

CLASS AND SOCIETY IN THE CITIES OF THE GREEK EAST: EDUCATION DURING THE EPHEBEIA*

Abstract: This article focuses on the character and objectives of the ephebeia during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. *Communis opinio* holds that the post-classical ephebeia was an institution that aimed at preparing the sons of the elite for their future leading roles in the cities of the Greek East. Scholars have found confirmation of its elitist character in the downward slide of the age of admission into the ephebeia as compared to classical Athens. Its brief duration would moreover testify to the need to have their preparation completed as soon as possible. The inclusion of horse-riding on the program and the required level of intellectual education were thought to have put up barriers that excluded adolescents of lower rank. However, as I hope to show in the following, the epigraphic record does not support this sketch of the character of the post-classical ephebeia. Rather, it indicates that members were a more mixed group; that they were not particularly young and that duration of membership was flexible. Focus was on sports and moral rather than intellectual skills, with rewards given for 'discipline' and 'diligence' and ties with civic life closely knit. The purpose of creating a leading class was achieved not by exclusivity in membership, but by the establishment of an internal hierarchy amongst a wider group of participants that replicated the prevailing social structure of the cities. The ephebeia prepared both elite sons and non-aristocratic adolescents for civic life.

Keywords: ephebeia, education, Greek East, socialization, civic life, city

Intellectual, brief in duration, and only for the sons of the elite: this was the character of the institution of the Athenian ephebeia in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. It is an established view that the ephebeia in the Greek East shared at least two of these characteristics. It too was intended only for the sons of the elite, who through their membership received the education necessary for their future leading roles in society. Like his post-classical Athenian counterpart, the eastern ephebe was expected to engage

* I wish to thank Dr. J.H.M. Strubbe (Leiden University) for the careful attention he paid to this article and to the doctoral thesis it is based on, as well as his encouraging way of helping me write them. I am also grateful to Prof. dr. L. de Ligt for his advice, and to Ms. E. Riley and dr. S. Northwood for their corrections of the English.

in a variety of sports, and had to master diverse intellectual disciplines¹. The exact length of an ephebe's membership, however, has been a much debated topic: estimates range from one to three years. As to the age of entry into the ephebeia, we encounter a similar situation. Some argue that a young man entered the ephebeia at the same age as the classical Athenian ephebe, roughly at 18 years; others suggest that he would have been younger, 14 or 15 years².

During much of the 20th century, these questions of duration and age were treated as isolated problems, until solutions were presented that were linked to general theories concerning the character and purpose of the ephebeia. Since the aim of the ephebeia was to prepare the sons of the upper class for taking over their fathers' tasks in social and political (city)life, it was argued by e.g. Pleket and Kleijwegt that their preparation must have been concluded as soon as possible. This would lessen the chances of their father dying — and consequently the power of the family with him — before the son was fully prepared to take on his new responsibilities. Thus, according to this theory, ephebes must have been young, fourteen years or even younger, and the ephebeia must have been limited to a duration of one year in most post-classical cities. Separated from their peers at an early age, these boys could all the more easily form a distinct group in society. The fact that inscriptions showed us how post-classical ephebes were trained in various sports, including horse riding, and in intellectual disciplines that required a considerable amount of preliminary education, seemed to confirm that the ephebeia was meant exclusively for the sons of the elite³. Apparently, the ephebeia fitted in perfectly with the norms and needs of aristocratised civic life.

It is true that one of the proponents of this theory, Pleket, in two of his later publications modified his position, by arguing that middle class boys

¹ Cf. for example H.-I. MARROU, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1965⁶ and M.P. NILSSON, *Die hellenistische Schule*, München 1955.

² The idea that ephebes in the cities of the Greek East were aged 18 at the start of their ephebeia seems to be based on the classical Athenian ephebeia, where the uniform age of entry for ephebes was 18 years. Cf. H.W. PLEKET, *Stadstaat en onderwijs in de Griekse wereld*, *Lampas* 14.3 (1981), p. 173, who describes this view as a «classicistische blunder» (transl. 'a classicizing blunder').

³ This elitist view was developed especially by Pleket and Kleijwegt. For Pleket's view see H.W. PLEKET, *art. cit.* (n. 2), p. 155-178 and *id.*, *Collegium iuvenum Nemesiorum. A Note on Ancient Youth Organisations*, *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969), p. 281-298. For that of Kleijwegt, see M. KLEIJWEGT, *Ancient youth. The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Roman Society*, Amsterdam 1991.

also frequented the gymnasium⁴. Unfortunately, however, this revision has not led to a re-investigation of all the arguments that have been adduced to buttress the view that the ephebeia in the cities of the Greek East was elitist in character. The elitist interpretation seems to persist, apparently partly due to the fact that the elitist ephebeia of post-classical Athens is considered representative of the entire Hellenistic world⁵.

In this article, I want to re-examine what the epigraphic sources, mainly those from Asia Minor⁶, tell us about the age of the ephebes, about the duration of their membership, and about the kind of education they received as participants in the ephebeia. By this investigation of the epigraphic record, I hope to show that the arguments previously adduced to support the elitist view of the ephebeia in the cities of the Greek East are not entirely convincing. In fact, there are strong indications that, here, the ephebeia was not strictly limited to the elite, but open to a broader group of young people⁷. At first sight, the admission of middle-class boys into the ephebeia may seem irreconcilable with the dominant role of the elite in the cities of the Greek East. A close inspection of the epigraphic record shows, however, that this superficially attractive conclusion is unwarranted.

AGE OF THE EPHEBES

As we have just seen, the age of the ephebes has been used as an argument in favour of an elitist interpretation of the post-classical ephebeia.

⁴ See H.W. PLEKET, *L'agonismo sportivo*, in S. SETTIS and M.L. CATONI (eds.), *I Greci. Storia Cultura Arte Società*, I: *Noi e i Greci*, Turin 1996, p. 519-520 and ID., *Mass-Sport and Local Infrastructure in the Greek Cities of Roman Asia Minor*, *Stadion* 24.1 (1999), p. 153. Unfortunately, Pleket does not explore the implications of this modification. He briefly mentions the fact that benefactions could cover part of the costs of participation, but does not reconsider the validity of other arguments that have been adduced to support the idea of an elitist ephebeia in the Greek East.

⁵ The extent to which our view of the Hellenistic ephebeia is influenced by that of the Athenian ephebeia is illustrated by the fact that handbooks on the Hellenistic period often lack descriptions of the post-classical ephebeia outside Athens (cf. e.g. G. SHIPLEY, *The Greek World after Alexander, 323-30 BC*, London / New York 2000). The description of the Hellenistic ephebeia in *Der Neue Pauly* is also based on the assumption that the ephebeia in the cities of the Greek East was similar in character to that of post-classical Athens. In contrast, the author of the entry in *OCD* (1996³) emphasizes that «the usual assumption, that Athens provided the model, is probably exaggerated».

⁶ The development of the character of the ephebeia in Egypt is an interesting matter as well, but beyond the scope of this article. Cf. note 41 for further literature on this topic.

⁷ I do not wish to argue that all adolescents were able to take part in the ephebeia; see below, p. 152.

Pleket states that the age for entrance to the ephebeia tended to fall, which resulted in *paides* being admitted to the ephebeia in the Roman period⁸. That is, even children aged under fourteen years came to participate in the ephebeia. Similarly, Kleijwegt emphasizes the youth of the ephebes in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor⁹.

However, a reconsideration of the (admittedly scanty) relevant epigraphic material¹⁰ casts serious doubt on this thesis. Although some post-classical ephebes were younger than their counterparts in classical Athens, their mean age seems to have been minimised. Among the nine texts I found that refer to the age of ephebes, only one describes a boy of fourteen years old as having been an ephebe¹¹. Another ephebe was fifteen¹²; two were sixteen¹³; another was seventeen¹⁴, and two were eighteen¹⁵.

⁸ H.W. PLEKET, *art. cit.* (n. 2), p. 165.

⁹ M. KLEIJWEGT, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 91-92.

¹⁰ I.e. material from cities in the Greek East during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, excluding Athens and Egypt, that informs us both of the age of an adolescent and of his membership of the ephebeia.

¹¹ C. DUNANT and J. POUILLoux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos* II, Paris 1958, no. 254. Thasos, 3rd or 4th century AD. ΜΟΝ[...]ΟΙ ΕΦΗΒΕΥΣΑΝΤΙ ΕΤΩΝ ΔΕΚΑ] ΤΕΣΣΑΡΩΝ — «For Mon[tan]os (?), who has been an ephebe, (having become) fourteen years». I cannot tell whether the aorist is indicating that we should regard his ephebeia as being completed, or is just hinting at a difference in condition between Mon[tan]os and the passer-by reading this inscription. As the boy was already dead, the aorist might be fitting anyway, regardless of whether Mon[tan]os died *being* an ephebe, or *having been* an ephebe.

¹² A.-M. VÉRILHAC, *Παῖδες ἄωροι — poésie funéraire* I (texts) and II (commentary), Athens 1978-1982, no. 62. From Gytheion (near Sparta), first century BC. Ἀτταλος ἐνθάδε ἐφηβ[ο]ς ἔτη ζήσας δέκ[α] πέντε κεῖται — «Attalos is lying here, the ephebe who has been living for fifteen years».

¹³ One of the two texts contains the only reference to the age of an ephebe in a city in the Greek East that I have been able to find in the literary sources. Written by Xenophon Ephesiacus, *Ephesiacorum Libri* V, ed. A.D. PAPANIKOLAOU, Leipzig 1973, 1.2.2. Ephesos, end of first century AD? He says about (H)abrokomes: ἦν δὲ αὐτὸς περὶ τὰ ἕξ καὶ δέκα ἔτη καὶ τῶν ἐφήβων προσήπτετο — «he was about sixteen years old and joined the ephebes». The second 16-year old ephebe comes from Arkesine on Amorgos, 1st century BC (possibly older), and outshined the other ephebes: τὸν δεκαῆξ ἐτέων ἀριθμοὺς προφέροντ' ἐν ἐφήβ[οις] αἰνόδακρυν λεύσσεις, ξεῖνε — «you are looking at the child of praise with the number of sixteen years, stranger, (the one) who surpassed the other ephebes». A.-M. VÉRILHAC, *op. cit.* (n. 12), no. 95.

¹⁴ A.-M. VÉRILHAC, *op. cit.* (n. 12), no. 77. Chios, 2nd century AD: ἔβδομον εἰς δέκατόν τε βίου λυκάβαντα περῶντα (...) ἄρτι δ' ἐφηβείαις θάλλων Διονύσιος ἀκμαῖς καὶ σελίσιν Μουσῶν ἤλυθον εἰς Αἶδαν — «passing through the seventeenth year of my life (...) whilst I, Dionysios, was just blooming at the heights of the ephebeia and the brightness of the Muses, I went to Hades».

¹⁵ W. PEEK, *Griechische Versinschriften* I, Berlin 1955, no. 48. Aigiale on Amorgos, 1st century BC: ἄρτι γὰρ ἐκ χαμύδος νεοπενθῆς ὄχρετ' ἐς Αἶδα

Two of these nine inscriptions present some difficulties regarding the age of the ephebes mentioned. The first, from Smyrna, is dedicated to the ephebe Herakleides. He passed away when he was «just joyfully crossing the number of sixteen years»¹⁶. The Greek is open to multiple interpretations here: it is hard to tell whether the term ‘crossing’ hints at the threshold to sixteen or to seventeen years. Hence the different interpretations given by various scholars¹⁷. I am inclined to agree with Petzl and Kleijwegt in regarding him as a seventeen-year-old ephebe. Since the verb ἀμείβω is often accompanied by an accusative and a genitive (ἀμείβω τί τινος: change X for Y), we seem to have an ellipsis of the genitive here, telling us that Herakleides changed the number of sixteen for that of seventeen. Either way, however, Herakleides was not a very young ephebe.

A similar problem of interpretation hinders our understanding of the epitaph for Prateonikos from Cardamyle¹⁸. This time it is the word μέτρον that causes trouble. Although we know that Prateonikos was eighteen years old when he died, we cannot be sure whether he was an ephebe at that moment. The text on his grave tells us he passed away οὐτ’ ἐς ἐφήβων μέτρον ἀφειγμένον — «without having reached the boundary of the ephebeia». Did Prateonikos die during his ephebeia, or before he started? Or, to put it differently, was the ‘μέτρον’ he did not reach the initial or the final border of the ephebeia? Again, both interpretations are defensible.

ὀκτωκαιδεχέτης — «since, just from his (ephebic) mantle he went to Hades, the one lately mourned, eighteen years old». The phrase ἐκ χλαμύδος demonstrates that the boy to whom this inscription was dedicated was an ephebe. The χλαμύς was a cloak specifically associated with ephebes, cf. *LSJ*: ἐκ χλαμύδος = ἐξ ἐφήβου. The second 18-year old ephebe came from Kalchedon (Hellenistic period): (...) οὐπω ἐφειβήην θηκάμενος χλαμύδα ὀκτωκαιδεχέτης δ’ ἔλιπεν φάος — «whilst he had not yet laid off his ephebic mantle, at eighteen, he left the light behind». The outcome of a discussion on the interpretation of θηκάμενος χλαμύδα is that the boy had not yet put down his ephebic cloak, and so was an ephebe at 18. See P. GAUTHIER, *A propos des chlamydes des éphebes: note rectificative*, *Chiron* 16 (1986), p. 15-16. For the text edition see R. MERKELBACH, *Die Inschriften von Kalchedon (IGSK, vol. 20)*, Bonn 1980, no. 32.

¹⁶ A.-M. VÉRILHAC, *op. cit.* (n. 12), no. 138: ἄρτι δ’ ἀριθμὸν ἐπὶ δὲ ξξ καὶ δέκα τερπνὸς ἀμείβων. Cf. G. PETZL, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna I (IGSK, vol. 23)*, Bonn 1982, no. 552.

¹⁷ Cf. the translation by G. PETZL, *op. cit.* (n. 16), no. 552: «eben noch sechzehn Lebensjahre fröhlich vollendend». Kleijwegt also presents Herakleides as a seventeen year-old ephebe: M. KLEIJWEGT, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 91-92, n. 95. VÉrilhac thinks he must have been sixteen: A.-M. VÉRILHAC, *op. cit.* (n. 12), p. 207.

¹⁸ Published by A.-M. VÉRILHAC, *op. cit.* (n. 12), no. 139. Cardamyle, 2nd century AD.

However, regardless of the fact that we do not know exactly at what age Prateonikos was an ephebe, he cannot have been an ephebe at fourteen, the age that Pleket and Kleijwegt seem to regard as customary.

In order to support the thesis that ephebes were very young, Kleijwegt adduces two additional pieces of epigraphical evidence from Thasos and Icaria, which he interprets as referring to an ephebe of twelve years old, and even one aged seven. However, the inscription from Thasos says only that Athlos, a boy aged seven, «was to be an ephebe soon», *τάχ' ἐφηβε[ύσσοντα]*¹⁹. We cannot be sure when that moment was to arrive: Athlos died at age seven, being described as *παῖδα* by his father. Instead of taking the phrase *τάχα* literally, we may interpret it as a poetical hyperbole, designed to express an intense feeling of sorrow over Athlos' premature death. In any case, the vagueness of the adverb *τάχα* permits no conclusion as to the age of entry into the ephebeia. The ephebe of twelve years turns out not to be an ephebe at all. He was a *pais*, as the text destined to mark his grave tells us: *Δωδεκέτους τάφος εἰμὶ Φιλοκλέος, ὃν θέτο μάτηρ ἀχνυμένα λυγρὸν παῖδα Φιλοκρατέα* — «I am the tomb of the twelve year old Philokles, (the grave) that his mother Philokratea erected, mourning for her unfortunate child»²⁰.

Surely, from a modern statistical point of view, the number of nine inscriptions is even less than minimal, and therefore any conclusion concerning the average age of the ephebes in the cities of the Greek East is necessarily tentative and open to challenge. Nonetheless, it suffices to outweigh the evidence that has been relied on to support the thesis of (very) young ephebes. The evidence presented above suggests that the average age of the ephebes in the cities of the Greek East was nearer to sixteen than to fourteen.

¹⁹ C. DUNANT and J. POUILLOUX, *op. cit.* (n. 11), no. 337: *ἐπταετῇ με θανόντα πατὴρ ἀπεγράψατο παῖδα τύμβου ἐπὶ στήλῃς Ἰθλὸν ἔχοντ' ὄνομα· ὃν τάχ' ἐφηβε[ύσσοντα]* — «When I died at age seven, my father inscribed me on a grave-stone as a *pais*, I who carried the name of Athlos, and who would become an ephebe soon».

²⁰ G. KAIBEL, *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin 1878, no. 295. Icaria, undated. The rest of the inscription shows as well that Philokles was not yet an ephebe: *σχέτλιος, οὐδ' ἔφθη χλάμυδας περὶ χρωτὶ βαλέσθαι οὐδ' ἐσιδεῖν Ἑρμῆν γυμνασίου πρόεδρον* — «the miserable one, he was too young to wrap his body up in a mantle and to look at Hermes, the leader of the gymnasium».

LENGTH OF THE EPHEBEIA

The duration of the post-classical ephebeia also attracted a considerable amount of attention. Scholarly discussion confined itself to finding the answer to the question of whether the duration of the ephebeia in the majority of the cities was one, two or three years. Diametrically opposed views were defended by Marrou, who regarded a duration of one year as the norm, and Nilsson, who argued that a one-year ephebeia was exceptional and that membership lasted for three years in most cities. The same inscriptions were used to support either view. Often-cited examples are the ephebeia in Chalcis, which may have lasted only one year, that of Apollonis (two years), and the ephebeia at Chios, where membership could last for three years²¹. As several other inscriptions indicate a two-year or a three-year duration, we should not dismiss the cases of Apollonis and Chios as exceptional²². On the other hand, there are no grounds for believing that most cities had a two-year or a three-year ephebeia²³.

²¹ Chalcis: *BCH* 103 (1979), p. 174-176: ΕΦΗΒΩΝ ΤΗΤΙΝΩΝ...; ΝΕΩΤΕΡΩΝ... — «the ephebes of the/this year...; the younger ones...». The inscription is problematic and possible interpretations vary between one year, shorter than one year and longer than one year. Apollonis: *TAM* V 2 (1989), no. 1204: οἱ ἐφηβεύσαντες ... διετεῖς μὲν ... ἐφέτῃοι δέ — «the ones who have been ephebes ... the second-years ... and the first-years» and no. 1206: οἱ ἐφηβεύσαντες (...) διετεῖς μὲν ἐφέτῃοι δέ [...]... Chios: *Syll.*³ (1920), no. 959: ἐφήβων νεωτέρων ... μέσων ... πρεσβυτέρων — «the younger ephebes ... the middle ones ... the elder ones».

²² Apart from the texts from Apollonis and Chios, seven other inscriptions show a two-year or a three-year ephebeia: (1) L. JONNES, *The Inscriptions of Heraclea Pontica* (IGSK, vol. 47), Bonn 1994, no. 60b (several years): ἐφήβων νεωτέρων — «the younger ephebes»; (2) *Sitzungsberichte Wien* 132 (1895), p. 29, no. 2 (Halicarnassos, several years): Διονύσιος Διοδότου νικήσας ἐφήβους νεωτέρου[ς] — «Dionysios, son of Diodotos, has defeated the younger ephebes»; (3) *IG* XII 5, no. 39 (Naxos, two years): [ἔ]φηβ[ο]ι περ[υ]σινοί ... [προ]περ[υ]σινοί — «the ephebes of last year ...; those of the year before last year...»; (4) *CIG* II, no. 3665 (Kyzikos, two years): Β' ἐφηβος — «ephebe twice»; (5) H. MALAY, *Researches in Lydia, Mysia and Aiolis* (*Denkschr. Wien* 279), Vienna 1999, p. 33-34, no. 16 (Thyateira, three years): τριετεῖς — «(ephebes) of three years»; (6) *SEG* XLIII (1993), no. 145 (Messene, three years): three lists of τριετίρνεες — «(ephebes) of three years» and (7) *SEG* XLVI (1996), no. 2221 (Teuchira, three years): τρίς ἐφηβος — «ephebe three times».

²³ In modern literature I have found only two references concerning a one-year ephebeia in the Greek East, yet I cannot tell whether the scantiness of references to a one-year duration is due to a lack of inscriptions, or rather due to the fact that a one-year ephebeia is regarded as too evident to need further explanation. Evidence is found in a series of inscriptions from Stuberra: *SEG* XXXVIII (1988), no. 675-685 (duration of one year implied by a lack of subdivision, even on a list with 135 names). The second reference is found in the explanation of a dream by Artemidoros from Daldis (I 54, l. 3-6). When someone dreams of being an ephebe, he will be idle for a year: ἐνιαυτὸν δὲ εἶπον διὰ τὸν τῆς

The evidence clearly shows that the ephebeia had no uniform length, but could vary from city to city. Therefore a choice between Marrou's and Nilsson's theories seems unnecessary.

Moreover, by confining itself to the question of regional variation, scholarly discussion has overlooked an important question that may contribute to our knowledge of the ephebeia: the question of whether length of membership could vary *within* the ephebeia of a single city. Several inscriptions recording the members of the ephebeia in a specific year classify the ephebes in subgroups. The arrangement according to age and/or length of membership is indicated by formulas like ἐφήβων νεωτέρων ... μέσων ... πρεσβυτέρων or οἱ ἐφηβεύσαντες ... διετεῖς μὲν ... ἐφέτηροι δέ²⁴. Two of these inscriptions, both from Apollonis, show a marked difference between the number of first-year ephebes and that of the juveniles who were members of the ephebeia for a longer period. According to the first catalogue, there were at least sixteen first-year but only three second-year ephebes²⁵. The second inscription from Apollonis suffers from lacunas. Despite this, it is clear that there cannot have been more than two names of ephebes filling the lacuna under what must have been the heading of the second-year ephebes, whereas six ephebes were registered as first-year members, ἐφέτηροι δέ²⁶. These variations seem too large to be explained as coincidences, or as the outcome of demographic fluctuations. Presumably not all teenagers who became members of the ephebeia completed the full course; their numbers were considerably reduced after the first year of membership. Apparently, the age-group structure of the ephebeia was pyramid-like, with a broad basis of ephebes entering the first year, and a much narrower layer of second- (or third-) year ephebes. This suggests that variations in length of membership could be a way of differentiating between ephebes of various standing within the ephebeia.

An inscription from Kyzikos supports this idea²⁷. On the inscription the names of 60 ephebes are preserved, but a lacuna probably contained

ἐφηβίας χρόνον. εἰ δέ που τριετίας ἐφηβεύουσι χρόνον, πρὸς τὸ τοπικὸν ἐξετάζειν χρή — «one year I said because of the length of the ephebeia. But if they are ephebes for three years somewhere, we must examine (the dream) according to local circumstances».

²⁴ E.g. *Syll*³ (1920), no. 959 and *TAM* V 2 (1989), no. 1204 (cf. n. 21).

²⁵ Apollonis (Lydia), ca. 150-100 BC; *TAM* V 2 (1989), no. 1204. The inscription is broken off after the sixteenth name of the first-year ephebes.

²⁶ Apollonis (Lydia), ca. 100 BC; *TAM* V 2 (1989), no. 1206.

²⁷ *CIG* II, no. 3665.

another 19 names; one of the ephebes, a certain Euelpistos, is specified as a β' ἔφηβος. The symbol β' is added to several names on this ephebic list as an indication of homonymy²⁸. However, the addition of the word ἔφηβος, which is lacking in the other cases where the symbol β' is used, leads us to infer that we should interpret this phrase as 'Euelpistos, ephebe for the second time' rather than as 'Euelpistos, son of Euelpistos, ephebe'²⁹. Moreover, contrary to the rest of the ephebes, who are listed according to the tribes to which they belonged, Euelpistos is not included among the other ephebes belonging to his tribe Αἰγικορεύς. His name appears at the top of the list, together with that of a certain Markos Aurelios Eutyches, who, being the διοικητής, probably performed an administrative or financial function in the ephebeia³⁰. Euelpistos' position at the top of the ephebic list suggests that he had a special role in the ephebeia, either because he was the only second-year ephebe, or because he combined his second-year membership with the holding of a function within the ephebeia. If that was the case, it would explain why Euelpistos is mentioned in the same breath as Eutyches, the διοικητής. At any rate, Euelpistos is definitely singled out from his co-ephebes by his prominent position on the inscription.

One of the inscriptions from Apollonis may shed some light on the social background of the ephebes who continued their ephebeia with a second or third year of membership. The ephebarch referred to in the inscription, Ἀπολλωνίδης Ἀπολλωνίου, was the son of the man who held the offices of gymnasiarch and stephanephoros in the same year³¹. The name of this Apollonides appears again on the inscription. While there is some doubt as

²⁸ There were three of these ephebes carrying the name of their fathers: see lines 20, 45 and 48 of the above-mentioned inscription.

²⁹ In this interpretation of Ἰούλιος Λόλλιος Ἰγνάτιος Εὐέλπιστος Αἰγικορεύς β' ἔφηβος I follow H.-I. MARROU, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 171 and A. BÖCKH, *CIG* II, no. 3665. Also, in this case the addition 'β' ἔφηβος' follows only *after* the tribe (Αἰγικορεύς), whereas you would expect it to be mentioned before that, directly after Εὐέλπιστος, if it were an indication of homonymy. The fact that this leaves Euelpistos without patronymic does not make him an exception on the list.

³⁰ According to Böckh, this Eutyches was an ephebe as well, although he is not explicitly described as such. Cf. his commentary on *CIG* II, no. 3665.

³¹ The ephebarch was the leader of the ephebes. Although there are attestations of ephebes being ephebarchs (e.g. *SEG* XXXVIII [1998], no. 683 from Stuberra), their function was probably only nominal — the real work was done by their fathers. In most cases, however, *neoi* — roughly aged between 20 and 30 — seem to have fulfilled the ephebarchy, as Kennell recently concluded. See for discussion on this topic N.M. KENNEL, *The Status of the Ephebarch, Tyche* 15 (2000), p. 103-108.

to whether this second passage was written *in rasura* or not, this does not detract from the information the lines provide us with: Apollonides is mentioned as one of the three young men who were second-year ephebes (διετείς)³². That this is the same Apollonides as the one who was the ephebarch is made clear by the description accompanying his name: Ἀπολλωνίδης Ἀπολλωνίου ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἐφήβαρχος. Apollonides was therefore both ephebarch *and* one of the few second-year ephebes. This would mean that one of the three boys who enjoyed a longer membership than the others had a truly aristocratic background: as we have seen, his father could afford to hold both the gymnasiarchy and the stephanephory, which demanded high financial investments even when performed separately. This background may well have been the reason for Apollonides' election to the honorary task of «leader of the ephebes», and will have given him the opportunity to distinguish himself from his fellow ephebes.

An inscription from Odessos at the Black Sea points in the same direction. Here, a list of 93 ephebes starts with a passage describing a certain Marcus Aurelius as being «the first of the ephebes», 'protostatès' and ephebarch. He was also the son of a man who was a priest for the Great Derzela, for Athena and for Herakles. Therefore, this ephebe, who had a prominent role within the ephebeia, was a member of a family belonging to the upper class of the city of Odessos³³.

Yet, even without the indications provided by these inscriptions, there can hardly be any doubt as to the social background of those most likely to continue their ephebeia into a second or third year: the options open to an ephebe must largely have been determined by his — or his parents' — financial scope.

INTERNAL HIERARCHY

The internal hierarchy within the ephebeia that could be established by picking out a few boys for one or two extra years of education could have

³² Whereas Keil in *TAM* V 2 (1989), no. 1204 recognized traces of an ancient correction on this part of the stone, and put this passage in double '*in rasura*' brackets, the *editio princeps* of Fontrier in *Museum kai Bibliothèkè* V 2 (1885-1886), p. 65, no. φνγ' and that of Foucart in *BCH* 11 (1887), p. 86, no. 6 do not mark such a *rasura*. The fact that neither of them saw anything remarkable suggests that the text is in good condition and easy to read — whatever erasures the ancient stone-cutter may have been making in these lines, the name of Apollonides apparently was not one of them: it is still clearly visible.

³³ Cf. *IGBR* I (1970), no. 47b, l. 7-9.

been strengthened by assigning (nominal) offices to certain ephebes. The case of Apollonides has already suggested this — and he was not the only one: on an ephebic list from his hometown Apollonis, the ephebe Damonikos is described as a gymnasiarch. His father shouldered the costs of the oil he had to provide, which shows that this ephebe must have been the son of a rich man. Although he probably did not carry out the tasks of the office of gymnasiarch by himself, Damonikos was nevertheless awarded the honours³⁴. By investing his father's money, Damonikos alleviated the financial burdens of his fellow ephebes. Several inscriptions from Apollonis, including the ephebic list that mentions Damonikos, refer to boys participating in the ephebeia without having to pay³⁵.

Two texts from Beroia and Oinoanda do not speak of ephebes, but of *paides* and *neoi* — their younger and older fellow pupils. However, they do confirm that euergetism within groups of students was not an unusual means of meeting education costs. In Beroia, three *paides* and three *neoi* were designated to organise torch races in honour of Hermes³⁶. They also became leaders of a running team and paid to provide for the team's oil. The children and young men in question were thus caused to act as euergetai. But there was a way out: if a boy or a young man, his parents, brothers or foster parents swore that they did not have the financial capacity to pay for ten days of oil for a team, the *pais* or *neos* was discharged from his task. In Oinoanda, the situation was similar. The inscription from this town explicitly states that the team leaders were not chosen from all young people, but only from those of the highest birth: ἐκ τῶν εὐγενεστά[των] παίδων³⁷. Unmistakably, the richest *paides* were supposed to act as euergetai for the boys whose families did not have an equal amount of money at their disposal. By their actions, they added to the numerous benefactions of the gymnasiarch³⁸. Donations that reduced the ephebes'

³⁴ On the topic of ephebes as (honorary) magistrates, see J.H.M. STRUBBE, *Young Magistrates in the Greek East*, *Mnemosyne* 58.1 (2005), p. 102-104. The inscription is published in *TAM* V 2 (1989), no. 1203.

³⁵ Names listed under the heading οἱ ἐφηβεύσαντες ἐπ' αὐτῶν δωρεάν in *TAM* V 2 (1989), no. 1203, 1204, 1205, (1206, restitution) and 1208.

³⁶ See P. GAUTHIER and M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia* (*Meletemata*, 16), Athens 1993, p. 23, l. 72-77.

³⁷ M. WÖRRLE, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (*Vestigia* 39), München 1988, p. 10, l. 65-68 and p. 220-226 (commentary).

³⁸ Since there is a very large collection of inscriptions recording benefactions by gymnasiarchs, it is neither possible nor useful to refer to them in detail here. For brief accounts see, e.g., F. QUASS, *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens*,

educational costs could be quite substantial, both in scale and duration. A series of eleven ephebic catalogues from Stuberra, dateable between 41 and 122 AD, illustrate the point: all of them show either gymnasiarchs or other euergetai paying for all olive oil. A gift made by one of them, a certain Philon, was large enough to secure the ephebes' oil for 35 years³⁹.

Even if both gymnasiarchs and other ephebes acted as benefactors towards those participating in the ephebeia, membership of this institution still had financial consequences for an ephebe's family. For example, ephebes were expected to contribute to sacrifices to the gods, as we know from the Beroian law⁴⁰. If a family could not afford to lose a son's contribution to its labour capacity or income, it could simply not afford to let him take part in the ephebeia. This will definitely have excluded lower-class boys from the ephebeia. On the other hand, benefactions by gymnasiarchs, other euergetai, and rich ephebes will have reduced general costs of participation to a considerable extent, and eased membership for citizen boys who did not belong to the aristocracy⁴¹. It may therefore be an exaggeration to think that the costs of participation made the ephebeia exclusively aristocratic⁴².

Lists of young men participating in the ephebeia seem to confirm this wider participation. Several inscriptions list a considerable number of participants. In Kyzikos, there were 79 members; a list from the city of Pergamon shows that there were 98 new ephebes in one year; Thyateira

Stuttgart 1993, p. 206-207 and 317-323; C. SCHULER, *Die Gymnasiarchie in hellenistischer Zeit*, in D. KAH and P. SCHOLZ (eds.) *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin 2004, p. 163-192 and M.P. NILSSON, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 54-56.

³⁹ SEG 38 (1988), nos. 675-685. There are inscriptions for every decade, except that of 60-69 AD. Olive oil provided by Philon: nos. 681-685, dating between 87-88 and 121-122 AD.

⁴⁰ P. GAUTHIER and M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *op. cit.* (n. 36), p. 22, l. 61-65.

⁴¹ Regarding this aspect, it is interesting to note that the Zenon archives from Egypt contain letters from boys unable to meet their education expenses who ask for support by benefactors. Cf. e.g. W. CLARYSSE and K. VANDORPE, *Zenon, un homme d'affaires grec à l'ombre des pyramides*, Leuven 1995, p. 57-62. Van Minnen doubts the thesis that in Egypt οἱ ἐκ τοῦ γυμνασίου were the elite: P. VAN MINNEN, Αἱ ἀπο γυμνασίου, in *Studia Hellenistica* 37 (2002), p. 337-353. For a general overview of the ephebeia in Egypt and its development, see B. LEGRAS, *Néotês. Recherches sur les jeunes grecs dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque et romaine*, Geneva 1999.

⁴² Cf. W.V. HARRIS, *Ancient literacy*, Cambridge / London 1989, on education for *paides*. He believes primary education was not restricted to the children of the elite, although parents had to pay for it. According to Harris the difference between rich and less rich was rather brought to the fore by differences in length of participation — just as I assume is the case for the ephebeia.

knew between 39 and 42 ephebes; Messene 35, Stuberra 135, Thespieae 55, Kios 56, and Kalindoia 89; Carian Iasos had up to 46 a year, and one of the lists from Apollonis counts at least 56 participants⁴³. Unfortunately though, the size of the populations of these cities is not preserved, nor can they be established by any other means. However, the majority of ancient cities were very small by our standards — it is assumed that they will have had between 5,000 and 10,000 inhabitants; often 5,000 or less⁴⁴. Taking into account that we have to deduct women and men of other age groups from this number, the total number of young men participating in the ephebeia mentioned in the inscriptions seems too high for them all to be sons of the elite — unless we assume that these cities were overflowing with rich families⁴⁵.

Unlike those who assume that the elite's need to distinguish itself is incompatible with a broader admission to the ephebeia, I do not believe that the one excluded the other. A mixture of upper class adolescents with boys from less wealthy families did not prevent the ephebeia from being an institution where the sons of the rich could distinguish themselves from their fellow ephebes who stood a few rungs below them on the social ladder. In fact our epigraphical sources suggest that a socially mixed ephebeia gave these elite adolescents excellent opportunities for achieving this distinction. By varying the length of membership, by assigning honorary tasks to a

⁴³ Kyzikos: *CIG* II, no. 3665; Pergamon: *MDAI(A)* 29 (1904), p. 170-173, no. 14 (all were ἐκκριθέντες ἐκ τῶν παίδων εἰς τοὺς ἐφήβους); Thyateira: H. MALAY, *op. cit.* (n. 22), p. 33-34, no. 16 (and fig. 17); Messene: *SEG* XLIII (1993), no. 145; Stuberra: *SEG* XXXVIII (1988), no. 679; Thespieae: *IG* VII 1777; Kios: T. CORSTEN, *Die Inschriften von Kios* (*IGSK*, vol. 29), Bonn 1985, no. 16; Kalindoia: P. GAUTHIER and M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *op. cit.* (n. 36), p. 168; Iasos: W. BLÜMEL, *Die Inschriften von Iasos II* (*IGSK*, vol. 28.2), Bonn 1985, no. 280; Apollonis: *TAM* V 2 (1989), no. 1203.

⁴⁴ On city size cf. H.W. PLEKET in F. VITTINGHOFF (ed.), *Europäische Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (*Handbuch der Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, vol. 1), Stuttgart 1990, p. 34.

⁴⁵ In order to exclude women, we would have to take off half the number of inhabitants, assuming that the male-female ratio was (close to) even. That would leave 2,500 to 5,000 men. Assuming that the elite consisted of a maximum of 10% of the total number of inhabitants, the elite ranks would consist of 250 to 500 men. As the age-group to which the ephebes belonged consisted of ca. 5.7 % of the total number of men, we would expect the ephebeia to have somewhere between 14 and 29 members in a medium-sized city, if it consisted of the sons of the elite only (5.7% of 250 to 500 elite men). However, as the membership lists of the above-mentioned cities show, its number of participants was often considerably higher. 5.7% is based on a maximum duration of the ephebeia of three years or 3/5 of the 15-20 age bracket. It is derived from Coale-Demeny's West model (level 3), which is regarded as the safest model for antiquity by T. PARKIN, *Demography and Roman Society*, Baltimore / London 1992, p. 145, table 7).

limited number of ephebes, and by giving some of them the opportunity to act as benefactors towards the others the ephebeia created a hierarchy among ephebes. This internal hierarchy must have given the elite an excellent means of passing on the existing social structures to the next generation. It may have worked as well as, or even better than, isolating the sons of the aristocracy in an exclusive ephebeia. Precisely by mixing the future leaders of society and those destined to be a little lower down the social scale, the ephebes would, by direct confrontation, get to know and come to terms with their position in society. If the ephebeia helped to internalise prevailing ideas about the 'right' structure of civic life in future generations, it might also help in forestalling potential problems or tensions between the elite and those free citizens who felt they also had the right to belong to this elite. In civic communities as small as many of the cities in Hellenistic and Roman antiquity this kind of socialization would fulfill a need.

SPORTS AND INTELLECTUAL EDUCATION

The idea that the ephebeia functioned as a socialising institution by establishing a hierarchy amongst its participants, a hierarchy which replicated the social structure of the cities in the Greek East in which they were going to function, is not incompatible with the content of the education enjoyed by the ephebes, as I hope to show in this section.

The general picture of the content of the ephebeia in the cities of the Greek East which has emerged since Marrou is a mixture of sporting or pseudo-military activities combined with intellectual education, consisting of literature, music, mathematics, and other scientific subjects. However, in his account of the content of ancient education Marrou did not consistently separate his data on the ephebeia during the Hellenistic and Roman periods in the East from that which relates to education in other periods or from data relating to other age groups. Our picture may therefore be partly distorted, and it seems worthwhile to take a fresh look at the evidence concerning the education received by ephebes in Hellenistic and Roman times. There is no doubt that ephebes were trained in a range of sports, for example, archery, javelin throwing, combat sports, torch races, and various running distances⁴⁶. Although *communis opinio*

⁴⁶ The disciplines in the programme of the ephebeia could vary from city to city. The sports referred to in the main text form a recurring pattern on inscriptions from (mainly)

holds that the military role of the ephebes faded in the Hellenistic period, this kind of physical training is sometimes thought of as military symbolism or as pseudo-military in character⁴⁷. This problem will not, however, be considered here. Instead, I prefer to concentrate on two other elements of the education of post-classical ephebes which have been used to underline the elitist character of the ephebeia in Asia Minor: first, the intellectual education received by the ephebes and, second, the practice of horse riding.

The intellectual education that boys are supposed to have received as part of their ephebeia is considered to have worked as a selective mechanism that excluded the non-elite⁴⁸. After all, if a boy was to comprehend subject matters at this 'secondary level' of education, he should have completed the full seven years of first level education as a *παῖς*, and, as has rightly been underlined, there will not have been many boys that were so privileged. In general, children are likely to have received only one or two years of primary education in the period between their seventh and fourteenth birthdays.⁴⁹ From this it has been inferred that most boys were unable to take part in the ephebeia simply because they lacked the skills and knowledge required at the outset. There can surely be no doubt that there existed a level of 'secondary' intellectual education, focusing mainly on literary studies, between the levels of basic education and rhetoric, and that, if this secondary education was provided within the framework of the ephebeia in the cities of the Greek East, it would have excluded anyone who did not have the necessary basic skills. But was it the

Asia Minor. Other sports were practised, but were presumably less widespread; e.g. slinging (see L. JONNES, *op. cit.* [n. 22], no. 60b).

⁴⁷ As the Athenian ephebeia started as a form of military service, the question is whether (and to what extent) the sporting exercises and competitions found in the ephebeia of the cities of the Greek East were a continuation of the initial military training, or rather an expression of the sportive and competitive character of Greek society in general. For the most recent view on the military aspect of the ephebeia in Asia Minor during the Hellenistic and Roman periods see A.S. CHANKOWSKI, *L'éphébie, une institution d'éducation civique*, in J.-M. PAILLER and P. PAYEN (eds.), *Que reste-t-il de l'éducation classique? Relire 'Le Marrou' Histoire de l'éducation classique*, Toulouse 2004, p. 277-279. Although he regards the ephebeia as having a military character, he assigns it a traditional and symbolic rather than a practical value.

⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. A.R. HANDS, *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome*, London / Southampton 1968, p. 120.

⁴⁹ Or rather sixteenth, as Gauthier thinks. See his remark in *BE* 1998, no. 113. If his view is correct, it may have its consequences for the average age of entrance into the ephebeia. Unfortunately, Gauthier does not make clear on which evidence his view concerning the duration of primary education is based.

ephebeia that normally led young men further into the world of literature and science? I believe it was not. To my knowledge there are only two non-Athenian inscriptions that refer to ephebes regularly taking lessons in literature. In Priene the ephebes were led by a man who was their teacher in φιλολογία. This ‘training of the mind towards arête’ is contrasted with their sports training, which is meant to firm their bodies⁵⁰. Similarly, in Eretria the Homeric philologist Dionysios, son of Philotas, taught the ephebes, the *paides* and all those who were well-disposed towards *paideia*⁵¹. During another gymnasiarch’s rule, the three groups received lessons in rhetoric⁵². The common feature in these cases is that the teachers were appointed by benefactors: the lessons in literature and rhetoric were provided as a result of a gymnasiarch’s personal initiative⁵³. Providing for these teachers was apparently not part of a gymnasiarch’s normal duty. A third inscription that refers to intellectual education shows ephebes honouring a teacher in geometry. In doing so, they were joined by the *paides* and *neoi*, and by οἱ παιδευταί, the other teachers⁵⁴. This inscription seems to be the only evidence for ephebes being educated in mathematics. The assertion that ephebes were also following courses in other sciences cannot be substantiated. Marrou stated that courses in medicine were taught to the ephebes of the city of Histria (Istros) on the shores of the Black Sea. However, the inscription in question does not mention ephebes as part of the audience of these public lectures⁵⁵. Since no other inscriptions clearly indicate ephebes taking courses in medicine, there are no grounds for presenting medicine as part of the programme of the ephebeia⁵⁶.

⁵⁰ *I. Priene*, no. 112, l. 73-74. After 84 BC.

⁵¹ *IG XII 9*, no. 235, l. 9-12. First century BC.

⁵² *IG XII 9*, no. 234, l. 8-12. Eretria, first century BC.

⁵³ ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου in *IG XII 9*, no. 235, l. 10. Since *I. Priene*, no. 112 is a decree honouring Zosimos for his gifts as a benefactor, it is clear that he must have paid for the teacher in philology as well.

⁵⁴ Published in J. KRAUSS, *Die Inschriften von Sestos (IGSK*, vol. 19), Bonn 1980, no. 5. The inscription does not specify who οἱ παιδευταί were. They may have been teachers in other intellectual disciplines, but also in sporting activities.

⁵⁵ See H.-I. MARROU, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 281-282. The inscription is published by E. POPESCU, *Studii si cercetari di istorie veche* 7 (1956), p. 346-348 (dated between 200 and 150 BC).

⁵⁶ Marrou’s references to inscriptions from other cities, in which medicine would have been part of the education programme, do not mention ephebes. These inscriptions bring up public lectures only in a general way. See: *SEG III* (1927), no. 416 (Elatea) en S. ŞAHİN, *Die Inschriften von Perge I: Vorrömische Zeit, frühe und hohe Kaiserzeit (IGSK*, vol. 54.1), Bonn 1999, no. 12.

All in all, only three inscriptions show that ephebes received courses in literature and science. That is a meagre result when compared to the large number of inscriptions relating to sporting activities. The situation is not very different in the field of music⁵⁷. As most of the epigraphic record concerning sporting activities consists of inscriptions honouring the victors of various contests, it might be argued that the scantiness of the evidence for intellectual training simply reflects the fact that there were fewer competitions in non-physical disciplines. However, as the existence of contests in moral skills shows⁵⁸, competitions were not restricted to sports. Moreover, in the case of *paides* there is clear evidence of contests in literary and musical disciplines — their winners were sometimes honoured on the same inscriptions as those of the sporting competitions⁵⁹.

The fairly limited number of inscriptions on intellectual education may therefore be taken as an indication that ephebes who received an education in literature and science actually received it elsewhere, outside the structure of the *ephebeia*; private education most probably filled the gap. Intellectual curiosity will have been stimulated by the presence of libraries attached to the gymnasium⁶⁰. Additionally, young men could attend lectures held by teachers who travelled around to teach anyone who was interested and willing to pay. When these lectures were given in the gymnasium, as they often were, some ephebes are likely to have joined the audience. It may even be assumed that some gymnasiarchs, or other *euergetai*, who were trying hard to become honoured as ‘the most generous ever’, attracted lecturers at their own expense. We should, however, bear in mind that in most cities lectures of this kind were not given on a regular basis. Their availability depended on the chance presence of a philosopher, a historian, a rhetorician, or some

⁵⁷ We do know that ephebes in Athens and Ptolemais participated in music competitions. The inscription that establishes Polythrous’ foundation for the education of the *paides* of Teos prescribes that ephebes share a music teacher with the *paides*. Ziebarth regards this as an example of «praktische fiskalische Sparsamkeit»: as the music teacher was already paid for to teach the *paides*, he might as well give some lessons to the ephebes to fill his time. E. ZIEBARTH, *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen*, Stuttgart 1914², p. 58. As there are no other inscriptions referring to music lessons, the evidence for regular education in music as a part of the *ephebeia* is altogether rather meagre.

⁵⁸ See below, p. 161f.

⁵⁹ See among others C. MICHEL, *Recueil d’inscriptions grecques* II, Brussels 1900, no. 913 (Teos) and *Syl³*, no. 959 (Chios).

⁶⁰ As for example in Teos and Pergamon, and on Cos and Rhodes. See E. ZIEBARTH, *op. cit.* (n. 57), p. 131-132; H.-I. MARROU, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 282 and G.C. PAPACHRISTODOULOU, *Νέα στοιχεία για βιβλιοθήκες στην αρχαία Ρόδο, Δωδεκανησιακά Χρονικά* 11 (1986), p. 265-271 (cf. *SEG* XXXVII [1987], no. 699).

other travelling scholar. In other words, the intellectual education which ephebes received was not part of a fixed curriculum, but was determined by the presence (or absence) of highly mobile individuals⁶¹.

As has been noted, the fact that ephebes practised horse riding has been presented as further proof of the elitist character of the ephebeia in the cities of the Greek East. Pleket believes that the ephebes not only practised horse riding for its own sake, but also as a means to improve their hunting skills⁶². Accordingly, as horse riding was a regular part of the training received by ephebes, the ephebeia must have been only for the well-to-do. In Athens, where the ephebeia certainly had an elitist character in the Hellenistic era, ephebes did ride horses. In Macedonian Amphipolis horse riding was also part of the ephebeian programme, as we know from the still unpublished ephebarchic law⁶³. But was horse riding also regularly practised by the ephebes of the Hellenistic and Roman cities of Asia Minor, as Pleket thinks; and if this was the case, does this necessarily imply that the ephebeia had an elitist character?⁶⁴ Pleket's thesis rests primarily on the interpretation of a long inscription from Ephesos, set up in honour of Gaius Vibius Salutaris, a Roman knight⁶⁵. According to the inscription, Salutaris dedicated to the ephebes of the city a statue that represented the ἱππικὸν

⁶¹ Cf. S.F. BONNER, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*, London 1977, p. 47. Regarding literary education he assigns a central role to private teaching. As a complement to this private education, «there might also be lectures of visiting scholars, and a gymnasium-library in which to browse». Cf. also P. SCHOLZ, *Elementarunterricht und intellektuelle Bildung im hellenistischen Gymnasium*, and W. AMELING, *Wohltäter im hellenistischen Gymnasium*, both in D. KAH and P. SCHOLZ (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*, Berlin 2004. Both conclude that the gymnasium should not be regarded as an «Institution des griechischen Geisteslebens».

⁶² H.W. PLEKET, *art. cit.* (n. 2), p. 170 and *id.*, *art. cit.* (n. 3), p. 291-293.

⁶³ The most recent information on this text (with photo) can be found in D. LAZARIDIS, *Amphipolis*, Athens 1997, p. 57-58 and fig. 57. Cf. also *SEG XLVII* (1997), no. 873 and K. LAZARIDIS, *Το έργον της αρχαιολογικής εταιρείας κατά το 1984* (1984), p. 22-24.

⁶⁴ I have some doubts as to the direct link that is made between horseriding and elitism. Though it is impossible to possess and maintain a horse without abundant resources, inscriptions from Macedonia make me wonder whether a direct interrelationship between horseriding and elitism can be assumed for the ephebeia as a collective. While the ephebeia in Amphipolis may be regarded as elitist due to the horseriding that was part of its programme, inscriptions from Kalindoia and Stuberra point out 80 to 135 participants a year. These numbers seem quite high if the ephebeia in this region was restricted to the upper classes. Although Amphipolis is not Thessalonica, Kalindoia or Stuberra, and its situation might have been different, the possibility should be considered that horseriding was only practised by *some* ephebes — the richest ones.

⁶⁵ The inscription is published by G.M. ROGERS, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos. Foundation Myths of a Roman City*, London / New York 1991, p. 152-171.

τάγμα, i.e. the equestrian group⁶⁶. Pleket seems to interpret this dedication as an expression of the bond felt between youth organisations in the Eastern and Western parts of the Empire⁶⁷. Since the ephebes received a statue of the ἵπικὸν τάγμα, horses would have been one of the characteristic 'attributes' of the ephebes. Building on this idea, he suggests that ephebes spent part of their time riding horses, just like the members of the *collegia iuvenum* that were the Western counterparts of the ephebeia⁶⁸.

In my view, this interpretation fails to take into account the context of the dedication of this statue. In the Salutaris inscription there are no indications that the statue was given in order to express feelings of partnership between the *collegia iuvenum* and the ephebeia. It was not given by any of those 'sister institutions', but by an individual Roman knight. In so far as it is possible to see a parallel between *collegia iuvenum* and ephebeia, the parallel depends on a connection supposedly made by Salutaris himself: Salutaris would have chosen to present the ephebes with this statue because they reminded him of the horse riding Roman *iuvenes*, who belonged to the equestrian order⁶⁹. The connection thus established between the Roman *ordo equester*, the *iuvenes*, the ephebes and horse riding seems rather loose. It is surely an insufficient basis for concluding that the ephebes practised horse riding.

Most importantly, the fact that Salutaris chose to give the ephebes a statue of the *ordo equester* does not necessarily imply that they rode on horseback themselves. In fact, it seems more plausible that he tried to use his gift for subtle self-promotion, for, as the inscription indicates, Salutaris was himself an ἀνὴρ ἵπικῆς τά[ξε]ος, a member of the *ordo equester* (lines 14-15). Furthermore, the ephebes who received the statue that represented the *ordo equester* were not expected to set it up in their

⁶⁶ G.M. ROGERS, *op. cit.* (n. 65), p. 160, l. 170.

⁶⁷ H.W. PLEKET, *art. cit.* (n. 3), p. 292-293. In this interpretation he seems to follow an article by J. KEIL, *Die Iuventus von Virunum und die ephesische Ephebie, Festschrift für Rudolf Egger II. Beiträge zur älteren Europäischen Kulturgeschichte*, Klagenfurt 1953, p. 261-264. Keil speaks of a «Verwandschaft» that was recognized by both sides.

⁶⁸ For information on *iuvenes*, cf. M. JACZYŃSKA, *Les associations de la jeunesse romaine sous le Haut-Empire*, Wrocław 1978; D. LADAGE, *Collegia iuvenum — Ausbildung einer municipalen Elite?*, *Chiron* 9 (1979), p. 319-346; P. GINESTET, *Les organisations de la jeunesse dans l'Occident romain*, Brussels 1991 and S. RANDAZZO, *Collegia Iuvenum — ossezioni in margine a D. 48.19.28.3, SDHI* 66 (2000), p. 201-222. It is interesting to note that Ladage, Ginestet and Randazzo all believe that the *iuvenes* associations were not aristocratic, but of mixed character.

⁶⁹ As is stated by J. KEIL, *art. cit.* (n. 67), p. 264.

headquarters in the gymnasium: it belonged to a group of 31 golden and silver statues which were to be carried through the city centre during processions. These processions accompanied many games, festivals, assemblies and other special occasions — events that occurred together so often that there must have been a procession every other week. The processions were meant to familiarise the participants and the audience with the history of the city, and simultaneously to promote Salutaris' φιλοτιμία or distinction, as Rogers has shown⁷⁰. All of the statues carried through the town were donated by Salutaris. Nine of them were dedicated to the city-goddess Artemis; the others were given a double consecration, both to Artemis and an Ephesian (or Roman) institution or a section of the Ephesian population. These groups of recipients included, for instance, the Senate, the Βουλή, the Γερουσία and various φυλαί. The Ephesian ephebes were also represented by a statue: an εἰκόνα ἐφηβείας (lines 28-31). Given this arrangement, it would contravene the pattern of the dedications if the statue of the *ordo equester* were again to symbolise the ephebeia. The ephebeia, in contrast to all other institutions and groups, would then have received *two* statues. That would surely have given the ephebes improper preferential treatment compared to the members of the Senate and other highly respected members of the community. For this reason alone, the statue of the *ordo equester* cannot be used to support the theory that riding on horseback was part of the curriculum of the ephebeia in the cities of the Greek East.

Apart from this inscription, three other texts could possibly indicate that ephebes were horsemen. But on further examination none of them emerges as convincing evidence. A list of victors in games for ephebes refers to a contest denoted by the term ἵππιος, but this turns out to be a foot-race rather than a horse-race⁷¹. In Ilion, there was a race on horseback, but this was presumably a race in which all the inhabitants of the city could take part⁷². Finally, Xenophon of Ephesos refers to a proces-

⁷⁰ G.M. ROGERS, *op. cit.* (n. 65), p. 112 and 173.

⁷¹ The text involved is *IG* XII 9, no. 952 from second-century Chalcis. Pleket initially read it as a horse-race, but in a footnote he acknowledged that it must be a foot-race, as Marrou had already said. See H.W. PLEKET, *art. cit.* (n. 3), p. 296, n. 63 and H.-I. MARROU, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 186.

⁷² *SEG* XLI (1991), no. 1052; published and commented on as well by F. PIEJKO, *Seleucus II and Ilium*, *C&M* 42 (1991), p. 127-138, no. 5. In Ilion there were two festivals honouring king Seleukos II: one held annually, organized by the gymnasiarch, and one held every five years as an extra event, organized by 'ἡμᾶς', «us». These are the people who, according to the inscription, showed their respect to the king in several other ways, and probably were the inhabitants of Ilion. Only their festival included a horse race, as can be deduced from the inscription.

sion in his home town, in which ephebes took part. The participants were accompanied by dogs and horses, and carried hunting equipment. Although these attributes might be linked to the ephebes, I prefer to associate them with Artemis, the hunting goddess and patroness of the city in whose honour this procession was held⁷³.

As I hope to have shown in this section, the traditional view that intellectual education was a characteristic feature of the ephebeia in the cities of the Greek East cannot be upheld by convincing evidence. Nor is there any epigraphical data that adequately supports the view that riding on horseback was a regular part of the curriculum of the ephebeia. Ephebes were not forced to spend large amounts of money on horses. Likewise, lack of intellectual skills and knowledge is unlikely to have prevented boys from participating in the ephebeia, as has often been assumed. Preliminary training would not have been as necessary for participating in the sports programme, which must have constituted the core of the ephebeia⁷⁴. There are therefore no firm grounds for holding that the contents of the curriculum of the ephebeia served to exclude many or most young men from participation.

THE EPHEBEIA AND CITY LIFE: SOCIAL EDUCATION

The ephebeia was about more than just sports. A long unnoticed aspect has recently been brought to the fore by Crowther⁷⁵. He shows that during the ephebeia considerable attention was paid to the development or improvement of what we would call 'moral' or 'social' skills. Various inscriptions list the names of ephebes who had won contests in «diligence» (φιλοπονία), in «good habit of body» (εὐεξία) and/or in «discipline» or «orderly behaviour» (εὐταξία). The gymnasiarchic law of Beroia shows that the assignment of these prizes was arranged by an elab-

⁷³ Xenophon Ephesiacus, *op. cit.* (n. 13), I-II. Cf. J. KEIL, *art. cit.* (n. 67), p. 263, who does not regard this text as convincing evidence for horse riding by ephebes either.

⁷⁴ On the importance of sports in the ephebeia of the cities of the Greek East, cf. O. VAN NIJF, *Athletics, Festivals and Identity in the Roman East*, *PCPhS* 45 (1999-2000), p. 176-200. He regards sports (or athletics) rather than literary and/or rhetoric education (παιδεία) as «an alternative passport to Greek identity».

⁷⁵ N.B. CROWTHER, *Euexia, Eutaxia and Philoponia: Three Contests of the Greek Gymnasium*, *ZPE* 85 (1991), p. 301-304, lists several inscriptions that contain these contests. Cf. S.D. LAMBERT, *ZPE* 141 (2002), p. 122-123 (only on *eutaxia*).

orate procedure⁷⁶. A jury had to judge which ephebe was best in εὐεξία on the day of the Hermaia; they were appointed after swearing that they would pass their judgement fairly and without bias. Winners in φιλοπονία and εὐταξία were chosen after the behaviour of the ephebes had been monitored for a full year.

Even the teachers themselves were assessed. In Priene they had to compete with their colleagues in the fields of philology and physical strength⁷⁷. Here, actual results were of minor importance. The main objective of these contests was to make them demonstrate their φιλοπονία, as the prize awarded to the winning teachers reveals: the gymnasiarch gave them τὸ ὑπὲρ τῆς φιλοπονίας ἔπαθλον, the prize on account of diligence. Stimulating *philoponia* did not happen to be just this gymnasiarch's hobby-horse: the contests for the teachers were established by law (ἐννόμους, l. 30). There is even a decree, passed by the Βουλή and the Δῆμος of Ephesos, in which a gymnasiarch is praised because he had encouraged young men — in this case *neoi* — to develop their εὐανδρεία («fitness») and φιλοπονία both physically and mentally. The honour awarded to this gymnasiarch by the city council demonstrates how important these values were at city level — and, simultaneously, how the ephebeia was an institution of social education based on widely accepted rules.

The decree of the Βουλή and the Δῆμος also reminds us that the ephebeia should not be regarded as an isolated educational institute. Ephebes were already participating in public life to a considerable extent. Inscriptions show that ephebes not only made private or collective sacrifices, but were also involved in public cult ceremonies. They took part in offerings and banquets, and walked along with city magistrates and religious officials in processions held in honour of the gods⁷⁸. Cult activities of this kind could take up a considerable amount of an ephebe's time: the incomplete school calendar found on Cos enumerates twelve festivals, offerings and/or processions, all taking place within the space of eight weeks⁷⁹.

⁷⁶ See P. GAUTHIER and M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *op. cit.* (n. 36), p. 22, l. 47-57.

⁷⁷ *I. Priene*, no. 113, l. 26-31.

⁷⁸ Cf. recently S. ANEZIRI and D. DAMASKOS, *Städtische Kulte im hellenistischen Gymnasion*, in D. KAH and P. SCHOLZ (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin 2004, p. 247-271 on public cult ceremonies in which members of the gymnasion (including ephebes) took part.

⁷⁹ *Syll*³, no. 1028 (2nd century BC). Admittedly, the school calendar does not refer to any adult citizens taking part in these religious activities. But judging from another Coan inscription (1st century BC), both adult citizens and ephebes participated in the ceremony

When ephebes benefited from the generous gifts of a benefactor, either because he had invested his money directly into the ephebeia, or because he had given it to the gymnasium (e.g. by providing oil), they were sometimes involved in paying tribute to this euergetes. The honours awarded by the ephebes and the *neoi* could consist of a statue in the gymnasium or a crown⁸⁰. In these cases the ceremonies in question are likely to have been held within the boundaries of the gymnasium, and therefore to have had a limited impact on city life.

However, awarding honour and respect to a Hellenistic king, a Roman emperor, or a local benefactor was often a fairly public event. Cities paid homage to these euergetai by organising processions, hymns sung in crowded theatres, and even public funerals. In these public ceremonies ephebes could also play a part. The school calendar from Cos shows how ephebes participated in a range of cult ceremonies for the gods, but also mentions three processions in honour of Hellenistic kings⁸¹. Within the eight weeks covered by the calendar, there were processions for the kings Ptolemaios, Eumenes and Attalos. Since the school calendar generally indicates when an activity was meant for a specific group of children, in these cases its lack of specification suggests that the processions were part of the programme for all age groups. Although the inscription does not explicitly state that the ceremonies were public, we may safely assume that they were, since they consisted of processions: it would hardly be conceivable that a procession would confine itself to a walk through the gymnasium. Besides, in several processions a combination of members of the gymnasium, magistrates, and citizens paraded through the city centre in order to honour 'ordinary' euergetai⁸². Therefore we may also expect processions in the honour of kings to be a city rather than a gymnasium event. When the benefactor Lucius Vacceius Labeo died, ephebes carried him to his grave at Kyme (Aiolis), passing through the agora of the town, where the herald of the city crowned him with gold⁸³. This role

for Zeus, one of the ceremonies mentioned on the school calendar. See M. SEGRE, *Inscrizioni di Cos*. Vol. 1: *Testo* and Vol. 2: *Tavole*, Rome 1993, no. ED 215, l. 33-38. Cf. SEG XLIII (1993), no. 549.

⁸⁰ E.g. the statues for an unknown euergetes in Messene: SEG XLVII (1997), no. 400 (1st century BC) and for Diodorus Paspas in Pergamon: A. CHANKOWSKI, *BCH* 122 (1998), p. 159-199, nos. 1 and 6.

⁸¹ Cf. note 79.

⁸² E.g. IGR IV, no. 159 (Kyzikos) (cf. J. and L. ROBERT, *BE* 1964, p. 180-181); IGR IV, no. 292, l. 42-47 (Pergamon); *I. Priene*, no. 108, l. 367-375.

⁸³ H. ENGELMANN, *Die Inschriften von Kyme (IGSK, vol. 5)*, Bonn 1976, no. 19.

had been assigned to them by the Βουλή and Δῆμος; the ephebes (or their leaders) played no part in the decision. In this case, ephebes were not one of many groups making up a large crowd; together with the *neoi*, they formed the entire procession. Their centrality in this honorary ceremony was not unique: ephebes were more often assigned a special role in these kinds of honorary ceremonies. Sometimes they shared it with other members of the gymnasium and the cities' magistrates⁸⁴.

The ephebes' attachment to civic life is shown even more clearly by the fact that they took part in honouring men who had not done anything for them in particular. Such was the case in Ephesos: here the procession of the statues referred to in the Salutaris inscription was held in order to honour both Artemis and Salutaris, and simultaneously to bring to the fore the glorious past of the city⁸⁵. When the religious officials arrived at the city gates, the ephebes had to take over the 31 statues and carry these through the city centre. They fulfilled this task at least 27 times a year. In other cases, we may also suspect that ephebes were selected to honour prominent men to whom their cities wanted to pay great respect, rather than that they simply rewarded the men who had presented great contributions to their education. Thus the ephebes singing a hymn to the emperor Hadrian when he visited the city of Ephesos performed their song of honour in a city-theatre, right in front of the emperor himself, who was — according to the inscription — listening with interest, and (as we may imagine) in front of a large crowd⁸⁶.

The important role of the ephebes in rites like these, which were of high symbolic value to the city, illustrates to what extent ephebes could be exposed to, and take part in public life. Apparently, ephebes performed tasks in which they almost acted as symbols of their city. As to the question why ephebes (and sometimes other members of the gymnasium as well) were the ones selected to perform these roles, we might find an answer in the central role of the gymnasium in the community life of the cities of the Greek East⁸⁷. Since ephebes, together with *paides* and *neoi*,

⁸⁴ Cf. the inscriptions on the honours given to Athenaios of Kolophon Nova and Thrasyboulos of Priene. Athenaios: M. HOLLEAUX, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* II, Paris 1938, no. 5, p. 51-61. Thrasyboulos: *I. Priene*, no. 104.

⁸⁵ Cf. p. 160.

⁸⁶ Inscription published by J. KEIL, *AAWW* 88 (1951), p. 335, no. 3.

⁸⁷ Cf. P. GAUTHIER, *Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques*, in M. WÖRRLE and P. ZANKER (eds.), *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*, München 1995, p. 1-11.

spent time in the gymnasium every day, where they were taught by their instructors, they constituted the core of the gymnasium. When ephebes, either separately or together with *paides* or *neoi* and gymnasiarchs, performed roles in public life, spectators will have regarded them as delegates of the gymnasium, and thereby as representatives of an important part of civic life.

CONCLUSION

For the ephebes, their participation in these diverse public ceremonies in honour of gods, benefactors and kings, resulted to a certain extent in involvement in civic life. Apart from this, their education during the ephebeia was focused on the mastering of diverse sports and the development of moral values, rather than on intellectual training. Through their membership of the ephebeia, youngsters in the cities of the Greek East were able to acquire skills in fields of crucial importance: both physical health and competitiveness, and values like φιλοπονία, εὐεξία and εὐταξία were highly respected accomplishments in Greek society. Arguments adduced to support the thesis that only the sons of the aristocracy participated in the ephebeia can be refuted: its content did not exclude those without preliminary intellectual education; ownership of a horse was not a necessity and length of membership was variable. There was no inclination to lower the age of entrance substantially in order to meet the needs of an elite circle, and the considerable numbers of ephebes found on several membership lists point towards the inclusion of a broader group of youngsters.

There may well have been an additional reason for admitting the sons of non-aristocratic citizens to the ephebeia⁸⁸. By integrating its members with the adult civic community and by training those skills that were important for civic life, the ephebeia seems to have aimed at moulding

⁸⁸ H.-J. GEHRKE, *Eine Bilanz. Die Entwicklung des Gymnasiums zur Institution der Sozialisierung in der Polis*, in D. KAH and P. SCHOLZ (eds.) *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*, Berlin 2004, p. 413-419, puts the question whether the gymnasium was an institution for «Jugendbildung» or for the formation of elites. Although he does not provide an answer to this question, and considers it an unresolved problem, he does emphasize that the gymnasium was a crucial element in socialization, creating social distinctions within the polis society. According to Gehrke, being educated in the gymnasium above all indicated that someone belonged to the polis, and to the social class of the free citizens.

boys aged between fourteen and eighteen into citizens. Although aristocratic families dominated the social and political scene of the cities in the Greek East, the vigorous community life of these cities clearly rested on the participation of a much larger group of citizens. To include the sons of those citizens would be a sensible choice: after all, these young men were eventually to contribute to community life as well.

Their inclusion did not preclude the formation of a social hierarchy within the ephebeia. Not only did some of the youngsters continue their membership longer than others, some of them also distinguished themselves by the fulfillment of special (honorary) tasks, or by acting, probably *in nomine*, as euergets⁸⁹. The replication of social stratification thereby created characterizes the ephebeia as an institution that fitted *par excellence* into the structure of the aristocratic cities of the Greek East.

Universiteit Leiden

Saskia HIN

Afdeling Oude Geschiedenis

⁸⁹ Cf. e.g. W. BLÜMEL, *Die Inschriften von Knidos I* (IGSK, vol. 41), Bonn 1992, no. 89. Dated to 50-100 AD. The ephebe Servius Sulpicius Apollonios is honoured by his city «for his excellence and his goodwill to the people of the Knidians»: Ὁ δᾶμος [ἐ]τείμασεν Σέρουιον Σουλπίκιον Σερούιου Σουλπικίου Γοργία υἱὸν Ἀπολλώνιον ἐφηβεύοντα ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας τᾶς ποτὶ τὸ πλῆθος τὸ Κνιδίων θεοῖς.