This overlooked passage from the corpus of Demosthenes does not answer conclusively all problems connected with the *apobates*, but is certainly extremely useful in our understanding of it.[16]

N. B. CROWTHER
The University of Western Ontario
London, Canada

[16] I am indebted to referees of the journal for helpful suggestions.

'Adopted Teians:' a passage in the new inscription of Public Imprecations from Teos.

The new inscription of Public Imprecations from Teos, apart from many other interesting features, represents what is surely the most important new evidence to accrue for a generation on the relations between Greek colonies and their mother cities.[1] The inscription was admirably published by P. Herrmann in the editio princeps,[2] and helpful contributions followed from Merkelbach[3] and Lewis[4] before its republication in *SEG* xxxi (1981; appeared 1984) 985, and, most recently, by McCabe and Plunkett.[5]

In his edition Herrmann did not venture a reading for the passage A.6–7, even though the gaps are small and there is no doubt about the letters preserved on the stone. Although he saw that it was possible to read [σ]ὺν θετοῖσιν [Τ]ηί[ο]ι[σ]ιν, his inability to see a good sense led him to print: [.]ΥΝΘΕΤΟΙΣΙΝ.ΗΙ.Ι.ΙΝ:.[6] Merkelbach suggested that the reading should be [σ]ὺν θετοῖσι (sic) [Τ]ηί[ο]ι[σ]ιν, yielding the complete phrase δς ἂν τιμὴν ἔχων [σ]ὺν θετοῖσι [Τ]ηί[ο]ι[σ]ιν τὸμ πλη-σίον δολῶται, τοῦτον ἀπόλλυσθαι καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ γένος τὸ κένο, which he translated 'Wer als Magistrat mit adoptierten (=neueingebürgerten) Teiern den Nachbarn unterjocht, der soll zugrunde gehen, er selbst und sein Geschlecht.'[7] Although this reading is attractive epigraphically, since it involves no change in the letters preserved and offers easy, acceptable supplements for those missing, it was not adopted by the editors of *SEG* nor by McCabe and Plunkett, who reprinted Herrmann's text.

The adjective θετός is a standard word for 'adopted' (adopted child, son, daughter, father etc.) attested from Pindar[8] and Aeschylus[9] down to Byzantine times,[10] and is glossed εἰσποιητός.[11] The basic meaning is 'made' as opposed to 'born', 'natural'.[12] The only parallel for 'adopted' citizens that I have found is *Anth. Graec.* vii.418.4, where the adjective is used with ἀστός:

Πρώτα μοι Γαδάρων κλεινὰ πόλις ἔπλετο πάτρα,
ἡνδρωσεν δ'Ἱερὰ δεξαμένα με Τύρος·
εἰς γῆρας δ'ὄτ'ἔβην, ἁ καὶ Δία βρεψαμένα Κῶς
κἀμὲ θετὸν Μερόπων ἀστὸν ἐγηροτρόφει.

However, even without contemporary parallel, the word's significance and usage make Merkelbach's understanding of it here entirely acceptable. The question remains what historical circumstances lay behind this description.

In none of the publications given above was there any mention of Pindar's Second Paean. This work makes allusions to several events in the early history of Abdera, the noted colony of Teos, whose appearances in the new inscription constituted its greatest surprise. One of these allusions runs as follows:

νεόπολίς εἰμι· ματρὸς
δέ μάτερ' ἐμᾶς ἔτεκον ἔμπαν
πολεμίοι πυρὶ πλαγεῖ-
σαν·

This is easily translated,[13] but the historical interpretation caused difficulty to early commentators, and unsatisfactory solutions long held the field. However, these were all swept away by the excellent and entirely convincing interpretation of Radt in his edition of the poem,[14] and that interpretation was rightly followed by G. Huxley.[15] Radt demonstrated that 'my mother' is Abdera, 'the mother of my mother' is Teos, and the passage thus provides evidence of a refounding of Teos by Abdera, which is not explicitly attested in any other extant literature.

Both Radt and Huxley discussed when this refounding took place. The two most obvious

[1] I suppose the decrees encouraging delation from Thasos (ML 83), first published by J. Pouilloux in 1954 (*Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*. I, Paris), was the last new evidence of comparable importance to appear. The scholarly world is still awaiting the publication of an inscription from Naupactus, which is apparently of at least equal significance, to judge by the tantalizing description by Mastrokostas in *Arch. Delt.* xix.2 (1964) 295.

[2] 'Teos und Abdera im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.,' *Chiron* xi (1981) 1–30 (hereinafter Herrmann).

[3] 'Zu dem neuen Text aus Teos', *ZPE* xlvi (1982) 212–13.

[4] 'On the new text of Teos,' *ZPE* xlvii (1982) 71–2.

[5] Donald F. McCabe and Mark A. Plunkett, *Teos inscriptions* (Princeton 1985) 262. This is the most recent published corpus of the inscriptions of Teos.

[6] See Herrmann, 6, 14f. and plate 1. Herrmann's success in deciphering large parts of this inscription with virtually complete certainty was deservedly praised by Merkelbach, 212.

[7] *Ibid.* Although Merkelbach omits the final nu of θετοῖσιν, it was clearly read by Herrmann, and we may henceforward silently correct this obvious slip.

[8] *Ol.* 9.62.

[9] *Fr.* 320.

[10] I rely on an 'all Greek' search of the *TLG* material by Ibycus computer, which was kindly performed for me by my friend and colleague, Professor Wesley Smith.

[11] Harpocration, s.v. θέτης.

[12] For the verbal use from which the adjective comes, see LSJ s.v. τίθημι 3.b.

[13] 'I am a young city; yet I gave birth to the mother of my mother, when she was smitten by the foeman's fire' (With acknowledgements to the translations of Sandys in the Loeb edition and of S. L. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* [Amsterdam 1958] 22f.).

[14] *Op. cit.* 33–9 (including information about earlier scholarship). It is regrettable that B. Isaac reverts to earlier interpretations in his recent book, *The Greek settlements in Thrace until the Macedonian conquest* (Leiden 1986) 90–2. Radt's refutation of these ideas was decisive.

[15] 'Teos in Pindar,' *Studies presented to Sterling Dow on his eightieth birthday* (Durham, N.C. 1984) 149–52.

possibilities are soon after Harpagus' conquest in *c.*545 and after the end of the Ionian revolt in *c.*493. In favour of the former are Strabo's statement that some of the colonists of Abdera later returned to Teos,[16] the fact that Teos was a substantial enough city to provide 17 ships at the battle of Lade,[17] and its early coinage. The first silver coins of Teos are contemporary with those of Abdera, and Abdera's were struck soon after its colonization by the refugees from Teos.[18] Furthermore, the precise similarity of the obverse type, except that Teos' griffin is turned to R., Abdera's to L, 'suggests that the two coinages were started in planned conjunction.'[19] So Teos existed again soon after the total evacuation of the city at the time of Harpagus' conquest,[20] and close relations with Abdera can be assumed.

However, the second possibility, after the Ionian revolt, is also attractive. Herodotus' description of the burning of the rebel Ionian cities by the Persians[21] makes a very good fit with Pindar's πολεμίοι πυρὶ πλαγεῖσαν, and the circumstances of the Ionian revolt seem also to suit better the gnome with which Pindar follows the allusion to the refoundation:

> εἰ δέ τις ἀρκέων φίλοις
> ἐχθροῖσι τροχὸς ὑπαντιάζει,
> μόχθος ἡσυχίαν φέρει
> καιρῶι καταβαίνων.[22]

While nothing can be pressed in such a vague generalization, if the choice is between the period following Harpagus' conquest and the end of the Ionian Revolt, the latter seems more apposite.[23] In addition to these arguments, the new inscription from Teos offers a further line of approach.

The ban against setting up an *aisymnetes* (A.22–4) has shown the correct interpretation of a parallel provision in the long-known similar inscription from Teos.[24] Both may be seen as forbidding the establishment of a tyrant, whose (possibly euphemistic) title at Teos was *aisymnetes*. Like the other Ionian cities, Teos may be assumed to have been ruled by pro-Persian tyrants before and, briefly, after the Ionian revolt.[25] As Herrmann pointed out,[26] the new inscription may well imply recent, severe political upheaval. The fall of the Ionian tyrants at the beginning of the Ionian revolt, their replacement by democracies, the re-establishment of tyranny at the end of the revolt, and its final demise in favour of democracy at the instigation of Mardonius,[27] obviously represent such severe political upheaval. Such circumstances offer a likely occasion for bringing in new citizens.[28]

It is difficult to choose between these two possibilities. Radt thought Abdera could have helped the mother city on both occasions, and here too he is followed by Huxley. However, Pindar's words seem to exclude the possibility of two refoundations, since they clearly imply a single act. Although my initial preference[29] was for the time after the Ionian Revolt, on the grounds that there would be less reason for pride if substantial numbers of the original settlers had (like the Phocaeans)[30] returned to Teos, I now incline to the view[31] that we have insufficient evidence to choose between the two possibilities, or even, strictly, to exclude other occasions unknown to us. The one certainty is that the refoundation occurred at some time within the early history of Abdera.

If Abdera sent to Teos a sufficient number of its citizens to refound the mother city, we seem to have here possible candidates for the 'adopted Teians' of the inscription. And if they were sufficiently numerous to represent a refoundation, it may not be surprising that the previous inhabitants of Teos entertained fears that they might suffer disadvantages at the hands of the newcomers. One remembers the fate of the old Sybarites at Thurii.[32] Presumably it was the fear of such a specific contingency that led to the inclusion of a provision apparently somewhat illogical: we can hardly believe that a magistrate who enslaved his fellow citizens *without* the help of the new citizens would be exempt from the curse. It may be, however, that this possibility was covered by the general undertakings that immediately follow (A.10ff.).

Naturally we cannot prove that the 'adopted Teians' of the inscription are the newcomers from Abdera who refounded their mother city, and there is one possible objection to such an identification. The presence of Abdera in the new inscription might be held to show that some form of *sympoliteia* existed between the colony and the

[16] xiv 1.30 (C644).

[17] Hdt. vi 8.1.

[18] C. M. Kraay, *Archaic and classical Greek coins* (London 1976) 33, 152; plate 53, 893–5; plate 30. The downdating of the first coins of Abdera to *c.*530–500, described by M. J. Price and N. Waggoner as 'inescapable' (*Archaic Greek coinage: The Asyut hoard* [London 1975] 37), is based, as often in that book, on a misconception of the chronological significance of Egyptian bullion hoards; *cf.* what the authors themselves say, 117. And L. H. Jeffery's argument that the letters on the coins are surprisingly advanced for *c.*540 is clearly a priori (*Local scripts of Archaic Greece* [Oxford 1961] 364). So it is unfortunate that B. Isaac has accepted the downdating; *op.cit.* 87–9. Kraay was right to follow J. M. F. May, *The coinage of Abdera* (London 1966), who took account of some good hoard evidence (51–2), which is perfectly consistent with the earlier dating. May also understood (49) that, just as at Elea (Kraay, 170), colonists familiar with coinage would not delay long in introducing it in their new home.

[19] Kraay, 35.

[20] Note the πάντες of Hdt. i 168.

[21] vi 32.

[22] Ll. 31–4: 'And if in helping one's friends a man ruggedly faces the enemy, peace is brought by toil which comes at the right time.'

[23] As Radt, 38. *For the gnome, see his commentary, 39–42.*

[24] *ML 30; see SEG xxxi (1981) 984.*

[25] See Hdt. v. 7–8; vi 43.4.

[26] Pp. 24, 29f.

[27] Hdt. locc. citt.; cf. also iv 137.2–138.

[28] It is relevant here that Herrmann would date the new inscription, on the basis of letter forms, to *c.*480–450, preferably closer to the lower terminus (p. 6).

[29] *Colony and mother city in Ancient Greece*, 2nd ed. (Chicago 1983), 'Addenda and Corrigenda', p. xxxi, no. 34.

[30] Who broke their oath: Hdt. 1.165.3.

[31] Cf. Radt, 38.

[32] Diod. xii 11.1–2.

mother city.[33] If relations were so close, would Abderites who refounded Teos properly be called 'adopted Teians'? We lack the necessary parallels to provide a sure answer to such a question. So here too we must acknowledge uncertainty.

Even so, this discussion has shown possible historical circumstances which would justify Merkelbach's reading of A.6–7, and even if they are not its specific justification, at least we know that Teos in this period had need of new citizens. Thus the historical background, either specifically or generally, supports a reading which was already very satisfying epigraphically. It should be promoted to the text.[34]

A. J. GRAHAM
University of Pennsylvania

θετοῖσιν

[33] *See* Herrmann's discussion, 26–30, though he does not hazard a political definition. N. Ehrhardt tentatively allows the possibility of sympolitеia; see Milet und seine Kolonien (Frankfurt, Bern, New York, 1983) 234.

[34] I am very grateful to my friend and colleague Professor Martin Ostwald for kindly reading this note in draft and making several helpful suggestions for its improvement.

Philostratos and the Pentathlon

One of the most vexing problems facing students of ancient athletics has been the method by which overall victory in the pentathlon was determined. Testimony from ancient sources assures us that the overall victor won three events of the five contested,[1] but that a man of lesser talent could very well emerge victorious.[2] Because one athlete in a large field of competitors could not be expected to outclass his opponents in three of five events, two interpretations of what occurred in the pentathlon have arisen. One theory suggests a progressive elimination of competitors so as to reduce the field and facilitate the emergence of one champion.[3] Another theory allots points to contestants for higher and lower finishes and sometimes allows elimination of athletes who consistently finish behind others.[4] Adherents of neither theory have, as yet, been able to convince members of the other school of thought to abandon what each feels is the weaker of the two *testimonia* from antiquity and line up behind the stronger.[5] The purpose of this paper is to remove the apparent contradictions in the ancient evidence and to show that *testimonia* point to a very simple answer to the problem.

If all we had from ancient times was the fact that the winner of the pentathlon won three of five events, the progressive elimination school would have little opposition. In a field of twelve pentathletes,[6] each athlete competing in five events calling for varied skills and physical strengths, rarely would one man win three events. The ancient pentathlon would regularly have gone without an overall champion or would have had to customarily crown multiple champions, unless a large part of the field was eliminated fairly early. We are told, however, that an athlete second-rate in most events could remain in contention to the end of the competition and even win! The victory of a second-rate athlete seems in fact to have been a desideratum in the pentathlon

This theory was accepted by Merkelbach (see n.2). In his *Sport in Greece and Rome* (Ithaca 1972) 34–35, Harris re-evaluated his previous stand and offered the more attractive theory that only winners of the first three events went to the race and wrestling competition.

[4] The early history of the theory of relative finish and its subsequent complication by the addition of numerical values can be found in Bean's article cited above. Since Bean's study, J. Ebert, 'Zum Pentathlon der Antike', *Abhandlungen saechs. Akademie der Wiss. zu Leipzig, phil.-hist. Klasse*, Band 56, Heft 1 (1963), has suggested that a pentathlete was eliminated whenever he was beaten three times by any other competitor. This theory is what prompted Merkelbach's article, cited above. Ebert answered Merkelbach's objections in *ZPE* xiii (1974) 257–62. A new twist to this theory has been offered by W. Sweet, *Sport and recreation in ancient Greece* (Oxford 1987) 56–9. Rather than keep count of second place finishes, Sweet suggests a repechage of early events, now lacking the former winners. For objections to various aspects of Sweet's theory see M. K. Langdon, 'Scoring the ancient pentathlon: Final solution?' *ZPE* lxxviii (1989) 117–118.

[5] Followers of the relative finish theory have historically placed great faith in Philostratos' testimony and have therefore had a high regard for second place finishes. Progressive elimination theorists, on the other hand, are convinced that only first place finishes were significant and have consequently had little regard for Philostratos. Philostratos is certainly not beyond reproach. For a good resumé of faults in his treatise see M. Poliakoff, *Studies in the terminology of the Greek combat sports* (Koenigstein 1982) 143–8.

[6] The rigors of mastering five different skills could not have encouraged large numbers of athletes to become pentathletes. Harris also tells us (*Sport in Greece and Rome*, 34) that prize money for the pentathlon was only a quarter of that offered for the combat sports at the beginning of the present era. M. Faber, *Philologus* 5 (1891) 492f., and N. Gardiner, *JHS* xxiii (1903) 61, insisted that the pentathlon probably seldom featured more than a dozen participants.

[1] For evidence that three victories in the pentathlon constituted overall victory see Pollux, *Onomasticon* iii 151, . . . ἐπὶ δὲ πενταέθλου τὸ νικῆσαι ἀποτριάδα; scholion to Aristides, *Panathenaicus* 339, . . . ἀρκεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῖς γ' τῶν ε' πρὸς νίκην. See also Pausanias iii 11.6 where Hieronymos of Andros defeats Tisamenos of Elis 3-2 and Bacchylides 9 where Automedes of Phlious emerges victorious by winning in the two throwing events and in wrestling.

[2] Philostratos, *Gymnastikos* 3, in a passage to be discussed at length below, is our best witness for this fact. See also R. Merkelbach, 'Der Sieg im Pentathlon', *ZPE* xi (1973) 261, for several ancient references to the second-class abilities of pentathletes.

[3] For a good summary of scholarship in the two schools of thought regarding victory in the pentathlon see G. E. Bean, 'Victory in the pentathlon', *AJA* lx (1956) 361–8. After Bean's study, H. A. Harris published *Greek athletes and athletics* (London 1964). On pages 77–80 he suggested that only victors in the first four events competed in wrestling, others being eliminated.