

XXV. The Cadet Colonels of the Ephebic Corps

FORDYCE W. MITCHEL

RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE

The present study¹ proposes to bring together and collate the epigraphical evidence concerning the officers and officials who were connected with the Athenian *ephêbeia*. The investigation has been limited to those monuments which presumably were set up before 322 B.C., and which are sufficiently well preserved to yield pertinent information. This collation, when compared with what Aristotle says concerning these officers and officials, shows almost complete agreement with the literary account, but also reveals additional titles which Aristotle does not mention. Of these the *taxiarchoi* are given special consideration, and it is claimed that they were cadet officers (comparable to the cadet *lochagoi*), some of whom are known and can be identified. Finally, it is suggested that the significance and importance of these cadet officers did not end with their *ephêbeia*, but that they continued to be of use in the tribal military organization.

Aristotle, in his account of the Athenian *ephêbeia* (*Ath. Pol.* 42.2-5), has given us an almost complete list of the regular army officers and the special officials who were responsible for the training of the ephebes. Among the special officials were the *kosmétês* and the *sôphronistês*, men chosen by their fellow demesmen and citizens for their high moral qualifications. They were responsible for the moral, spiritual and intellectual training of the youths in their charge. Other special officials were the *paidotribai*, whose function Aristotle does not define, and the *didaskaloi*,

¹ I wish to thank Professor B. D. Meritt for inviting me to work at the Institute for Advanced Study and Professors A. E. Raubitschek and O. W. Reinmuth, both of whom have read my manuscript and made many helpful suggestions. Special thanks go to Mr. John Travlos for his generous permission to use the name of the taxiarch from the Eleusis inscription (v, see below). I also wish to thank Mr. G. A. Stamires who will publish the inscription in *Arch. Eph.* as soon as possible. Although the present study was well advanced before Mr. Stamires showed me his copy of this inscription, it is the information from this text which provides that decisive bit of evidence which many fine hypotheses unfortunately lack. The research was carried out with the help of a grant from the University Center in Virginia.

who were instructors in heavy-armed fighting and in the use of bow, javelin and catapult. These men were merely technicians and had no peculiar qualifications other than competence in their respective skills. As for the regular officers, Aristotle refers to them only obliquely, for he mentions the several military establishments where the ephebes were stationed and where they naturally came under the jurisdiction of the regular army commandants. These were the generals of the Piraeus, Munichia, and Acte, where the first-year ephebes were in garrison, and the general of the countryside, who had charge of the several frontier forts where the young men spent their second year in garrison and on patrol.

These officers and officials mentioned either directly or indirectly by Aristotle correspond almost exactly with those whose names and titles appear on the ephebic monuments which were set up in the period from 334 to 323, that is, from the time the *ephêbeia* was reorganized by the law of Epicrates (*ca.* 335) until it was changed, for a time at least, by the pro-Macedonian oligarchs after the battle of Crannon (322).² Since this is the very period Aristotle was describing, the agreement between his account and the epigraphical evidence is hardly surprising.

The inscriptions of the period are:³

I. Cecropis	334/3	IG II ² . 1156.
II. Hippothontis	334/3	IG II ² . 1189.
III. Leontis	333/2	B. D. Meritt, <i>Hesperia</i> 9 (1940) 59-66, No. 8.

² The timocratic constitution of 322 deprived many citizens of their rights, and probably the citizens' sons were also excluded from the ephebeia. Cf. W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1912) 22, 48; also Georg Busolt-H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, Mueller's *Handbuch der kl. Alt.* 4.1.1 (München 1920-26) 1190 and note 5.

³ The dates given for I-IV, in which the archons' names are preserved or can be restored, refer to the year in which the ephebes were enrolled and not to the year in which the decrees were passed or the monuments were set up. For instance, since the ephebes of I and II were enrolled in the year of Ctesicles (334/3), their first year in training began in Boedromium, 334; their year as *peripoloi*, then, began in Boedromium 333. Therefore the *terminus post quem* (if not *terminus quo*) for the setting up of their monuments would be the late summer of 332, when their service was over and they were being praised for it. Assuming that these ephebes who were enrolled in the year of Ctesicles were the first ones after the reorganization under the law of Epicrates, the *terminus ante quem* for that law would be 334/3 and not 335/4 as calculated by Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staats.*, page 1189, note 11, following U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin 1893) 1.193-94.

iv. Pandionis	333/2	B. D. Meritt, <i>AJP</i> 66 (1945) 234-39 = <i>IG</i> II ² . 2976.
v. Cecropis	333/2?	J. Travlos, <i>Praktika</i> 1954 (1957) 70-71.
vi. Oeneis	ca. 330	W. K. Pritchett, <i>Hesperia</i> , Suppl. 8 (1949) 271-78.
vii. Pandionis	ca. 330	J. Pouilloux, <i>La Forteresse de Rhamnonte</i> (Paris 1954) 107-10, No. 2.
viii. Leontis	324/3	B. Leonardos, <i>Arch. Eph.</i> 1918, pages 73-100.
ix. Acamantis	334/3 to 307/6	W. E. McLeod, <i>Hesperia</i> 28 (1959) 121-26.

The following collation will show which of the officials are mentioned most often and on which inscriptions. Parentheses indicate that the official is the dedicator rather than one of those honored; square brackets indicate that the official is restored or simply assumed by the editor to have been mentioned:

στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῷ Πειραιεῖ—III, IV, V, VIII.

στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀκτῇ—VIII.

στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῇ χώρᾳ—III, IV, V, VIII.

στρατηγός—VI.

κοσμητής—III, IV, VIII.

σωφρονιστής—I, II, III, (IV), V, VI, VIII.

διδάσκαλοι—III, [IV], V, VI, (i.e. ἀκοντιστής), VII, VIII.

Clearly the only official, mentioned by Aristotle, who does not appear in these dedications is the *paidotribés*.⁴

On the other hand the inscriptions reveal to us certain titles which do *not* appear in the *Ath. Pol.*, and their identification is

⁴ Unless one accepts the restoration, πα[ίδοτριβήν], in *IG* II². 478 (305/4), the first *paidotribés* appears in an inscription of 269/8, *IG* II². 665; see *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 302. Concerning the *didaskaloi* it should be noted that the evidence of the inscriptions supplements but does not parallel the account of Aristotle. Aristotle says that the instructors for the ephebes (presumably for the whole corps) were elected by the *dêmos*, while III and IV (as restored by Meritt) show that different tribes had different *didaskaloi* in the same year (333/2), that at least one of them was a non-citizen, and that one tribe had four while another had but two. If the *didaskaloi* mentioned by Aristotle did in fact belong to the corps as a whole, then the persons honored in the ephebic inscriptions must constitute a different group of *didaskaloi* who were teachers of the individual *phylai* and not of the corps as a whole. Cf. Meritt, *AJP* 66 (1945) 237.

difficult. Since they fall outside Aristotle's description, there is a strong implication that none of them had any officially recognized connection with the *ephēbeia* and that their functions were not specifically defined by the state. In other words, their functions, whatever they may have been, were either strictly internal and had to do with the inner organization of the ephebic corps, or they were peripheral, that is, they may have included such things as public relations in the frontier forts or the provision of some special need of the ephebes by someone who was acting essentially in his capacity as a private citizen. These additional officers are as follows:

ταξίαρχος—III (here the taxiarch is also restored as one of the dedicators), [(iv)], v, [vi], [ix].

λοχαγός—III, iv, v, [vi], vii, viii, [ix].

ἐπιμελητής—VIII only.

[ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτ]ικῶν—VII only, line 8.

Obviously the ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν is not an ephebic official, and we do not know why he might have appeared on an ephebic monument. Nor do we know anything about the specific duties of the *epimelētai*. Both the literary and the epigraphical references to the office are tantalizingly vague and ambiguous.⁵

The *lochagoi* of the ephebic inscriptions have long been recognized as cadet captains who belong to the inner organization of the ephebic corps.⁶ The relationship between them and the regular *lochagoi* mentioned by Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 61.3) has been explained by the assumption that the ephebic corps was imitating the military organization of the *phylē*.⁷

⁵ Plato mentions an *epimelētēs* of education (*Leg.* 6.765D; cf. also 7.801D, 12.951E) in language which is echoed by Aristotle in his account of the selection of the *sōphronistai* and the *kosmētēs* (*Ath. Pol.* 42.2). Aeschines (1.9) mentions an ἀρχή which was an ἐπιμέλεια of the νεανίσκοι (= ἐφηβοί, *LSJ*). And Dinarchus (3.15) says that Philocles was voted ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἐφήβων ἐπιμελείας in the very year (324/3, see viii above) when the ephebes honored him as their *kosmētēs*. And yet any attempt to equate ἐπιμελητής with either κοσμητής or σωφρονιστής is precluded by the appearance of all three titles in the same inscription (viii). For other suggestions concerning the possible functions of the *epimelētai* see P. Roussel, *BCH* 54 (1930) 279–81, and J. Pouilloux, *La Forteresse de Rhamnonte* (Paris 1954) 106–7, commentary on No. 1.

⁶ This was first pointed out by B. Leonardos, *Arch. Eph.*, 1918, No. 95, page 83; cf. P. Roussel, *Rev. arch.* 18 (1941) 223.

⁷ B. D. Meritt, *AJP* 66 (1945) 234, suggested "that the [tribal] taxiarch appointed these ephebic lochagoi just as Aristotle says he appointed those in the regular service."

Of all the officers, however, who appear on the ephebic monuments, the one whose connection with that institution presents the greatest problem is the taxiarch. This officer appears or is restored on five of the monuments from the period under discussion. Of the two inscriptions on which the title is actually preserved, only one has been published. That is the monument of Leontis belonging to the year 333/2, edited by Meritt (III), and that is the one we must first re-examine.

Undoubtedly it was the appearance in lines 20–22 of the clause, [ἐπαυν]έσαι δὲ καὶ τὸν ταξίαρχον [τῆς φ]υλῆς Φιλοκλέα Φ[ιλ]οθέου Σ[ουιν]ᾶ, that led Meritt to believe that he was dealing with the tribal taxiarch. But beyond this, the fact that the taxiarch also happened to be the son of the *sôphronistês* and that ταξίαρχος made an attractive restoration in the prescript led Meritt to the conclusion that there was some special connection between the office of the *sôphronistês* and the office of the taxiarch.⁸ Meritt says, “The propriety of the joint dedication by the sophronistes and the taxiarch is enhanced by the fact that they were father and son.”⁹ Actually the association is unique—on the assumption that the restoration is correct—and a more accurate statement would have been that, although ephebic dedications were normally made by the ephebes of a tribe and their *sôphronistês*, in this one case the joint dedication by the taxiarch of the tribe and the *sôphronistês* might be explained on the basis of

In support of this view Meritt cites “the parallelism in organization between the army and the ephebic corps.” Subsequently, W. E. McLeod, *Hesperia* 28 (1959) 123, linked what he supposed to be a tribal taxiarch with ephebic *lochagoi* by stating that “it is known that the *taxiarchos* appointed a number of *lochagoi* from among the ephebes.” Such unqualified acceptance of a suggestion, however reasonable in its original context, is surely unwarranted.

⁸ See especially Meritt, *Hesperia* 9 (1940) page 61, for the desirability of [ταξίαρχο]s, and page 64 for the necessity of the plural σ[τεφανωθέντ]ε[ς].

⁹ *Ibid.* page 64. On the basis of this conjecture, Meritt (*AJP* 66 [1945] 238) has restored in line 5 of *IG* II². 2976, [ὁ ταξίαρχος τῆς Πανδ[ι]ονίδος καὶ ὁ σωφ[ρονιστῆς] where the more normal formula would be [οἱ ἐφηβοὶ οἱ τῆς Πανδ[ι]ονίδος καὶ ὁ σωφ[ρονιστῆς], and in support he says (italics mine) that the “official who *must* be associated with the sophronistes is *of course* the taxiarch.” Subsequently, Pritchett (*Hesperia*, Suppl. 8 [1949] 277) cites this very passage in Meritt as his sole authority for his suggestion that one Philippus, who is otherwise unidentified but whose name appears beneath that of the *sôphronistês* on the left side of the stele, should be identified with the tribal taxiarch. And he says (italics mine) that Philippus “is to be identified as the taxiarch of the phyle, rather than one of the gymnastic or military instructors named by Aristotle; *for this official was regularly associated with the sophronistes.*” Repetition has given Meritt’s seemingly reasonable conjecture an unwarranted status.

their personal relationship. An analysis of the preserved body of the decree will show that Philocles, ὁ ταξίαρχος τῆς φυλῆς, was not a tribal officer but an ephebe.

The first thing to be established from Col. 1, lines 4–12, is that there was an ephebic tribe Leontis which existed as a separate entity (because its members were not yet full citizens) from the tribe Leontis itself. Philotheus was designated officially not as the *sôphronistês* of the tribe Leontis but of the ephebic tribe Leontis ὁ σωφ[ρον]ιστῆς τῆς Λεωντίδος φυλῆς τ[ῶν ἐ]φήβων). Furthermore, the tribe Leontis (that is, the citizens) decides to honor the ephebic tribe Leontis (δεδοχθαι τ[ῇ] Λεων[τι]δί ἐπαινεσαι τὴν Λεωντιίδα φυλὴν τῶν ἐφήβων). It would seem, then, that the tribe Leontis is not honoring the ephebes of the tribe (for this would be ἐπαινεσαι τοὺς ἐφήβους τοὺς τῆς Λεωντίδος φυλῆς) but the ephebic tribe itself. Such praise from the adults shows that the ephebic *phylê* was recognized by them as a separate organization, run by the ephebes themselves with the help of their *sôphronistês*. That any such organization had officers in order to function will not be denied, and indeed the existence of ephebic *lochagoi* is already known.

The ephebic officer above these *lochagoi* is mentioned in Col. 1, line 20, ταξίαρχον τῆς φυλῆς, but this time the cumbersome τῶν ἐφήβων has been left out. It had been mentioned twice already; both this and the fact that the stele was an ephebic monument would have been sufficient warning to the reader that the titles referred in part to cadet officers. Since we know that an Athenian standing before an ephebic monument understood “cadet captain” when he read λοχαγός, we must assume that he also understood “cadet colonel” when he read ταξίαρχος τῆς φυλῆς in the same place. Similarly, when he read (Col. 1, lines 33–34) τὸς [δ]ιδ[ασκάλου]ς τῆς φυλῆ[ς], he knew that these were instructors of the ephebic tribe Leontis and did not suppose that they taught the adults as well. Here again the τῶν ἐφήβων has been omitted as superfluous.

Furthermore, it is possible to show, by itemizing the provisions of the decree, that the taxiarch was associated with the *lochagoi* and not with the *sôphronistês*, from whom he is completely separated:

Δεδόχθαι

1. ἐπαινεσαι τὴν φυλὴν τῶν ἐφήβων,
2. ἐπαινεσαι δὲ καὶ τὸν σωφρονιστήν, (1000 drachmas)

3. ἐπαινέσαι δὲ
καὶ τὸν ταξίαρχον καὶ τοὺς λοχαγούς, (500 drachmas)
4. ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ τὸς διδασκάλους.

Clearly there are four different categories of persons to be praised, and it will be noticed that the taxiarch is bracketed with the *lochagoi* both by paragraph and by the value of the crowns they received. On the other hand he is distinguished from the *sôphronistês* by being mentioned in a subordinate paragraph and by receiving a crown worth only half as much. It is unlikely that the commander of the tribal regiment would have been considered so inferior to an official who acted as disciplinary officer for the ephebes.

Finally the list of officers associated with the ephebes of Leontis (Col. II, lines 9–21) must be considered. They appear in a descending order of prestige with the regular army officers at the top, the adult special officials next, and finally the cadet officers:

[στ]ρα[τ]ηγ[ός ἐπὶ τῷ Πειραι[εὶ Κόνω]ν Τιμοθέου Ἀναφλύστιος
[στρατηγ]ός ἐπὶ τῇ χώρῃ Σώφιλος Ἀριστοτέλους Φυλάσιος
κοσμη[τῆς - - -] Αἰνησιστράτου Ἀχ[αρνεύς]
[σωφρο]νιστῆς Φιλόθ[εος] Φιλοκλέους Σουνιεύς
[ταξίαρχος Φιλοκλέης Φιλ]οθέου [Σουνιεύς]
[λοχαγοὶ Παν]αίτης Πα[σικλέος Ποτάμιος] κτλ.

Had the taxiarch been the regular army officer, he would have appeared in the list after the *stratégoi*, but in his present position he is clearly associated with the ephebic *lochagoi*.

Of course one would like to see something definite like ταξίαρχος τῆς φυλῆς τῶν ἐφήβων actually inscribed on a stone of this early period. Therefore the full publication of the Cecropid monument from Eleusis (v, see above) has been eagerly awaited. The photograph indicates that the inscription is in good condition, and Travlos' brief description shows that it belongs perhaps to the same year as III and IV, or at least close to it. The approximate date is established through the identification of the general of the Piraeus, Conon son of Timotheus, and the general of the countryside, Sophilus son of Aristoteles (above, v, page 70). The main difference between the inscription from Eleusis and the other two is that, in addition to the prescript honoring the officers, there are preserved the names of forty-four ephebes (above, v, page 70). Coming before the ephebic register are the names and

titles of the two generals already mentioned, the *sôphronistês*, the taxiarch, seven *lochagoi* and two instructors (*ibid.*). This order, except for the omission of the *kosmêtês*, is very close to the order found in the first two columns of III:

	III	V
Col. I (decree)	Col. II (list)	(prescript)
1. Tribe		
	1. General of the Piraeus	1. General of the Piraeus
	2. General of the countryside	2. General of the countryside
	3. <i>Kosmêtês</i>	
2. <i>Sôphronistês</i>	4. <i>Sôphronistês</i>	3. <i>Sôphronistês</i>
3. <i>Taxiarchos</i>	5. <i>Taxiarchos</i>	4. <i>Taxiarchos</i>
4. <i>Lochagoi</i>	6. <i>Lochagoi</i>	5. <i>Lochagoi</i>
5. <i>Didaskaloi</i>		6. <i>Didaskaloi</i>
	7. <i>Ephéboi</i>	7. <i>Ephéboi</i>

This collation establishes such a close similarity between the two texts that what holds true for the one should hold true for the other. And while the text from Eleusis does not refer to a *ταξίαρχος τῆς φυλῆς τῶν ἐφήβων*, it does contain evidence no less decisive. For in the prescript it honors τὸν *ταξίαρχον Σύμβουλον Εὐβούλου Φλυέα* and, among the *lochagoi*, *Εὐβουλον Εὐβούλου Φλυέα*, while in the register the first name under the heading *Φλυῆς* is *Σύνβουλος Εὐβούλου*, and the second is *Εὐβουλος Εὐβούλου*.¹⁰ There can be little doubt that Synbulus held the rank of cadet colonel of the ephebic tribe Cecropis, and that similarly Philocles of Sunium, son of Philotheus, was the cadet colonel of the ephebic tribe Leontis.

Now that it seems highly probable that the ephebic office of cadet colonel existed, a re-examination of the inscriptions under discussion may reveal the names of others who could have held the office. Likely candidates are those ephebes of VI, VIII, and IX, who are given some special but undefined honor by having their names engraved some place on the stone outside the deme-register.

¹⁰ The inscription from Eleusis, like the one from Oropus (VIII), lists first under the deme-captions the names of the cadet captains. But in the case of Synbulus and Eubulus the latter was outranked by his (older?) brother and therefore came second.

In vi Pritchett has already suggested (above, vi, page 277) that Philippus, whose name appears without patronymic or demotic beneath the name of the *sôphronistês* on the left side of the stele, is the taxiarch. Of course Pritchett means tribal taxiarch; but, if Philippus was taxiarch at all and my suggestion that there were cadet taxiarchs is accepted, it was the ephebic office that he held. However, Philippus' claim to the title is considerably dimmed by the fact that the only ephebe who has that name appears in the register of the Acharnians (line 54), and *he* has already been identified by the editor (page 276) with the Philippus of Acharnae who is honored in lines 76–77 at the bottom of the obverse. Pritchett is correct in saying (*ibid.*) that the five names at the bottom on the obverse “are unquestionably the ephebic lochagoi,” although no such title is given. Since there is no indication that the office of ephebic taxiarch was a “graduation” promotion from the rank of the *lochagoi*, it is better to assume that the Philippus on the side of the stele was not an ephebe at all and that he was one of the other officials regularly associated with the *ephêbeia*, perhaps *kosmêtês*, *epimelêtês* or *didaskalos*.

A far stronger candidate for the title of ephebic taxiarch is Naucydes Acharneus, son of Diogenes (line 50 of the register and the first citation on the right side). Pritchett has suggested (page 276) that Naucydes was a sixth *lochagos*, but one may then ask why he was not cited along with the other *lochagoi* on the obverse; certainly there was no lack of space. But if Naucydes was the cadet taxiarch, that fact alone would explain why his citation was given a special position on the side of the stele apart from the *lochagoi* (cf. viii, below).

In viii Lysistratus, son of Euxenus, appears as the first name under *Κήττιοι* (lines 35–36), and it may be assumed that he was the outstanding ephebe of his deme. Indeed this has already been noted by Leonardos (above, viii, page 83). It is not surprising therefore to find him cited along with the ephebic officials on the left side of the stele. The implication is that Lysistratus, too, was an officer or official. All the others have specific titles, and he alone has none. It may be suggested that the reason for his citation was his office of *ταξίαρχος τῆς Λεωντίδος φυλῆς τῶν ἐφήβων*.

Finally, the recently discovered dedication from Rhamnous (ix) must be considered. The restoration [*ταξίαρχ*]os at the

head of the register seems fairly certain and therefore [— — —, — — —]*κου Θορίκιος* may be added to the list of cadet colonels. One may suggest, moreover, that the dedication was set up not just by the taxiarch and the ten *lochagoi*, as the editor says (above, ix, page 123), but by all the ephebes of Acamantis, as was usual for the early period. What is preserved is only the upper right corner of a rather tall pillar, and there would have been ample room for a new heading [*ἐφηβοι*] beneath the name of the last *lochagos*, and for the ephebic register with its several demecaptions.¹¹ Even with this change, the difference between this inscription and all the others under discussion indicates that it may belong to a period later than 323.¹²

The existence of the *lochagoi* and *taxiarchoi* in the ephebic corps suggests one further question for consideration. What became of them after their *ephēbeia*, when *διεξεληθόντων δὲ τῶν δυνεῖν ἐτῶν ἥδη μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων εἰσίν*? Was there any significance attached to these ephebic offices within the *hēlikiai*? If not, all the young citizens of the newest *hēlikia* started over again on an equal footing, and any future elections or appointments to positions of military leadership and responsibility depended entirely on distinctions acquired *after* the *ephēbeia*.

On the other hand, it is possible that each new *hēlikia* joined the ranks of those liable to service in the field with its cadre of officers already formed. In this way each tribe would have had

¹¹ The *vacat* indicated in the drawing (Fig. 1, page 122) is too large, for the surface of the stone is chipped away; cf. Plate 25.

¹² Cf. W. E. McLeod, *Hesperia* 28 (1959) 123. The editor establishes only the *terminus ante quem*, 307/6, on the basis that the deme Hagnous was transferred in this year from Acamantis to the newly created tribe Demetrias. The editor's claim that the first three lines of the dedication had been deliberately erased seemed at first to suggest that 307/6 might be the *terminus quo*; for such a *rasura* would be comparable to those on the decree honoring Phaedrus of Sphettus (*IG* n^o. 682), which referred to his services to the kings, Antigonus and Demetrius. But an examination of the stone in Athens convinced me that no *rasura* exists. Dr. Mitsos very kindly looked at the stone with me; he was most emphatic on this score and went on to point out that the whole surface of the stone as it now exists was prepared by the same hand and at the same time; there is no possibility whatever that there was an erasure and that then the *rasura* was resurfaced after the two surviving lines had been inscribed. Therefore the dedication must be restored on the basis of two lines, not five. The length of these lines is determined by the correct restoration of the phrase:

[ca.12-13
..... στεφ]ανωθέντες ὑπὸ
[τῆς βουλῆς καὶ το]ῦ δήμου.

It is also possible that only the right lateral face is preserved, and that there was a main text on the front.

a supply of experienced personnel from which to draw candidates for the election of the annual tribal taxiarch and, perhaps no less important, the acting-taxiarchs. The ephebic organization with its taxiarchs and *lochagoi* would have been set up not so much in imitation of the regular army as in preparation for it, but the survival of the ephebic organization within that of the regular army is a matter for further investigation.¹³

¹³ I have checked the usual places, *LSJ*, *RE*, the indices of the historians, orators and Aristophanes, and the indices of *CIA*, *SIG*³, and *IG*; and I have paged *IG*, all without turning up much that would indicate a usage of *ταξίαρχος* in any but the strict sense of Aristotle (*ταξίαρχος τῶν ὀπλιτῶν*) or the loose sense of Herodotus and Xenophon, that is, the leader of any sort of troop (*τάξις*) whatever. Only two passages seem to be of interest for the present study:

1. Dem. 54.5, where the taxiarchs involved were probably not the tribal officers and yet stood in some official relationship to the young men (not to say ephebes) in the story; but a full discussion of this passage must await a re-examination of the terms *ἐν τοῖς ἐπωνύμοις* and *ἐν τοῖς μέρεσιν*;

2. Aeschin. 1.167, where he calls to witness *τοὺς συνεφήβους καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἡμῶν*. The MSS. have *συνάρχοντας*, with the emendation attributed to Bekker, who may never have thought of ephebic taxiarchs and *lochagoi*. I would suggest the possibility of retaining the reading of the MSS., and instead of "my fellow ephebes and our officers" I would translate "my fellow ephebes and my fellow officers," the implication being that Aeschines was himself an ephebic officer. Cf. Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staats.*, page 1190, note 4, who assume that the officers referred to were the *peripolarchoi*.