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.1
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1 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. The inscription was admirably published by P. Herrmann in the editio princeps,2 and helped contributions followed from Merkelbach3 and Lewis4 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 he saw that it was possible to read [στό]ν θεσσαλίαν [Την]άγιο [στό], his inability to see a good sense led him to print: [:]ΤΥΘΕΙΣΙΝ ΗΛΙΟΝ.6 Merkelbach suggested that the reading should be [στό]ν θεσσαλίαν (sic) [Την]άγιο [στό], yielding the complete phrase δε δυν τιμή έχον [στό]ν θεσσαλίαν [Την]άγιο [στό]ν το πλή­σιον δολώτα, τούτον άπολύσας από τούτον και γάνος το κέο, which he translated ‘We as Magistratus with adopted (= neutering bourgeois) Teians of Naupactus utter this, and he himself and his city’. However, even without contemporary parallel, the word’s significance and usage make Merkelbach’s interpretation of Radv’s refutation of Herrmann’s text.7

The adjective θεσσαλίας is a standard word for ‘adopted’ (adopted child, son, daughter, father etc.) attested from Pindar8 and Aeschylus9 down to Byzantine times,10 and is glossed ἐπίσθεντος.11 The basic meaning is ‘made’ as opposed to ‘born’, ‘natural’.12 The only parallel for ‘adopted’ citizens that I have found is Anth. Gr. vii.4.18.4, where the adjective is used with ἐτέος:

Πρότασα μοι Γαδύρου κλεάν τόλαι ἐπέλασε πάτρας, μηδέρσων τ’ έστα τιμάμενα με Τούρος εἰς γήρας δ’ έν θύμιν, καὶ Δία δρεσμένα Κόις καὶ θεόν Μερκάπτων αυτόν ἐγνωρόθηκε.

This is easily translated, 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 Radv in his edition of the poem,14 and that interpretation was rightly followed by G. Huxley.15 Radv 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 Radv and Huxley discussed when this refounding took place. The two most obvious

10 Ol. 9.62.
11 Fr. 320.
12 I rely on an ‘all Greek’ search of the TLG material by Iyous computer, which was kindly performed for me by my friend and colleague, Professor Wesley Smith.
13 Harpocrate, s.v. ἐπίσθεν.
14 For the verbal use from which the adjective comes, see LSJ s.v. τιμάοιν 3.b.
15 ‘I am a young city: yet I gave birth to the mother of my mother, when she was smitten by the formian’s fire’ (With acknowledgements to the translations of Sandys in the Loeb edition and of S. L. Radv, Pindar’s zweiter und zehnter Palmar [Amsterdam 1958] 245.).
16 Op. cit. 33-9 (including information about earlier scholarship). It is regrettable that B. Isaac returns to earlier interpretations in his recent book, The Greek settlements in Thrace under the Macedonian conquest (Leiden 1986) 90-2. Radv’s refutation of these ideas was decisive.
17 ‘Teos in Pindar: Studies presented to Sterling Dow on his eightieth birthday (Durham, N.C. 1984) 149-22.'
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, and the fact that Teos was a substantial enough city to provide 17 ships at the battle of Lade, 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. Furthermore, the precise similarity of the reverse type, except that Teos' griffin is turned to R, Abdera's to L, 'suggests that the two coinages were started in planned conjunction. So Teos existed again soon after the total evacuation of the city at the time of Harpagus' conquest, 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 makes a very good fit with Pindar's polémoi που πλαγέσαι, and the circumstances of the Ionian revolt seem also to suit better the gnome with which Pindar follows the allusion to the refoundation:

εἰ δὲ τις ἀρείους ἀγεί
ἐξήρθαι τραχοῖς ὑπαντήσαι,
μάχεσθαι ἡσαυρίαν φέρει
κατοίκοι καταβαίνουν.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 appropriate. In addition to these arguments, the new inscription from Teos offers a further line of approach.

The ban against setting up an aisyymetes (A. 22-4) has shown the correct interpretation of a parallel provision in the long-known similar inscription from Teos. Both may be seen as forbidding the establishment of a tyrant, whose (possibly ephemerist) title at Teos was aisyymetes. Like the other Ionian cities, Teos may be assumed to have been ruled by pro-Persian tyrants before and, briefly, after the Ionian revolt. As Herrmann pointed out, 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, obviously represent such severe political upheaval. Such circumstances offer a likely occasion for bringing in new citizens.

It is difficult to choose between these two possibilities. Raft 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 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 Phocaens) returned to Teos, I now incline to the view 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. 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

22 See Hdt. vi. 10.8; vi. 43.4.
23 Pp. 24, 30ff.
24 Hdt. loco cit.: cf. aliv. 157.2-158.
25 It is relevant here that Herrmann would date the new inscription, on the basis of letter forms, to 480-450, preferably closer to the lower terminus (p. 6).
26 Colony and mother city in Ancient Greece, 2nd ed. (Chicago 1983), 'Addenda and Corrigenda', p. xxxi, no. 34.
27 Who broke their oath. Hdt. i. 165.3.
28 CF. Raitt, 38.
29 Diod. ii. 11.1-2.
mother city. If relations were so close, would
Abderites who refounded Teos properly be called
‘adopted Ticians’? 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 many 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
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33 See Herrmann’s discussion, 26-30, though he does not
hazard a political definition. N. Ehrhardt tentatively allows
the possibility of sympolitica; see Milet und seine Kolonien
(Frankfurt, Bern, New York, 1983) 214.

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

PHILOSORASTOS 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 com-
petitors so as to reduce the field and facilitate

the emergence of one champion.3 Another theory
allocs points to contestants for higher and lower
finishes and sometimes allows elimination of ath-
letes 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 con-
tention 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

1 For evidence that three victories in the pentathlon con-
stituted overall victory see Pollux, Onomasticon i 131, i. Eri
βαλαντία τον νίκησαν ἀποστάσεώς; scholion to Aristides,
Panathenaeus 330, . . . οικέτη γίνοντα τον ἐν η τρίτη ἀθλήτῃ.
See also Pausanias iii 11.6 where Hieronymos of Andros
defeats Tsimenios of Elis 3-2, and Bacchylides 9 where Auto-
medes of Phlius emerges victorious by winning in the two
throwing events and in wrestling.

2 Philostratos, Gymnastike 3, in a passage to be discussed at
length below, is our best witness for this fact. See also P.
Merkelbach, Der Sieg im Pentathlon, ZPE xi (1973) 261, for
several ancient references to the second-class abilities of pen-
tathletes.

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 1x (1956) 363-8. 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.

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 in der Antike’, Akademien,Arch.
Akademie der Wiss. zu Leipzig, phil.-hist. Klasse, Band 66, 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 xn
(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 reappraisal 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 solu-

5 Followers of the relative finish theory have historically
placed great faith in Philostrato’s 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
without reproach. For a good resume of faults in his treatise see
M. Poliakoff, Studies in the terminology of the Greek combat
sports (Koenigstein 1982) 143-8.

6 The rigorous mastering of five different skills could not have
encouraged large numbers of athletes to become pentathletes. But
Harris also tells us (Sport in Greece and Rome, 54) that pride
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 xxi
(1903) 61, insisted that the pentathlon probably seldom
featured more than a dozen participants.