Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History

Paul Christesen

CAMBRIDGE

This page intentionally left blank

OLYMPIC VICTOR LISTS AND ANCIENT GREEK HISTORY

This is the first comprehensive examination of Olympic victor lists. The origins, development, content, and structure of Olympic victor lists are explored and explained, and a number of important questions, such as the source and reliability of the date of 776 for the first Olympics, are addressed. Olympic victor lists emerge as a clearly defined type of literature that has largely escaped the attention of modern-day scholars. This book offers a new perspective on works by familiar writers such as Diodorus Siculus and a sense of the potential importance of less well-known authors such as Phlegon of Tralleis.

Paul Christesen is assistant professor of ancient Greek history at Dartmouth College.

OLYMPIC VICTOR LISTS AND ANCIENT GREEK HISTORY

PAUL CHRISTESEN

Dartmouth College

CONTENTS

v

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

PREFACE

In the course of bringing this project to completion I have been immeasurably aided by more individuals than I can properly thank. The Class of 1962 at Dartmouth College generously provided a fellowship that made it possible to carry out much of the research for this book. I was also fortunate to spend a summer as a Margo Tytus scholar at the Department of Classics at the University of Cincinnati and to make use of their wonderful facilities.

Numerous people, most notably Michael Flower, Mark Golden, Donald Kyle, Alden Mosshammer, Max Nelson, Kurt Raaflaub, and Zara Torlone, have taken the time to read earlier drafts and to make suggestions that contributed markedly to the final product. My colleagues in the Department of Classics at Dartmouth, Margaret Graver, Jeremy Rutter, Roberta Stewart, Jim Tatum, Hakan Tell, and Roger Ulrich, also provided helpful comments for which I am most grateful. Along the way I have received advice on specific points and assistance from Richard Burgess, Dominic Machado, Susannah Maurer, Elliot May, Sarah Murray, Peter Siewert, Michael Stone, Elizabeth Sullivan, Meg Sullivan, and Christoph Ulf. William Stoddard edited the manuscript and notably improved it in the process. Peter Katsirubas was immensely helpful in shepherding the manuscript through the various stages of publication. The debt I owe to my family in general and my parents in particular defies simple expression but is no doubt well known to readers from their own experience. Finally, special thanks are due to my wife, Cecilia, for her unswerving patience and support.

Hanover, New Hampshire
February 17, 2007

A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY, TRANSLITERATIONS, AND EDITIONS

This book is aimed primarily at scholars who specialize in classical antiquity, but I have made an effort throughout to ensure that the narrative is as accessible as possible to a broader audience. In the interests of brevity, I have refrained from explaining terms and abbreviations that might be unfamiliar to nonspecialists but that can be found in the standard reference book for all things Greek and Roman, the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. I have supplied definitions of terms not found in the *OCD* in notes to the main text. Both specialists and nonspecialists will want to consult Section 1.4 for discussion of the terminology used to distinguish different kinds of Olympic victor lists.

Much of the evidence for Olympic victor lists consists of fragments.[1] In collections such as Felix Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (*FGrH*) and Karl Müller's *Fragmenta Historicum Graecorum* (*FHG*), a fragment is considered to be either a verbatim quote from a lost text or a reference that makes clear the content of a piece of a lost text. Jacoby also compiled what he called testimonia, which provide evidence for an author's biographical details and corpus. Throughout the discussion that follows, the terms *fragment* and *testimonium* are employed in accordance with the usages of Jacoby and Müller.

All dates are BCE unless otherwise specified. In some cases dates are cited in a split-year format, such as 884/3. This is a necessary convention because both Olympiads and Athenian archon years, two of the basic time-reckoning systems used by ancient Greeks, began in

---

[1] On the difficulties involved in using fragments to reconstruct original works, see Baron 2006, 1–14 and *passim*; Brunt 1980; and the articles assembled in Most 1997.

the summer and hence straddle two Julian years. Some events dated on the basis of Olympiads or Athenian archons can be assigned to a specific point in time and hence to a specific Julian year. In other cases, that is not possible, and the date is indicated in a split-year format.

All translations of ancient Greek sources are those of this author unless otherwise specified. Greek names have been transliterated in such a way as to be as faithful as possible to original spellings while taking into account established usages for well-known people and places. Unless otherwise specified, all ancient Greek texts are taken from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (*TLG*), and authors' names are spelled as in the *TLG*. The latter practice, in combination with the transliteration system used here, can have the unfortunate effect of producing variant spellings for homonyms, such as King Theopompos of Sparta and Theopompus of Chios. I have, nonetheless, employed the spellings from the *TLG* because many of the authors cited below are sufficiently obscure to make easy reference to the *TLG* desirable. I have also adopted the titles for individual works suggested by the *TLG*. Many of those titles are Latinized (e.g., Pausanias' guide to Greece is given the appellation *Graeciae Descriptio*). This custom has the weight of tradition behind it, but is not without its problems. When dealing with works not specifically listed in the *TLG*, I have as a rule directly transliterated the Greek title. It is, unfortunately, impossible to achieve complete consistency in transliterating the names of people, places, authors, and works without detaching oneself completely from earlier conventions or ruthlessly Latinizing all Greek names and words.

All citations pertaining to Eusebius' *Chronographia*, with the exception of the Greek version of the Olympic victor list found in that work, refer to the 1911 translation of Josef Karst. All citations of line numbers in the Greek version of Eusebius' Olympic victor list refer to the text printed in Appendix 4.1. All citations pertaining to Jerome's translation of Eusebius' *Chronikoi Kanones* refer to the second edition of Rudolf Helm's *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*.[2]

---

[2] Helm 1956. On the intricacies of properly citing Jerome's translation of the *Chronikoi Kanones*, see Burgess 2002.

The texts of inscriptions and papyri are marked in accordance with the Leiden system, which can be briefly summarized as follows:

αβ̣.	Letters that survive in part, but not sufficiently to exclude alternative readings
[αβ]	Letters not now preserved that the editors believe to have been part of the original text
{αβ}	Letters inscribed/written in error by the cutter/scribe and deleted by the editors
<αβ>	Letters supplied by the editors because the cutter/scribe either omitted them or inscribed/wrote other letters in error
(αβ)	Letters supplied by the editors to fill out an abbreviation in the text as transmitted
[[αβγ.δ.[εζ]]]	A passage that has been erased and can [or cannot] now be read
[. . .]	Lost letters that cannot be restored, of the number indicated
[– – – –]	A lacuna or space of indeterminate size
v	One letter-space uninscribed
vacat	(Remainder of) line uninscribed/left blank[3]

Series of letters that are capitalized indicate places where the reading of the letters is clear, but the meaning is not.

---

[3] The descriptions given here are taken from Rhodes and Osborne 2003, xxv–xxvi.

AN INTRODUCTION TO OLYMPIC VICTOR LISTS

1.1. THREE QUESTIONS

For on the day of judgement the Holy One will judge his world as it says, "For by fire will the Lord execute judgement." And the fire will increase to fifteen cubits above Mt. Tabor, and above the highest of all mountains, the mountain called Olympus. For from that mountain the Greeks made the reckoning of the Olympiads. For each four years they would ascend Mount Olympus, and they would write their victories in the dust of the soft earth which was on the mountain. (*Signs of the Judgement*, Hebrew version, 257r.3–8)[1]

The anonymous Christian author who wrote *Signs of the Judgement* eloquently expresses, albeit in a poetic and slightly confused way, the importance ancient Greeks attached to recording the names of victors in the Olympic Games. Indeed, Olympic victor lists were documents of considerable importance in the ancient world. Nevertheless, they remain largely unknown even among classicists. It may be helpful, therefore, to begin by answering three basic questions I have been repeatedly asked during the time that I have worked on this project: What, exactly, was an Olympic victor list? What sort of textual evidence is available? Why are Olympic victor lists of more than passing interest?

In its original and most basic form, an Olympic victor list was a cumulative catalog of victors at the Olympic Games. These catalogs began with the Olympics held in the year corresponding to 776 BCE

---

[1] The translation is taken from Stone 1981, which should also be consulted for information on date and authorship.

and continued to the time they were compiled. Hippias of Elis assembled the first Olympic victor list sometime around 400 as part of a larger work on the history of Olympia and the Olympic Games. By the Roman period, Olympic victor lists covered more than 200 Olympiads and contained the names of well over 2,000 athletes. Information about individual Olympic victors appeared in other types of literature such as local histories of Elis and treatises on athletic contests. It is, however, important to avoid conflating works that include scattered information about specific athletes with those that contain cumulative catalogs of Olympic victors. To do so would be to group together a large number of texts that have little in common. Only those works that offer catalogs of victors for multiple Olympiads can properly be described as Olympic victor lists.[2]

Olympic victor lists would have remained little more than a curiosity had it not been for the fact that Olympiads proved to be a convenient means of reckoning time. Starting in the fourth century, numbered Olympiads and the names of victors in the *stadion* (a short footrace) at those Olympiads became the basis of a widely used system for identifying individual years. As a result, the Olympic victor list became a useful, chronologically ordered framework that was utilized by both chronographers and historians. Chronographers took the Olympic victor list and added the names of magistrates and kings that served as the bases of other dating systems. Historians added notes about important events that took place during each Olympiad. Numerous different versions of the Olympic victor list came into being as successive chronographers and historians updated the catalog of victors and made choices about how much and what kind of information to attach. Some sense of the varied nature of Olympic victor lists can be had from the fact that the

---

[2] Historical works based on numbered Olympiads without named Olympic victors are for obvious reasons not discussed here. The most well-known example of such a work is Polybius' *Historiae*, in which each Olympiad is generally covered in two books and in which numbered Olympiads are used as date markers on numerous occasions. Polybius does not, however, name the corresponding Olympic victors, so the *Historiae* is not an Olympic victor list. On the structure of the *Historiae*, see Marincola 2001, 116–24. Another relevant example can be found in the *Historiae* of Posidonius, who probably organized his historical work in the same fashion as Polybius. See Malitz 1983, 60–74.

shortest version took up less than a single book, whereas the longest versions occupied twenty books or more.[3] Ancient Greeks used the word *Olympionikai* to describe Olympic victor lists of all varieties, and these two terms are used interchangeably here.

The history of Olympic victor lists extends from the work of Hippias of Elis in the late fifth century BCE to that of Panodoros in the beginning of the fifth century CE.[4] The roster of authors who are known to have written *Olympionikai* includes Aristotle, Cassius Longinus, Castor of Rhodes, Ctesicles of Athens, Dexippus of Athens, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Eratosthenes, Eusebius of Caesarea, Hippias, Panodoros, Philochorus of Athens, Phlegon of Tralleis, Scopas, Sextus Julius Africanus, Thallus, and Timaeus of Tauromenium. The large number of *Olympionikai* that were compiled and their wide circulation is evident from the fact that the extensive papyrus finds from Oxyrhynchus in Egypt, an unexceptional city on the edge of the Greek world, include three different Olympic victor lists.

Only a fraction of the *Olympionikai* produced by ancient authors has come down to us, but the sum total of the extant text is nonetheless considerable. The *Olympionikai* of Eusebius, Diodorus Siculus, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus survive in something close to their original form. The only complete Olympic victor list extant is the catalog of winners in the *stadion* at Olympiads 1–249 found in Eusebius' *Chronographia*.[5] Diodorus' *Bibliotheca Historica* originally supplied the

---

[3] Because most Olympic victor lists survive in a fragmentary state, we are largely dependent on statements by ancient authors for information about their length. Those statements typically do nothing more than specify a number of books. The length of a book in an ancient prose work was generally in the neighborhood of 2,000 lines. There was, however, considerable variation, with the shortest books running to about 1,100 lines, the longest to more than 5,500. Even within individual works books could vary widely in length. Book 6 of Pausanias' *Graeciae Descriptio* contains 2,500 lines, Book 8 4,172. On book lengths, see Birt 1959 (1882), 307–41.

[4] Panodoros worked with his contemporary Annianos, but the precise nature of their association remains unclear. In the interests of simplicity, their joint efforts are here ascribed solely to Panodoros. For further discussion, see Sections 4.1–4.

[5] Eusebius produced a chronographic study in two books called the *Chronika*. The books were almost independent works, so each had its own preface and title. The first book was called the *Chronographia*, the second the *Chronikoi Kanones*. The Olympic victor list appeared only in the *Chronographia*.

names of *stadion* victors in the first 180 Olympiads, but the preserved sections of the work cover only the mythological period (before the beginning of the Olympics) and the 75th to the 119th Olympiads. Dionysius' *Antiquitates Romanae* originally supplied the names of *stadion* victors in the 68th to 129th Olympiads, but the preserved sections of the work end in the 85th Olympiad.[6] We also have lengthy fragments of *Olympionikai* by Castor, Phlegon, and the anonymous authors of *POxy* I 12, II 222, and XVII 2082. Numerous short fragments from about fifteen other *Olympionikai* are extant.

Olympic victor lists are of great interest to the modern scholar for five reasons. First, *Olympionikai* constitute a particular, well-defined type of literary work that has heretofore received little attention. Olympic victor lists came into being at a relatively late date and were never intended for performance, so it would be inappropriate to identify them as constituting a distinct literary genre, as that term is currently understood.[7] At the same time, *Olympionikai* served a specific range of functions and were a recognized and recognizable type of text with an expected constellation of features. There is, however, a tendency to treat each version of the Olympic victor list separately or in relation to one or two other such works, rather than collectively. Careful study of the surviving fragments of *Olympionikai* as a group makes it possible to add a small but important dimension to the current understanding of ancient Greek literary activity.

Second, Olympic victor lists present intriguing interpretive possibilities, many of which have never been properly explored. Among Foucault's intellectual legacies is the now widely accepted belief that the way humans organize and present knowledge reflects and affects their understanding of the world around them and the power structures of the society in which they live. More specifically, texts that systematize knowledge necessarily impose an order on the material they contain, an order that enshrines a particular worldview. *Olympionikai*, especially those *Olympionikai* that included historical

---

[6] The last *stadion* victor named is Crison, in the 83rd Olympiad. Fragments of the missing sections of both Diodorus' and Dionysius' histories survive, but not enough to complete their victor lists.

[7] On ancient and modern definitions of genre, see Conte 1994, 105–28. On genre in ancient historiography, see Marincola 1999.

notices, were by their very nature a means of systematizing knowledge. Olympic victor lists were structured in such a way as to create a uniform, endlessly extensible temporal grid based on the Olympic Games, which were a powerful symbol of Hellenic tradition and identity throughout classical antiquity. As a result, *Olympionikai* had a special attraction for authors of the Hellenistic and Roman periods interested in the relationship between past and present, Greek and non-Greek. What might seem to be a simple literary form can thus offer important insights into evolving *mentalités*.[8]

Third, *Olympionikai* were one of the means by which literate Greeks familiarized themselves with recent events in the Mediterranean basin. In the era before the printing press or electronic communications, there was a need for compact summaries of important happenings that could be easily updated.[9] This need was felt with particular urgency among Greeks, who were dispersed over an unusually large geographical area. The Greeks, like other premodern, literate cultures, responded by producing simply organized historical chronicles, and the Olympic victor list proved to be very useful for this purpose.[10] The resulting chronicles were organized on a strictly chronological basis and were internally divided on the basis of Olympiads. It was difficult to produce such a work with a larger narrative structure and clear ending. As Hayden White has noted, "The chronicle . . . often seems to wish to tell a story, aspires to narrativity, but typically fails to achieve it. More specifically, the chronicle usually is marked by a failure to achieve narrative closure. It does not so much conclude as simply terminate . . . *in medias res*, in the chronicler's own present. . . ."[11] The absence of a clear narrative structure was advantageous in that new chronicles organized around Olympiads could be quickly produced by copying some or all of the contents of earlier accounts and adding more recent

---

[8] For a discussion of the relevant parts of Foucault's work, see Smart 1985, 18–70. For the intellectual background to Foucault's work, see Burke 2000, 1–17. For a discussion of the potential interpretive importance of systematizing texts from classical antiquity, see König 2005, 1–44.

[9] On the dissemination of information in the classical world, see Lewis 1992 and Riepl 1913.

[10] For one significant comparandum, see Spiegel 1978 on chronicle writing in medieval France.

[11] White 1987, 5.

information to the end. We have fragments from twelve historical chronicles of this sort, and it is clear that they were quite popular in the ancient world. As a result, an exploration of Olympic victor lists can provide a glimpse of one of the ways Greeks learned about their world.

Fourth, Olympic victor lists were the basis of a widely used time-reckoning system and thus are critical to our understanding of the chronological underpinnings of Greek history. The reliability of the early parts of the Olympic victor list was the subject of vigorous, but ultimately inconclusive, debate in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Scholarship that has appeared since that time makes it possible to revisit this debate and to resolve many previously contentious issues such as the source of the date of 776 for the first Olympics. These issues are of potentially great significance because minor changes in our understanding of chronology can have major interpretive ramifications that impinge on such disparate issues as the conquest of Messenia by the Spartans and the introduction of athletic nudity. Finally, Olympic victor lists are a key source of information about the history of Greek athletics, a subject of enduring interest to both scholars and the general public.

Given the importance of *Olympionikai* and the large amount of textual evidence that is available, one might think that Olympic victor lists would have been the subject of monographic treatment in the past. In fact, no such treatment has ever been produced, nor have all the extant fragments of *Olympionikai* ever been collected in a single publication.[12] The reasons for this are not entirely clear, but they would at minimum include the fact that a thorough study of the Olympic victor lists requires a firm grounding in both Greek chronology and the history of Greek athletics. Felix Jacoby, for instance, demurred writing a detailed study of Hippias' *Olympionikai* on the grounds that such a study would require a full consideration of the *Grundlagen* of Greek chronology.[13] The quantity and quality of the scholarly literature

---

[12] Luigi Moretti assembled a list of the names of all known Olympic victors but did not print the source texts on which his list is based (Moretti 1957).

[13] Jacoby 1923–58, 3b1: 223. The emphasis that Jacoby and others placed on the work of the fifth-century "founders" of Greek historiography has probably also contributed to the neglect of *Olympionikai*. For the importance of Jacoby and his predecessor Eduard

on chronology and on athletics have improved considerably in the past half century, removing what may have been perceived as an insuperable obstacle.

Most of the important scholarly literature on Olympic victor lists consists of short studies dating to the period before World War II. The standard treatments remain the ten pages that Julius Jüthner devoted to *Olympionikai* in his 1909 commentary on Philostratus' *De Gymnastica* and the surprisingly brief discussion found in Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.*[14] The one aspect of Olympic victor lists that has attracted continuing attention from scholars, the first of whom was none other than Isaac Newton, has been the reliability of the names and dates in the early parts of the list. Articles continue to appear on this subject, but the parameters of the debate have not changed significantly in close to a century, and recent work has done little more than stir up old embers.

The time is ripe, therefore, for a systematic study of Olympic victor lists. *Olympionikai* have remained largely unknown in no small part due to the scattering of the relevant texts and scholarship in publications that have appeared over the course of more than two centuries. My goal in writing this book has been to bring together all of this material and to present it in a fashion that enables readers to work through it with relative ease. This is an overtly preliminary study that makes no claim to exhausting the interpretive possibilities of Olympic victor lists. Rather, my hope is that this book will facilitate future research on *Olympionikai*.

Before proceeding further, a few words on organization are in order. The remainder of this chapter supplies brief introductions to Greek chronography (Section 1.2) and to Panhellenic athletic festivals (1.3), a basic understanding of which is a prerequisite for any serious discussion

---

Schwartz in enshrining a relatively negative view of Hellenistic historiography, see Strasburger 1977. Another possible factor is the tendency to value narrative history over chronicles, on which see White 1987, 1–25.

[14] Jüthner 1909, 60–70 and Jacoby 1923–58, 3b1: 221–8. Gustav Gilbert's treatise on Olympic victor lists is at points strikingly insightful (Gilbert 1875). It is, however, only ten pages long and is thoroughly out of date because it was written before the excavations at Olympia and the publication of the papyrus finds from Oxyrhynchus. Bengtson's brief but widely cited comments on Olympic victor lists derive directly from Jüthner (Bengtson 1983, 21–5).

of Olympic victor lists. Those knowledgeable in these areas may find it expedient to move directly to Section 1.4, which contains a capsule history of Olympic victor lists and samples of different types of *Olympionikai*. Chapter 2 offers a detailed study of Hippias' *Olympionikai*, including the sources on which Hippias drew in compiling his victor catalog and hence the reliability of the early parts of the Olympic victor list. Chapter 3 treats *Olympionikai* that included both a victor catalog and extensive material on Olympia and the Olympic Games. Chapter 4 examines Olympic victor lists compiled by chronographers; Chapter 5 focuses on Olympic victor lists compiled by historians. Chapter 6 returns to the question of why *Olympionikai* repay careful attention. The reasons for arranging the material in this manner are discussed in Section 1.4.

A collection of all the known fragments of Olympic victor lists and the relevant testimonia can be found in Appendices 1 through 5. In order to avoid repetition, the fragments of *Olympionikai* treated in the main text are for the most part given in English translation only. References to the appropriate appendices are supplied to guide the reader to the Greek text. Appendices 6 through 15 contain treatments of various technical issues. I have placed this material in appendices because it supports and supplements the discussion in the main text while being sufficiently removed from the primary narrative as to be potentially distracting. Here again appropriate references are supplied to guide the reader.

1.2. A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO GREEK CHRONOGRAPHY

Prior to the fifth century, Greeks did not have any system of absolute chronology that was used beyond the boundaries of a single *polis*.[15] Moreover, even systems used only within individual *poleis* were

---

[15] A system of absolute chronology consists of an uninterrupted series of time units, each occupying a known, fixed span, and thus provides a uniform chronological scale. See Bickerman 1980, 62–79. The overview of the development of time-reckoning systems in ancient Greece given here is based on Ginzel 1906–14, 2: 350–60; Holford-Strevens 2005, 108–30; Mosshammer 1979, 84–127; and Samuel 1972, 189–248.

rare or perhaps nonexistent through the entirety of the Archaic period.[16] Indeed, Alden Mosshammer has argued that "there was not . . . a sense of historical time at all" before the fifth century.[17] Starting at the end of the sixth century, Greeks began showing an interest in developing systems capable of clearly quantifying temporal distance. Sometime around 500 Hecataeus of Miletus published his *Genealogiai*, which presented a rationalized account of the progression of generations in Greek myth. By establishing generational relationships among various mythological and historical figures, Hecataeus placed those figures into a chronological relationship. Although generational reckoning was a blunt instrument, the imposition of a fixed sequence of generations represented a major advance in imposing a uniform temporal grid on past and present.[18]

The next significant step was taken in the last third of the fifth century, when Greek communities began to identify individual years by reference to the name of an eponymous magistrate. The calculation of temporal distance between two events required a continuous list of magistrates so that the number of intervening eponyms could be counted. Most *poleis* eventually marked years on the basis of eponyms. This produced a bewildering array of time-reckoning arrangements, because each *polis* used its own magistrates as a reference point.

The multiplicity of eponym systems presented a serious problem for Greek authors interested in specifying dates in a fashion

---

[16] Ancient Greek history is frequently divided by modern scholars into the following periods: Geometric (900–700 BCE), Archaic (700–480), Classical (480–323), and Hellenistic (323–31).

[17] Mosshammer 1979, 85. The development in ancient Greece of what Mosshammer calls a sense of historical time has been the subject of much discussion. See Möller and Luraghi 1995 and Momigliano 1977, 179–204.

[18] On the mechanics of generational reckoning in ancient Greece, see Ball 1979; den Boer 1954, 5–54; and Prakken 1943, 1–48. Generational reckoning remained important even after the development of more precise means of measuring time because of the need to assign dates on a *post eventum* basis. On this subject, see Burn 1935. The chronographic significance of Hecataeus' work is a subject of some debate. Meyer believed that Hecataeus used generational relationships to date events (Meyer 1892, 1: 169–88). A number of scholars, including most recently Bertelli, have argued that Hecataeus did not exploit the chronographic potential of his genealogies. On Hecataeus, see Bertelli 2001; Hornblower 1994, 7–16; Jacoby 1912; and the bibliography cited therein.

comprehensible to large numbers of readers. One solution was to utilize the names of officials from three particularly influential communities, Sparta, Athens, and Argos, all of which seem to have developed eponym-based time-reckoning systems at an early date. Spartans began identifying years using the names of their ephors shortly after 440, and a list of Spartan kings and ephors was compiled, possibly by Charon of Lampsacus, at about this time. The Athenians employed the names of their archons for this purpose, and the Athenian archon list was inscribed on marble *stelai* and put on display in the agora sometime in the last quarter of the fifth century. In the second half of the fifth century, Hellanicus of Lesbos assembled a continuous list of the priestesses of Hera at Argos and specified the number of years that each priestess held the office. For each year thus defined, he listed events that took place in various parts of Greece.[19]

It is against this background that the initial compilation of the Olympic victor list must be understood. Hippias compiled the first complete list of Olympic victors sometime around 400. Hippias' catalog of Olympic victors was probably framed around an unnumbered series of *stadion* victors who functioned as eponyms, the same format used for the lists of Spartan ephors, Athenian archons, and priestesses of Hera. A fragment of the historian Philistus of Syracuse shows that Olympic *stadion* victors were being used as chronological referents in the first half of the fourth century. This indicates that the chronographic potential of Hippias' list of *stadion* victors was rapidly exploited.[20]

Once various systems of absolute dating had been established, it became necessary to clarify the relationship among those systems so that dates expressed in one fashion could be compared with those expressed in another. This was accomplished in the late fourth or early third century by Timaeus of Tauromenium who, according to Polybius, "matches the ephors with the kings of Sparta starting from the earliest times and sets the lists of Athenian archons and priestesses of Argos alongside the list of Olympic victors..." (12.11.1; see Appendix 4.2 for the Greek text).

---

[19] See Section 2.5 for further discussion of eponym lists and relevant bibliography.
[20] See Sections 2.1 and 2.5 for further discussion of the Philistus fragment.

The chronological system based on Olympiads eventually became predominant.[21] In part this was because Olympiads enjoyed the advantage of Panhellenic appeal and immediate familiarity. Another contributing factor was the innovation of numbering the Olympiads that was introduced by Aristotle in the second half of the fourth century.[22] Numeration made it possible to calculate the temporal distance between events without consulting the full list of eponyms and engaging in laborious counting.[23] The names of eponymous *stadion* victors continued to be used, in conjunction with numbered Olympiads, because the pairing of name and number helped prevent the corruption of the alphabetic numerals found in Greek manuscripts. Name and number could be checked against each other to ensure accuracy. This in turn meant that the Olympic victor list continued to be of considerable importance despite the advent of numbered Olympiads. It is important to keep in mind that Olympiad dates were used primarily in literary sources, particularly by historians and chronographers. Individual communities continued to maintain their own eponym systems, which were the basic time referents employed in documents such as laws and honorary decrees.[24]

---

[21] The Pythiads and Nemeads (though evidently not the Isthmiads) were eventually numbered, but the iterations of these contests were not used to date historical events. (On the numeration of the Pythiads, see Section 3.4. On the numeration of the Nemeads and not the Isthmiads, see Section 2.5.) There is a single use of the Actia games, which were founded by Augustus and which, like the Olympics, were held every four years, to date a historical event. In *De Bello Judaico* Josephus writes, "After the first Actiad, Caesar added to Herod's kingdom the area called Trachonitis . . ." (1.398.1). This must reflect a failed attempt to install Actiads as a parallel to or replacement for Olympiads.

[22] See Sections 3.2 and 3.4 for more on Aristotle's *Olympionikai*.

[23] Consider, for example, someone in what we would designate as 400 BCE who was interested in learning how long ago the Battle of Salamis had been fought and who knew that it took place during the archonship of Calliades in Athens and that this corresponded to the first year of the 75th Olympiad (480 BCE). If he used the archon date, he needed to locate a continuous list of Athenian archons, start with the current archon, and carefully count each of the eighty intervening names. Matters were much simpler if he used the Olympiad date because all he needed to know was that it was currently the first year of the 95th Olympiad in order to figure out that Salamis had been fought 80 years earlier.

[24] The growth of larger political units such as the Hellenistic kingdoms led to the development of dating systems that were used over large areas and that either supplemented or supplanted local time-reckoning arrangements. The Seleucids, for instance, employed a system that numbered years from the restoration of Seleucus to power in Babylon.

The dominance of Olympiad dating in literary contexts was also due in part to Eratosthenes of Cyrene (c. 285-c. 195). Eratosthenes produced an *Olympionikai* and a chronographic study called the *Peri Chronographion*. The latter was an extremely influential work that formed the basis of all subsequent chronographic endeavors in the Greek world. The *Peri Chronographion* provided dates for a wide range of important people and events in Greek history based on numbered Olympiads. In employing Olympiads Eratosthenes had to confront two problems. First, the *Peri Chronographion* began with the Trojan War and thus well before any possible date for the first Olympiad. Eratosthenes solved this problem by using the Spartan king list as the chronological frame for the period stretching from the Trojan War to the first Olympiad. Second, Olympiads were held every four years, and thus were not as precise a chronological indicator as annual eponymous magistrates. The solution adopted by Eratosthenes was to subdivide each Olympiad into years 1 through 4. An illustrative example of the resulting system can be found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Antiquitates Romanae*, in a passage that explores the date of the founding of Rome:

With respect to the final settlement or founding of Rome or whatever it should be called, Timaeus . . . says that it took place at the same time as the founding of Carthage, in the thirty-eighth year before the first Olympiad. . . . Porcius Cato does not make use of Greek chronological systems, but . . . declares that it occurred 432 years after the Trojan War. This year, according to the *Peri Chronographion* of Eratosthenes, corresponds to the first year of the 7th Olympiad. (1.74.1–2; see Appendix 4.3 for the Greek text)

Eratosthenes reinforced the importance of the Olympiads in general, and of the first Olympiad and the corresponding date of 776 in particular, by using the first Olympiad as a critical epoch. He divided the history of the world into three parts, the "obscure" period (stretching from creation to the Flood), the mythical period (from the Flood to the first Olympiad), and the historical period (everything after the first Olympiad).[25] This division was widely accepted, and so 776 became

---

[25] On Eratosthenes' eras, see Censorinus, *De Die Natali* 21.1–3, as well as Jacoby's comments on this passage (Jacoby 1923–58, 2d: 709–10). Astrid Möller has recently argued that Jacoby was wrong in believing that the Censorinus passage cited above reflects

the epoch that separated history from myth. Numerous modern scholars continue to identify 776 as the first firm chronological point in Greek history.[26]

Apollodorus of Athens (c. 180–c. 110) continued Eratosthenes' work in the *Chronika*, a treatise written in iambic trimeters. Apollodorus' work differed from that of Eratosthenes in that it was built around Athenian archons rather than numbered Olympiads. The reasons for this change are not entirely clear, but probably had something to do with Apollodorus' Athenian extraction and the fact that archon names fit more easily than Olympiad numbers into verse. The *Chronika* was complex and unwieldy and so was not widely used, but the dates contained therein were almost immediately summarized in chronological handbooks that enjoyed a great deal of popularity. Many of these handbooks deviated from the original in that dates were expressed in Olympiads, almost certainly under the influence of Eratosthenes' work. The Athenian archon list did, however, remain important in chronological systems, and a composite approach, utilizing both Olympiads and Athenian archons, was frequently employed.[27]

With the absorption of Greece into the Roman sphere of influence, it became necessary to synchronize Greek and Roman time-reckoning systems. Eventually, a dating system using Olympiads, Athenian archons, and Roman consuls came into being. Diodorus Siculus, for instance, starts his account of the first year of the 108th Olympiad (348 BCE) as follows:

Theophilos held the archonship in Athens, Gaius Sulpicius and Gaius Quintius were appointed consuls in Rome, and the 108th Olympiad was held, in which Polycles of Cyrene won the *stadion*. (16.53.1)

Eratosthenes' ideas (Möller 2005). She suggests instead that Wolfram Ax may be right in arguing that the threefold division of time in Censorinus ultimately derived from Castor of Rhodes (Ax 2000, 359). However one chooses to read the evidence, there can be no doubt that ancient chronographers used Olympiad 1 as an important dividing line between the periods of myth and of history.

[26] See, for example, the second edition of Oswyn Murray's *Early Greece*, in which 776 is marked as the first date in Greek history derived from chronologically reliable lists (Murray 1993, 310).

[27] On Apollodorus and his work, see the bibliography cited in n. 15, as well as Jacoby 1902a, 1–74 and *passim*.

The spread of Christianity created new challenges. Christians needed to incorporate the events recounted in the Hebrew scriptures into extant chronological systems. They also wished to demonstrate that Biblical history considerably antedated anything Greek. Theophilus of Antioch, whose work dates to the second half of the second century CE and who was one of the earlier Christian chronographers, puts it succinctly in his *Ad Autolycum*:

From the compilation of the periods of time and from all that has been said, the antiquity of the prophetic writings and the divine nature of our message are obvious. This message is not recent in origin, nor are our writings, as some suppose, mythical and false. They are actually more ancient and more trustworthy.[28] (3.29, trans. Robert Grant)

Christian chronographers necessarily concerned themselves with earlier time reckoning systems, including Olympiads, to which they needed to refer to make themselves understood.

Christian chronography rapidly developed an eschatological dimension. This is evident in the work of Sextus Julius Africanus (c. 160-c. 240 CE). Africanus wrote a five-book chronographic study, the *Chronographiai*, that synchronized sacred and secular history. In this work, Africanus dated events from creation, so that years were numbered *Annus Mundi*. He placed creation in the year corresponding to 5501 BCE, which put the birth of Jesus in 5501 AM. He expected the end of the world to come in 6000 AM, based on the idea that one millennium was allotted for each day of creation.[29] A different system, also structured around Christian beliefs, was created by Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260–c. 340 CE). Eusebius strongly opposed the eschatological, millenarian ideas that lay behind Africanus' *Annus Mundi* system.

---

[28] On the development of Christian chronography, see Adler 1989, *passim* and Landes 1988.

[29] Technically speaking, Africanus numbered years not from the creation of the world, but from the creation of Adam. This distinction is irrelevant in the present context but was of considerable importance to Christian chronographers. See Adler 1989, 43–6. Africanus supplied a highly specific date for creation: March 22, 5501 BCE. On this date, see Grumel 1958, 22–4 and Mosshammer 2006. On Africanus and his work, see the bibliography cited in n. 20 of Chapter 4.

Instead of dating from creation, Eusebius numbered years from the birth of Abraham, which he placed in the year corresponding to 2016 BCE.[30]

With the cessation of the Olympics in the early fifth century CE,[31] Olympiads rapidly went out of fashion as a means of reckoning time. The chronographic importance of Olympiads had in any case been gradually undermined by the imposition of Roman rule over the entire Mediterranean and the conversion of Rome into an empire. The names and regnal years of rulers had long been used in the Near East as chronological referents, and a similar system became the dominant means of reckoning time in the later Roman empire.

1.3. A VERY BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO PANHELLENIC ATHLETIC FESTIVALS

There were four major Panhellenic athletic festivals in ancient Greece: the Olympic, Pythian, Isthmian, and Nemean Games. The traditional founding date of 776 for the Olympics is, as we will see, open to question, but there can be no doubt that athletic contests were being held regularly at Olympia by the early seventh century at the latest. The Olympics, which had originally been attended almost exclusively by inhabitants of the area around Olympia, gradually developed a higher profile and became a truly Panhellenic event in the sixth century. The Olympics created a model that was followed at other sites. A preexisting festival at Delphi was reorganized in 586, giving rise to the Pythian Games. The Isthmian and Nemean Games were founded shortly thereafter. The Olympic and Pythian Games were held every four years, the Isthmian and Nemean Games every two years.[32] These four games were arranged in a four-year cycle so that they did not

---

[30] On Eusebius' views on chronology and eschatology, see Landes 1988. On Eusebius' views on the chronology of the earliest period of the world, see Adler 1989, 43–71 and Eusebius *Chronographia* 36.17–37.9 Karst.

[31] See the bibliography cited in n. 6 of Chapter 5.

[32] An excellent general survey of Greek athletics can be found in Miller 2004. On the development of the Olympics into a Panhellenic event, see Funke 2003; Morgan 1990, 26–105; and Ulf 1997b.

overlap. This cycle was known as the *periodos*, and athletes who won at all four games were known as *periodonikai*.[33]

There were two basic components of the *periodos* games, the *gymnikos agon* and the *hippikos agon*.[34] The program of events in the *gymnikoi* and *hippikoi agones* at the four *periodos* games was sufficiently similar that the Olympics can, for present purposes, be taken as typical. The array of contests evolved over the course of time, and the synopsis given here reflects the situation at the end of the third century, after which time few changes were made. The *gymnikos agon* consisted of four different footraces, the pentathlon, and the combat sports (boxing, wrestling, and *pankration*). The four footraces were the *stadion* (one length of the track, roughly 200 meters), the *diaulos* (two lengths of the track), the *dolichos* (typically 20–24 laps and so roughly 7–9 kilometers), and the *hoplites* (two lengths of the track, carrying armor).[35] Competitors in the *gymnikos agon* were divided into two age classes at Olympia and Delphi (boys and men) and into three age classes (boys, youths [*ageneioi*], and men) at Isthmia and Nemea. The *hippikos agon* consisted of chariot races for two and four horses and two and four colts as well as races for colts and horses. There were also contests for heralds and trumpeters, with the winners fulfilling these functions for the duration of the festival.

Notes about additions to the program of events at the Olympics were a basic feature of Olympic victor lists. The dates at which specific events were believed to have been added can be summarized as shown in Table 1.[36] The tradition that the Olympic Games originally consisted

---

[33] By the second century CE the idea of the *periodos* had been expanded to include some or all of the following contests: the Heraia at Argos, the Actia at Nicopolis, the Sebasta at Naples, and the Capitolia in Rome. See Golden 1998, 10–11.

[34] The *gymnikos agon* consisted of events conducted in the nude and hence its name was based on the Greek term for being unclothed (*gymnos*). The *hippikos agon* consisted of various kinds of equestrian contests and hence its name was based on the Greek word for horse (*hippos*). For the sake of convenience, these events are described below as gymnic and hippic. At the Pythian and Isthmian Games there was a third component, the *mousikos agon* (musical contests), which is not of interest here because there were no comparable contests at Olympia and hence no entries for victors in musical contests in Olympic victor lists.

[35] At Nemea there was a fifth footrace, the *hippios* (two laps of the track). The length of the *dolichos* varied from place to place. See Jüthner 1965–8, 2: 108–9.

[36] The relevant ancient sources are examined in detail in Section 3.5.

TABLE 1. *Additions to the Program of Events at Olympia*

Olympiad	Year	Event
1	776	*stadion*
14	724	*diaulos*
15	720	*dolichos*
18	708	pentathlon, wrestling
23	688	boxing
25	680	four–horse chariot race
33	648	*pankration*, horse race
37	632	boys' *stadion*, boys' wrestling
38	628	boys' pentathlon (immediately discontinued)
41	616	boys' boxing
65	520	*hoplites*
70	500	race for mule carts (discontinued in 444)
71	496	race for mares (discontinued in 444)
93	408	two–horse chariot race
96	396	heralds and trumpeters
99	384	four–colt chariot race
129	264	two–colt chariot race
131	256	colt race
145	200	boys' *pankration*

solely of the *stadion* accounts for the use of *stadion* victors as eponyms in the Olympic victor list.[37]

Olympia was located in the region of Elis in the northwestern Peloponnese. The region of Elis was not politically unified until a late date, and control over Olympia seems to have fluctuated between the residents of the Peneios River valley in northern Elis (Hollow Elis) and the residents of the Alpheios River valley (Pisatis) in southern Elis for a considerable period (see the map in Section 2.2). Hollow Elis gradually asserted control over most of the region of Elis during the course of the Archaic period and seems to have taken over Olympia in a definitive and final way in the second quarter of the sixth century.[38]

---

[37] See Appendix 9 for the evidence pertaining to the early program of events at Olympia. See Appendix 8 for the idea that Olympic victors in the *pankration* were used as eponyms before the time of Hippias.

[38] The history of Elis is treated in detail in Section 2.2.

The date at which athletic contests began at Olympia is unclear.[39] There are hundreds of dates in the ancient sources expressed in terms of numbered Olympiads. These numbered Olympiads imply a date for the first Olympiad, but this requires that they be converted into modern systems of time reckoning. Fortunately, several ancient authors place independently dateable events in specific Olympiads. Eusebius, for example, synchronizes the fifteenth year of Tiberius' reign with the fourth year of the 201st Olympiad (*Praeparatio Evangelica* 10.9.2–3), and Diodorus records a solar eclipse in the third year of the 117th Olympiad (20.5.5).[40] These and similar passages indicate that Olympiad 1 was placed in the year corresponding to 776.[41]

This is not the end of the matter, however, because most Greeks believed that what was designated as Olympiad 1 was not the first time games were held at Olympia. There seems to have been general agreement in the ancient world that contests were held intermittently at Olympia beginning in the "heroic" period (with Heracles or even earlier), so that what was identified as the first Olympics for the purposes of reckoning time (Olympiad 1) was not in fact the first

[39] The origins of the Olympic Games have been the subject of extended and as yet unresolved debate. Four basic possibilities have been identified. The Olympics might have originated in a funerary contest that was institutionalized, in initiatory rites that were gradually transformed, in games that were part of a recurring or intermittently celebrated religious rite, or in a purely secular fashion. The relevant evidence is sparse and late and does not support a definitive conclusion. This is not a matter of critical importance in the present context. For a thorough treatment of the sources, ancient and modern, see Ulf and Weiler 1980.

[40] On the evidence that connects the first Olympiad to the year corresponding to 776, see Clinton 1834, 1: 150–52 and Samuel 1972, 189–90.

[41] There has been a certain amount of confusion in the modern scholarship about the equation of Olympiad 1 with 776 because of the variant starting dates of different ancient calendars. The Olympics were timed to coincide with the second full moon after the summer solstice and hence took place in July or August (Miller 1975). Ancient chronographers typically equated each of the four years of an Olympiad with a corresponding year in the Athenian calendar, which also began in the summer. The overlap between what might be called Olympic years and other calendars was much less precise. A particular problem has been the Syro-Macedonian calendar, which placed the beginning of the year in the autumn. The various extant versions of Eusebius' *Chronikoi Kanones* have led some scholars to conclude that Eusebius synchronized Olympiads with Syro-Macedonian years and that he thus placed the first Olympiad in the year corresponding to 777. Others believe that this is simply a problem of textual transmission. On this subject, see the conflicting opinions expressed in Burgess 1999, 28–35 and Mosshammer 2006. It is here assumed that Eusebius equated Olympiad 1 with 776.

Olympics. At least some chronographers placed the first games held at Olympia in the year corresponding to 1581 BCE.[42] There was a consensus that the continuous series of Olympiads that ran until the fifth century CE began when the Games were refounded by Lycurgus of Sparta and Iphitos of Elis, and there was a concomitant tendency to identify the Lycurgus-Iphitos Olympics as the first Olympiad. Even this was a problem, however, because there were two divergent dates assigned to the Olympiad organized by Lycurgus and Iphitos, 884 and 776.[43]

The date of the first celebration of games at Olympia is typically given as 776 in modern scholarship because Olympic victor lists began with Coroibos of Elis, whose victory in the *stadion* was placed by ancient Greeks in the year corresponding to 776. The identity of Coroibos as the first recorded Olympic victor is most evident in the Olympic victor list preserved in Eusebius' *Chronographia*, which begins with Coroibos.[44] A range of other sources make it clear that Eusebius expressed a standard opinion in listing Coroibos as the first recorded Olympic victor.[45] The placement of Coroibos' Olympic victory in the year corresponding to 776 is also evident from Eusebius, who uses the Coroibos Olympics as an epoch and synchronizes it with dates expressed in a variety of other time-reckoning systems. Here again Eusebius simply adopted a well-established position. The preserved fragments of Aristotle's *Olympionikai* show that he almost certainly dated the first Olympiad to 776.[46] Eratosthenes (*FGrH* 241 F1a) and Apollodorus (*FGrH* 244 F61a) both dated the first Olympiad by means of intervals to later events, such as the Peloponnesian War and the death of Alexander.[47] These events are independently dateable, and

---

[42] See Appendix 14.

[43] See Section 2.8 for further discussion.

[44] See Appendix 4.1 for the text. Pindar (*Olympian X*) gives a list of victors in the Olympiad organized by Heracles, but the mythical figures mentioned by Pindar do not appear in any known catalog of Olympic victors. On this subject, see Appendix 6.

[45] See, for example, Athenaeus 382b, Aristodemus of Elis *FGrH* 414 F1, Callimachus F541 Pfeiffer, Eustathius *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* 3.308.16–17, Pausanias 5.8.6, Phlegon *FGrH* 257 F1, scholiast Lucian *Lucianic* work 41 section 9, Strabo 8.3.30, and Tiberius Claudius Polybius *FGrH* 254 F2.

[46] See Section 3.2.

[47] See Section 2.8.

they show that both Eratosthenes and Apollodorus, the two most prominent chronographers of the ancient world, dated the Olympiad in which Coroibos won the *stadion* to the year corresponding to 776.

Eratosthenes and Apollodorus, however, both believed that the continuous series of Olympiads began with Lycurgus and Iphitos, whose Olympics they placed in the year corresponding to 884. Those who subscribed to Eratosthenes' and Apollodorus' ideas described the Olympiads between 884 and 776 as "unregistered" because the names of the victors in them were not recorded.[48] The potential confusion about what precisely is meant by the term "first Olympiad" or "Olympiad 1" is sometimes avoided by describing the games held in 776 as the "Coroibos Olympics."

All this goes to show that there was considerable dispute even in the ancient world about when games were held at Olympia for the first time and about when the continuous series of Olympiads began. The problem is further compounded by the fact that all the dates in the ancient Greek sources pertaining to the early history of Olympia and the Olympic Games rest on weak foundations and cannot be taken as trustworthy.[49] The literary sources that suggest a date of 776 for the first Olympics are thus problematic in a number of different ways.

The archaeological data from Olympia does not provide a significantly higher level of clarity. Olympia became a sanctuary of Zeus

---

[48] The entire structure of Olympiad dating is nicely summarized in the following scholion to Lucian (Lucianic work 41 section 9):

Among the ancients the number of the Olympiad was used for the identification of years. Thus, for example, "The following thing took place in the 100th Olympiad [----]." And this was recognition of the precision of the years, just like the annual magistracy of the Athenian archons among the Athenians, on which basis it was recorded, "in the archonship in Athens of such and such a person the following thing took place." The annual notes of the consuls [were used for the same purpose] among the Romans. The registration of the Olympiads begins with Iphitos who renewed the Olympic Games, which began with Heracles, as Pindar says: "Indeed, Heracles established the Olympic Games" [*Olympian II* 5]. The contest having been neglected until the time of Iphitos, he next renewed it, but as the victors were not registered, the games remained unmarked for a long period of time. From which, as Callimachus relates, thirteen Olympiads from [----] in the 14th Olympiad a certain Coroibos won the *stadion*, from which the registration of the Olympiads occurs and this Olympiad is placed first in order. But others say that from the time when Heracles the son of Alcmene founded the contest at Olympia to the first numbered Olympiad there are 459 years.

[49] See Section 2.8.

by 1000 and large dedications in the form of monumental bronze tripods began by 875.[50] Tripods frequently functioned as prizes in athletic contests, and so the tripods at Olympia have been seen as evidence of the existence of games prior to the eighth century. Tripods were, however, dedicated for a range of reasons, not all of which had to do with athletic contests.[51] The votives found at Olympia indicate that it was originally patronized primarily by residents of the immediately surrounding regions and that visitors from a gradually widening area began to frequent the site in the last quarter of the eighth century. Major work was carried out in the sanctuary at the end of the eighth century, including the diversion of the river Cladeos and the digging of wells to accommodate the needs of spectators. This has led the excavators at the site to suggest a date of around 700 for the inception of the Olympics.[52] It remains possible, nonetheless, that games of purely local significance were held at Olympia prior to 700.

1.4. A CAPSULE HISTORY OF *OLYMPIONIKAI*

We can now turn our attention back to Olympic victor lists. The purpose of this section is to outline the history of *Olympionikai* from beginning to end. The reason for this arrangement is that there are numerous, complex, interlocking questions about the development, structure, and contents of Olympic victor lists. It is to be hoped that the summary treatment offered here will make it easier to work through the sometimes intricate argumentation in later chapters.

The reader should be aware that this section is proleptic in that it incorporates but does not defend a number of conclusions reached

---

[50] The archaeological data is summarized in Morgan 1990, 26–105, though see now also Eder 2001a, Eder 2003, and Kyrieleis 2002. Morgan concludes that "the earliest and most likely time for the beginning of wider participation in the Olympiads is the last quarter of the eighth century, and there are no grounds for pushing back any further a formalised Olympic games on the later model" (48).

[51] See Appendix 9. W. D. Heilmeyer has argued that the date of 776 can be supported archaeologically on the basis of Geometric statuettes found at Olympia (Heilmeyer 1972, 90 and Heilmeyer 1979, 19–24), but this has been effectively refuted by Herrmann (1982). See also Cartledge 1982.

[52] Mallwitz 1988.

in subsequent parts of the work. Many of the points discussed in this section are based directly on my own analysis of the frequently imperfect evidence. I have made a concerted effort to introduce appropriate qualifications, but it is impossible to present a history of *Olympionikai* that is both concise and fully nuanced. Cross-references are supplied throughout to detailed presentations of the relevant evidence and scholarship found in Chapters 2 through 5. My expectation is that some readers will find it expedient to pursue cross-references that pertain to points of particular interest to themselves, whereas others will prefer to proceed in a more linear fashion and simply read from the beginning of the book to the end.

The only clear statement in the ancient sources about the genesis of the first *Olympionikai* can be found in Plutarch's *Numa*:

It is difficult to make precise statements about chronology, and especially chronology based on the names of Olympic victors. They say that Hippias of Elis produced the list of Olympic victors at a late date, starting with nothing authoritative that would encourage trust in the result. (1.4; see Section 2.1 for the Greek text)

Plutarch's wording implies that Hippias' Olympic victor list was known as *Olympionikon Anagraphe* (*Register of Olympic Victors*).[53]

The heart of Hippias' *Anagraphe* was a catalog of Olympic victors that began with the iteration[54] of the Olympics organized by Iphitos of Elis and Lycurgus of Sparta in 776. Hippias identified the 776 Olympics as "first" because he believed that it was at this point that an unbroken series of iterations of the Games began. Individual Olympiads in the catalog were identified solely by the names of *stadion* victors. The catalog itself seems to have been very simple. It consisted of a listing of the names of all the victors at each Olympiad, along with their hometowns and events in which they won.

Hippias' *Anagraphe* also seems to have included a considerable amount of historical material, in no small part because Hippias produced his *Olympionikai* in order to buttress Elean claims to Olympia

---

[53] Hippias' *Olympionikai* is treated in detail in Chapter 2.
[54] The term "iteration" is used to describe one occurrence of any athletic contest that was held on a regular basis at fixed intervals.

and the surrounding regions, which were threatened by Sparta. This historical material identified the Spartans in general and Lycurgus in particular as playing a major role in establishing Elean control of Olympia and adjacent territories, a clever maneuver that made it more difficult for Sparta to take control of Olympia away from Elis.

Hippias played a pivotal role in the history of *Olympionikai* because he compiled the first cumulative catalog of Olympic victors. Before Hippias produced his *Anagraphe*, lists of victors in at least some specific iterations of the Olympics were inscribed on bronze plaques displayed at Olympia. In addition, there were numerous dedications of and honorary inscriptions to individual Olympic victors, both at Olympia and elsewhere, that preserved relevant information. There were also orally transmitted stories about successful athletes. There was, however, no single document, epigraphic or otherwise, that contained a complete, sequentially organized list of Olympic victors.

The complexity of the task that Hippias undertook is not to be underestimated. The material with which he worked contained substantial lacunae that could be made good only with great difficulty. Moreover, the written records at his disposal were not organized in anything resembling a systematic fashion, did not reach back beyond the sixth century, and offered little or no internal dating information. Hippias, as a result, faced serious challenges, first in assembling an exhaustive list of victors, and then in putting those victors into an accurate chronological sequence.

Hippias seems to have begun by calculating a starting date for the first Olympiad in his victor catalog. He probably did so by associating that Olympiad with Lycurgus and then using the Spartan king list and generational reckoning to arrive at a date. (Lycurgus was believed to have been the offspring of a Spartan king.) Hippias then distributed the names he collected into the space between the first Olympiad in his catalog and his own time. The date of 776 should thus be understood as an approximation. The participation of Lycurgus in the first Olympiad is far from certain, generational dating was notoriously inaccurate, and widely variant dates for Lycurgus were circulated in the ancient world. In addition, the archaeological evidence from Olympia has been taken to show that athletic contests did not begin at the site until sometime around 700. Though the archaeological evidence is too ambiguous to

be conclusive, it too suggests that the date of 776 ought not be treated with reverence.

The accuracy of the early parts of the Olympic victor list, roughly speaking the period before the early sixth century, is also problematic. Many if not most of the names in the Olympic victor list, including those for the early Olympiads, are likely to be correct in the sense that the individual in question won an Olympic victory at some point. At the same time, there is no reason to think that Hippias had anything but the most approximate sense of when earlier athletes won their victories. The precision that is suggested by the placement of specific individuals in specific Olympiads, such as Antimachos of Elis in the 2nd Olympiad and hence 772, is illusory. This means that the entries in the early parts of the Olympic victor list cannot serve as the bases of sound argumentation unless they can be confirmed from alternative sources, which are almost always lacking.

Hippias' *Olympionikai* was supplanted by another recension of the Olympic victor list produced by Aristotle in the 330s.[55] Aristotle's *Olympionikai* contained both a catalog of Olympic victors that listed the winners in all events and a collection of information on the history and structure of the Olympics. Aristotle introduced an important innovation in numbering the Olympiads. Thereafter individual iterations of the Olympics were identified by both the name of a *stadion* victor and a number. Hippias' *Olympionikai* is never cited by later authors, quite possibly because the Olympiads in its victor catalog were not numbered, which meant that it was difficult to use and functionally obsolete by the second half of the fourth century.

Timaeus of Tauromenium stands next in the line of compilers of Olympic victor lists. Timaeus was born c. 350 in Sicily and spent much of his life in exile in Athens. He produced an important chronographic study with the title *Olympic Victors or Praxidikan Chronological Matters*.[56] In this work, Timaeus synchronized four lists of eponyms: Spartan kings and ephors, Athenian archons, priestesses of Hera at Argos, and Olympic victors.

---

[55] On Aristotle's *Olympionikai*, see Sections 3.2 and 3.4.
[56] This title (Ὀλυμπιονίκας ἤτοι χρονικὰ πραξίδικα) is difficult to translate into English because the significance of the second part is not clear. On Timaeus and his work, see Section 4.5.

Timaeus' *Olympionikai* represented a new form of Olympic victor list in that it was a purely chronographic document. The *Olympionikai* of Hippias and Aristotle both responded to a real interest in the history of the Olympic Games and in Olympic victors. In Timaeus' *Olympionikai*, however, chronographic issues were front and center. Timaeus used Olympiads and Olympic victors simply as one of a number of different means of reckoning time. He probably supplied only the names of *stadion* victors, and not a complete catalog of all the winning athletes in each Olympiad, because, for chronographic purposes, the names of the other victors were superfluous. The stripped-down Olympic victor list exhibited by Timaeus was likely presented as one part of a table in which various eponym systems were laid side by side so that dates from one system could be quickly converted to another.

Timaeus was also responsible for another important innovation. In his *Historiai* (a history of Magna Graecia), he began the practice of using numbered Olympiads to date historical events. This rapidly became a standard approach among Greek historians. Timaeus did not, however, take the next obvious step and organize the narrative in his *Historiai* on the basis of numbered Olympiads. In the late fifth century, Hellanicus wrote a historical chronicle organized annalistically using the list of the priestesses of Hera at Argos as the framework and a local history of Athens that probably used Athenian kings and archons in the same way.[57] It was merely a matter of time until someone used the Olympic victor list in a similar fashion, particularly after Aristotle numbered the Olympiads. A significant hurdle that needed to be overcome in producing a historical chronicle with Olympiads as a framework was that all the dates found in earlier sources needed to be converted into Olympiads. Timaeus' *Olympionikai* made it possible to do this with relative ease, and it is almost certainly not coincidental that Philochorus, who wrote the first known chronicle organized around Olympiads, lived in the same city at the same time as Timaeus.

Philochorus was born c. 340 and enjoyed a long career as an author and religious official in Athens.[58] He produced an *Olympionikai* in two books with the title *Olympiades*. The title is significant because it

---

[57] There is some debate as to whether Hellanicus' history of Athens (*Atthis*) was annalistic or not. See the bibliography in n. 123 of Chapter 2.

[58] On Philochorus, see Section 5.1.

emphasizes Olympiads rather than Olympic victors and signals a concomitant shift in subject matter. Whereas earlier *Olympionikai* focused on the Olympic Games and Olympic victors or the chronological ramifications of the Olympic victor list, the *Olympiades* was primarily a historical chronicle that included the names of Olympic victors for chronological purposes. The text consisted of entries for each Olympiad, identified by number and the names of one or more victors. Each entry listed important historical events that took place during the Olympiad in question.

By the early third century, then, three types of Olympic victor list had come into being: (1) simple listings of Olympic victors, (2) catalogs of Olympic victors that were modified to fulfill purely chronographic functions, and (3) catalogs of Olympic victors that included historical notices. Most versions of the Olympic victor list that were subsequently produced can be placed under one of these three headings, in part because *Olympionikai* typically fulfilled one of a limited number of functions and were composed accordingly and in part because later writers were aware of the precedents set by Hippias, Aristotle, Timaeus, and Philochorus. Once these authors had produced their *Olympionikai*, they began a chain of transmission that continued thereafter. Authors working on *Olympionikai* drew on the texts of their predecessors for victor catalogs, which they then updated, and no doubt copied other information as well.[59] This helped make anyone compiling an *Olympionikai* cognizant of the structure and contents of earlier works of the same sort.

As the *Olympionikai* produced after the time of Philochorus are more easily understood when treated as examples of one of these three types (and hence not generic Olympic victor lists), the discussion that follows is based on this tripartite classification. A cautionary note is, however, in order. Each of the three categories of Olympic victor list should be understood as an ideal type that functions as a heuristic device rather than as precise description. *Olympionikai* were produced in considerable numbers for nearly a millennium. Authors compiled versions of the Olympic victor list that suited their own ends, so that each edition of the Olympic victor list was in some ways unique.

---

[59] For further discussion of the high level of interconnection between various *Olympionikai*, see Appendix 17.

Moreover, there was never anything approaching a prescription for composition that rigidly guided the choices of authors who produced Olympic victor lists. Authors of *Olympionikai* were conscious of their predecessors' work while pursuing their own ends. As John Marincola has shown, "the dictates of ancient literary criticism enjoined authors to work within a tradition, and to show their innovation within that tradition."[60] All this goes to say that there is sufficient uniformity in *Olympionikai* to make the categorization of different versions of the Olympic victor list useful, but the limits of the signification of such categories need to be kept in the foreground.

It is, for obvious reasons, critical to have at our disposal terminology that clearly differentiates the three types of Olympic victor list. The terminology utilized here is largely my own. The Olympic victor list as it was first compiled will hereafter be identified as a standard catalog of Olympic victors. Standard catalogs were cumulative registers of Olympic victors that listed the winners in all events but provided very little in the way of information beyond victors' names, hometowns, and the events in which they won. Catalogs of Olympic victors that contained additional chronographic information will be called chronographic catalogs of Olympic victors. Chronographic catalogs seem to have given the names only of winners in the *stadion*. Catalogs of Olympic victors with added historical notices will be referred to as Olympiad chronicles.[61] The victor lists in Olympiad chronicles

---

[60] Marincola 1997, 258. For further discussion, see pp. 12–19 of the same work, as well as Marincola 1999.

[61] The term "Olympiad chronicle" is applied here to all historical works that were built around a framework of numbered Olympiads and named Olympic victors, regardless of the length and format of the historical notices supplied for each Olympiad. The defining traits of chronicles (as opposed to narrative histories) are normally considered to be (1) presentation of material in strict chronological order and (2) minimal authorial interpretation or comment. All Olympiad chronicles clearly conform to the former criterion. The latter is less immediately applicable to works such as Diodorus' *Bibliotheca Historica*. Even in the case of Diodorus, however, the choice to present material in chronological order divided by Olympiads had notable implications (see Chapter 6). It is possible to arrive at a different, and equally valid, definition of the term Olympiad chronicle by putting aside the presence or absence of named Olympic victors as a criterion and by placing more emphasis on the format of the historical notices attached to each numbered Olympiad. For such an approach, see the forthcoming work of R. W. Burgess and Michael Kulikowski cited in n. 105 of Chapter 2. For a discussion of the terms "annal," "chronicle," and "history," see Croke 2001.

supplied either the names of the winners in all events or just those in the *stadion*.

Catalogs of Olympic victors were incorporated into different kinds of treatises, and so it is also necessary to supply terminology for these larger works. Standard catalogs of Olympic victors circulated as stand-alone works and appeared in treatises that provided information about Olympia and the Olympic Games. These treatises are here called *Olympionikon anagraphai*.[62] Chronographic catalogs of Olympic victors were invariably incorporated into larger chronographic studies that contained lists of magistrates and kings that were used to reckon time. These larger studies will be called Olympiad chronographies. Only a single term is necessary to describe catalogs of Olympic victors with added historical notices and the works in which those catalogs appeared – Olympiad chronicles – because in this instance the catalog of victors and the work as a whole were coterminous. The resulting terminological system is summarized in Table 2.

In view of the fact that *Olympionikai* remain a relatively obscure form of literature, it may also be helpful to provide short samples of each type of Olympic victor catalog. A standard catalog of Olympic victors is preserved on *POxy* II 222, which dates to the middle of the third century CE and consists of two columns of text, the contents of which cover the 75th through 78th and 81st through 83rd Olympiads (480–468, 456–448).[63] Here is a section of text from column 1 (see Appendix 3.4 for the Greek text):

76th Scamandros of Mytilene *stadion*
Dandis of Argos *diaulos*
[. . .] [[. .]] of Laconia *dolichos*
[. . . . .] of Taras pentathlon
[. . . . .] of Maroneia wrestling
Euthymos of Locris in Italy boxing
Theogenes of Thasos *pankration*

---

[62] The usage adopted here proceeds by analogy with the title of Hippias' *Olympionikai*. *Anagraphe* was regularly used in Greek texts to describe documents consisting of sequentially listed information such as registers of names. *Pinax* was occasionally used in the same way. On the meaning of *anagraphe* and *pinax*, see Aly 1929, 46–9; Pritchett 1996, 27–33; and Wilhelm 1909, 257–75. The term *anagraphe* is capitalized when used as part of the title of Hippias' *Olympionikai* and otherwise left in lower case.

[63] For a full treatment of *POxy* II 222, see Section 3.5.

TABLE 2. *Terminology for Different Types of* Olympionikai

Type of Catalog of Olympic Victors	Terminology for Catalog	Terminology for Treatise in Which That Type of Catalog Appeared
Simple listing of winners in all events	Standard catalog of Olympic victors	*Olympionikon anagraphe* (standard catalogs also circulated as stand-alone works)
Listing of *stadion* victors with supplemental chronographic information	Chronographic catalog of Olympic victors	Olympiad chronography
Listing of victors in all events or just of *stadion* victors with added notices of historical events that took place in each Olympiad	Olympiad chronicle	Olympiad chronicle

[. . . . . . .] of Laconia boys' *stadion*
Theognetos of Aegina boys' wrestling
Agesidamos of Locris in Italy boys' boxing
[. . .]uros of Syracuse *hoplites* most powerfully of all
Theron of Acragas four-horse chariot
Hieron of Syracuse horse race

77th Dandis of Argos *stadion*
[. . .]ges of Epidauros *diaulos*
Ergoteles of Himera *dolichos*
[. . .]amos of Miletus pentathlon
[- - - -]menes of Samos wrestling
Euthymos of Locris in Italy boxing
Callias of Athens *pankration*
[. . .]sandridas of Corinth boys' *stadion*
[. . .]cratidas of Taras boys' wrestling
Tellon of Mainalos boys' boxing
[. . .]gias of Epidamnos *hoplites*, winning twice

Demos of Argos four-horse chariot
Hieron of Syracuse horse race

78th Parmeneides of Poseidonia *stadion*
Parmeneides the same *diaulos*
[. . .]medes of Laconia *dolichos*
[- – – –]tion of Taras pentathlon in the friendliest fashion
Epharmostos of Opous wrestling
Menalces of Opous boxing
Epitimadas of Argos *pankration*
Lycophron of Athens boys' *stadion*
[. . .]emos of Parrhasia boys' wrestling most beautifully
[. . .]nes of Tiryns boys' boxing
[. . .]los of Athens *hoplites*
Hieronymos [Hieron?] of Syracuse four-horse chariot

A chronographic catalog of Olympic victors is found in Eusebius'
Chronographia. Four short sections from this catalog will give the flavor
of the whole (see Appendix 4.1 for the Greek text):

1st Olympiad, in which Coroibos of Elis won the *stadion*.
   For this was the only contest in which they competed for thirteen
   Olympiads.
2nd. Antimachos of Elis *stadion*.
   Romos and Romulos were born.
3rd. Androclos of Messenia *stadion*.
4th. Polychares of Messenia *stadion*.
5th. Aischines of Elis *stadion*.
6th. Oibotas of Dyme *stadion*.
7th. Diocles of Messenia *stadion*.
   Romulos founded Rome.
8th. Anticles of Messenia *stadion*.
9th. Xenocles of Messenia *stadion*.
10th. Dotades of Messenia *stadion*.
11th. Leochares of Messenia *stadion*.
12th. Oxythemis of Coroneia *stadion*.
13th. Diocles of Corinth *stadion*.
14th. Desmon of Corinth *stadion*.
   The *diaulos* was also added, and Hypenos of Elis won.
. . .
54th. Hippostratos of Croton *stadion*.

Arechion of Phigaleia, being strangled, died while winning the *pankration* for the third time. His corpse was crowned, his opponent having conceded defeat, his leg having been broken by Arechion.

55th. Hippostratos, the same man, for a second time.

This was when Cyrus became king of the Persians.

56th. Phaidros of Pharsalos *stadion*.

57th. Ladromos of Laconia *stadion*.

. . .

114th. Micinas of Rhodes *stadion*.

Alexander died, after which his empire was divided up among many, and Ptolemy became king of Egypt and Alexandria.

115th. Damasias of Amphipolis *stadion*.

116th. Demosthenes of Laconia *stadion*.

117th. Parmenides of Mytilene *stadion*.

118th. Andromenes of Corinth *stadion*.

Antenor of Athens or Miletus, (won) the *pankration*, uncontested, a *periodonikes*, unconquered in three age groups.

119th. Andromenes of Corinth *stadion*.

120th. Pythagoras of Magnesia-on-Maeander *stadion*.

Ceras of Argos (won) the wrestling, he who tore the hooves off a cow.

. . .

183rd. Theodoros of Messenia *stadion*.

Julius Caesar was sole ruler of the Romans.

184th. The same, a second time.

Augustus became emperor of the Romans.

185th. Ariston of Thurii *stadion*.

Much of the supplemental information found in the Eusebian list, such as the accession of Cyrus in the 55th Olympiad and the reigns of the Roman emperors, was present because it was chronographically significant. Cyrus, for example, was a key link between Persian, Greek, and Biblical chronologies. The catalog of Olympic victors in the *Chronographia* was but one of twenty-three different lists of magistrates and rulers that were used as the bases of the chronological systems of the Assyrians, Medes, Lydians, Persians, Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans.[64] The *Chronographia* was thus what is here called an Olympiad chronography.

---

[64] On Eusebius' chronographic work, see Sections 4.1–4.4.

The catalogs of Olympic victors in Olympiad chronicles supplied either the names of victors in all events or just those of *stadion* victors. A good example of an Olympiad chronicle with a full victor listing can be found in a fragment from an *Olympionikai* written by Phlegon of Tralleis, who worked in the second century CE.[65] Photius, a ninth-century CE Byzantine scholar, wrote a careful summary of Phlegon's Olympiad chronicle. Photius evidently copied verbatim the beginning of the last entry he read, the one for the 177th Olympiad (72 BCE). The repeated use of καί ("and") at the beginning of sentences in the appended historical notices indicates that Photius summarized rather than copied this part of the entry, but Photius nonetheless supplies a good sense of what the work looked like.

I have read as far as the 177th Olympiad, in which Hecatomnos of Miletus won the *stadion* and the *diaulos* and the *hoplites*, winning three times, Hypsicles of Sicyon *dolichos*, Gaius of Rome *dolichos*, Aristonymidas of Cos pentathlon, Isidoros of Alexandria wrestling, winning the *periodos* without having suffered a fall, Atyanas son of Hippocrates of Adramytteion boxing, Sphodrias of Sicyon *pankration*, Sosigenes of Asia boys' *stadion*, Apollophanes of Cyparissiae boys' wrestling, Soterichos of Elis boys' boxing, Calas of Elis boys' *pankration*, Hecatomnos of Miletus *hoplites*, he who was crowned three times in the same Olympiad, for the *stadion*, *diaulos*, and *hoplites*, Aristolochos of Elis four-horse chariot, Hagemon of Elis horse race, Hellanicos of Elis two-horse chariot, the same man four-colt chariot, Cletias of Elis two-colt chariot, Callipos of Elis colt race.

Lucullus was laying siege to Amisus, and having left Murena with two legions to carry on the siege, he himself set out with three other legions to Cabeira, where he went into winter quarters. And he ordered Hadrian to wage war on Mithridates, and upon attacking Hadrian was victorious. And there was an earthquake in Rome that destroyed much of the city. And many other things happened in this Olympiad. And in the third year of this Olympiad the census of the Romans reckoned their number as 910,000. And upon the death of Sinatrouches the king of the Parthians, Phraates succeeded to the throne, the one called Theos. And Phaidros the Epicurean was succeeded by Patron. And Vergilius Maro the poet was born in this year, on the ides of October. In the fourth year Tigranes and Mithridates, having collected 40,000 infantry and 30,000 cavalry, arranging them in the Italian

---

[65] Phlegon's work is discussed in detail in Section 5.7.

fashion, attacked Lucullus. And Lucullus won, and 5,000 of Tigranes' men fell in battle and a larger number was taken prisoner, without taking into account the rest of the general rabble. And Catulus dedicated the Capitoline in Rome, and Metellus, having set out to make war in Crete, having three legions, came to the island, and defeating Lasthenes in battle, he was acknowledged as imperator, and he shut the Cretans within their walls. And Athenodoros the pirate, having enslaved the Delians, shamefully maltreated the images of the so-called gods, but Gaius Triarius, having repaired the damaged parts of the *polis*, fortified Delos. (*FGrH* 257 F12; see Appendix 5.7 for the Greek text)

Other Olympiad chronicles supplied only the Olympiad number and *stadion* victor. One such Olympiad chronicle survives on *POxy* I 12. This is a third-century CE papyrus that contains six columns of writing with short lacunae at the top and bottom of each column.[66] The following section, covering the years 348–337, is typical of the whole (see Appendix 5.9 for the Greek text):

[Column 1]
In the 108th Olympiad, Polycles of Cyrene won the *stadion*, and the archons at Athens were Theophilos, Themistocles, Archias, and Euboulos. In the first year of this Olympiad, the philosopher Plato died and Speusippos succeeded him as head of the school. In the second year, Philip [lacuna due to cutting down of papyrus]

[Column 2]
In the 109th Olympiad, Aristolycos of Athens won the *stadion*, and the archons at Athens were Lyciscos, Pythodotos, Sosigenes, and Nicomachos. In the second year of this Olympiad, Dionysius II, tyrant of Sicily, having fallen from power, sailed to Corinth and remained there, teaching letters. In the fourth year, the eunuch Bagoas murdered Ochos, the king of the Persians, and established the youngest of Ochos' sons, Arses, as king, while he himself controlled everything.

In the 110th Olympiad, Anticles of Athens won the *stadion*, and the archons at Athens were Theophrastos, Lysimachides, Chairondes, and Phrynichos. In the first of these years, the Samnites arrayed themselves for battle against the Romans. In the second year, the Latins, having banded together, attacked the Romans. In the third year, Philip, the king of the Macedonians, defeated

---

[66] For a full treatment of *POxy* I 12, see Section 5.9.

the Athenians and Boeotians in the famous battle at Chaeronea; his son Alexander fought with him and distinguished himself. And at that time Isocrates the rhetor died, having lived about ninety years [lacuna due to cutting down of papyrus, text for this entry continues in next column]

[Column 3]
the eunuch Bagoas killed Arses, the king of the Persians, along with his brothers, and he established Dareios the son of Arsames, who belonged to the royal family, as king in Arses' place. And at that time the Romans fought against the Latins. In the fourth year, the assembly of the Greeks met and chose Philip to be supreme commander in the war against the Persians.

The historical notices in *POxy* I 12 are quite brief, but the same basic format could be used in much more elaborate chronicles. This is apparent from Diodorus' *Bibliotheca Historica*. Diodorus built the sections of the *Bibliotheca* covering the years after 776 around a framework that is nearly identical to that found in *POxy* I 12.[67] His historical account is annalistic and uses numbered Olympiads and *stadion* victors, along with the names of the Athenian archon and Roman consuls, to identify the first year of each Olympiad. When the account of the first year of an Olympiad ends, the arrival of the next year is noted through citation of the succeeding Athenian archon and Roman consuls. The following passage is typical (see Appendix 5.3 for the Greek text):

When this year had passed, Theophilos held the archonship in Athens, Gaius Sulpicius and Gaius Quintius were appointed consuls in Rome, and the 108th Olympiad was held, in which Polycles of Cyrene won the *stadion* (348 BCE). During the magistracies of these men, Philip, who was eager to lay hands on the *poleis* of the Hellespont, seized Mecyberna and Torone without a battle on account of treachery. Then he launched an expedition against Olynthos, the greatest of the *poleis* in those regions, with a large army. Having first defeated the Olynthians in two battles, he shut them into their walls and laid siege to the city, and he lost many of his soldiers in making continuous assaults against walls. In the end he corrupted with money the chief magistrates of the Olynthians, Euthycrates and Lasthenes, and on account of their treachery captured Olynthos. (16.53.1–2)

[Approximately ninety lines of text follow, describing other events in this year.]

---

[67] On Diodorus' work, see Section 5.3.

In the archonship of Themistocles at Athens, Gaius Cornelius and Marcus Popilius succeeded to the office of consul (347 BCE). During the magistracies of these men, the Boeotians, having pillaged much of Phocis' territory around the city named Hya, defeated their enemies and killed around seventy of them. . . . (16.56.1)

[Approximately 125 lines of text follow, describing other events in this year.]

Despite the marked difference in the length of the historical notices, the *Bibliotheca Historica* and *POxy* I 12 are virtually identical in terms of basic structure.

We can now complete our exploration of the history of Olympic victor lists by tracing the development of each of the three types of *Olympionikai*, picking up where we left off in the third century BCE. The *Olympionikon anagraphe* did not enjoy a long history after Aristotle. Sometime in the early third century part or all of Aristotle's *Olympionikon anagraphe* seems to have been inscribed on stone and erected in the Lyceum in Athens. The surviving text (*IG* II² 2326) includes a summary of the order in which events were introduced into the Olympic program and the beginning of a list of athletes who won multiple victories at Olympia. This was, however, not a new *Olympionikon anagraphe*, but the monumentalization of an existing one.[68] In the middle of the third century, Eratosthenes produced the next *Olympionikon anagraphe*, and there are no known examples thereafter. *Olympionikon anagraphai* became extinct because new kinds of literature came into being in the early Hellenistic period that offered detailed information about Olympia and the Olympic Games. These included periegetic writings that described Olympia for the benefit of visitors, treatises on athletic contests, and local histories of Elis. None of these works included catalogs of Olympic victors, so they were not *Olympionikai*, but their existence made the long historical excurses in *Olympionikon anagraphai* superfluous.[69]

It is beyond question that standard catalogs of Olympic victors of the type originally found in *Olympionikon anagraphai* continued to be produced, but they appear to have circulated as independent works.

---

[68] For more on *IG* II² 2326, see Section 3.5.

[69] On Eratosthenes' *Olympionikai*, see Section 3.3. On periegetic writings, treatises on athletic contests, and local histories of Elis, see Section 3.1.

Each of the two basic components of *Olympionikon anagraphai*, histori-cal material on the Olympics and a victor catalog, thus became separate entities, spelling the end of this type of *Olympionikai*. Stand–alone cat-alogs of Olympic victors served an important purpose because they were compact and thus relatively inexpensive to reproduce and easy to consult. Registers of Olympic victors could also be found in Olympiad chronographies or Olympiad chronicles, but these were longer works that required more time and effort to copy and use. We have already seen an example of a stand–alone catalog of Olympic victors in *POxy* II 222, which was written in the third century CE. The date when stan-dard victor catalogs began to be circulated as independent entities can-not be established with any precision. Pausanias saw in the gymnasium at Olympia an inscribed victor list set up by an Elean named Paraballon (6.6.3). There are no extant remains of this inscription, and so it is impossible to be certain as to its exact contents, but it is likely to have been a simple list of victors. Paraballon is typically dated to the third century, so this inscription may have been the earliest standard catalog of Olympic victors that was not part of an *Olympionikon anagraphe*.[70]

After the time of Timaeus, chronographic catalogs of Olympic victors and Olympiad chronographies were produced intermittently throughout classical antiquity, typically in response to the need to syn-chronize Greek chronology with that of other peoples in the Mediter-ranean. There are five known Olympiad chronographies in addition to that of Timaeus. In the first century, Castor of Rhodes produced an Olympiad chronography that synchronized the chronological sys-tems used by Greeks, Romans, and various peoples to the east such as the Assyrians.[71] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the second half of the first century, compiled an Olympiad chronography in which he compared Greek and Roman time-reckoning systems and calculated a foundation date for Rome.[72] The emergence of Christianity resulted in the production of a number of chronographic works that outlined new time-reckoning systems using Hebrew and Christian scriptures as their primary referent. We have already encountered one such work,

---

[70] For further discussion of Paraballon's inscription, see Section 2.5.
[71] Castor's work is treated in Section 5.4.
[72] Dionysius' work is treated in Section 4.6.

Eusebius' *Chronographia*, which included a chronographic catalog of Olympic victors. Eusebius copied his Olympic victor list from an Olympiad chronography written by Sextus Julius Africanus (who in turn worked from an earlier Olympiad chronicle written by Cassius Longinus), and Panodoros wrote the last known *Olympionikai* c. 400 CE in the form of a revised version of Eusebius' *Chronographia*.[73]

The passage of time and accumulation of historical events inevitably made any Olympiad chronicle obsolete, and so this type of *Olympionikai* was produced with some regularity. Eleven Olympiad chronicles are known in addition to that of Philochorus. Nine of the eleven can be associated with specific authors: Ctesicles of Athens (Hellenistic period), Castor of Rhodes (first century), Diodorus Siculus (first century), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (end of first century), Thallus (first or second century CE), Phlegon of Tralleis (who produced two different *Olympionikai* in the second century CE), Cassius Longinus (third century CE), and Dexippus of Athens (third century CE). The other two extant Olympiad chronicles come from anonymous papyri. *POxy* XVII 2082 dates to the second half of the second century CE and *POxy* I 12 to the first half of the third century CE.[74]

Two further *Olympionikai* are known but cannot be classified for lack of sufficient evidence. Scopas wrote an *Olympionikai* at some point before the first century CE, but all that can be said about its contents is that they included a story about an athlete who turned into a wolf.[75] Tiberius Claudius Polybius (late first century BCE or early first century CE) is mentioned by Eusebius and Syncellus alongside authors who wrote Olympiad chronicles (*FGrH* 254 F1–3). Eusebius cites Polybius for the number of Olympiads before the Coroibos Olympics (F2) and describes him as "attentive to Olympiads" (F3).[76] Polybius thus possibly but not certainly wrote an Olympiad chronicle. One other author can very tentatively be added to the list of those who compiled *Olympionikai*. Aristodemus of Elis, who probably lived in the second century, is cited by later authors for information about the number

---

[73] On Eusebius', Africanus', and Panodoros' *Olympionikai*, see Sections 4.1–4.4.

[74] *POxy* II 222 and XVII 2082 have been taken as copies of Phlegon's *Olympionikai*, but this is far from certain. See Appendix 17.

[75] For Scopas' work, see *FGrH* 413.

[76] For Tiberius Claudius Polybius' work, see *FGrH* 254.

of Olympiads prior to the Olympiad in which Coroibos won the *stadion*, the number of *Hellanodikai*, and the Altis,[77] but nothing further is known about his work.[78] It is likely that Aristodemus wrote an *Olympionikai* of some sort, but the information for which he is referenced might also have been found in a local history of Elis. These authors will not be discussed in the main text, but the relevant fragments are collected in Appendices 1.1–1.3.

The sum total of known *Olympionikai* comes to approximately twenty-five examples, and can be summarized as shown in Tables 3 though 5.

These tables understate, by an unknowable margin, the number of *Olympionikai* that were produced in the ancient world. This is clear from the Olympiad chronicles. The majority of the twelve known Olympiad chronicles date to the first century and later, a reflection of the fact that historical chronicles needed to be updated with some regularity. We can be virtually certain that Olympiad chronicles were produced throughout the Hellenistic period but did not survive because they became obsolete.[79] In addition, we are often dependent upon titles of lost works as a means for identifying them as *Olympionikai*, which indicates that some works of which we have only the title but which are not cited in the preceding lists probably included catalogs of Olympic victors. This is most applicable to Olympiad chronographies. The known examples of this type of *Olympionikai* for which we have titles all bore sole or alternate appellations that obscure the inclusion of an Olympic victor list. A number of authors, including Autocharis (*Chronoi*), Euthymenes (*Chronika*), Xenagoras (*Chronon*), and Xenocrates (*Chronika*), are known to have written chronographic studies that may well have incorporated Olympic victor lists, but the extant evidence does not make a firm judgment possible.[80]

---

[77] The Altis was the name of the sanctuary at Olympia.

[78] For Aristodemus' work, see *FGrH* 414. The scholiast to Pindar *Olympian X* 55 should be added to the fragments cataloged by Jacoby. The authorship of the first Olympic victor list is erroneously ascribed to Aristodemus in Wacker 1998.

[79] Relatively little historical writing from the Hellenistic period survives. For an estimate of the amount that was originally produced and discussion of the reasons for its loss, see Strasburger 1977. It is also possible that Olympiad chronicles became more popular in the Roman period for reasons that are discussed in Chapter 6.

[80] See n. 3 of Chapter 4.

TABLE 3. *Known Examples of* Olympionikon Anagraphai *and Standard Catalogs of Olympic Victors Circulating as Independent Works*

Author	Date That Work Appeared	Title of Work	Number of Books	State of Preservation
Hippias of Elis	c. 400	*Olympionikon Anagraphe* (*Register of Olympic Victors*)	?	1 testimonium
Aristotle, probably with Callisthenes	330s	*Olympionikai* (*Olympic Victors*)	1	6 short fragments
IG II² 2326 (probably an inscribed copy of the Aristotelian *Olympionikai*)	275–250	n/a	n/a	17 lines
Victor list inscribed in gymnasium at Olympia by Paraballon, later updated by Euanoridas	3rd and 2nd centuries	n/a	n/a	mentioned by Pausanias
Eratosthenes of Cyrene	3rd century	*Olympionikai*	at least 2	10 short fragments
POxy II 222, unknown author	mid–3rd century CE	?	?	85 lines (with *POxy* XXIII 2381)

TABLE 4. *Known Examples of Olympiad Chronographies*

Author	Date That Work Appeared	Title of Work	Number of Books	State of Preservation
Timaeus of Tauromenium	late 4th/early 3rd century	*Olympionikai etoi Chronika Praxidika* (Olympic Victors or Praxidikan Chronological Matters)	?	5 short fragments
Castor of Rhodes	1st century	*Kanon* (Canon)	1	20 fragments total (5 of which are lengthy) from this work and from Castor's Olympiad chronicle
Dionysius of Halicarnassus	end of 1st century	*Chronoi* (Time Periods)	?	9 fragments of varying length
Sextus Julius Africanus	217–221 CE	5	?	at least 55 fragments, many of which are lengthy
Eusebius	first quarter of 4th century CE	*Chronika* (Chronological Matters)[a]	1	nearly complete
Panodoros	c. 400 CE	Revised version of Eusebius' *Chronika*	?	numerous lengthy fragments[b]

[a] Eusebius' Olympic victor list appeared in the first book of his *Chronika*. This book had its own title, *Chronographia*. See Sections 4.1 and 4.2.

[b] Panodoros produced both a revised version of Eusebius' *Chronika* and his own chronographic study that drew heavily on the *Chronika*. As a result, attribution of many of the preserved fragments from Panodoros' work is difficult.