II.—The Genesis of the Athenian Ephebia

O. W. REINMUTH

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

The dictum of Wilamowitz that the ephebia began to function in 335/4 on the basis of a law passed the year before,[1] has had the effect of diverting later studies on the subject from an examination of the antecedents of the institution and of confining discussion of its beginnings largely to arguments about the date of its origin.[2]

[1] U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin 1893) 1.193–4.

[2] They repeat and expand W.'s three chief arguments: 1) the date of the first ephebic inscriptions (*IG* 2^2.1156, 1189); 2) the language of the decrees honoring the ephebes, as well as that of Aristotle in describing the ephebia, reflects a civic innovation; 3) the absence in literature and inscriptions of reference to the institution as Aristotle describes it and the inconsistency with previous educational theory of compulsory supervision of youth under *sôphronistai*. A. A. Bryant, "Boyhood and Youth in the Days of Aristophanes," *HSCP* 18 (1907) 74–88, emphasizes these arguments: There is no evidence to show that the state concerned itself with a boy's education or that two years of his life were preempted for military service. Against Girard (*DarSag.* 2.1, 621 f., under *ephebi*) who pointed out that the state might teach military science without being open to the charge of interfering with education, B. argued that compulsory military training combined with gymnastics, which involved living in barracks under constant supervision is such a departure from tradition that "we can give it no place" except at a time when "old ideals were already hopelessly subverted." "It is unique in Attic institutions." The real crux of the problem ("I suppose the real difficulty which one feels is that of accounting for the ephebia as a creation") he dismisses with the statement, "It is unwise to press the argument from evolution." If one finds it too difficult to accept the spontaneous generation of the ephebia, the care by the state of war orphans might have suggested it. Alice Brenot, "Recherches sur l'éphébie attique et en particulier sur la date de l'institution," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* fasc. 229 (Paris 1920) 3 ff. She presents two main lines of argument: a) there are no incontestable references to the ephebia prior to Aristotle; b) a purely military ephebia is inconsistent with the Athenian attitude toward military preparedness. C. A. Forbes, *Greek Physical Education* (New York and London 1929), Chapter VI, "The Athenian Ephebia," 109–178, is the fullest post-Wilamowitz treatment. The general and specific causes leading to the creation of the ephebia, Forbes finds to be: a) general, Plato's description of a two-year period of guard duty for young men and the concomitant educational prescriptions in *Laws* 6, 760A–763C, elaborating W.'s flat assertion, "Platons gesetze haben die ephebie erzeugt"; b) specific, the defeat at Chaeronea, which induced the Athenians to rectify their military infirmity by the introduction of compulsory military training. But he does not pursue this significant point, viz., that the ephebia may well have been in its inception, military and not educational, civic and not individual, and he dismisses Girard's pregnant suggestion that it developed from a military apprenticeship merely because Aristotle's ephebia is more than that. The Xenophontic Socrates' advice (Xen. *Mem.* 3.5.25–7) on guarding the passes into Boeotia and the practice of educating

The pre-Wilamowitz scholars, who specifically studied the Attic ephebes, uniformly held, implicitly or expressly, to the concept that they were united in a military and/or gymnastic organization prior to 335/4.[3] Girard, whose studies in the field of Athenian education were both extensive and thorough, particularly insisted that the antecedents of the Aristotelian ephebia must be sought in a previous organization of youth under state supervision.

Dissent from the view of Wilamowitz was first expressed in two reviews[4] of Mlle. Brenot's study (see note 2) which appeared in 1920. Since then a number of scholars, without specifically studying the question, have stated their conviction that the ephebia was established earlier than 335/4.[5] J. O. Lofberg's short article on "The Date of the Athenian Ephebia" was the first treatment of the subject which challenged Wilamowitz' position. Two of the lines of argument which he adduced are basic to the question of an organized body of ephebes before 335/4 and must be amplified and examined in more detail.[6] In addition we must seek to discover

war orphans at state expense served as precedents. He considers the *argumentum ex silentio* in full. He offers a refutation of the arguments which Lofberg (see notes 4 and 6) advanced for an ephebia before Aristotle on the ground that these arguments do not prove an organization like that in the *Constitution* of Aristotle. The ephebic oath may be ancient, but it does not "presuppose any sort of military organization." Without specific discussion of the subject, the following scholars, among others, accept the position of Wilamowitz: Julius Beloch, "Griechische Aufgebote," *Klio* 5 (1905) 341–74; Georg Busolt-H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, Müller's *Handbuch der kl. Alt.* 4.1.1 (München 1920–26) 496, 577; Hiller von Gaertringen, note 1 on *SIG*^{3} 957; Johannes Kirchner in his notes on *IG* 2^2.1156.

[3] August Boeckh, *Kleine Schriften* (1874) 137–156; Wilhelm Dittenberger, *De ephebis atticis* (Göttingen 1863); Albert Dumont, *Essai sur l'éphébie attique* (Paris 1875–6) 2 vols.; Lorenz Grasberger, "Die Ephebenbildung," vol. 2 of *Erziehung und Unterricht im klassischen Altertum* (Würzburg 1881); Paul F. Girard, *L'éducation athénienne* 2nd ed. (Paris 1891) and art. *ephebi* in *Dar.-Sag.* 2.1.621–36; Johannes Sundwall, "De institutis reipublicae Atheniensium post Aristotelis aetatem commutatis," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae* vol. 34 (Helsingfors 1906).

[4] J. O. Lofberg, *CP* 17 (1922) 156–7; P. Roussel, *REG* (1921) 459.

[5] Louis Robert, "Études Épigraphiques et Philologiques" *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* fasc. 262 (Paris 1938) 306, note 3; G. Matthieu, "Remarques sur l'éphébie attique" *Mélanges A. M. Desrousseaux* (Paris 1937) 311–318; A. W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (Oxford 1933) 8 n. 3; R. J. Bonner, *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*, Sather Classical Lectures, vol. 11 (Berkeley 1933) 88; W. Jaeger, *Paideia, The Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet (Oxford 1947) vol. 3.250.

[6] *CP* 20 (1925) 330–335. I leave aside, among others, what Lofberg considered a most important argument, viz., the black-figured vase painting which is generally considered to represent what Conze labelled it to be, "Giuramento da Efebo," in *Annali dell'Inst. di corr. arch.* 40 (1868) 266, Plate H. The vase must be dated at

the antecedents of the institution in the political concepts of the Athenians and show how it gave external expression to the logical evolution of these concepts.

In reply to Demosthenes' taunting reference to him as a "fine soldier" Aeschines recounted his military experience, beginning with a two-year period of service within the country as a *περίπολος* and his later service as a soldier outside the country *πρώτην δ'ἐξελθὼν στρατείαν τὴν ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι* (Aeschin. 2.167–8; cf. 1.49). Since Aeschines was born ca. 390, he was speaking of the year 372/1 as the time when he passed from boyhood and became an ephebe-peripolos for two years. That Aechines did not mean mercenary service is clear from the fact a) that he mentioned the service with pride; b) that he was the son of citizens (D. 18.180); c) that he was serving in his own country; d) that his fellow-ephebes were available to testify to the facts since they were living in Attica.

Besides Aeschines would not need to hire himself out as a mercenary soldier — assuming that he could obtain such service at eighteen years of age — in order to support himself. He had apparently assisted in his father's school while continuing his exercises in the gymnasium (D. 18.265) and in early manhood had supported himself as a clerk to minor officials (D. 18.261).

In D. 18.261, Demosthenes indicated that Aeschines began work as a clerk when his name had been entered upon the register of his deme, at precisely the time when Aeschines states that he became an ephebe and a peripolos for a period of two years. Attempts to reconcile the flatly contradictory statements might be made by assuming that Aeschines' service was intermittent over a two-year period and that Demosthenes loosely referred to the periods between or immediately after such service, or that enrolment in the deme took place two years after "passing from boyhood." The last possibility must be eliminated since Demosthenes states in D. 1.5 that his father had given the yield of a certain sum of money to Therippides "until I should be declared a man," and in D. 46.20–21 we learn that he claimed it on the basis of a law

least 145 years before 335/4 when, according to experts in this field, red-figured vases fully replaced this style. Forbes objects to the identification of the figure before the altar with an ephebe because Nike holds in readiness for him a helmet rather than a *petasos* which, according to Pollux alone (8.164), the ephebes wore. Aristotle mentions only that they wore a chlamys and received a spear and shield from the state. Is it possible that the state provided them (or they, themselves) with a helmet also?

which granted control of an estate to a young man "two years after passing from boyhood." As proof that he had reached the age of 18, he pointed to the fact that he was at that time engaged in military service for the state as commander of a trireme.

In the absence of definite evidence on the point, I take the most likely interpretation to be that at this period, ephebic service was confined to the season for making war, spring and summer, over a period of two years. It is not only *a priori* reasonable, but would also in part explain why the institution was considered so normal and commonplace as to call for only incidental reference. It would also explain the freedom of movement and of activity apparently exercised by certain young men of ephebic age in the first half of the fourth century, a point stressed by Wilamowitz, Bryant and Forbes as proof of the non-existence of the ephebia before 335/4.[7]

But to return to Aeschines' ephebic service. It would seem that he knew best what he was doing during his ephebate, and he was prepared to offer in court evidence for his ephebic service as he actually did for his later military service (Aeschin. 2.170). Xenophon (*Vect.* 4.52) mentioned the activities of two classes of citizens around 335/4 which should be more strongly supported by the revenues in order to make "the city more obedient, better disciplined, and more efficient for war," οἵ τε ταχθέντες to undertake physical training in the gymnasia, and a second class οἵ τε [ταχθέντες] φρουρεῖν ἐν τοῖς φρουρίοις, οἵ τε πελτάζειν καὶ περιπολεῖν τὴν χώραν. The second group were doing essentially what Aeschines said that he did in 372/1 during his ephebic years. Aeschines' statement of service is in full accord with what the ephebes did under the constitution which Aristotle described some 50 years later, φρουροῦσι δὲ τὰ δύο ἔτη (*Ath.* 42.5). The verb φρουρέω applies with equal pertinence to their stay in garrison at Munichia and Akte during

[7] Wilamowitz (see note 1) 191, Demosthenes managed his estate and engaged in litigation. Bryant (see note 2) 82 and Forbes (see note 2) 118, a young man went off to Abydos immediately after his *dokimasia* (Antiphon frag. 67); Glaucon was ignorant of military matters and has never even visited the frontier. (But the statement that he had never gone to the frontier, made by both Bryant and Forbes, is not borne out by the account in Xen. *Mem.* 3.6.1. Socrates asks Glaucon, "Have you been on a tour of inspection, or how do you know that the frontier garrisons are badly maintained?" Since a recruit's service at several or all of the frontier posts could hardly be called an "inspection," the pompous Glaucon must in all honesty answer. "By conjecture.") Bryant, 82 further cites Glaucon's attempts to speak in the ecclesia and Alcibiades' aspirations to political preferment as inconsistent with an ephebia before 335/4.

the first year before they received a shield and spear from the state, φρουροῦσιν οἱ μὲν τὴν Μουνιχίαν, οἱ δὲ τὴν Ἀκτήν, as it does at the time when περιπολοῦσι τῆν χώραν καὶ διατρίβουσιν ἐν τοῖς φυλακτηρίοις (*Ath.* 42.3). Aristotle makes no division of the two years' service between theory and practise as Bryant states.[8] The frontier posts included Munichia and Akte as well as Rhamnous and Panakton, and it may be presumed that the ephebes were as effective as guards at the more permanent garrisons as they were when they moved from one to the other of the lesser frontier posts, whether they made use of the arms stacked in depots or those given to them as their personal property. Pollux (8.105, under περίπολοι) is consistent with Aeschines and Aristotle, "for two years the ephebes were numbered among the peripoloi."

Although there is evidence to indicate the employment of mercenary peripoloi as early as 411/10 (Thuc. 8.92.5), it seems reasonable to assume with Kent[9] that the earliest Athenian peripoloi were citizen troops. The commander of these border contingents was called *peripolarchos* and was an Athenian citizen elected for the post as late as the period 307/6 to 304/3 (*IG* 2^2.1260. 9–22) even after the term peripoloi had fallen into disuse. The military integration of ephebic border patrols and frontier guards with the soldiers assigned for the same purpose is not entirely clear. Busolt-Swoboda (p. 1195, note 3) think that the officers under whose immediate command Aeschines and his fellows stood were called *peripolarchoi*, but it seems more likely that the ephebes under their own subordinate officers were attached to the troops of the *peripolarchos* and that they formed separate units rather than "being distributed in the ranks of the professional soldiers" as Kent suggests in the article just cited. Kent concludes that garrison troops in the third century were made up both of mercenary and citizen soldiers (p. 344) and that they served in separate detachments (p. 349).

The relationship of the body of ephebes to the soldiers under a *peripolarchos* on frontier duty in the latter half of the fourth century may be deduced from three inscriptions of that period. *IG* 2^2.1193.6–8, dated end of the fourth century, is a decree of the Eleusinians honoring the *peripolarchos* Smikythion because ἔπραττεν

[8] Bryant (see note 2) 87.

[9] J. H. Kent, "A Garrison Inscription from Rhamnous," *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 348–9.

πρός τε τοὺς στρατηγούς (no doubt more specifically, τὸν στρατηγὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν Arist. *Ath.* 61.1) . . . ὅπως φυλακὴ ἱκανὴ ἔλθοι Ἐλευ[σι]νάδε. A few years earlier, in the first ephebic inscriptions of the year 334/3, the people of Eleusis honor the young men of the tribes Kekropis (*IG* 2^2.1156) and Hippothontis (*IG* 2^2.1189) ἐπειδὴ καλ[ῶς καὶ φι]λοτίμως ἐπιμελοῦνται τῆς φυλακῆς Ἐλευσῖνος (1156.45–46 and essentially the same formula in 1189.4–5). The connection of the two groups with the guarding of Eleusis is unmistakably suggested by the language of these decrees. In the case of the soldiers it is direct and primary, in the case of the ephebes, casual and secondary. We shall not go far wrong in thinking that in this period, and with great likelihood in the first half of the century as well, the ephebes were attached for training purposes to the troops of the *peripolarchos* under the high command of the strategos.

Since Aeschines calls his comrades "fellow-ephebes," E. Hommel's remark in *RE* (under *peripoloi*) is altogether pointless, "von Epheben . . . darf man dabei also streng genommen noch nicht reden." His attitude is typical of the post-Wilamowitz approach to the problem of the antecedents of the Aristotelian organization: nothing having any connection with an organized group of ephebes must be introduced into its pedigree, since it has none. The Aristotelian ephebia lost its two most distinctive characteristics within thirty-five years of the time when we first learn of it — its universal compulsory nature over a two-year period, and its distinctive officers, the *sôphronistai*; yet we do not, therefore, consider that the ephebia came to an end. Hommel continues, "Dagegen dürfte sich die zwei-jährige Dauer der Leistung (Aischin. a. O.) eingebürgert und später der Einrichtung der offiziellen Ephebie . . . zum Vorbild gedient haben".

The crux of the matter is doubtless what one considers "die offizielle Ephebie" to be. Of the age classes which we find commonly mentioned in our sources, παῖδες, ἔφηβοι, νέοι, ἄνδρες, γέροντες, and those confined to the contestants in games παῖδες, ἀγένειοι and ἄνδρες, only one has a legal and official significance — ἔφηβοι. The term had its origin in a physiological phenomenon, "at the age of puberty" and might be and was used to designate a boy at the point of transition from boyhood to manhood. The natural ἐφ' ἥβης is variable; used to denote legal status, it becomes fixed. It begins at a point two years before a young man is officially enrolled in the register of his deme, ἅμα ἡβήσῃ ἐπὶ διετές (D. 46.20), as the

legal phrase puts it, that is sixteen years of age.[10] The date of the young man's entrance into the official status of ephebe at eighteen years of age was the date used to determine his eligibility for any office or duty for which a specific age was prescribed.[11]

In the first half of the fourth century B.C., as later, the status of *ephebos* marks the beginning of his rights as citizen and also the beginning of his duties. In the exercise of his rights as a citizen — the administration of his property, sueing and being sued in the courts, attendance at the ecclesia, engaging in marriage, there was nothing to distinguish him from citizens of other age-groups.[12] "The only public duties required of a citizen were military service and the payment of taxes according to financial ability."[13] In carrying out the first of these, ephebes in the first half of the fourth century as in the second half formed a separate group. They were not μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων in the τάξεις, their duties were confined to φρουρεῖν and did not include στρατεύεσθαι. The official status of the ephebate becomes visible in the group organization in which Aeschines served (Aeschin. 2.167) in order to perform the cardinal duty of citizenship. Under the constitution which Aristotle describes, at least one of the rights was limited and one of the duties was held in abeyance during the two-year ephebic period: ephebes could not sue or be sued except in certain kinds of cases and they were exempt from taxes. After the two year period, they were, in the words with which Aristotle concludes the section on the ephebia, ἤδη μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων (*Ath.* 42.5).

The oath of citizenship, generally agreed to go back to the fifth century, and in all likelihood, to even an earlier period, is called the ephebic oath from the time that the term *ephebos* comes into use to mean one entering upon citizenship. Demosthenes refers to it as τὸν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀγλαύρου τῶν ἐφήβων ὅρκον (D. 19.303), and Plutarch (*Alc.* 15.4) has Alcibiades speak of it thus: τὸν ἐν Ἀγραύλου προβαλλόμενον ἀεὶ τοῖς ἐφήβοις ὅρκον.

The oath is not merely a civic oath in the general form, "I pledge allegiance to . . . ," but a military oath — "I will never

[10] See Girard's clear exposition of the matter with full citations in *DarSag.* 2.1.621 under *ephebi.*

[11] Ulrich Kahrstedt, *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörigkeit in Athen, Studien zum öffentlichen Recht Athens,* Teil I (Stuttgart-Berlin 1934) 59 ff.

[12] Kahrstedt (see note 11) 76.

[13] Bonner (see note 5) 94.

bring reproach upon my hallowed arms, nor will I desert the comrade at whose side I stand, but I will defend . . . ," and a religious pledge as well — "I will honor the religion of my fathers," thus combining three essential aspects of Athenian citizenship traditionally and historically associated with the concept. It is significant that the civic part of the oath is expressed not merely in terms of obedience, "I will obey whoever is in authority and submit to the established law and all others which the people shall harmoniously enact," but in terms of what-am-I-going-to-do-about-it as a citizen-soldier — "If any one tries to overthrow the constitution or disobeys it, I will not permit it but I will come to its defense single-handed or with the support of all." An oath of this kind could have meaning only to those who were going to use arms in the exercise of their citizenship, or as Bonner puts it, "(it) could have been administered only to men who had received military training or expected to receive it."[14]

The ephebic oath was found engraved on a stele which had been set up in Acharnai. L. Robert[15] dates it on the basis of the lettering in the second half of the fourth century. It is introduced as follows: *ὅρκος ἐφήβων πάτριος, ὃν ὀμνύναι δεῖ τοὺς ἐφήβους*. Robert has shown that this oath except for one particular is identical with the oath as given by Stobaeus (43.48), Pollux (8.105–6). and the part cited by Lycurgus (*Contra Leocr.* 76). The oath on the stele from Acharnai adds as witnesses of the oath after the gods, "the boundaries of our native land, wheat, barley, vine, olive, fig." This addition explains the strange language of the oath in Plut. *Alc.* 15.4 and its reflection in Cicero (*Rep.* 3.9.15) which Kahrstedt (above, note 10, 73) finds "völlig abweichend — wohl ein Missverständnis" and proves the existence of the self-same oath as early as the second half of the fifth century.

[14] Bonner (see note 5) 90.

[15] Robert (see note 5) 305, "Le texte même du serment était complet dans Stobée et Pollux; il n'y manquait aucun engagement relatif aux frontières de l'Attique ou à la culture du sol. C'est parmi les temoins du serment que sont nommés après les dieux *ὅροι τῆς πατρίδος, πυροί, κριθαί, ἄμπελοι, ἐλάαι, συκαῖ*. C'est cette formule que déformait étrangement Alcibiade, en l'isolant de ce qui précède et en rattachant *πυροί, κριθαί* et cet. à *ὅροι τῆς πατρίδος*, il lui faisait dire: 'les bornes de la patrie sont les blés, etc.' et de la formule sibylline ainsi créée il tirait un appel à l'expansion territoriale." Cf. also Martin Bock, "Die Schwurgötter der Epheben von Acharnai," *WJh* 33 (1941) 46–59 who attempts to show that the choice and order of the gods named in the oath as witnesses are peculiarly appropriate to ephebes. He, too, considers the ephebia older than 335/4, pp. 57–58.

Robert concludes (p. 315) that the oath of the ephebes is an administrative document; the ephebes took the oath each year; it existed in an official form without variants; everyone could secure it; the authentic text of the oath is given on the stele from Acharnai.

Aristotle does not mention anything about ephebes taking an oath, doubtless because the practise was of such long standing as to render any statement on the matter superfluous. There seems to be no question that all young men took this oath when they became ephebes, and in all likelihood not in the separate demes, but jointly in the sanctuary of Aglauros, perhaps the first step in the "circuit of temples" which in Aristotle's account was the first order of business for the whole body of ephebes under the guidance of their supervisors.

The origin of the ephebia must be sought in the Athenian concept of citizenship which made military service "the legal basis of civic life."[16] It is necessary to emphasize and document this fact because preoccupation with education in gymnastics, civics and morals which later became so large a part of the concept of ephebic training has obscured it, so that even Wilamowitz (see note 1, 189) felt that the full description of the ephebia in Aristotle as a definition of citizenship "fällt eigentlich aus der Staatsordnung heraus" and that the ephebia was primarily a means of juvenile reform which only incidentally was concerned with the establishment of citizenship.

But from the days when warfare developed out of the stage in which well-equipped noblemen bore the brunt of combat and into that in which the masses of the people took a more prominent part in battle, the bearing of arms brought with it civic rights.[17] The Homeric *agorai* show the first outworking of this principle.[18] Aristotle states that "the earliest form of constitution among the Greeks after the kingship consisted of those who were actually soldiers" (*Pol.* 4.10.10, 1297B).

Solon retained the four property classes into which the people had been divided "assigning each office to the several classes in proportion to the amount of their assessment" (Arist. *Ath.* 7.3–4). The basis of citizenship was being widened. The original purpose

[16] Jaeger (see note 5) 250.

[17] Johannes Kromayer-Georg Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*, Müllers *Handbuch der kl. Alt.* 4.3.2 (München 1928) 22.

[18] Emil Szanto, *RE* 1.877, under *agora*.

of the division into classes was probably to determine their capabilities for military service[19] which in turn fixed their political status. The ability to provide one's self with arms was in the early period an index of one's economic condition. Solon apparently systematized the property ratings and frankly recognized them as the basis for political rights, specifically for eligibility to to hold office.

When Pisistratus seized the government, he disarmed the people by the well-known trick (Arist. *Ath.* 15.3–4), as did the Thirty at a later date (Arist. *Ath.* 37.1). The arms of the people were the symbol of their citizenship, the means of insuring the perpetuation of their *politeia*. Solon's protest against Pisistratus' first move in the direction of tyranny took the form of bringing his armor out in front of the house, so that some one else could exercise his prerogative of citizenship from which he was kept by old age (Arist. *Ath.* 14.2–3).

Cleisthenes' constitution made no change in the basic connection of citizenship and military service.

The enactment of Pericles which confined citizenship to persons of citizen birth on both sides (Arist. *Ath.* 26.4) did not affect the responsibility of citizens to bear arms, but rather defined the hereditary qualifications of those who might be admitted to the arms bearing class.

Thus under the proposed constitution of the Four Hundred, "all the rest of the functions of government," those not provided for in the offices of archons and presidents, were to be turned over to 5000 "the most capable persons to serve the commonwealth in person and in property" and these were on the armed rolls, ἐκ τῶν ὅπλων.[20]

In theory as well as in practise the inseparable concomitant of citizenship was military service. To Aristotle[21] it is logical that "when the multitude govern the state with a view to the common advantage . . . the class that fights for the state in war is the most powerful and that it is those who possess arms who are admitted to the government." His reason for this is that "although it is

[19] Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* (1893) 2.653 ff.

[20] Arist. *Ath.* 29.5 and 33.1. Cf. the similar locution in regard to recruitment of men for cavalry detachments τοὺς δυνατωτάτους καὶ χρήμασι καὶ σώμασι in Xen. *Eq. Mag.* 1.9.

[21] *Pol.* 3.5.2–3, 1279A and B. Here and throughout, the translations from Aristotle are those of H. Rackham in the Loeb Classical Library editions.

possible for one man or a few to excel in virtue, when the number is larger it becomes difficult for them to possess perfect excellence in respect of every form of virtue, but they can best excel in military valour, for this is found with numbers." When criticizing the constitution of the state proposed in Plato's *Republic*, Aristotle wonders about the Farmers and the Artisans (*Pol.* 2.3.1, 1264B) "whether they are excluded from government or have some part in it, and whether these classes also are to possess arms and to serve in war with the others or not," since Socrates has said nothing on the point. That the class of Soldiers have a share in the state is taken for granted.

In his discussion of the constitution in Plato's *Laws*, Aristotle (*Pol.* 2.3.9, 1265B) describes the constitutional form intermediate between an oligarchy and a democracy as one in which "the government is constituted from the class that bears arms." "Sharing in the government" meant sharing in rights, chief among which Aristotle placed participation in the courts, the assemblies and the offices (*Pol.* 3.1.4, 1275A). It also entailed responsibilities which rested both on the σώματα and the χρήματα of the citizens, the carrying out of which insured the state's existence as a "collection of persons sufficiently numerous, speaking broadly, to secure the independence of life" (Arist. *Pol.* 3.1.8, 1275B).

The military responsibility of the citizen could be carried out only in groups. The citizen-soldiers were subdivided, no doubt in an early period, into three divisions, the young and inexperienced in war, the men capable of active duty in war, and those past the prime of life fit only for limited service. The first and third classes, Thucydides called νεώτατοι and πρεσβύτατοι and their service was confined to garrison and frontier duty (2.13.7). Later the age limits were fixed at 18–20 for the first group who were called ephebes, 20–50 (exceptionally to 60) for active soldiers, and 50 (or 60) and beyond for the oldest group.[22]

Certainly from the time of Aeschines, the young citizens formed a much more closely knit group than the other two. They were not only called out in time of war, but served in time of peace. They were used for a limited service and for a limited time It is inconceivable that their officers did not make use of the period of garrison service for military exercises of all kinds in order to prepare them for their later activity as full-fledged soldiers Bonner

[22] Kromayer-Veith (see note 17) 48.

has well remarked that Athens could not have held her predominant position during the period of her empire with armies made up of untrained recruits.[23]

In earlier days, both the provision of weapons and the training, if any, were left in private hands. But with the growth of the state in numbers, the inclusion of citizens who could not afford the time or the equipment to train for war, the increasing necessity to engage in conflict with well-trained and experienced armies, Athens could not rely upon haphazard and individual training. Individual prowess and preparedness were inadequate in wars in which the tactics and maneuvers of trained units decided the outcome. Aristotle recognized this necessity in his advice to the founders of oligarchies. He argued (*Pol.* 6.4.5, 1321A) that while cavalry and heavy infantry are the most suitable units for an oligarchy, the common people get the better over the well-to-do in party strife by the superior mobility of their distinctive military unit, light infantry. "Therefore to establish this force (the light infantry) out of this class (the common people) is to establish it against itself, but the right plan is for men of military age to be separated into a division of older and one of younger men and to have their own sons while still young trained in the exercises of light and unarmed troops, and for youths selected from among the boys to be themselves trained in active operation."

The supervision by the state of military training during the first years of citizenship developed so naturally and so logically from citizenship as the Athenians conceived it, that it is not strange that we read so little about this preliminary training in our sources. Initially, doubtless, basic training in maneuvering by groups and rudimentary facility in handling arms was stressed. Such training has no more to do with the fighting in armor about which Lysimachus asked Socrates "Is it suitable for our boys to learn or not?" than fencing has to do with learning how to handle a sword in battle.[24]

[23] Bonner (see note 5) 89.

[24] Plato, *Laches* 182C. Small wonder that "teachers" of this kind of fighting avoided Lacedaemon (183B) if the weapon used in a similar exhibition is representative of the art (183D). There is little justification for Kromayer-Veith (see note 17) 48, n. 2 to drag in this reference as an example of private training for war. There is no reason at all for citing it in connection with hoplomachy as a branch of military instruction as Bryant (see note 2) 80, n. 2; 81, n. 2 and Forbes (see note 2) 116, do. The question turns on the educational value of learning to handle heavy weapons with the dexterity displayed by a certain Stesilaus whose performance the interlocutors, in-

In the ephebia as it later developed the streams of four separate activities, military, athletic, educational and ethical, merged and commingled. Elements of all four were present, to be sure, in the original purely military ephebia, but they were incidental and not formally integral. The ephebic oath with its solemn invocation of the gods, its promise to obey authority and to honor the religion of the fathers must have been a strong incentive to religious feeling and civic morality. Escorting the ephebes in a body to the various temples of the gods and participation in parades on religious and civic occasions would have the same effect.[25] Even in our day the ordinary disciplinary regimen of an army organization carries with it ethico-moral implications. The attempt to keep ephebes "streng von der corruption des lebens entfernt" which impressed Wilamowitz in the ephebia, is duplicated in modern armies solely in the interests of military efficiency. But modern efforts have as little effect as the regulations of the ephebia in Menander's time, if the picture reflected in Terence's *Eunuchus* is like the original, in keeping soldiers in the barracks and out of the city.

In an institution which marked the transition from youth to the participation in the social and religious life of the group, Athenian officers could not fail to regard discipline as something more than a means to military efficiency. When public opinion defined its concept of discipline for citizenship more broadly in educational and moral, as well as in military terms, the *paidotribês* and the *sôphronistês* were added to the officers in charge of its young citizens.

The thinking of Isocrates and his school, with its emphasis on making the idealized deeds of the past a guide to political action, played a great part in shifting emphasis from individual development for its own sake to individual development for the common good. It also furthered the idea of utilizing education in the service of the state.[26]

We may assume that neither education of the mind nor formal training of the body, gymnastics, had an integral place in early ephebic training. For education among the Athenians was pri-

cluding two experienced generals, had witnessed. It was addressed to Socrates, the educational expert, and not to the generals. Sorry generals they must have been to have debated the value of training in hoplomachy for war!

[25] Bock (see note 15) 47, suggests the possibility that the ephebes visited the shrine of each of the deities mentioned in the oath.

[26] Gisela Schmitz-Kahlmann, "Das Beispiel der Geschichte im politischen Denken des Isokrates," *Philologus*, Supplbd. 31.4 (Leipzig 1939) 93, 115 and *passim*.

marily a matter of private, not public concern. Gymnastics were carried on in the gymnasium which developed in a somewhat parallel but inverted fashion to the ephebia. At the outset gymnasia were simply places for exercising and running, but in the course of time they became elaborate installations provided by the state in which citizens found recreation in exercises and in games and athletes a place to pursue their training for contest. A later stage was reached when they became the center of social and intellectual life. Although the state provided the facilities for gymnastics, the individual citizen paid for such instruction as he cared to have in these accomplishments.

In this sense gymnasia were full-fledged public institutions as early as 421/0 (*IG* 2^2.84). When the scope of required military training was broadened to include gymnastics, the ephebes made use of the facilities of the existing gymnasia.[27] Gymnastics in the gymnasium and in the ephebia were practised for different purposes, in the former for pleasure, health and education, in the latter for physical stamina and adroitness. Aristotle lists gymnastics along with other matters of essential pertinence with regard to citizens — participation in the assembly, the magistracies, the courts, military service and gymnastics.[28] But gymnastics is an addition to what earlier in his treatise he described as cardinal marks of a citizen — sharing in the courts and in office holding (*Pol.* 3.1.4–5, 1275A), where the holding of office includes participation in the assembly, and the possession of arms (*Pol.* 3.5.3, 1279B).

The simple reason why Plato, Isocrates, Xenophon and other Greek authors do not mention the ephebia (or before the term ephebe was used in a legal sense, any formal military training) is because it was not considered an educational institution, nor was military training in the concept then current, educational other than in the general sense in which Simonides called the city the teacher of the man (*Lyra Graeca* 2.337).[29] The ephebia began as

[27] Forbes (see note 2) 155.

[28] *Pol.* 4.10.6, 1297A. *LSJ* define γυμνασία in this passage as "the right to use γυμνάσιον," and we may perhaps translate with regard to the other items as well, "the right to participate in the assembly, to make use of the courts, et cet."

[29] Forbes (see note 2) 122 uses this argument as evidence for the nonexistence of the ephebia before 335/4: "Aeschines did not account his service as peripolos as part of his education, any more than such patrol duty was a phase of education when performed by mercenaries." It is, on the contrary, evidence only that the ephebia in Aeschines' time did not possess characteristics which to the Athenian way of thinking at that time were educational.

the logical utilization of the first years of citizenship as preliminary training in the one field in which from the very beginning the citizen owed a duty to the state, the field of military service. Its later development is marked by the extension of the concept of training for citizenship to include areas which at the outset were the concern of the individual, first gymnastics in the sense of training, then gymnastics in the sense of education, and finally education in the sense of intellectual training. The distinctions here made are nicely brought out in Isocrates (15.181), "Certain of our ancestors, long before our time, seeing that many arts had been devised for other things, while none had been prescribed for the body and for the mind, invented and bequeathed to us two disciplines, physical training for the body, of which gymnastics is a part, and, for the mind, philosophy."

State institutions reflect state needs. In factional strife and in the struggle with small neighboring states, Athens could and did depend upon untrained, self-equipped citizen-soldiers. When she fought against trained and disciplined armies as she did for over a century before 335/4, there can be no question that her soldiers received formal training. Bonner rightly opposes the statements of Isocrates, "We are at no pains to prepare ourselves for it (war)," and of Socrates, "Military training is not publicly recognized by the state," with the declaration of Pericles, "We are superior to our opponents in our system of training for warfare."[30]

In the course of the fourth century, however, it became increasingly clear that the prosecution of war had developed into a science and was the business of professionals. New and elaborate systems of tactics were devised and mercenary troops were employed in large numbers.[31] The ephebia reflected the changing external circumstances. There is a shift from military to educational purposes.

It would be difficult to choose a more unlikely time for the establishment of a new military-educational institution with compulsory attendance for all citizens between the ages of 18 and 20 than the year 335/4. Three years before the Macedonians had defeated the Athenians at Chaeronea. Athens together with all Greece except Sparta had just entered a defensive-offensive alliance

[30] Bonner (see note 5) 89.

[31] Kromayer-Veith (see note 17) 130.

with Macedonia and had recognized Philip's hegemony. In the excitement at the prospect of freedom from Macedonia occasioned by the murder of Philip two years after Chaeronea, if we are to believe Wilamowitz and his followers, the Athenians passed a law to establish the ephebia. Its prime purpose was to build up military strength against Macedonia.[32]

It is too much to ask of credulity to believe that a program so hostile to Macedonia in its intent could have been undertaken at this time, and that if it had been launched, it was not forthwith quashed. The transfer of Philip's powers over the Greeks to Alexander had been accomplished without a hitch. A Macedonian garrison was as close to Athens as Thebes. Alexander had demonstrated energy and resoluteness no less than his father's in maintaining his leadership. While he was victoriously campaigning against the Illyrians in the late summer of 335/4 word came to him that his garrison in Thebes was being besieged by the Thebans with the support, among others, of the Athenians. Within 13 days he appeared before Thebes, ruthlessly destroyed the city and sold its inhabitants into slavery. Would he have permitted a new military training program just getting under way at Athens to continue? His feeling would be quite different, however, toward an old established institution whose original military purpose had become somewhat blunted under changing world conditions.

The proponents of Wilamowitz' theory can not consistently hold, in one breath that the ephebia was to be a bulwark of military strength and, in the next, that it did not exist before 335/4 because there was nothing educational in Aeschines' service as ephebe-peripolos.[33]

Such a program was no remedy for the replacement of the citizen-soldiers by mercenaries which in the final analysis was caused by changing conditions of warfare and of power balance. If compulsory military training was actually introduced in 355/4, it had no appreciable effect upon the proportion of citizen-soldiers

[32] Wilamowitz (see note 1) 194; Forbes (see note 2) 124–5. So, too, most recently, but only with reference to the purpose of universal compulsory military training of ephebes — he does not commit himself on the date of establishment of the institution — H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte*, Müllers *Handbuch der kl. Alt.* 3.4 (München 1950) 312.

[33] Forbes (see note 2) 122. Cf. p. 115: "The compulsion to enter the ephebia was occasioned by the desire to train as many soldiers as possible to fight for Athens in the period of her military decline." So, too, Bryant (see note 2) 80, n. 3.

to mercenaries in Athens' last military effort thirteen years later. Athens' contribution in the so-called Lamian War (summer, 322/1) was 5000 infantry, 500 cavalry and 2000 mercenaries (Diod. 18.10.11).

If one were to hazard a suggestion about the period in which the young men of Athens were first called upon to undergo organized military training, one might with some justification propose the period after the Persian War when the Council of the Areopagus was at the head of affairs. Themistocles had laid the foundations of a great navy which had proved its worth at Salamis. The naval victory had followed hard upon the heady success at Marathon. The finances of the state were flourishing as a result of the discovery of the mines at Maronea (Arist. *Ath.* 22.7). Augmented in 478/7 by the tribute from the allied states, the revenues of Athens were sufficiently large to underwrite the costly undertaking. At this time, writes Aristotle (*Ath.* 24.1), the Athenians were "emboldened" to take the advice of Themistocles that they should aim at leadership. Themistocles had told them that there would be food for all, "some serving in the army and others as guards and others conducting the business of the state." The juxtaposition of service in the army and service as guards suggests the contrast between the services of the mature citizen and the preliminary service of the young citizens which we see in the ephebia. Among those who actually received subsistence from the state under the policy Themistocles had suggested to the Athenians Aristotle lists φρουροὶ νεωρίων πεντακόσιοι (*Ath.* 24.3). One is tempted to identify them with οἱ φρουροῦντες in Arist. *Ath.* 24.1 referred to above and the young men later called ephebes. At this time, too, there was training for war: "For during this time it occurred that the people practised military duties and won high esteem among the Greeks and gained the supremacy of the sea against the will of the Lacedaemonians" (*Ath.* 23.2). Finally it was a time when warfare and power relationships among states were at a stage which permitted citizen armies to be effective.