## VICTOR MATTHEWS

## THE GREEK PENTATHLON AGAIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 100 (1994) 129–138

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## The Greek Pentathlon Again

Waldo Sweet has called the scoring of the pentathlon "perhaps the most puzzling problem in all Greek athletics".<sup>1</sup> He does an excellent job of demolishing the well-known explanation of E. Norman Gardiner which was based on the win-loss record of each competitor against each of his rivals.<sup>2</sup> Gardiner depicted the relative standing of a field of six athletes in the first four events of the pentathlon. In his example, the three athletes A, B, and C are tied with scores of 2-2 vis-a-vis each other. Athletes D, E, and F are eliminated (all beaten 3-1 by A), so that A, B, and C qualify for the deciding wrestling. Gardiner does not suggest how a wrestling match with three qualifiers is to proceed. Sweet and Bean before him have demonstrated that there can easily be combinations where all competitors were beaten by three rivals which by Gardiner's theory would eliminate them.<sup>3</sup>

Sweet's own solution is as follows: all competitors took part in the first three events. If the same man won all three, he was the outright winner and events four and five were not held. Failing an absolute winner of the first three events, all contestants completed in the fourth event, after which there would remain only four possibilities:

- 1) one competitor now had three wins, so that the last event was cancelled.
- 2) two athletes now had two victories each. In the fifth event one of them would obtain his third victory.
- 3) one athlete now had two wins and two others one win each.
- 4) there were four different winners in the four events.

For the third case, Sweet suggests that the pair with a single win each contended (again) in an event which neither had won, the winner then going on to wrestle with the man who already had two victories. In the last case, he suggests that the four contenders were paired by lot and that each pair then competed in one of the two events which neither had won (again determined by lot). The victor from each pair would then proceed to the wrestling to decide the winner of the pentathlon. Sweet refers to this procedure as a form of repechage, but as he indicates in his note, in modern sport repechage is a term generally used of a system whereby first-round losers (usually only second placers) compete against each other for the right to a place in the next round with the first round winners (*ZPE* 50 [1983] 289 n. 5). Having previously competed in separate heats, these competitors would thus be facing each other for the first time. In the Greek context which Sweet posits the contenders in fact would already have

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Waldo E. Sweet, *Sport and Recreation in Ancient Greece* (Oxford 1987) 56. In his book, Sweet presents a shorter version of the arguments in his article, "A New Proposal for Scoring the Greek Pentathlon" *ZPE* 50 (1983) 287-290.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> E. Norman Gardiner, Athletics of the Ancient World (Oxford 1930) 178-180.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Sweet, 58; G.E. Bean, AJA 60 (1956) 363.

competed against each other in the event(s) in question. With their relative standing already established, there would seem to be no reason for them to compete again in one of the same events.

Sweet's solution is in fact a very slight modification of that put forward by H.A. Harris in 1964, the only difference being in the method of solving situations 3) and 4), for which Harris had suggested wrestling semi-finals.<sup>4</sup>

In formulating his own solution, Sweet regards as "immaterial" the order of the events of the pentathlon, other than accepting the well-grounded belief that the wrestling came last (p. 289). Harris, on the other hand, had suggested that the first three events held were those peculiar to the pentathlon, i.e. the two throws and the jump. If no competitor had won all three (thus ending the competition), Harris suggested that the fourth event, the stade race was held (apparently with all competitors, as with Sweet). But in 1972, Harris put forward a revised scheme in which only those athletes who have won one of the first three events proceed in the competition. Two possibilities result: (1) A with two wins and B with one win proceed to the footrace. If A wins, he wins the pentathlon. If B wins, the pair now have two victories each and advance to the fifth deciding contest in wrestling. Or (2) A, B, and C each have one win. The trio run the footrace. A wins, giving him two victories; by virtue of this he is given a bye (as *ephedros*), while B and C wrestle a semi-final for the right to meet A in the wrestling final.<sup>5</sup>

Harris presented his second solution without emphasizing how it differed from his earlier one, but it can be seen at once that it does possess a definite logic, i.e. if a competitor does not have a single win after three events he cannot win a five-event contest and should therefore be eliminated from the competition.

In fact this idea that only the outright winners in the first three events were admitted to the running did not originate with Harris, but was first put forward in a valuable article by George Bean in 1956. He was not particularly satisfied with the situation where three men had one each, since the footrace by itself is incapable of reducing three men to two which would be most suitable for a wrestling match. Bean suggests with some misgiving either that both first and second in the footrace proceeded to the wrestling or that two races were run, the winners going on to contest the wrestling (*loc. cit.* [above, n. 3] 363f.). Harris' idea of a bye for the winner of the race and a wrestling semi-final for the two losers seems preferable here.

Bean however reluctantly abandoned his theory that victory in one of the first three events was necessary for advancement to the run and (if necessary) to the wrestling because of Philostratos' story about the origin of the pentathlon: *Gymn. 3:* "Before the time of Jason and Peleus, the jump won its own wreath, as did the discus, and the javelin was enough for a victory in those days when the *Argo* was sailing. Telamon was best at throwing the discus,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> H.A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics* (London 1964) 77-80. Sweet rejects Harris' theory on the grounds that it gives too great an advantage to a wrestler (*ZPE* 50 [1983] 290 with note 6).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> H.A. Harris, *Sport in Greece and Rome* (London 1972) 34-5. Sweet (p. 290 n. 6) does not appear to notice that Harris had changed his position.

Lynceus at hurling the javelin, the Boreads at running and jumping. Peleus was δεύτεροc in these but was supreme over all in wrestling. Therefore when they were holding contests in Lemnos, they say that Jason to please Peleus combined the five and Peleus thus obtained the victory"<sup>6</sup> Gardiner believed that Philostratos "as a professed writer on gymnastics surely carries weight as an authority", while Merkelbach says that from Philostratos it follows with certainty that in the pentathlon the second-best had a chance to win the victory.<sup>7</sup> But Michael Poliakoff has recently argued strongly that "we should treat any unique information in Philostratos with skepticism."<sup>8</sup> With the story must fall any theory that enables a pentathlete to win the wrestling and thus the whole competition without doing better than second in the previous events.

But this theory of second-places has also been given support by wrong inferences drawn from some ancient references to the pentathlon. Among these are the stories about the nicknames applied to Eratosthenes. The Suda says ( $\varepsilon 2898$ ): 'Epatoc $\theta$ ένηc ...  $\delta$ ιà ... τὸ δευτερεύειν ἐν παντὶ εἴδει παιδείας τοῖς ἄκροις ἐγγίςαςι Βῆτα ἐπεκλήθη, οἱ δὲ καὶ δεύτερον ἢ νέον Πλάτωνα, ἄλλοι Πένταθλον ἐκάλεςαν. This passage should not be taken to mean that second place counted in the pentathlon, as is suggested by Merkelbach (*ZPE* 11 [1973] 262). As Ebert has seen, it simply reflects the all-round ability of the pentathlete as compared to the athlete who specialized in an event like the stade or the wrestling. Ebert presents the fitting analogy of a competitor in the Nordic combined event in the modern Winter Olympics as compared to the specialist ski-jumper and the specialist cross-country skier (*ZPE* 13 [1974] 258 n. 6). The athlete in the combined event would normally not be expected to be as good in either of the constituent parts as the man who specialized in one of them. So too with the Greek pentathlete—in running and wrestling he might be considered "second rate" compared to the specialist stade runner or wrestler, despite such exceptional individuals as Xenophon of Corinth, who won both the stade and the pentathlon in 464.<sup>9</sup>

Exactly the same point emerges from the pseudo-Platonic *Amatores*: Discussing the philosopher, Sokrates says (135 E) "you seem to mean someone like the pentathletes in comparison with the runners or wrestlers. The former yield to the latter in their specialities and are  $\delta\epsilon$ ύτεροι to them, but they are πρῶτοι over the other athletes and beat them."<sup>10</sup> He goes on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> πρό μὲν δὴ Ἰάcovoc καὶ Πηλέως ἄλμα ἐcτεφανοῦτο ἰδία καὶ δίcκοc ἰδία καὶ τὸ ἀκόντιον ἤρκει ἐc νίκην κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους οῦς ἡ Ἀργὼ ἔπλει· Τελαμὼν μὲν κράτιcτα ἐδίcκευε, Λυγκεὺς δὲ ἠκόντιζεν, ἔτρεχον δὲ καὶ ἐπήδων οἱ ἐκ Βορέου· Πηλεὺς δὲ ταῦτα μὲν ἦν δεύτερος, ἐκράτει δὲ ἀπάντων πάλῃ· ὑπότ' οὐν ἠγωνίζοντο ἐν Λήμνῷ, φαcὶν Ἰάcovα Πηλεῖ χαριζόμενον cυνάψαι τὰ πέντε, καὶ Πηλέα τὴν νίκην οὕτω cυλλέξαcθαι. See Bean (above, n. 3) 365.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Gardiner, JHS 23 (1903) 66; R. Merkelbach, ZPE 11 (1973) 262.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> M.B. Poliakoff, *Studies in the Terminology of the Greek Combat Sports*, Beitr. z. klass. Phil. 146 (Königstein<sup>2</sup> 1982), Appendix 4: "Philostratos' *de gymnastica* as a Witness to Greek Sport", 143-147, esp. 143. Sweet accepts Poliakoff's misgivings about Philostratos' information (*ZPE* 50 [1983] 287-289).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> For Xenophon see L. Moretti, *Olympionikai, i vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici*, Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 8 (Rome 1957) 94, nos. 249-250.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> δοκεῖς γάρ μοι λέγειν οἶον ἐν τῷ ἀγωνία εἰςιν οἱ πένταθλοι πρὸς τοὺς δρομέας ἢ τοὺς παλαιςτάς. καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τούτων μὲν λείπονται κατὰ τὰ τούτων ἆθλα καὶ δεύτεροί εἰςι πρὸς τούτους, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἀθλητῶν πρῶτοι καὶ νικῶςιν αὐτούς.

to say (136 A) that those who pursue philosophy are inferior to the men of the first rank in their understanding of the crafts, but by holding second rank they surpass the others and thus the man who studies philosophy is a sort of  $\ddot{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\kappa\rho\sigma c$  in everything.<sup>11</sup> In response, the interlocutor is led to agree that the philosopher is not such a man who because of his attention to one particular thing would be found wanting in everything else, like the craftsmen, but one who would have moderate contact with everything. Again at 138 E Sokrates returns to the question of whether the philosopher ought to be πένταθλον ... καὶ ὑπακροc, holding second rank in all aspects of a field.<sup>12</sup> The word ὑπακροc, denotes someone who is not quite top rank.

The same comparison is drawn by [Longinus] when he discusses the respective merits of Hypereides and Demosthenes and states that the former is more versatile and has more good qualities: "In all things he is not quite of the top-rank ( $\forall\pi\alpha\kappa\rho\sigma\epsilon$ ), like the pentathlete, so that in all disciplines he is the first-placed over the non-specialists, but falls short of the top-quality of the other contestants (sc. the specialists)" (34.1).<sup>13</sup> Thought, vocabulary, and structure are influenced by the *Amatores*. The word  $\forall\pi\alpha\kappa\rho\sigma\epsilon$ , occurring in the *Amatores* four times,<sup>14</sup> is found nowhere else; and tŵv µèv πρωτείων ἐν ἄπαcιν τŵν ἄλλων ἀγωνιcτŵν λείπεcθαι, πρωτεύειν δὲ τŵν ἰδιωτŵν recalls 135E ἐκεῖνοι τούτων μὲν λείπονται ... καὶ δεύτεροί εἰcι πρòc τούτους, τŵν δὲ ἄλλων ἀθλητŵν πρῶτοι καὶ νικῶcι αὐτούς (see n. 10 and 13) and 136A τŵν μèv πρώτων ... ἐλλείπεcθαι, τὰ δευτερεῖα δ' ἔχονταc τŵν ἄλλων περιεῖναι (see n. 11). The pentathlete is not quite "top-rank" so that he falls short or is inferior to those among the other contestants who are of the first rank in an event (the context in *Amatores* shows that the specialist stade racer or wrestler is meant), but he is superior to those who are not specialist.

It is now time to return to our theory that a victory in one of the first three events was necessary to proceed in the pentathlon. It may be useful to set forth at this point the undisputed facts about the event:

1) The five events were discus, jump, javelin, running, and wrestling.<sup>15</sup>

2) The wrestling came last.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> των μέν πρώτων εἰς ςύνεςιν περὶ τὰς τέχνας ἐλλείπεςθαι, τὰ δευτερεῖα δ' ἔχοντας τῶν ἄλλων περιεῖναι, καὶ οὕτως γίγνεςθαι περὶ πάντα ὕπακρόν τινα ἄνδρα τὸν πεφιλοςοφηκότα·

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> πότερον οὖν καὶ περὶ ταῦτα λέγωμεν, ἔφην, πένταθλον αὐτὸν δεῖν εἶναι καὶ ὕπακρον, καὶ ταύτης μὲν τὰ δευτερεῖα ἔχοντα πάντων τὸν φιλόςοφον, καὶ ἀχρεῖον εἶναι κ.τ.λ.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> καὶ cχεδὸν ὕπακροc ἐν πᾶcιν ὡc ὁ πένταθλοc, ὥcτε τῶν μὲν πρωτείων ἐν ἅπαcιν τῶν ἄλλων ἀγωνιcτῶν λείπεcθαι, πρωτεύειν δὲ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν. In the translation above, τῶν ... πρωτείων ... τῶν ἄλλων ἀγωνιcτῶν λείπεcθαι is the other side of what [Plato] phrases as τῶν ... ἄλλων ἀθλητῶν πρῶτοι καὶ νικῶcιν αὐτούc.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> In addition to the passages quoted (nn. 11 and 12) twice in 136C.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> The order in which these are presented by our sources varies considerably, sometimes for metrical reasons (Simonides, *Epigr*. XLII Page: Ἰcθμια καὶ Πυθοῖ Διοφῶν ὁ Φίλωνος ἐνίκα | ἅλμα ποδωκείην δίςκον ἄκοντα πάλην) or for some other reason (e.g. Philostratos' explanation of the origins of the event).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> This is clear from Xenophon (*Hell.* 7.4.29). At the time of the Elean invasion of Olympia at the Games of 364 "they had already completed the horse-racing and the stadium events (τὰ δρομικά) of the pen-

## 3) Victory in three of the five events was sufficient to win.<sup>17</sup>

In addition we can make some reasonable assumptions. I would support Bean's argument that the "first triad" must refer to the three events which were peculiar to the pentathlon, i.e. discus, jump, and javelin. One factor in favour of this argument, which Bean has noticed, is that in these three events a high number of competitors creates little difficulty, unlike the footrace or the wrestling where elimination heats or rounds would be necessary (Bean [above, n. 3] 363). The fact that there could be a very large number of entrants is confirmed by *IAG* 86 Moretti, where we read that at Neapolis Demetrios defeated 87 entrants ( $\dot{\alpha}\pi\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha$ - $\psi\alpha\mu\acute{e}vovc$ ). Sweet, while acknowledging the 87 competitors at Neapolis, ignores the problem such a number would cause in the footrace, as the starting line restricted the numbers of starters.<sup>18</sup> I would suggest that all competitors took part in the first triad and that only the winner of each of these events proceeded to the footrace and (if necessary) to the wrestling.

I also believe that Bean was right in interpreting Plutarch *Symp.* 9.2 (738A) as a reference to the way in which the pentathlon competitors were progressively reduced. Plutarch is explaining how the letter alpha is superior to the other letters in three ways, like the pentathletes: 1) it is superior to most letters in being a vowel 2) among the vowels it has two quantities 3) of those with two quantities it is superior by always coming first (in diphthongs).<sup>19</sup> Thus the "competitors" in the alphabet are successively reduced from twenty-four to the seven vowels (as by the first triad), then to the three with two quantities (as by the footrace) and finally to alpha alone (as by the wrestling).<sup>20</sup>

I would venture to strengthen the case by adducing Pindar Nemean 7. 70-74: Εὐξένιδα πάτραθε Σώγενες, ἀπομνύω | μὴ τέρμα προβαὶς ἄκονθ' ὥτε χαλκοπάραον ὄρςαι | θοὰν γλῶςcaν, ὃς ἐξέπεμψεν παλαιςμάτων | αὐχένα καὶ cθένος ἀδίαντον, αἴθωνι πρὶν ἁλίω γυῖον ἐμπεςεῖν. | εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλέον πεδέρχεται. Here I accept

tathlon. Those who had reached the wrestling were no longer in the *dromos*, but were wrestling between the *dromos* and the altar". Cf. the story of Teisamenos who after winning the stade and the jump came within one wrestling fall of winning the pentathlon (Hdt. 9.33; Paus. 3.11.6). Also the inscription of Akmatidas of Sparta (*IAG* 8) tells that he won the pentathlon  $\dot{\alpha}\kappa ov\tau t$  "without dust". As Moretti has seen, this term applies to the wrestling, not to the whole pentathlon, i.e. Akmatidas did not win by default, but had the pentathlon won without wrestling, i.e. after the fourth event (*Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* [Rome 1953] 19).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> E.g. Schol. Aristeides *Panath.* 3.339. Cf. the noun τριακτῆρ (Schol. Aisch. *Agam* 171) and the verb ἀποτριάζειν (Pollux 3.151) used of a victorious pentathlete. But of particular interest is the phrase πρώτη τρειάδι, "in the first triad", found in an inscription listing the victories of Polykrates of Kibyra (*IAG* 82 Moretti). This can only mean that he won the first three events of the pentathlon so that the remaining two were not held, i.e. to win "in the first triad" is to go one step better than to win ἀκονιτί. Such a victory showing complete dominance over one's rivals must have been quite rare.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> ZPE 50 (1983) 290. The starting line at Olympia could accommodate only 20 runners, while Nemea was equipped for only 12 or 13 (cf. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, 66ff.; M. Goethals in *Nemea: A Guide to the Site and Museum*, ed. Stephen Miller [Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford 1990] 182).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> διὸ τοῖς τριςίν, ὥςπερ οἱ πένταθλοι, περίεςτι καὶ νικῷ τὰ μὲν πολλὰ τῷ φωνᾶεν εἶναι, τὰ δ' αὖ φωνάεντα τῷ δίχρονον, ταῦτα δ' αὐτὰ τῷ πεφυκέναι καθηγεῖςθαι, δευτερεύειν δὲ μηδέποτε μηδ' ἀκολουθεῖν.

 $<sup>^{20}</sup>$  Gardiner missed the point of the argument, when he wrote: "surely nothing can be more unscientific or more unliterary than to build up a theory on the details of a metaphor or simile" (*JHS* 23 [1903] 56). Plutarch would not have made the comparison if there was no analogy to be drawn.

the explanation by Hugh Lee that τέρμα προβαίc means "having stepped up to the line [from which the javelin was thrown]", without any reference to a foul, and more importantly the interpretation offered by Charles Segal for the rest of the passage, so that it means "Sogenes by descent member of the family of Euxenias, I swear that I did not, having stepped up to the line, hurl forth my tongue like the bronze-cheeked javelin which sent the neck and strength (of a losing contestant) unwetted out of the wrestling before his limbs encounter the burning sun. If there was toil, the pleasure follows in greater abundance."<sup>21</sup> Pindar is saying that he is not like one of those who are "sent out" or eliminated from the final stage, the wrestling. Segal remarks that "it would be helpful, though not absolutely necessary, if the javelin contest came fourth, immediately before the wrestling" (loc. cit. [n.21] 39). I would argue that it came third. On my theory it would thus be the last chance for an athlete who had not won the discus or the jump to remain in the competition. Should he succeed in winning the javelin he would then have to win both the race and the wrestling to win the pentathlon. Indeed if there were three different victors in the first three events and our javelin winner failed to win the footrace, he might even have had to wrestle twice, a semi-final against his fellow loser in the footrace and the final against the winner of the footrace who by virtue of two victories would have earned a bye. Thus failure in the javelin can be said to send a man out of the wrestling, which must always have been feared as the most painful and strenuous of the events in the pentathlon.22

If the javelin was the third event, then the discus throw was the first and the jump the second event, because the discus preceded the jump according to a very fragmentary inscription from Rhodes.<sup>23</sup> That the discus was an earlier event than the javelin is clear from the sequence of the victories of Automedes of Phlious as described by Bakchylides.<sup>24</sup> An inscription of an unknown pentathlete from Ephesos who claimed to be "undefeated in discus, undefeated in javelin" might be thought to support this order.<sup>25</sup>

One athlete who won a pentathlon by obtaining his third victory in the stade race is Nikolaidas of Corinth, if we accept the suggestion of Merkelbach that we read  $\dot{\epsilon}v \delta \dot{\epsilon} \Phi \lambda \epsilon i o \hat{v} \tau i$ ctadíoici tà πέντε κρατήcac in v. 11 of [Simonides] XLIII Page (A.P. 13.19).<sup>26</sup> It also

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> H.M. Lee, "The TEPMA and the javelin in Pindar *Nemean* vii 70-3, and Greek athletics", *JHS* 96 (1976), 70-79; C. Segal, *GRBS* 9 (1968) 31-45. See also G. Most, *The Measures of Praise*, Hypomnemata 83 (Göttingen 1985) 191-196.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Note that Homer calls wrestling παλαιμοςύνης ἀλεγεινῆς (*Il.* 23.701).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> L. Moretti, *RFIC* 84 (1956), 55; Stephen G. Miller, *Arete* <sup>2</sup> (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford 1991) 50, No. 46.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Bakch. 9.30-36: τοῖος Ἐλλάνων δι' ἀπ[ε]ίρονα κύκλον | φαῖνε θαυμ[α]cτὸν δέμας | δίcκον τροχοειδέα ῥίπτών, | καὶ μελαμφύλλου κλάδον | ἀκτέας ἐς αἰπεινὰν προπέμπων | αἰθέρ' ἐκ χειρὸς βοὰν ἄτρυνε λαῶν | ἢ τελευτάςας ἀμάρυγμα πάλας.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> IAG 75 (2nd c. AD): ... καὶ μετὰ τὰ ᾿Ολύμπεια νεικήcαντα τοῦc ἐν Μακ[εδο]νία ἀγῶνας, ἀπαραδίςκευτον, ἀπαρακόντιςτον, ἄλειπτον, κ.τ.λ.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> ZPE 14 (1974) 184. cταδίοιcι τὰ Merkelbach : cτάδιον τὰ τε Hermann : cταδίφ τε P. For the traditional interpretation i.e. that Nikolaidas won the stade and the pentathlon at Phthious, see D.L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981) 264. But in support of Merkelbach's conjecture, L. Koenen pointed out to me the following consideration. The epigram is a catalogue of one, two, three, and four victories which

seems a reasonable assumption that while three victories guaranteed the pentathlon crown, as in the case of Automedes of Phlious who won the discus, javelin, and wrestling (Bakch. 9.30-6), there could be instances where the overall winner won only two of the constituent events. For example the story of Teisamenos and Hieronymos as described by Herodotos and Pausanias shows that Teisamenos won the run and the jump, but lost to Hieronymos in the wrestling by a single but decisive fall (Hdt. 9.33; Paus. 3.11.6). While it is tempting to assume (as many do) that Hieronymos won the two throwing events, the possibility remains that he only won one of them and that three men contested the running which gave Teisamenos his second victory. Hieronymos must then have reached the wrestling final on the basis of some other superiority over the third contender, perhaps by a wrestling semi-fianl as suggested earlier. Perhaps victory in such a semi-final might also be thought to be one of the three victories that sufficed to win the pentathlon.

Merkelbach (*loc. cit.* [above, n. 10]) has made the observation that the first four events often saw double victories of two sorts, i.e. the same athlete might win the jump and the run (like Teisamenos) or a single athlete the two throws (like Automedes and the athlete from Ephesos who was undefeated in discus and javelin. This is because the two pairs of events call upon related abilities e.g. the sprinter-jumper combination is common, as with Jesse Owens or Carl Lewis. The discus and javelin throws are not quite as closely related, the latter placing less of a premium on size and bulk.<sup>27</sup> But a good discus thrower is more likely to beat a sprinter at javelin-throwing than vice-versa. Many pentathlon competitions must have been decided in the final wrestling between two double victors from the first four events.

There are several athletes whose attested abilities suggest the events they are likely to have won in their pentathlon victories. Xenophon of Corinth, the recipient of Pindar's Olympian 13, was an outstanding sprinter who won both the separate stade championship and the pentathlon at Olympia in 464, the first ever to record this double. In his pentathlon, he is likely to have won the jump, the sprint, and the wrestling. The same might be said for Gor-

Nikolaidas won in the course of his life in each of twelve different places, including Delphi, Isthmus, and Nemea. Only in lines 3 and 11 is the contest identified. In line 3, where the poet talks about a victory at the Panathenaean games, he speaks about victory in the pentathlon, but this identification can refer back to, and include, his victory in Delphi, mentioned in line 2: ἄνθηκεν τοδ' ἄγαλμα Κορίνθιος, ὅcπερ ἐνίκα | ἐν Δελφοῖc ποτε, Νικολάιδας, |<sup>3</sup> καὶ Παναθηναίοις στεφάνους λάβε πέντ' ἐπ' ἀέθλοις | ἑξῆντ' ἀμφιφορεῖc ἐλαίου (ἑξῆντ', "sixty", Merkelbach [*ZPE* 2, 1968, 3f.]: ἑξήκοντα P [unmetrical] : ἑξᾶc [sc. ἑξὰν] Salmasius). When the poet's list turns to Phleious, the last place in his list, we hear again that he won, at least, the pentathlon. Thus the list is framed by the mention of the pentathlon, and it is quite possible that all the victories won by Nikolaidas were in this contest. What made the last victory a particular triumph and lead the poet to repeat the mention of the pentathlon? The answer may be found in Merkelbach's explanation. Finally, as also was pointed out to me by L. Koenen, even Hermann's emendation can be understood in this way: "In Phleious he won the stade and the pentathlon." Winning the stade meant that he won the entire contest. Wilamowitz, reading a different and wrong text in line 11 and thinking that Nikolaidas won all his victories in the stade, had the right feeling for the structure of the poem: "Darin, daß der Mann überall als Läufer siegt, hat das ganze Gedicht seinen Zusammenhalt (Sappho und Simonides [Berlin 1913] 218).

 $<sup>^{27}</sup>$  Philostratos (*Gymn.* 3) classed the discus with the wrestling as a "heavy" event, but put the javelin with the jump and the run as a "light" one.

gos of Elis, the only man by Pausanias' time to have won four Olympic pentathlons, to which he added one victory each in the diaulos and the armed race.<sup>28</sup>

The best-known jumper in the Greek World, the famous Phayllos of Kroton, won two Pythian pentathlons and one Pythian stade (probably in 482 and earlier; Paus. 10.9.2). Clearly he owed his pentathlon success largely to his jumping and sprinting, since Aristophanes twice refers to his running ability (*Acharn.* 215; *Wasps.* 1206). Gardiner mistakenly interprets the famous epigram "Phayllos jumped five over fifty feet, but threw the discus five under a hundred" as implying that Phayllos won these two events plus the run (*loc. cit.* [above, n. 6] 62). But Harris correctly suggested that Phayllos was a superb jumper but a poor discus thrower (*op. cit.* [above, n. 4] 90f.). At the Pythians he more likely managed to win the wrestling, but it is notable that he never won at Olympia.

I have been able to find only two others who won separate races and pentathlons as adults. Aelius Granianus of Sikyon who won the boy's stade in A.D. 133 and then added the men's diaulos, hoplite race, and pentathlon in 137. He repeated the pentathlon victory in 141. The other is Demetrios of Cyprian Salamis, who in the third century won three Olympic stades in a row and two pentathlons.<sup>29</sup>

Among other known winners of pentathlons and footraces, some achieved all of their victories as boys or *ageneioi*, e.g. Damiskos of Messene, who won the boy's stade at Olympia in 368 at the age of twelve, later won pentathlons at Nemea and Isthmia.<sup>30</sup> In view of his extreme youth at the time of his Olympic victory it is reasonable to assume that his pentathlon victories were also in the boys' category. There was no boys' pentathlon at Olympia for him to win and if he did compete as an adult he apparently was not successful. Similarly Polykrates of Kibyra dominated his boy competitors in pentathlon, winning twice in the first triad. As an *ageneios* he won both the stade and the pentathlon at the Athenian Hadrianea and had other *ageneios* stade victories, but no adult victories are listed in the surviving part of the inscription (*IAG* 82). Since he is styled *pentathlon*, any adult victories he had are likely to have been in that event.

Several others enjoyed sprint success along with pentathlon victories as boys, but only pentathlon wins as *ageneioi* or adults. These include two pentathletes from Kos, the first of whom won the "Isthmian boys" stade and pentathlon on the same day; he had another boys' stadion victory at Myndos, amid many boys' pentathlon victories, but secured only pentathlon victories as an *ageneios* and a single adult pentathlon victory (at Nemea; *IAG* 60, ca. AD 5); his compatriot won the "Isthmian boys" stade, diaulos, and pentathlon on the same day at the Romaia Games in Kos and had two other boys' stade victories, but as an *ageneios* and an adult had only pentathlon wins (*IAG* 61, ca. AD 5).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Paus. 6.15.9; Moretti, *Olympionikai*, 177, Nos. 961-966.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Granianus: Paus. 2.11.8; Moretti, *Olympionikai*, Nos. 848,850-2,856; Demetrios: *IAG* 86; Moretti, *Olympionikai*, Nos. 922-3, 925-6, 928, dates these victories to 229, 233, and 237.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> Paus. 6.2.10-11; Moretti, Olympionikai, No. 417.

These situations indicate that in antiquity, just as today, some boys matured faster than their peers and could be athletically superior over a range of activities, but later the others catch up and many precocious age-group champions do not repeat their success in adult competition. Others achieve success by narrowing their focus and by concentrating on one particular sport or event.

A victor list from the Erotidia games at Thespiai shows that there could be a tie in the pentathlon: SEG 3 (1929) 335: "men's pentathlon. P. Albinius [Methodicus Corinthius]. Psychicus (son) of Heracleon, a Theban was crowned with him."<sup>31</sup> Merkelbach misunderstands this inscription by suggesting that Albinius is clearly the winner, yet Psychicus is called "crowned together" with him. He suggests that the pair must have won two events each, that before the final event the score was 2-1 in favour of Psychicus, but that by winning the wrestling, Albinius became the overall victor, but because their score was then 2-2, Psychicus was crowned with him (loc. cit. [above, n. 6]). The true explanation, as seen by Bean, is that the pair must have tied in the final event, the wrestling (loc. cit. [above, n. 3] 367). Such ties, when neither competitor was able to achieve a final decisive throw, must have been reasonable common, since twice Polybios uses the image of a drawn wrestling contest, in both instances with the phrase "to make the crown ιερόν" (1.58.5; 29.8.9). It may have been the judges' decision whether there were to be joint-winners (systephanoi) or the crown to be made sacred. In later times the latter practice seems to have become quite common in the combat events. M. Aurelius Hermagoras, a wrestler from Magnesia, listed twenty-nine victories in sacred games, but also mentioned a draw at Olympia and eighteen other draws.32

We are now in a position to explain a major difficulty in the inscription about Demetrios of Salamis (*IAG* 86, after AD 229):

Δημήτριος δὶς Cαλαμείνιος πένταθλο(c), --- νεικήςας τρὶς ἘΟλύμπ[ια] κατὰ τὸ ἑξῆς ἀνδρῶν ςτάδιον καὶ δὶς πέν[τα]θλον, --- ἘΙςθμια δὶς ἱερόν, ἐν Νέα πόλει τῆς ἘΙταλίας Ceβαςτὰ νεικήςας τοὺς ἀπογραψαμένους πζ΄ --- ἘΑναζάρβου τῆς μητροπόλεως ἙΑδριάνειον ἱερὸν δίς, --- κοινὸν ἘΑςίας νεικήςας πέμπτῷ †ΑΠΛΩ† ἘἘΠάτον ποιήςας αὐτῷ τετράκις ςὑνδρομον, κ.τ.λ.

 $\ddot{\alpha}$  (θ)λ $\omega$  Matthews : (π $\dot{\alpha}$ )λ $\omega$  Woodward : ἁπλ $\hat{\omega}$  Bean : ( $\ddot{\omega}$ )πλ $\omega$  Gough

Moretti has misinterpreted the two instances of the word  $i\epsilon\rho\delta\nu$  (lines 7, 12) as referring to "sacred" games. In fact the word refers to a tie or draw. Demetrios records four such draws, two at Isthmia and two at the Hadrianeion at Anazarbos. Recognition of these circumstances will now enable us to solve the problem of the next part of the inscription: "at the Koinon of Asia (Demetrios) defeated Optatus in a fifth --- (?) after having tied with him four

 $<sup>^{31}</sup>$  ἀνδρῶν πένταθλον·Π. Ἀλβίνιος [Μεθοδικὸς Κορίνθιος·] Ψυχικὸς Ἡρακλέωνος Θηβαῖος <br/> cυν[εςτεφανώθη].

 $<sup>^{32}</sup>$  IAG 77, 2nd c. AD: M. Αὐρ(ήλιος) Έρμαγόρας Μάγνης Σιπύλου, παλαιςτής, --- νεικήςας ἱεροὺς ἀγῶνας κθ΄ καὶ θεματικοὺς ρκζ΄. Ὀλύμπια ἐν Πείςῃ ἱεράν, ἄλλας ἱερὰς ιη΄.

times". Bean thought that this sentence referred to the footrace of the pentathlon, that in the first triad Demetrios had two wins and Optatus one and that the footrace would thus be a "single" ( $\dot{\alpha}\pi\lambda\hat{\varphi}$ ) between these two. They dead-heated four times before Demetrios scored a clear win at the fifth attempt and thus won the pentathlon (*loc. cit.* [above, n. 3] 367f.). But there is no evidence for dead-heats being re-run and the likelihood of four of them in succession over a distance of approximately two hundred metres is surely remote. I would suggest that the four ties with Optatus are in fact the four draws in Demetrios' career mentioned above. We should read  $\check{\alpha}\theta\lambda\varphi$  and take the passage to mean that at the Koinon of Asia, in their fifth contest (meeting), Demetrios finally defeated Optatus, having previously tied with him four times in a pentathlon (presumably after stalemate in the wrestling).

University of Guelph

Victor Matthews