and H. and M. van Effenterre (1960), pp.13–6.

[2] For full references to the excavation reports see P. Alin, *Das Ende der Myken. Fundstätten auf dem Gr. Festland* pp.130–2, and V. R. D'A. Desborough, *The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors*, p.125. The excavators spoke of Granary-Style pottery, but Alin, who discusses the published material very thoroughly, concludes that they applied the term to L. H. IIIB types, and that the settlement probably did not outlast this period, although a tenuous reoccupation after the catastrophe is not quite excluded.

[3] The consequences for the story of the Sacred War were firmly drawn by Jannoray (1937) and by Roger and van Effenterre (1944).

century at least.[1] But this little town was certainly not the formidable target of the First Sacred War: so far as can be seen, it was never even walled.

Thus the archaeological evidence is perfectly clear and ought to be decisive: no Archaic city has been found, and no possible setting is left to explore.[2] The literary evidence, rightly interpreted, points to the same conclusion.

A papyrus scrap of Alcaeus has the adjectival form Κιρσάης or Κιρσάησι (fr. 7 L-P, line 9), probably referring to the Crisaean Gulf.[3] From a linguistic point of view Κίρσα and Κρῖσα are normal equivalents (differing only in the metathesis of ρ), and so are Κίρσα and Κίρρα. The series Κρῖσα/Κίρσα/Κίρρα is matched, for example, by θράσος/θάρσος/θάρρος.[4] It would be astonishing if, as many scholars believe, the forms Crisa and Cirrha were used to *distinguish* a pair of neighbouring sites: a parallel case in Greek toponymy is impossible to find. The equivalent forms ought to denote the same place, and there is no objection to supposing that they did so as long as 'Crisa' remained a living form. But after the fifth century only 'Cirrha' is used of a contemporary place, namely the harbour town; and late sources who expressly consider the two names give conflicting reports. Let us review the position as briefly as possible, setting aside until the last the aberrant testimony of Strabo and a few other writers.

The harbour town, which existed continuously from the Archaic period down to the time of Pausanias and beyond, was commonly known as Cirrha both in literature and in Delphic inscriptions. To be sure, the inscriptions do not begin until the later fourth century (e.g. *SIG*^{3} 246 H^2 52, of 342 B.C.), and the earliest writer to refer unmistakably to the harbour town is Aeschines in his speech of

[1] Jannoray (1937), pp.39–40, and Roger and van Effenterre (1944), pp.18–20, describe their trial excavations at the site of the harbour town, now called Xeropigado; the remains which they uncovered, on the hill Magoula and on the low ground between Magoula and the sea, range in date from the sixth to the fourth century; at Magoula the traces of this period directly overlie the prehistoric settlement. For Jannoray in 1937 these findings were evidence enough of the Archaic city of the Sacred War; Roger and van Effenterre are rightly sceptical, but their suggestion that further remains may lie close at hand, concealed by the alluvium of the Pleistus, is unconvincing; as Frazer notes on Paus. 10.37.4, H. N. Ulrichs in 1837 found many scattered ruins of the harbour town, which were doubtless plundered later by the builders of Itea and Xeropigado (n.1, p.48 below).

[2] Some are still optimistic, however. The city may have lain at some unknown spot in the plain, say Roger and van Effenterre (1944), pp.19–20, and also Dor, Jannoray, and H. and M. van Effenterre (1960), p.15. But for a powerful and prosperous city we want a defensible and advantageous site, which will include a harbour and an acropolis. According to Sordi (1953), pp.334–7, the second stage of the Sacred War was fought against a great stronghold (which she calls 'Kraugallion' after Aeschines and others) on the south slope of Mount Cirphis, to be identified with the slight traces of an ancient settlement at Desphina. As already noted by Bölte, *RE* xi. 1 (1921), 507–8, s.v. Kirphis, this was an unimportant place, and cannot possibly be 'the greatest city' of the Crisaeans as described by [Thessalus], who beyond all doubt means the site at Ay. Georghios (for Sordi's answer to this see n.2, p.69 below).

[3] As L-P observe, lines 9–12 of the papyrus suggest the story of Phalanthus' shipwreck in the Crisaean Gulf (Paus. 10.13.10).

[4] It may be that the name Crisa/Cirrha is related to such words as κιρρός 'orange-coloured', κιρσός 'varicose vein', κίρα, κίραφος 'fox'; cf. Wilamowitz (1922), p.71. Κίρφις, the name of the mountain south of Parnassus which comes down to the sea by the harbour town of Cirrha, is superficially alike but intractable from a linguistic point of view (though Aly (1950), p.251, tells us that the resemblance between Crisa and Cirrha is 'only accidental' and that Cirrha 'belongs rather with Kirphis').

330 (3.107–23). But in the early fifth century Pindar, while celebrating Pythian victories in horse-races, foot-races, and wrestling, repeatedly speaks of 'Cirrha' as the setting (*P.* 3.74, 7.12, 8.19, 10.15, 11.12), and since in Pindar's day the stadium as well as the hippodrome lay in the plain that stretches from the foot of Parnassus to the harbour town, 'Cirrha' probably denotes the plain, called in prose 'the Cirrhaean Plain' or 'the Crisaean Plain'.

So much for Cirrha. Pindar also uses the form Κρίσα and its adjective Κρισαῖος in just the same way (*I.* 2.18, *P.* 5.37, 6.18)[1] and this form prevails in the Archaic period (*Il.* 2.520; *h. Ap.* 269, 282, 431, 438, 445–6; Hecat. *FGH* I F 115). It would be natural to suppose that Crisa is merely an earlier or a poetic form equally denoting the harbour town (and the plain), as Pausanias expressly says in the course of his visit to Cirrha (10.37.5); he refers to both the *Iliad* and the *Hymn to Apollo*. In the *Iliad* and in the fragment of Hecataeus, however, we cannot tell what place is meant.[2] The Pythian part of the *Hymn* mentions Crisa in describing first Apollo's advent at Delphi and then the arrival of the Cretan sailors and the kindling of the sacrificial fire, which is said, hyperbolically of course, to have illuminated 'all Crisa' and frightened the Crisaean women. Of all these passages but one it can be stated without further ado that either the harbour town or the plain behind it or indeed any other familiar place close to Delphi might be in view (the plain is best understood at line 269, referring to the hippodrome, and at lines 445–6, the illumination miracle).[3] More enigmatic are lines 282–6:

> ἵκεο δ' ἐς Κρίσην ὑπὸ Παρνησὸν νιφόεντα
> κνημὸν πρὸς ζέφυρον τετραμμένον, αὐτὰρ ὕπερθεν
> πέτρη ἐπικρέμαται, κοίλη δ' ὑποδέδρομε βῆσσα
> τρηχεῖ'· ἔνθα ἄναξ τεκμήρατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
> νηὸν ποιήσασθαι κτλ.

Here the 'foothill turned toward the west', with a cliff above and a deep glen below, is placed in apposition to 'Crisa'. Many scholars take them to be the same thing, and identify the foothill as the spur of Ay. Georghios.[4] But this is quite

[1] At *P.* 5.34–9 the charioteer Carrhotus, coming from Cyrene to compete in the hippodrome, 'went past the Crisaean hill into Apollo's level glen', Κρισαῖον λόφον / ἄμειψεν ἐν κοιλόπεδον νάπος / θεοῦ. 'The Crisaean hill' is probably the mountain spur north-east of the harbour town (called Myttikas according to Frazer on Paus. 10. 37.5). At *P.* 6.18 a chariot victory is said to take place 'in the folds of Crisa', Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς; so too at *h. Ap.* 269 the future hippodrome is located 'at Crisa under a fold of Parnassus'. If Leake and others have correctly placed the hippodrome at the site called Komara at the northern edge of the plain (§ VIII below), it is in fact enclosed in a fold formed by two outrunners of Parnassus.

[2] Another fr. of Hecat., *FGH* 1 F 105, cited by St. Byz. s.v. Chaonia, appears to locate the 'Cirrhaean' Plain and Gulf (MSS. Κιραῖος, Κιρραῖος) In Chaonia. The text has not been convincingly emended or explained. Jacoby, *SPAW* (1933), 746 n.2, favours B. A. Müller's Κι<χυ>ραῖος. N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (1967), pp.451, 458, 478, adopts the name 'Ciraeus' for the shallow gulf north of Buthrotum and the plain behind it, mainly on the ground that this is the only sizeable coastal plain in Chaonia; his remark that 'the name is probably earlier here' than in central Greece presupposes an emigration of Greek speakers from Epirus.

[3] The name is taken to denote the plain by Defradas (1954), p.57, and Guillon (1963), pp.85–8.

[4] Frazer on Paus. 10.75.5; Allen, Halliday, and Sykes ad loc.; R. Hope Simpson and J. F. Lazenby, *The Cat. of the Ships in Homer's Il.* (1970), p.41. Wade-Gery (1936), p.62 n.1, who identifies Crisa with Ay. Georghios, recognizes the setting at 282–6 as 'the Kastalian Glade', and says that the name Crisa is here applied to it because the city 'still controlled the Oracle'. This would be a curious procedure even if the city *were* as near as Ay. Georghios.

impossible, for the site of Apollo's temple can only be Delphi itself, not Ay. Georghios several kilometres away. And in fact Delphi may well be called 'a foothill turned toward the west', since it is a shelf lying west of the Phaedriades, the most conspicuous peaks in the area; and the cliff above and the glen below suit Delphi at least as well as Ay. Georghios. If we allow that Crisa is the harbour town or the plain, the apposition of the phrase describing Delphi is slightly illogical, but not surprising in a poet: he means to say that Apollo arrives in the *vicinity* of Crisa (as a prose-writer would put it), specifically at the shelf west of the Phaedriades.[1]

The upshot is that 'Crisa' in the *Hymn*, and both 'Crisa' and 'Cirrha' in Pindar, appear to denote either the harbour town or the level plain behind the harbour town.[2] In prose and in iambics the plain is called either 'Crisaean' (e.g. S. *El.* 730; Hdt. 8.32.2) or 'Cirrhaean' (e.g. Scyl. 37; Aeschin. 3.107–23; D. 18.149, 152; D. S. 16.23.3).[3] For the gulf (meaning as a rule the whole Corinthian Gulf rather than the Bay of Itea) usage seems to have fixed the form 'Crisaean' (e.g. Th. 1.107.3, 2.69.1; Str. 9.1.1, 2.15, 3.1, 3.3),[4] although 'Cirrhaean' is found at least once (Heliod. 5.1). We may infer (1) that both plain and gulf are named after the same town, and (2) that this town is the harbour town, which was undoubtedly called 'Cirrha'. The nomenclature reflects the point of view of travellers to Delphi, who will often have sailed through the Gulf of Corinth and disembarked at Crisa/Cirrha (at *h. Ap.* 431 'the wide gulf towards Crisa opened out' before the Cretan sailors rounding the Peloponnesus).

Thus far the ancient notices of the harbour town and the adjacent plain, together with the Pythian hippodrome and stadium. When our sources from the late fourth century onward speak of the Archaic city destroyed in the First Sacred War, what place is meant? Usually, it appears, the harbour town. In most accounts of the War the forms 'Crisa' and 'Cirrha' with their respective adjectives are used indifferently. 'Crisa' on the one hand appears in [Thessalus] *presb.* (Hp. ix 404–26 Littré); Front. 3.7.6; sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* a, *N.* 9 *inscr.* 'Cirrha' on the other hand appears in Aeschin. 3.107–23; [Ar.] *Peplus* fr. 637 Rose; *marm. Par. FGH* 239 A 37; D. S. 'ix' fr. 16; Plu. *Sol.* 11.1; Polyaen. 3.5, 6.13; sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* b, d. According to Ath. 13.10, 560 B–C, 'Callisthenes in his book on the Sacred War', sc. the war of 356–346, spoke of 'the so-called Crisaean War' involving the 'Cirrhaeans' (*FGH* 124 F 1): it is likely, though it cannot be proved, that both forms go back to Callisthenes; 'Cirrha' certainly does, for as we shall see, the *Register of Pythian Victors* compiled by Callisthenes and Aristotle jointly was consulted by Plutarch and by sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* b, d, who all use the form 'Cirrha'.[5]

[1] Line 230 has a similar apposition, Ὀγχηστὸν δ' ἶξες Ποσιδήϊον ἀγλαὸν ἄλσος.

[2] Only Guarducci, *SMSR* 19–20 (1943–6), 87–8, has hitherto equated the 'Crisa' of the *Hymn* with the harbour town; she does not examine the usage closely.

[3] Frazer on Paus. 10.37.5 regards the plain between Parnassus and the sea as falling into two parts, a southern and a northern, divided by mountain spurs advancing from E and W: the southern part, he says, is the Cirrhaean plain, 'still almost as treeless as it was in the days of Paus.' (but Paus. thus describes the whole expanse of plain as far as Parnassus) and hence to be identified with the consecrated territory, whereas the northern part is 'the Crisaean plain proper'—though he admits that the term is sometimes applied to the whole plain. No one has followed Frazer here.

[4] It is clear that ὁ Κρισαῖος κόλπος in Th. means the Corinthian Gulf; Str. calls this ἡ Κρισαῖα θαλάττη (9.2.15) and applies the term ὁ Κρισαῖος κόλπος to the Bay of Itea (9.1.1, 3.1, 3.3).

[5] Aly (1950), pp.250–2 thinks it significant that whereas Str. and Ath. speak of 'the Crisaean War', the conquered people are called not 'Crisaeans' but 'Cirrhaeans' in sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* b, d, Ath., and Plu. This

Now since the harbour town existed throughout Greek and Roman times under the name of Cirrha, we must conclude that the Archaic city in the story of the First Sacred War was normally conceived to be the harbour town. And indeed Pausanias, who regards 'Crisa' as the earlier form of 'Cirrha', assumes without question that the harbour town was the target of the War (10.37.5–8).

Most accounts of the First Sacred War say nothing about the aspect of the Archaic city which the Amphictyons destroyed; we are free to suppose that the harbour town is meant. The fullest accounts describe two stages in the fighting. In the version of sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* b, d the first stage saw the Amphictyonic army vanquish 'the Cirrhaeans'—presumably meaning that the city of Cirrha was taken; in the second stage the surviving Cirrhaeans took refuge on Mount Cirphis until they were mopped up by a residual force. The blockade of Cleisthenes (sch. Pi. *N.* 9 *inscr.*) and the poisoning of the water-supply (Paus. 10.37.7; Polyaen. 6.13; Front. 3.7.6) doubtless belong to the first stage.[1] Pausanias says that the poison was introduced into the Pleistus River, which supplied the city through a conduit; if this detail was taken from an earlier account of the War, there too the city must have been the harbour town, lying just east of the present mouth of the Pleistus; certainly no one could have imagined the dwellers at Ay. Georghios piping their water *up* from the Pleistus. Thus the harbour town suits the usual version of the War, which we shall find reason to ascribe to Callisthenes.

But this is not the end of the story. Although the site of Ay. Georghios lay desolate in historical times, the massive Cyclopean walls of the fortress were none the less conspicuous: we shall see in due course that they inspired the original legend of a lair of bandits preying on Delphic pilgrims. For the moment it is enough to note that this site—lying 'close to the place where the horse races are now held'—is unmistakably referred to in the speech of [Thessalus] as 'the greatest city' of the Crisaeans (Hp. ix 408, cf. 412). Here, according to [Thessalus], the second stage of the war took place after the Amphictyons had won an initial victory over the Crisaeans, sacking 'their territory and their cities' (Hp. ix 406–8: the harbour town and other settlements in the plain?), and forcing the enemy to withdraw to this great stronghold—which is left unnamed. [Thessalus] draws on the local legend, but he also knows Callisthenes' account of the War featuring the Thessalian general Eurylochus (Hp. ix 412); and in order to avoid a clash between the two versions he leaves the cities of both the first and the second stage without a name, merely speaking of 'Crisaeans' throughout. But other writers took the further step of identifying the Mycenaean ruins as Crisa/Cirrha. Sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* a begins a very summary account of the Sacred War with the words 'Crisa

circumstance—which he calls *dieser ganze Überlieferungskomplex*—leads him to infer that the war was originally directed against the great city of Crisa (Ay. Georghios) and that after the fall of Crisa 'unexpected resistance' continued in the harbour town of Cirrha. But the sources allow no such distinction, for it is precisely the victims of the *first* stage of the fighting who are called 'Cirrhaeans' in *hyp.* b, d, and indeed the city destroyed in the first stage is called 'Cirrha' in *hyp.* d (as also at *marm. Par.* A 37).

[1] The oracle that requires Apollo's precinct to meet the sea (D.S. 'ix', fr. 16; Paus. 10.37.6; wrongly inserted at Aeschin. 3.112) might have been issued at either stage; Paus. puts it before the poisoning. In the summary paraphrase of Polyaen. 3.5 the sea must touch, not Apollo's precinct, but 'the Cirrhaean land'; and 'the Cirrhaeans made light of it, being very far removed from the sea'; but since the Cirrhaean land itself adjoined 'the sacred land stretching to the sea', Cleisthenes was able to satisfy the oracle by dedicating 'both the city and the Cirrhaean land'. It seems likely that the oracle was thus amended in order to fit the version of the War which placed Cirrha/Crisa at Ay. Georghios (discussed below).

having been established at the narrows of the road leading to Delphi': this can only mean Ay. Georghios. At Polyaen. 3.5 the Delphic oracle which notified the condition for ending the War has been crudely altered so that it is 'the Cirrhaean land', instead of Apollo's precinct, that must meet the sea; and the Cirrhaeans are described as 'very far removed from the sea'.[1] So the name Crisa or Cirrha was in fact attached to the ruins at Ay. Georghios; but this was a very late development.

We have now followed the usage of Crisa and Cirrha through the mainstream of Greek literature, and found it clear and consistent. Both in contemporary references to Delphi and in stories of the First Sacred War the two names are interchangeable, and the place which they denote can usually be recognized as the harbour town or the plain behind it. Only in late variations of the Sacred War are the names applied to the Mycenaean ruins at Ay. Georghios. It remains to consider a few lexical and geographical sources, which show that in later days —not before the Roman period—there was some dispute about Crisa and Cirrha. St. Byz. s.v. *Krisa* says that 'some' identified Crisa and Cirrha; so does *E.M.* s.v. *Krisa*, while recording the opinion of Leocrines (otherwise unknown) that the two were distinct. Moreover, Crisa and Cirrha are juxtaposed in several geographers: Str. 9.3.1, 3.3–4; Plin. *H.N.* 4.8; Dion. Calliph. 73, 81;[2] Ptol. 3.14.3. Pliny says that Crisa was destroyed long ago; Strabo, that both Crisa and Cirrha were destroyed before his time. Possibly the distinction was prompted by the different versions of the Sacred War noticed above, although—as far as we can tell from Polyaenus and sch. Pi.—the names Crisa and Cirrha were both applied to Ay. Georghios as to the harbour town. It is more likely that commentators familiar only with 'Cirrha' as the current name of the harbour town were bemused by the strange old name 'Crisa'. Of all these sources only Strabo goes into the matter at any length, and his example warns us to take none of them seriously.

According to Str. 9.3.3–4 Cirrha and Crisa are to be distinguished as two ancient cities of Phocis—both situated on the coast south of Delphi, and both destroyed before Strabo's own time. The means of Cirrha's destruction is obscured by an unfortunate lacuna in the text; but Crisa at any rate fell to Eurylochus the Thessalian 'during the Crisaean War', after this prosperous city had levied tolls on travellers to Delphi in violation of Amphictyonic law. In a subsequent passage (9.3.10) Strabo relates that the games at Delphi underwent a decisive change at the hands of the Amphictyons 'after the Crisaean War', 'in the time of Eurylochus'. What value shall we attach to Strabo's account?

In describing the transformation of the Pythian Games Strabo agrees in part with *marm. Par. FGH* 239 A 37–8, Paus. 10.7.4–5, and sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* a, b, and d. As we shall see, some of the details reported by these sources go back to the two fourth-century works on the Pythian Games, the *Pythicus* of Menaechmus and the *Register of Pythian Victors* of Aristotle and Callisthenes. But there is nothing to suggest that Strabo's distinction between Cirrha and Crisa was derived from this quarter. For Pausanias Crisa was the earlier name of Cirrha (10.37.5), the harbour town which he knew at first hand. The form 'Cirrha' is used in *hyp.* b and d, *marm. Par.* A 37, 'Crisa' in *hyp.* a and *N.* 9 *inscr.*: both forms plainly refer to the same place, and it is perverse to suggest that the Sacred War was

[1] The original oracle was evidently already known to Ephorus as the source of D.S. 'ix', fr. 16 (so Wilamowitz (1893), i. 18 n.29).

[2] At Dion. Calliph. 81 Κρῖσα is Harduin's certain correction of MS. Λάρισα.

waged against two cities in succession, first Crisa and then Cirrha. No, the distinction between the two names is unknown to any other writer on the Sacred War.

We must therefore suspect that Strabo himself conceived the idea of distinguishing Crisa and Cirrha. His manner of speaking strengthens the suspicion. The notice of Cirrha is precise and accurate: 'Below Cirphis lies an ancient city Cirrha, situated on the sea, from which the ascent to Delphi is about 80 stades; it is set opposite Sicyon, and in front of Cirrha stretches the Crisaean Plain with its fertile soil.'[1] The term 'Crisaean', by contrast with 'Cirrha', leads him to mention Crisa: 'For again, next in order, is another city Crisa, from which the Crisaean Gulf takes its name; then comes Anticyra' etc. Now in the sentence *πάλιν γὰρ ἐφεξῆς ἐστὶν ἄλλη πόλις Κρῖσα* the words *ἐστὶν ἄλλη* are emphatic: Strabo means to contest the view that Cirrha and Crisa are one. And yet his account of Crisa could not be more perfunctory and vague. He cites no authority and adduces no evidence. The site of Crisa, unlike that of Cirrha, is left unspecified. What is the interval between the two? Or between Crisa and Anticyra? It is certain that in Strabo's view Crisa lay on the coast east of Cirrha. At 9.3.1 Crisa, like Cirrha and Anticyra, is described as situated directly on the sea, *ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἱδρυμένη τῆς θαλάττης*, and is contrasted with neighbouring inland sites such as Delphi and Cirphis. There can be no question, then, of identifying Strabo's Crisa with the site of Ay. Georghios 7 kilometres inland.[2] Now there might be room for another coastal settlement *to the west*, on the level stretch between Cirrha and Chaleium.[3] But the context at 9.3.3 indicates that Strabo put Crisa *east* of Cirrha: the series Cirrha-Crisa-Anticyra belongs to the Periplus, the coasting journey from west to east which resumes, with a backward glance at Anticyra, at 9.3.13. And the inhospitable headland between Cirrha and Anticyra offers no possible setting.

Strabo recounts the destruction of Cirrha and Crisa in the following words. *ἡ δὲ Κίρρα καὶ ἡ Κρῖσα κατεσπάσθησαν, ἡ μὲν ὕστερον ἡ ὑπ' Εὐρυλόχου τοῦ Θετταλοῦ κατὰ τὸν Κρισαῖον πόλεμον· εὐτυχήσαντες γὰρ οἱ Κρισαῖοι κτλ.* The best manuscripts repeat *ἡ* after *ὕστερον* (as above), some others do not.[4] Although none of the manuscripts indicates a lacuna, something has certainly dropped out,

[1] Paus. 10.37.4 gives the distance from Cirrha to Delphi as 60 stades, Harp. s.v. *Kirrhaion pedion* as 30. Harp.'s figure is much too small; Str. and Paus. are in the proper range; but the windings of the upper road between Chrysó and Delphi complicate the reckoning, as Frazer observes. Cirrha is not strictly 'opposite Sicyon', but in Str.'s day there were no towns of any account between Sicyon and Aegium far to the west (8.7.4–5).

[2] The identification is affirmed by Aly (1950), p.251. Noting that Str. is commonly understood to place Crisa on the coast, Aly brands this opinion as 'false', and attempts a different explanation. The words *πρόκειται δὲ τῆς Κίρρας τὸ Κρισαῖον πεδίον εὔδαιμον*, says Aly, describe the plain not as lying inland from Cirrha, but as meeting the sea west of Cirrha in the vicinity of modern Itea. This rendering of *πρόκειται* is extremely dubious, but in any case has no bearing that I can see on what follows, viz. *πάλιν γὰρ ἐφεξῆς ἐστὶν ἄλλη πόλις Κρῖσα, ἀφ' ἧς ὁ κόλπος Κρισαῖος, εἶτα Ἀντίκυρα*, which can only mean that Crisa lies on the coast between Cirrha and Anticyra. Perhaps it was in Aly's mind to interpret the passage as locating Crisa somewhere on the northern periphery of the Crisaean plain, but then he need not have troubled about *πρόκειται*, for Ay. Georghios lies north-*east* of Cirrha. On top of this confusion Aly has overlooked 9.3.1, where Crisa is expressly said to lie *on the sea itself*.

[3] That Crisa should be sought in this area was suggested (without reference to Str.) by Dor, Jannoray, and H. and M. van Effenterre (1960), p.15; but as they admit, no traces have ever been observed.

[4] For the manuscript readings see Aly (1950), p.251, together with the footnote added by Sbordone.

for after *κατεσπάσθησαν* we require two phrases in apposition (*ἡ μέν . . . ἡ δέ*), referring to Cirrha and Crisa respectively. The remedy adopted in the Loeb text of H. L. Jones goes back to Korais: *ἡ μὲν <πρότερον ὑπὸ Κρισαίων, αὐτὴ δ' ἡ Κρῖσα> ὕστερον ὑπ' Εὐρυλόχου κτλ*. This supplement takes no account of the *ἡ* after *ὕστερον*, which was not read by earlier editors. A recent proposal of W. Aly, *ἡ μὲν ὕστερον, ἡ <δὲ Κρῖσα> ὑπ' Εὐρυλόχου κτλ*. is therefore preferable, and has the further merit of maximum brevity: indeed *<δέ>* alone would suffice, since the name Crisa need not be repeated after such a brief space. While accepting this supplement we must reject Aly's interpretation of the sentence; he holds that Cirrha and Crisa were both destroyed during the Sacred War—Crisa by Eurylochus, and Cirrha at a later stage when Eurylochus had withdrawn. But Strabo is more naturally taken to mean that the Sacred War concerned only Crisa, and that Cirrha met its end at some later time. Strabo's remarks on the site of Cirrha leave no doubt that for him, as for other Greek and Roman writers, Cirrha was the harbour town which existed from the Archaic period down to Late Roman times. Throughout this period neither the literary nor the archaeological record gives any hint that Cirrha was ever 'razed'.[1] But we may easily suppose that in Strabo's day Cirrha, like many another city in mainland Greece, was impoverished and depopulated, and Strabo was perhaps misled by its ruinous aspect into speaking of a violent overthrow—which however he does not explain. It may be too that having distinguished Cirrha and Crisa on no satisfactory grounds, Strabo deemed it convenient and plausible to represent both as vanished cities.

The upshot is that Strabo's distinction between Cirrha and Crisa is an arbitrary venture, unsupported by argument or authority. Strabo asserts that Crisa was 'another city' without telling us where it lay; he asserts that Cirrha was destroyed 'later' than Crisa without telling us how or when. The geographer is not at his best in this passage and does not deserve the respectful attention which has been accorded him in the past.

We have now surveyed all the ancient notices of Crisa and Cirrha that are in any way helpful, including both contemporary references to the landscape round Delphi and later accounts of the First Sacred War; and the picture that emerges is clear and uniform. Apart from the harbour town there was no Archaic city in the neighbourhood of Delphi, whether at Ay. Georghios or elsewhere. The harbour town figures in Greek literature from Pindar onward as 'Cirrha', and it is practically certain that 'Crisa' in the Archaic period denotes the same place: at any rate no reason exists to suppose that this name was ever applied in living speech to Ay. Georghios or any other site. The Archaic city destroyed in the First Sacred War is called 'Crisa' or 'Cirrha' indifferently, but 'Cirrha' is much commoner, as it is also the current name of the harbour town. And as a rule the harbour town was

[1] Aeschines boasted that in 340/39 he and other Amphictyonic delegates, reacting to Amphissa's encroachments on the sacred land, 'went down into the plain of Cirrha and demolished the harbour and burnt the houses before withdrawing again' (3.123). In order to evade responsibility for bringing Philip into Greece, Aeschines must exaggerate the indignation of the Amphictyons and the severity of their reprisals against Amphissa. The harbour town of Cirrha figures in Delphic inscriptions before and after this date without any perceptible change; we ought not to imagine that it was laid in ruins by Aeschines and his colleagues. Now Str. 9.3.4 devotes a couple of sentences to these events, but the destruction of Cirrha which he previously alleged does not belong here, for he associates the Amphissians with Crisa, not Cirrha: 'they revived Crisa, and tilled once more the plain that had been cursed by the Amphictyons, and proved harsher to foreigners than the Crisaeans of old had been.'

conceived to be the target of the War, though in a late—and plainly aberrant—version 'Crisa' is equated with the Mycenaean ruins at Ay. Georghios. The name 'Crisa', beside 'Cirrha', did finally prove perplexing, as we see from Strabo and other sources later still: but the perplexity did not arise until Roman times, among sciolists of a darkening age, for the Pindaric scholia abundantly prove that Hellenistic authorities never even contemplated a distinction between Crisa and Cirrha.

One other argument for identifying the site of Ay. Georghios as 'Crisa' is sometimes offered. On the shelf of Parnassus just north of Ay. Georghios is the modern village of Χρυσό. Despite the accent, which points to χρυσός 'gold', scholars commonly derive 'Chrysó' from 'Crisa'; and no doubt this is possible, since place-names are often deformed by folk etymology. Yet even so it does not follow that the name was transferred to the village from the neighbouring site of Ay. Georghios. In Late Roman times the inhabitants of the harbour town, here as elsewhere in Greece, will have removed to higher ground for security,[1] and the name may well have followed them to the site of the village. But it is much more likely that the village name Chrysó comes from the hero Χρυσός worshipped in the hippodrome near by (§VIII below).[2]

Our results so far may be summarized as follows. Although ancient accounts of the First Sacred War imply that the offending city was rich and powerful and strongly fortified, no such place is known to the archaeological record; Ay. Georghios in particular, the site favoured by many historians, was never occupied at all in Greek times. And although it is now common practice to distinguish Crisa and Cirrha, the great Archaic city and the modest harbour town, the two names are used interchangeably in most ancient sources, and can often be seen, and for the rest nearly always surmised, to denote the harbour town. Late writers who say or hint otherwise are palpably confused. This evidence by itself would seem sufficient to discredit the traditional view of the First Sacred War. At the least believers must henceforth specify what site they propose, and show what title archaeology provides.

III. THE ARGUMENT FROM SILENCE

The First Sacred War is never even glancingly referred to in Greek literature down to 342 B.C. Here the argument from silence is indeed compelling, for Classical writers have much to say of Delphi and its oracle during the Archaic period, and Herodotus and Plato in particular had many opportunities for noticing the War. There is also an Archaic account of the Delphic oracle which might be expected to throw some light on the War, namely the *Hymn to Apollo*; and this we ought to consider first.

The second part of the *Hymn*, i.e. lines 182—546, dealing with the establishment of Apollo's cult and oracle at Delphi, was once an independent poem. Since tradition ascribed the *Hymn* as a whole to Cynaethus of Chios, active in 504/501 B.C. (sch. Pi. *N.* 2.1c, cf. le), some critics have supposed that it was Cynaethus

[1] The modern settlements on the coast date from the nineteenth century—Itea from 1837, Xeropigado from 1871: see L. Lerat, *Les Locriens de l'ouest* i. 163.

[2] Wilamowitz (1922), p.71 n.4, 73 n.0 regarded the hero Χρυσός as a disguised form of Κρῖσος, in conformity with his view that the Delphians and others sought to abolish all memory of Crisa by substituting Χρύση, Χρυσόθεμις for earlier names like Κρίση (in the Troad!) and Κρισόθεμις, and also by turning Κρῖσος into Ἀκρίσιος (but cf. *Der Gl. der Hell.* ii. 32 n.2); this is very far fetched.

who first joined the Delian and the Pythian parts and added whatever finishing touches were needed.[1] But although the final redaction of the *Hymn* may be as late as this or even later, it still remains to be decided just when the Pythian part was first composed, and how far the existing *Hymn* reproduces the original version. Despite long debate no substantial measure of agreement has been reached: the Pythian part is put by some scholars before the traditional date of the First Sacred War,[2] by others after it.[3] Especially controversial are the closing lines of the poem, which warn the Delphic priesthood that future misconduct will bring them under external control: 'There shall be some idle word or deed, or such arrogance as mankind is prone to; then other men shall become your masters, under whose constraint you will be bound for ever' (lines 540–3). This is plainly a *vaticinium ex eventu*, but who are the external arbiters of Delphi?

In the previous section we saw that 'Crisa', meaning the harbour town and the adjacent plain, is mentioned several times in the *Hymn*—as marking Apollo's general destination (269, 282), as the landfall of the Cretan sailors (431, 438), and as witnessing the inauguration of Apollo's worship (445–6). Many scholars have been led to say that the *Hymn* glorifies the great city of Crisa, and some to infer that the lines quoted above signify Crisa's domination of Delphi. Neither opinion is justified. It was obviously convenient for the poet, in describing Apollo's choice of a new cult site, to refer to the only other town in the area (whether the historical occupation of Crisa/Cirrha actually preceded the historical occupation of Delphi was no concern of his); there is nothing to suggest that Crisa was an important place in its own right, much less that it controlled Delphi. And supposing for a moment that these things were true, and that the passage quoted could describe the Crisaeans lording it over Delphi in the days before the First Sacred War, is it conceivable that a passage so topical and partisan could survive both the period of transmission after the Sacred War and the final redaction by Cynaethus or another? δεδμήσεσθ' ἤματα πάντα, says the Hymn.

On the most natural interpretation, the passage refers not to Crisa but to the Amphictyony that administered Delphi from at least the Late Archaic period onward (though not always very effectively).[4] We do not know how the Amphictyons came to take charge of the sanctuary. Since Thessaly and its subject neighbours held a majority of places in the Amphictyonic Council, and since the Amphictyony was formerly centred on Anthela (or else incorporated another Amphictyony centred on Anthela) at the gateway between northern and central Greece, the advent of the Amphictyony probably coincided with Thessaly's subjugation of central Greece, which on general grounds ought not to be dated before the sixth century, and perhaps not before the second half of the century. It must be stressed that in ancient accounts the First Sacred War has nothing to do with the advent of the Amphictyony or with the extension of

[1] Wade-Gery (1936); M. L. West, *CQ* 69 (1975), 161–70.

[2] Jacoby, *SPAW* (1933), 749 n.1; Allen, Halliday, and Sykes pp.185, 199–200; Wade-Gery (1936), pp.62–8; Defradas (1954), pp.55–85; Parke and Wormell (1956), i. 107–8; Guillon (1963), pp.85–98; A. Lesky, *Gesch. der Gr. Lit.*[2], p.106; West, *CQ* 69 (1975), 165.

[3] Wilamowitz (1922), p.74; Guarducci, *SMSR* 19–20 (1943–6), 86–7; Forrest (1956), pp.34–5; J. Fontenrose, *Univ. Calif. Publ. Class. Arch.* iv. 3 (1960), 222; N. J. Richardson, The *Hom. H. to Dem.* (1974), pp.11 n.2, 332.

[4] Wade-Gery (1936), p.64—as part of a revision soon after the Sacred War; Forrest (1956), pp.34–5, 42–4; Parke and Wormell (1956), i. 107–8.

Thessalian power. All sources agree that the Amphictyony existed before the War began, while Delphi was oppressed by Crisa/Cirrha; in other contexts the origin of the Amphictyony is placed far back in mythical times.[1] The Amphictyons, we are told, resolved on war and put an army in the field; Solon advocated the war, Alcmeon led an Athenian contingent, Cleisthenes played a part (at least in certain versions), and Eurylochus of Thessaly was commander-in-chief. As a result of the War Crisa/Cirrha was destroyed and the adjacent plain consecrated to Apollo; no other changes are reported. Thus the Sacred War did not, on the ancient view, bring the new 'masters' of the *Hymn*; and modern scholars who give a different reconstruction of events have failed to explain how the tradition can be wrong about such a fundamental point.

Before leaving the *Hymn* we may observe that if the First Sacred War is not in view at lines 540–3, then it goes unnoticed altogether. Crisa is spoken of without unkindness; the Amphictyons control Delphi (for Apollo, speaking at the moment of Delphi's foundation, envisages Amphictyonic control). Did this situation lead to the Sacred War? Did it follow the Sacred War? In fact it is as if the Sacred War never took place.

It is more surprising still that Herodotus, who has so much to say about Delphi, never even alludes to the War. The leading role which Cleisthenes of Sicyon supposedly played in besieging Crisa/Cirrha goes unmentioned in the two digressions on this tyrant (5.67–9.1 and 6.126–31.1), though in the latter, when Pheidon of Argos is named incidentally as the father of one of Agariste's suitors, Herodotus finds room to record and condemn his intervention at Olympia (6.127.3). Herodotus describes at length Cleisthenes' reform of the cults and festivals of Sicyon, for which he sought the sanction of the Delphic oracle; it would have been pertinent to say (had it been true) that the greatest festival of Sicyon, the Pythian Games celebrated in Pindar's 9th *Nemean*, was founded by Cleisthenes out of his share, a third part, of the spoils of the Sacred War (so sch. Pi. *N.* 9 *inscr.*). It has often been observed that as the liberator of Delphi in the Sacred War, and as the founder of a local version of the Pythian Games, Cleisthenes deserved something better than the sharp rebuff which he received from the oracle during his efforts to discredit Adrastus (Hdt. 5.67.2); we need not examine all the special pleading that has been expended on the contradiction. Herodotus is interested in the earlier history of Athens, in Solon's career, and in the fortunes of the Alcmeonids, including their relations with Delphi; why does he fail to mention the role of Athens, Solon, and Alcmeon in the First Sacred War? Finally, the events of 480 lead Herodotus to emphasize repeatedly the abiding hostility between Phocis and Thessaly, and to relate the previous stages of the conflict (8.27–33); yet the Sacred War would seem to have a special bearing on this theme, since Crisa is usually reckoned a Phocian town, and the Thessalian general Eurylochus must have traversed Phocis in any case.

Thucydides 1.15.2–3 holds that wars in Greece down to the Persian invasion were local affairs involving no large coalitions or distant campaigns, except perhaps for the early conflict between Chalcis and Eretria.[2] But in the First Sacred War we

[1] Jacoby (1904), pp.33–5.

[2] Gomme ad loc. does not mention the First Sacred War but finds two other exceptions to Th.'s rule, namely the conquests of early Sparta and of Pheidon of Argos. It seems to me that these wars, being fought by a single state against its neighbours, are not exceptions at all, unless with Gomme we interpret the first sentence of 1.15.2 to mean 'there was no war that led to any real

hear of an Amphictyonic army which included contingents from powers as widely separated as Thessaly and Athens, and also the fleet of Sicyon; and these forces served far from home for several years. The tradition of the Sacred War and its modern exponents make Thucydides a liar or a fool.[1]

The Sacred War continues unnoticed through the first half of the fourth century; so far as we can see, it was never treated by any of the Attic chroniclers from Hellanicus down to Philochorus and Ister.[2]

IV. THE PARTISANS OF PHILIP

In 346 Philip ended the so-called Third Sacred War by dispelling the last Phocian resistance, and proceeded to impose a far-reaching settlement which left the Athenians, as recent allies of Phocis, feeling baffled and aggrieved. In the ensuing controversy over Philip's conduct the First Sacred War leaps into view. It was first bruited in literary tracts composed by supporters of Philip, notably Speusippus and Callisthenes, who held up the Archaic conflict as a worthy precedent for the Third Sacred War and Philip's intervention. The earliest datable reference comes in Speusippus' *Letter to Philip* of 342, and Speusippus drew upon the then unpublished researches of an aspiring historian named Antipater of Magnesia. Callisthenes' monograph on the Third Sacred War, which treated the Archaic paradigm, probably dates from about the same time. The *Register of Pythian Victors*, ascribed jointly to Callisthenes and Aristotle, also

accession of power'; but could Th. possibly mean *that*?

[1] This passage of Th. and the Phocian chapters of Hdt. were previously adduced by Guillon (1963), p.57, as incompatible with the tradition of the First Sacred War. But he continued to believe in the main events of the War.

[2] Had it always been known that both Solon and Alcmeon were deeply concerned in the War, we should expect the Attic chroniclers to dwell upon the subject, and the results ought then to be canvassed by the Alexandrian commentators on P., who drew freely on these chroniclers. Instead sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* b and d appear to use one source only for the Sacred War (apart from Euphorion's passing mention of Eurylochus), namely the *Register of Pythian Victors* (§§ V–VI below). Admittedly the silence of the Attic chroniclers is not a strong argument against the authenticity of the War, but it is worth observing that they *are* silent, inasmuch as some critics have persistently but falsely stated that the tradition is in fact indebted in some measure to the Attic chroniclers. Wilamowitz (1893), i, 13–14 asserted that Aeschines' notice of Solon at 3.108 could only derive from an Attic chronicler ('This conclusion, which perhaps seems too bold at this point, will be self-evident to one who has read my book through'); in truth Aeschines might have consulted any of the three contemporary treatments that we know of, Callisth. *On the Sacred War*, Ar. and Callisth.'s *Register of Pythian Victors*, or the researches of Antipater of Magnesia, *FGH* 69 F 2; or—since the Sacred War was very much in the air—he might have relied on hearsay at Athens or even at Delphi, where he had recently been Pylagorus. Citing these pages of Wilamowitz, Jacoby went a few steps further and spoke of 'extensive' comment by the Attic chroniclers and of 'abundant' traces of such comment ((1904), p.102, and again in his note on *FGH* 239 F 37–8: according to Jacoby it was an *Atthis* that supplied the Parian chronicler with his dates for the War and for the origin of the Pythian Games. Jacoby also conjectures that Androtion, who regarded the original 'Amphictyony' as nothing more than a gathering of neighbours (*FGH* 324 F 58), offered this explanation while recounting the First Sacred War; but nowhere else is the lore of Amphictyonic origins connected with the Sacred War; and it is much more likely that Androtion spoke of the Amphictyony in connection with the Athenian king Amphictyon, for in all other sources the Amphictyony is founded by one Amphictyon, either the Attic king or a homonym.

gave some details in connection with the origin of the Pythian Games; this work cannot well be later than 330 and may be as much as fifteen years earlier. Finally, Aeschines in the year 330 spoke of the First Sacred War as justifying the recent action of the Amphictyonic Council which brought about the Fourth Sacred War and led to the battle of Chaeronea; and he had urged the same argument before the Amphictyonic Council in 339, when the action was taken (here Aeschines' report is confirmed by Demosthenes 18.149).

That the First Sacred War is first heard of in the 340s does not of course prove it a fiction invented at that moment. It may be said that there was simply no occasion for earlier sources to mention such a thing; and yet, if we have understood Herodotus and Thucydides correctly, these writers at least had excellent reason to report the Sacred War. Moreover, two of our earliest witnesses expressly characterize the First Sacred War as a mere tale, μῦθος; although their attitudes differ, both plainly mean that they will not vouch for the truth of what is said about the War. Demosthenes 18.149 asserts that at the Amphictyonic meeting of 339 Aeschines gulled his impressionable audience by 'concocting pretty speeches and tales about how the Cirrhaean territory came to be consecrated', λόγους εὐπροσώπους καὶ μύθους ὅθεν ἡ Κιρραία χώρα καθιερώθη συνθείς. But since it was obviously Demosthenes' aim to impugn the motives and ridicule the arguments of his adversary, perhaps the orator's testimony should simply be set aside.

It is not so easy, however, to explain away the compromising tone and context of Speusippus' notice of the Sacred War (*Let. to Phil.* 8–9).

> Since the affairs of the Amphictyony too have plainly engaged your attention, I wish to recount a tale from Antipater, ἐβουλήθην σοι φράσαι μῦθον παρ' Ἀντιπάτρου, about how the Amphictyony was first constituted, and how certain member states of the Amphictyony were destroyed—the Phlegyans by Apollo, the Dryopians by Heracles, and the Crisaeans by the other Amphictyons. All these states belonged to the Amphictyony but afterwards lost their votes, which went to new members recruited in their place. Some of these, says Antipater, gave the example for you to follow, and you have now received from the Amphictyons, as a Pythian prize for your expedition to Delphi, the two votes of the Phocians.

Antipater offers ancient precedent for Philip's intervention in the Third Sacred War, and the precedent is carefully tailored: Phlegyans, Dryopians, and Crisaeans all were members of the Amphictyony, like the Phocians, and all found themselves expelled, again like the Phocians, to make way for a newcomer, such as Philip was. Nowhere else is it said of any of these ancient peoples that they belonged to the Amphictyony, and so this feature at least can be safely ascribed to Antipater. How much else did he invent? Earlier in the letter we are told that Antipater 'was the first to relate credible tales', πρῶτος ἀξιοπίστους μύθους εἴρηκε, giving Philip as a Heraclid ancestral title to Chalcidice, Thrace, and Ambracia; in all these places, according to Antipater, Heracles slew wrongdoers and then left their domains in trust to local worthies who later were unjustly dispossessed by the Greek states ranged against Philip. Most of the stories of Heracles' exploits in these distant parts can be shown to have existed before Antipater; what he has added is the scheme of παρακαταθήκη, together with the very nebulous figures who are entrusted with the lands.[1] So in the present case it

[1] As Bickermann (1928), pp.27–9, explains, Antipater aimed to establish Philip's *legal* title to places like Pallene, Torone, Amphipolis, and Ambracia: they had all been justifiably seized by Heracles in reprisal for wrongdoing, and then duly

is unlikely that Antipater was the first to represent Phlegyans, Dryopians, and Crisaeans as offenders against Delphi;[1] his contribution will have been the detail of Amphictyonic membership, which of course makes the analogy with Phocis all the more explicit.

Antipater himself, then, is not to be suspected of inventing the First Sacred War. It is disturbing none the less that in producing a mythical charter for Philip's conquests and ambitions, Antipater dealt as freely with the First Sacred War as with the tales of Phlegyans and Dryopians and the adventures of Heracles. Speusippus puts all these tales on the same footing, though we might expect him to single out the Sacred War as the most recent and solid precedent. And in Callisthenes too the War had a mythical air, for all the details of his account that are directly attested prove to be nothing but motifs taken from the Trojan War: the Cirrhaeans provoked the War, which lasted ten years, by 'abducting Megisto daughter of Pelagon of Phocis'—Great Lady daughter of Sea-King—'and the daughters of the Argives as they were returning from the Pythian sanctuary' (Ath. 13.10, 560 B–C = *FGH* 124 F 1). As we shall see later, other elements of his narrative were equally mythical.

That the First Sacred War was still a novelty in the late 340s is also suggested by the pattern of Aeschines' references to the early history of Delphi and of the Amphictyony. In 339 and again in 330 he exalted the War as a stern crusade against Delphi's impious neighbours, who prefigure the Amphissans of 339. It is of interest that just a few years before, in the speech *On the Embassy* of 343, Aeschines said nothing of the War—though it would have scored a point. During the embassy in question, in the early summer of 346, Aeschines (by his own account) gave Philip much earnest advice on how to treat the Phocians and the Thebans in the aftermath of the Third Sacred War. On that occasion, says he (2.114–16), he expounded the ideals of the Delphic Amphictyony and enumerated the twelve Greek peoples who were represented on equal terms. The point which he is making is that Greece has long-standing procedures for dealing with just such a case as the Third Sacred War, and that Philip, as an outsider, ought to pay close attention to Greek practice and to an adept like Aeschines. Now if the First Sacred War had been known to Aeschines and his audience of 343 as a close analogue of the Third Sacred War, how could it fail to be mentioned here? It would show the full membership of the Delphic Amphictyony working together to re-establish peace and order. And as Athens' spokesman Aeschines might use-

placed on deposit with trustees whom he appointed.

[1] Among extant sources Antipater is in fact the first to describe either Phlegyans or Dryopians as offenders against Apollo's shrine. To be sure, a sch. on *Il.* 13.302, after relating at length the conflict between Thebes and the Phlegyans, adds that 'they also burned the temple of Apollo at Delphi', and appears to ascribe the latter tale as well as the former to Pherecydes (*FGH* 3 F 41e); but the very cursory mention of the temple-burning, when set beside several other notices of Pherecydes on the Phlegyans (*FGH* 3 F 41b, c, d), makes it virtually certain that the mythographer treated only the Phlegyan encroachment on Thebes. The Phlegyans are properly at home in the region of Orchomenus (*h. Ap.* 278). The next writer after Antipater to bring the Phlegyans to Delphi is Demophilus in the last book of Ephorus' *Histories* (*FGH* 70 F 93). As for the Dryopians, Heracles drove them out at the bidding of the Delphic oracle (B. fr. 4 Snell[8]), but their offence was against Heracles and perhaps Ceyx, not against Delphi. So it is likely enough that the Phlegyans and Dryopians, stock villains both, were brought to Delphi to provide a mythical paradigm for the Phocian villainy of the Third Third Sacred War. But we must not attribute this bold step to Antipater, whose creative imagination seems very limited.

fully have added that Solon of Athens was a guiding spirit in the earlier enterprise. Indeed if the course of the War had been at all familiar, to pass over it here would be extremely damaging, inasmuch as the fate of Cirrha might seem to authorize Philip's severity towards the Phocians and to belie the pacific ideals which Aeschines ascribes to the Amphictyony from the moment of its founding.[1] The only reasonable conclusion to be drawn from Aeschines' remarks is that in 343 he was unacquainted with the details which he paraded in 339 and 330.

Thus the first sources to mention the Sacred War—Speusippus, Callisthenes, Aeschines, Demosthenes—intimate in different ways that the story was dubious and fluctuating. It was also very topical in the 340s and 330s, and no doubt much more was said about it by contemporary writers who are lost to us for ever;[2] it is the merest chance that Speusippus' letter was included in the Socratic collection and so reached us in a single manuscript;[3] but for Speusippus we should never have heard of Antipater of Magnesia and of his elaborate apology for Philip. In these circumstances it is impossible to know who first laid down the main lines of the story. The only candidate that could be named is Callisthenes, who certainly had much to do with forming the tradition, and was suitably endowed and motivated; yet he may only have elaborated suggestions from another quarter. But although we must beware of claiming too much for Callisthenes, it will be useful to conclude our review of fourth-century witnesses by considering his place in the series.

V. *THE REGISTER OF PYTHIAN VICTORS*

Two separate works come into question, both dimly known. Of the monograph on the war of 356–346 (*FGH* 124 T 25, F 1) we hear no more than that

[1] Aeschines tells his Athenian audience in 343, as he professedly told Philip in 346, that the Amphictyons in old days—seemingly at their first meeting, though Aeschines is not quite clear on this point—swore a great oath never to devastate a member city or subject it to the rigours of siege warfare; and he quotes the archaic-sounding oath. Now although Crisa is not usually regarded as a member of the Amphictyony, the treatment which she received from the Amphictyons plainly contravenes the spirit if not the letter of the oath, and modern scholars have been put to some trouble to explain the inconsequence. It is simpler to infer that when Aeschines and doubtless others before him held up the Amphictyonic oath as a pattern of conduct, the First Sacred War had not been heard of. Whether the oath is in any sense authentic may be doubted: the question has not been much advanced, so far as I can see, by the text of the 'Greek Oath' inscribed at Acharnae in the mid-fourth century, which contains the same undertaking in the same language, but in favour of the cities leagued against Xerxes. Even if the Greek Oath in both the epigraphic and the literary versions is a figment, as the majority opinion reasonably holds, there is no telling whether the formulas inserted in the Acharnian text came from a well-known model such as the Amphictyonic oath might have been, or from some indiscriminate stock of such things (cf. G. Daux, 'Serments amphictioniques et serments de Platées', in *Stud. Pres. to D. M. Robinson* ii. 775–82).

[2] The notion that Menaechmus of Sicyon dealt with the Sacred War and gave a leading role to Cleisthenes (so e.g. Parke and Wormell (1956), i. 104–5) depends upon Boeckh's treatment of sch. Pi. *N.* 9 *inscr.*, which was certainly misguided. 'The Halicarnassian' there cited cannot be Hdt., as Boeckh thought, and though something has dropped out of the citation, another authority such as Menaechmus is not wanted in the lacuna; 'the Halicarnassian' told of Cleisthenes' blockading Crisa and founding the Pythian Games at Sicyon out of the spoils of war. As Wilamowitz (1893), i. 18 n.27, saw, 'the Halicarnassian' will be Dionysius, who might well treat the foundation of the Sicyonian festival in his work περὶ χρόνων (*FGH* 251, where this passage is not canvassed, however.)

[3] Vatic. gr. 64 (Bickermann and Sykutris (1928), p.7).

it contained a few romantic details, already noted, about the First Sacred War; these details might, but need not, belong to a consecutive account of the War; we cannot say whether the First Sacred War was treated in an Archaeologia prefaced to the work, or in a digression, or in several asides.[1] For information about Solon's role in the War Plutarch, *Solon* 11.1, turned to the *Register of Pythian Victors*, a joint work of Aristotle and Callisthenes according to a Delphic or Amphictyonic decree honouring the pair (*SIG*^{3} 275 = *GHI* 187). In Plutarch and other literary sources the *Register* is ascribed to Aristotle alone (so frr. 616–17 Rose; cf. also D. L. 5.26, nos. 131–4, and Hsch. nos. 123–5, as interpreted below), but of course they are all outweighed by the inscription, for it is natural that in later memory the greater name should have ousted the lesser. And indeed if the younger and obscurer man originally received equal credit, we must suspect that the labour was chiefly his.[2]

What sort of work was the *Register of Pythian Victors*, ἡ τῶν Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφή? This appears to be the proper title, used in Delphic accounts of the year 327/6 (*SIG*^{3} 252, line 42) and at Plu. *Sol.* 11.1;[3] it is also implied by the form of citation in other sources (frr. 616–17 Rose). In another Delphic inscription, datable only to the period after the institution of the Tamiae in 339, the work is described as a 'table', πίναξ, of Pythian victors and of the organizers of the contest (*GHI* 187 = *SIG*^{3} 275, line 10; the word is plausibly restored in lines 1–2). Such usage might lead us to think of the work as a bare list of names, comparable to the list of Olympic victors copied out on *P. Oxy.* 222 (*FGH* 415).[4] But the *Register* contained discursive entries, reporting Solon's advocacy of the Sacred War (so Plutarch) and explaining the proverb 'Buthus rambles' as a reference to a simple-minded Pythian victor (so Hesychius). Moreover, it has been reasonably inferred that the *Register* is the source of the information which the *hypotheses* to Pindar's *Pythians* retail about the stages of the First Sacred War and the foundation of the Pythian Games, inasmuch as these events are dated by both Athenian and Delphic archons.[5] According to *hyp.* a, b, and d the commander-in-chief Eurylochus conducted a festival with substantial prizes in 591/0, and the victorious Amphictyons established the regular Pythian Games with crowns in 582/1. When the Delphic inscription already mentioned describes the work of Aristotle and Callisthenes as a table of Pythian victors and τῶν ἐξ ἀρχ [ῆς τὸ]/ν ἀγῶνα καταστ [ενα]/σάντων, this phrase probably refers to the actions of Eurylochus and the Amphictyons, and also to the successive enlargements of the festival programme (cf. Paus. 10.7.4–8)—for it is scarcely credible that the *Register* should have set out the names of all actual or putative Agonothetae.[6] Thus

[1] Jacoby on *FGH* 124 F 1 and L. Pearson, *The Lost Hist. of Alex. the Great*, p.28, thought of 'an introduction' to the book.

[2] Jacoby, *RE* x 2 (1919), 1685 s.v. Kallisth. 2, and again on *FGH* 124 T 23.

[3] The accounts were inscribed under the archon Caphis, formerly assigned to 331/0. The adjustment of the 'Aristotle publication-date' (not a happy term) was pointed out by D. M. Lewis, *CR* N.S. 8 (1958), 108.

[4] The catalogue of Aristotle's works also has the title *Olympic Victors* (D. L. no. 130; Hsch. no. 122); but as this was only a single volume, beside the three volumes of the *Register* (of which more below), it must have dealt with some limited aspect—perhaps victors in a single event, or disputed names and provenances in the list.

[5] Wilamowitz (1893), i. 13–24; Jacoby on *FGH* 239 F 37–8.

[6] That it did so was maintained by Pomtow at *SIG*^{3} 275 n.6 and by Tod on *GHI* 187. Dem. Phal.'s reference to Creon as staging an ennaeteric Pythian festival just before the Trojan War (fr. 191 Wehrli, cited by Eust. on *Od.* 3.267, and perhaps deriving from the *Homericus*, as Wehrli suggests) must not be taken to prove that the Agonothetae were on record.

Aristotle and Callisthenes gave much more than a list of Pythian victors, although their work took its name from this constant element; the *Register* was in fact a compendious chronicle of the origin and development of the Pythian Games. We know that the lists of Olympic victors used by such writers as Pausanias and Philostratus had the same broad scope.[1]

The *hypotheses* to Pindar's *Pythians* reckon the regular series of Pythian Games from the year 582/1, when Gylidas was archon at Delphi; and in the Delphic inscription honouring Aristotle and Callisthenes the table of victors is said to begin, according to much the likeliest restoration, in the archonship of Gylidas: *τῶν ἀ [πὸ Γυλίδα νεν]/ικηκ[ότ]ων τὰ [Πύθια]*. But of course the Sacred War, as the immediate cause of the new dispensation, may have been treated very fully. And indeed we are free to suppose that the *Register* also described the earlier eighth-yearly celebration commemorating Apollo's victory over the serpent; for the lists of Olympic victors likewise dealt with the legendary antecedents of the historical festival. So the details of the earlier celebration furnished by the Pindaric *hypotheses* may equally derive from the *Register*.[2] The *Pythicus* of Menaechmus of Sicyon, which Aristotle's work is said to have superseded (Hsch. no. 123 = *FGH* 131 T 3),[3] must have covered the same ground.[4] The only fragment of this work that we possess looks back to the mythical period; it is an oracle on the death of Orpheus (sch. Pi. *P.* 4.313a = *FGH* 131 F 2), who was prominently depicted in Polygnotus' *Nekyia* (Paus. 10.30.6–8). Now Orpheus with other mythical singers figures in Pausanias' account of the ancient musical contest (10.7.2–3), which is followed by his account of the historical Pythian Games (10.7.4–8). Both sections are at odds with the Pindaric scholia (*hyp.* a is fullest on the musical contest); in Pausanias the regular Games notoriously begin in 586/5, and the extraordinary celebration of 591/0 is omitted. On general grounds, and in view of Orpheus' role, it is not unreasonable to conjecture that Pausanias here reproduces (not directly, of course) Menaechmus' *Pythicus*.[5] If so, it is significant that Pausanias' version of the development of the Pythian festival

[1] J. Jüthner, *Philostr. über Gymn.*, pp.109–16.

[2] In the Aristotelian *Peplus* too the Pythian festival had a mythical origin, being founded by the Amphictyons to commemorate the slaying of the serpent (sch. Aristid. *Panath.* p.323 Dindorf = fr. 637 Rose: according to Phot. *ex* Helladius, cited by Rose ibid., the work also described the historical Pythian Games as originating after the fall of Cirrha, but this notice does not accord with the scope of the *Peplus* or with its treatment of the other great festivals, and can probably be disregarded). It is natural to suppose that the *Peplus* incorporates the view set forth in the *Register*.

[3] *Πυθιονίκας* (*leg.* *Πυθιονικῶν*) *βιβλίον ᾱ, ἐν ᾧι Μέναιχμον ἐνίκησεν*, runs the entry in Hsch.'s catalogue, which is the only piece of evidence that Menaechmus is earlier than Aristotle; whereas other indications, *FGH* 131 T 1, 4b, imply that he lived a generation or two later (despite Jacoby on *FGH* 131, followed by Pearson and others); and so it might be argued that the entry in Hsch. is merely the inference of some Alexandrian scholar faced with two concurrent works. Alternatively we may postulate two Menaechmi (!) or even several. Jacoby is prepared to distinguish the sculptor who wrote about his art (T 2), but diaeresis could be carried a good deal further.

[4] At any rate a *Πυθικὸς* (*λόγος*) would hardly contain a list of victors, as Jacoby observes at *FGH* IIIb *Komm.* ii (*Noten*), 140 n.24; so this was not the point in which Aristotle 'superseded' Menaechmus (or possibly anticipated him, as suggested in n.3 above).

[5] That Cleisthenes of Sicyon is credited with the first victory in the chariot race, instituted in 582/1 (Paus. 10.7.6), might also be thought to point to Menaechmus (but as was said in n.2, p.54 above, Menaechmus is not our source for Cleisthenes' role in the Sacred War).

has nothing to say of the First Sacred War. In this respect as in others Aristotle and Callisthenes 'superseded' Menaechmus.

Whatever may be thought of this conjecture—which has at least the merit of aligning authors and traditions in the most economical fashion—we can be sure that the *Register* of Aristotle and Callisthenes and the *Pythicus* of Menaechmus were alike in relating at length the early history and the pre-history of the Pythian Games. In the *Register* the list of victors must have been carried down to the time at which the work was issued, if only because no reason can be imagined for stopping at any earlier point.[1] But after the early period the chronicle of larger events was either much reduced or entirely absent; later scholars never consulted the *Register* for the Sacred Wars of the fifth and fourth centuries.[2] Thus the *Register* contained very disparate elements—the tale of Apollo's victory over the serpent and its commemoration by an ancient musical contest; the annals of the First Sacred War and the institution of the Pythian Games as a result of the War; subsequent additions to the festival programme, and anecdotes about interesting victors; and a full list of victors in all events. It is not surprising then that whereas the *Register of Pythian Victors* is spoken of as a unitary work in the literary sources and the Delphic documents considered so far, we look in vain for this title in the ancient catalogue of Aristotle's works, which instead names three separate volumes dealing with the Pythian festival.

The catalogue in question, surviving at D. L. 5.22–7 and in Hesychius' *vita*, can be traced in large part to Hermippus, and to the same extent is generally taken to represent the collection of Aristotle's works possessed by the Library at Alexandria in the third century B.C.[3] The catalogue aims to be fully descriptive, and so the *Register* is divided into three parts, as follows.[4] D. L. no. 131/2, Πυθιονῖκαι μουσικῆς ᾱ,[5] and Hsch. no. 124, περὶ μουσικῆς ᾱ, will comprise the account of the ancient musical contest commemorating Apollo's victory, and perhaps also the subsequent list of musical victors in the historical Pythian Games. D. L. no. 133, Πυθικὸς ᾱ, and Hsch. no. 123, Πυθιονίκας (*leg.* Πυθιονικῶν) βιβλίον ᾱ, ἐν ᾧι Μέναιχμον ἐνίκησεν, will comprise the First Sacred War and the

[1] The only dated victory expressly cited from the *Register* belongs to Pythiad 24 of 490 B.C. (sch. Pi. *I.* 2 *inscr.* = fr. 617 Rose).

[2] Cicero makes it clear that Callisth.'s work on the Third Sacred War was a separate monograph, not a part of the *Register* (*Fam.* 5.12.2 = *FGH* T 25).

[3] So Düring (1957), pp.67–9, 90–2, who rejects Moraux's ascription of the catalogue, as of other elements in Aristotle's biography, to Ariston of Chios. In the text of D. L. and Hsch. I follow Düring's careful recension at pp.49 and 86.

[4] It is the fixed idea of the *Register* as a uniform documentary compilation that has prevented scholars from seeing the direct and simple relationship between the *Register* and the Pythian titles in the Alexandrian catalogue. Düring (1957), p.339, represents the majority view in equating D. L.'s Πυθιονικῶν ἔλεγχοι with the Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφή of the Delphic inscription and in describing this as 'the original work', i.e. the very pith and quintessence of the methodical, disinterested research that is held to typify Aristotle and his school; D. L.'s Πυθιονῖκαι μουσικῆς then becomes 'an extract' giving the list of musical victors, and D. L.'s Πυθικός 'a historical work from which Plu. took the facts mentioned in *Sol.* 11'; at the same time the title known to Plu., Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφή, can be identified neither with the 'historical work' nor with the documentary work called by this very name at Delphi—it must be a 'comprehensive title' for all three works listed by D. L.! No wonder then that Jacoby at *FGH* IIIb *Komm.* ii (*Noten*), 140 n.24, abandons the effort of analysis altogether, and postulates 'a confusion which we cannot comprehend'.

[5] In D. L.'s catalogue Rose made two entries out of one by supplementing Πυθιονῖκαι <ᾱ. περὶ> μουσικῆς ᾱ (for the first ᾱ does not occur in the best manuscripts). This procedure mars instead of mends the concurrence with Hsch.

institution and early development of the Pythian Games; this volume is said to have superseded Menaechmus, perhaps because (as we have conjectured) the earlier writer reckoned the Games from 586/5 instead of 582/1, or because (as we have also conjectured) the First Sacred War as the occasion of the new festival was unknown to him. D. L. no. 134, Πυθιονικῶν ἔλεγχοι ᾱ, and Hsch. no. 125, <Πυθιονικῶν> ἐλέγχων <ᾱ> [σοφιστικῶν ἢ περὶ ἐριστικῶν],[1] will comprise the list of victors in the Games—perhaps only the athletic and equestrian victors, if the musical victors were registered under the first title.

There is practically no evidence to show at what point in their careers Aristotle and Callisthenes published the *Register*. Late in the year 327 a leading citizen of Delphi received a payment of 2 minas for having the work inscribed, doubtless in excerpt (*SIG*^{3} 252, line 42);[2] but of course this proceeding need not have followed the original publication at all closely;[3] the year 327 saw Alexander's star at its zenith, and since the authors of the *Register* both had great influence with Alexander and the Macedonian court, it seems very likely that the Hieromnemons who authorized the inscribing did so at least in part with the aim of pleasing the two pundits and of obtaining credit with Alexander. The honorific decree (*GHI* 187 = *SIG*^{3} 275), whether issued by Delphi or by the Amphictyony (for the preamble is lost), perhaps had a similar purpose; as already said, it may have come at any time after 339, and so even within Philip's lifetime. Of course the *Register* must have been complete before Callisthenes joined Alexander's expedition; but despite the opinion prevailing among modern historians, it is nearly certain that Callisthenes did not accompany the King from the outset, but came at a later stage;[4] so even a lower terminus is to seek.

[1] *Legendum* Πυθιονικῶν ἐλέγχων ᾱ. *Verbo* Πυθιονικῶν *casu quodum deperdito scriba supplevit titulum sane notum sed huic locum alienum* (Düring).

[2] Some have tried to compute the quantity of lettering that 2 minas would buy. The results however have little value—not because contemporary rates are unknown, as Pfeiffer asserts, *Hist. of Class. Schol.* i. 80 n.7, for in fact the same contractor was paid 4 obols per 100 letters in 334 and a drachma per 100 in 339, the difference no doubt depending on the size and quality of the letters, and Pomtow reasonably used the cheaper rate as the base—but because the contractor may have received other payments for the same task in earlier and later years. In any case it is inconceivable that a three-volume work should have been inscribed *in toto*. The contractor Deinomachus, otherwise known as Hieromnemon and Councillor, was probably charged with making suitable excerpts.

[3] No matter what view we take of the length and completeness of the inscribed text, as also of the period of time spent at the task, it seems to me quite misguided to regard the Delphic undertaking as the actual publication of Ar. and Callisth.'s book, and to speak of 327 as 'one of the best attested publication-dates in the ancient world' (so D. M. Lewis, *CR* N.S. 8 (1958), 108).

[4] That Callisth. was with the expedition from the outset is the modern consensus, argued by Jacoby, *RE* x 2 (1919), 1675–6; H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* ii. 192–3; and J. R. Hamilton, *Plu.'s Alex.*, p.147. Although it may be true that certain frr. of Callisth. dealing with the early stages of the expedition 'absolutely presuppose an eye-witness' (so Berve), the eye-witness need not have been Callisth. himself. We may readily believe that Ar. commended Callisth. to Alexander, as many sources say; but the commendation might come at any time. No reliance whatever can be placed on D. L. 5.4, where Ar., on moving to Athens, introduces Callisth. to Alexander; for this brief, bold sketch of Callisth.'s career has him carried round in an iron cage at the end and then thrown to a lion. Nor can the story of the Recension of the Casket (Str. 13.1.27; Plu. *Alex.* 26.1–2) be pressed to show that Callisth. and Alexander were on familiar terms 'before the conquest of Persis'. On the other hand the tradition that Callisth. arrived late in Alexander's camp is firm and consistent (Plu. *Alex.* 53.1, *Mor.* 1043D; Just. 12.6.17; V. Max. 7.2 ext. 11; Amm. Marc. 18.3.7); and there is no reason why this detail should be invented (it scarcely enhances the story of Callisth.'s concern for Olynthus, as Berve holds).

We can only ask what circumstances are likely to have prompted Aristotle and Callisthenes to undertake the *Register*. The answer depends partly on our view of Callisthenes' monograph on the Third Sacred War and of its relationship to the *Register*.[1] The single book which he devoted to this subject—ἐν τῶι περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πολέμου, says Athenaeus—is rather short measure for a ten-year struggle; it was evidently not a work of much art or research, but a brief partisan tract, published soon after the War, while controversy was still warm; indeed a preliminary version may well have circulated before the end of the War. The monograph spoke of the First Sacred War as another ten-year conflict, touched off by the rape of Megisto and some other ladies; but clearly there was not much room to expatiate. The full-length, authoritative treatment of the First Sacred War came in the three-volume *Register of Pythian Victors*, in connection with the founding of the Pythian Games. In the spring of 346 the Amphictyonic Council asked Philip to preside over the next Pythian Games, and so he did in the following summer; but the interloper was offensive to many, especially at Athens. This was the moment for Philip to summon the aid of his literary friends. Aristotle was then at Atarneus, living with Philip's ally Hermias; perhaps he deputed his nephew Callisthenes, who in any case would be recommended for the task by his recent monograph. Between them Aristotle and Callisthenes were able to show that the Pythian Games owed their very existence to another rescue mission from the north, led by the Thessalian Eurylochus. The likeliest conclusion, then, is that the *Register* was produced roughly within the period 345–340, and that the Hieromnemons, continuing to act as Philip's creatures, thanked the authors in the early 330s.[2]

We have considered the *Register* at some length because the scope and character of the work are commonly misconceived. It was not a brief, spare catalogue of documentary items, but a varied account of the origin and growth of the Pythian festival; much space was given to early history and above all to the First Sacred War, probably treated in the second book. The list of Pythian victors which gave its name to the whole was perhaps confined to the third and last book, unless the musical victors appeared in the first to round off the story of the ancient musical contest. In its arrangement—a colourful and unreliable narrative followed by factual matter—and in its misleading title, which strictly applies only to the last part, the *Register of Pythian Victors* resembles the *Constitution of Athens*. If the First Sacred War was indeed a fiction, there is no objection to our supposing that the fiction was propagated in the *Register*.

One other indication may seem to favour the view that Aristotle and Callisthenes' account of the First Sacred War could only be sober and well founded. The very

[1] According to Jacoby, *RE* x 2 (1919), 1685–6, and again on *FGH* 124 T 23, the monograph belongs in the 340s, soon after the end of the War; the *Register* is linked to the monograph in theme, and may or may not have directly followed it. Düring (1957), p.340, dates the *Register* 'between 340 and Aristotle's return to Athens in 334', but not for any compelling reason.

[2] Speusippus' *Let. to Phil.* is dated by internal evidence to the late summer of 342 (Bickermann (1928), pp.29–38), when Callisth.'s monograph on the Third Sacred War must have been before the public, and perhaps also the *Register of Pythian Victors* or a part of it. Needless to say, we should not expect Speusippus to mention Antipater's debt to Callisth. or to Callisth. and Ar. jointly, supposing that he was aware of it. The venomous head of the Academy derides Isocrates at length for the ineptitude of his recent *Address to Philip*, and also rounds on Theopompus, said to be residing at Philip's court. There is no word of Ar. or Callisth.; this means, not that Speusippus was well disposed or indifferent to these rivals, but that they were too close to Philip for him to venture an attack.

passage of Plutarch that cites the *Register* is also thought to bespeak ancient Delphic archives stocked with cardinal historical documents. At *Sol.* 11.2 Plutarch says that 'the Delphic records' name Alcmeon as the Athenian commander, ἔν τε τοῖς τῶν Δελφῶν ὑπομνήμασιν Ἀλκμαίων, οὐ Σόλων, Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς ἀναγέγραπται. What are these Delphic records? It is sometimes held that Delphic officials had always kept yearly records of important transactions, and that such records, embracing the First Sacred War, were available to Aristotle and Callisthenes when they came to write the *Register*.[1] This opinion can never be disproved, but seems terribly optimistic. There is a much simpler explanation. 'The Eleian records', τὰ Ἠλείων γράμματα, is a favourite phrase with Pausanias and Philostratus, which means nothing more than a literary list of Olympic victors; at Olympia as at Delphi the victor-lists reached back to legendary times, and Pausanias 5.4.6 cites τὰ Ἠλείων γράμματα ἀρχαῖα for a variant in the paternity of Iphitus. 'The Delphic records' looks like a similar usage, denoting a list of Pythian victors—merely a later version of Aristotle and Callisthenes, which went a step further in elaborating the tale of the Sacred War.[2]

VI. ARISTOTLE AND CALLISTHENES' DATING OF THE WAR

Thus far we have examined the circumstances in which the story of the First Sacred War first comes to our attention; these circumstances may lead us to suspect that the whole story was invented and put about in order to commend a certain view of the Third Sacred War. It is time to look at the substance of the tradition, and at first glance the firmest element appears to be the dates transmitted by sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* b and d and also by *marm. Par.* A 37–8. These sources offer two dates—591/0, as the year in which a 'money-festival', ἀγὼν χρηματίτης or χρηματικός, was held to celebrate the initial victory over Cirrha, and 582/1, as the year in which the Pythian Games were established is something like their canonical form in consequence of the final defeat of the last Cirrhaean resisters. In the Pindaric scholia the two dates are expressed both as Delphian and as Athenian archon-years, and so doubtless come from Aristotle and Callisthenes' *Register of Pythian Victors.* Accepting the testimony of the scholia at face value, modern historians commonly date the war 'about 590'; in fact, as other evidence shows, Aristotle and Callisthenes assigned the War precisely to the decade 594/3–585/4. Most critics would probably regard the dates given by Aristotle and Callisthenes as the surest warrant that the story of the War is at least partly authentic. But this confidence is misplaced. We saw in the previous section that the *Register* contained much fictitious matter; and the dates that it gave for the War are easily recognized as a mere deduction from two very doubtful premisses, namely that Solon launched the War, and that the allied victory led to the founding of the Pythian Games.

[1] *FGH* IIIb *Komm.* i (*Text*), 214–5, ii (*Noten*), 139–40. Admittedly the term ὑπομνήματα is applied to 'the notices of public business issued by officials, which in the Hellenistic period were often published at the end of the year wholly or in excerpt on stone or wood'; but it is unlikely that Plu. intended the word in any technical sense.

[2] As Jüthner, *Philostr. über Gymn.*, p.110, observes, the use of the term τὰ Ἠλείων γράμματα for a literary list of Olympic victors conforms to Paus.' habit of citing recondite local tradition wherever possible. But it may well be that the recensions of the Olympic victor-list which circulated widely in Imperial times were actually seen to by the administrators of the sanctuary; so too the Pythian victor-list known to Plu.

The means of establishing the dates 591/0 and 582/1 need to be stated first.[1] The Pindaric scholia and the Parian Marble place the founding of the Pythian Games in the Athenian archonship of Damasias, which came 318 years before the epoch of the Parian Marble, i.e. either 582/1 or 581/0, according as we reckon exclusively or inclusively (for the Parian Marble is not consistent in this respect);[2] since the Games fell in the third year of each Olympiad, 582/1 is indicated.[3] The Pindaric scholia and the Parian Marble, again, place the money festival in the Athenian archonship of Simon ('Simonides' in *hyp.* b), 327 years before the epoch of the Parian Marble, i.e. either 591/0 (exclusive reckoning) or 590/89 (inclusive reckoning); the latter year is excluded by the Aristotelian *Constitution of Athens* 13.1, which reports that Athens had no archon in the fifth year after Solon's archonship of 594/3.[4]

It is obvious how the date 582/1 was arrived at: this is the beginning of the historical sequence of fourth-yearly Pythian festivals.[5] Tradition said that in

[1] The dates ought to have been settled long ago by Jacoby's analyses, (1902), pp.168 n.10, 169 n.11, 170 n.12, and (1904), pp.102–5, 165–7.

[2] The dates that are certainly inclusive run from A 45 to A 66; in A 39–44 the system is in doubt; our two entries come just before, A 37–8. I speak of 'exclusive' and 'inclusive' reckoning for convenience only; T. J. Cadoux, *JHS* 68 (1948), 83–6, has argued convincingly that so far as arithmetic goes, the Parian must be counting exclusively throughout, but that at A 45 or thereabouts he turned from one source to another and mistook the terminal year of his second source; on this view the terms 'orthodox' and 'unorthodox' dating are more accurate.

[3] M. Miller, *Klio* 37 (1959), 46–7, followed by A. E. Samuel, *Gr. and Rom. Chronol.*, p.202, dates Damasias to 586/5 (despite the plain arithmetic of the Parian Marble, which is dismissed as 'error'). Yet their interpretation of the Pindaric scholia and of *Const. Ath.* 13.2 cannot in fact be sustained. *Hyp.* b, the better form of the Pindaric scholium, does *not* say that the Pythian Games were founded in the sixth year after Simon: see below. At *Const. Ath.* 13.2 *διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν χρόνων* is a perfectly commonplace expression meaning 'after the same interval' (cf. Smyth, *Gr. Gram.* 1685 1 c), adopted here for the sake of *variatio* after two five-year intervals have already been mentioned: it is not a 'curious phrase', and cannot mean 'still within the same period' (first suggested, I believe, by von Fritz and Kapp), which would be rather *ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν χρόνων*. So this passage too gives the date 582/1 for Damasias (n.5 below).

[4] Although Sosicrates, doubtless drawing on Apollodorus, placed Solon's archonship in 594/3 (D. L. 1.62), it is sometimes held that *Const. Ath.* 13.1–2, 14.1 implies a date two years later; and the date accepted by the *Const. Ath.* matters here, because the same archon list will have been used in the *Register of Pythian Victors*, written perhaps fifteen or twenty years earlier. No matter how we interpret or evade the statement of *Const. Ath.* 14.1 that Peisistratus first came to power 'in the thirty-second year after the law-giving, in the archonship of Comeas', it seems to me that 594/3 is the year indicated for Solon's archonship at 13.1, inasmuch as the three five-year intervals that follow can only lead to the dates 590/89, 586/5, and 582/1 for the two anarchies and the first year of Damasias respectively: see Cadoux, *JHS* 68 (1948), 93–9. *Δαμασίου τοῦ δευτέρου* at *marm. Par.* A 38 means not 'the second year of Damasias', as Samuel has it (and many others before him), but 'the second Damasias', with reference to the homonymous archon of 639/8 (D. H. 3.36.1); A 36, as Jacoby observes, speaks of *Κριτίου τοῦ προτέρου*. For if 582/1 were in fact the second year of Damasias, we should expect our other, better sources to say so (*Δαμασίου τὸ δεύτερον ἄρχοντος* or the like); after all, the Pindaric scholia are doubly precise and reproduce the *Register of Pythian Victors*, and Dem. Phal. wrote up a *Register of Archons*, whether or not fr. 149 Wehrli came from this work; here Dem. dates the emergence of the Seven Sages to Damasias *simpliciter*, evidently synchronizing this occasion with the first Pythiad in the light of the well-known ties between the Sages and Delphi (Wehrli's comment is off the mark).

[5] Whether 582/1 is the true date we can never know. Paus. 10.7.4 gives 586/5 as the first Pythiad, and has taken some hard words from Wilamowitz and Jacoby, who postulate

earlier days Apollo's festival at Delphi returned at eight-year intervals, Ennaeterides (Dem. Phal. fr. 191 Wehrli, cited by Eus. on *Od.* 3.267; sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* c; Censor. 18; *Inschr. Magnesia* 17 = *FGH* 482 F 3, lines 14–15): is the money-festival of 591/0 to be equated with the last of the eighth-yearly celebrations? The inference has generally been rejected, on the grounds that the money festival is dated nine years, not eight, before 582/1; and it is held that because the date seems irregular (falling in the second year of an Olympiad, rather than in the third), it must be authentic.[1] But the date is probably not irregular. To be sure, if the last Ennaeteris—whether reckoned as eight solar years or as ninety-nine lunar months—were counted back from the Pythian Games of 582/1, the previous festival ought to fall in the archonship corresponding to 590/89. Yet this is to assume that the fourth-yearly Pythian cycle coincided with the earlier eighth-yearly cycle—a most unlikely assumption.[2] For the date of the Pythian festival from 582/1 onward was almost certainly based on the date of the pre-existing Olympian festival. The Pythian Games, like the Olympian, fell in late summer, and exactly midway between the Olympian Games:[3] in effect, the Greeks now had a great athletic festival every second summer instead of every fourth. On the other hand, there is no reason why the eighth-yearly Pythian festival, consisting solely of a musical contest, should have been aligned in any way with the Olympic Games, consisting solely of athletic contests.[4] In Plutarch's day three festivals, Septerium, Herois, and Charila, were still celebrated together at eight-year intervals (*Mor.* 293 B–F); they evidently

confusion with the 'money festival' of 591/0. But as we saw, it is quite possible that Pausanias' system goes back to Menaechmus of Sicyon and so antedates Ar. and Callisth. (on the usual view of Menaechmus). Pausanias' statement that athletes received substantial prizes at the first Pythiad, but never again, need not be a misunderstanding of the 'money festival', but rather an earlier *aition* for the worship of Chrysus in the hippodrome. It may be true that the higher dating of the Pythiads, which Boeckh adopted from Paus., does not work so well for the victories celebrated by Pindar; but Menaechmus (if it was he) might have reckoned these victories a Pythiad later.

[1] So Jacoby (1904), pp.102–5, who refuted previous attempts to show how the eighth-yearly festival might come to be dated a year too early in the Pindaric scholia.

[2] The assumption is made both in treatments of our chronological problem (so e.g. Cadoux, *JHS* 68 (1948), 100–1) and in studies of the calendar (e.g. M. P. Nilsson, *Die Entst. und rel. Bedeut. des gr. Kal.*², p. 47). On this subject Cadoux appears to fall into some confusion. To counter Jacoby's arguments for 591/0 as the date of the money festival, he suggests the 'possibility that the aggression of the Kirrhaians had brought about a positive interruption of the religious calendar, and that a completely fresh start was made. Had this been the case, the date from which the new series of festivals ran might well have been that of the triumphal ἀγὼν χρηματίτης, which, on this hypothesis, must have taken place in 590/89'. If the money festival fell in 590/89 (= 01. 47.3), no disturbance of the cycle need be postulated, for it is only *marm. Par.* A 37 that points to a different cycle from the Pythian Games. Nor would it be plausible to argue that whereas the money festival fell on the regular date of the old cycle, the second stage of the Sacred War displaced the first celebration of the Pythian Games and hence led to a new cycle; for the first Pythian Games came two years after the end of the War, and the old cycle could have been resumed in the interval; on this point, which he treats separately, Cadoux is quite mistaken (n.1, p.63 below).

[3] As to the month of the Pythian Games see Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*² i. 2.143.

[4] It is sometimes held that the Pythian Ennaeteris was the first lunisolar calendar in Greece; and if so, the lunisolar date of the Olympic Games (which plainly follows an eighth-yearly cycle, coming after alternate intervals of forty-nine and fifty lunar months) must have been calculated from this calendar; but any date *within* the calendar was open to choice.

mark the ancient Ennaeteris, and from Plutarch's way of speaking we can be sure that this cycle did not coincide with the Pythian Games. Before 582/1 the Pythian festival belonged to the same cycle, and was doubtless celebrated just before the Septerium, inasmuch as the aetiological myths of the two festivals are complementary, the Pythian supposedly commemorating the first encounter with the serpent, and the Septerium either the subsequent pursuit or else the purification of Apollo. Since the ancient eighth-yearly cycle continued to be observed in the three festivals known to Plutarch, Aristotle and Callisthenes could easily compute the date of the last festival before 582/1; and that date was very likely 591/0. The festival of 591/0 was indeed an exceptional event, for the victorious Amphictyons, having sacked Cirrha, used the spoils to award substantial prizes for a variety of athletic contests, hitherto unknown; whence the term 'money festival'. The significance of this detail we shall see below (§ VIII). Now if the two dates 591/0 and 582/1 serve as a framework for the narrative of the First Sacred War, we may suspect that they have no real value.

But the matter is not so simple. 591/0 marks the fall of Cirrha and the end of the first stage of the War. Yet the second stage, during which the Cirrhaeans continued a guerrilla resistance on Mount Cirphis, lasted six years, not eight or nine, according to the repeated testimony of sch. Pi. *P. hyp.* b and d; the War ended, therefore, in 585/4, and the victors waited until the end of the eight-year cycle before organizing the fourth-yearly Pythian Games.[1] Why fasten on the year 585/4 as the end of the War? The answer, I think, is that it tied the Sacred War to a convenient landmark in Athenian chronology.

Callisthenes, in his separate treatment of the War, gave its length as ten years (*FGH* 124 F 1). The *Register of Pythian Victors*, which supplied the dates 591/0 and 582/1 to the Pindaric scholia, must be likewise the authority for the six-year period after 591/0 and hence for the terminal date of 585/4. Furthermore, we have good reason to think that the *Register* put the outbreak of the War in 594/3, the year of Solon's archonship. For according to Plutarch, *Sol.* 11.1, the *Register* named Solon as the author of the Amphictyonic resolution against Cirrha; Euanthes of Samos, cited ibid., improved on this by making Solon a commander in the field. There can be little doubt, then, that Aristotle and Callisthenes in the *Register*, and Callisthenes in his separate work, dated the War from 594/3, Solon's archonship, and that they did so because Solon was popularly said (as by Aeschin. 3.108) to have sponsored the Amphictyonic declaration of war. In fixing the duration of the War at ten years Callisthenes was of course inspired by the analogy of the Third Sacred War and even more by the example of the Trojan War, which worked upon him in other ways as well.

[1] *Hyp.* b runs as follows, *μετὰ δὲ χρόνον ἐξαετῆ καταγωνισαμένων τῶν μετὰ τοῦ Ἱππίου τοὺς ὑπολελειμμένους τῶν Κιρραίων, ἐπὶ μὲν Ἀθήνησιν ἄρχοντος Δαμασίου ἐν δὲ Δελφοῖς Διοδώρου ὕστερον καὶ στεφανίτην ἔθεντο κατορθώσαντες*. It is perfectly clear that the founding of the Pythian Games follows the end of the War by an interval of time, *ὕστερον*; the scholiast only neglects to specify the interval as *τρισὶν ἔτεσιν*, and his statement is not in the least 'clumsily worded', as Cadoux, *JHS* 68 (1948), 100 n.153, contends, preferring the version of *hyp.* d. *Hyp.* d, much abbreviated, has indeed conflated the sixth-year victory with the founding of the Games, dating both events by the two archons; but this form of the scholium can be disregarded.

VII. SOME OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE LITERARY TRADITION

We have seen that the dates offered by the Pindaric scholia depend on synchronisms which may well be arbitrary: the beginning of the War was synchronized with Solon's archonship, the end of the first stage with the last festival of the old cycle, and the end of the whole War with the inauguration of the Pythian Games. If the dates are given up, the rest of the tradition is very much at risk. No time need be wasted on the details cited from Callisthenes' monograph on the Third Sacred War, because nearly everyone agrees that the abduction of noble ladies and the ten years' fighting are simply stock motifs of Greek legend, familiar to all from the Trojan War.[1] The treatment of the First Sacred War in the *Register of Pythian Victors* is commonly assumed to have differed *toto caelo* from such frivolity; for now Aristotle laid his hand upon his nephew's shoulder. But the *Register* contained a good deal of fiction (§ V above); and indeed the Pindaric scholia prove that here too the Trojan War served as a model for the Sacred War.

Hyp. b and d begin with mention of Eurylochus, the Thessalian commander who gave the Amphictyons their initial victory over Cirrha. It is clear then that Eurylochus was prominent in the *Register.* At the end *hyp.* b quotes three hexameter lines of Euphorion, *hyp.* d one line, to corroborate the story (fr. 80 Powell): 'And we hear of a younger Achilles, Eurylochus, for whom choirs of Delphian maidens raised the fair paean when he sacked <Crisa>, the halls of Lycorean Phoebus'. Eurylochus is like Achilles: does the comparison originate with Euphorion? Some have thought so,[2] but it seems most unlikely. Euphorion is more allusive than original; in fact his speciality, as the papyrus fragments have shown us, is to string together a breath-taking series of brief but recondite allusions. Our passage is plainly such a brief allusion to Eurylochus in his quality of champion and victor;[3] and we must infer that Euphorion calls him 'a younger Achilles' precisely because he was so presented in the work which Euphorion means to evoke. And this work was almost certainly the *Register of Pythian Victors.*

At the time the *Register* was published, the name Eurylochus had great significance for everyone in Greece, since it was borne by one of Philip's senior generals, a peer of Antipater and Parmenio. In the spring of 346, these three men came to Athens on behalf of Philip in order to compose the final terms of the peace treaty that bore on the Third Sacred War, now almost ended (*hyp.* D. 19.5). Somewhat later Eurylochus led a force of mercenaries to Eretria, where the regime installed by Philip needed purging; a later intervention at Eretria was entrusted to Parmenio (D. 9.58).[4] In the spring of 342 Eurylochus was one of Philip's two Hieromnemons at Delphi, perhaps also in the fall of 342, and for several years before (*SIG*^{3} 230 A 37; cf. *SIG*^{3} 242 B 5–6, where the name is restored by Pomtow; the Macedonian Hieromnemons of 346–343 are unknown). Early in Alexander's reign he met the same fate as Parmenio later (Just. 12.6.14). Unfortunately we cannot tell what part Eurylochus took in Philip's campaigns against

[1] *Nearly* everyone: for Aly (1950), pp.252–3, lays himself out to vindicate all these details.

[2] Wilamowitz (1893), i. 18 n.29; Aly (1950), p.252; Sordi (1953), p.334 n.1.

[3] For this reason it is hopeless to guess at the poem from which the fr. comes (*Alexandros* Meineke, *Geranos* Wilamowitz, ultimately from Rhianus' *Thessalika* through Euphorion's prose work *On the Aleuads* Hiller von Gaertringen, etc.).

[4] In the two best manuscripts of D. the passage about Eurylochus and Parmenio was inserted *inter lineas* by the copyist, but its authenticity is not in doubt.

the Phocians during the Third Sacred War. The man's family origins are of course completely unknown. It is interesting, however, that the name Eurylochus was favoured by nobles of Larisa in Thessaly: 'Eurylochus of Larisa' is named as an awesome potentate in a Cynic anecdote about Socrates (D. L. 2.25), and the courtesan Lais reputedly took up with 'a certain Eurylochus or Aristonicus' in Thessaly (sch. Ar. *Pl.* 179).[1] Now Larisa and its ruling clan, the Aleuads, always had close ties with the kings of Macedon,[2] including Philip, who indeed took a wife from Larisa, Philinna (Satyrus, cited by Ath. 13.5. 557 C).[3] Perhaps then Eurylochus had some Thessalian blood: in any case his career shows several striking resemblances to the Eurylochus of the First Sacred War. To say that this figure was simply invented in the late fourth century as a tribute to the contemporary friend of Philip may seem a bold conjecture; and yet it is quite certain that any Greek in the late 340s or early 330s, reading of Eurylochus and the First Sacred War in the *Register of Pythian Victors*, would be reminded at once of the Macedonian baron who virtually dictated to the Athenians the conditions for ending the Third Sacred War, who forcibly settled the affairs of a leading city of central Greece, and who afterwards sat on the Amphictyonic Council.

According to *hyp.* b and d another Thessalian, Hippias, was deputed by Eurylochus to continue the war with a smaller force, and it was he who gained the final victory over the Cirrhaean remnants; Hippias played Neoptolemus to Eurylochus' Achilles. The name Hippias is so common, and so apt for a commander of Thessalian cavalry, that it probably had no contemporary reference.

The two stages in the fighting appear to be taken from the Third Sacred War. The first stage ended after four years (§ VI above) with the Cirrhaeans defeated: thus were the Phocians defeated after four years of war in the battle of the Crocus Field, and the Third Sacred War would have ended then had Philip not been checked at Thermopylae. For six years more the Cirrhaeans kept up a guerrilla resistance on Mount Cirphis: thus did the Phocians, falling back on their mountains, prolong the Third Sacred War for six years more. Given this course of events, the two Pythian festivals which followed Solon's archonship—i.e. the last of the old eighth-yearly cycle and the first of the new fourth-yearly cycle—were naturally regarded as punctuating the two stages, even though the latter

[1] Though both anecdotes are certainly unhistorical, they show the associations of the name Eurylochus. D. L.'s anecdote, which represents Socrates as spurning the gifts and invitations of 'Archelaus of Macedon and Scopas of Crannon (!) and Eurylochus of Larisa', is plainly inspired by the famous passage of Plato's *Crito*, 53 d–54 a, and no doubt issues from the Socratic literature of the fourth century. The *parergon* of Lais seems to be modelled on the much more famous affair of Thargelia and Antiochus, which was handled by Aeschines the Socratic (fr. 23 Dittmar, cited by Philostr. *Ep.* 73). It seems likely then that both anecdotes employing Eurylochus grew up in the early or middle fourth century; together they suggest that Eurylochus was then a prominent name in Larisa.

[2] Transactions between the Aleuads (or other nobles of Larisa) and the kings of Macedon before Philip are reported by Th. 4.78.2; [Herodes] *Pol.* 16–18; Ar. *Pol.* 5.10, 1311^{b}17–20; and D. S. 15.61.3, 76.14.2.

[3] From Satyrus' notice of Philinna and from the fact that her son Arrhidaeus was brought up as a prince, Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*^{2} iii.2.69, reasonably deduced Aleuad lineage. The inference is contested by H. D. Westlake, *Thess. in the Fourth Cent. B.C.*, p.168, on the grounds that Philinna is called a 'dancer' or a 'harlot' or a 'worthless, common woman' in our sources (collected by Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* ii. 385 n.4, who also takes them at face value); but such testimony, coming from historians of Alexander, is moonshine (cf. Hamilton on Plu. *Alex.* 77.7).

festival came two years after the end of the ten-year War. The reason for speaking of a 'money festival' will emerge in § VIII.

Most of the details of Aristotle and Callisthenes' account have now been examined, and prove to be easily explicable on the hypothesis that these writers were elaborating a moral paradigm of the Third Sacred War. It remains to show how the notion of a war fought over Delphi in ancient times arose in the first place. But before we turn to the strange local legends retailed by [Thessalus], we ought to round off our study of the literary tradition by noting a couple of developments that cannot be attributed to Aristotle and Callisthenes, and are probably due to later historians—namely the roles ascribed to Cleisthenes and Alcmeon.

Nothing is said of Cleisthenes of Sicyon in *hyp.* b and d, which draw on Aristotle and Callisthenes, but elsewhere in the Pindaric scholia he takes an important part: since provisions were reaching Crisa by sea, the siege proved ineffectual until Cleisthenes furnished a fleet to blockade the city; he received a third of the spoils and founded the Pythian Games at Sicyon (*inscr. N.* 9).[1] That Crisa was a sea-power is also implied by Strabo 9.3.4, who speaks of 'tolls on goods from Sicily and Italy' as enriching the Crisaeans and so leading them on to tax pilgrims as well, in defiance of the Amphictyony. Here then is a different view of the *casus belli* and of the course of the War; it eliminates the resemblance to the Third Sacred War, for the Phocians under Philomelus and his successors might be regarded as sacrilegious brigands, but not as extortionate harbour-masters; and of course there was no naval action in the Third Sacred War, at least in the Phocian theatre. When this version was put forward is impossible to say; the Pindaric scholia seem to have it from Dionysius of Halicarnassus' book on chronology.[2] It is doubtless a purely literary variation. A Sicyonian may be responsible, especially if the starting-point was the Pythian Games at Sicyon. But some memorial of Cleisthenes at Delphi might equally inspire the tale. And indeed Pausanias 10.7.6 records a chariot-victory of Cleisthenes in the Pythian Games of 582/1; in the context this has nothing to do with the Sacred War, which Pausanias ignores in tracing the history of the festival, perhaps because his ultimate source is Menaechmus of Sicyon, writing before the Sacred War was even heard of (§ V above). Conceivably the victory is authentic (though the date need not be), or else it was inferred from some Sicyonian monument at Delphi;[3] in either case we could understand how Cleisthenes came to figure in the Sacred War.

According to Plutarch, *Sol.* 11.2, 'the Delphic records' named Alcmeon as commander of the Athenian contingent in the Sacred War; this source, as we saw above, probably gave a list of Pythian victors together with a history of the festival, thus corresponding in form and title to 'the Eleian records' known from other late writers. As a much later version of Aristotle and Callisthenes' work, it improved upon the traditional role of Solon by adding another famous Athenian to the story of the Sacred War. The conjunction of illustrious names is not only

[1] At Front. 3.7.6 it is a strategem of Cleisthenes to introduce hellebore in Crisa's water-supply; this device goes back to Delphic legend (§ VIII below), and may have been credited to Cleisthenes quite off-handedly, once he was linked with the War.

[2] See n.2, p.54 above.

[3] It has been conjectured that Cleisthenes' chariot was kept in one of the two Sicyonian treasuries built in the first half of the sixth century; but perhaps any ancient-looking Sicyonian chariot would have set the story going.

suspicious in itself but actually irreconcilable with the little that we seem to know of Athenian history at this time; for in the very next chapter (12.1–4) Plutarch reports that all the descendants of Megacles were convicted of impiety and expelled from Attica after a trial which Solon himself arranged at some time before his archonship; how then could Alcmeon command Athenian troops in the Sacred War?[1] Rather than burke such plain inconsequence, we should ask how Alcmeon might intrude himself in the tradition of the Sacred War; and in fact the answer is perfectly clear.

The great temple of Apollo that dominates the sanctuary at Delphi from its massive platform was built, or at least brought to completion, by the Alcmeonids, who received the contract from the Amphictyons (Hdt. 5.62.2–3 etc.); the Alcmeonid contribution was magnificent (Pi. *P.* 7.103) and long remembered (Them. *Or.* 4, 53A). Now according to [Thessalus], who as we shall see in § VIII was very well acquainted with Delphic legend, the Amphictyons dedicated this temple in token of their victory in the Sacred War, ἐφ' οἷς οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες τῶι μὲν Ἀπόλλωνι νηὸν ἀνέθεσαν, τὸν νῦν ἐόντα ἐν Δελφοῖς (Hp. ix. 412). In speaking of 'the temple that stands there now'—a phrase which echoes Hdt. 2.180.1, 5.62.2—[Thessalus], like other ancient writers (Str. 9.3.9; Paus. 10.5.13), ignores the reconstruction of the fourth century, as indeed was natural, since the temple erected then, although substantially a new building with new sculptures, had roughly (or even exactly) the same size and plan and so the same general aspect as its predecessor.[2] And of course it is true that the Alcmeonid temple itself was two or three generations later than the dating of the Sacred War which we examined above; but this dating was due to Aristotle and Callisthenes, and we may be sure that in Delphic legend and in general knowledge the story was not tied to any chronology. The Alcmeonid temple seemed ancient enough. And if this temple was linked with the conclusion of the Sacred War, then the War must have engaged the Alcmeonids. Within the family the obvious choice was the eponym, renowned as the first Athenian victor in the Olympic chariot-race (Hdt. 6.125.5; Isoc. 16.25); he and Solon could be readily taken as

[1] Forrest (1956), pp.41–2, 49–50, who holds that the curse was laid on the Alcmeonids by Delphi, and that the Sacred War was launched to chastise Delphi and Cirrha for past mistakes, is not surprised to find Alcmeon leading the Athenian contingent, for when Delphi was discredited, the Alcmeonids will have been rehabilitated. Whatever may be thought of this interpretation of events, it is not a sufficient answer; for as Forrest himself remarks, the Alcmeonids were forced into exile by a judicial verdict, not by a vague malaise; before Alcmeon could serve as general, the verdict must be reversed; and Forrest stops short of affirming that the verdict *was* so soon reversed, whether by the Solonian amnesty-law or by any other piece of legislation passed in or before 594/3—doubtless because he recognized that no memory could then survive of such a signal condemnation as Plu. describes at *Sol.* 12.4. And that Alcmeon could command Athenian troops while still in exile seems to me completely out of the question; Alcibiades, whom Forrest here invokes, gained authority on Samos for the very reason that the Athenians there were equally at odds with the home government.

[2] Str. and Paus. likewise fail to distinguish the Alcmeonid temple from its fourth-century successor (whereas both are clear about the predecessor of the Alcmeonid temple, the building of Trophonius and Agamedes, which according to Paus. and others was destroyed in 548/7). It is misguided to infer, as some have done, that the legend retailed by [Thessalus] must antedate 373/2, when the Alcmeonid temple was somehow laid in ruins. Pomtow (1918), p.325, went much further, holding that the tale ignores the Alcmeonid temple as well, and hence must have reached the Asclepiads in its present form by the early or mid-fifth century, before Hdt. publicly announced the fact of the Alcmeonid reconstruction.

contemporaries, for popular anecdotes had both men conversing with Croesus (Hdt. 1.29–33, 6.125). Here then is a reasonable explanation of Alcmeon's role in the First Sacred War.

VIII. THE LOCAL LEGENDS OF DELPHI

The speech ascribed to Thessalus son of Hippocrates (Hp. ix. 404–26 = *epistologr. Gr.* 312–18 Hercher), probably a late Hellenistic composition,[1] contains an extended narrative of the First Sacred War by way of illustrating one of several benefactions which Greece has received from the Asclepiads of Cos, especially from the branch issuing in Hippocrates and Thessalus. In the speech, as in Aristotle and Callisthenes' account, the War has two stages, the first ending with the defeat of the Crisaeans at large, the second continuing for a long time against a pocket of resistance; the Pythian Games are founded at the conclusion of the War, but there is no celebration after the first stage. In other respects too [Thessalus] is close to Aristotle and Callisthenes, or to Callisthenes in his separate work: the Crisaeans are rich and powerful and phenomenally wicked, oppressing Delphi and molesting pilgrims, but at last brought to book by an Amphictyonic army; and we hear of the Thessalian Eurylochus as commander-in-chief and of the poisoned water-supply. But although these details (or at least some of them) prove that the author of the speech was perfectly familiar with the vulgate account of the War, his real interest lies elsewhere, in a curious sequence of events that sees the Crisaean resisters finally overthrown by the intervention of a certain Nebrus ('Fawn') and his son Chrysus ('Gold'), both fetched from Cos at the prompting of an oracle. [Thessalus]' version is in fact a strange amalgam. Apart from the vulgate contribution and the *aition* of the Alcmeonid temple, already noticed, the principal elements are (1) an *aition* of the Mycenaean ruins at Ay. Georghios; (2) an *aition* of the cult of the hero Chrysus in the Delphic hippodrome; (3) an *aition* of the Asclepiads' prerogatives at Delphi; and (4) an *aition* of the Calydonians' prerogatives at Delphi. This was probably the order in which the several elements grew up, and we shall follow the same order in analysing the story.

(1) After the Crisaean territory and settlements were devastated in the first stage of the War, the survivors retired to a great stronghold well stocked with provisions, 'near the place where the horse races are now held'. The exact site of

[1] The only external indication of date comes from Erotian (*med. s. I p.*), who includes the *Presb.* in his list of Hp.'s works; to pass as authentic with Erotian, the speech ought to be distinctly older. On internal grounds the date of composition has been variously estimated. A strong current of opinion places it in the fourth century: so R. Herzog, *Koische Forsch. und Funde*, p.215, and again at *RE* vi A 1 (1936), 166, s.v. Thessalos; Pomtow (1918), pp.326–7 (late fourth century, after Thessalus' death); Roger and van Effenterre (1944), pp.16–17; Sordi (1953), p.324 (the work of 'a Coan rhetor of the fourth century'); Bousquet (1956), p.581 (perhaps an authentic speech of Thessalus). But this dating is founded on preconceptions about the evidential value of the speech. The style is certainly later than the Classical period; Wilamowitz (1922), p.73 n.0, says 'no doubt Late Hellenistic', and Parke (1957), p.277, concurs. If the Calydonian prerogatives at Delphi, which inspired the tale of Chrysus' friend from Calydon, were obtained during the Aetolian ascendancy, the speech cannot antedate the third century, and of course may be later. Edelstein, *RE Suppl.* vi (1935), 1300–5, s.v. Hippokrates, holds that most of the Hippocratic legends reflected in the letters and speeches grew up in the second and first centuries B.C. The upshot is that the work is likelier to fall late than early in the Hellenistic period.

the hippodrome has never been determined, though we know that it lay in the plain. Leake's suggestion is still the likeliest; he placed it (without reference to our passage) at a spot called Komara just below the precipice on which the Mycenaean fortress stands.[1] At the last Chrysus led an assault on the fortress and 'seized the tower', but pierced by a javelin 'fell down the cliff from the tower' to his death; afterwards the Amphictyons 'buried him in the hippodrome and laid it on the Delphians to honour him as a hero with public sacrifice.' The author of the speech clearly had the Mycenaean ruins in view.[2] The enormous Cyclopean walls, 14 feet thick and still standing up to 12 feet high, might well inspire both the general story of a proud city laid under siege and also the picture of Chrysus scaling the tower.[3]

The fortress on its rocky spur appears to lack only a source of water to be impregnable; but not far to the north, at the modern village of Chrysó, are abundant springs from which water might be piped to the fortress. Hence the story of the poisoned water-supply. There is always a conduit leading into the stronghold ([Thes.]; Paus. 10.37.7, though he regards the Pleistus as the source, which will not do for Ay. Georghios; Polyaen. 6.13; Front. 3.7.6); Polyaenus speaks of a secret underground conduit discovered by accident, and [Thessalus] explains that the discovery was made when Eurylochus' horse, rolling in the dust, struck the pipe with its hoof. Since Parnassus was famous for hellebore,[4] it was natural to say that the Crisaeans were discommoded by this common purgative—even though the plant could not in fact be used to taint flowing water.[5]

(2) Chrysus, summoned when the Amphictyonic army despaired of the siege, led the final assault, but in the affray on the tower was struck down 'by Mermodes, brother of that Lycus who had died by stoning, when he entered the

[1] Since Leake this site has been mooted by Frazer on Paus. 10.37.4; by Pomtow (1918), pp.330–1, who observes that the water needed for the horses could readily be brought here from the springs at Chrysó; and by Bousquet (1956), pp.591–2, who publishes a dedication from the hippodrome.

[2] That the speech describes the site of Ay. Georghios ('Crisa' in the usual parlance) was recognized by Pomtow (1918), pp.321, 330, and others. Sordi (1953), pp.328–30, aware that archaeological evidence rules out any real connection between this site and the Sacred War, but believing the speech largely reliable, is put to the necessity of interpreting the remarks about the Crisaean stronghold as 'an explanatory note of the rhetor of the fourth century', who mistakenly identified the city of the Sacred War with the Crisa of early poetry, taking its 'topographic position' from Hom. and Pi. (But where are the topographic details in Hom. and Pi.?)

[3] The redoubtable aspect of these ruins is best described by Frazer on Paus. 10.37.5, from whom I borrow details.

[4] The hellebore of Parnassus, as also of Oeta and Helicon, is commended by Plin. *H.N.* 25.49. Of course it is the port of Anticyra that figures as the staple source of hellebore in literature, but only because the medicinal form was here prepared and exported (cf. Str. 9.3.3; Plin. *H.N.* 22.133, 25.52), and because some distinguished patients resorted here for treatment. The plant must have come from Parnassus; for although Paus. 10.36.7 assures us that it grew in plenty on the desolate crags above Anticyra, expert opinion cited by Frazer ad loc. pronounces this region quite unsuitable. When Polyaenus 6.13 speaks of the Amphictyons' fetching hellebore from Anticyra, we can only smile.

[5] A pharmacist of Munich told P. Siewert, *Der Eid von Plataiai* (1972), p.77, that 'no medicinal effect can be obtained by infusing hellebore in water that has not been heated'. Some have preferred to rationalize the tale, suggesting that the besiegers did not use hellebore at all, but introduced the waters of a salt-spring still existing some way east of the harbour town of Cirrha, for in the nineteenth century these waters were said to be valued locally as a purgative: so Wilamowitz (1893), i. 18 n.29, and Frazer on Paus. 10.37.7.

adytum to despoil the tripod'. Μερμόδης and Λύκος, like Chrysus, are heard of nowhere else, but it is clear that local legend knew them well; Mermodes' name, related to such words as μέρμερος and μέρμηρα, identifies him as a villain, like his brother. A struggle for the tripod is of course a recurring theme, even within the speech: the oracle that directed the Amphictyons to Chrysus also warned them that if the Crisaeans should first despoil the tripod, the siege must fail. [Thessalus] gives us no more than a glimpse of a large background of Delphic legend. Though Chrysus met his end in falling from the tower to the future site of the hippodrome, the stronghold was taken—how, we are not told, but Mermodes was doubtless killed by Chrysus' companion-in-arms, an unnamed Calydonian. Chrysus' gallant death is an *aition* of the hero-cult in the hippodrome which the Amphictyons instituted in his honour. In much the same spirit a hero at Olympia gave himself as a sacrifice in response to an oracle, and was worshipped thereafter in the Olympic hippodrome on the anniversary of his death (sch. Lyc. 42).[1] Chrysus may seem an odd name, but it is interesting that the hero in the hippodrome at the Isthmus was Glaucus,[2] whose name is also a colour term, and that the turning-point of the track at Nemea was marked by a red (πυρρά) rock, which gleamed like fire (Paus. 6.20.19).[3]

The hero cult of Chrysus in the hippodrome cried out for an *aition*, and [Thessalus]' speech gives us one response. But Chrysus has also contributed to the version of the Sacred War which we encountered in the Pindaric scholia and the Parian Marble, and ascribed to Aristotle and Callisthenes. There it was said that after defeating the Cirrhaeans the Amphictyons celebrated a money festival, ἀγὼν χρηματίτης or χρηματικός. Surely this strange detail was invented to account for the worship of Χρυσός, 'Gold' or 'Money', in the hippodrome newly established by the Amphictyons.

(3) As the object of a hero-cult in the hippodrome, and as the congener of such obscure local worthies as Mermodes and Lycus, Chrysus ought to be native to the region of Delphi: yet he is not so presented by [Thessalus]. Instead he comes from Cos, together with his father Nebrus, who is said to be an Asclepiad and thus a forebear of Hippocrates and Thessalus. Now 'the so-called Nebridae' of Cos are known to Stephanus, s.v. Kos, who makes Hippocrates a member of the clan and gives the genealogy Nebrus-Gnosidicus-Hippocrates I-Heracleides-Hippocrates II, the famous physician; the same genealogy, with several ascendants

[1] At Olympia the hero bore the epithet Taraxippus, for which Paus. 6.20.15–9 offers a variety of explanations, most of them jejune and none identifying the hero as Ischenus, the name given by Lycophron and his sch.: the sch.'s *aition* will be earlier than any of Pausanias'.

[2] The hero Glaucus at the Isthmus, otherwise mentioned only by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.21, 137, and perhaps implied by Nic. *Alex.* 606, was inevitably said to be the son of Sisyphus, and so a substantial figure of legend; but it has often been observed that Sisyphus and his line belong to some other part of Greece and were probably first appropriated for Corinth in the body of epic poetry subsumed under the name 'Eumelus'; and if so, the hero Glaucus at the Isthmus may antedate 'Eumelus' and may even have assisted the transposition.

[3] According to Paus. the heroes at Olympia and the Isthmus, and the gleaming rock at Nemea, made the horses shy; Frazer on Paus. 6.20.15 records speculation that the horses were startled by their own shadows, suddenly cast in front of them as they rounded the track; and the name Chrysus, as denoting bright sunlight (cf. e.g. Pi. *P.* 4.144), might suit this idea. But Paus. 10.37.4 says that the Delphic hippodrome, in contrast to the Olympic, 'is not apt to induce terror in the horses, either on account of a hero or for any other reason'; the conjectured site of the hippodrome is in fact partly shaded from the sun.

of Nebrus, appears in the second letter of Hippocrates (p.289 Hercher). Moreover, Stephanus refers to the tale related by [Thessalus]: 'For Nebrus was the most famous of the Asclepiads, as even the Pythia gave witness.' The oracle alluding to Nebrus and the manner of its fulfilment are indeed a curious rigmarole. During the second stage of the War, when things went badly for the allies, with the siege force sickening and dying, and counsel divided, an oracle bade them go to the island of Cos and 'bring back the child of a deer for succour together with gold', *ὑπισχνέετο κρατήσειν, ἢν ἐς Κῶ ἐλθόντες ἐλάφου παῖδα ἐς ἐπικουρίην ἀγάγωνται ξὺν χρυσῶι.* On Cos a certain Nebrus and his son Chrysus stepped forward to assist, and even fitted out a warship at their own expense. When they arrived in the allied camp, Apollo rejoiced and took away the plague; and Nebrus as well as Chrysus had a hand in bringing victory, for it was Nebrus as an Asclepiad who hit on the device of tainting the water 'with drugs', after Eurylochus' horse had exposed the conduit. At the end of the War it was seen that 'the succour of the fawn together with gold had proved successful, both in medical and in military matters', *ἥ τε τοῦ Νέβρου ἐπικουρίη σὺν Χρυσῶι ὀρθῶς ἀπήντησε καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἰητρικὰ καὶ κατὰ τὰ πολεμικά*; Chrysus received his hero-cult and 'for Nebrus' sake the Asclepiads of Cos were given the right of consulting the oracle first, like the Hieromnemons'.[1]

The oracle and the story so strangely associating Nebrus and Chrysus can have only one explanation. Epigraphic evidence shows that the Asclepiads of Cos were active and influential at Delphi from the first half of the fourth century onward, and in fact enjoyed the very privilege which [Thessalus] traces to the First Sacred War;[2] the privilege was restricted to 'Asclepiads in the male line', the very words which [Thessalus] uses of his own family (Hp. ix. 416).[3] From this circumstance and from Stephanus' testimony we may reasonably infer that the Nebridae were a small clan or corporation within the larger circle of Asclepiads, who must have included a great many practitioners, at Cnidus as

[1] The right accorded to the Asclepiads appears as *προμυθίη πρὸς μαντείην* in Littré's text, where the first word, otherwise unknown, was adopted by Littré from a single manuscript with the sensible observation that the phrase is a high-flown equivalent of *προμάντεια*. Other manuscripts give *προμηθίη* or *προμηθείη*, both obvious mistakes, though the latter found favour with Hercher (*Epistologr. Gr.* 314), who translated the phrase as *praesentia ac scientia rerum futurarum*! Other critics have worried the text, Pomtow (1918), p.326, suggesting *προπυθίη* or *προπευθίη*, and Bousquet (1956), pp.584–5, *προθυσίη <καὶ> προμαντείη*. All this represents a loss of ground since Littré.

[2] Bousquet (1956), pp.579–85, 593 = *SEG* XVI. 326 = Sokolowski, *LSCG Suppl.* 42, a decree of the *koinon* of Asclepiads of Cos and Cnidus posted at Delphi. According to Bousquet (1956), pp.587–90, a Delphic decree honouring the Asclepiads (*Fouilles de Delphes* III, no. 394) soon followed, probably in the second quarter of the fourth century. Delphi has also yielded the remains of a four-line epigram on a votive base, with the names Thessalus and Hippocrates in the first line. The monument, said to be datable to the first half of the fourth century, is discussed by Pomtow (1918), pp.307–16, and by Bousquet (1956), pp.586–7; but Pomtow's interpretation, with reference to Paus. 10.2.6, is entirely fanciful.

[3] The expression *Ἀσκληπιάδαι κατ' ἀνδρογένειαν* occurs both in the Asclepiad decree (n.2 above), lines 10–11, and in [Thessalus]' speech. In the eyes of Bousquet (1956), p.581, this proves the speech close in date to the inscription; but the phrase *κατ' ἀνδρογένειαν* is of course common in itself, and the significance of male descent was doubtless long remembered by the Asclepiads; a grave relief from Miletupolis in Phrygia, of the second century after Christ, describes the deceased as *ἰητροῦ πατρὸς ὢν Ἀσκληπιάδης* (Peek, *GVI* i. 718, line 3, adduced by Sokolowski on *LSCG Suppl.* 42).

on Cos.[1] At some time or other the Nebridae were honoured with a place in Delphic legend. The mysterious hero worshipped in the hippodrome became a son of Nebrus, and the father too was given a role in the First Sacred War—medical rather than military, to use our author's terms; and an oracle, suitably devious, was framed to motivate a course of events that was devious in itself.

(4) In speaking *en passant* of Mermodes and Lycus and of the threat to the tripod, the author of the speech shows that he knows much more of Delphic legend than his purpose requires. Another enigmatic figure is the unnamed 'man of Calydon' living in the household of Nebrus on Cos, and included in the ship's company bound for the Sacred War. [Thessalus] promises to say more of him when the time comes; and indeed we hear that he fought at Chrysus' side on the tower, but nothing further; no doubt he avenged his companion's death by killing Mermodes. In token of his service the Calydonians afterwards received, and still keep, the right of consulting the oracle first and also of dining at public expense. Here then is an *aition* of Calydonian prerogatives at Delphi.

Obviously the man of Calydon was central to some earlier form of the story: in recounting the Asclepiad version, [Thessalus] is careful to give the Calydonian his due, even though he has become a mere encumbrance. It is particularly strange to find the Calydonian residing with Nebrus on Cos, and then tagging along to the Sacred War, though the oracle did not point to him at all. If a Calydonian is to play a leading part at Delphi, let him come from Calydon more or less directly, without a pointless sojourn in distant Cos and an equally pointless return. We may safely conclude that the Calydonian *aition* was once independent of the Asclepiad *aition*. Which came first cannot be known and does not matter; the Calydonian prerogatives which the story explains may well date from the period of Aetolian ascendancy, i.e. the third century B.C. Another Delphic myth also features an Aetolian champion, Eurybatus, who rescues a local boy, Alcyoneus, from a monster inhabiting a cave on Mount Cirphis (Ant. Lib. 8).[2] Eurybatus and Alcyoneus thus somewhat resemble the man of Calydon and Chrysus; but the origin of the tale about Eurybatus is no less obscure.

[1] Apart from St. Byz. the clan-name Nebridae occurs only in Arn. *Adv. nat.* 5.39, where it seemingly denotes a class of Dionysiac worshippers at Eleusis (Demeter 'honoured the Nebridae with the fawn-skin'), and so is perhaps a mistake for some ritual term like νεβρίζοντες. Whether the clan-name derives from a real Nebrus, and whether it denotes a true kinship group, is impossible to know. Herzog, *SBAW* 1928, no. 6, p.43, lists all the known gentilician names on Cos, including of course some patronymic forms; but none of the hypothetical forebears has a name like 'Nebrus'. That descendants of Hp. should be named Draco is not surprising; the fawn however has no known significance in the cult of Asclepius. To my knowledge two historical bearers of the name Nebrus are attested—Nebrus son of Lysis in a subscription list at Cyrene, from the end of the fourth century (*SEG* XX. 735 b I 91), and Nebrus son of Nebrus in another subscription-list on Cos, dated to *c.* 240 (W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, *The Inscr. of Cos*, pp.277–9, no. 387, l. 27, and pp.335–6). But the first instance as well as the second could be due to the celebrity of the Asclepiad Nebrus. The speculation about the origin of the clan canvassed by E. Wüst, *RE* xvi 2 (1935), 2156, s.v. Nebridai, is not helpful; and few will be convinced by the nature symbolism which K. Kerenyi, *Asklepios* (1959), p.55, discerns in the pairing of Nebrus and Chrysus.

[2] Eurybatus son of Euphemus, though descended from the R. Axius, is described as ἐκ τῆς Κουρήτιδος ἀπιών; and the land of the Kouretes, in this context, can only be Aetolia. Aetolia and Macedon are linked again in mythical genealogies at Paus. 5.1.5, 4.4.

IX

We have seen that certain features of Delphic topography gave rise to the story of a great war fought over the sanctuary. Travellers must have spread this local legend. It may be that Athens was drawn into the story at an early stage through the Alcmeonid temple, even though the temple and Alcmeon entered the literary tradition very late. Whether this connection existed or not, it was natural that a leading role should fall to Solon, the sage of Athens whose legislation was authorized by a Delphic oracle, and who drew up several statutes in favour of Delphi. And it was from the popular view of Solon's role that Aristotle and Callisthenes deduced the archon-date for the outbreak of the War.

In the mid 340s the First Sacred War was imported into literature and made into a moral tale which prefigured Philip's intervention in Thessaly and Phocis. A space of five years or so saw three diverse treatments, by Callisthenes, Antipater, and Aristotle and Callisthenes jointly; we hear of the first two by the merest chance, and there were undoubtedly others. In the following decade Aeschines found another contemporary application for the story.

The First Sacred War offers a valuable though astringent lesson, for we see how easily and how profusely earlier history was rewritten during the fourth century. There is a positive gain too. Now that the illusion has been dispelled, we shall be much better placed to understand Thessaly's advance in the late sixth century, and the relations between Thessaly and the rest of Greece on the eve of the Persian invasion and thereafter.

Brock University, Ontario NOEL ROBERTSON