

Elena Franchi*

The Ambivalent Legacy of the Crisaeans: Athens' Interstate Relations (and the Phocian Factor) in 4th-Century Public Discourse

<https://doi.org/10.1515/klio-2019-1004>

Summary: The First Sacred War was hotly debated in the 4th century. The crimes committed by the Crisaeans in this war were later equated to those committed by the Phocians during the Third Sacred War, or those committed by the Locrians of Amphissa during the Fourth Sacred War. This paper shows how the parallels drawn between the First and Third Sacred Wars (SW1–SW3) and between the First and Fourth Sacred Wars (SW1–SW4) were respectively shaped and used as an argument in two different milieus: in pro-Macedonian intellectual circles in Athens, and in the Athenian forensic and deliberative arena. The main aim of this paper is to understand why ‘SW1–SW3’ is not used as an argument in the latter. In fact, Athens' most prominent politicians had to cope with the Athenian support for the Phocians in the so-called Third Sacred War. Thus, the Phocians were depicted as guilty, but not to the point that they were compared to the Crisaeans. The legacy of the latter was ambivalent and lent itself to this shift in meaning.

Keywords: Sacred Wars, Phocians, Demosthenes, Aeschines, Speusippus

*Kontakt: Elena Franchi, E-Mail: elena.franchi@unitn.it

1. Introduction: A Brief Survey of the Evidence on the So-Called First Sacred War

As has long been recognized, the modern image of the so-called First Sacred War¹ is based on several ancient sources;² these sources divide into four groups.³ The older (“archaic”) sources form a first group and mention several attacks on Delphi, undertaken by various people or heroes in archaic times (among others, the Phlegyans, Dryopes and Kragalidai)⁴. These stories have the flavour of legend, but cannot therefore be rejected a priori. They form the so-called prehistory of the First Sacred War.⁵ In recent studies, the sources belonging to this first group were connected with some archaeological remains suggesting a major horizon of violence and destruction in the years around and after the 580s.⁶

1 On the sacred wars, see e.g. Pack 1876; Cloché 1915; Jannoray 1937; Kahrstedt 1953; Sordi 1953; Defradas 1954, 55–85; Forrest 1956; Parke – Boardmann 1957; Sordi 1958a; Hackett 1970; Robertson 1978; Cassola 1980; Lehmann 1980; Prandi 1981; Wankel 1981; Kase – Szemler 1984; Miller 1986, 99 f. and 122 f.; Tausend 1986; Buckler 1989a, 1989b; Londey 1990; Brodersen 1991; Spikes 1992; Davies 1994, 1996; Parker 1997; Lefèvre 1998, 169–171; Skoczylas Pownall 1998; Sánchez 2001, 58–80; Mari 2002, 73–203; Hammond 2003; Howe 2003; Zachos 2003; Typaldou-Fakiris 2004; Mari 2006; Davies 2007b; Maronati 2007; Hornblower 2009; 2011; Franchi 2013a; 2013b; Steinbock 2013, 332; Franchi 2015; Londey 2015; Franchi 2016a, ch. 4 and 5, 2019.

2 The most important sources on the so-called First Sacred War are: [Hom.] h. Ap. 540–543; Isokr. or. Plat. 31; CID I 10, ll. 15–17; Arist. fr. 637 Rose; Speus. Epist. ad Phil. 8 Natoli (=Antipatr. FGrHist 69 F 2); Kallisth. FGrHist 124 F 1; Aischin. 3.107–12; Demosth. or. 18.149; Marm. Par. FGrHist 239 A 37–39; [Thessalos] Presbeutikos 2–4; 7; 10–13; 18; Strab. 9.3.10; Frontin. strat. 3.75; Polyain. 3.5; 6.13; Plut. Sol. 11.1–2; Paus. 10.7.4–6; 10.37.5–8; Hyp. Pind. P. a, b, c, d. In the following “First Sacred War”, “Second Sacred War”, “Third Sacred War” and “Fourth Sacred War” are used according to the modern meaning, since the numbering of the sacred wars in Ancient Greece is a modern construct: scholars collected the different sources about various struggles fought around Delphi and involving, to a greater or lesser extent, the Amphictyony, thereby recognizing four different “wars”.

3 For a more detailed description of these groups, see Franchi 2019.

4 Pherekyd. FGrHist 3 F 41 E ap. schol. T Hom. Il. N 302 = 41 c Fowler; Ephor. FGrHist 70 F 93 ap. schol. T Hom. Il. 13.302; Apollod. 3.41; 118 (see also: [Hom.] h. Ap. 278; Paus. 2.26.3; 9.36.2–3; schol. in Apoll. Rhod. 3.62.3 Wendel; Philostr. imag. 2.19.1.5; Hesych. s.v. Φλεγύαι; Eust. Hom. ad Il. 3.473.25; 474.18). To this group also belong the stories on the struggle for the tripod, the combat of Heracles and Cynus, the fight between the twins Crisus and Panopeus and the hybris-guilty offenders of Delphi (the ones cited in the pseudo-homeric “hymn to Apollo”). Sources and overall interpretation in Franchi 2013 and 2019 (with previous bibliography).

5 On the concept of “prehistory of the First Sacred War”, see Prandi 1981.

6 De la Coste-Messelière 1969; Bommelaer – Laroche 1991, 92–102; Luce 1992, 2008, ch. 4 and 7; Mari 2002, 163–169; Davies 2007b, 53. The excavations revealed a series of houses (“jaune”, “noir” and “rouge”) to the east of the later temple of Apollo and dating back to Delphi’s earliest

The second group touches on the question of the holy land that cannot be cultivated, and actually only contains two sources: Isocrates (Plat. 31) who mentions that the plain of Crisa had been abandoned to pasturage, perhaps as a consequence of a war,⁷ and an inscription (CID I 10, 15–17), testifying to the fact that the cultivation of a plain consecrated by the Amphictyonians was prohibited, which most probably referred to land considered holy, as Crisa had been, since the time of Homer (Il. 2.519). These sources are very important for two reasons: from a strictly historical point of view, because they most probably reflect and hand down an early classical tradition (5th century?); from a heuristic point of view, because they allow us to exclude the idea that a war around Crisa dating back to previous (Archaic?) times was a fiction largely constructed during the Third Sacred War.⁸ Isocrates's *Plataicus* was actually written between 373 and 371 BC.⁹

A third group consists of sources written during – or very probably in the decades immediately after – the Third Sacred War, i.e. also at the time of the Fourth Sacred War. Here again, we can distinguish three subgroups: a) a text written at Plato's Academy, the Letter of Speusippus;¹⁰ b) texts written by the intellectuals of Philip's circle (Aristotle and his scholars, most probably in the 340s or 330s);¹¹ c) the speeches of Aeschines and Demosthenes.¹² In these sources the idea of a single war with a beginning and an end, with allies and enemies, is quite clear.

The fourth group is made up of more or less later sources.¹³ These provide the most detailed image of the First Sacred War, but are not relevant to the present analysis.¹⁴

Here, the focus is on an important distinction that emerges within this third group. For the intellectuals that collaborated (or aspired to collaborate) with Philip, the First Sacred War functioned primarily as a precedent for the Third,

past. The dating of the destruction of the Maison Rouge (c. 585–575 BC), and of the building of the first *peribolos* over it, no later than the end of the 570s reveal that by 575 something violent had happened in Delphi, leading to a renovation of the settlement of the sanctuary – a war?

7 See below, p. 513.

8 See below, p. 514.

9 Roos 1949, 273; Momigliano 1966, 421–455; Mathieu – Brémond 1967, 61; Mandilaras 2003, 3.

10 Speus. Epist. ad Phil. 8 Natoli (= Antipatr. FGrHist 69 F 2).

11 Kallisth. FGrHist 124 F 1 (cfr. also Arist. fr. 637 Rose with comment by Robertson 1978, 56). See below, n. 51.

12 Esp. Aischin. 3.107–112; Demosth. or. 18.149.

13 [Thessalos] Presbeutikos 2–4; 7; 10–13; 18; Strab. 9.3.10; Frontin. strat. 3.75; Polyain. 3.5; 6.13; Plut. Sol. 11.1–2; Paus. 10.74–6; 10.375–8; Hyp. Pind. P. a, b, c, d.

14 They are dealt with in Franchi 2016, 212–230 (with sources and previous bibliography).

while in the Athenian orations of Aeschines and Demosthenes, the First Sacred War was only considered as a precedent for the Fourth. The main aim of this paper is to understand why.

2. The Legacy of the Impious Crisaeans in Philip's (Aspiring) Partisans' Works

It is usually assumed that the retrospective shaping of earlier Phocian history was strongly fostered by the Third Sacred War.¹⁵ Newly invented details would have enriched older traditions while simultaneously manipulating them. This is not surprising: the Third Sacred War determined the glorious heyday in Greece of the Phocians, the zenith of their power in Delphi and, indeed, of their influence in most Greek affairs. As is well known, this war was caused by the Thessalians and the Thebans,¹⁶ and began when the Amphictyonians imposed a large fine on the Phocians, which the latter refused to pay.¹⁷ The Amphictyonians had to punish the Phocians for the offense of cultivating sacred land. The Phocians opposed the sanctions and eventually occupied Delphi,¹⁸ robbing the sanctuary of a significant part of its treasure, which, later on, they actually melted down for coinage.¹⁹ The resulting money was used to recruit mercenaries, who were employed against the adversaries of the Phocians. The Phocians fought surprisingly well, and their resistance was only broken when the Macedonian King Philip II sent his army against them. Philip used the Third Sacred War to polish his image in the Greek world.²⁰ The Thessalian allies and the troops of the Amphictyonic Council fought with him,²¹ while Sparta and Athens sided with the Phocians. In 352 BC,

15 Sánchez 2001, 18–20, 27, 75, 262–267.

16 Hammond 1937, 45–78, esp. 45, 55, 60; Sordi 1958b, 136–139; Hackett 1970, 12–15, 32–34, 227; Buckler 1989a, 148–176; Jehne 1994, 117f.; McInerney 1999, 209; Hornblower 2009, 47. On the enmity between Thebans and Phokians since the last invasion of Epaminondas in the Peloponnese: Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.4; cfr. Hornblower 2009, 48.

17 Cfr. Xen. *hell.* 5.2.27–31; Androtion *FGrHist* 324 F 50; Diod. 15.20.2; 16.23.2–3; 28.4; 29.2; *Iust.* 8.1.5; *Plut.* *Ages.* 23.6; *Nep. Pel.* 1–4. See Flathe 1854, 5; Schaefer 1858 I 2, 488–491; Fiehn 1938, 2524–2525; Sordi 1957, 51; Hamilton 1982, esp. 19; Buckler 1989a, 15–17, 242f.; Hammond 1991, 46, 194; Buckler – Beck 2008, 221, 223.

18 Cfr. Momigliano 1934, 46; Sordi 1958a; Buckler 1989a, 28; Jehne 1994, 117.

19 Diod. 16.28.2; 30.1; 56.5; cf. Parke 1933, 134f.; Buckler 1989a, 38; Davies 2007a.

20 Hammond 1937, 58.

21 Gehrke 1986, 195; Buckler 1989a, 63f.; Buckler – Beck 2008, 262.

Philip II defeated the Phocians in a decisive battle on the Crocus Field.²² As a punishment for their desecration of the sanctuary, Philip ordered the execution of 3,000 Phocians.

The Amphictyonians expelled the Phocians from the Council, tore down the walls of all their cities and broke them up into villages of not more than fifty houses.²³ The Phocians were also ordered to pay taxes to Delphi until they had replaced the 10,000 talents stolen from the sanctuary. Philip received their votes in the Amphictyony.²⁴ The peace of Philocrates (346 BC) sealed the peace terms. Athens had to recognize Philip's territorial expansion and the city's former colony, Amphipolis, thus also lost its claim to autonomy. Philip, moreover, obliged the Athenians to enter into a defensive alliance.²⁵

It is not surprising that the traditions about the First Sacred War were extensively altered (or even invented, according to some scholars)²⁶ during the Third Sacred War and in its aftermath. Considerable research has already been devoted to this matter. In the second half of the 4th century, a number of intellectuals were attempting to promote themselves in Philip's eyes. One of them was Speusippus, Plato's nephew and successor as director of the Academy in 347 (whose head he remained for eight years).²⁷ Speusippus' letter, written between 343 and 341,²⁸ was designed to cause Philip to look unfavourably upon Isocrates by discrediting his "Philip" (of 346), while simultaneously, through justifying Philip's conquests, to win the King's approval of Speusippus' own writings. To this end, both earlier and more recent history was depicted using a mixture of legends and historical sources. The historical and mythological research of the otherwise unknown Antipater of Magnesia was useful for these purposes; he belonged to the Academy

22 Diod. 16.35.3–6; Iust. 8.2. See Griffith in Hammond – Griffith 1979, 266 f. On the battle see Buckler 1989a, 70, 76; 2003, 218 f.; Mari 2002, 112; Buckler – Beck 2008, 230; Worthington 2013, 118.

23 Diod. 16.60.1–3; Paus. 10.3.1.

24 Demosth. or. 19.81; Diod. 16.60; Paus. 10.3; Buckler 1989a, 138–142.

25 See Franchi 2016, 126–142 with references.

26 Robertson 1978. Sánchez (2001, 18–20, 27, 75, 262–267), Christesen (2007, 190) and Londey (2015) are more cautious; Londey interestingly points to a 5th-century horizon too.

27 Trampedach 1994, 104, 138–140; Theys 1998 (FGrHist 1009 T 1 = Diog. Laert. 4.1 [= F 2 Isnardi Parente = T1 Tarán]). See also Merlan 1959; Chroust 1971.

28 Elias Bickermann and Johannes Sykutris (1928) identified the letter as a public document and they concluded from its style and vocabulary that it was genuine. See Bickermann – Sykutris 1928, 29–34; Markle 1976, 92; Isnardi Parente 1980, 395; Mari 2002, 117; Natoli 2004, 31; Mari 2013, 138; Sprawski 2016. Cfr. also Bertelli 1976; 1977; and Tarán 1981, 8 n. 30 (both question the authenticity of this text).

circle, wrote his history in the forties²⁹ and was probably one of Speusippus' own students.³⁰

In this letter, Speusippus also deals with the story of the Amphictyony of Delphi and the First Sacred War, in order to demonstrate precedents for Philip's acts from his point of view. It was necessary to create a counter-narrative to the image of the desperate Phocians being abused by the barbarian Macedonians – a picture that Demosthenes had strengthened and exploited in his speech *De falsa legatione*, in 343.³¹ According to Speusippus (and to Antipater), the Crisaeans, like the Phlegyans and the Dryopes, were probably Amphictyonians who had committed crimes against Delphi. The Phlegyans were defeated by Apollo, the Dryopes by Heracles, the Crisaeans by their fellow Amphictyonians. All of them were therefore expelled from the Amphictyony, and their votes were eventually given to others. The whole story is suspicious. Neither Phlegyans nor Dryopes nor Crisaeans are mentioned as members of the Amphictyony in the extant membership lists.³²

Nevertheless, we should not assume that Antipater invented this *ex novo*,³³ but rather imagine that he recounted (at least the) kernel of a tradition which had been largely forgotten, and was afterwards exploited by Speusippus.³⁴ And to what end? There are clear parallels between all of this and the end of the Third Sacred War, the fate of the Phocians and the fact that their votes were given to Philip.³⁵ Speusippus states that very clearly: “(8) [...] he [Antipater] asserts that you [Philip] have imitated the example of some of these and taken the Phocians' two votes from the Amphictyonians as the Pythian prize of your Delphic campaign.” Philip was thus put on a par with Heracles and Apollo, who had punished

29 Jacoby FGrHist 69 Einleitung.

30 Kaers 1894; Köhler 1928, 116; Markle 1976, 94; Landucci 2002; Natoli 2004, 99 f., 110; Bearzot 2011. See also Meißner 1989, 47 and 143.

31 See below, p. 523.

32 Aischin. 2.116; Theop. FGrHist 115 F 63; Diod. 16.29.1–2; Paus. 9.8.2.

33 As does Nilsson 1951, 105: “These tales are certainly invented by Antipatros, for they are not mentioned elsewhere. This letter is unusually full of references to myths, some of them are bold inventions, one invented for the purpose of giving reasons for an enterprise which failed. This is an extreme and most flagrant instance of the use and abuse of mythology for political propaganda. The author knew it, for finishing his account of the myths he says that they may be useful for Philip's power.”

34 I wonder if Antipater, or his source, combined information about the destruction of the Maison Rouge with traditional accounts of the crimes committed by the Dryopians and Phlegyans, the destruction of the plain of Crisa, the struggle between Crisus and Panopeus and that for the tripod, and thus gave birth to a tradition about the First Sacred War.

35 Diod. 16.60.1–3; see Markle 1967, 253–273, 1977, and Jehne 1994, 125.

the Phlegyans, Dryopes and Crisaeans.³⁶ Through these devices, the First Sacred War was turned into a more plausible precedent for the Third.

In the texts written by intellectuals in Philip's circle who actually worked closely with the Macedonian kings (not only aspired to do so), the question seems a bit more complicated. In contrast to Noel Robertson, who maintained that Callisthenes, like Speusippus, "held up the Archaic conflict as a worthy precedent for the Third Sacred War and Philip's intervention"³⁷, I argue that in the historian's work the legacy of the Crisaeans is not uniquely related to the impious Phocians. Two different but connected pieces of evidence are significant in this regard.

In the late 340s or in the 330s, either in a period when he was already at Philip's court, or immediately before,³⁸ Callisthenes of Olynthus compiled the *Pythionikai* with Aristotle,³⁹ a table (πίναξ) of Pythian victors and of the organizers of

36 See Fuscagni 1974, 71–82; Bertelli 1976, 294–300; Mari 2002, 115–118; Sprawski 2016. Speusippus, by the way, does not mention the so-called First Sacred War. However, it is highly probable that he – or, if we are right, Antipater – depicts one of the starting points from which the traditions of the First Sacred War went on to be shaped by a fusion of old and more recent traditions.

37 Robertson 1978, 15.

38 Jacoby ad FGrHist 124 T 23; Düring 1957, 340 (between 340 and 334); Robertson 1978, 59 (late 340s); Prandi 1985, 14–16, 66–68 (between 339 and 335); Spoerri 1988; Mari 2002, 169, 2013, 131; Natoli 2004, 28–31; Christesen 2007, 180, 188 and n. 64 (in the mid-330s); see also below, n. 39. Aristoteles is usually believed to have spent the years 340–335 in Stagira: Barnes 1995, 1–6; Düring 1957, 249–262.

39 An inscription (SIG³ 275 = RO 80) refers to a decree praising both Aristotle and Callisthenes for compiling a pinax listing the Pythian victors and the original founders of the game (ed. Jacoby):

συ|νέ|ταξαν πίνακα τῶν ἀπ[ὸ] Γυλίδα νεν|ικηκ[ό]των τ[ὰ] Πύθια| και τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὸν ἀγῶνα κατασκ[ευα]σάντων, ἐπαινέ[σαι] Ἀριστοτέλην κ[αὶ] Κ[α]λλισθένην και στεφανα-νώσαι ἀνα[θεῖν]αι δὲ τὸν πίν[ακα] τοῦς ταμί[ας] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ με[τα]- γεγραμμένον [εἰς] στήλην.

"And they composed a table of those who won the Pythian Games since Gyildas and of the organizers from the very beginning. To praise Aristotle and Kallisthenes and to crown them. The treasurers shall place the tablet, being copied to the stele, in the sanctuary" (transl. by Rzepka).

Scholars are divided regarding the chronology of this table: Homolle and Pomtow (1898b, 631 [cf. also 1898a]; Pomtow ad loc.) maintain that the inscription dates back to 334/332; Jaeger (1923, 347) and Jacoby (FGrHist 124 T 23 Kommentar) are instead more cautious. In any case, t.p.q is 337, when the treasurer of the Amphictyony, cited in the present decree (assuming it is by the Amphictyony: see Rzepka 2016 ad loc.) was introduced; t.a.q. 327, when Callisthenes died (cf. Bousquet 1989, 146–149; see also Lewis 1958, 108; Chaniotis 1988 [L 8]; Tod GHI 187 ad loc.; Prandi 1985, 15). In his list of works by Aristotle, Diogenes cites some pieces of information which rightly were connected with this inscription (5.26), mentioning three different titles, Πυθιονικαι μουσικῆς, Πυθικός and Πυθιονικῶν ἔλεγχος. Plutarch (Sol. 11.1) refers instead to Aristotle's

the contest which included discursive entries, some of which dealt with the First Sacred War.⁴⁰ Callisthenes was a relative (probably a nephew) and a student of Aristotle and together with Aristotle he played a significant role at the Macedonian court.⁴¹ He knew the work *Amphiktyonikos* by Isocrates of Apollonia Pontica, a student of Isocrates. Only a few fragments of this catalogue of the winners in the Pythian Games survive,⁴² but Plutarch (Sol. 11.1–2)⁴³, who uses it as a source,⁴⁴ says very clearly that he learnt from a note in the *Pythionikai* that Solon took part

Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφῆ; and a further inscription (SIG³ 252, dated to the archonship of Kaphis: 327/326 BC) records a payment to a certain Deinomachus for inscribing an ἀναγραφῆ Πυθιονικῶν. All these titles most probably refer to one and the same work and this work was written both by Callisthenes and Aristotle: see Jacoby FGrHist 124 T 23 Kommentar; Bosworth 1970, 408 f. Cfr. also Christesen 2007, 181–185.

40 See Robertson 1978, 55–60; Mari 2002, 165 f., 169 and 2013, 131. It is usually maintained that the *Pythionikai* were the source for hypotheses to Pindar’s “Pythians” (notoriously, in dealing with the First Sacred War) because the dates are given according to both Athenian and Delphian archonships: Wilamowitz 1893, I 13–24; Jacoby FGrHist 239 FF 37–38; Robertson 1978, 55 f.; Christesen 2007, 192–194 (and below, n. 46). More generally, on the *Pythionikai*: Jacoby 1923–1958, 3B 1, 213–216; Müller 1978; Chaniotis 1988, 195 f., 293–296; Higbie 1999, 65–70; Sánchez 2001, 18–20, 27, 75, 262–267.

41 Arr. an. 4.10; Iust. 12.6.17; Plut. Alex. 52; 55.8; Diog. Laert. 5.4–5; Sud. s.v. Kallisthenes. See Bosworth 1970; Prandi 1985, 14–22.

42 FHG (2: 184) F 265–266 (F 615–617 Rose).

43 [1] ἤδη μὲν οὖν καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων ἔνδοξος ἦν ὁ Σόλων καὶ μέγας. ἐθαυμάσθη δὲ καὶ διεβοήθη μᾶλλον ἐντοῖς Ἑλλήσιν εἰπῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς, ὡς χρὴ βοηθῆναι καὶ μὴ περιορᾶν Κιρραίους ὑβρίζοντας εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον, ἀλλὰ προσαμύνειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ Δελφοῖς. πεισθέντες γὰρ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ὤρμησαν οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες, ὡς ἄλλοι τε μαρτυροῦσι καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ τῶν Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφῇ Σόλωνι τὴν γνώμην ἀνατιθεῖς. [2] οὐ μόντοι ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἀπεδείχθη τὸν πόλεμον, ὡς λέγειν φησὶν Ἑρμιππος Εὐάνθη τὸν Σάμιον: οὔτε γὰρ Αἰσχίνης ὁ ῥήτωρ τοῦτ’ εἶρηκεν, ἔν τε τοῖς Δελφῶν ὑπομνήμασιν Ἀλκμαίων, οὐ Σόλων, Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς ἀναγέγραπται. – [1] “These events, then, presently made Solon famous and powerful. But he was even more admired and celebrated among the Greeks for what he said on behalf of the temple at Delphi, namely, that the Greeks must come to its relief, and not suffer the people of Cirrha to outrage the oracle, but aid the Delphians in maintaining the honor of the god. For it was by his persuasion that the Amphictyons undertook the war, as Aristotle, among others, testifies, in his list of the victors at the Pythian games, where he ascribes the measure to Solon. [2] He was not, however, appointed general for this war, as Evanthes the Samian says (according to Hermippus), for Aeschines the orator makes no such statement, and in the records of Delphi it is stated that Alcmaeon, and not Solon, commanded the Athenians” (transl. by Perrin 1914). Euanthes of Samos, cited by the Peripatetic Philosopher Hermippus (3rd c. BC) who wrote a biography of Aristotle (cfr. Bollansée 1999), is an otherwise unknown historian cited only in this source (Jacoby – Bollansée – Schepens 1999, 200, 291); Müller (1848, FHG III p. 2), followed by Jacoby (1907, 846) and Wehrli (1974, 48), identifies him with Euanthes of Miletus cited by Diog. Laert. 1.29.

44 Christesen 2007, 187 f.

in a war against the inhabitants of Cirrha (Crisa, or somewhere nearby)⁴⁵. This indicates that a note on the First Sacred War was preserved in the *Pythionikai*⁴⁶ and that this note highlighted the role of a prominent Athenian, Solon,⁴⁷ who had advised the Amphictyonians to attack the Cirrhaeans.⁴⁸ Thus, in the *Pythionikai*, the defenders of Delphi are the Amphictyonians.

Around the same period in which he compiled the *Pythionikai*,⁴⁹ Callisthenes also wrote a work on the Third Sacred War which mentioned the war for Cirrha as well. In this narrative, the root cause of the war was purported to be a woman: the Cirrhaeans had raped Megisto, the daughter of Pelagon the Phocian, and the daughters of the Argives, as they were returning from the Pythian temple.

45 Κρίσα (e.g. Il. 2.250, more archaic?), Κίρρα (more classical?) and Κίρσα (e.g. Alk. fr. 7 L–P) seem to be interchangeable in most of the sources, see e.g. Kallisth. FGrHist 124 F 1 in Ath. 13.10 560 BC: καὶ ὁ Κρῖσαικός δὲ πόλεμος [...] Κίρραῖοι [...] Κίρρα (see below, nn. 51 and 60); Bakchyl. Ep. 4.14 [where it is, admittedly, an integration]; IG I³ 155; VII 3213; but not in all of them, see e.g. Strab. 9.416 and 14.418 (who distinguishes Κρίσα and Κίρρα) and Paus. 10.375. Cirrha's location is known – it serves as the port of Delphi – whereas the location of Crisa is difficult to identify, and scholars have suggested alternative explanations: see Pieske 1922; Jannoray 1937; Pritchett 1942; Roger – van Effenterre 1944, 19 f.; Meritt 1952; Dor – Jannoray – van Effenterre 1960, 15; Walbank 1978; Förstel 1979, 208; Hope Simpson 1981, 77 (who identifies Crisa with modern Ag. Georgios); Schachter 1981, 11; Themelis 1983; Skorda 1992 (who identifies Crisa with modern A. Varvara); Anderson 1995, 184; Parker 1997, 18 f.; McInerney 1999 (Chryso); Freitag 2000, 114–116; Rousset 2002, 31–33; Oulhen 2004, 405; Torelli in Bultrighini – Torelli 2017 ad 10.375 (pp. 509 f.), who argues that Crisa was located between Cirrha and Anticyra. In any case, even if one agrees with Pausanias (10.375) who states that Crisa is old and Cirrha more recent, it is necessary to take into account that Cirrha was already used by Pindar as a metonym for Delphi (P. 3.74; 7.16; 8.19; 10.15; 11.12 with comment of Briand 2018, 38–50) and that it was in Cirrha that the Pythian games most probably took place before the 3rd century (as both the archaeological evidence and Pindar [P. 11.12] seem to confirm: see Luce 2018, 21). Crisa most probably lost relevance in the 4th century and this explains why Callisthenes mentions the Κρῖσαικός πόλεμος but writes that it is fought by the Κίρραῖοι (see below, n. 51 and n. 60); and why Aeschines only mentions Cirrha (see below, pp. 520 f.).

46 A note which was also the source of the Pindaric scholia (hypotheses a, b, c and d to the Pythian odes) and of Pausanias 10.71–8.1. Cfr. Higbie 1999, 69 f. (with reference to Pausanias); Christesen 2007, 192–198.

47 According to the records of Delphi cited by Plut. Sol. 11.2 (see above, n. 43) another Athenian played a major role, Alcmaeon, who led the Athenian contingent against the impious Cirrhaeans.

48 It cannot, however, be inferred from this that Aristotle and Callisthenes invented the First Sacred War. One wonders, instead, if the authors' interest in Delphi's history and archives led them to find a note about the First Sacred War and the impious Cirrhaeans, which then turned out to be extremely useful to the politics of King Philip II, with whom they were working or preparing to work. See Mari 2002, 165 f. and 2013, 131 f.; more skeptical Robertson 1978, 54–60.

49 Jacoby ad F 1.

The war for Cirrha (which is mentioned as Κρισαικός πόλεμος by Callisthenes)⁵⁰ lasted ten years, and as adversaries of the impious Cirrhaeans, the Phocians- and not more generally the Amphictyonians- were mentioned (Κιρραῖοι πρὸς Φωκεῖς ἐπολέμησαν).⁵¹ These details deserve our attention: on the one hand, the topos of rape as a cause of war, which is widespread and whose most famous case is the rape of Helen causing the Trojan Wars,⁵² seems to establish a link between the First and the Third Sacred Wars: indeed, before citing Callisthenes' remark on the First Sacred War, Athenaeus cites Duris on the Third Sacred War (FGrHist 76 F 2), and according to Duris the cause of the Third Sacred War is the rape of a Theban girl, Theano, by a Phocian.⁵³ So, we may assume that in the second half of the 4th century, the First and Third Sacred wars were put on a par because of various similarities. Furthermore, the very fact that Callisthenes cites the First Sacred War in a monograph on the Third hints at the possibility that in the imaginary these two wars were connected.

On the other hand, however, we should not neglect to note that in Callisthenes the Phocians are deemed the defenders of Delphi and the adversaries of the Cirrhaeans, who are considered guilty.

This positive role accorded to the Phocians becomes even more interesting if one thinks that it resonates with a well-known passage by Thucydides which refers to a "sacred war" (ἐρὸν πόλεμον) which modern scholars call the "Second"

50 Κρισαικός πόλεμος: see above, n. 45, and below, n. 51 and n. 60.

51 Kallisth. FGrHist 124 F 1 in Ath. 13.10 560 BC: καὶ ὁ Κρισαικός 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 ἔάλω καὶ ἡ Κίρρα. – "The war, also, which is called the Crisaeian War [as Callisthenes tells us in his account of the Sacred War], when the Cirrhaeans made war upon the Phocians, lasted ten years; and it was excited on this account, because the Cirrhaeans carried off Megisto, the daughter of Pelagon the Phocian, and the daughters of the Argives, as they were returning from the Pythian temple: and in the tenth year Cirrha was taken" (transl. by Bohn 1854, adapted by me). Κρισαικός πόλεμος was the name by which this war was known in antiquity (Rzepka 2016, ad loc.). On the importance of the Troika in constructing this ten year dating of the sacred wars and the key role played by Callisthenes in placing the alleged end of the Third Sacred War in 346, i.e. exactly 1000 years after the alleged end of the Trojan war, see Mari 2002, 140. Cfr. also Cic. fam. 5.12.2. See, more generally, Jacoby 1909, 1674–1726; Pearson 1960, 28 f.; Guillon 1963, 56 f.; Asheri 1983, 68; Prandi 1985, 66–68. Other scholars also devoted monographs to the Third Sacred War (Demoph. FGrHist 70 fr. 93–96, Kephisodoros FGrHist 112 and Leon of Byzantium FGrHist 132), but the surviving fragments don't allow us to infer whether or not they dealt with the First Sacred War.

52 Cfr. Hdt. 1.1–5 with Asheri ad loc. See Hornblower 2008, 46.

53 On the historicity of these tales, which are not to dismiss, see Hornblower 2009, 47.

War. This war took place between 449 and 448 BC (but had deeper roots⁵⁴) and erupted when Sparta liberated Delphi from the Phocians and handed it back to the Delphians, and the Athenians recaptured Delphi in order to return it the Phocians, their allies,⁵⁵ to whom, in Thucydides' words, (the control of) Delphi has been handed over.⁵⁶

In the light of Thucydides' picture of the Phocians, we may infer that Callisthenes' representation of the Phocians as defenders of Delphi inserts itself in a strong tradition (Thucydides); what's more, it must have prevented the establishment of a complete equivalence between the First and the Third Sacred Wars (in the latter, it was the Phocians as a whole that were accused of being guilty for having offended Delphi). This leads us to suggest that Callisthenes is responding not so much to the events of the Third Sacred War and its aftermath, but to other events. Which ones?

Just a few years after the "Third" Sacred War, another Sacred War broke out: the Fourth, partly also caused by the Athenian orator Aeschines. In March 339 BC, in the Amphictyonic council, he accused the Ozolian Locrians of Amphissa of having illegally used the plain of Cirrha, which belonged to Apollo, to their own advantage.⁵⁷ In October 339 BC, the Amphictyonians called upon King Philip II of Macedonia to lead the war, which was about to begin in this traditionally strategic area, and which would give him an opportunity to defeat the Locrians.⁵⁸ This incident led to the Battle of Chaeronea, which had a considerable impact on the

54 Hornblower 2009, 48.

55 Thuk. 1.112.5 (with IG I³ 9 [= IG I² 26 = StV II 142]; IG I² 27); cfr. Theop. FGrHist 115 F 156; Philoch. FGrHist 328 F 34a; b; Eratosth. FGrHist 241 F 38; Plut. Per. 21.1–3; schol. Eur. Tro. 9; Hsch. s.v. ἱερὸν πόλεμον; Sud. s.v. ἱερὸς πόλεμος. See Sordi 1958c; Meiggs 1972, 419; Roux 1979, 44 f., 239–241; Hornblower 1991, ad 1.107.2 (pp. 168–169); Lefèvre 1998, 170; Freitag 2000, 121; Mari 2006, 233–237; Costa 2007, 247–254; Gallo 2011, 188; Hornblower 2009, 48, 2011, 54–58; Steinbock 2013, 332; Londay 2015; McInerney 2015, 211; Franchi 2016, 277.

56 Thuk. 1.112.5: Λακεδαμόνιοι δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν ἱερὸν καλούμενον πόλεμον ἐστράτευσαν, καὶ κρατήσαντες τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ παρέδοσαν Δελφοῖς; καὶ αὐτίς ὕστερον Ἀθηναῖοι ἀποχωρησάντων αὐτῶν στρατεύσαντες καὶ κρατήσαντες παρέδοσαν Φωκεῦσιν. – “After this, the Lacedaemonians took in hand the war called the holy war and, having won the temple at Delphi, delivered the possession thereof to the Delphians. But the Athenians afterward, when the Lacedaemonians were gone, came with their army and, regaining it, delivered the possession to the Phocians” (transl. by Hobbes 1853). See Lefèvre 1998, 31.

57 It is important to stress that they were from Amphissa given Amphissa's ‘Sonderstellung’ among the Ozolian Locrians: Bauer 1907, 41; Lerat 1952 II 57.

58 Aischin. 3.115–40; Demosth. or. 18.143–52, 178, 216; Philoch. FGrHist 328 F 34a, b; Dein. 1.74; Diod. 16.84.1–2; Polyain. 4.2.8. Cfr. Bommelaer – Bommelaer 1983; Croissant 1996, 133 f.; Lefèvre 1998, 167 and n. 67; Mari 2002, 142–152.

entire Greek world.⁵⁹ However, this is another story. What is of interest for us is that it was exactly in the aftermath of the Third Sacred War that the Fourth war broke out and this might have led Callisthenes and his circle to at least rethink this notice about the First Sacred War which survived – fragment 1 – with an eye to the impious Locrians of Amphissa,⁶⁰ who were punished by Philip with the support of his allies, among them the Phocians. That would explain why in this reference to the First Sacred War the Phocians appear as defenders of Delphi.

Thus, we may conclude that for the intellectuals collaborating, or aspiring to collaborate, with Philip, the First Sacred War was more often considered as a precedent for the Third Sacred War, and only sometimes also considered a precedent for the Fourth. This made the legacy of the impious Crisaeans ambivalent. What was happening in the meantime in the Attic speeches?

3. Guilty Phocians and Locrians in the Attic Speeches

In the Attic speeches, the ἀσέβεια (“impiety”) of the Cirrhaeans makes its first appearance rather late: in fact, Aeschines and Demosthenes mention it first in their speeches of 339 and 330 with reference to the Fourth Sacred War (and not earlier) and the impious Locrians of Amphissa.⁶¹

Aeschines mentions the impious Cirrhaeans in his speech “Against Ctesiphon” (330), in which he accuses Ctesiphon – who had suggested the honour of a golden crown for Demosthenes – of irregularity. In Aeschines’ opinion, the (First Sacred) war occurred because the Cirrhaeans and the Kragalidai had committed offences against the sanctuary in Delphi and its votive offerings, and this angered the Amphictyonians, who asked for an oracle concerning the appropriate pro-

⁵⁹ Sotriadis 1903; Kromayer 1905, 16–23; Beloch 1912–1927² III 1, 560; 2, 295; Costanzi 1923; Hammond 1938; Wüst 1938, 553–555; Braun 1948; Pritchett 1958; Sordi 1958b, 293 and 369–377; Hammond 1973, 534–557; Ellis 1976, 186 f.; Sealey 1978, 311; Hammond – Griffith 1979, 517–519; Rahe 1981; Wankel 1981; Bousquet 1988; Londey 1990, 241; Harris 1995, 26; Lefèvre 1998, 22, 66, 267 f., 293; Marchetti 1998; Mari 2002, 152–157; Buckler 2003, ch. 13; Buckler – Beck 2008, ch. 17.

⁶⁰ This was already noted by Prandi 1985, 68.

⁶¹ Aeschines addresses the impious Cirrhaeans in 3.107 (that is in 330), but in the same year in his speech “On the Crown” Demosthenes (18.149) accuses Aeschines of having invented and used the impious Cirrhaeans already in 339, when he accused in an Amphictyonic council the Ozolian Locrians of Amphissa that they illegally used the plain of Cirrha.

cedure (Aeschin. 3.107–112, esp. 107–109).⁶² The Athenians were the first to react to these offences, and Solon suggested that the Amphictyionians declare war. Aeschines also reports the capture of the city and the enslavement of its inhabitants. The country was consecrated to Apollo, Artemis, Leto and Athena Pronaia.

62 Ἔστι γάρ, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τὸ Κιρραῖον [ἄνομασμένον] πεδίον καὶ λιμὴν ὁ νῦν ἐξάγιστος καὶ ἐπάρατος ἄνομασμένος. ταύτην ποτὲ τὴν χώραν κατώκησαν Κιρραῖοι καὶ Κραγαλῖδαι, γένη παρανομώτατα, οἱ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς καὶ περὶ τὰ ἀναθήματα ἠσέβουν, ἐξημάρτανον δὲ καὶ εἰς τοὺς Ἀμφικτύοντας. ἀγανακτήσαντες δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς γιγνομένοις μάλιστα μέν, ὡς λέγονται, οἱ πρόγονοι οἱ ὑμέτεροι, ἔπειτα καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἀμφικτύονες, μαντεῖαν ἐμαντεύσαντο παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, τίμη χρῆ τιμωρίᾳ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τούτους μετελθεῖν. [108] καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀναίρει ἡ Πυθία πολεμῆν Κιρραίοις καὶ Κραγαλῖδαις πάντ' ἤματα καὶ πάσας νύκτας, καὶ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐκπορθήσαντας καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀνδραποδισμένους ἀναθεῖναι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Πυθίῳ καὶ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ Λητοῖ καὶ Ἀθηνᾷ Προνοίᾳ ἐπὶ πάσῃ ἀεργίᾳ καὶ ταύτην τὴν χώραν μῆτ' αὐτοὺς ἐργάσασθαι μῆτ' ἄλλον ἔαν. λαβόντες δὲ τὸν χρησμόν οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες ἐψηφίσαντο Σόλωνος εἰπόντος Ἀθηναίου τὴν γνώμην, ἀνδρὸς καὶ νομοθετῆσαι δυνατοῦ καὶ περὶ ποιήσιν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν διατετριφότες, ἐπιστρατεύειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐναγεῖς κατὰ τὴν μαντεῖαν τοῦ θεοῦ. [109] καὶ συναθροίσαντες δύναμιν πολλὴν τῶν Ἀμφικτύωνων, ἐξηνδραποδίσαντο τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ τὸν λιμένα καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν κατέσκαψαν καὶ τὴν χώραν [αὐτῶν] καθιέρωσαν κατὰ τὴν μαντεῖαν· καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ὄρκον ὤμοσαν ἰσχυρόν, μῆτ' αὐτοὶ τὴν ἱερὰν γῆν ἐργάσεσθαι μῆτ' ἄλλω ἐπιτρέψειν, ἀλλὰ βοηθήσειν τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῇ γῆ τῇ ἱερᾷ καὶ χειρὶ καὶ ποδὶ <καὶ φωνῇ> καὶ πάσῃ δυνάμει. – “There is, fellow citizens, a plain, called the plain of Cirrha, and a harbor, now known as ‘dedicate and accursed’. This district was once inhabited by the Cirrhaeans and the Cragalidae, most lawless tribes, who repeatedly committed sacrilege against the shrine at Delphi and the votive offerings there, and who transgressed against the Amphictyons also. This conduct exasperated all the Amphictyons, and your ancestors most of all, it is said, and they sought at the shrine of the god an oracle to tell them with what penalty they should visit these men. [108] The Pythia replied that they must fight against the Cirrhaeans and the Cragalidae day and night, bitterly ravage their country, enslave the inhabitants, and dedicate the land to the Pythian Apollo and Artemis and Leto and Athena Pronaia, that for the future it lie entirely uncultivated; that they must not till this land themselves nor permit another. Now when they had received this oracle, the Amphictyons voted, on motion of Solon of Athens, a man able as a law-giver and versed in poetry and philosophy, to march against the accursed men according to the oracle of the god. [109] Collecting a great force of the Amphictyons, they enslaved the men, destroyed their harbor and city, and dedicated their land, as the oracle had commanded. Moreover they swore a mighty oath, that they would not themselves till the sacred land nor let another till it, but that they would go to the aid of the god and the sacred land with hand and foot and voice, and all their might” (transl. by Charles Darwin Adams).

It is surprising that Aeschines cites the Kragalidai and the Cirrhaeans but not the Dryopes and the Phlegians, who are cited together with the Crisaeans by Speusippus. According to Sprawski (2016), “it seems that either Antipatros did not know the story of the Kragalidai’s enmity with the Amphiktynes or in Aeschines’s story the Kragalidai stand for the Dryopes”. The first hypothesis seems more plausible to me since Aeschines most likely depends on Callisthenes but adds some details from a different source.

This is the story which Aeschines links to the lawless Locrians of Amphissa, i.e. to the Fourth Sacred War.⁶³

Demosthenes' immediate response to Aeschines, in the speech "On the Crown" (18.149), denies any historicity to the First Sacred War. According to Demosthenes, the First Sacred War was used by Aeschines to exploit the naivety of the *hieromnemes*, who believed that the plain of Cirrha was holy.⁶⁴ There is no mention of the fate of the Phocians in the Third Sacred War.

This may seem surprising, given that they had spoken of the unlawful and/or desperate Phocians more than once in speeches over the previous decades;

63 Cassola (1980, 424–430) made the attractive suggestion that Aeschines uses τὸ Κιρραῖον πεδῖον and Κιρραῖοι (instead of Κρισαικὸς δὲ πόλεμος and Κρίσα) in order to better compare the First Sacred War with the Fourth, since Cirrha was more famous and relevant in his time and thus it was easier for his audience to relate old tales to present events. However, this suggestion is not useful with reference to our topic (the shift from the parallels drawn between the First Sacred War-Third Sacred War to that drawn between the First Sacred War-Fourth Sacred War) since the use of Κίρρα instead of Κρίσα would have made the parallel between the First Sacred War-Third Sacred War more likely as well – and as likely as the parallel between the First Sacred War-Fourth Sacred War.

64 πῶς οὖν ταῦτ' ἐποίησεν; μισθοῦται τουτονί. δὲ προειδότης, οἶμαι, τὸ πρᾶγμα οὐδὲ φυλάττοντος, ὥσπερ εἴωθε τὰ τοιαῦτα παρ' ὑμῖν γίνεσθαι, προβληθεὶς πυλάγορος οὗτος καὶ τριῶν ἢ τεττάρων χειροτονησάντων αὐτὸν ἀνερρήθη. ὡς δὲ τὸ τῆς πόλεως ἀξίωμα λαβῶν ἀφίκετ' εἰς τοὺς Ἀμφικτύονας, πάντα τ' ἄλλ' ἀφείς καὶ παριδῶν ἐπέβαινε ἐφ' οἷς ἐμισθώθη, καὶ λόγους εὐπροσώπους καὶ μύθους, ὅθεν ἡ Κιρραία χώρα καθιερώθη, συνθείς καὶ διεξελλθῶν ἀνθρώπους ἀπείρους λόγων καὶ τὸ μέλλον οὐ προορωμένους, τοὺς ἱερομνήμονας, [150] πείθει ψηφίσασθαι περιελθεῖν τὴν χώραν, ἣν οἱ μὲν Ἀμφισσεῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν οὕσαν γεωργεῖν ἔφρασαν, οὗτος δὲ τῆς ἱερᾶς χώρας ἡτιᾶτο εἶναι, οὐδεμίαν δίκην τῶν Λοκρῶν ἐπαγόντων ἡμῖν, οὐδ' ἂν νῦν προφασίζεταί λέγων οὐκ ἀληθῆ. γνώσεσθεδ' ἐκεῖθεν. οὐκ ἐνήν ἄνευ τοῦ προσκαλέσασθαι δήπου τοῖς Λοκροῖς δίκην κατὰ τῆς πόλεως τελέσασθαι. τίς οὖν ἐκλήτευσεν ἡμᾶς; ἐπιποίας ἀρχῆς; εἰπέ τὸν εἰδῶτα, δείξον. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἔχοις, ἀλλὰ κενῆ προφάσει ταύτη κατεχρῶ καὶ ψευδεῖ. – "How did he manage it? By hiring Aeschines. Nobody, of course, had any inkling; nobody was watching- according to your usual custom! Aeschines was nominated for the deputation to Thermopylae; three or four hands were held up, and he was declared elected. He repaired to the Council, invested with all the prestige of Athens, and at once, putting aside and disregarding everything else, addressed himself to the business for which he had taken pay. He concocted a plausible speech about the legendary origin of the consecration of the Cirrhaean territory, and by this narration induced the commissioners, men unversed in oratory and unsuspecting of consequences, [150] to vote for a tour of survey of the land which the Amphissians said they were cultivating because it belonged to them, while Aeschines accused them of intruding on consecrated ground. It is not true that these Locrians were meditating any suit against Athens, or any other action such as he now falsely alleges in excuse. You will find a proof of his falsehood in this argument: Of course it was not competent for the Locrians to take proceedings against Athens without serving a summons. Well, who served it? From what office was it issued? Name anyone who knows; point him out. You cannot; it was a false and idle pretext of yours" (transl. by C. A. Vince and J. H. Vince 1926).

especially in the case of Aeschines, who usually denigrated the Phocians and emphasised their unlawful behaviour. This deserves more attention: the picture portrayed by Aeschines triggered, in turn, a defense of the Phocians by Demosthenes, who represents them as desperate and victims of deceit (which in turn may have encouraged Aeschines to further emphasize the unlawful behaviour of the Phocians), as the following scheme makes clear (tab. 1):⁶⁵

Tab. 1: Insolence and desperation of the Phocians

356–346	Third Sacred War	
346	Aischin. 2.117 and 138	The Phocians stole the temple treasures.
346	Aischin. 2.131	The Phocians steal .
346	Aischin. 2.131	The Phocians are too daring .
346	Aischin. 2.135.4	The leaders of the Phocians are τύρανοι.
346	Aischin. 2.140.7	The Phocians destroy temples and devastate land.
	Aischin. 2.138.5	They act under the influence of a madness (μανία).
346	Demosth. or. 19.30; 19.56; 19.64	The unhappy Phocians are ruined by their own deeds, and offer a terrible but at the same time pitiful sight.
346	Demosth. or. 19.73 (cfr. Diod. 16.38.6)	The Phocians are ἀσεβείς (impious) .
346	Demosth. or. 19.56; cfr. 19.58; 19.61; 19.63; 19.76; 19.125; 19.179; 19.317	They were deceived and were therefore defeated.
346	Demosth. or. 19.77–78; cfr. 19.43	They were victims of deceit (ἀπάτη).
346	Demosth. or. 19.128	They suffered a lot.
340–332	4th Sacred War	

Aeschines and Demosthenes built contrasting images of the Phocians. According to Aeschines, the Phocians were guilty of *hybris*, victims of μανία and unlawful: Philip was εὐσεβής (pious) because he punished them; according to Demosthenes they were also somewhat ἀσεβείς, but this was because they were desperate, because Philip cheated them. Given that stories about the impious Cirrhaeans were already circulating in Athens and beyond (as proved by the works of Antipater, Speusippus and Callisthenes-Aristotle), one wonders why Aeschines,

⁶⁵ See Franchi 2015.

in opposing Demosthenes, did not exploit them with reference to the impious Phocians in the Third Sacred War. After all, he could have exploited the Cirrhaeans both with reference to the Third and to the Fourth Sacred Wars, since he explicitly put them on par (3.14). But he does not. Why?

There are two reasons in my view. The first one is that Aeschines depends on Callisthenes and on the *Pythionikai*, as the reference to Solon's intervention and the use of Cirrha instead of Crisa reveal.⁶⁶ As we have stressed above, Callisthenes exploits the Thucydidean image of the Phocian as "those to whom (the control of) Delphi has been handed over". This positive role accorded to the Phocians contrasts with Aeschines' general picture of the Phocians as unlawful.

To shed light on the second reason, it is necessary to take a closer look at the relations between Philip and the Athenians between the 350s and the end of the 340s. In the 340s, the Attic orators had many awkward issues to deal with concerning the fate of Athens, Philip, and the Phocians after the Peace of Philocrates.⁶⁷ These troubles were made more embarrassing by a fact that is important to remember: Athens had assisted the Phocians during the Third Sacred War, and the alliance with the Phocians has distant roots, since it can be traced back to at least the fifties of the 5th century.⁶⁸ Relations between Athens and Philip were generally complex and delicate; the Philip-Phocian-Athenian triangle is, in this context, very tense, and further complicated by Theban and Thessalian affairs.

As is well known, Philip and the Athenians had both many common and many conflicting geopolitical interests, all of which contributed to the tensions between them. The Chalcidian peninsula was a hot spot in this respect. Philip took Amphipolis in 357, and Potidaea in 356, the latter then being handed over to the Chalcidian League (Diod. 16.8). Although Athens was still involved in the Social War, troops were sent to help the Potidaeans, but failed to arrive in time (Diod. 4.35). Moreover, Philip was invited to take on the protectorship of Crenides (which he later refounded as Philippi) in the Pangaeum, and towards the end of 355 he besieged Methone on the Thermaic Gulf, the last Athenian foothold in the north-west Aegean (Diod. 16.34). Athens was avoiding involvement in costly foreign commitments, since the city's coffers were almost empty after the Social War, which ended in 355, so Philip's control over areas of Athenian interest steadily increased: by 354 he was in control of the entire Macedonian coastal region

⁶⁶ Had he used Speusippus' image, it would have been easier to put the impious Cirrhaeans and the Phocians on a par.

⁶⁷ Hunt 2010, 38, 92, 103–107.

⁶⁸ Cfr. RO 116; Thuk. 1.107; 112.5.

apart from the Chalcidic peninsula. At this point, due to his Thessalian connections, he became involved in the Third Sacred War (355–346). Phocis was an ally of the tyrants of the Thessalian city Pherae, and in 353 Larissa appealed to Philip for assistance against Pherae. This meant that Philip entered the war as an enemy of the Phocians, who were supported by the Athenians (Diod. 16.35–38). The Macedonian king took an army to Thessaly but was defeated twice by Lycophron's Phocian allies under Onomarchus and forced to withdraw to Macedonia (Diod. 16.35.2). In 352, however, he returned to defeat the Phocians on the Thessalian coastal plain at the Battle of the Crocus Field (Diod. 16.35.3–6, see above). He even tried to enter central Greece by advancing towards the strategically important Pass of Thermopylae. This was too much: the Athenian politician Eubulus finally supported military involvement and an Athenian force arrived in time to block Philip's way (Diod. 16.38.1–2). Philip made no attempt to continue, withdrew to Thessaly and returned to Macedonia. Tensions with Athens were, however, soon to rise again, and again over the Chalcidic area. In 349 Philip turned against the Chalcidian League and started to besiege their most important city, Olynthus (Diod. 16.53; Iust. 8.3.10). Demosthenes incited the Athenians against Philip in his three "Olynthiac Speeches", but the Athenians failed to respond quickly to the threat being posed to Olynthus. In the summer of 348 Philip conquered the city (Diod. 16.53.2), razed it to the ground and sold the inhabitants into slavery (Diod. 16.53.3). The open wound between Athens and the Macedonians got worse: Philip also captured a number of Athenians in Olynthus and transported them to Macedonia as slaves. The fall of Olynthus led to the collapse of the Chalcidian League and Athens then tried to call Greece to arms against Philip, but the other Greeks failed to respond. Diplomatic negotiations between Philip and Athens followed in 346, initiated by the Macedonian ruler. The Athenian politician Philocrates proposed that the Athenians listen to Philip's terms, so three Athenian embassies (including Philocrates, Demosthenes and his later rival Aeschines) went to Pella and a Macedonian embassy (including Antipater and Parmenion) travelled to Athens. The last of the three embassies to Pella returned when the envoys learnt that the Phocians had been defeated by Philip; one of the topics discussed by the first and second embassies had in fact been the fate of the Phocians. The Athenians did their best to defend their former allies but failed, partly because other elements were at play, and Athens was trying to gain as much as possible from Philip. The peace of Philocrates ended the war over Amphipolis and the Athenians recognized Philip's conquests on the coast and renounced all claims to Amphipolis. In return, Philip released his Athenian prisoners from Olynthus and promised to spare Athens' settlements in the Thracian Chersonese (these settlements were crucial to Athenian survival, since they controlled the grain supply from the Black Sea). Phocis was excluded from the peace: the Athe-

nians were far from happy with the terms, but they seem to have accepted that Phocis was the price to pay. The Athenian support for the temple-robbers was proving unsustainable, and now was the time of reckoning.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, even now the Athenians did not completely abandon the Phocians. The peace negotiations between Athens and Philip were taking place during the Third Sacred War; Thebes appealed for help from Philip to free several Boeotian cities from Phocian control. Philip saw his chance and managed to gain control of Thermopylae, at that point under Phocian control. The Athenians were attended to send Philip a force against the Phocians because of their recent alliance with him, but they did not do so. Nevertheless, the Phocians were defeated and punished by the Amphictyonians, the temple robbers were executed and Philip was given the two Phocian seats in the Amphictyonic Council (Diod. 16.60.1). The Athenians expressed their discontent by refusing to recognize his membership, or to attend the Pythian Games, over which he presided that year (Demosth. or. 19.128). At that stage, in the forties, the Athenians were not yet ready to disavow the Phocians – the memory of their alliance was still fresh (Aischin. 3.118).

3.1 How Did the Orators Cope with the Situation?

In this context, within this network of political issues and meanings, it would have made no sense to refer to the alleged precedent of the First Sacred War: in that war, the Athenians had fought, not supported, the *asebeis*: the *asebeis* were the Cirrhaeans, who can easily be paralleled with the Phocians, i.e. the people they supported in the Third Sacred War and whom they were not yet ready to disavow. We have already seen that Plutarch's source for the participation of the Athenians in the First Sacred War (either Alcmaeon or Solon, that question is debated) are the *Pythionikai*, written in exactly this period (the 340s or 330s, at the latest), and Aeschines himself is convinced that the Athenians' engagement against the Phocians started "on motion of Solon of Athens" (3.108).⁷⁰ This is why it does not suit the Athenians to compare the First Sacred War-Cirrhaeans with the Third Sacred War-Phocians. In contrast, it undoubtedly makes more sense to build a comparison between the First Sacred War-Cirrhaeans and the Fourth Sacred War-Locrians of Amphissa, as the first table, in conjunction with an analysis of the speeches of Aeschines and Demosthenes in the thirties, shows (tab. 2):

⁶⁹ Franchi 2016, 126–132; with references and further literature.

⁷⁰ On the participation of Solon, see also Paus. 10.37.6–7. For the Athenians as active members of the Amphictyony from its origins, see Aischin. 2.116 and 3.107, 118.

Tab. 2: The impiety of the Amphissaians

356–346	Third Sacred War	
346	Aischin. 2.117 and 138	The Phocians stole the temple treasures .
346	Aischin. 2.131	The Phocians steal .
346	Aischin. 2.131	The Phocians are too daring .
346	Aischin. 2.135.4	The leaders of the Phocians are τύραννοι .
346	Aischin. 2.140.7	The Phocians destroy temples and devastate land.
	Aischin. 2.138.5	They act under the influence of a madness (μανία).
346	Demosth. or. 19.30; 19.56; 19.64	The unhappy Phocians are ruined by their own deeds, and offer a terrible but at the same time pitiful sight.
346	Demosth. or. 19.73 (cfr. Diod. 16.38.6)	The Phocians are ἀσεβείς (impious).
346	Demosth. or. 19.56 (cfr. 19.58; 61; 63; 76; 125; 179; 317)	They were deceived and were therefore defeated.
346	Demosth. or. 19.77–78; cfr. 19.43	They were victims of deceit (ἀπάτη).
346	Demosth. or. 19.128	They suffered a lot.
340–332	4th Sacred War	
339	Demosth. or. 18.149	Aeschines invented and used the impious Cirrhaeans already in 339, when he accused in an Amphictyonic council the Ozolian Locrians of Amphissa that they illegally used the plain of Cirrha (see above, n. 61).
330	Aischin. 3.107–12	Narrative of the First Sacred War.
330	Aischin. 3.113	The Locrians are unlawful (παρανομώτατοι).
330	Aischin. 3.115	The Amphissaians are impious (τῆς τῶν Ἀμφισσέων ἀσεβείας).
330	Aischin. 3.118	The memory of the alliance of Athenians with the Phocians is still fresh.
330	Aischin. 3.118	The Amphissaians are impious (ἐπήει δ' οὖν μοι ἐπὶ τὴν γνώμην μνησθῆναι τῆς τῶν Ἀμφισσέων περὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν ἱερὰν ἀσεβείας).
330	Aischin. 3.117	The Amphissaians are most licentious (τις τῶν Ἀμφισσέων, ἄνθρωπος ἀσελγέστατος).
330	Demosth. or. 18.149	The “First Sacred War” was invented.
	Diod. 16.23.3.	The Phocians were arraigned in the Council and were fined a large number of talents for having cultivated a large portion of the consecrated territory named Cirrhaean (οἱ δὲ Φωκεῖς ἐπεργασάμενοι πολλὴν τῆς ἱερᾶς χώρας τῆς ὀνομαζομένης Κιρραίας δίκας ὑπέσχον ἐν Ἀμφικτύοσι καὶ πολλοῖς ταλάντοις κατεκρίθησαν).

If we can “trust in its essentials Aeschines’ claim that the Locrians of Amphissa started the quarrel by accusing the Athenians”⁷¹, then we may expect that to justify the attack on the Locrians of Amphissa it was strategic for Aeschines and his political allies to compare the Locrians of Amphissa to the Crisaeans of the First Sacred War (they both illegally used the plain of Cirrha) and therefore to describe them as the Crisaeans: unlawful, impious, and licentious.

4. The Ambivalent Legacy of the Crisaeans in 4th-Century Public Discourse

One usually investigates 4th-century evidence related to the First Sacred War to distinguish historical elements from mythical ones: the main aim is to understand how far back in the past one can trace the historical information in order to reconstruct the historicity of the First Sacred War, one of the monster-problems of Archaic Greek history.

The focus of this article was different. The aim was not to investigate 4th-century evidence related to the First Sacred War in order to reconstruct Archaic History but rather to shed light on how interstate relations between Athens and Central Greece people in the 4th century were shaped in public discourse by drawing on the story of the First Sacred War.

In this framework, the ‘Phocian factor’ played a major role: Athens’ alliance with the Phocians during the Third Sacred War became an embarrassing friendship in the following decade. This had a valuable consequence: whereas, in the intellectual circles close to Philip, the First Sacred War was considered as a precedent for the Third Sacred War in which the impious Phocians were defeated by the pious Philip II; in the Athenian forensic and deliberative arena, the only possible way to use the First Sacred War as an argument was by relating it to the Fourth Sacred War and the impious Locrians of Amphissa. Indeed, the Phocians were Athens’ allies during the Third Sacred War, and Athens supported them even in its immediate aftermath, while negotiating the Peace of Philocrates. It would have made no sense to compare them to the impious Crisaeans. However, stories about the First Sacred War had begun to circulate more broadly. Moreover, in the same period these stories were heavily shaped by intellectuals. The most efficient way to deal with these stories was not to neglect them, but to shape them further in order to convert them into a precedent for the Fourth Sacred War. Thus, the

⁷¹ Harris 1995, 129 (cfr. Demosth. or. 18.150).

impious Crisaeans became the ancestors of the impious Locrians of Amphissa; and this allowed the Athenians to address their previous otherwise embarrassing friendships.

Acknowledgements: A first draft of this paper was presented at the 4th meeting of the international network “*historiai*. Antike Geschichtsschreibung und Vergangenheitsvorstellungen” (17.–18.06.2016): <https://www.altegeschichte.uni-freiburg.de/forschung/internationales-netzwerk-historiai> (last accessed on 19.07.2020). I am grateful to the members of the Netzwerk for their suggestions on this and other occasions.

Bibliography

- Anderson 1995: J. K. Anderson, The Geometric Catalogue of Ships, in: J. B. Carter – S. P. Morris (eds.), *The Ages of Homer. A Tribute to E. T. Vermeule*, Austin 1995, 181–191.
- Asheri 1981: D. Asheri (ed.), *Erodoto, Le Storie, I: Libro 1, la Lidia e la Persia*, Milan 1981.
- Asheri 1983: D. Asheri, Il millennio di Troia, in: D. Ambaglio – D. Asheri – D. Magnino (eds.), *Biblioteca di Athenaeum, II: Saggi di letteratura e storiografia antiche*, Como 1983, 53–98.
- Barnes 1995: J. Barnes, Life and Work, in: J. Barnes (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*, Cambridge 1995, 1–26.
- Bauer 1907: E. Bauer, Untersuchungen zur Geographie und Geschichte der nordwestlichen Landschaften Griechenlands, Halle 1907.
- Bearzot 2011: C. Bearzot, Royal Autobiography in the Hellenistic Age, in: G. Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity*, Leiden 2011, 44–45.
- Beloch 1912–1927: K.-J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte I–IV*, Strasbourg – Berlin – Leipzig 1912–1927.
- Bertelli 1976: L. Bertelli, L’epistola di Speusippo a Filippo. Un problema di cronologia, *AAT* 110, 1976, 275–300.
- Bertelli 1977: L. Bertelli, La lettera di Speusippo a Filippo. Il problema dell’autenticità, *AAT* 111, 1977, 75–111.
- Bickermann – Sykutris 1928: E. Bickermann – J. Sykutris (eds.), *Speusipps Brief an König Philipp*. Text, Übersetzung, Untersuchungen, Leipzig 1928.
- Bohn 1854: H. J. Bohn (ed.), *Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists or Banquet of the Learned*, London 1854.
- Bollansée 1999: J. Bollansée (ed.), *Hermippos of Smyrna. Critical Edition and English Translation of the Extant Fragments*, Leiden 1999.
- Bommelaer – Bommelaer 1983: B. Bommelaer – J.-F. Bommelaer, *Eschine et le temple d’Apollon à Delphes*, in: C. Froidefond (ed.), *Mélanges E. Delebecque*, Aix-en-Provence 1983, 19–31.
- Bommelaer – Laroche 1991: J.-F. Bommelaer – D. Laroche, *Guide de Delphes. Le Site*, Paris 1991.
- Bosworth 1970: A. B. Bosworth, Aristotle and Callisthenes, *Historia* 19, 1970, 407–413.

- Bousquet 1988: J. Bousquet, *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes. Les comptes*, Paris 1988.
- Bousquet 1989: J. Bousquet, *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes, II: Les comptes du quatrième et du troisième siècle*, Paris 1989.
- Braun 1948: E. Braun, *Zur Schlacht von Chaironeia*, *JÖAI* 37, 1948, 81–89.
- Briand 2018: M. Briand, *Delphes dans les Pythiques de Pindare*, in: J.-M. Luce (ed.), *Delphes et la littérature d'Homère à nos jours*, Paris 2018, 35–61.
- Brodersen 1991: K. Brodersen, *Heiliger Krieg und Heiliger Friede in der frühen griechischen Geschichte*, *Gymnasium* 98, 1991, 1–9.
- Buckler 1989a: J. Buckler, *Philip II and the Sacred War*, Leiden 1989.
- Buckler 1989b: J. Buckler, *Pammenes, die Perser und der Heilige Krieg*, in: H. Beister – J. Buckler (eds.), *Boiotika*, München 1989, 155–162.
- Buckler 2003: J. Buckler, *Aegean Greece in the Fourth Century BC*, Leiden 2003.
- Buckler – Beck 2008: J. Buckler – H. Beck, *Central Greece and the Politics of Power in the Fourth Century*, Cambridge 2008.
- Bultrighini – Torelli 2017: U. Bultrighini – M. Torelli (eds.), *Pausania. Libro X: Delfi e la Focide*, Milan 2017.
- Cassola 1980: F. Cassola, *Note sulla guerra crisea*, in: J. Fontana – M. T. Piraino (eds.), *Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di E. Manni I*, Rome 1980, 415–439.
- Chaniotis 1988: A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften. Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie*, Stuttgart 1988.
- Christesen 2007: P. Christesen, *Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History*, Cambridge 2007.
- Chroust 1971: A. H. Chroust, *Speusippus succeeds Plato in the Scholarchate of the Academy*, *REG* 84, 1971, 338–341.
- Cloch e 1915: P. Cloch e, * tude chronologique sur la troisi me guerre sacr e*, Paris 1915.
- Costa 2007: V. Costa, *Filocolo di Atene*, Rome 2007.
- Costanzi 1923: V. Costanzi, *Il leone di Cheronea e alcune questioni con esso connesse*, *RFC* 51, 1923, 61–70.
- Croissant 1996: F. Croissant, *Les Ath niens   Delphes avant et apr s Ch ron e*, in: P. Carlier (ed.), *Le IVe si cle av. J-C: approches historiographiques*, Nancy – Paris 1996, 127–139.
- Davies 1994: J. K. Davies, *The Tradition about the First Sacred War*, in: S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford 1994, 193–212.
- Davies 1996: J. K. Davies, *Documents and “Documents” in Fourth-Century Historiography*, in: P. Carlier (ed.), *Le IVe si cle av. J.-C.: approches historiographiques*, Nancy – Paris 1996, 29–39.
- Davies 2007a: J. K. Davies, *The Phokian hierosyllia at Delphi. Quantities and Consequences*, in: N. Sekunda (ed.), *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald*, Gdansk 2007, 75–96.
- Davies 2007b: J. K. Davies, *The Origins of the Festivals, especially Delphi and the Pythia*, in: S. Hornblower – C. Morgan (eds.), *Pindar’s Poetry, Patrons and Festivals*, Oxford 2007, 47–69.
- De la Coste-Messeli re 1969: P. de la Coste-Messeli re, *Topographie delphique*, *BCH* 93, 1969, 730–758.
- Defradas 1954: J. Defradas, *Les th mes de la propagande delphique*, Paris 1954.
- Dor – Jannoray – van Effenterre – van Effenterre 1960: H. Dor – J. Jannoray – H. van Effenterre – M. van Effenterre, *Kirraha.  tude de pr histoire phocidienne*, Paris 1960.
- D ring 1957: I. D ring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*, G ring 1957.

- Ellis 1976: J. R. Ellis, Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism, London 1976.
- Fiehn 1938: K. Fiehn, Philomelos, in: RE XIX.38, 1938, 2524–2525.
- Flathe 1854: T. Flathe, Der phokische Krieg, Plauen 1854.
- Forrest 1956: G. Forrest, The First Sacred War, BCH 80, 1956, 33–52.
- Förstel 1979: K. Förstel, Untersuchungen zum homerischen Apollonhymnos, Bochum 1979.
- Franchi 2013a: E. Franchi, Die Herkunft der Phlegyer und der dritte Heilige Krieg, Hermes 141, 2013, 450–458.
- Franchi 2013b: E. Franchi, Pausanias' Mental Maps und die Polis: 10.4.1 in context, Ktèma 38, 2013, 323–340.
- Franchi 2015: E. Franchi, The Phocian Desperation and the Third Sacred War, Hormos 7 (n.s.), 2015, 49–71.
- Franchi 2016: E. Franchi, Die Konflikte zwischen Thessalern und Phokern. Krieg und Identität in der griechischen Erinnerungskultur des 4. Jh.s., München 2016.
- Franchi 2019: E. Franchi, The Memory of the Sacred Wars and Some Origin Stories, in: M. Giangiulio – E. Franchi – G. Proietti (eds.), Commemorating War and War Dead. Ancient and Modern, Stuttgart 2019, 271–286.
- Freitag 2000: K. Freitag, Der Golf von Korinth. Historisch-topographische Untersuchungen von der Archaik bis in das 1. Jh. v. Chr., München 2000.
- Fuscagni 1974: S. Fuscagni, Aspetti della propaganda macedone sotto Filippo II, in: M. Sordi (ed.), Propaganda e persuasione occulta nell'antichità, Milan 1974, 71–82.
- Gallo 2011: L. Gallo, Appunti per una storia del *koinon* focidese, in: L. Breglia – A. Moleti – M. L. Napolitano – R. Calce (eds.), Ethne, identità e tradizioni, I: la 'terza' Grecia e l'Occidente, Pisa 2011, 187–196.
- Gehrke 1986: H.-J. Gehrke, Jenseits von Athen und Sparta. Das dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt, München 1986.
- Guillon 1963: P. Guillon, Le Bouclier d'Héraclès et l'histoire de la Grèce centrale dans la période de la première guerre sacrée, Aix-en-Provence 1963.
- Hackett 1970: N. J. Hackett, The Third Sacred War, Diss. University of Cincinnati 1970.
- Hamilton 1982: C. D. Hamilton, The Early Career of Archidamus, EMC 1, 1982, 5–20.
- Hammond 1937: N.G.L. Hammond, Diodorus' Narrative of the Sacred War and the Chronological Problems of 357–352 BC, JHS 57, 1937, 44–78.
- Hammond 1938: N.G.L. Hammond, The Two Battles of Chaeronea (338 B.C. and 86 B.C.), KLIO 31, 1938, 186–218.
- Hammond 1973: N.G.L. Hammond, The Victory of Macedon at Chaeronea, in: N.G.L. Hammond (ed.), Studies in Greek History, Oxford 1973, 534–557.
- Hammond 1991: N.G.L. Hammond, Philip of Macedon, London 1991.
- Hammond 2003: N.G.L. Hammond, The Meaning of οἱ ἀργυρολογέοντες and the Beginning of the Third Sacred War, Historia 52, 2003, 373–377.
- Hammond – Griffith 1979: N.G.L. Hammond – G. T. Griffith, A History of Macedonia, II: 550–336 B.C., Oxford 1979.
- Harris 1995: E. M. Harris, Aeschines and Athenian Politics, Oxford 1995.
- Higbie 1999: C. Higbie, Craterus and the Use of Inscriptions in Ancient Scholarship, TAPhA 129, 1999, 43–83.
- Homolle 1898a: T. Homolle, Inscriptions de Delphés, BCH 22, 1898, 260–270.
- Homolle 1898b: T. Homolle, Les Pythioniques d'Aristote, BCH 22, 1898, 631–633.
- Hope Simpson 1981: R. Hope Simpson, Mycenaean Greece, Park Ridge 1981.
- Hornblower 1991–2008: S. Hornblower, A Commentary on Thucydides I–III, Oxford 1991–2008.

- Hornblower 2009: S. Hornblower, Did the Delphic Amphiktionion Play a Political Role in the Classical Period?, in: I. Malkin – C. Constantakopoulou – K. Panagopoulou (eds.), *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*, London – New York 2009, 39–56.
- Hornblower 2011: S. Hornblower, *Thucydidean Themes*, Oxford 2011.
- Howe 2003: T. Howe, Pastoralism, the Delphic Amphiktionion, and the First Sacred War. The Creation of Apollo's Sacred Pastures, *Historia* 52, 2003, 129–146.
- Hunt 2010: P. Hunt, *War, Peace, and Alliance in Demosthenes' Athens*, Cambridge 2010.
- Isnardi Parente 1980: M. Isnardi Parente (ed.), *Speusippo. Frammenti*, Napoli 1980.
- Jacoby 1907: F. Jacoby, Evanthes, in: RE VI.1, 1907, 846.
- Jacoby 1909: F. Jacoby, Kallisthenes (2), in: RE X.2, 1909, 1674–1707.
- Jacoby 1923–1958: F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin 1923–1958.
- Jacoby – Bollansée – Schepens 1999: F. Jacoby – J. Bollansée – G. Schepens, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Continued*, Leiden – Boston – Köln 1999.
- Jaeger 1923: W. Jaeger, *Aristoteles. Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*, Berlin 1923.
- Jannoray 1937: J. Jannoray, Krisa, Kirrha et la première guerre sacrée, *BCH* 61, 1937, 33–43.
- Jehne 1994: M. Jehne, Koine Eirene. Untersuchungen zu den Befriedigungs- und Stabilisierungsbemühungen in der griechischen Poliswelt des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr., Stuttgart 1994.
- Kaers 1894: J. Kaers, Antipatros (12), in: RE I.2, 1894, 2502.
- Kahrstedt 1953: U. Kahrstedt, Delphoi und das heilige Land des Apollon, in: E. Mylonas – D. Raymond (eds.), *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson II*, St. Louis 1953, 749–757.
- Kase – Szemler 1984: E. W. Kase – G. J. Szemler, The Amphictyonic League and the First Sacred War. A New Perspective, in: J. Harmatta (ed.), *Proceedings of the VIIIth Congress of the International Federation of the Societies of Classical Studies I*, Budapest 1984, 107–116.
- Köhler 1928: L. Köhler, *Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker*, Leipzig 1928.
- Kromayer 1905: J. Kromayer, Zu den griechischen Schlachtfelderstudien, *WS* 27, 1905, 1–34.
- Landucci 2002: F. Landucci, Il caso di Antipatro, *Aevum* 76, 2002, 27–33.
- Lefèvre 1998: F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions*, Paris 1998.
- Lehmann 1980: G. A. Lehmann, Der Erste Heilige Krieg – Eine Fiktion?, *Historia* 29, 1980, 242–246.
- Lerat 1952: L. Lerat, *Les Locriens de l'Ovest I–II*, Paris 1952.
- Lewis 1958: D. M. Lewis, An Aristotle Publication Date, *The Classical Review* 8.2, 1958, 108.
- Londey 1990: P. Londey, The Outbreak of the 4th Sacred War, *Chiron* 20, 1990, 239–260.
- Londey 2015: P. Londey, Making up Delphic History. The 1st Sacred War Revisited, *Chiron* 45, 2015, 221–236.
- Luce 1992: J.-M. Luce, Travaux de l'École française en Grèce en 1991: Delphes, *BCH* 116, 1992, 686–704.
- Luce 2008: J.-M. Luce, *Fouilles de Delphes, II: L'aire du Pilier des Rhodiens (fouille 1990–1992): A la frontière du profane et du sacré*, Paris 2008.
- Luce 2018: J.-M. Luce, Introduction, in: J.-M. Luce (ed.), *Delphes et la littérature d'Homère à nos jours*, Paris 2018, 9–32.
- Mandilaras 2003: B. G. Mandilaras (ed.), *Isocrates: opera omnia II*, Stuttgart – Leipzig 2003.
- Marchetti 1998: P. Marchetti, Note sur la date des archontes de Delphes de 346 à 336, *Topoi (Lyon)* 8, 1998, 167–172.
- Mari 2002: M. Mari, Al di là dell'Olimpo. Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dall'età arcaica al primo ellenismo, Athens 2002.

- Mari 2006: M. Mari, *Tucidide e l'anfizionia di Delfi*, BCH 130, 2006, 231–261.
- Mari 2013: M. Mari, *From Inscriptions to Literature (and Sometimes Back Again)*. Some Uses of the Epigraphic Sources in the Ancient Literary Traditions on Delphi, in: P. Liddel – P. Low (eds.), *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Manchester, June 25–26, 2009, Oxford 2013, 125–147.
- Markle 1967: M. M. Markle, *The Peace of Philocrates. A Study in Athenian Foreign Relations 348–346 BC*, Diss. University of Princeton 1967.
- Markle 1976: M. M. Markle, *Support of Athenian Intellectuals for Philip. A Study of Isokrates' Philippus and Speusippus' Letter to Philip*, JHS 96, 1976, 80–99.
- Maronati 2007: M. Maronati, *Gli strateghi focesi nella terza guerra sacra*: Filomelo, *Aevum* 81, 2007, 65–85.
- Mathieu – Brémond 1967: G. Mathieu – É. Brémond, *Isocrate, Discours: Tome iv*, Paris 1967⁵.
- McInerney 1999: J. McInerney, *The Folds of Parnassos. Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis*, Austin 1999.
- McInerney 2015: J. McInerney, *Phokis*, in: H. Beck – P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge 2015, 199–221.
- Meiggs 1972: R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford 1972.
- Meißner 1989: B. Meißner, *Historiker zwischen Polis und Königshof. Studien zur Stellung der Geschichtsschreiber in der griechischen Gesellschaft in spätklassischer und frühhellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen 1989.
- Meritt 1952: B. D. Meritt, *Greek Inscriptions*, *Hesperia* 21.4, 1952, 340–380.
- Merlan 1959: P. Merlan, *Zur Biographie des Speusippos*, *Philologus* 103, 1959, 198–214.
- Miller 1978: St. Miller, *The Date of the First Pythiad*, *ClAnt* 11, 1978, 127–158.
- Miller 1986: A. M. Miller, *From Delos to Delphi. A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Leiden 1986.
- Momigliano 1934: A. Momigliano, *Filippo il Macedone*, Florence 1934.
- Momigliano 1966: A. Momigliano, *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Rome 1966.
- Müller 1848: K. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, Paris 1848.
- Natoli 2004: A. F. Natoli (ed.), *The Letter of Speusippus to Philip II. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Stuttgart 2004.
- Nilsson 1951: M. P. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece*, Athens 1951.
- Oulhen 2004: J. Oulhen, *Krisa*, in: M. H. Hansen – T. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford 2004, 405.
- Pack 1876: H. Pack, *Die Quelle des Berichtes über den 3. Heiligen Krieg im XVI Buche Diodors*, *Hermes* 11, 1876, 179–201.
- Parke 1933: H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus*, Oxford 1933.
- Parke – Boardman 1957: H. W. Parke – J. Boardman, *The Struggle for the Tripod and the First Sacred War*, JHS 77, 1957, 276–282.
- Parker 1997: V. Parker, *Bemerkungen zum ersten Heiligen Kriege*, *RhM* 140, 1997, 17–37.
- Pearson 1960: L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, New York 1960.
- Perrin 1914: B. Perrin (ed.), *Plutarch. Plutarch's Lives*, Cambridge (MA) – London 1914.
- Pieske 1922: E. Pieske, *Krisa und Kirrha*, in: RE XI.2, 1922, 1887–1892.
- Prandi 1981: L. Prandi, *I Flegiei di Orcomeno e Delfi. La preistoria delle guerre sacre*, in: M. Sordi (ed.), *Religione e politica nel mondo antico*, Milan 1981, 51–63.
- Prandi 1985: L. Prandi, *Callistene. Uno storico tra Aristotele e i re macedoni*, Milan 1985.

- Pritchett 1942: W. K. Pritchett, *Greek Inscriptions*, *Hesperia* 11, 1942, 230–249.
- Pritchett 1958: W. K. Pritchett, *Observations on Chaironea*, *AJA* 61, 1958, 307–311.
- Rahe 1981: P. A. Rahe, *The Annihilation of the Sacred Band at Chaeronea*, *AJA* 85, 1981, 84–87.
- Robertson 1978: N. Robertson, *The Myth of the First Sacred War*, *CQ* 28, 1978, 38–73.
- Roger – van Effenterre 1944: J. Roger – H. van Effenterre, *Krisa-Kirra*, *RA* 122, 1944, 15–20.
- Roos 1949: A. G. Roos, *The Peace of Sparta of 374 BC*, *Mnemosyne* 4, 1949, 265–285.
- Rousset 2002: D. Rousset, *Le territoire de Delphes et la terre d'Apollon*, Paris 2002.
- Roux 1979: G. Roux, *L'amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IV^e siècle*, Lyon 1979.
- Rzepka 2016: J. Rzepka, *Kallisthenes (124)*, in: *Brill's New Jacoby*, (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a124, last accessed 28.5.2019).
- Sánchez 2001: P. Sánchez, *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes*, Stuttgart 2001.
- Schachter 1981: A. Schachter, *Cults of Boeotia I*, London 1981.
- Schaefer 1858: A. Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*, Leipzig 1856–1858.
- Sealey 1978: R. Sealey, *Philipp II und Athen, 344/3 und 339*, *Historia* 27, 1978, 295–316.
- Skoczylas Pownall 1998: F. Skoczylas Pownall, *What Makes a War a Sacred War*, *EMC* 42, 1998, 35–55.
- Skorda 1992: D. Skorda, *Recherches dans la vallée du Pléistos*, in: J.-F. Bommelaer (ed.), *Delphes. Centenaire de la "grande fouille"*, Leiden 1992, 39–66.
- Sordi 1953: M. Sordi, *La guerra tessalo-focese del V secolo*, *RFIC* 31, 1953, 235–258.
- Sordi 1957: M. Sordi, *La fondation du collège des Naopes et le renouveau politique de l'Amphictionie au IV^e siècle*, *BCH* 81, 1957, 38–75.
- Sordi 1958a: M. Sordi, *La terza guerra sacra*, *RFIC* 36, 1958, 134–166.
- Sordi 1958b: M. Sordi, *La lega tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno*, Rome 1958.
- Sordi 1958c: M. Sordi, *La posizione di Delfi e dell'anfizionia nel decennio tra Tanagra e Coronea*, *RFIC* 36, 1958, 48–59.
- Sotiriadis 1903: G. Sotiriadis, *Das Schlachtfeld von Chaeronea und der Grabhügel der Makedonen*, *MDAI(A)* 28, 1903, 301–330.
- Spikes 1992: D. Spikes, *The First Sacred War*, *Balkanica Posnaniensia, Acta et Studia* 5, 1992, 115–122.
- Spoerri 1988: W. Spoerri, *Epigraphie et littérature: à propos de la liste des Pythionikes à Delphes*, in: D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cite grecque*, Neuchâtel-Genève 1988, 111–140.
- Sprawski 2016: S. Sprawski, *Antipatros of Magnesia (69)*, in: *Brill's New Jacoby*, (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a69, last accessed 06.06.2019).
- Steinbock 2013: B. Steinbock, *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse. Uses and Meanings of the Past*, Ann Arbor 2003.
- Tarán 1981: L. Tarán, *Speusippus of Athens. A Critical Study with a Collection of the Related Texts and Commentary*, Leiden 1981.
- Tausend 1986: K. Tausend, *Die Koalitionen im 1. Heiligen Krieg*, *RSA* 16, 1986, 49–66.
- Themelis 1983: P. Themelis, *Δελφοί και περιοχή των 8ο και τον 7ο π.Χ. αιώνα (Φωκίδα – Δυτική Λοκρίδα)*, *ASAA* 61, 1983, 213–256.
- Theys 1998: E. Theys, *Speusippus of Athens (1009)*, in: *FGrHist IV*, (<https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/fragmente-der-griechischen-historiker-iv/speusippos-of-athens-1009-a1009?lang=de>, last accessed 06.06.2019).
- Tod 1948: M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, II: From 403 to 323 B.C.*, Oxford 1948.

- Trampedach 1994: K. Trampedach, *Platon, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik*, Stuttgart 1994.
- Typaldou-Fakiris 2004: C. Typaldou-Fakiris, *Villes fortifiées de Phocide et la IIIe guerre sacrée 356–346 av. J.-C.*, Provence 2004.
- Walbank 1978: M. B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxies in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Toronto 1978.
- Wankel 1981: H. Wankel, *Bemerkungen zur delphischen Amphiktionie im 4. Jh. und 4. Heiligen Krieg*, ZPE 42, 1981, 153–166.
- Wehrli 1974: F. Wehrli, *Hermippos des Kallimacheer*, Basel – Stuttgart 1974.
- Wilamowitz 1893: U. von Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen I*, Berlin 1893.
- Worthington 2013: I. Worthington, *Demosthenes of Athens and the Fall of Classical Greece*, Oxford 2013.
- Wüst 1938: F. R. Wüst, *Philipp II von Makedonien und Griechenland in den Jahren 346 bis 338*, München 1938.
- Zachos 2003: G. A. Zachos, *Mnaseas and Mason. Two Elateians of the Third Sacred War*, C&M 54, 2003, 113–126.