

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

ΘΕΤΟΪΣΙΝ

³³ See Herrmann's discussion, 26-30, though he does not hazard a political definition. N. Ehrhardt tentatively allows the possibility of *sympoliteia*; 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

¹ For evidence that three victories in the pentathlon constituted overall victory see Pollux, *Onomasticon* iii 151, ... ἐπι δὲ πεντάθλου τὸ νικῆσαι ἀποτριάζει; scholion to Aristides, *Panathenaius* 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.

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. Poliakov, *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.

and to have been crucial in the foundation of the sport.⁷

πρὸ μὲν δὴ Ἴάσονος καὶ Πηλέως ἄλμα ἐστεφανοῦτο ἰδίᾳ καὶ δίσκος ἰδίᾳ καὶ τὸ ἀκόντιον ἤρκει ἐς νίκην κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους οὗς ἡ Ἀργὼ ἐπλεῖ· Τελαμών μὲν κράτιστα ἐδίσκευε, Λυγκεὺς δὲ ἠκόντιζεν, ἔτρεχον δὲ καὶ ἐπήδων οἱ ἐκ Βορέου· Πηλεὺς δὲ ταῦτα μὲν ἦν δεῦτερος, ἐκράτει δὲ ἀπάντων πάλῃ· ὁπότ' οὖν ἠγωνίζοντο ἐν Λήμνῳ, φασὶν Ἴάσονα Πηλεῖ χαριζόμενον συνάσαι τὰ πέντε, καὶ Πηλέα τὴν νίκην οὕτω συλλέξασθαι (Philostratos, *Gymnastikos* 3)

It is easy to see why many scholars have refused to accept the theory of progressive elimination when faced with this myth. If Peleus was superior in only one event, he would appear to be in danger of elimination long before the competition reached wrestling, the event everyone agrees came fifth. But if we assign to each athlete a score based upon his finish in previous events, Peleus, thanks to a string of second place finishes, will be leading as he enters his best event and will win the overall competition.⁸

If, however, we interpret Philostratos' story according to the theory of progressive elimination, we can, at the same time, unveil a stroke of genius in Jason's invention. If elimination began with the first event instead of with the third or fourth, as has previously been held, we discover a foolproof scheme for the ultimate victory of Peleus. Suppose that Jason first proclaimed that the all-round champion should demonstrate excellence in all the events contested in the first pentathlon and for that reason the last-place finisher in each event of the pentathlon would be eliminated until someone accumulated three victories.⁹ Under such rules Peleus could not lose. No matter what order of events was followed, Peleus was sure to win. In the first event Peleus would either win (if it was wrestling) or he would finish second. The fifth

finisher would sit down, at the same time assuring Peleus of a victory in a later event.¹⁰ The same thing would occur in the second event. The worst Peleus could do was finish second and, with the departure of another athlete, he was assured of another victory. Peleus would then win event three, the last of the triad (jump, discus, javelin), and the stade race, thanks to the elimination of the two men most skilled in these areas. No doubt Philostratos supposed that wrestling came last in Jason's time, as it did in his, and that the first pentathlon had included all five events, with Peleus winning in the end as best of the wrestlers.

Implementing elimination

If we agree that the three-victory criterion and the tale of Philostratos have been persuasively harmonized, it remains to describe how this new theory of progressive elimination could be applied in practice.¹¹ Given a field of indeterminate size, it would not be difficult or unfair to eliminate one-third of the competitors at the end of the first event. Each of the events in the triad were trials contested, in the major games, only in the pentathlon. It would therefore not be unfair to eliminate those who were inferior to two-thirds of their opponents in a purely pentathletic event. Such an early elimination would rid the field not only of

⁷ It is impossible to say whether Philostratos believed that the origin of the pentathlon lay in the myth which follows—nor is his belief important to us. He thought the story worth telling. No great honor attaches to the pentathlon from having been invented by Jason or having been won by Peleus. Philostratos' reason for telling the story must be that it accounts for the glorification of the second-class athlete whom the competition would attract and that it contains within itself a way by which the best among seconds could achieve victory.

⁸ Herein lies the basis for the theory of relative finishes and the antipathy of progressive eliminationists towards Philostratos.

⁹ The supposition required here is not gratuitous. Clearly Philostratos expects his contemporaries to be familiar with the basic rules by which the pentathlon was contested. This accounts for the bare presentation of the myth. It is we who are in the dark and have been confounded by his, for us, unclear presentation. The point of this paper is that Jason would have mandated early elimination as a feature of this new contest, a feature well-known to Philostratos and his contemporaries. Immunity from elimination was, of course, granted to a winner of any event until one man had accumulated three victories. This point is agreed by both schools of thought. Thus, if the winner of the first event finished last in the second, he nonetheless was included in the number of those going on to event number three, the man finishing last but one being eliminated.

¹⁰ Ebert, Merkelbach and other investigators of the pentathlon have been strongly influenced by the contention of J. Juethner, *Philostratos ueber Gymnastik* (Leipzig 1909) 193, that δεῦτερος in the passage cited above was used by Philostratos to mean 'inferior', not 'second best'. To support this contention Juethner cites five occurrences of . . . δεῦτερος in the collected works of various Philostratosi as they appear in Kayser's edition of 1840. Two occur in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* and clearly mean 'second'. The other three are neuter plural in form and carry the significance Juethner suggests. We should not, however, try to force this significance on singular forms. I. Avotins and M. M. Avotins, *An index to the Lives of the Sophists of Philostratos* (Hildesheim 1978) 68, list nine occurrences of δεῦτερος in this work in addition to the two cited by Juethner. All nine are singular and mean 'second'. Juethner's own Wortregister for *Gymnastikos* lists two other places where our Philostratos used δεῦτερος, both meaning 'second'. In addition, had Philostratos wanted to imply a general inferiority of Peleus, he would have used δεῦτερος as a pendant to the earlier κράτιστα or a suitable antonym, χείρονα or ἡσσονα, not the singular δεῦτερος which can here, as elsewhere, mean only 'second'.

The interpretation offered here obviously depends upon the five contestants listed by Philostratos being the only contestants, a fact, as far as I know, acceptable to all. The sense of δεῦτερος demonstrates that Philostratos does not mean that the sons of Boreas were both best at both running and jumping. Also, in no case could ties or dead heats be allowed in the pentathlon. See H. A. Harris, *JHS* lxxxii (1962) 21-4.

¹¹ Practical application appears to have played a small role in the development of some earlier theories. We should expect the pentathlon to be carried out expeditiously and in a way which would be readily appreciable to even casual spectators. For the need to complete the pentathlon in a reasonable length of time see Pausanias v 9.3 and the forced rearrangement of events when the pentathlon intruded upon the running of more popular events. In addition, most of the theories of relative finish are too complicated to be easily employed by any but the most dedicated fans of the sport.

those whose skills were not sufficiently honed, but it would remove the possibility that a specialist sprinter or wrestler¹² who had joined the field of pentathletes could capitalize on his skills later in the competition.

Picture then the pentathlon opening at the jumping pit. Each contestant in the field would compete and have his best jump noted by a marker bearing his identification.¹³ At the end of the event the judges would pull the first eight markers of a twelve man field, calling out the name of each man who was to pass to the second event and giving his supporters the opportunity to cheer his success. The four who were eliminated could be passed over in silence. The same process would be followed in the discus throw. The four highest finishers would be proclaimed and would pass on to the javelin throw.¹⁴ After the javelin competition only winners from the first three events would go to the stade race,¹⁵ thus assuring that one man would have three victories by the end of the wrestling.

If three men, each with one victory, went into the stade race, two emerged still having one victory and the winner of the sprint now had two. There has been some dissatisfaction with the suggestion that the two single winners then wrestled one another for the right to meet the stade race victor for the overall title. The objection is that the winner of the wrestle-off thereby gained credit for a second win and then sought a third win in the same event. The wrestling would thus, in effect,

¹² It was the realization that those who specialized in the sprints and those who regularly competed only in wrestling would have an unfair advantage if elimination was held off until the completion of the stade race which led Harris, in *Greece and Rome* xix (1972) 64, to revise his earlier theory. An especially skillful sprinter or wrestler might well try to invade the pentathlon if safeguards were not built into the competition.

¹³ For the use of markers in competition see Homer, *Od.* viii 192ff. where the discus cast of Odysseus is marked by Athene. See also J. Swaddling, *The ancient Olympic Games* (London 1980) 55, for a photograph of a jumper with markers in a vase painting. It might be useful to distinguish winners of the earliest events from those subject to elimination. This could be accomplished by a fillet tied around the thigh of the jump winner or the non-throwing arm of the discus and javelin winners. Vase paintings of filleted athletes are common, but they seem never to have been studied from an athletic viewpoint. See J. Juethner, 'Siegerkranz und Siegesbinde', *Oesterreich. Archaeolog. Institut. Jahreshefte* i (1898) 42-48.

¹⁴ Whether a total of four competitors or the four best discus throwers and the best jumper (if he did not finish in the top half of the discus field) passed to event number three is not especially troublesome. It would not be surprising if practice varied from place to place and time to time.

¹⁵ The nature of the triad leads one to believe that most commonly three men survived to take part in the fourth round. Jumping called for good legs. The throwing events required a strong arm, but two very different techniques. We know from ancient sources that sometimes one man triumphed ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τριάδι, but the hope of games organizers and pentathlon fans must have been a full five event competition. Thus, even if a strong-armed thrower won events two and three, the stade race would favor a jumper and lead to the tie-breaking wrestling final.

provide two wins and contribute inordinately to victory in the pentathlon.¹⁶

In defense of the wrestle-off we must point out that wrestling, unlike the other four events of the pentathlon, is a one-on-one competition which obviates the possibility of strict fairness whenever the field totals an odd number. In wrestling competition outside the pentathlon a bye had to be granted whenever there was an uneven number of participants. And if in an even number field someone was hurt and unable to continue, a bye would likewise be required for his next scheduled opponent. Byes in wrestling were therefore so common as to be almost a regular feature of the sport. Thus, granting a bye in the pentathlon to the holder of two victories would be as close to fair as one could come in the circumstances. A well-rested holder of a bye would be in a good position to defeat the winner of the wrestle-off. By the same token, the winner of a preliminary bout who could then outwrestle the bye holder would have removed any doubt about his right to be proclaimed the overall victor.¹⁷

Summary

The final picture of the pentathlon competition which this study outlines is, in the end, very close to the revised plan of H. A. Harris. Only winners in the triad go on to the stade race and, if necessary, to the wrestling. Different from Harris is the suggestion that elimination of contestants began early in the competition, a suggestion based on a new interpretation of a vexing passage from Philostratos which Harris and others have discounted because of its unreasonable appearance. It appears now that Philostratos' myth is not only reasonable but is especially suitable to the pentathlon. Jason is an especially appropriate figure to associate with the invention of the pentathlon. Himself a second-class

¹⁶ Dissatisfaction with what was felt to be excessive importance placed upon wrestling skill goes back to Percy Gardner in 1880 and has continued, apparently being Sweet's motivation for backing a replay of events from the triad. Merkelbach, 265, maintains that a double winner entering the wrestling against two single winners could do no worse than tie for the championship. His belief that a two-time winner had to wrestle twice (264 n.8) is based on doubtful evidence, a lacunose line in which his key word σώματα is the suggested reading for γυια[...].ματα. Harris sees no problem in the setup outlined here, nor does Langdon, p.118.

¹⁷ An anonymous referee to whom I am exceedingly grateful for numerous suggestions concerning this paper has posed an interesting question. We are told in some ancient inscriptions that prizes were sometimes offered to second place finishers in the pentathlon. How were they determined? I believe the most likely candidate for this honor would be the loser of the final wrestling match. He would always have two wins, while the overall winner would have three. If the pentathlon ended after the stade race, the runner-up would be the winner of the one event of four not won by the overall victor.

hero,¹⁸ it is altogether fitting that he institute a competition for second-rate athletes. It is also consistent with Jason's character as depicted in drama and epic that he carry out the implementation of his invention through trickery and out of love for his dear friend Peleus, the winner of the first pentathlon.

DONALD F. JACKSON

The University of Iowa

¹⁸ Jason's less than heroic nature in his dealings with Medea is well known from the tragedies of Euripides and Seneca. For a good description of Jason in Hellenistic epic see G. Lawall, 'Apollonius' *Argonautica*: Jason as anti-hero', *YCS* xix (1966) 121-69. Interesting from our point of view is Lawall's observation that Apollonius has little use for the specialized skills of the Argonauts and that Jason exploits love (136). He notes also that Lemnos is a place where the resourceful Jason begins to emerge (151) and that it is a mark of Jason's character that he sacrifices heroic values for success.

Theodoret of Cyrus and the Speakers in Greek Dialogues

The modern convention for printing dialogues includes printing the names of the speakers on the margin at the beginning of their statements. But this practice was virtually unknown in ancient Greek dialogues. Instead, the most common convention for showing the shift from one speaker to another is through punctuation such as the colon, the παραγράφος or a horizontal stroke.¹ Recently, N. G. Wilson has attributed the inclusion of the names of the speakers at the transitional points in Greek dialogues to Theodoret of Cyrus (mid-fifth century CE; composed *Eranistes* in 447) who, in this view, 'deserves the credit for devising a literary convention that is now regarded as essential'.² This appraisal has since found a receptive audience. G. H. Ettiinger, the editor of the critical edition of Theodoret's *Eranistes* (Oxford 1975), cites Wilson's article and concurs (p. 5, n. 3): 'Thus he [Theodoret] gives a new direction to an ancient literary form.' In the prologue (29) to the *Eranistes*, Theodoret explained his mode of presentation:

I will not include the names of those who pose questions and those who answer in the body of the text (οὐ τῷ σώματι τοῦ λόγου συντάξω), as the wise among the Greeks did, but I will write them on the margin beside the starting-points of the sections (ἀλλ' ἐξωθεν παραγράψω ταῖς τῶν στίχων ἀρχαῖς). For while they [the Greeks] offered their works to people who were thoroughly educated, and to whom literature was life, I wish the reading and the discovery of benefit to be an easy task even for the illiterate. This will be possible, if the names of the characters engaged in the discussion appear outside by the margin (ἐκ τῶν παραγεγραμμένων ἐξωθεν).

¹ J. Andrieu, *Le dialogue antique. Structure et présentation* (Paris 1954) 214-15, 263-66.

² 'Indications of speakers in Greek dialogue texts', *CQ* xx (1970) 305.

According to our author, this departure from the convention of οἱ πάλαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων σοφοί was made in the interest of popularisation—in order to make the catechetical dialogue more accessible to readers who were less well-educated than the ideal readers of Platonic dialogues in antiquity.

While Theodoret's statement may well be the first literary attestation of what is now common practice, it does not support the view that Theodoret had done something radically different from the practice of his contemporaries by his inclusion of the names of the speakers. To be sure, Theodoret himself was making a contrast between the mode of presentation in his *Eranistes* and that used by the 'ancient Greeks' who wrote dialogues. Yet, in making this claim, Theodoret was not so much referring to his writing out the names of the interlocutors per se as to his practice of writing the names of the speakers—probably in full when they first made their appearance and in a truncated form thereafter—in the margins, outside the main body of the text. In fact he said as much by his repeated use of forms of παραγράφω with ἐξωθεν. Names placed τῷ σώματι τοῦ λόγου were juxtaposed with those put ἐξωθεν ταῖς τῶν στίχων ἀρχαῖς. In the context of this contrast (ἀλλά), the σώμα τοῦ λόγου referred to is less likely to mean 'the spoken words' (Wilson 305) as the main body of the written text on the page even though Wilson's interpretation is not without merit. Clarity was to be achieved by this distinctive placement of the names rather than by their mere inclusion.

In fact, Theodoret was not the first person to have included the names of speakers. The 'innovator' was probably a humble stenographer a few centuries back whose name will, in all likelihood, be forever lost to history. The Toura papyrus found near Cairo is significant in this regard. It contains the only MS of a text which is named in the colophon as Ὀριγένους διάλεκτος πρὸς Ἡρακλεῖδην καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπους (dated to c. 300 CE) which purports to be a stenographic transcription of events which transpired in a church in Bostra in the middle of the third century CE.³ In the first section of this composite document, Origen, the famous Christian teacher from Alexandria, held a discussion with the bishop Heracleides in a way reminiscent of literary and philosophical dialogues. When it becomes necessary to mark off a transition from one speaker to another in their exchange of words, we find that the colon, commonly followed by a blank space, is often used together with a παραγράφος on the left-hand margin. This is highly conventional, and no surprise. What is surprising is the fact that these signs, almost always considered sufficient markers of transitions in themselves, are employed in conjunction with explicit statements of who the next

³ J. Scherer ed., *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide et les évêques ses collègues sur le père, le fils, et l'âme* (Cairo 1949). On the use of the plural of διάλεκτος, see Scherer, ed., *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide* (Sources chrétiennes lxxvii, Paris 1960) 5, n. 3. It is useful to keep in mind the fact that Origen held a good number of such 'discussions' with many important personages and that these were gathered together into a collection of dialogues in Palestinian Caesarea.