

EPHEBES IN THE STADIUM (NOT THE THEATRE): ATH. POL. 42.4 AND IG II².351

τὸν δεύτερον [sc. ἐνιαυτὸν] ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ γενομένης ἀποδειξάμενοι τῷ δήμῳ τὰ περὶ τὰς τάξεις καὶ λαβόντες ἀσπίδα καὶ δόρυ παρὰ τῆς πόλεως περιπολοῦσι τὴν χώραν καὶ διατρίβουσιν ἐν [τ]οῖς φυλακηρίοις.¹

Thus the author of the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* describes the second year of ephebic service at Athens, at the very start of the section devoted to the present state of the constitution (*Ath. Pol.* 42.4). With one notable exception (see below, section II), scholars have believed that what is meant here is that on this occasion the Assembly met in the theatre of Dionysus and held a review of the ephebes at the start of their second year; the young men were then given their weapons and armour, and they headed out for service on the frontiers. There is, however, a major difficulty. Belief that this review was in some sense paralleled by the passing-out parade by the war-orphans has tended to obscure the simple point that it was not possible for the ephebes to hold a military demonstration in the orchestra of the theatre; there was not enough room. This paper will take up first the problem of military drill in the theatre, then the evidence that supports placing the ephebic demonstration in the stadium, and, finally, the supposed similarity of the demonstration to the orphan ceremony.

I. THE PROBLEM: DRILLING IN THE THEATRE?

As Rhodes rightly notes in his commentary, the phrase τὰ περὶ τὰς τάξεις should mean something along the lines of ‘their skill at manoeuvring in formation’, not simply ‘military skill’ or ‘knowledge of warfare’.² But the scholars who came up with these earlier, vaguer renderings of τὰ περὶ τὰς τάξεις were very likely sensitive to the problem that the more usual understanding of the phrase implied elaborate and vigorous movements that were not possible in the theatre, and hence felt a more general meaning was intended. The noun τάξις and the allied verb τάσσω denote in the first instance ‘drawing up in rank and file’ (LSJ⁹ rev., s.v. τάξις I.1). At the very least this would have meant deploying from a marching column (λόχοι ὀρθιοι) into a battle line (φάλαγξ).³ Ancient military authorities suggest that the ability to perform this re-formation with speed and precision was very difficult. Xenophon, for instance, implies that only the vaunted Laconian infantry could do this with ease (*Lac. Pol.* 11.5–8; cf. *An.* 4.6.6, 8.10–13). If the ephebic display involved this sort of elaborate drill and rapid movement, the orchestra would not have been a possible site.

¹ I have printed Chamber’s text (Leipzig, 1986), preserving the variation between iota-adscript and subscript.

² P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981), 508 ad loc. Note Rhodes’s very careful translation as well from the Penguin Library, *Aristotle. The Athenian Constitution* (Harmondsworth, 1984), 88: ‘The following year there is an assembly in the theatre, at which the cadets display to the people the *manoeuvres* which they have learned and receive a shield and a spear from the state’ (my emphasis).

³ See, for example, J. K. Anderson, *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon* (Berkeley, 1970), 98–102.

In an important passage from the *Anabasis*, Xenophon puts into real terms how much more difficult drilling in an urban setting could be, and what sort of unusual spaces were required to do so. He tells us that in Byzantium there was an area called 'the Thrakion' (*An.* 7.1.24; cf. *Hell.* 1.3.20);⁴ Xenophon ordered the Cyreans to form into battle line there because this quarter of the city is uniquely suited to such a manoeuvre: τὸ δὲ χωρίον οἶον κάλλιστον ἐκτάξασθαι ἐστὶ τὸ Θράκιον καλούμενον, ἔρημον οἰκιῶν καὶ πεδινόν. The crucial phrase is the last: the square is ideal because it is free from buildings and flat.⁵ If the ephebic drill described by the phrase τὰ περὶ τὰς τάξεις from *Ath. Pol.* 42.4 approximated at all to what Xenophon and his men were doing in Byzantium, as described at *An.* 7.1.24, it could not have been carried out in the theatre of Dionysus. Admittedly, the number of troops involved would not have been the same (more on this below), but that does not alter the fact that the orchestra was simply not big enough to permit even a modestly sized contingent from executing rapid re-formations, particularly extensions of its lines from column to phalanx.⁶

It is perhaps tempting to cite at this point those places in ancient authors where military drill is linked explicitly to the training of choruses. While these do abound,⁷ it nevertheless remains that the orchestra of the theatre would have been an impossible location for the display of ephebic prowess at movement in formation. The main problem is simply the sheer number of individuals involved. Although there is speculation that the largest tragic chorus may have been made up of fifty individuals (a special one for Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy), this would have been otherwise unheard of and has been rejected; twelve was the norm. Old Comedy featured choruses of twenty-four members.⁸ Habicht has estimated that each ephebic class was made up of 500 young men.⁹ Indeed, it ought to be remembered that the Ephebeia contemporary with the writing of the *Athenaion Politeia* was the newly reorganized one of the Lycurgan era, and that, unlike in later periods, it was compulsory for all citizen youths who had reached their eighteenth year.¹⁰ While it is possible that not all 500 were involved in the display at one time, there is no mention of separate drilling in the text. In fact, Reinmuth nos. 11 and 15 seem to show the ephebes functioning *en masse* at Rhamnous and Oropus, suggesting that on important occasions entire ephebic classes were involved at the same time in state functions.¹¹

⁴ Noted also later by Cassius Dio (74.14.5); see also the Suda, s.v. *Βυζάντιον*.

⁵ Cf. O. Lendle, *Kommentar zu Xenophons Anabasis* (Darmstadt, 1995), 419–20 ad 7.1.21–4.

⁶ It is true that Aeneas Tacticus refers to military activities in theatres, but chiefly as places for mustering or requiring guards: 1.9, 3.5, 22.4.

⁷ The connection is familiar from Xenophon, for example: see esp. *Oec.* 8.3–7, *Mem.* 3.5.18, 21. J. J. Winkler has collected many other cases: 'The Ephebes' song: tragoidia and polis', in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin (edd.), *Nothing to do with Dionysos* (Princeton, 1990), 51–7. See also Xenophon, *An.* 6.1.5–13, for individuals performing military dance, and for discussion, E. L. Wheeler, 'Hoplomachia and Greek dances in arms', *GRBS* 23 (1982), 223–33.

⁸ A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 2nd edn rev. by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis (Oxford, 1968), 234–6; E. Csapo and W. J. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor, 1994), 353.

⁹ C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* (Cambridge MA, 1997), 24. See also J. D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley, 1998), 41.

¹⁰ After 307 service was no longer mandatory, and the Ephebeia developed into the aristocratic institution so familiar and widespread in the Hellenistic period, naturally in considerably smaller numbers: C. Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'Éphébie Attique. Des Origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (Paris, 1962), 160–4.

¹¹ O. W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.*, *Mnemosyne Suppl.* 14 (Leiden, 1971), 39–40, 58–60, 77. See also R. Parker, *Athenian Religion* (Oxford, 1996), 254, n. 126. I would further note that the games at Oropus were held in a stadium, and for the first time

On the other hand, it is certainly true that the ephebes were organized by tribal *lochoi*, as we are told earlier in the same passage from the *Athenaion Politeia* (42.2), with each *lochos* being under a *sophronistes*, and a whole ephebic class under a single *kosmetes*.¹² Hence the display could have involved a succession of units from each of the ten tribes. But even if the ephebes did drill by tribal *lochoi* and not all at once, we would still have to imagine approximately fifty individuals attempting movements that normally a group of twenty-four were never expected to perform. And a quick survey of documents in Pélékidis' monograph on ephebes shows that while a figure of around fifty is the usual for one tribe's annual total, in certain years it could be more than that (from some time between 345 and 325 the Oineis tribe put forward around fifty-three individuals in a single year; and remarkably, in 324/3, Leontis produced sixty-two).¹³ An average derived from a table of known sizes of ephebic tribal *lochoi* in Reinmuth yields a figure of forty-seven individuals, omitting the smaller totals from the years after the reform of 307 (see above n. 10).¹⁴ Significantly, we know for certain that in these later years the demonstration by the ephebes was held in the stadium, not the theatre, even though their numbers were smaller than they would have been in the fourth century.¹⁵

II. IG II².351: ASSEMBLY IN THE STADIUM

The later practice of holding the review in the stadium offers an important clue. Indeed, a solution to our problem can be found if we understand the words ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ at *Ath. Pol.* 42.4 to refer not to the theatre of Dionysus, but to the closed, theatre-shaped end of the Panathenaic Stadium, a suggestion first advanced by S. Humphreys, but either insufficiently appreciated or rejected.¹⁶ The crucial text that supports this interpretation is IG II².351 + 624 = Schwenk no. 48, lines 16–17.¹⁷ In this document, dating to 330/29, Lycurgus himself proposes honours for Eudemus of Plataea for his benefactions to Athens, among which is the supplying of a thousand yoked teams for important state building:

... καὶ νῦν [ἐπ]ι [δέδ]ω[κεν] 15
 εἰς τὴν ποιήσιν τοῦ σταδ[ίου]
 καὶ τοῦ θεάτρου τοῦ Παναθη[ναί]-
 κού χίλια ζεύγη καὶ ταῦτα
 πέπομφεν ἅπαντα π[ρὸ Π]αναθη-
 ναίων καθὰ ὑπέσ[χετο] ... 20

in 329, that is precisely the same period as the composition of the *Ath. Pol.*: D. Knoepfler, 'Adolf Wilhelm et la *pentétéris* des Amphiaraia d'Oropos. Réexamen de A.P. LIV 7 à la lumière du catalogue IG VII 414 + SEG I 126', in M. Piérart (ed.), *Aristote et Athènes* (Paris, 1993), 279–302, and Parker, 149 and n. 109. Cf. also L. Robert, 'Sur une loi d'Athènes relative aux petites Panathénées', *Hellenica* 11–12 (1960), 194–202, and F. W. Mitchel, *Lykourgan Athens: 338–322*, Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple (Cincinnati, 1970), 46.

¹² Mitchel (n. 11), 37.

¹³ Pélékidis (n. 10), 119–52, 283–94. The texts in question are *Hesperia* Suppl. 8 (1949) 273 [Oineis]; *Αρχαιολογικὴ Εφημερίς* (1918), 73–100, nos. 95–7 [Leontis].

¹⁴ Reinmuth (n. 11), 107.

¹⁵ Pélékidis (n. 10), 272–3; cf. S. Humphreys, 'Lycurgus of Butadae: an Athenian aristocrat', in J. W. Eadie and J. Ober (edd.), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian* (Lanham, 1985), 227, n. 32.

¹⁶ Humphreys (n. 15), 227, n. 32. M. Faraguna, *Atene nell' età di Alessandro* (Rome, 1992), 279, n. 111 rejects Humphreys's suggestion.

¹⁷ Humphreys (n. 15), 227, n. 32. The text is best found in C. J. Schwenk, *Athens in the Age of Alexander. The Dated Laws & Decrees of "The Lykourgan Era" 338–322 B.C.* (Chicago, 1985).

Curtius and, following him, Dittenberger believed that the stone-cutter erred and should have written τοῦ σταδίου τοῦ Παναθηναϊκοῦ καὶ τοῦ θεάτρου (lines 16–17),¹⁸ but many scholars have followed the position first advocated by Dörpfeld and Reisch that the engraver did not err and meant what he carved: the teams were for the construction of the stadium and the ‘Panathenaic Theatre’ or stands at end of the same structure.¹⁹ Dörpfeld and Reisch drew attention to two inscriptions that support their view. *IG* II².1682 = *SIG*³ 970 dates from the early third century (c. 288) and makes mention of τὸ θέατρον τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταδίου at Eleusis (line 6). *IG* VII.4255 = *SIG*³ 973, dating even more closely to *IG* II².351, namely 338–322, but probably specifically to 333–332,²⁰ refers similarly to a theatre at Oropus that may in fact be part of a structure for athletic exercises (λίθοις δὲ χρῆσεται τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου κατὰ τὸν βωμόν, line 18).²¹ These texts suggest that it was not unusual in Attic documents to style the closed end of a stadium a ‘theatre’.²²

A major issue that complicates the view that at *Ath. Pol.* 42.4 a display in the stadium is in fact being described is that of the documentary formulae used to indicate meetings of the Assembly in the theatre of Dionysus at Athens in the fourth century. There were two ways that meetings of the Ecclesia in the theatre were described: either as an ἐκκλησία ἐν Διονύσου (a shorthand expression for ‘assembly in [the precinct of] Dionysus’), or ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ.²³ The earliest instance of the first is from 343/2 (*IG* II².223B, lines 5–6). In all the cases of the first formula, the meeting was devoted to matters relating to the Greater Dionysia that had just been held.²⁴ This meeting of the Assembly in the theatre was stipulated by law, as we know from a

¹⁸ C. Curtius, ‘Zum Redner Lykurgos’, *Philologus* 24 (1866), 273; W. Dittenberger, *SIG*³ 288, n. 5.

¹⁹ W. Dörpfeld and E. Reisch, *Das griechische Theater* (Athens, 1896), 282. See also, for example, A. Wilhelm, rev. of C. Michel, *Recueil d’inscriptions grecques* (Bruxelles, 1897), *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (1898), 221; M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* 2 (Oxford, 1948), 280; Schwenk (n. 17), 238.

²⁰ For the more precise date, see Robert (n. 11), 195; he places the building of the structure in question (a fountain for the Amphiaraeum) in this more defined period.

²¹ Dittenberger, *SIG*³ 973, n. 18, believed that the reference must be to the actual theatre at Oropus, not the closed end of the stadium. The theatre was situated next to a long stoa, and hence perhaps created an arrangement similar to what was apparently the case at Olympia: see Xenophon *Hell.* 7.4.31, and Dörpfeld and Reisch (n. 19), 282. In the course of describing the fighting between the Arcadians and Eleans at Olympia in 365, Xenophon reports that the Eleans drove their enemy ‘into the space between the Council House and the temple of Hestia and the theatre next to these places’ (τοῦ πρὸς ταῦτα προσήκοντος θεάτρου). G. E. Underhill, *A Commentary on the Hellenica of Xenophon* (Oxford, 1900), 297 ad loc., was unable to identify these structures, as was J. Hatzfeld later, *Xénophon Helléniques* 2 (Paris, 1939), 230. Importantly, the latter speculates that the ‘theatre’ in question might refer to the slope that overlooks the stadium near the terrace of the treasuries and the Echo Portico. Dörpfeld and Reisch believe the reference in *IG* VII.4255 is to the stadium, not the theatre, at Oropus. In the most recent discussion of the text, B. Ch. Petrakos, *Οἱ Επιγραφές του Ωρωπού* (Athens, 1997), 194, notes that the question which structure is referred to is still open, though he favours the theatre.

²² It is not my intention to go into the question here of where the stadium at Athens was located. I agree with the consensus as articulated by G. R. Stanton and P. J. Bicknell, ‘Voting in tribal groups in the Athenian assembly’, *GRBS* 28 (1987), 88–9, appendix I.

²³ W. A. McDonald, *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks* (Baltimore, 1943), 47–59, esp. the tables on 48 and 57–8. Pélékidis (n. 10), 304–5, offers some corrections to McDonald’s lists.

²⁴ McDonald (n. 23), 49 and 51. Cf. also M. H. Hansen, *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes* (Oxford, 1987), 14, and id., ‘How many Athenians attended the Ecclesia?’, *GRBS* 17 (1976), 117 and nn. 17–19 = *The Athenian Ecclesia. A Collection of Articles* (Copenhagen, 1983), 3.

passage in Demosthenes (21 [Ag. *Meidias*] 8–9), where in fact the wording is τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν Διονύσῳ.

The second formula is more problematic. McDonald believed that the earliest extant examples were two inscriptions from 327/6 (*IG* II².357, line 6 = Schwenk no. 57, line 7; and *Hesperia* 3 [1934] 4 no. 5, lines 3–4 = Schwenk no. 59, lines 3–4). However, it should be noted that both these examples are in fact restorations, and that in Schwenk's republication of the *Hesperia* 3 document, it has not even been included in the text.²⁵ As for *IG* II².357, although McDonald regarded ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ as certain,²⁶ Schwenk notes ad loc. that the restoration (which includes four more letters) fails to fill out the *stoichedon*-line of twenty-nine characters (it consists of twenty-eight altogether).²⁷ Hence, the first absolutely certain attestation for the phrase ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ is in fact McDonald's third example from 293/2 (*IG* II².389, lines 5–6 = *SEG* 21.354).²⁸ When the Assembly met in the theatre of Dionysus, the formula for that meeting was ἐκκλησία ἐν Διονύσῳ in the fourth century. Hence, although the formula ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ was common later, the expression ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ in the third quarter of the fourth could refer to another theatre or theatre-shaped structure, and not necessarily the Dionysus theatre. It is true that the definite article τῷ from *Ath. Pol.* 42 does indeed suggest a customary usage, and that in the roughly contemporary texts *De Corona* of Demosthenes and *Against Ctesiphon* of Aeschines the phrase ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ is common and must refer to the theatre. However, in special circumstances, it may not have.

If we accept the conventional dating of the *Athenaion Politeia* to some time in the late 330s, that is, after the reorganization of the Ephebeia of c. 335/4,²⁹ then the passage in question would have been composed at exactly the time when the theatre of Dionysus was undergoing a major restoration and the Panathenaic stadium was being built.³⁰ What is more, it would be contemporary with a text that demonstrates that 'theatre' could mean 'the closed-end of the stadium', and also when the routine way to indicate meetings of the Assembly in the theatre of Dionysus was ἐκκλησία ἐν Διονύσῳ. But even more than these supporting texts, I think common sense demands that we place the display of ephebes before the Ecclesia that is described at *Ath. Pol.* 42.4 in a location that was suitable. That place is the Panathenaic Stadium, with the Assembly in the stands or 'theatre' as it was also known, not the orchestra of the theatre of Dionysus.

III. ORPHANS AND EPHEBES

Another problem for my interpretation of *Ath. Pol.* 42.4 is the so-called passing-out parade of war orphans held at the start of the Greater Dionysia in the theatre of Dionysus. Since this event is sometimes thought to involve ephebes or ephebe-like persons, it may seem that such a rite would prove that a parallel exists for a military demonstration by second-year ephebes before the assembly in the theatre. It has even been suggested that in some sense the ephebic display actually replaced the parade of

²⁵ Schwenk (n. 17), 295.

²⁶ McDonald (n. 23), 56.

²⁷ Schwenk (n. 17), 286: the entire line, plus the words before and after, reads as follows: πρυταν]είας· ἐκκλ[ησία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ· τῶν π][ροέ]δ[ρων]...

²⁸ Cf. A. S. Henry, *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees*, *Mnemosyne Suppl.* 49 (Leiden, 1977), 39.

²⁹ Rhodes (n. 2, 1981), 51–8, esp. 52 and 56.

³⁰ See esp. B. Hintzen-Bohlen, *Die Kulturpolitik des Eubulos und des Lykurg. Die Denkmäler- und Bauprojekte in Athen zwischen 355 und 322 v. Chr.* (Berlin, 1997), 21–9 and 38–9.

orphans. Two questions need to be raised in reply. (i) What precisely happened in the passing-out parade, and was it similar to what is described in the *Ath. Pol.*? (ii) Ought we in fact to connect the war orphans with the ephebes, that is, should they be used as proof for the existence of an ephebic institution in the fifth century?

Three texts, all oratorical, deal with the war orphans in the theatre at the opening of the Dionysia: Lysias fr. vi (*Against Theozotides*) 1–2 Gernet & Bizos = *P. Hib.* i 14a–b, Isocrates 8 (*De Pace*) 82, and Aeschines 3 (*Against Ctesiphon*) 154. In the case against Theozotides, who was seeking to remove the names of bastard and adopted sons from the rolls of state-supported orphans in 403/2, Lysias provides the briefest description of the ceremony.³¹ The essential point to note in connection with the passage is that the ceremony seems to have consisted primarily of the public herald reading out the names of the orphans and their patronyms.³² In his *De Pace* of 355, Isocrates criticizes two displays that took place at the start of the Dionysia: the presentation of the tribute and of the orphans, both mandated by decree.³³ From this passage it is clear that the orphans were actually conducted into the theatre when it was already full of spectators, and possibly into the orchestra itself, although this is only stated for the display of the tribute. Isocrates' text also implies that these practices were no longer observed (cf. 8.80 *περὶ τῶν ἐν ἐκείνοις τοῖς χρόνοις γενομένων*, 81 *τὴν ἄνοιαν τῶν τότε πολιτευομένων*). The emphasis in the passage is very much on the Athenians making ill-advised demonstrations to others, not on the orphans demonstrating anything of their own military prowess.

Clearly the most important description of what precisely happened in the theatre regarding the orphans comes from Aeschines in the *Against Ctesiphon* (delivered in 330). I quote it here in full:

τίς γάρ οὐκ ἂν ἀλγήσειεν ἄνθρωπος Ἑλλήν καὶ παιδευθεὶς ἐλευθερίως, ἀναμνησθεὶς ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ³⁴ ἐκεῖνό γε, εἰ μηδὲν ἕτερον, ὅτι ταύτῃ ποτὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μελλόντων ὥσπερ νυνὶ τῶν τραγῳδῶν γίνεσθαι, ὅτ' εὐνομεῖτο μᾶλλον ἢ πόλις καὶ βελτίοσι προστάταις ἐχρήτο, προελθὼν ὁ κήρυξ καὶ παραστησάμενος τοὺς ὀρφανούς, ὧν οἱ πατέρες ἦσαν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τετελευτηκότες, νεανίσκους πανοπλία κεκοσμημένους, ἐκήρυττε τὸ κάλλιστον κήρυγμα καὶ προτρεπτικώτατον πρὸς ἀρετὴν, ὅτι τούσδε τοὺς νεανίσκους, ὧν οἱ πατέρες ἐτελεύτησαν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ γενομένοι, μέχρι μὲν ἥβης ὁ δῆμος ἔτρεφε, νυνὶ δὲ καθοπλίσας τῇδε τῇ πανοπλίᾳ, ἀφίησιν ἀγαθὴ τύχη τρέπεσθαι ἐπὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν, καὶ καλεῖ εἰς προεδρίαν. τότε μὲν ταῦτ' ἐκήρυττεν, ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν.

³¹ Διονυσίοις γάρ, ὅταν ὁ κήρυξ ἀναγορεύῃ τοὺς ὀρφανούς πατρώθεν ὑπειπὼν ὅτι τῶνδε τῶν νεανίσκων οἱ πατέρες ἀπέθανον ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ μαχόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἄνδρες ὄντες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ τούτους ἡ πόλις ἔτρεφε μέχρι ἥβης.

³² Cf. R. S. Stroud, 'Theozotides and the Athenian orphans', *Hesperia* 40 (1971), 289. Note also *SEG* 10.6, a text dating to c. 460 from Eleusis that also seems to concern in part the war orphans; additionally, Cratinus F 183 *PCG*, Thuc. 2.46, Plato, *Menex.* 248e.

³³ ἐψήφισαντο τὸ περιγινόμενον ἐκ τῶν φόρων ἀργύριον, διελόντες κατὰ τάλαντον, εἰς τὴν ὀρχήστραν τοῖς Διονυσίοις εἰσφέρειν ἐπειδὰν πλήρες ᾖ τὸ θέατρον· καὶ ταῦτ' ἐποιοῦν καὶ παρεισήγον τοὺς παῖδας τῶν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τετελευτηκότων, ἀμφοτέροις ἐπιδεικνύοντες, τοῖς μὲν συμμαχοῖς τὰς τιμὰς τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῶν ὑπὸ μισθωτῶν εἰσφερομένας, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις Ἑλλήσι τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὀρφανῶν καὶ τὰς συμφοράς τὰς διὰ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ταύτην γιγνομένης (Mathieu).

³⁴ Note that in the edition of Blass (Leipzig, 1908) the phrase ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ is put in square brackets on the assumption that it is repeated from section 153, creating hiatus here in 154, and hence should be removed. Dilts, however, retains the reading in his edition (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997).

Several points need to be made in connection with this passage. First, the wording of the pronouncement itself (the *κήρυγμα*) is so close in several details to the version in the Lysias passage that we must have the basic elements of the actual formula used in the ceremony.³⁵ Second, even more clearly than with the Isocrates text, it is clear from what Aeschines says that the rite is no longer held. Finally, unlike the other two descriptions, it is fairly clear what actually happens in the course of the ceremony. The herald first ‘brought forward the orphans’ (*παραστησάμενος τοὺς ὀρφανούς*—the very same term is used of producing individuals in a law court, LSJ s.v. *παρίστημι* C.I); the youths were already in their armour (*νεανίσκους πανοπλία κεκοσμημένους*). The herald then announced that the demos had nurtured the orphans until their majority, had now armed them with their panoply, and was sending them out to tend to their own possessions with every good wish. They were then invited to the front seats in the theatre. Note: the orphans are not presented with their armour, they are already wearing it.

Even more importantly, at no point is it obvious from this description that the youths drilled in any way: yes, they are introduced into the theatre by the herald, probably singly, in order for their names and patronyms to be read out, and then they are ushered to their seats of honour. Nowhere in these passages are we told that the orphans gather in the orchestra and march in battle-order; instead they are presented to the people and shown their seats. That is all. Perhaps this ceremony can be called a parade of sorts, but it is not a military display of the type found at *Ath. Pol.* 42.4. If there had been any meaningful and obvious similarity between the parade and the demonstration by the ephebes, Aeschines would not presumably have spoken of the orphan ceremony as a thing of the past and irretrievable.

We need also to examine the second larger question posed above, namely even if the parade of war orphans was in fact similar to the display by second-year ephebes (though it seems it was not), ought we to understand any connection between the orphans and the ephebes? It is certainly true that the orphans are routinely presented as ephebes in discussions that rely on precisely the texts presented above. Thus in a recent article on Athenian civic ideology and tragedy, Goldhill speaks of ‘the parade of ephebic war orphans’ in the fifth century, a notion that, once introduced, is more unambiguously phrased a few lines later in the same paragraph as ‘the parade of ephebes’.³⁶ There is a problem in terminology here: while it is true that in a non-technical sense the orphans are passing from youth to manhood and are hence putting aside their ephebic status (note the phrase *μέχρι ἡβης* from the *kerugma*), it is misleading for them to be styled ‘ephebes’, for the institution did not exist until the Lycurgan period. While it is true that a fifth-century date for the Ephebeia has not been ‘finally proven or disproven yet’,³⁷ the documentary silence from before 334/3 is deafening:³⁸ it is simply beyond belief that an institution of such size and importance

³⁵ From the Lysias passage note esp. *ὅτι τῶνδε τῶν νεανίσκων οἱ πατέρες ἀπέθανον ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ μαχόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἄνδρες ὄντες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ τούτους ἡ πόλις ἔτρεφε μέχρι ἡβης*. On the similarity of the *κήρυγμα* in Lysias and Aeschines, see L. Gernet and M. Bizon, *Lysias. Discours II* (Paris, 1989), 258, n. 2, and Stroud (n. 32), 289, n. 20. On the longing evident in Aeschines for the old *kerugma*, note also elsewhere in the same speech, 3.4.

³⁶ S. Goldhill, ‘Civic ideology and the problem of difference: the politics of Aeschylean tragedy, once again’, *JHS* 120 (2000), 46, arguing on the basis of Isocrates 8.82.

³⁷ S. Goldhill, ‘The Great Dionysia and civic ideology’, in *Nothing to Do with Dionysos* (n. 7), 125.

³⁸ Cf. D. M. Lewis, rev. of Reinmuth, *Ephebic Inscriptions*, *CR* 24 (1974), 254. The year 334/3 seems to be the date for the decree of Epicrates, first suggested by Wilamowitz as the document

would have left no epigraphic trace unless in fact it was not there. And although Goldhill is careful to avoid reviving the old thesis of Mathieu that the parade of orphans was connected in some sense to the origin of the Ephebeia,³⁹ his views require something very like the ephebate to exist,⁴⁰ and that stand-in is the orphan ceremony. This position in turn implies that the parade of the orphans and the demonstration by the ephebes were very similar, a claim that in my opinion is untenable.

The parade of orphans and the ephebes' demonstration of their ability to move in formation were very different events, and the first should not be thought of as being replaced by the second. The first was a 'coming-of-age' marker, akin to academic graduation ceremonies; it was a fitting conclusion for an institution aimed at caring for the orphaned boys of war-heroes. The second was a military display, demonstrating the readiness of new citizen-soldiers for war. While it would be a serious mistake to underestimate the broader cultural importance of the ephebate, especially in the Lycurgan era,⁴¹ it is equally wrong to lose sight of the basic fact that it was designed as a military institution: Athens felt itself under threat in the 330s, perhaps best witnessed by the decree against tyranny of 337/6 (*SEG* 12.87 = *Hesperia* 21 [1952], 355–9, no. 5), and was searching for ways to make its citizenry better prepared for war.⁴²

The Ephebeia, in other words, had a real military purpose, and required real drilling. A passage from Xenophon's *Memorabilia* helps to underscore this point. In the last quarter of the fifth century Thucydides could imagine Pericles asserting in the Funeral Oration that his city was as militarily prepared as the Spartans, but did not need the rigorous drilling they practised *from youth* (εὐθὺς νεοὶ ὄντες, Thuc. 2.39.1); a truly martial ephebate cannot be conceived of as existing in this Athens.⁴³ In the middle of the fourth century, Xenophon pictured Pericles' son in conversation with Socrates, and the latter observing that Attica was protected by a natural frontier of mountains, and needed only to have 'active young Athenians more lightly armed and occupying the mountains' to be a menace to the city's enemies and a strong bulwark for its defence (*Mem.* 3.5.25, 27).⁴⁴ Obviously, the Ephebeia does not exist at this point either, but the need for it is now clearly felt, and precisely as a serious arm of Athens's military. It is

that formally instituted the Ephebeia: *Aristoteles und Athen* 1 (Berlin, 1893), 191–2 and 353, and cf. Lycurgus (Conomis) F v.3 = Harpocration, s.v. 'Επικράτης. See also S. V. Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter Cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.* (Berkeley, 1995), 10–11, n. 21, Habicht (n. 9), 16, and P. Wilson, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia* (Cambridge, 2000), 266.

³⁹ Goldhill (n. 37), 125, referring to G. Mathieu, 'Remarques sur l'éphébie attique', in G. Mathieu (ed.), *Mélanges Desrousseux* (Paris, 1937), 311–18. Mathieu's views were dismantled by Pélékidis (n. 10), 14–17.

⁴⁰ A precursor to the Ephebeia probably did exist, as we can tell from the ephebic oath, discussed by P. Stewart, 'The Ephebic Oath in fifth-century Athens', *JHS* 97 (1977), 102–11; cf. Lewis (n. 38), 255, citing Thuc. 1.105.4 and 2.13.7, as well as Aeschines 2.167. But it clearly was very different both from the nurturing of the orphans and the later Ephebeia.

⁴¹ Cf. Wilamowitz (n. 38), 1.353.

⁴² See esp. Habicht (n. 9), 17 and Wilson (n. 38), 266 and n. 10.

⁴³ Cf. esp. W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War II* (Berkeley, 1974), 210–11.

⁴⁴ Translation from Marchant, *Xenophon IV*, LCL (Cambridge, MA, 1923), 203. For discussion, see A. Delatte, *Le Troisième Livre des Souvenirs Socratiques de Xénophon*, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 58 (Liège and Paris, 1933), ch. 5, esp. 58–9, and Pélékidis (n. 10), 20–1. The dramatic date of *Mem.* 3.5 is some time after the battle of Delion in 424 and before Pericles the Younger's death in 406; the date of the composition of the text is put by Delatte late in Xenophon's career, and he draws our notice to similarities in orientation with the *Hipparchicus* with its own accent on the newly perceived need for military training.

probably not coincidental that about twenty years later, the ephebes were precisely stationed in these frontier posts,⁴⁵ just as Socrates imagined. It is significant that the *Hipparchicus*, with its similar accent on the new idea of rigorously trained citizen-cavalry, is datable to approximately the same period as *Mem.* 3. The military training of citizenry is just beginning to be imagined in the second quarter of the fourth century.

Discussions of the political and ideological setting of Athenian drama, as well as broader, anthropologically based studies of the transition of youth to adult as reflected in social institutions and literature have done much to explain to us the importance of the ephebe-figure in Greek culture.⁴⁶ Some form of the ephebe no doubt existed at Athens before the Lycinan period, and had perhaps for some time (see above n. 40). But to drag the well-documented Ephebeia of the fourth century into service as a representative of its shadowy antecedent in the fifth misrepresents the evidence.⁴⁷ Perhaps the ease with which we think about the political aspects of the Greater Dionysia at Athens, as well as our willingness to understand the transition of youth to adulthood as a moment especially appropriate to a theatrical setting, have prevented us from seeing the improbability of military drill in the theatre, and further that the possibility exists for such exercises taking place in a much more suitable place, one no less public and 'stagey' to be sure, but with a lot more room.⁴⁸

University of Virginia

JOHN DILLERY

⁴⁵ Cf. Rhodes (n. 2, 1981), 506 ad *Ath. Pol.* 42.3.

⁴⁶ Goldhill's work is representative of the first category. For the second I am thinking especially of P. Vidal-Naquet, *The Black Hunter* (Baltimore and London, 1986), in particular ch. 5.

⁴⁷ Cf. A. H. Sommerstein, 'Response', in A. H. Sommerstein and C. Atherton (edd.), *Education in Greek Fiction*, Nottingham Classical Literature Studies 4 (Bari, 1996), 53–9.

⁴⁸ I would like to thank the referees for *CQ* who made several useful corrections and suggestions, and J. E. Lendon and S. Myers for discussion and help with bibliography.