

XIV.—The Ephebate and Citizenship in Attica

O. W. REINMUTH

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Ephebic training, which at the outset was required of all young men of Attic birth before they could become citizens *de facto*, later became a means of obtaining Attic citizenship by young men of non-Attic birth who enrolled in the ephebia. The Athenian ephebia became a school to educate foreigners for Attic citizenship. All foreign ephebes were entitled to enrolment in an Attic deme and Attic citizenship by virtue of their ephebic training. Those who had decided to exercise their new right and had registered in a deme before the commemorative stone was set up, were at first called *πρωτέγγραφοι*, that is, "those first enrolled (in a deme)." Later they were listed with no distinction in the roster of Attic-born ephebes. The *ἐπτέγγραφοι* were foreign born ephebes who were "(eligible to be) enrolled (in the deme) later," should they decide to avail themselves of the Attic citizenship, which was theirs *de jure*.*

Citizenship in Attica was obtained by birth¹ or by grant to aliens.² The qualifications for admission to the citizen body on the basis of birth were two: both parents must be Attic citizens and the candidate must have reached the age of eighteen. Validation of these facts by the deme, subject to the review, at least of the age qualification by the *Boulê*,³ resulted in the registration of the candidate's name in the *ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον* of his father's deme and citizenship.⁴

Beginning in the year 335 B.C., however, another prerequisite was added. Every young man registered in a deme was required to enter a two-years' apprenticeship training, at the outset almost entirely military in nature, as a step in the process of becoming a full-fledged citizen.⁵ In the ephebia the young men, maintained at government expense and, to begin with, paid a small stipend, were under the rigorous moral and disciplinary supervision of selected officials. They were taught the rudiments of military science,

* See *TAPhA* 78 (1947) 433 f. See also below, ADDENDUM.

¹ *Φύσει*, Isocr. 4.105; Dem. 45.78 ff.

² *Κατὰ ψήφισμα*, Aristot. *Pol.* 3.1275.6; Pollux 3.56; or *ποιήσει, ποιητοὶ πολῖται*, later *δημοποῖητοι*, Szanto in *RE* s.v. *δημοποίητος*. Cf. A. Billheimer, *Naturalization in Athenian Law and Practice* (Diss. Princeton, 1922).

³ Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen* (2 vols., Berlin, 1893) 1.190.

⁴ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 42.1; Schol. Aeschin. 3.122.

⁵ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 42.2.4–5.

received a shield and spear from the state and under the *stratêgoi* performed patrol and guard duty throughout Attica.⁶

Although the young men were citizens *de jure* from the moment their names were registered in the demes, they were not yet citizens *de facto*. They could not vote, attend meetings of the *ekklêsia* or be parties to a suit, except in matters of inheritance or an hereditary priesthood. They were exempt from liturgies, and except for extraordinary levies on property for military purposes, did not pay taxes. Indeed, membership in the ephebia was an indication only of eligibility to citizenship. Aristotle emphasizes this point when he writes that the *Boulê* reviews *τοὺς ἐγγραφέντας* (i.e. the demesmen, not the citizens) and then immediately continues, *ἐπὰν δὲ δοκιμασθῶσιν οἱ ἔφηβοι*, clearly showing that the *δοκιμασία* had for its purpose the exclusion from the ephebia of all demesmen who were not yet eighteen. Enrolment in the ephebia was proof that eligibility for citizenship had been established, i.e. the young man was of Attic parentage and 18 years old.

The attainment of full citizenship was marked by the completion of the ephebic training. As Aristotle put it, "When the two years are up, they (the ephebes) now are members of the general body of citizens."⁷ At this time their names were entered upon the *πίναξ ἐκκλησιαστικός* of their demes, showing that they were entitled to attendance and a vote in the *ekklêsia*, as well as all other privileges and responsibilities of citizens.

Prior to the institution of the ephebia, registration in the deme was the final step in the making of the demesman *and* of the state citizen. The demotic was the mark of citizenship. The uniform employment of the demotic was designed to express the fundamental equality of the citizens without reference to nobility of birth. The regularity of its use varied in the century after Cleisthenes, but it was employed generally in the period after the democratic restoration of 403/2 especially in official language, and in certain classes of documents its use with the name was required.⁸

Before the discovery of Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, Girard argued that not all citizens were required to undergo ephebic training, but only those of the first three classes of the Solonian constitu-

⁶ C. A. Forbes, *Greek Physical Education* (New York and London, 1929) 109-178.

⁷ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 42.5.

⁸ G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*³ in Iwan v. Müller, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* (Munich, 1926) 4.1.1, Zweite Hälfte, 876, note 1. Cf. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* (above, note 3) 169-171.

tion, i.e. those of whom military service would eventually be required.⁹ But that position is no longer tenable. In the second half of the fourth century before Christ, the term $\delta \epsilon \phi \eta \beta \epsilon \upsilon \sigma \alpha \varsigma$, as earlier $\delta \eta \mu \acute{o} \tau \eta \varsigma$, was synonymous with $\pi \omicron \lambda \iota \tau \eta \varsigma$.

Several stages in the development of the ephebate in relation-ship to citizenship are clearly marked out by the manner in which the ephebes are catalogued and by the presence or absence of the demotic in the numerous ephebic inscriptions, the earliest of the very first year of its existence, 334/3 before Christ, the latest of the latter part of the third century after Christ.¹⁰ Let us examine these, using as our touchstone the fact that the demotic attached to a name indicates registration in the deme of a young man who has reached the age of 18. We shall make one assumption, a valid one, I think, that in both official inscriptions and also in those privately set up, the use of the demotic is consistent: if it is attached to some names in the list, all names entitled to such designation bear it.

The first stage, in which all demesmen were required to undergo ephebic training, may be set from the foundation of the ephebia in 335/4 to 306/5. During this period of obligatory attendance the number of ephebes was so large that it would have been impracticable to include all their names, along with the customary decrees pertaining to them, upon one stone. In any event, there is no inscription extant of this period in which all tribes were represented and it seems to have been customary for each tribe to honor its own ephebes. The five inscriptions extant of this period show

⁹ P. Girard, *L'Éducation Athénienne* (Paris, 1891) 287.

¹⁰ Throughout this article the dates of the inscriptions cited are those given by the most recent editor, with consideration of the chronological studies listed below where these present pertinent material. A discussion of moot points of chronology goes beyond the compass of this article. W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (New York, 1939); W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940); W. Kolbe, "Studien zur attischen Chronologie der Kaiserzeit," *MDAI(A)* 46 (1921) 105-156; P. Graindor, *Chronologie des archonts athéniens sous l'empire* (Brussels, 1922); *idem*, *Album d'inscriptions attiques d'époque impériale* (Ghent, 1924); J. Kirchner, *IG* 2², Pars Altera, Fasc. Post. (1931) pp. 789-796; P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo, 1934) 29; J. H. Oliver, "Appendix on Athenian Archons under the Roman Period," *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 81-89; J. A. Notopoulos, "Ferguson's Law in Athens under the Empire," *AJPh* 44 (1943) 44-45. The earliest ephebic inscription is *IG* 2².1156 (334/3), the first year of its existence. The latest is *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 71 no. 37 (latter part of s. 3 A.D.). The editor states concerning it, "It is later than any datable ephebic document."

similar form and arrangement in the roster of names.¹¹ They list the ephebes of one tribe, each followed by the patronymic, under the names of their respective demes.

The first of these, of the year 334/3, was set up in honor of some 44 ephebes of the Cecropid tribe, who were members of the first ephebic class. For the following year, 333/2, the second ephebic class, we have an inscription of the tribe Leontis, but unfortunately the list of names is so fragmentary that no satisfactory estimate of their number can be made. An inscription dated 324/3 gives the names of the ephebes of Leontis in similar fashion. An average of the 63 names for this tribe and the estimated 44 in the fragmentary inscription of Cecropis would yield the total of 18-year-old males one should expect on the basis of population statistics for Attica at that time. Beloch and Sundwall independently estimated that if attendance was obligatory upon all Attic youth of 18 years of age, the enrolment should be from 450 to 500.¹²

The ephebic inscription published in *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 185 no. 91, which honored the ephebes of the tribe Aiantis, cannot be exactly dated. It is placed by the editor at the end of the fourth century before Christ. The publication of a similar ephebic inscription of Oineis is promised in the forthcoming Supplement VIII of *Hesperia*. Since the next datable ephebic inscription, of the year 305/4 (*IG* 2².478), marks a radical change in the form of this type of inscription by listing the ephebes of all tribes, a change which reflects a modification in the institution, the two *Hesperia* inscriptions of Leontis and the promised one of Oineis, if the latter is not independently dated, can be placed with considerable certainty between 333/2 and 306/5.

The inscription of 324/3 presents a problem. Among the 63 names are 7 pairs of homopatronymics, four pairs of the seven having the same demotic and one name following immediately after the other. Such pairs of names do not occur in any of the other inscriptions of this period.

¹¹ *IG* 2².1156 (334/3) of Cecropis; *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 59 no. 8 (333/2) of Leontis; 'Αρχ. 'Εφ. 1918, 75 no. 95 (324/3) of Leontis; *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 185 no. 19 (end of s. 4 B.C.) of Aiantis; and an ephebic inscription with arrangement similar to the foregoing of the tribe Oineis, the publication of which is promised in Supplement VIII of *Hesperia*.

¹² Beloch, *Klio* 5 (1905) 351-3; J. Sundwall, *Acta Scientiarum Fennicae*, 34 (1906) 22. Girard, *L'Education Athénienne*, 288, thought that the number should be 900 to 1000 annually.

Do these pairs of names represent brothers? The two Eupolises with father Calliades of the deme Phrearios (lines 6 and 12) are obviously not brothers, nor is it likely that the two boys whose father was called Antigenes, but who are from different demes and whose names are separated by three lines (2.8 and 11), are thus related. One may also suspect the fraternal connection of the two boys of like patronymic and the same demotic whose names are separated by three lines (2.29 and 32). But what about the four remaining pairs of names one following the other with the same patronymic and the same demotic (1.7-8, 9-10; 2.18-19, 25-26)?

The editor Leonardos does not consider the possibility that they may be brothers, since that would be impossible (unless they were twins) if the customary practise of entering upon ephebic training in the year following the 18th birthday had been followed in all cases. He, therefore, explains these pairs of names as representing "in all likelihood," albeit with no further reason, cousins german, second cousins or sons of second cousins. But the one assumption that he does not consider, viz., that one of the two boys had either registered in the deme or had entered the ephebia *after* he was 18 years of age, is the only assumption which is consistent with the conditions, and is in itself not unlikely. The requirement that all young men embark upon ephebic training after registration in the deme at 18 years of age apparently was increasingly difficult to enforce since, as we shall observe, obligatory attendance was given up entirely as early as 306/5. Boys who for one reason or another failed to enter at the normal time, i.e. after their eighteenth birthday, might enter later along with their younger brothers. Their names were listed one after the other in the inscriptions.

In the *dokimasia* the demesmen were fined only if they had registered a boy under eighteen, not if they had failed to register him at the age of 18. An individual could present himself to the demesmen for examination, and doubtless in the majority of cases did so, at 18. If he did not seem to them to be 18, he might return another year. As Wilamowitz expressed it, the Athenians of this period had an official age, but "ihr faktisches Geburtsjahr stand keineswegs fest."¹³ The attestation by the demesmen of legitimate Attic birth stands; the question of age is subject to review by the

¹³ Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* (above note 3) 1.190.

Boulê, and it is after its *dokimasia* that the boys are admitted to the ephebia.

In 1879 Köhler had concluded that two pairs of names with homopatronymics and homodemotics appearing in the inscription of 305/4 (for the ephebes entering in 306/5) represented brothers,¹⁴ against Dumont who interpreted these and similar cases as coincidences.¹⁵ Forbes accepted Köhler's conclusion and also the corollary which Köhler had drawn that the 18-year age-requirement had been relaxed, but failed to note that brothers had been admitted to the ephebia at least nine years earlier, as the inscription of 324/3, which had been published in the meanwhile, proves.¹⁶ But the inference that boys of less than 18 could enter the ephebia at this period is not warranted by the occurrence of pairs of brothers in the inscriptions of either 324/3 or 305/4 for the simple reason that in all cases both brothers were demesmen. If demesmen they had reached the age of 18, unless the age of registration in the deme had been lowered, for which there is no evidence. It was not until much later, as we shall see, that the age requirement was relaxed.

In the inscriptions of the following centuries homopatronymics and homodemotics are frequently found, their names placed in sequence in twos and threes (in one case at least four) while other names with the same patronymic and the same demotic are separated. It seems to have been the practise to list the names of brothers in sequence so that when two or more names with the same patronymic and the same demotic follow each other, one may assume that they represent brothers.¹⁷

¹⁴ U. Köhler, *MDAI(A)* 4 (1879) 333.

¹⁵ A. Dumont, *Essai sur l'éphébie attique* (2 vols., Paris, 1875) 1.41 f.

¹⁶ Forbes, *op. cit.* (above, note 6) 152.

¹⁷ Homopatronymics who by the rule of sequence in all likelihood represent brothers, are found in the following inscriptions. In all cases in which demotics are given the sets of homopatronymics are also homodemotics. The absence of a notation before the line numbers indicates Athenian ephebes. 'Αρχ. Έφ. 1918, 75 no. 95 (324/3) 1.7-8; 9-10; 2.18-19, 25-26; *IG* 2².665 (283/2 or 282/1) 3.63-64; 681 (275/4?) 1.16-17; 2.8-9, 22-23; 787 (ca. 236/5) 1.25-26; 1006 and *Hesperia* 17 (1948) 23 no. 11 (123/2) 1.121-122; 1008 (119/8) foreigners, 4.114-115; 1009 (117/6) 4.110-111; 1011 (107/6) 1.107-108; 4.97-98; 1028 (101/0) 1.111-112; 3.133-134; 1039 (83/2-78/7) 1.75-77 (3), 84-85; 2.84-85; 1963 (13/2) 21-22, 36-37; 1961 (ca. 40/39) 45-46; 1965 (end of s. 1 B.C.) foreigners, 6-7; 1967 (36/7) 9-10 (?), 15-16; 1996 (84/5-92/3, 20 (2), 21-22, 33-34 (?), 35-36, 45-46, 48-49, 58-59, 69-70, 73-74, 125-126, 129-130, 136-137; foreigners, 108-109, 113-114, 123-124, 151-152 (?), 156-158 (3), 161-162, 183-184, 191-192, 244-245 (?), 250-252 (?3); 2018 (beg. s. 1) 35-36; foreigners (?), 76-79, 86-88 (3), 93-94, 106-107, 131-132; 1999 (end s. 1) 6-7; foreigners, 39-40, 43-44, 47-48,

Unfortunately this democratic program for the training of all young men for citizenship did not continue long. As early as 322/1, the timocratic constitution of Antipater restricted full civic rights to those who possessed property of 2000 drachmas, and even after the return of a democratic order, this rating remained for fathers

49–51 (3); 2003 (end s. 1) 5–7 (3), 10–11, 17–18, 31–32; 2001 (s. 1) 18–19; 2017 (a little after 102/3) 11–12 (?); 2021 (before 112/3) 22–24 (3); 2020 (ca. 110/11 or a little after) 9–10, 37–38, 45–46, 49–50, 79–80, 85–86; foreigners, 118–119; 2022 (ca. 112/3) 18–19, 40–41; 2023 (ca. 112/3) 15–16, 19–20, 26–27, 52–53, 77–78; 2024 (112/3) 38–39; foreigners, 90–91, 107–108, 113–115 (3), 116–118 (3); 2026 (116/7) foreigners, 29–30, 40–41, 42–43, 48–49, 67–68, 73–74; 2028 (110–120/1) 1–2, 10–11; 2029 (112/3–125/6) 11–14 (3); 2033 (before middle s. 2 A.D.) 37–39 (3); 2037 (125/6) 14–15, 19 (2); foreigners, 42–43, 45–46, 54–55; 2039 (126/7) 6–7, 14–15, 27–28; 2041 (128/9) 14–15; 2046 (a little before 140/1) 25–26, 28–29 (?), 38–39; 2044 (139/40) 39–40; foreigners, 98–100 (3), 107–108, 111–112, 114–115; 2049 (142/3) 45–46, 74–75; foreigners, 99–100; 2050 (143/4 or 144/5) 63–65, 75–76 (?), 83–84, 89–90 (?), 96–97, 100–101 (?); 'Αρχ. 'Εφ. 1893, 67–74 (143/4) 1.11 (2), 56 (2); foreigners, 1.52–53, 55–56; 2.24–25; 2051 (144/5–148/9) 7–8, 47–48; 2052 (145/6) 37–38 (?), 55 (2), 92–93, 96–97; 2059 (147/8 or a little later) 19–20, 30 (??), 32 (2); foreigners, 93–94, 118–119, 121–122; 2060 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 8–9, 16–17; 2061 (middle s. 2 A.D.) foreigners, 44–45; 2063 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 3–4, 13–14, 37–38; 2064 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 3–4, 7–8, 25–26, 27–28; 2065 (150/1) 28–30 (2), 105–106, 117–118, 121–122; 2066 (150/1–160/1) 3–4, 17–18 (?), 19–20, 22–23, 26–27; 2067 (154/5) 27–28, 36–37, 41–42, 50–52 (3), 54–55, 67–68, 81–82, 85–86, 87–88, 90–91, 95–96, 125–126, 135–136, 144–145, 148–149, 156–157, 158–160 (3), 173–174, 177–178; 2068 (155/6) 18–20 (3), 21–22, 23–24, 46–47 (?), 82–83, 85–86, 97–98, 99–100, 103–104, 107–108, 109–110; foreigners, 136–137, 140–141, 153–155 (3), 156–157, 160–161, 163–164, 230–231, 242–243, 247–248; 2069 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 3–4, 15–16, 20–21, 27–28, 35–36, 37–38, 41–42; 2074 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 3–4; 2075 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 13–14 (?); 2076 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 6–7, 23–24, 26–27; 2081 (ca. 160/1) 16–17; 2082 (after middle s. 2 A.D.) foreigners, 58–59; 2083 (after middle s. 2 A.D.) foreigners, 2–3, 12–13, 43–44, 54–55, 79–80, 104–105; 2084 (after middle s. 2 A.D.) 13–14, 26–27; 2085 (161/2) 33–34, 40–41, 45–46, 70–71, 73–74; 2086 (163/4) 53–55 (3), 60–62 (3), 72–73 (?), 146–147, 176–177; 2087 (163/4) 18–20 (3); 2088 (ca. 163/4) 12–13; 2089 (162/3 or 164/5) 22–23; 2090 (165/6) 39–40, 78–79, 104–105; 2094 (ca. 166/7) foreigners, 57–58, 70–71, 89–90; 2097 (169/70) 214–215, 217–218, 219–220, 235–236; foreigners, 99–100, 113–114, 168–169, 254–255, 266–268 (3), 303–304; 2096 (after middle s. 2 A.D.) 7–8; 2099 (163/4–169/70) 24–25; 2102 (a little after 169/70) 11–12, 62–63, 138–139; foreigners, 146–147, 153–154; 2103 (172/3 or a little after) 44–45, 48–49, 52–53, 62–63, 104–105, 159–160; foreigners, 200–201 (?), 283–284; 2104 (ca. 173/4) 9 and 11 (?); 2106 (ca. 178/9) foreigners, 20–21; 2107 (a little before 180/1) 11–12, 15–16, 28–29, 54–55, 63–64; foreigners, 74–75, 79–80 (?), 87–88, 89–90; 2111/2112 (182/3–190/1) 49–51 (3), 53–54, 57–58, 62–63, 68–69; 2113 (183/4–191/2) 82–83, 92–93, 97–98, 135–136; foreigners, 187–188 (?), 200–201; 2119 (180/1–191/2) 42–43, 57–59 (3), 71–72, 75–76, 77–78 (?); foreigners, 117–118; 2121 (end s. 2 A.D.) 14–15; 2122 (a little before 190/1) 22–23, 27–28, 29–30, 43–44; 2123 (190/1–200/1) 10–11, 21–22; 2128 (190/1–200/1) 8–10 (3), 11–12, 19–20, 32–34 (3), 42–43, 44–45, 58–59, 72–73, 75–76, 77–78, 84–85, 101–102; foreigners, 135–136, 177–178; 2129 (190/1–200/1) 13–14; 2130 (192/3) 98–99, 100–101 (?), 112–113, 114–115, 127–128, 130–131, 136–137, 162–163, 168–169, 174–175; foreigners, 215–216; 2132 (ca. 192/3) 9–10, 12–13, 20–21, 24–25, 26–27, 32–33, 37–39 (3), 49–50, 52–53, 61–62, 64–65; 2134 (ca. 195/6) 7–8, 9–10; 2136 (?) (end s.

who wished to send their sons to the ephebia.¹⁸ The project was too expensive for a state of meager resources and the Macedonian hegemony discouraged its development along the original lines.

In the second stage, beginning about 306/5 and continuing until 119/8, ephebic training was no longer a requirement for full citizenship. The number of ephebes listed in the inscription of 305/4 is much smaller than would be expected in that case. All tribes were represented on the one stone but the names were listed as previously under the deme names. The term of ephebic instruction was shortened to one year, for the young men entered under one archon "were graduated" under his immediate successor.¹⁹ Although we have no positive evidence, we may safely assume that

2 A.D.) 30-31, 34-35, 37-38. There is no evidence that this is an ephebic catalogue. J. Oliver, *TAPhA* 71 (1940) 310 no. 14, points out that if *Neukias Eioιδώπου* of line 27, tribe Hippothontis, is identical with the ephebe of the same name and tribe, and of the deme 'Αἰγνεύς in *IG* 2².2068, line 94 of 155/6, it cannot be. Oliver suggests a list of *paianistai*. 2147 (s. 2 A.D.) 5-6; 2155 (s. 2 A.D.) foreigners (?), 18-19, 22-23; 2159 (s. 2 A.D.) 30-31; 2160 (s. 2 A.D.) foreigners, 28-30 (3); 2162 (s. 2 A.D.) 23-24, 43-44, 48-49, 50-51, 54-55; 2164 (s. 2 A.D.) 6-7, 8-9, 15-16; 2166 (s. 2 A.D.) 13-14; 2168 (s. 2 A.D.) 6-7, 9-10; 2172 (s. 2 A.D.) 5-6; 2175 (s. 2 A.D.) 5-8 (?4); 2191 (ca. 200/1) 5-6, 14-15, 18-19, 20-21, 24-26 (3), 40-41, 58-59, 85-87 (?3), 95-96, 98-100 (?3), 104-105 (?); foreigners, 31-32, 108-109; 2193 (ca. 200/1) 50-52 (3), 55-56, 60-61, 104-105, 110-111, 114-116 (?3), 117-118, 119-120, 135-136, 142-143; foreigners, 168-170 (3), 174-175, 176-177; 2194 (ca. 200/1) 1-2, 32-33; 2199 (ca. 200/1) 97-98, 104-105, 107-108, 111-112, 115-116, 118-119, 128-129; foreigners, 157-158, 165-166, 172-174 (3); 2201 (a little after 200/1) 71-72, 99-100, 101-102; 2205 (beg. s. 3) 3-4, 5-6; 2207 (beg. s. 3 A.D.) 7-8, 9-10, 14-16 (3), 22-23; 2208 (212/3 or a little after) 53-54, 60-61, 66-67, 68-69 (?), 114-115, 121-122; foreigners, 143-144; 2210 (beg. s. 3 A.D.) foreigners, 17-18, 28-29; 2211 (beg. s. 3 A.D.) 17-18; six ephebes, all with father Dionysodorus, 14-19, but only 17-18 have the same demotic; 2221 (217/8 or a little after) 5-6 (?), 9-10 (?), 12-13 (?); 2223 (218/9 or a little after) 42-43, 49-50, 70-71, 72-73, 78-79; 2226 (ca. 218/9) foreigners, 55-56; 2228 (ca. 200/1) 15-16, 27-28, 34-35, 48-49; 2235 (226/7-234/5) 99-100, 115-116, 119-120 (?), 121-122, 124-125, 126-128 (3); foreigners, 194-195; 2237 (230/1-235/6) 36-37, 39-40; 80-82 (3), 83-84, 87-88, 92-93, 102-103, 134-135 (?), 151-153 (3), 163-164; 2239 (238/9-243/4) 37-39 (3), 45-46, 74-75, 109-110, 111-113 (3), 124-125, 141-142, 148-149, 151-152, 153-154, 156-157, 158-159, 163-164, 169-170, 209-210, 215-216, 218-220 (?), 221-222, 239-240, 266-267, 277-278, 279-280, 291-292, 294-295, 305-306, 316-317, 327-328; 2242 (238/9 or 212/3) foreigners, 54-55 (?); 2243 (after 243/4) 44-46 (3); 2245 (262/3 or 266/7) 46-47, 58-60 (?3), 88-89, 96-97, 104-105, 106-107, 133-134, 196-199 (?4), 213-214, 216-217, 219-220, 221-222, 243-244, 245-246, 250-251, 252-253, 296-297, 320-321, 334-335, 339-340, 355-356, 361-362, 365-366, 396-397, 414-415, 421-422.

¹⁸ G. de Sanctis, "Contributi alla storia ateniese della guerra lamiaca alla guerra cremonidea," in Beloch, *Studi di Storia Antica* (Rome, 1893) fascicolo 2.1-63.

¹⁹ *IG* 2².478. Graindor, *op. cit.* (above, note 10) 295, has shown that the space for the name of the archon under whom the ephebes enrolled is too small for the name of the archon of two years earlier, but exactly corresponds to the length of the archon's name who was the immediate predecessor of the archon under whom these ephebes finished their course.

registration in the deme marked the entrance upon citizenship of unrestricted competence for those who did not enter the ephebia. But throughout the period, only those who had been enrolled among the demesmen could become ephebes, for the names of all ephebes are accompanied by the demotic. That is, a boy had to be 18 years of age or over before he could enter the ephebic corps.

The earliest datable inscription of the third century before Christ, 283/2 or 282/1, continues to list the ephebes under their deme name,²⁰ but the next in point of time, 275/4 (?), introduces the system thereafter generally followed, of dispensing with the superscribed deme name and adding the demotic to each name under the several tribes.²¹ The inscription of 283/2 shows one pair of names with like patronymics and demotics, and the inscriptions of 275/4 (?) and ca. 236/5 show three pairs and one pair respectively.²² These pairs of brothers were citizens and hence eighteen years or over, since the names are followed by demotics.

The inscription of 119/8 marks the beginning of the third stage in the development of this institution, the admission of foreigners.²³ Under the usual caption, *οἱ ἐφηβεύσαντες ἐπὶ τοῦ δέλτου ἀρχοντος* the catalogue is divided into two categories, Attic ephebes arranged by tribes, each name with patronymic and demotic, and a list of 17 names with the subheading Ξ for $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\nuοι$, each with its patronymic and ethnic. Aliens — for that is the technical connotation of $\Xi\acute{\epsilon}\nuοι$ — share with citizens the benefits of the ephebia. The following inscriptions of the second and first centuries before Christ when foreigners are listed show the same arrangement and division.²⁴ A clear distinction is made between citizens and non-citizens.

In their detailed studies of the Attic ephebia, Dumont²⁵ and Forbes²⁶ concluded that alien ephebes were treated no differently

²⁰ IG 2².665.

²¹ IG 2².681.

²² IG 2².681, 787.

²³ IG 2².1008. See O. W. Reinmuth, *The Foreigners in the Athenian Ephebia*, University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature, and Criticism, No. 9 (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1929).

²⁴ IG 2².1009 and *Hesperia* 15 (1946) 213 no. 42, and *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 170 no. 67 (116/5); 1011 (107/6); 1028 (101/0); 1031 (90/89–80/79); 1039 (83/2–78/7) caption for *xenoi* missing, but list of names with ethnics; *Hesperia* 3 (1934) 39 no. 27 (middle s. 1 B.C.) fragmentary, no foreigners listed; IG 2².1961 (40/39); 1043 (39/8) no caption for foreigners, but list of names with ethnics; 1963 (13/2) no foreigners; 1965 (end s. 1 B.C.; 8/7–2/1, Graindor) no foreigners; 1964 (end of s. 1 B.C.) no foreigners listed; 1962 (end of s. 1 B.C.) no foreigners listed.

²⁵ Dumont, *op. cit.* (above, note 15) 98.

²⁶ Forbes, *op. cit.* (above, note 6) 159.

from citizen ephebes. They visited the shrines, engaged in the sacrifices, were members of the same training divisions (*systemmata*), were paired with citizen ephebes (*systatai*), made the rounds of the fortresses, filled the office of gymnasiarch, were sometimes directors or exhibitors of ephebic contests (*agônothetai*). They attended the same classes in military studies, the same lectures in philosophy and literature, and took their meals in the same mess halls.

The admission of foreigners on equal terms with natives in an institution originally designed for apprenticeship training in citizenship seems strange. It is true that the restricted original purpose of creating a trained citizen army had become increasingly less important, and had lost all point after 146 B.C. when Athens came under the power of Rome. Even when one grants, however, that the spirit and scope of training had changed, that gymnastic and athletic contests and the "playing at war," which Cicero in ridicule associates with training in the ephebia,²⁷ had displaced actual military duty, and that philosophical and literary studies were introduced, one must still admit that ephebic training, particularly in its religious, military, moral, and civic aspects, was peculiarly adapted to Attic citizens.

That the stress was placed primarily upon the training of citizens is indicated by the statement of a speaker in the ecclesia in the year 122/1.²⁸ "The people being ever most zealous for the training and discipline of the ephebes and desiring that those who are leaving boyhood and entering upon manhood become worthy successors of their fathers in the duties of citizens, enjoined by law that they should become acquainted with the land, the fortresses, and the borders of Attica, and that they should perform in arms the exercises appertaining to war. On account of the aforesaid training, the people have adorned the city with trophies, most beautiful and august; for which cause likewise, it chooses the *kosmêtês* from the men who have led the noblest lives."

Before proceeding to the further development of the ephebate and its relation to citizenship *vis à vis* foreigners, a significant change regarding the admission of Attic youth should be noted, which will help to explain that development.

²⁷ Cic. *Rep.* 44.

²⁸ IG 2².1006.52 ff. Translation by Forbes, *op. cit.* 27.

It has remained unnoticed hitherto that beginning with an isolated example in 107/6²⁹ and thereafter occurring with increasing frequency in the ephebic catalogues, some names appear under the tribal divisions without a demotic, although the others bear this designation.³⁰ The occurrences are too numerous to make credible the caprice of the stone cutter as an explanation, even if one should so far ignore the pride of an Athenian in the immortalization of his name on stone, as to offer it. Nor, in most instances, can space-saving account for the omission of the demotic.

The only name without a demotic in the inscription of 107/6 is the last name under the Attalids. It is an inscription set up by the state and it is complete and fully legible. The young man was not a foreigner, otherwise he would have been listed with the 24

²⁹ *IG* 2².1011.2.105.

³⁰ Names of Attic ephebes without demotics in lists in which the majority of other names give the demotic are found in the following inscriptions: *IG* 2².1011 (107/6) 2.105; 1967 (36/7) 16, 17, 18, 19, 20–24 (?); 2017 (a little after 102/3) 12 (2); 2020 (ca. 110/1 or a little after) 87; 2029 (112/3–125/6) 6, 16–21; 2033 (before middle s. 2 A.D.) 20–25, names in lines 1–25 have patronymic and demotic and the 17 names following line 25 under the caption *ἐπὶ ἐγγράφοι* all have demotics; 2035 (before middle s. 2 A.D.) names are run together, no caption, no tribal division, most names with “Milesian” in place of the demotic and these names are placed before the names with demotics; 2039 (126/7) only one name in list with demotic, line 20, and apparently no reason to distinguish him from other like-named individuals, *Φιλομενὸς Εὐπλόδος Λευκ[ονεύς]*; 2041 (128/9) 15, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25; 2042 (135/6) 14, 15, 20; 2044 (139/40) 89, 90, 91; 2046 (a little before 140/1) 20; 2049 (142/3) 65, 70, 92–95; 2050 (143/4 or 144/5) 53, 55–58; 2051 (144/5–148/9) 7–9, 13–15, 19–21, 26, 30, 31, 37–39, 43–44, 49–51, 59–60, 64–67, 72–75, 81–84, 88–90, 97–99, names without demotics come at end of tribal lists throughout; 2052 (145/6) 51; 2065 (150/1) 56, 115 (?); 2067 (154/5) 179, 180, 205–207; 2068 (155/6) 34, 35, 37, 48, 51 (?), 57 (?), 103–104; 2070 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 1, 4; 2073 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 4–7, 13–18; 2075 (middle s. 2 A.D.) 9, 24; 2082 (after middle of s. 2 A.D.) 37, 38 (?); 2086 (163/4) 180; 2088 (ca. 163/4) 12, 13; 2090 (165/6) 49 (?), 53, 95–97, 99, 101; 2095 (ca. 170/1) 1 (?), 5; 2097 (169/70) 54, 57, 62, 209, 225, 239; 2098 (163/4–169/70) 5; 2099 (163/4–169/70) 15; 2102 (a little after 169/70) 11–12, 16, 19–20, 23–25, 27–30, 32, 34, 51–56, 59, 60 (?), 61–66, 68, 71, 72 (?), 73, 75–78, 80–88, 91–95, 131–133, 135–141; 2103 (172/3 or a little after) 96, 97 (?), 101, 125, 150; 2119 (180/1–191/2) 69 (?), 70 (?), 71 (?), 72 (?), 86; 2122 (a little before 190/1) 10, 12 (?), 15, 17 (?), 20, 21; 2123 (190/1–200/1) 7, 14, 24, 25; 2128 (190/1–200/1) 7, 11–13, 17–20, 30, 36, 40, 47 (?), 52, 54–56, 72–73, 83, 87, 94–96, 98, 102, 108; 2130 (192/3) 136–137; 2163 (s. 2 A.D.) no tribal division, no division for *ἐπὶ ἐγγράφοι*, no demotics, but line 38, *Ἐρμίας* ♂ *Μελή[σιος]*, and line 40, *Ἐρμίας* ♂ *Μελ[ι]τρεύς*; 2193 (ca. 200/1) 103, 112, 121, 137, 142–145; 2207 (beg. s. 3 A.D.) 5, 18–20, 22–23, 30–31, 33; 2208 (212/3 or a little after) 60–61, 75; 2214 (after 212/3) 32; 2215 (after 212/3) 4, 5, 11, 13, 16, 21; 2229 (ca. 200/1) 32; 2237 (230/1–235/6) no demotics except lines 101–103 and 105 under tribe Akamantis; 2239 (238/9–243/4) no demotics except with names in lines 31, 32, 40, 48, 121–123, 149; 2245 (262/3 or 266/7) no demotics, except for names in lines 44–48, 68, 86, 121, 147, 203–205, 284, 315, 327, 328 (?); 2257 (s. 3 A.D.) 3, 5, 6, 11 (?), 12(?).

xenoi whose names follow, and his ethnic would have been given. He was an Attic youth who had been admitted before being registered in a deme and, therefore, before he was 18. He was a prospective citizen, hence listed under the tribe in which he would eventually be enrolled. The important fact is that he was reckoned among the citizen ephebes. It is clear that he had become a citizen ephebe *de jure* by admission to the ephebia, and not, as before, by registration in the deme. The interposition of the *dokimasia* by the *Boulê* between the vote of the deme on the age of a young man and citizenship had marked the beginning of the decline of the concept, citizen of a deme, and the preponderance of state citizenship. Here another step is taken in the same direction, for henceforth registration in the deme was a mere formality for one who had been an ephebe, without significance in establishing the right of citizenship.

From this date forward, therefore, the age of 18 was no longer a requirement for admission. In later catalogues, we find further confirmation. Pairs of brothers are found listed, the name of the one with the demotic, the other, without.³¹

The beginning of a change in the status of foreign ephebes can be observed in the inscription of 39/8,³² a change which marks the entrance upon the fourth stage of development. In this inscription the names of foreigners have no caption, but follow immediately after the names of the ephebes under tribal divisions with no break except one space in the first of three columns, and are distinguishable only by the ethnic in place of the demotic.

Immediately after the only name with a demotic under Antiochis, there appear 11 (perhaps 13) names with 'Αθηναῖος in place of the demotic. Two explanations of the status of these individuals have been advanced. According to Wilhelm, they were Attic youths under 18 not yet registered in a deme, while Hiller von Gärtringen thought that they were new Athenian citizens.³³ We can now

³¹ IG 2².1967.15-16 (36/7); 2041.14-15 (128/9); 2128.101-102 (190/1-200/1).

³² IG 2².1043.

³³ Hiller von Gärtringen adduces the practise of the Rhodians, who gave to foreign statue makers the right of sojourn (*ἐπιδαμία*) whereby their sons automatically became citizens, and points out that Rhodes patterned its state after Athens. He implies that the new citizens here were sons of resident aliens. Possibly they were, but that fact was of no significance in the grant of citizenship by undergoing ephebic training, as the later developments of the ephebia show.

definitely exclude Wilhelm's supposition, since we have seen that Attic young men under 18 not yet enrolled in a deme were listed without a demotic under the tribe to which their father's deme belonged.

These young men, then, were alien ephebes who had become citizens. By grant of the state and by vote of the assembly or by virtue of their enrolment in the ephebia? In this instance, perhaps, by individual grant, since the other ephebes from abroad are still listed with the ethnic.

But an examination of later inscriptions makes it imperative to conclude that membership in the ephebia came to carry with it, automatically, the right of citizenship, both for the young men of Attica who were under 18 as well as for non-Attic youth. In all succeeding inscriptions, not only is the heading *Ξένοι* dropped, but what is more significant, no names with ethnics are found. Does this mean that foreigners ceased to enter the ephebia? Not at all. It simply means that once admitted they could not rightly be listed as foreigners since the Athenians no longer so regarded them. On the other hand, their names did not appear under the tribal divisions, because like the Attic youth in the inscription of 107/6, they had not been registered in a deme.

In the older period, aliens to whom Attic citizenship had been granted by decree were permitted to choose the deme and the phratry in which they wished to be registered.³⁴ But not all foreigners thus honored actually assumed the practise of citizenship in Attica. Demosthenes thought that they should.³⁵ But whether they did or did not "affiliate themselves with the state,"³⁶ they were nevertheless called *πολιται* not *ξένοι*, and were officially regarded as such. Demosthenes argued that Charidemus should be treated as a citizen: 'You must look what is the position of the man in whose favor the decree has been moved; whether he is an alien, a resident alien, or a citizen. If we call him a resident alien, we shall not be speaking the truth; if an alien, we shall not be acting justly; for the people's grant, by which he became a citizen, ought to stand good. We must treat him, therefore, in argument it seems, as a citizen.'³⁷

³⁴ Busolt-Swoboda, *op. cit.* (above, note 8) 2.947. After the revision of the roster of citizens in 346/5, the choice of phratry was limited to certain phratries.

³⁵ Dem. 23.126.

³⁶ The quotation here is from Billheimer, *op. cit.* (above, note 2) 99.

³⁷ Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* (above, note 3) 2.175, pointed out the case of Euphron of Sicyon who did not exercise his honorary grant of citizenship; yet after his death, his son was taken under the guardianship of Athens, like the children of other citizens.

At some time shortly after 39/8, all ephebes, whether of Attic or non-Attic origin, were *ipso facto* regarded as citizens. Enrolment in the ephebia became a third way by which the right of citizenship could be achieved.

The citizen status of the foreign ephebe was still anomalous in one respect: would he decide to exercise his right of citizenship? This anomaly was reflected in the groping for a name by which to designate these "prospective" citizens, apparent in the succeeding inscriptions.

There are only Athenians in the next following inscription, of 13/2,³⁸ but in the inscription of 36/7,³⁹ the first eight names — there is no tribal division or caption — have both patronymic and demotic; the next eight do not have the demotic, but are otherwise not set apart. The last-named youth in the first group, line 15, Χαρβέας Τιμοκράτο(υ)ς Πειραιεύς, was no doubt the brother of the following (line 16) ephebe, Ἀριστοτέλης Τιμοκράτο(υ)ς, the first of the second group. The younger brother was not yet 18 and had not been registered in the deme. The remaining seven names represent ephebes from abroad who were entitled to citizenship. The next full inscription — there are a number of fragmentary ephebic inscriptions and lists of φίλοι, γοργοί of the intervening period — dated 84/5–92/3,⁴⁰ divided the ephebes into Πολίται, names under tribal divisions and with demotics, and Μειλήσιοι, names without demotics. No satisfactory explanation of the term "Milesians" has been given,⁴¹ but there can be little question that this group included all ephebes from outside Attica, and was the same group previously called *xenoi*, or the group of names following those of the Attic ephebes with no caption but without demotics. The names are too

³⁸ IG 2².1963.

³⁹ IG 2².1967.

⁴⁰ IG 2².1996.

⁴¹ Of the many explanations suggested, Forbes, *op. cit.* (above, note 6) 172, accepts the theory of Thalheim, in *RE* s.v. *epheboi*, that all ephebes from abroad were called by the ethnic of the preponderant group. I have earlier indicated a possible reason for the large influx of Milesians assumed by this hypothesis: the probable close of the ephebia at Miletus, whose existence, attested as early as 260/59, is last mentioned in 130/29; Reinmuth, *op. cit.* (above, note 23) 40–42. But the theory is far from convincing. There are tantalizing bits of evidence to connect the name "Milesians" with the recording of the names of citizens ephebes in the μητρώον, referred to in an ephebic inscription of 61/2, IG 2².1990.9 (ὁ κοσμητής) τοῦσδε παρέδωκεν ἐφήβους εἰς τὸ μητρώον. We know that among other records kept here were the διαψηφίσματα making honorary grants of citizenship. But this is not the place to discuss the question at length.

numerous to represent ephebes from Miletus alone, and there is no other list of foreigners in these catalogues. "Milesians" was a temporary designation found in four other inscriptions: those of 112/3 and 116/7, a third before the middle of the second century, and a fourth, undated (*IG* 2².2271), which can now, because of the occurrence of *Μειλήσιοι*, be placed in the beginning of the second century of our era.⁴²

Whatever the explanation of the term "Milesians" may be, they represent individuals who by virtue of their ephebic training are eligible for *de facto* citizenship in Attica. The inscription in which the term first occurs lists Titus Flavius Synekdomos as a Milesian.⁴³ Some 20 years later, 112/3, we find a Titus Flavius Synekdomos of the deme Marathon filling the position of ephebic gymnasiarch.⁴⁴ The distinctive name and the time interval make it very likely that the gymnasiarch of Marathan was the son of the homonymous "Milesian." Like the honorary grants of citizenship which included the descendants of the man honored (although, to be sure, the grant was formally renewed to them) and remained valid whether the new citizen exercised it or not,⁴⁵ the ephebic training of the father made him and his son a citizen.

In this same period, roughly the first half of the second century after Christ, one group of ephebes was called *Πρωτέγγραφοι* in five inscriptions.⁴⁶ In the same inscriptions another group is invariably labelled *Ἐπέγγραφοι*. Scholars have seen in *πρωτέγγραφος* an antithesis to the term *ἐπέγγραφος* which is regularly employed in all ephebic inscriptions of the imperial period other than the five in which *Μειλήσιοι* is used to designate non-Attic ephebes. They have explained *πρωτέγγραφοι* as "equivalent to citizens of Attic birth," and this definition has crept into Liddell-Scott-Jones.

The interpretation is not correct, however, since in the inscription dated a little after 102/3, in which we first find the term, there are not two, but three categories of names, *πρωτέγγραφοι*, ephebes by tribes, and *ἐπέγγραφοι*. Obviously the second group represents the citizen ephebes of Attic birth. Furthermore among the *πρωτέγ-*

⁴² *IG* 2².2024, 2026, 2035, 2271.

⁴³ *IG* 2².1996.101.

⁴⁴ *IG* 2².2024.16.

⁴⁵ Billheimer, *op. cit.* (above, note 2) 100 f.

⁴⁶ *IG* 2².2017 (a little after 102/3), 2027 (beg. s. 2 A.D.), 2044 (139/40), 2046 (a little before 140/1), 2068 (155/6).

γραφοι there occur two names without a demotic, representing individuals who are not citizens *de facto*,⁴⁷ and one name without a patronymic and without a demotic.⁴⁸ It is inconceivable that a citizen of Attic parentage should be designated without either a demotic or patronymic, not to mention without both, in a catalogue of names all the others of which have both.

We have already noted a tripartite division in the inscription of 39/8, where in addition to citizens and aliens, eleven Ἀθηναῖοι were listed.⁴⁹ A closer parallel is presented by the inscription dated 84/5–92/3, in which under the heading of Πολῖται (line 23) 11 names with patronymic and demotic are given first, then a list of names arranged by tribes, and finally, “Milesians,” i.e. foreigners.⁵⁰

These two inscriptions give us the clue to the meaning of the word and the status of the πρωτέγγραφοι. In its original use in these documents, the term represents those among the foreign ephebes who were first to avail themselves of their eligibility to become citizens. The names with demotics were those who had registered in a deme during their ephebic year or before the commemorative stone was set up. Those without demotics were individuals who had declared their intention to remain in Attica, but who had not yet been registered in a deme, because (among other reasons) they had not yet reached the legal age. In the inscriptions with threefold division, the Ἀθηναῖοι, the eleven names with patronymics and demotics outside the tribal divisions, and the πρωτέγγραφοι, were ephebes of the same status. They were the first fruits of the institute for the training of new citizens.

In the remaining inscriptions in which the heading πρωτέγγραφοι occurs, it is the caption of one of only two groups, the second being the ἐπέγγραφοι. In these inscriptions it will be noted that there is no tribal division. Clearly here πρωτέγγραφοι include ephebes of Attic birth *and* new citizens of non-Attic birth. For in all three lists we find names without demotic⁵¹ and without patronymic under that heading.⁵² Some of the names without demotic may, to be sure, represent Attic youth under 18.⁵³ The hitherto accepted

⁴⁷ IG 2².2017.12, last two names.

⁴⁸ IG 2².2017.12, second last name.

⁴⁹ IG 2².1043.

⁵⁰ IG 2².1996.

⁵¹ IG 2².2046.20; 2044.90–91; 2068.34, 35, 37, 48, 57, 103–104.

⁵² IG 2².2046.1.20, 24, 27, 29, 40; 2044.1.45; 2.32–33; 2068.34–36, 49, 56, 101, 105.

⁵³ That the minimum age for registration in a deme and presumably also for the exercise of citizenship remained fixed, doubtless at 18, is certain from the case of an

meanings of *πρωτέγγραφος* and *ἐπέγγραφος* rested doubtless on the dual division of these inscriptions in which an easy correspondence between the separation of citizens and aliens in the earlier inscriptions was sought.

Not all foreign ephebes chose to become practising citizens. These were at first marked from the rest by listing their names without demotics after those of the citizen ephebes. Then they were called "Milesians," then *ἐπέγγραφτοι*, next "Milesians" again in three inscriptions with reversions to the caption *ἐπέγγραφτοι* in between, until finally *ἐπέγγραφτοι* became the regular term. It will be remembered that Demosthenes found no word to describe the political status of an individual who was eligible for citizenship but had not elected to exercise it. (See above, note 35.)

How apt the designations *πρωτέγγραφτοι* and *ἐπέγγραφτοι* now appear when it is seen that they were coined with enrolment in the deme, not the ephebia in view. The distinction "those enrolled first" and "those enrolled in addition," or more accurately so far as the actual meaning was concerned, "those (eligible to be) enrolled in addition," is inane when applied to the ephebia. The position of the names on the stone was apparent, there was no difference in the treatment accorded the two groups, and there was no question of earlier or later enrolment for the ephebes of one year and under the same archon. The interpretation of *ἐπέγγραφτοι* as equivalent to *ξένοι* is philologically inconsistent, too, if *πρωτέγγραφτοι* is the term for citizens.

The logic of the evidence is inescapable. From the time when the designation *ξένοι* and the ethnic disappeared in the listing of foreign ephebes, they were granted, *qua* ephebes, the right of enrolment in a deme and of citizenship. Further confirmation can be added. In an ephebic inscription dating from before the middle of the second century after Christ, all the names under the caption *ἐπέγγραφτοι* are followed by demotics.⁵⁴ In other words all the

Attic youth, Kalligamos, son of Dionysios, who appears under the tribe Hadrianis without a demotic in one ephebic inscription (in which the majority of other names are accompanied by the demotic), *IG* 2².2193.103, while in another ephebic inscription of the same year, *IG* 2².2194.30, the same individual (name, patronymic, and tribe are identical) has the demotic Eleousios. He had no doubt reached the age of 18 and had been registered in his deme in the interval between the erection of the two stones.

⁵⁴ *IG* 2².2033. So too in 2034 where two names in the fragmentary list under the caption *ἐπέγγραφτοι* have the demotic, and in 2035 where under the heading *ἐπέγγραφτοι* all the names have either a demotic or *Μιλήσιος*. Both these inscriptions are dated before the middle of s. 2 A.D. There are five other cases (all occurring in inscriptions of the second century after Christ) in which the demotic is found with the names of *ἐπέρ-*

ephebes of foreign birth had chosen to exercise their right of citizenship and had been registered in a deme. Graindor notes that one of these individuals later became a prytanis,⁵⁵ and the son of another, an instructor of the ephebes.⁵⁶

Graindor thought that these young men had been granted citizenship — whether individually or collectively he does not state — under the revised constitution given Athens by Hadrian,⁵⁷ which restored to that city the right taken from it by Augustus. But we have seen that foreign ephebes became citizens as early as 39/8 and in the time of Domitian and Trajan as well. The interdiction of Augustus which forbade the Athenians to make anyone a citizen for money⁵⁸ did not apply to the process of becoming a citizen by undergoing ephebic training. Although the ephebia ceased to be fully state-supported as early as the end of the fourth century before Christ, and those who attended contributed heavily to its upkeep (sometimes obligatory as in the purchase of 100 books annually by the ephebes),⁵⁹ notably in bearing the burden of the gymnasiarchy, there is no evidence of entrance or tuition fees which could be construed as a *quid pro quo*.

If one assumes, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that Athenian citizenship was bestowed upon individuals in this period, as we know it was from 519 to 100 before Christ, only for *ἀνδραγαθία πρὸς δῆμον*,⁶⁰ it would be necessary to conclude that seventeen foreign ephebes in that one year had presented some real or specious claim to public service or to eminence in a profession in order to justify

γραφοί. In IG 2².2128.124–125 (190/1–200/1) we find under the caption *ἐπὶ ἐγγράφοι, Ζώσιμος* > Σχ and Ζώσιμος > Ἀγρ, where the two abbreviations may merely be used to distinguish two ephebes of the same name and patronymic. Σχ is not known otherwise as the abbreviation for an Attic deme. If we expand Σχ(οινιεύς) we have the demotic of a town in Boeotia, RE s.v. *Schoineus*, no. 3, col. 617; if Σχ(οινούντιος), a hamlet in Arcadia. Neither is very likely. An area of pasture land in the vicinity of the Piraeus was known as τὸ (χωρίον) τοῦ Σχοινοῦντος, l.c. no. 8. Dittenberger doubted Graindor's restoration in IG 2².2068.111 (155/6) Σάρυρος Σου[νιεύς?]. Although all the other *ἐπὶ ἐγγράφοι* in this list have the patronymic, the name Σουινιάδης is very rare and is not found in the imperial period, as J. Kirchner *ad loc.* points out. IG 2².2113.174 (183/4–191/2), [. . .] Εἰσιδώρου Φαληρεύς, is a clear case of an *ἐπὶ ἐγγράφος* who "took out" citizenship during his ephebic year. The restoration ἐξ Οἰού after the name in 2.27 of the last-named inscription is not at all certain.

⁵⁵ Cf. IG 2².2033.29, of this inscription with 1765.14 (138/9).

⁵⁶ Cf. line 27 of this inscription with 2086.30–31 (163/4).

⁵⁷ Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* 1.23; RE s.v. *Delos*. col. 2500.

⁵⁸ Dio 54.7.

⁵⁹ IG 2².1009.7 ff. (119/8).

⁶⁰ Billheimer, *op. cit.* (above, note 2) 109.

the grant. Allowing for the fact that in this period Athens was very liberal in conferring citizenship, and that *ἀνδραγαθία* can be, and often was loosely interpreted, nevertheless this seems very unlikely. The development of the ephebia which has here been outlined makes it possible to state with confidence that all foreign ephebes of this particular year chose to remain in Attica and to become citizens in fact. If the term *πρωτέγγραφοι* had been current in the sense in which it was first employed, these ephebes would have been thus designated. As in the case of other *ἐπέγγραφοι* it is idle to guess how many were metics or sons of metics. Both categories were doubtless represented.

An examination of the use of the demotic in the ephebic inscriptions, which cover a range of some six centuries, demonstrates that what in the early period was the carefully guarded hall-mark of Attic citizenship, later became, for those who had been ephebes, a mere formal badge. Enrolment in the ephebia indicated the same status as the demotic. In the ephebic inscriptions of the period before Christ and continuing on to the middle of the second century after Christ, the demotic is almost invariably found where the ephebes are catalogued by tribes. Where there is no tribal division, the demotic is usually omitted. After the middle of the second century after Christ, however, the demotic is less commonly found: roughly a fourth of the datable inscriptions drop it throughout even when there are tribal divisions.

The number of boys younger than 18 in the ephebia became proportionately larger in the late first, the second and the third centuries after Christ. This is shown by the increase of isolated names without demotics in the tribal lists, and by the striking rise in the number of pairs of brothers, both among Athenians and foreigners. Single inscriptions yield as many as 13 pairs out of 80 Athenians and some 11 pairs out of 147 "Milesians" in some year between 84/5 and 92/3;⁶¹ 11 pairs out of 78 Athenians and 9 pairs out of 116 *ἐπέγγραφοι* in 155/6;⁶² in ca. 200/1, 10 sets of brothers including three cases of three brothers out of 59 Athenians and 2 pairs out of 61 *ἐπέγγραφοι* only a few of which have patronymics.⁶³

⁶¹ *IG* 2².1996 (84/5–92/3).

⁶² *IG* 2².2068 (155/6).

⁶³ *IG* 2².2191 (ca. 200/1).

The grant of Roman citizenship to the peoples of the Roman Empire is reflected in the ephebic inscriptions by the prefixes AUR., AIL., KL., before the names of Attic and foreign ephebes alike, but does not seem to have affected at all the assiduity with which non-Athenians cultivated the ephebia.⁶⁴

I have narrowly confined myself to the demonstration that the ephebia at Athens, originally a school for citizenship of its own youth, developed into a means of training young men of non-Attic birth as well for citizenship in Attica. It is amazing for how long, how widely, and how highly ephebic training was prized, certainly not in most cases primarily to obtain the right of Attic citizenship, but rather for the cultural advantages and for the prestige which it offered.

For the ephebia was essentially an educational institution during the major part of its existence. While military training was always a stock part of its program, gymnastics and physical exercises gave ground to athletic contests, riding, torch races, mock naval battles, and parades. The study of philosophy, literature, rhetoric, and music occupied a large place. The ephebes formed a miniature state of their body, duplicating all major officials, and thus acquired experience in politics and government. They visited the principal shrines and show places of the violet-crowned city and its environs and attended the lectures of the intellectual leaders of the day, both native and foreign, in the gymnasia, the Lyceum and the Academy. Religious ceremonials, sacrifices and sacred processions constituted an important part of their activities. Their health, discipline, morals, and application to duty were carefully supervised by the *kosmêtês*, and his corps of instructors, particularly the *sôphronistai*.

The important point in the whole matter is that the Athenian people should make such an education a prerequisite for citizenship; that the concept of citizen should broaden from a mere fighting unit to the physically sound individual, acquainted with the history, literature, thought, governmental structure, and religious aspirations of the people, a part of which he was to become; that such education should be required of foreign youth who wished to become members of their state; and finally that their practise should win such wide emulation in the Hellenic world.

⁶⁴ IG 2².2208 (212/3 or a little later), all AUR.; 2221 (217/8 or a little after), AUR. with one AIL. and one IOU.; 2214 (after 212/3), AUR., POP., FL., KL.; 2227 (after 218/9), AUR., one AIL.; 2218 (after 212/3), all AUR.; 2235 (226/7-234/5), many AUR., one KL.

ADDENDUM

Several months after the oral presentation of this paper at the 1947 meeting of the Association, Professor James A. Notopoulos published a short note, "Tribal Affiliations of Foreigners in Ephebe Lists," in *AJPh* 69 (1948) 415-417. After noting the fact that in a number of ephebic inscriptions there occur names without the demotic under tribal divisions, he suggests that such names represent foreigners "who enjoy all the privileges of the tribes except citizenship." He finds "corroboration" for his suggestion in one such document, *IG* 2².2051 (144/5-148/9), because it does not contain a list of *ἐπὲγγραφοί*. He thinks that the 40 names without the demotic under tribal divisions (compared to 44 with the demotic) are foreigners who "through friendship or family connections have been given the privilege of enrolling with the ephebes of the tribe during their stay in Athens."

Aside from the fact that I know of no privileges attaching to tribal membership which all ephebes, foreign and native-born alike, did not enjoy by virtue of being ephebes, it seems to me that in a field in which the documentary material is fairly extensive, Professor Notopoulos oversimplifies and generalizes on insufficient evidence when he writes that the conclusions which he draws from "an analysis of two ephebe inscriptions" are "applicable to the rest of the ephebe lists." To state an obvious point, he overlooks the possibility that names without demotics under tribal divisions may, and in all likelihood do, at least in part, represent Attic-born lads under eighteen years of age, for we know that in the period of the Empire with which he concerns himself, the minimum age requirement of eighteen was no longer enforced. The first occurrence of a name without a demotic under a tribal division is apparently in the inscription of 107/6, *IG* 2².1011.2.105. It is found in a roster in which all other names have the demotic or are listed under the caption *Ξενοί* with the ethnic. The fact that we find the name of one ephebe with the demotic in *IG* 2².1967.15 (36/7) *Χαρβέας Τιμοκράτο(υ)ς Πειραιεύς*, and immediately following it the name of another without the demotic, apparently his brother, *Ἀριστοτέλης Τιμοκράτο(υ)ς*, as well as another similar case which I shall presently cite, would strongly indicate the possibility mentioned.

How explain the fact that in *IG* 2².2033 (first half of s. 2 A.D.), an inscription to which Notopoulos refers, all names under the caption *ἐπὲγγραφοί* bear the demotic, while of the names preceding them in the roster (the unvarying position for the native-born ephebes) five do *not* bear the demotic? Do the five represent foreigners "with privileges of the tribe"?

Professor Notopoulos oversimplifies the problem when he states that in *IG* 2².1996 (84/5-92/3) there is a differentiation of ephebes "*πολείται* vs. *Μειλήσιοι*." Actually there are three distinct groupings of the names in this inscription: *πολείται* (lines 24-34)—eleven names, ten with the demotic, one *without* the demotic; ephebes by tribes (lines 35-80)—all names except one with the demotic, *Ἀσιατικός Ζωπύρου* (45), where the editor has supplied (wrongly, in my opinion) [*Παιανεύς*] from the demotic of the preceding name, doubtless a brother who being eighteen years of age was enrolled in a deme; and finally *Μειλήσιοι*. If names without demotics under tribal divisions represent "privileged foreigners," why are the two names—the one without demotic under *πολείται*, and that of Asiaticus, son of Zopyrus (both of whom are listed with citizen groups and hence with young men who are tribesmen)—placed in separate categories? Which one is the foreigner? Similarly Notopoulos sees a contrast, "names with demotic vs. *ἐπὲγγραφοί*," in *IG* 2².2017 (shortly after 102/3). But the caption *πρωτέγγραφοί* plainly precedes five names with patronymic and demotic, and two names without demotic, followed by a second group of names which are arranged by tribes, and ending with a third group following the word [*Ἐπὲγγραφοί*]. How are the two names without demotic under *πρωτέγγραφοί* related to names without demotics under tribal divisions? The problem of the names without demotics under tribal divisions in the ephebic lists must be approached by a consideration of these and related questions.