

# The Date of the First Pythiad—Again

*Alden A. Mosshammer*

**M**OST HISTORIANS have long agreed that the first in the regular series of Pythian festivals celebrated every four years at Delphi took place in 582/1. Now H. C. Bennett and more recently S. G. Miller have argued that we should instead follow Pausanias in dating the first Pythiad to 586/5, because the Pindaric scholiasts, they maintain, reckon Pythiads from that year.<sup>1</sup> The debate is an old one, but it has important implications for our understanding of the sequence of events at the time of the First Sacred War. Bennett and Miller have rightly criticized the excessive claims that have been made for some of the evidence; and Miller, in particular, has offered some important new insights into the problem. The argument in favor of 582/1 nevertheless remains the stronger case. It needs to be presented once again, both to take these new objections into account and to elucidate the tradition that has given rise to the debate.

## I. The Problem

According to the *Parian Marble*, our earliest evidence (264/3), the Amphictyons celebrated a victory against Cirrha by dedicating a portion of the spoils as prizes for a chrematitic festival celebrated in 591/0, and again the games became stephanitic in 582/1.<sup>2</sup> Pausanias

<sup>1</sup> H. C. BENNETT, "On the Systemization of Scholia Dates for Pindar's Pythian Odes," *HSCP* 62 (1957) 61–78; STEPHEN G. MILLER, "The Date of the First Pythiad," *CSCA* 11 (1978) 127–58 (cited hereafter by authors' names alone). For the earlier history of the question see C. Gaspar, *Chronologie pindarique* (Brussels 1900), esp. 2–13.

<sup>2</sup> The editorial problems of reconstruction need not detain us, since there is no longer any disagreement on how we should read the entries relevant to the establishment of the Pythian Games. See Felix Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin 1904) 12–13, 102–05, 165–66, and *FGrHist* 239A 37–38 with commentary; T. J. Cadoux, "The Athenian Archons from Creon to Hypsichides," *JHS* 68 (1948) 99–103. The Parian's *πάλιον* reflects the tradition that Pythian games had been celebrated since heroic times, supposedly on an eight-year cycle, but were interrupted by the Sacred War. The historicity of the earlier festival is dubious, and we need not be bothered in any case by the fact that the Parian's two dates are separated by nine years instead of four or eight. As Jacoby has pointed out, the chrematitic festival was occasioned by the

agrees in dating the stephanitic festival to 582/1; but he says that the chrematitic competition took place in 586/5, referring to this explicitly as the first Pythiad.<sup>3</sup> Outside of Pausanias, we encounter numbered Pythiads only in a few of the scholia to Pindar. The texts are fraught with difficulties, especially in the transmission of the numerals, so that they do not in themselves permit a secure inference as to the date from which Pythiads were counted. A papyrus fragment of an Olympic victor-list published in 1899 and bearing on the text of two particularly crucial scholia seemed absolutely to exclude 586/5 as a base-date and to guarantee the date 582/1 for the first Pythiad.<sup>4</sup> Finally, the Delphian inscription honoring Aristotle and Callisthenes for their work in drawing up the list of Pythian victors has been restored to show that the list began in the year of Gylidas, Delphian archon in 591/0, another vindication of the Parian's chronology.<sup>5</sup>

H. C. Bennett has now argued that the Pindaric scholia, with or without the Oxyrhynchus fragment, offer no positive evidence for dating the first Pythiad to 582/1 and that we should therefore accept the clear and explicit testimony of Pausanias that the first Pythiad was celebrated in 586/5. Professor Miller re-examined the fragments of the Delphian inscription and demonstrated that the name Gylidas must absolutely be excluded, not only because it exceeds the available space, but because it cannot be made to fit the traces of a vertical stroke still clearly visible on the stone. The name of Diodorus, archon in 582/1, is equally impossible, so that the lost name must be that of the (unknown) archon of 586/5. He also argues that the Pindaric commentators consistently reckon from 586/5, providing positive evidence for that date.

It is certainly true that the Oxyrhynchus fragment and the Delphian decree have been forced to carry an evidentiary burden in this debate that they cannot bear. The Pindaric scholia, however, are equally fragile. The arguments of Bennett and Miller rest on historical and philological subtleties that exceed the evidence of these sometimes hopelessly corrupt texts. In particular, Professor Miller inter-

---

accidents of warfare, so that we should not expect its date to coincide with any regular cycle of observance.

<sup>3</sup> Paus. 10.7.4–5. The same chronology underlies his subsequent statement (10.7.7) that the hoplitodromos was added at the 23rd Pythiad, five Olympiads later than at Olympia, where he elsewhere says (5.8.10) the first victory in that competition took place at the 65th Olympiad (520/19).

<sup>4</sup> *P.Oxy.* II 222, bearing on *schol.Olymp.* 9 17c and 12 inscr.

<sup>5</sup> Tod II 187; *FGrHist* 124T23 with Jacoby's commentary. The name of Gylidas we have from *schol.Pyth.* hyp. d, with variant 'Eulidas' in hyp. b.

prets the word 'Pythiad' itself in a highly technical chronographic sense for which there seems to be insufficient warrant. This is an issue that requires clarification before we can turn our attention again to the relevant texts.

## II. Pythiads and Olympiads

Professor Miller writes of Pythiads and Olympiads as if they were fully analogous, each word having the same range of meanings. He suggests that the first Pythiad, like the first Olympiad, was a chronological era, so that we should be particularly attentive to the evidence of Pausanias and the Pindaric commentators, since they were following a source that used the Pythian era. He also argues that a Pythiad, like an Olympiad, is a period of four years, and that this sense is critical for the interpretation of the scholia.

The basic meaning of *Pythias* is 'a celebration of the Pythian festival', as that of *Olympias* is 'a celebration of the Olympic festival'. Even the first Olympiad was itself never used as a chronological era for public purposes analogous to the commemorative eras of the Hellenistic period.<sup>6</sup> As chronological references Olympiads gained currency only after the time of Eratosthenes (*ca* 225 B.C.) and only for historiographical purposes.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, the system of Olympic chronology subsequently became so common in literary texts that the word 'Olympiad' could be understood as a unit of time encompassing four years. Such a usage is somewhat anomalous; and it apparently offended the Greek ear, for most authors long avoided it. Even Diodorus dates by Olympiads only in Olympic years, so that the word retains its original force. Eventually, such authors as Diogenes Laertius and Pausanias adopted the convention of dating by numbered and subdivided Olympiads, no longer naming the victor. Often they date an event to a certain numbered Olympiad, not specifying a precise year. An 'Olympiad' thus became the period of four years between celebrations, rather than an actual observance of the Olympic festival.

We can trace no such development for Pythiads. No ancient author uses the first Pythiad as a base-date from which to calculate an interval like Eratosthenes' date for the fall of Troy, 408 years before the

<sup>6</sup> On the Hellenistic eras, which were fewer than is sometimes supposed, see E. J. Bickerman, *Chronology in the Ancient World*<sup>2</sup> (Ithaca 1980) 70–75.

<sup>7</sup> On Olympic chronology see Jacoby, *FGrHist* 3b 221–28 (introduction to the commentary on F408–16, "Elis und Olympia"), and Truesdell S. Brown, *Timaeus of Tauromenium* (Los Angeles 1958) 10.

first Olympiad (*FGrHist* 241F1). Nowhere do we encounter a date expressed as the first, second, third, or fourth year of a numbered Pythiad. Even the name of a Pythian victor (which would have been the first step in the development of a Pythian chronology) we find as a chronological reference in only one text. A fragment of the *Magnesian Chronicle* (ca 200 B.C.) dates the epiphany of Artemis in 221/0 by reference to the Pythian citharoedist of the preceding year, as well as several other indications of the date. As Jacoby has shown, however, the dating formulae of this text are so unusual and so highly artificial that it can offer no evidence for the general use of the Pythian victor list as a chronological reference.<sup>8</sup>

The point of disagreement between the Parian and Pausanias is not whether the Pythian era should be dated to 586/5 or 582/1, but whether the chrematitic festival was celebrated in 591/0 or in 586/5. The Parian might well have agreed with Pausanias that the festival of 582/1 was the second Pythiad in the plain and literal sense that it was the second celebration of the Pythian games. The question to be asked of those who enumerate Pythiads is not the date of the Pythian era, but whether they began the count with the first stephanitic celebration or with an earlier chrematitic festival. Pausanias assigned the number 1 to the chrematitic games. We must now ask whether the Pindaric commentators did likewise or whether their list of victors began with the *stephanephoroi* of 582/1.

### III. The Pindaric Scholia

A large number of the Pindaric scholia have been adduced in favor of one dating system or the other. As Bennett and Miller have shown, there are only three sets of texts that can properly be considered as bearing directly on the question. The most important are the scholia to the dedication of *Pythian* 3, inscribed Ἰέρωνι Συρακουσίῳ κέλητι.

*Inscr.* a: γράφει τὸν ἐπίνικον Ἰέρωνι νικήσαντι κέλητι τὴν εἰκοστὴν ἕκτην καὶ εἰκοστὴν ἐβδόμην Πυθιάδα. καὶ φανερόν εἰς ἀμφότερας τὰς νίκας τὸν ἐπίνικον συντάττει, δι' ὧν ὀνομάζει στεφάνους ἀέθλων καὶ κώμους ἀέθλων.

<sup>8</sup> *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 557; *FGrHist* 482F2. Miller does not discuss this text. A date for the first Pythiad cannot be derived from it because the author did not number the Pythiad in his reference. The gap on the stone at this point is barely large enough for the name of the citharoedist and cannot also accommodate a number.

*Inscr. b*: Ἰέρωνι Πύθια νικήσαντι τὴν κζ' Πυθιάδα· μέμνηται δὲ καὶ τῆς πρὸ ταύτης Πυθιάδος, ὥστε ἐπὶ ταῖς δύο νίκαις τὴν ᾠδὴν συντετάχθαι. συνάδει δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων. ὡς γὰρ ἤδη βασιλεύοντός φησιν· ὃς Συρακόσσαισιν ἄρχει πραῦς ἀστοῖς. καθίσταται δὲ ὁ Ἰέρων βασιλεὺς κατὰ ος' Ὀλυμπιάδα τῆς κη' Πυθιάδας τῇ προκειμένῃ Ὀλυμπιάδι συγχρόνου οὔσης, ὥστε πάντῃ τε καὶ πάντως μετὰ τὴν ἕσπερον Πυθιάδα, ἣτις γέγονε περὶ τὴν οε' Ὀλυμπιάδα, συντετάχθαι τόνδε τὸν ἐπίνικον.

According to *inscr. a*, Hieron was listed as victor in the riding competitions at the 26th and 27th Pythiads. The commentator believes the poem to have been written in honor of both victories, since line 130 mentions Pythian wreaths in the plural. *Inscr. b* offers additional evidence for the same conclusion. The poem refers to Hieron as a ruler. He became king in the 76th Olympiad, at which time the 28th Pythiad was celebrated. Thus the poem must have been composed after the second (ἕσπερον) Pythian victory, the one that occurred during the 75th Olympiad. These statements are consistent with one another and imply a synchronization between the first Pythiad and the 49th Olympiad. Since we know that the Pythian games took place in what would correspond to the third year of a chronographic Olympiad, the first Pythiad by this system took place in 582/1.

Bennett agrees that this is the date for the first Pythiad that follows from these texts as printed in Drachmann's edition. He dismisses the evidence, however, on the grounds that the texts are corrupt and mutually contradictory. The date given for Hieron's kingship is either corrupt or wrong, he argues, because both *schol. Pyth. 1 inscr.* and Diodorus (11.38) state that Hieron succeeded Gelon in the 75th Olympiad. He also states that the correct manuscript reading in the next synchronization is ος' (76th Olympiad), so that the commentator contradicts himself by synchronizing both the 28th and the 27th Pythiads with the same (76th) Olympiad.

Apparently Bennett misread Drachmann's apparatus (63.4). οε' (75th) is the manuscript reading in the second synchronization of *inscr. b*; ος' is Schroeder's conjecture. Furthermore, the commentator's date for Hieron's kingship in the 76th Olympiad (the earlier statement) cannot be so easily dismissed as a corruption or an error. The same date appears in the *Chronicle* of Eusebius and elsewhere in the Pindaric scholia; for Hieron formally proclaimed himself king of Syracuse and oecist of Aetna at the 76th Olympic festival (476/5), although he had succeeded Gelon as tyrant a couple of years previously.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Full elucidation of the point would require a lengthy digression on a subject not directly relevant to the point at issue in this paper. Briefly, Eusebius enters Hieron's

Miller accepts the texts as they stand and takes a new approach to their interpretation. He argues that *προκειμένη* means ‘previous’ to the Olympiad just mentioned (the 76th), so that the 28th Pythiad is synchronized with the 75th Olympiad. He understands *ὑστερον* in the next clause as a reference to the last Pythiad mentioned, so that the 28th is again synchronized with the 75th Olympiad. He suggests that the ambiguity arising from the alternation in the texts between the 75th and the 76th Olympiad reflects the fact that Olympiads and Pythiads are not exactly synchronous. The commentator, he says, uses *περί* in the second statement to indicate that the 28th Pythiad and the 75th Olympiad overlap each other chronologically.

This argument requires us to understand four words in other than their ordinary sense. Miller’s interpretation of *προκειμένη* is not supported by the lexicon and not justified by the scholiastic parallels he cites.<sup>10</sup> In *inscr.* b the word means ‘previous’ in either of two literal senses. The 76th is the previous Olympiad both in being the one just named in the text and in that it was (by the standard chronology) the celebration of the Olympic games immediately previous to the celebration of the 28th Pythiad. Miller’s understanding of *ὑστερον* as referring to the last of three Pythiads mentioned is also a departure from ordinary usage. The word generally means the latter of two. Since the commentator is trying to demonstrate that the poem celebrates two victories, the ‘latter Pythiad’ is most naturally taken as a reference to the second, the victory at the 27th Pythiad.

---

accession twice, in both the 75th and the 76th Olympiads (109<sup>f.i</sup> Helm), apparently drawing from two sources. The first date is confirmed by Diod. 11.38, the second by Diod. 11.49, where he relates the foundation of Aetna under the year 476/5. *Schol. Ol.* 1 *inscr.* a says the poem was occasioned by Hieron’s victory at the 76th Olympiad, at which he proclaimed himself ‘Syracusan and Aetnean’. The poem is inscribed to Hieron of Syracuse, however, and l. 35 refers to him as ‘Syracusan king’. The scholion to that line reflects a scholarly debate on the issue. Some believed that Hieron was already calling himself ‘Aetnean’ at the time of the victory; others, including Apollodorus (*FGrHist* 244F69), said he was not yet the Aetnean at the time of the festival since the foundation was not yet complete. *Schol. Nem.* 1 *inscr.* a gives no dates but adds valuable information. Hieron did not wish to be called ‘tyrant’, but rather ‘oecist’; he therefore undertook to found a new city at Aetna and proclaimed himself ‘Aetnean’ at one of the festivals (*ἐν τισι τῶν ἀγώνων*). Thus it seems that Hieron became tyrant in 478/7, but proclaimed himself ‘king of Syracuse and oecist of Aetna’ at the Olympic games of 476/5, whereupon he proceeded to carry out the establishment of his new city. On such dedications see L. Robert, *RevPhil* SER. III 41 (1967) 14–27, esp. 21 where Robert briefly notes Hieron’s case.

<sup>10</sup> *Schol. Nem.* 6.67a refers to the verse previous to the one under discussion. *Schol. Pyth.* 11.21 refers to the Pythiad previous to the one the commentator believes to have occasioned the poem. Neither example suggests a chronographic usage in the sense of ‘previous to the aforementioned’.

Miller also asks us to understand a Pythiad as a period of four years overlapping an Olympiad, rather than as a specific celebration of the Pythian games. For reasons already adduced, this usage is inappropriate for Pythiads. It is true that Pythiads and Olympiads are not exactly synchronous; but one could certainly state that the Pythia, like any other event, took place during a numbered Olympiad in the usual chronographic sense. Miller's contention that *περί* has precisely the force of weakening the synchronization again places too great a burden on an ordinary word. The authors from whom we derive our knowledge of these conventions use *περί* and *κατά* interchangeably.<sup>11</sup> A good example is *schol. Ol. 6 inscr. a*, where *περί* is used for a precise Olympic date: οἱ δὲ χρόνοι τῆς ᾠδῆς πρὸ τῆς καταλύσεως τοῦ τῆς ἀπῆνης ἀγωνίσματος· κατελύθη δὲ περὶ τὴν π' Ὀλυμπιάδα ('at' the 85th Olympiad).

The standard interpretation of *schol. Pyth. 3 inscr. b* is the correct one: the 28th Pythiad was celebrated during the 76th Olympiad, the 27th during the 75th, the first during the 49th (584/1, *viz.* 582/1).

The second set of scholia crucial to the case are those commenting on the inscription of *Olympian 12*, dedicated to Ergoteles of Himera. The commentators seek to identify the victories mentioned in lines 23–24, νῦν δ' Ὀλυμπία στεφανωσάμενος καὶ δις ἐκ Πυθῶνος Ἴσθμοῖ τ' Ἐργοτέλες.

*Inscr.*: Ἐργοτέλει Ἱμεραίῳ δολιχοδρόμῳ Πύθια καὶ Ἴσθμα νικήσαντι τὴν οζ' Ὀλυμπιάδα.

*Inscr. a*: Ὀλυμπιάδα μὲν ἐνίκησεν οζ' καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς οθ' Πυθιάδα δὲ κέ' καὶ Ἴσθμα ὁμοίως.

*Inscr. b*: ὃς ἠγωνίσαστο ἐβδομηκοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς Πυθιάδα εἰκοστὴν ἐννάτην.

*Inscr. a* contains at least two corruptions. The next Olympiad after the 77th was not the 79th. According to *inscr. b*, Ergoteles won at the 29th Pythiad, not the 25th. Tycho Mommsen therefore emended 79th to 78th (ση') and 25th to 29th (κθ'). The discovery of *P.Oxy. 222*, however, showed that Ergoteles did not win at the 78th Olympiad. Beck therefore emended οθ' to κθ' Πυθιάδα, so that the scholion mentions two Pythian victories, one at the 25th and another at the 29th Pythiad. Although Ergoteles did win two Pythian victories, they are not likely to have been separated by as much as sixteen

<sup>11</sup> See for example Diog.Laert. 1.62, 72, 79, 98; Tatian *Orat.* 31, 41; Clem.Alex. *Strom.* 1.65, 129, 131: in all of which *περί* is used in reference to ordinary Olympic dates with no suggestion that they are only approximate.

years.<sup>12</sup> Wilamowitz suggested τὴν ἐξῆς Πυθιάδα κθ' καὶ Ἴσθμια ὁμοίως.<sup>13</sup> All these suggestions rely on the common corruption between ε and θ in numerals, and rightly so. Equally common is corruption between ε and αι in words. The original text was perhaps Ὀλυμπιάδα μὲν ἐνίκησεν οζ' καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς κθ' Πυθιάδα, Πυθιάδα δὲ καὶ Ἴσθμια ὁμοίως. The commentator was thus saying that Ergoteles won Pythian and Isthmian victories during the same season. This is a possible interpretation of Pindar's δῖς, as Wilamowitz has noted (and this is the case for which *P.Oxy.* 222 has been considered so decisive).<sup>14</sup> Indeed this may be what the commentator is telling us in the *inscr.*: to Ergoteles of Himera victor in the dolichodromos Pythian, Isthmian, and 77th Olympian.

Whatever the implications of the *inscr.*, one cannot rest a case on so fragile a text as *inscr. a.* *Inscr. b.*, however, is unproblematic: Ergoteles competed at the 77th celebration of the Olympic festival and at the next celebration of the Pythian, the 29th. The 77th Olympiad took place in 472. The next Pythian was celebrated in 470. Since this was the 29th, the first by this system of counting took place in 582.

Bennett dismisses these scholia as evidence, charging the commentators with error about the dates of Ergoteles' Olympic victories and confusion about the number and dates of the Pythian. Miller leaves *inscr. a.* unemended and he punctuates after ἐξῆς in *inscr. b.* Thus no date for any Pythiad can be inferred, whether the 25th, the 29th, or the 79th. He argues, however, that the victory at the 29th Pythiad must have taken place before the 77th Olympiad, not after. First, he says, Pindar's νῦν refers specifically to the Olympic victory, so that the Pythian must already have occurred. Second, he argues that ode must follow so closely upon victory that an interval of as much as two years cannot be envisioned. The poem must therefore have been composed on the occasion of the 77th Olympiad and before the next Pythiad. He also maintains that the 29th Pythiad cannot have followed the 77th Olympiad even on the traditional chronology; for the last year of that

<sup>12</sup> Pausanias mentions a memorial at Olympia dedicated to Ergoteles' multiple victories (6.4.11). The remains are extant; see E. Kunze, *Kretika Chronika* 7 (1953) 138–45.

<sup>13</sup> *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 305 n.1. Beck and Mommsen I cite from Drachmann's apparatus.

<sup>14</sup> The Isthmian games were biennial, held in the springtime of what would correspond to the second and fourth years of a chronographic Olympiad (Thuc. 8.9.1). The Pythian games were held during the third year of an Olympiad (Paus. 10.7.4), probably in late summer (*C.I. Delphes* I 10.45). Thus it would be possible to win at the Isthmus and at Delphi during the same spring-summer season, though not during the same chronographic Olympic or archon's year. On the interpretation of δῖς see Wilamowitz (*supra* n.13) 305–06.



Olympiad was 469/8 and the next Pythiad cannot begin until 466/5, the 30th Pythiad by the traditional count.

This argument is unconvincing in each of its points. The commentators are enumerating victories, not marking off four-year intervals of time; and the word ‘Pythiad’ never referred to such an interval anyway. Surely the next Pythiad after the Olympic celebration of 472 took place in 470. The argument that two years cannot have elapsed between the commissioning of the poem in honor of the Olympic victory of 472 and its completion has little basis in the evidence. We have no way of knowing what the expectations were in such matters, nor can we state with any confidence that this is a specifically Olympionician ode. Ergoteles may well have commissioned the poem after a series of victories in honor of them all. Pindar refers (in line 1) to the liberation of Himera. The political turmoil that followed the death of Theron did not begin until after the Olympic victory of 472 (Diod. 11.52), so that it may easily have been two years or more before Pindar could refer to the city as liberated. Finally, Pindar’s *νῦν* should not be taken in too narrow a temporal sense. The poet states (21) that Ergoteles would never have become famous had not civil strife prompted his removal from Cnossos to Himera. “Now,” having won at Olympia and twice at Delphi and the Isthmus, he has graced both himself and his adoptive city. The word is consecutive, introducing a conclusion. It is the whole group of victories that has won Ergoteles immortal fame, not the Olympic alone.

In the third case, the commentators seek to identify the Olympic and Pythian victories of Epharmostus to which Pindar refers at *Olympian* 9.11, 18.

17a: καὶ γὰρ ἐν Πυθίᾳ ἐνίκησε λγ' Πυθιάδι.

17c: ἐνίκησε δὲ ὁ Ἐφάρμοστος καὶ Ὀλύμπια ὡς προεῖπον καὶ Πύθια ἐβδομηκοστῇ ὀγδόῃ [τρίτη codd.] Ὀλυμπιάδι.

18a: καὶ γὰρ Πύθια ἐνίκησεν ὁ Ἐφάρμοστος τὴν λ' Πυθιάδα.

*P.Oxy.* 222 shows that Epharmostus was listed as a victor at the 78th Olympiad, requiring Drachmann’s emendation in 17c. If Epharmostus won at the 78th Olympiad and at the Pythia about the same time, as 17c suggests, then 17a is wrong to identify the Pythiad as the 33rd, and we must follow 18a in numbering it the 30th. The 30th Pythiad was celebrated in 466, if we date the first to 582, during the 78th Olympiad. The result is consistent with that which follows from the cases already considered.

Miller argues, rightly, that 17c does not absolutely require us to date the Pythian victory within the 78th Olympiad. We can punctuate after Ὀλύμπια, προεῖπον, and Πύθια. The 78th Olympiad is then to be taken strictly as a reference to the festival at which Epharmostus was victorious, but not chronographically as a date for the Pythian victory as well. Miller also contends, following Bennett, that the Pythian victory must have preceded the Olympic, because this is an Olympian ode and the time between victory and ode cannot have been so long as two years. This argument is the same as that adduced against the usual interpretation of the scholia to *Olympian* 12, discussed above, and unpersuasive for the same reasons. We may add that the arrangement of these poems in the collection and the composition of their dedicatory lines are the work of Alexandrian editors, not of Pindar. What the editors believed about the occasion of a poem is not necessarily the truth of the matter. *Olympian* 9 celebrates a prodigious list of victories (lines 125–50) in honor of both Epharmostus and his brother Lampromachus. Such a poem may have been jointly commissioned at the end of long and successful athletic careers. It is natural to give pride of place to an Olympic victory, but it need not for that reason have been the most recent. Still, we must agree that the claims for a decisive resolution of the question on the basis of these scholia and *P.Oxy.* 222 are excessive. The evidence of 17c is moot.

#### IV. Other Evidence

In the two cases from which the extant texts permit a conclusion, the Pindaric commentators enumerate Pythian victories from a starting point corresponding to 582/1. What little other evidence there is, besides Pausanias, supports this date for the first in the regular historical series of Pythian games. Most directly relevant is the *Chronicle* of Eusebius.<sup>15</sup> Eusebius noted the establishment of the Isthmian and Pythian festivals in a single synchronistic entry, dated to the third or

<sup>15</sup> Miller dismisses the evidence of Eusebius as unimportant both for its lateness and because it is not based on the 'Pythian era'. The lateness of Eusebius is in fact an argument in favor of his evidence in this case, since such information as reached him can be regarded as representing the chronographic vulgate of antiquity. In fact, Eusebius is our best and sometimes only source for the foundation dates of several of the great festivals, including the Isthmian and the Nemean, as well as the Gymnopaedia and Panathenaea. We have no reason to doubt the authenticity of the tradition that reached him in any of these cases.

fourth year of the 49th Olympiad (583–581) in all but one of the manuscripts of Jerome’s version: *Isthmia post Melicerten et Pythia primum acta*.<sup>16</sup> Georgius Syncellus preserves a Greek version, without a date, among his miscellany (453.15 Bonn): “Ἰσθμια καὶ Πύθια πρῶτως ἤχθη μετὰ Μελικέρτην. Melicertes is the mythical hero of the ancient Isthmian festival, which was supposedly interrupted by the Cypselid tyranny.<sup>17</sup> The wording of all three versions implies that the Pythian festival to which this notice refers was considered the first. Their respective cycles of repetition preclude the two festivals from having been celebrated in the same chronographic Olympic or archon’s year, yet Eusebius reports their establishment in a single notice. The synchronism suggests that here as often Eusebius’ sources reported an Olympiad date for both festivals but not the precise year. The consensus of the manuscript evidence argues for the 49th Olympiad, and the same Olympic date for the Isthmian is reported by Solinus (7.14).

Eusebius’ sources dated the first Pythian to the 49th Olympiad (584/1). In this tradition it was the first stephanitic competition of 582/1 that constituted the beginning of the historical festival. No other source (besides Pausanias) refers specifically to a ‘first’ Pythiad.<sup>18</sup> A well-known fragment of Demetrius of Phalerum, however, offers indirect evidence. According to Demetrius (Diog.Laert. 1.22; *FGrHist* 228F1), Thales and the rest of the Seven Sages were canonized as ‘wise’ during the archonship of Damasias. Demetrius’ rationale for this date has long been recognized.<sup>19</sup> To Damasias’ year,

<sup>16</sup> 101<sup>d</sup> Helm. The Bern MS. enters the notice at the third year of the 50th Olympiad, but its entries are consistently lower than the consensus of the other MSS. (and the truth) throughout this portion of the work (e.g., Solon in 592/1 instead of the Apollodoran date 594/3 to which the other MSS. attest).

<sup>17</sup> *Schol.hyp.Isthm.*, cf. Solinus 7.14. I have defended the traditional chronology of the Cypselid tyranny and argued that the date of the Isthmian festival was one of the starting points for the precise chronographic dates: *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg/London 1979) 234–45. The classic statement against the historicity of these dates is E. Will, *Korinthiaka* (Paris 1955) 363–440.

<sup>18</sup> Strabo’s note (594) is not helpful to either side in the debate: μετὰ δὲ τὸν Κρισαῖον πόλεμον οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες ἵππικὸν καὶ γυμνικὸν ἐπ’ Εὐρυλόχου διέταξαν στεφανίτην καὶ Πύθια ἐκάλεσαν. According to *schol.hyp. b Pyth.* it was the chrematitic festival in the archonship of Simon, 591/0, that Eurylochus organized, yet Strabo seems to call them stephanitic and ‘the Pythia’. Thus he has compressed the chrematitic and stephanitic into a single note which is simply wrong. On the other hand, if we punctuate cleverly enough we might have him say, “After the Crisaeian War the Amphictyons organized a hippic and gymnastic contest under Eurylochus; the stephanitic they called the Pythian.” Such an argument would convince no one. Neither would an attempt to adduce Strabo in support of Pausanias’ reference to the chrematitic as the first Pythia, for Strabo calls these games stephanitic and he implies a date different from that of Pausanias in 586/5.

<sup>19</sup> See Cadoux (*supra* n.2) and Jacoby’s commentary.

582/1, the *Parian Marble* and *schol.hyp. Pyth.* b, d date the first stephanitic games. Demetrius synchronized Apollo's formal recognition of the Seven as Wise with that festival. The synchronism is appropriate only if the celebration of 582/1 was generally recognized as the first in the regular series, that is, the 'First Pythiad'.

## V. The First Pythiad and the Chronology of the Sacred War

The *Parian Marble* and the scholiastic hypotheses to the Pythian odes associate the establishment of the historical Pythian festival with an Amphictyonic war against Cirrha—the First Sacred War. They agree, minor textual variants aside, that the Amphictyons celebrated a victory by holding a chrematitic competition during the archonship at Athens of Simon, 591/0. They also agree that the first stephanitic festival was organized in the archonship of Damasias, 582/1. The scholia add the names of the Delphian archons for each year, Gylidas and Diodorus. These agreements imply a common source which combined the early history of the festival with a narrative on the First Sacred War. As Professor Miller has suggested, that source was Aristotle's *Ἀναγραφὴ τῶν Πυθιονίκων*. Plutarch cites that work (*Solon* 11.1–2) for the belief that Solon owed his prestige partly to his rôle in supporting the Amphictyonic declaration of war. The Pindaric commentators cite Aristotle (e.g., *schol.Ol.* 2.87d) for the list of Pythian victors, and it is reasonable to conclude with Miller that Aristotle was also their source for the information about the establishment of the Pythia.

This Aristotelian *anagraphe* is the same *pinax* for which the Delphian decree examined by Miller honors Aristotle and Callisthenes. If it was the common source for the Parian and the Pindaric commentators, it included a preface narrating the early history of the festival in the context of the Sacred War. We would expect such a preface by analogy to the narrative that introduces Eusebius' list of Olympic victors (89 Karst) and the introduction to Phlegon's *Ὀλυμπιονίκων καὶ χρόνων συναγωγή* (*FGrHist* 257F1). Callisthenes wrote a history of the Third Sacred War (*FGrHist* 124T25–26), from which Athenaeus (560B–C; F1) quotes some facts about the First Sacred War:

καὶ ὁ Κρισαϊκὸς δὲ πόλεμος ὀνομαζόμενος, ὡς φησι Καλλισθένης ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Πολέμου, ὅτε Κιρραῖοι πρὸς Φωκεῖς ἐπολέμησαν, δεκαέτης ἦν, ἀρπασάντων Κιρραίων τὴν Πελάγοντος

τοῦ Φωκέως θυγατέρα Μεγιστῶ καὶ τὰς Ἀργείων θυγατέρας ἐπανιούσας ἐκ τοῦ Πυθικοῦ ἱεροῦ· δεκάτῳ δὲ ἔτει ἐάλω καὶ ἡ Κίρρα.

Callisthenes' *Sacred War* was separate from his *Hellenica* and was doubtless researched at the same time that he was at work on the Pythian *pinax*. Indeed, as Jacoby has suggested (*ad* τ24), Callisthenes may well have been largely responsible for the entire *anagraphe* that circulated under Aristotle's name. If that is so, we may combine his ten-year interval for the First Sacred War with what facts the scholiasts report from the *anagraphe* in an effort to discover the genesis of the chronological system.

The dates of the chrematitic celebration in 591/0 and of the stephanitic in 582/1 we may take as being historical. That is, they are to be regarded as among the starting points for the construction of a chronological system, not its results. The fact that the two dates are not related by the four- or eight-year cycle of repetition is in itself an argument for their historicity, as Jacoby has pointed out.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, Callisthenes' ten-year interval for the Sacred War is patently a fiction—a doublet of the Trojan War, as is his description of the Cirrhans' provocation in carrying off young ladies returning from the shrine. The implication in the accounts of both the Parian and the Pindaric commentators is that the victory which occasioned the chrematitic festivals occurred after a period of warfare, which must therefore have started before 591. Plutarch's citation of the *anagraphe* explains how Solon came to acquire the reputation for justice that led to his appointment as archon and arbitrator.<sup>21</sup> In this system his speech to the Amphictyons must have taken place before his archonship in 594/3. A final clue is provided by the interval of six years in the Pindaric scholia between the chrematitic festival and the end of the war. The commentators state that Eurylochus was victorious over the Cirrhans in the archonship at Athens of Simon, at Delphi of Gylidas.<sup>22</sup> Eurylochus left part of the force with Hippias to deal with the Cirrhans who had fled to Mt Cirphis, while he himself organized the chrematitic festival. Six years later, after Hippias' vic-

<sup>20</sup> See *supra* n.2. The mythical enneateric festival is reported by the scholiastic hypotheses to the Pythian odes. All questions of its historicity aside, the enneateric interval would certainly have corresponded to eight years by our count, whatever N. G. L. Hammond, *JHS* 60 (1940) 74 = *Studies* 150, meant by "the multiple of three (a nine-year interval) required between the two Pythian festivals."

<sup>21</sup> Whether or not Plutarch was right to equate the archonship with the arbitration is irrelevant. Most ancient authors, including Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 5.2), synchronized the two.

<sup>22</sup> *Hyp. Pyth.* b, d; b has 'Simonides', but this is a textual variant without chronological implication.

tory over the remaining Cirrhans, in the archonship at Athens of Damasias, at Delphi of Diodorus, they established the stephanitic competitions.<sup>23</sup>

A difficulty arises from this interval of five or six years between the chrematitic and stephanitic festivals, between the archonships of Simon and Damasias. To deny the nine-year interval of the Parian and move the archonship of Simon to 587/6 or that of Damasias to 586/5 would solve nothing and do unacceptable violence to our best reconstructions of the Athenian archon-list for this period. Professor Miller has therefore suggested an explanation for this interval in Pausanias' date for the chrematitic games of 586/5. There was one such celebration after the initial victory in 591/0, another in the sixth year later to celebrate the end of the war, and the stephanitic festival followed on the regular cycle in 582/1. The confusion arose in part, Miller suggests, because 586/5 was one of the years without an archon during the civil turmoil in Athens. Hence Aristotle, unable to give an archon's year, dated this second chrematitic festival by reference to Olympiads. Pausanias preserves the Olympic date, the scholiasts confirm it with their six-year interval.

Such an hypothesis is attractive and accounts for much, but too many problems stand in its way. None of our sources suggests that there were two chrematitic festivals, and it is therefore unlikely that Aristotle and Callisthenes reported two. Neither Aristotle nor Callisthenes would have given an Olympic date to avoid the problem of the year without an archon, especially since it was not an Olympic year. Dating by reference to numbered and subdivided Olympiads was as yet unknown, and we know that years of *anarchia* were entered in the list and reported as such in chronographic formulae.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, the scholiasts' six-year interval does not lead to a date in 586/5 for a second chrematitic festival, but to a wrong date in that year for the first stephanitic competitions.

Professor Miller is right that a date in 586/5 follows from the six-year interval in the scholiastic texts. Mostly likely, this was Callisthenes' date for the end of the Sacred War as reported in the prologue to the *anagraphe*. His date for its beginning was therefore 595/4, and there is a ready explanation for the system: the ten-year interval is a doublet of the Trojan War. Callisthenes derived precise dates by supposing that Solon delivered his speech to the Amphictyons shortly before his archonship and that the victory celebrated by

<sup>23</sup> μετὰ δὲ χρόνον ἑξαετηῆ ἡγρ. β, καὶ ἔτει ἕκτω δ.

<sup>24</sup> See for example Diod. 14.3.1, ἀναρχίας οὐσῆς Ἀθήνησι.

the chrematitic games in 591/0 marked the mid-point of the war. Thus the Sacred War began in 595/4 and ended in 586/5.<sup>25</sup>

The scholiasts assumed that the stephanitic festival followed immediately upon the final victory, as the chrematitic had the earlier victory. The error did not affect their numbering of Pythian victories, however, since the archonship of Damasias was not for them a date. A similar confusion might be held to account for Pausanias' date in 586/5—a false, but understandable, synchronism between the chrematitic festival and the end of the war, instead of the fall of Cirrha. Such an hypothesis seems improbable, for Pausanias' history of the Pythian festival (10.7) and his account of the Sacred War (10.37) are so completely separate that he must have derived them from different sources. His history of the Pythian festival is an excerpt that did not include the Sacred War and its association with the chrematitic festival. In the Aristotelian *anagraphe* the chrematitic victors were mentioned in the prologue, separately from the stephanitic list. Hence those who, like the Pindaric commentators, enumerated Pythian victors began with the first *stephanephoroi*. In Pausanias' excerpt, the prologue was omitted; but the names of the chrematitic victors were included in order to make the history of the festival complete. Since the narrative had disappeared, these names now stood at the head of a list of Pythian innovations. It was therefore natural for him to refer to them as the victors at the first Pythiad. The date 586/5 is his own inference, having nothing to do with the chronology of the Sacred War or the six-year interval of the scholiasts. Knowing the standard date for the reorganized stephanitic festival in 582/1, he simply assumed that the chrematitic festival had taken place four years earlier on the regular cycle.

Professor Miller has demonstrated that we must exclude Gylidas, the Delphian archon of 591/0, from the crucial gap in the inscription commemorating the Aristotelian *anagraphe*. His conjecture of Hip-pias, commander of the victorious forces in 586/5, fits the stone. More likely would be the name of the victor with whom the list began, by analogy with the Olympic list and Coroebus.<sup>26</sup> The Magnesian chronicle discussed above shows that the citharoedic victor at the

<sup>25</sup> Athenaeus' paraphrase of Callisthenes has Cirrha fall in the tenth year. Strictly speaking, on my hypothesis, the city of Cirrha fell in the fifth year, and the Cirrhan war ended in the tenth.

<sup>26</sup> See the testimony on the Olympic list at *FGrHist* 416 with Jacoby's commentary. The first Olympiad is universally associated with the name of Coroebus, the first eponymous victor, not with the name of an Elean official or other organizing superintendent.

Pythia was eponymous. Melampus, whom Pausanias (10.7.4) names as citharoedist at the chrematitic festival, will not fit. The official list as referred to on the stone must therefore have begun with the citharoedist at the first stephanitic competitions in 582/1. His name unfortunately is not reported, but we have nevertheless an additional argument for insisting that the list of Pythian victors began with the *stephanephoroi* and that the stephanitic festival of 582/1 constituted 'the First Pythiad'.

We have no way of knowing why the Amphictyons waited until 582/1 to declare the Pythia stephanitic and quadrennial. Jacoby suggested that a regular celebration of the old octennial festival had been due in 590/89 but was omitted because of the extraordinary festival the previous year. The next Pythiad was celebrated when due in 582/1, at which time the festival was reorganized.<sup>27</sup> The historicity of this earlier cycle is, however, dubious at best. Perhaps it simply took the Amphictyons a few years after the end of the war to consolidate their control over Delphi so as to be able to organize a panhellenic festival.<sup>28</sup> An irregular number of years between an extraordinary chrematitic festival and the organization of an official series of stephanitic competitions is just what we should expect. Whatever the correct explanation for the date 582/1 may be, Pausanias' date in 586/5 contributes nothing to our understanding of the problem. It is an error.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO  
*December, 1981*

<sup>27</sup> *Das Marmor Parium* (*supra* n.2) 102–05.

<sup>28</sup> On the political setting of the war see George Forrest, "The First Sacred War," *BCH* 80 (1956) 33–52. One may wonder whether the organization of the Isthmia the previous year prompted the Amphictyons to organize their own festival. In that case, something of the rivalry between Cleisthenes of Sicyon (staunch supporter of the Amphictyons) and the Corinthians (neutral at best) may be involved.