

XVI. A "Diogenes' College" in Athens?

O. W. REINMUTH

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

"Diogenes' College" is the name given by Marrou to an "official secondary school" in the *Diogeneion*, a gymnasium of Athens, which he describes as "a state school for young men preparing for the *ephēbia*" whose "teaching staff and (the) servants were classed with those of the *ephēbia* proper." The students were called "mellephebes."¹ In the essential points Marrou here follows Graindor's classic study of οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογέειον (*MusBelge* 26 [1922] 222-28) except that Graindor and, among others, Forbes² suggest that the staff for these students was distinct from that of the *ephēbia*.

A novel theory has now been proposed for the meaning of οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογέειον in a recent article by Sterling Dow (*HSCP* 63 [1958] 423-36). They are not students at all. No preparatory school for the *ephēbia* is involved. "Those around the *Diogeneion*" are a separate staff of the *ephēbia*, "the officials, trainers, secretaries, etc., who were associated with the *Diogeneion* not just for a year or so, as schoolboys, but professionally for life" (431). Elsewhere he makes clear that he means the officials sometimes grouped together under the caption οἱ διὰ βίου.

Dow's theory involves, among other difficulties, the acceptance of inconsistency in the use of technical terms in several formal epebic inscriptions, and fails to connect a salient and significant development in the *ephēbia* of the imperial period with the occurrence of this new designation whose meaning is being sought. In attempting to explain this phrase, we cannot, as Dow does, ignore a fact which the epebic inscriptions, beginning with the first century before Christ and in the centuries after Christ, clearly reveal: the presence in the *ephēbia* in increasingly large numbers of young men below the epebic age. In another connection I

¹ H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Paris 1948). I cite from the English translation made from the third French edition and published in London 1956. Here page 114.

² C. A. Forbes, *Greek Physical Education* (New York and London 1929) 176-77.

had previously gathered and published the evidence to substantiate it, and I shall discuss it below.³

A designation for these individuals would have to be invented if one did not occur, since they were, strictly speaking, not *ephēboi*, and of course they were not officials. This fact is the strongest kind of confirmation of Graindor's conclusion, which he arrived at by an examination of the *testimonia* about the *Diogeneion* alone. All the evidence is consonant with and suggests the following interpretation. "Those around the *Diogeneion*" were, as Graindor *et al.* have concluded, pre-ephebic students; but contrary to Graindor, Forbes and Marrou there was no separate school for them and no separate staff (Graindor, Forbes). The *ephēbia* proved its vitality and adaptability by incorporating pre-*ephēboi* into the select number of its students, and the same ephebic officials served both groups.

In brief Dow's argument runs as follows. The individuals whose names are listed in ephebic inscriptions are "divisible into two main groups, viz., the officials and the epheboi." The phrase "those around the *Diogeneion*" . . . "cannot designate the citizen epheboi . . . and it cannot designate the epengraphoi." The officials can be divided into groups, and they have never been considered in whole or in part. *Οἱ διὰ βίον* are listed as a group in *IG II².2245*. He concludes, "The suggestion seems inevitable that the latter group in 2245 (*οἱ διὰ βίον*) is the one referred to as *οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογέειον*."

There are three designations in the heading of 2245, which is dated in 262/3 by Notopoulos (*Hesperia* 18 [1949] 51-57), for those whose names are inscribed upon the stone: 1) *synarchontes autou* (the *kosmētēs*), 2) *hoi peri to Diogeneion*, and 3) *synephēboi*. The names for groups 1) and 3) are unambiguously known from earlier inscriptions. Without exception they mean: 1) *all* fellow-officials, although they may be, and sometimes are, divided into sub-groups; and 3) fellow-*ephēboi*. This last group may also be broken down into several sub-groups, two of which are always separately captioned in the rosters: the citizen *ephēboi*, and the foreign *ephēboi*; but these sub-groups are never mentioned in the headings.

Nor is the designation for group 2), *hoi peri to Diogeneion*, used for

³ *TAPA* 79 (1948) 211-31.

the first time in 2245. The phrase was in use some 70 years earlier. In the ephebic inscription of ca. 190/1, *IG* II².2113.142–51, "those around the *Diogeneion*" are stated to have received the *περίλοιπα* in the distribution of the *Sebastophorika* of Plataea which had been made to two groups: the *ephēboi*, and τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν αὐτῶν τεταγμένοις. The heading of *IG* II².2130, which is dated only one or two years later (192/3), names only *synarchontes* and τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῷ ἐφηβεύσαντας. In the body of the inscription, however, it is twice mentioned that an *ephēbos* dined his fellow-*ephēboi* and "those around the *Diogeneion*" (lines 60–62 and 91–93). It is noted in *IG* II².2221.20–23 (217/8 or a little later) that the *ephēboi* and "those around the *Diogeneion*" celebrated τὰ ἐξιτήρια together with a banquet. The inscription also contains a list of officials under the caption (line 70) τάξεις ἐν Διογενείῳ. Dow identifies them with "those around the *Diogeneion*." We shall come back to this inscription. Here it is enough to remark that the use of two different technical designations for the same group in the same inscription is a most difficult assumption to make. We do not know what group designations were employed in the heading since it is not preserved.

The meanings then of all three designations in the heading of *IG* II².2245 must have been known and relatively well fixed in 262/3. When Dow equates "those around the *Diogeneion*" in 2245 with a part of the *kosmētēs*' staff, he of necessity imposes upon the unqualified designation for group 1), *synarchontes autou*, a restricted, technical meaning also, i.e. the sub-group of officials who served for a year. He justifies this by stating that the heading of this inscription is "isolated in time and unique in phrasing" and that "here alone" a clear distinction is made between two groups of ephebic officials. But the "uniqueness" of the heading in 2245 consists in the collocation of the three group designations and not in their meanings as *termini technici*, since two of them had always been employed before with unvarying meanings, and the third had been in use for at least 70 years. This being the case, are we justified in assuming an exceptional meaning for *synarchontes autou* in one of the longest, fullest and most completely preserved of extant ephebic inscriptions?

The phrase "those around the *Diogeneion*" occurs five times in the headings of ephebic inscriptions between ca. 230/1 and 262/3. If by synecdoche it came to mean "all officials" and displaced

synarchontes in these five inscriptions, we should expect it to appear regularly in the headings subsequent to its first appearance. But at least two headings within this 30 year period apparently use only the old designation *synarchontes* along with *ephēboi*: *IG* II².2235.3-4 (234/5): [τούς τε συνάρχον]τας καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῶ [ἐφηβεύσαντας], and 2242.1-2 (238/9): τοὺς [συνάρ]χο[ντας καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῶ ἐφηβεύσαντας]. *Synarchontes* is also the designation for all officials in the one inscription with preserved heading which is later in date than *IG* II².2245, namely: *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 71-74, no. 37, lines 8-9: τοὺς τε συνάρχοντας καὶ τοὺς ἐπ' αὐτῶ ἐφήβους. Dow refers to this inscription (but not in connection with his discussion of the meaning of "those around the *Diogeneion*") as post-Herulian in date. Oliver, who published it, assigned it to the "Latter Part of the Third Century after Christ." I should date it shortly after 262/3 and certainly before the Herulian invasion of 267/8. In any case there is agreement that it is later than *IG* II².2245.

It is most unlikely that two technical terms should be used interchangeably in the headings of official inscriptions to mean all officials of the *kosmétēs*' staff if, in actuality, the precise significance of one is part of that staff, the "professionals" with life tenure, and of the other, another part of that staff, the annual officials.

In fact οἱ διὰ βίου cannot be recognized as a closed group of officials by being listed together, or separately referred to, until long after the designation "those around the *Diogeneion*" occurs in ephebic inscriptions. We find an official with life appointment as early as 118/9 (*IG* II².2030.7-10), and in succeeding inscriptions some of the officials whom Dow places in this category did have life tenure, others did not. If we assume that a distinction between annual and life officials was made, we must establish a third category of officials in *IG* II².2239 (239/40) to include the *prostatēs*, whose title and name occur among the officials *dia biou* mentioned *honoris causa* in the heading. He is not a life appointee although he is one of the "professionals" listed under the caption *hoi dia biou* in 2245. So, too, in *IG* II².2113 (ca. 190/1), where the titles and names of life appointees are listed indiscriminately not only among other "professionals" who do not have tenure for life, but also in the roster, some before and some after the *sôphronistai* and *hyposôphronistai* who, under the theory proposed, belong to the group of annual officials. We cannot then use the fact that

in 2245, and in all likelihood in 2243 also, all the "professional" officials were appointed for life, as evidence that the designation "those around the *Diogeneion*," which had currency before that happened to be the case, was the technical designation for a group of officials with appointment for life.

Obviously there is *a priori* as much justification for assuming that a group of *ephēboi* as well as a group of officials should be separately mentioned in the headings. Perhaps even greater justification, since in our extant inscriptions there is no grouping of officials, if we except the phrase under discussion; but there are many groupings of *ephēboi*, and technical designations exist for these categories, several of which occur as captions in the catalogues. The determination of their meanings and applications is a complicated matter.⁴ *Ephēboi*, *politai*, *Athēnaioi*, *xenoi*, *Milēnaioi*, *prōtengraphoi*, *epengraphoi*, categories without a formal designation, —citizen *ephēboi* without a demotic, *epengraphoi* with a demotic, brothers, one with, the other without a demotic, and at the very end "those around the *Diogeneion*," not to mention *mellephēboi*, — all are found in our inscriptions and call for an explanation. But the fact is that none of these sub-groups of *ephēboi* and, except for the moot phrase, no categories of officials are mentioned in the headings of extant ephebic inscriptions.

Need we confine our investigation of the meaning of the phrase in question in a strait jacket by making the assumption that no other group except officials and *ephēboi* can be mentioned in the headings? Is it not logical to assume that, since no sub-groups of either officials or *ephēboi* had been mentioned in the headings for over 500 years, when a new designation appears there, it must mean a new group distinct from the customary two? I think we must make that assumption.

For the evidence of the inscriptions is incontrovertible that such a group was present in the *ephēbia* in the later period. Beginning with an isolated example in 107/6 (*IG* II².1011. col. v.106) we find names of citizen *ephēboi* without the demotic, although the majority of names do have it. This can only mean that young men below the age of 18 were admitted to the *ephēbia*, exceptionally

⁴ Dow (430): "The interesting complications about these terms which O. W. Reinmuth has attempted to introduce are irrelevant here: *TAPA* 79 (1948) 211–231." I did not introduce either the terms or the complications; I merely tried to explain some of them.

at first, to be sure, because the *ephēboi* were a legally determined age group, and eighteen was the age prerequisite for admission into the *ephebēia* which Aristotle described. The evidence for this fact has been assembled in the article already referred to (above, note 3) where I wrote (229):

The number of boys younger than 18 in the *ephebēia* became proportionately larger in the late first, the second and third centuries after Christ. This is shown by the increase of isolated names without the demotic 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 (*IG* II².1996), 11 pairs out of 78 Athenians and 9 pairs out of 116 *epengraphoi* in 155/6 (2068), in *ca.* 200/1, 10 sets of brothers including three cases of three brothers out of 59 Athenians, and 2 pairs out of 61 *epengraphoi* only a few of which have patronymics (2291).

These young men were not *ephēboi* in the strict sense of that term and could not be accurately designated as such. So long as they were few in number and were apparently given the same training and treatment as the *ephēboi*, they were counted as such.

The number of such names without demotics, as has been said, increases in the first century and a half after Christ (complete listing of occurrences in my article, page 221, note 30). After the middle of the second century A.D. the demotic is not as regularly given as before. Roughly only one-fourth of the datable ephebic lists after this time give the demotic, but in those that do we continue to find names without the demotic, as can be seen e.g. in *IG* II².2102 (a little after 169/70), 2128 (190/1–200/1), and 2215 (after 212/3). Unfortunately the demotic is not found with the names in the three inscriptions which both preserve the names and also mention "those around the *Diogeneion*" in the headings (2239, 2243 and 2245), with the exception of 10 or 11 names in the long list of 2245. For the mention of demotics with these few names out of the preponderant number without demotics, I do not venture an explanation. Although demotics are not given in many of the later lists, a fact which is *per se* an indication of a relaxation of the age requirement for one class of students, if not for all, the large number of homopatronymics (listed on page 216, note 17 in

my article), especially in the inscriptions of the second and third centuries after Christ, many of whom were doubtless brothers, points in the same direction.

Let us for the present dismiss from consideration the question whether these young men below the age of 18 in our ephebic lists are to be identified with the *mellephēboi*. The *mellephēboi* whom Graindor *et al.* equated with "those around the *Diogeneion*" are known only from three inscriptions from the Piraeus (*BCH* 7 [1883] 75 ff., no. 3—two inscriptions—and *ArchEph* [1884] 187 ff.) and a crude graffito on a fourth (*IG* II².1940). I hope to consider the *mellephēboi*, along with other problems, in my re-study of the Attic *ephēbia* which is now in progress.

It is only reasonable to suppose that the existence of this body of pre-ephebic students in the *ephēbia* should in time be recognized by giving it a separate designation, especially if they were given a training differing in some respects from that of the *ephēboi*. Since the members of this group were neither officials nor *ephēboi* but distinct from both, a new term was coined to designate them, "those around the *Diogeneion*."

A cursory review of the references which mention the *Diogeneion* in connection with the *ephēboi* and ephebic activities will perhaps give some indication why this designation was especially appropriate for this group.

A whole series of ephebic inscriptions from the beginning of the second century A.D., up to and including the latest known, list an *epi Diogeneiou* among the officials. He is now generally recognized to have been the watchman or caretaker rather than the director of the *Diogeneion*, as Graindor at first thought him to be, because he is always listed near the end of the roster of officials, which under the Empire sometimes numbered as high as 25.⁵

Nine inscriptions dated from *ca.* 190/1 to 262/3 mention "those around the *Diogeneion*." Dow has added two references to each of these two groups which were collected by Graindor, and has subtracted two from the group mentioning "those around the *Diogeneion*" because the restorations are open to question, to which exclusions I agree. I can add five references to Dow's amended list for *epi Diogeneiou* and mention one dubious addition to the other group. For convenient review I list them below in

⁵ Forbes (above, note 2) 164-70, where the titles and functions are most easily reviewed.

chronological sequence.⁶ The dates are those given in the latest serious study of the several inscriptions.

When the *Diogeneion* was founded, some time after the beginning of the second century B.C. (*RE* 5.734), it apparently became a center of ephebic activity. The *kosmêtês* Eudoxos in 107/6 restored the wall enclosing the gymnasium area at his own expense (*IG* II².1011.41). Plutarch tells us (*Quaest. conv.* 9.1) that a (final?) examination of the *ephêboi*, who were studying *grammata*, *geometria*, *rhetorika* and *mousikê*, was conducted here with a *stratêgos* presiding. In an inscription of 145/6 (*IG* II².3741.7–11) we find that the *kosmêtês* Athenaeus was honored ἔνεκεν . . . (τῆς) ἐπιμελείας τῆς περὶ τὸ Διογένειον; and when ca. 220/1 the Eleusinians wanted to be sure that all *ephêboi* see the decree which they had passed in their honor, they directed that a copy be posted in the *Diogeneion* (*IG* II².1078.39–43). The *ephêboi* and “those around the *Diogeneion*” celebrated τὰ ἐξιτήρια in the *Diogeneion* with a banquet after sacrifices and a libation (*IG* II².2113.20–23).

But their living quarters and the “offices” or stations of their staff were apparently elsewhere, and their education was carried on at many other places as well. For the long inscriptions of the last two centuries before Christ frequently state that the *kosmêtês* “led” them to the various gymnasia and “sat by their side” in the lectures and classes there. We are told that he conducted them also to the sacred *temenos* of the *Diogeneion* in order to sacrifice at the *Diogeneia*, the festival in honor of the Macedonian general who, for a price, had withdrawn his soldiers from Attica in 229/8.⁷ The gymnasium was built within the sacred *temenos* along with a *hêrôion* for Diogenes.

The staff of the *ephêbia* was increased in the imperial period, partly no doubt in order to care for a larger number of students.

⁶ ἐπὶ Διογενείου: *IG* II².2018 (beginning s. II A.D.); 2155 (s. II A.D.); 2147 (s. II A.D.); 2067 (154/5); 2099 (163/4–169/70); 2094 and 2015: Mitsos, *BCH* (1949) 358, no. 4 (ca. 166/7); 2100 (after 169/70); 2193 (ca. 200/1); 2207 (before 212/3); 2208 (212/3 or after); 2223 (218/9 or a little after); 2236 (ca. 230/1); 2239 (239/40); 2243 (244/5); 2245 (262/3); *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 71–4, no. 37 (latter part of s. III A.D.)
 οὐ περὶ τὸ Διογένειον: *IG* II².2113 (ca. 190/1); 2130 (192/3); 2221 (217/8 or a little after); *Hesperia* 22 (1953) 178–79, no. 2 (220/1–240/1); *IG* II².3765 (226/7–234/5); 2149 and 2145: Mitsos, *ArchEph* (1950/1) 22 (a little after 230/1); *IG* II².2239 (239/40); 2243 (244/5); 2245 (262/3). The “dubious addition” to this category is the fuller reading of *IG* II².2230 (231/2) in *ArchEph* (1950/1) 47, no. 29 which, in line 6, restores this phrase out of whole cloth.

⁷ *IG* II².1006.60–5 (123/2); 1011.14–15 (106/5); 1028.24–5, 32–3, 82–6 (100/99); 1039.55 (83/2–73/2); 1043.19–20, 43 (39/8).

The pre-ephebic students accounted for a part of that increase. It is most significant in trying to determine the meaning of "those around the *Diogeneion*" to note that this designation appears first in the very period in which we have evidence not only of the presence of a body of pre-ephebic students in the *ephēbia*, but clear indication also that several officials of the enlarged staff are specifically stated to have their post at the *Diogeneion*, indicating that their duties were performed there. I venture to suggest that the two facts are related as cause and effect. The pre-*ephēboi* would in all likelihood confine their training largely to gymnastics and physical education, which was probably carried on largely at the *Diogeneion* for *ephēboi* and pre-*ephēboi* alike. We know that the *ephēboi* received a more extensive education. They were conducted to the lectures of philosophers, to the schools of the rhetoricians; they made excursions to Salamis, Eleusis and elsewhere. "Those around the *Diogeneion*," we may conjecture, confined their activities to that gymnasium.

The *epi Diogeneiou* was of course regularly stationed at the *Diogeneion*. The first reference to this official comes from *IG* II². 2018, which is dated in the beginning of the second century A.D. It has escaped the notice of most scholars who have discussed this problem that an *epi Diogeneiou kestrophylax* is listed in the roster of ephebic officials in *IG* II². 2208.39 of 212/3 or a little after, with the *epi Diogeneiou* listed next.⁸ There is no question of crowding, correction or inadvertence. The title is written in one line, the name in the next. Why this addition to the title of the *kestrophylax*? I see no need to seek another explanation than that he carried on his work, for this year at any rate, at the *Diogeneion* along with the *epi Diogeneiou*.

The idea of a separate group of officials for "those around the *Diogeneion*" which Graindor and Forbes⁹ but not Marrou (above note 1, 114) suggest, if they do not explicitly state it, rests upon

⁸ This is one of the additions to Dow's revision of Graindor's list of references to the *Diogeneion*, referred to above. Graindor does mention this official in the text of his article (below, note 9, 227) but by inadvertence he failed to include a citation to it in the 20 *testimonia* which Dow checked.

⁹ Graindor (*MusBelge* 26 [1922] 227): "Le texte no. 12 (*IG* II². 2221) nous fait en tout cas connaître le personnel du Diogéneion, tout au main vers 220, car il n'est pas mentionné dans d'autres documents . . ." Forbes (above, note 2) 168: "... there were some special officers for the Diogeneum . . . The reason for this separate corps in the Diogeneum . . .," and 176: "... the custom originated of reserving it (the Diogeneum) for those who were preparing to enter the ephebia, the *mellephebi*."

what seems to be an erroneous interpretation of a single line in an incomplete inscription (*IG* II².2221.70 of 217/8 or a little after), *τάξεις ἐν Διογενείῳ* followed by the titles and names of the *hypopaidotribês*, *hoplomachos*, *grammateus*, *hypogrammateus*, *kestrophylax*, *didaskalos*, *hêgemôn* and *thyôrros*.

Kirchner (*ad loc.*) explains *taxeis* as *mellephêboi*, but otherwise the opinion is unanimous that the word refers to the titles and names which follow. There is no convincing reason, however, for making a separate staff of these individuals. They are all ephebic officials, known by the same titles from many other inscriptions. The inscription records the names of the students by tribes without demotics. Only a part of the complete roster of officials is represented by this list, here placed at the end of the inscription. The missing upper part doubtless recorded the names of the others. Anyone can easily convince himself that the sequence and placement of the officials on the stone varied, as Dumont and Forbes have pointed out.¹⁰ There is no reason at all to read more than the usual unambiguous meaning of *taxis* (*LSJ* s.v. *taxis* III), "post, rank, position, station," in that term here. "Posts in the *Dio-geneion*" simply indicates that the officials in question (for this year, possibly regularly) have their station at the gymnasial center of the *ephêbia*, as was true of the *epi Diogeneiou* regularly and the *epi Diogeneiou kestrophylax* for the year of the inscription referred to above.¹¹ Finally, if these officials are in fact *hoi peri to Diogeneion*, why is this designation not applied to them since it is employed in this same inscription, lines 20–22, as has already been mentioned?

In *IG* II².3765 (226/7–234/5), Dow (432) finds the noun which he feels must be supplied in every occurrence of *hoi peri to Diogeneion*, and confirmation for his interpretation of the phrase. It is a dedication by οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογένειον συνάρχοντες ἀρέτης ἕνεκεν to the son of the *kosmêtês* who had died prematurely. Dow apparently takes the phrase to mean all ephebic officials. But to express that meaning *synarchontes* would have been adequate, as it had been before this and was after this time. Furthermore, the inscription is a private and "unofficial" rather than a quasi-public and formal one. Why was it felt necessary to qualify *synarchontes*

¹⁰ A. Dumont, *Essai sur l'éphêbie attique* (Paris 1875–76) 1.203–206; Forbes (above, note 2) 170.

¹¹ Cf. *SB* 6674 from Egypt, *τάξις ἔχοντος ἐν τῷ Μουσείῳ*.

here, while in the formal heading of *IG* II².2245 the meaning of *synarchontes autou* in a limited and exceptional sense should be taken for granted? Is it perhaps evidence to show that the phrase without *synarchontes* might be misunderstood?

Doubtless all fellow-officials of the *kosmêtês* mourned the death of his son. The body of the inscription strongly suggests, however, that those who were stationed at the *Diogeneion* had a special reason for honoring his son. After the representation of a phallus, lines 10–17 (the printed text numbers half-lines) read:

ὁστις καὶ τίνας εἰμὶ εἰμὶ τὰ πρόσθεν γράμματα φράζε[ι].
 ἀμφὶ δ' ἐμῆς μοίρης πᾶς ἐδάκρυσε λεῶς,
 οὐνεκεν οὐκ ἔφθην χλαῖναν περὶ αὐχένι θέσθα[ι]
 κώμῳ ἐν ἡγαθέῳ πανσάμενος βίотου.

The *kosmêtês*' son aspired to become an *ephêbos*: his ambitions centered on wearing the distinctive *chlamys*, here represented by the literary variant, *chlaina* (cf. the literary form *λεῶς* in line 13, which Kaibel rightly explained as *λεῶς ἐφήβων* from *IG* II².3744.1), and riding with them in the most holy Dionysiac parade at the Panathenaea, *κώμῳ ἐν ἡγαθέῳ* (line 16). He was in all likelihood a pre-ephebic student, one of "those around the *Diogeneion*," and it was for this reason that the *synarchontes* around the *Diogeneion*, who were more closely associated with these students than the other officials, should as a group erect this *herma* to commemorate his name. Although the phrase is unique, it perfectly describes the officials whose *taxeis* were in the *Diogeneion*.

In four ephebic inscriptions the distribution and disposition of the *Sebastophorika* of Plataea are mentioned (*IG* II².2086, 2113, 2130 and 2221). Three groups were the recipients of the funds in *ca.* 190/1 as recorded in 2113.142–51: 1) *τοῖς ἐφήβοις*, 2) *τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν αὐτῶν τεταγμένοις*, and 3) *τοῖς περὶ τὸ Διογένειον*. After stating that this text "seemed to distinguish between the officials and οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογένειον," Dow continues:

By isolating this from all other texts, it is possible to make any desired identification of the last-named group—foreigners, *mellephêboi*, or any others, including *τοῖς περὶ τὴν τῶν ἐφήβων ἐπιμέλειαν τεταγμένοις*. This phrase has only to be written out to show that it had to be shortened. On the other hand, this is its first appearance, A.D. 190/1–191/2, in any preserved document. It was new enough so that clarity could only be attained by writing it out fully the first time.

Dow's language is ambiguous. He apparently means, however, that τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν αὐτῶν τεταγμένοις "had to be shortened" and that *hoi peri to Diogeneion* makes its first appearance in 2113, as it does, and that the cumbersome, periphrastic phrase is employed to clarify the meaning of *hoi peri to D.* For the same cumbersome, periphrastic phrase was used in the same connection in 2086.34–35 (which Dow cites) of the year 163/4, some 20 years earlier than 2113. If the distinction in 2113 is again as in 2245 between annual officials and officials appointed for life, why did not the explanatory periphrastic phrase make this distinction clear? If no distinction was to be made, why was not the simpler *terminus technicus*, *synarchontes*, used to explain *hoi peri to D.*, and why is the same cumbersome phrase used in 163/4 (2086) with the meaning *synarchontes*?

IG II².2086 does give us a very good clue to the meaning of the phrase "those around the *Diogeneion*" which was later used in connection with these same distributions. After recording that the *Sebastophorika* were distributed 1) to the *ephēboi* and 2) τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν αὐτῶν τεταγμένοις, the passage goes on to state (lines 36–38): καὶ εἰς τὸν ἐνδεήσαντα χρόνον ἐξ αὐτῶν (τὰ Σεβαστοφορικά) ἐγυμνασιαρχήθ[η] καὶ ὑδρία ἀνετέθη τοῖς αἰεῖ ἐσομένοις ἐφήβοις. The third group here sharing in the benefits are τοῖς αἰεῖ ἐσομένοις ἐφήβοις to whom *hydria* were dedicated from the available funds (ἐξ αὐτῶν). It is possible to interpret the phrase to mean future classes of *ephēboi*, but it is also possible to translate the future participle as expressing intention, "to those who each year intend to be *ephēboi*." It precisely describes the individuals who in the similar notices in 2113.150–51 and 2221.20–22 shared in these distributions and were called "those around the *Diogeneion*."

In all inscriptions, except one, which name both groups, the *ephēboi* take precedence of mention over *hoi peri to D.*, which would surely not be the case if the second designation refers to officials. The demands of punctilio in this regard were strictly observed, as can be seen in the listing of the officials themselves. They appear in the rosters in sequence of importance and honor. So, too, in the notices of these two groups banqueting together, once with an *ephēbos* as host (IG II².2130.57–64 and 85–93) and again celebrating *ta exitēria* together in the *Diogeneion* (IG II².2221.20–22), the *ephebes* are mentioned first, as we should expect if *hoi peri to D.*

refers not to officials but pre-ephebic students. The one exception, *IG* II².2245, can reasonably be explained by the fact that the stone was erected by the student officers in the ephebic corps who, motivated either by the wish to honor the larger-than-usual number of pre-ephebic students or by courtesy or both, named them before their *synephēboi*. I believe we must exclude *Hesperia* 22 (1953) 178–9, no. 2 (220/1–240/1) as a possible exception. Even the editors question their restoration which reverses the normal sequence (line 2 ff.); and the reading ὑπ' αὐτῷ ἐφήβους for τε συνάρχοντας, which is found in *IG* II².2201.3 (208/9) meets the space requirements.¹²

Failure to distinguish *ephēboi* from pre-*ephēboi* in the catalogues need not disturb us. When demotics were employed, the distinction was adequately indicated and immediately apparent. When an age minimum was no longer a requirement for admission to the *ephēbia* and students younger than 18 were in fact accepted, the demotic was less frequently used. The practice of listing citizen *ephēboi* by tribes was firmly established and served to distinguish them from foreign *ephēboi*. The indication of a further classification of citizen *ephēboi* on the stones would add to the expense of setting up these memorials and was apparently deemed unnecessary.

The designation, οἱ περὶ τὸ Μουσεῖον παιδευταί (in Ephesus) which Dow cites (435–36) from *Hesperia* 3 (1934) 191–96, I agree, is an excellent parallel for οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογένηιον συνάρχοντες but not for οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογένηιον (συνάρχοντες); and it proves nothing about the meaning of the moot phrase. A random parallel for the *hoi peri* construction with *neaniskoi* in the place of *paideutai* and *synarchontes* comes from Thyatira (*CIG* 3503.1–5): οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα τῶν πρώτων γυμνασίων . . . νεανίσκοι.¹³

¹² There is a great variety in the headings of the stones set up by the *kosmētēs*, but the designation for the officials as a group always precedes the designation for the students, the *ephēboi* and "those around the *Diogeneion*," when this phrase occurs. Individual officials are sometimes singled out for special honor by being named in the heading. The remaining officials are once named in an unbroken roster; at other times part of them are listed before, and a part of them after, the names of the students. A cursory examination of the inscriptions will be enough to show this. See e.g. *IG* II².2026 (116/7), 2054 (145/6), 2059 (147/8 or a little after), 2085 (161/2), 2086 (163/4), 2113 (183/4–191/2), 2208 (213/4 or a little after), 2225 (221/2).

¹³ After this paper was in galley proof, L. Robert published a review (*Gnomon* 31 [1959] 657–74) of Theodor Wiegand, *Didyma*, 2. Teil: *Die Inschriften*, von Albert Rehm (Berlin 1958). Robert cites (668) with strong approval Dow's interpretation of οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογένηιον as a parallel for οἱ περὶ τὸ μαντεῖον πάντες in the sense of "tout le

I think Graindor's interpretation must stand: *hoi peri to D.* were pre-ephebic students, if not *mellephēboi*. It removes the formidable obstacle of assuming that *synarchontes* in one complete and full text bears a meaning which it nowhere else has, and that *hoi peri to D.* may mean once all the officials and again, a part of them. It is consonant, too, with all the related evidence of the ephebic inscriptions and notably with the fact that there actually were students of pre-ephebic age enrolled in the *ephēbia* of the empire.

Of the boys whom we may picture loitering around the *Diogeneion* and aspiring to become *ephēboi*, first younger brothers of *ephēboi* were admitted, then others, too, who were younger than 18. They came to be referred to as "those around the *Diogeneion*." The designation was used unofficially to begin with as early as its first occurrence in *ca.* 190/1 (*IG* II².2113), and later officially in headings, where it is used first in our extant documents *ca.* 230/1 (*IG* II².2149 and 2151) as restored in *ArchEph* (1950/1) 22. It would be appropriately applied to younger students whose training was largely confined to gymnastics and physical education which were provided at the *Diogeneion*. Better to care for this group as well as the *ephēboi*, a number of ephebic instructors were regularly stationed there. When there is occasion to refer to these officials, they are specifically designated: "the fellow-officials (of the *kosmētēs*) around the *Diogeneion*," or "*taxeis* in the *Diogeneion*."

The interesting question which Nilsson raises, whether the *ephēbia* influenced the Hellenistic School or vice versa, can perhaps never be definitely answered.¹⁴ In its beginnings doubtless *ephēbia* (rather than *the ephēbia*) was confined to *ephēboi*, meaning an age-group, in training them for war. Under the constitution which Aristotle described, *the ephēbia* became an institution concerned with the revolutionary program of training all citizens for two years before permitting them to exercise unrestricted citizenship. This grandiose scheme was carried out for a few years. Then the program was sharply limited: there was, in the late

personnel de l'oracle et du sanctuaire" in four inscriptions from Didyma (nos. 393, 395, 396, 400 [?], *op. cit.* 239-41) which name this group of individuals among those who honor the treasurer. Rehm did not commit himself ("Was *οἱ περὶ τὸ μαντεῖον πάντες* meint, ist nicht ganz klar," *op. cit.* 239 A), but suggested that the phrase was a general designation for the two groups which follow it, *οἱ κατοικοῦντες* and *οἱ πρόσχωροι*.

¹⁴ M. P. Nilsson, *Die hellenistische Schule* (Munich 1955) 29.

fourth, certainly in the third century B.C., a decline in numbers and doubtless in prestige. Thereafter Athens officially provided for the education of only a small number of its own citizens, possibly because fewer could afford to enrol rather than by reason of a limitation imposed by the state, since foreigners were accepted in comparatively large numbers.

Certainly the *ephêbia* in its earliest stage anticipated the gymnasial schools elsewhere in the number of citizen youth which it served. Which school initiated the plan of including humanistic studies it is hard to say, in part because of the paucity of information in the ephebic records of the third century B.C. In the *ephêbia* of the late second century B.C. literary and philosophical studies were joined with gymnastic training as in the gymnasial schools of the Hellenistic world, at state expense, but unlike these schools only for those eighteen years of age and for only a few of these. In its latest years this vital institution extended its age-range by admitting students of pre-ephebic age, "those around the *Diogeneion*," albeit still in limited numbers.