

Chapter 10

ALEX MCAULEY – Cardiff University, Cardiff
mcauleya1@cardiff.ac.uk

From the Cradle: Reconstructing the *ephēbeia* in Hellenistic Megara

If we seek to gain some measure of insight into the lived experience of a local community in the Greek world such as Megara, then the *ephēbeia* provides one of the most promising fields of study. The institution as such is predicated on the transmission and perpetuation of local customs and communal sensibilities from one generation of citizens to the next, and functions as much as a didactic process as one of civic initiation. The education of the program provides the young members of a given community with the military and civic formation necessary to fulfill their dual role in it as both hoplites and citizens. The investment of several years of each young citizen's life into this program represents a massive commitment of time and effort that only marks the beginning of his civic career. In the process of his training, bonds are formed with his fellow ephebes which further strengthen the social ties that bind the citizen community. Perhaps no other institution common to the autonomous Greek city-state so practically ensures the survival of the polis community in the realm of politics and warfare than this – in Megara as elsewhere. In spite of this centrality of the *ephēbeia* to civic life, it has been only attracted intermittent scholarly attention in the century and a half since Collignon's 1877 dissertation.¹

1 Kennell 2006: 1-5 for its scholarly history as a topic of study, along with Vidal-Naquet 1991: 151-153 with notes.

Yet in another sense the *ephēbeia* straddles the divide between the local and trans-local, or perhaps more accurately, between the local and the Panhellenic. On the one hand the institution manifests itself quite differently among different poleis, allowing for a great deal of local idiosyncrasy which has been recently highlighted by Nigel Kennell (2006) and Andrzej Chankowski (2010). But on the other hand, the ubiquity of ephebic programmes in the third century and beyond – ‘attested in 190 cities, ranging from Marseilles to Babylon and from the Ukraine to North Africa’² – means that it is deeply woven into the fabric of the value system that unites disparate communities throughout the Greek world. In the same way that the common ideology of magistracies and assemblies manifests itself in local constitutional particularities, so too does the common valuation of civic and military formation produce myriad local ephebic programmes.³ It is precisely this negotiation between the local and the trans-local which lies at the core of my approach to the Megarian *ephēbeia* in this paper, and I hope that in trying to tease out the precise character and regime of the *ephēbeia* in the Megarid we might catch some glimpse of the communal life of its Hellenistic citizens.

The sparse evidence that we have for the *ephēbeia* in Megara and its narrow chronological timeframe have typically led scholars to view it as an institution that was imposed on the Megarians by outside forces: either the Boiotians, the Achaians, or both in sequence – or perhaps even the Athenians if we follow the threads back to the fifth century.⁴ The *ephēbeia* is thus included in that list of ‘foreign’ institutions that were not indigenous to the city or region, along with *polemarkhoi*, *damiourgoi*, or the *synedrioi* which had to be adopted by the member cities of such federal states in the name of uniformity. According to the *communis opinio*,⁵ the city’s entrance into first the Achaian League and then the Boiotian koinon brought with it a considerable modification of its political institutions: the Megarian *archontes*, *polemarkhoi*, and *synarchiai* were new imitations of the equivalent

2 Kennell 2006: vii–viii.

3 This thread was first developed by Vidal-Naquet (1991: 152), in which he mentions that the two universal criteria for advancement to citizenship in the Greek world are marriage and service in the hoplite corps of a community.

4 Chankowski 2010: 158 note 75 is his only mention of the Megarian institution in the context of his discussion of the Boiotian equivalent. Robu 2014a: 368 on the epigraphic evidence for the Megarian *ephēbeia* and its roots after the battle of Pydna, here and elsewhere – also discussed by Knoepfler and Robu 2010: 768.

5 As represented by Chankowski 2010 and Robu 2014a: 368; 2014b.

Boiotian and Achaian institutions, imported to Megara in the name of federal consistency. The *ephēbeia* thus, it follows logically, is part of this decidedly extra-local set of institutional transformations; it was not, it seems, already a Megarian institution. Chankowski perhaps inadvertently seems to support this view by only mentioning Megara's *ephēbeia* in a footnote to his discussion of the Boiotian institution.⁶

In this paper I argue instead that the few epigraphic appearances of the *ephēbeia* in Megara reveal that the institution must have existed in the region before it joined the Boiotian League. It should not be viewed as an external imposition, but rather as an institution that had long been part of the communal fabric of Megaris. The epigraphic documents at our disposal only reflect the adoption of Boiotian and Achaian habits with which to catalogue the institution, and such changes, I believe, are largely cosmetic. To reconstruct this longer ephebic history of Megara, we must first review the epigraphic evidence at our disposal and consider its place in the context of Boiotian federalism, which in turn allows some specifics of the program to be reconstructed. From then a somewhat broader chronological perspective will review potential hints of ephebic programmes in the *longue durée* of Megarian history. In the end, this particular ephebic history seems to be enigmatic to Megara, along with the garlic and salt for which this corner of Greece was justifiably renowned.

The Epigraphic Dossier

As mentioned above, all of the extant attestations of the *ephēbeia* in Megara are epigraphic and limited to the fairly narrow timespan of 223 to 146 BCE – although the second-century dates are somewhat less certain. All are roughly similar in structure and adhere to the general conventions of Hellenistic military catalogues: the inscriptions begin with dating according to an eponymous magistrate (or several), and then proceed to provide a list of personal names followed by a genitive patronymic of those who are identified as either entering or leaving the ranks of the *ephēbeia*. The city of Megara itself provides five

⁶ Chankowski 2010: 158 n75.

such catalogues,⁷ and Aigosthena provides a relatively abundant *corpus* that is generally overlooked with another nine catalogues, though a few are heavily fragmentary.⁸

These ephobic lists tend to be placed in one of two groups: first, those which follow the typical Boiotian formulary for ephobic catalogues and refer to Boiotian federal magistrates and institutions, and second, those which do not follow these conventions – generally assumed to be from the Achaian period following Megara’s departure from the Boiotian *koinon*. *IG VII.27* and *28* provide fitting exempla of these Boiotian-style military catalogues, and are dated by Étienne and Knoepfler to successive years – 221/220 BCE and 220/219, respectively.⁹ The former begins with the formula at lines 1–3 ‘ἄρχοντος Κλειμάχου, / ἐν δὲ Ὀγχηστῶι Ποτιδαίχου / ἐπολεμάρχουν’ and then lists the five *polemarkhoi* for the year before the lines ‘τοῖδε ἀπῆλθον ἐξ ἐφήβων / εἰς τὰ τάγματα (l.9–10) which introduce a list of 16 names followed by patronymics. The latter inscription, *IG VII.28* dated to the following year by Robu¹⁰ based on the chronology of Étienne and Knoepfler, follows the exact same structure but names different archons and *polemarkhoi*. Lines 1–3 read ‘ἄρχοντος Ὀμόφρ[ο]νος, / ἐν δὲ Ὀγχηστῶι Ἀριστοκλέος, / πολεμαρχούντων’ and then introduce the five *polemarkhoi* for the year, none of whom appear in the previous inscription. The same formula recurs at lines 9–10 with ‘τοῖδε ἀπῆλθον ἐξ ἐφήβων / εἰς τὰ τάγματα’, though in this case the catalogue provides 23 personal names and patronymics.

7 The five catalogues from Megara proper are: *IG VII.27*, *28*, *29*, *30*, *31*.

8 The nine catalogues from Aigosthena are:

IG VII.208 (223–201 BCE)

IG VII.209 (223–201 BCE)

IG VII.210 (223–146 BCE)

IG VII.211 (223–146 BCE)

IG VII.2.212–214? (two fragmentary lists)

IG VII.215 (217–198 BCE)

IG VII.216 (216–196 BCE)

IG VII.217 (215–194 BCE)

IG VII.218 (214–193 BCE)

9 Étienne and Knoepfler 1976: 302, 350. The dating of Étienne and Knoepfler 1976 is likewise recorded and adhered to by Robu 2014b: 103–106.

10 Robu 2014b: 107–109.

γραμματέυς τοῦ δάμου.¹⁵ Nonetheless, Smith notes that various types of *grammateis* are attested before and after the Boiotian period,¹⁶ thus the possibility exists that this inscription could pre-date the region's membership in the Boiotian League, although the ambiguity surrounding the date at which the office of *gymnasiarch* was first adopted by the city renders it a mysterious document.¹⁷ The next catalogue, IG VII.30, is too fragmentary to be dated with any certainty, as the dating formulae have been lost and it only contains a list of names.

The final inscription in our ephebic *corpus*, IG VII.31, is a somewhat shorter catalogue dated according to the 'γραμματέος τῶν συνέδρων' and the *gymnasiarch* 'ἐν Ὀλυμπείῳ'. The institutional heritage of this *grammateus* has inspired a fair bit of scholarly debate, though I am convinced by Smith's argument that this official's title is from the Boiotian period, though not after the Battle of Pydna in 167 as has elsewhere been supposed.¹⁸ This group of five ephebic catalogues from Megara itself along with the nine Boiotian-style catalogues from Aigosthena thus comprises the entirety of our epigraphic evidence for the region's *ephēbeia*. While the inscriptions are helpful in tracking the local institutional impact of the region's membership in the Boiotian and Achaian Leagues, unfortunately the evidence provides no insight into the structure or character of the ephebic program itself. We are provided only with lists of those either entering or completing the training programme, and essentially the observation to be gleaned from these is that the *ephēbeia* must have been a fairly common and widespread training regimen for the young citizens of the Megarid. The inclusion of between 16 and 28 individuals in these lists represents a fairly significant portion of the city's young citizen body, and allows us to perhaps surmise

15 Robu 2014b: 108 for the publication history of this decree and the others of the Achaian corpus first identified by Feyel. See also Robu 2014b: 108 note 47 for his further discussion of this. Smith 2008: 110-111 provides a full overview of the attestations of different types of *grammateis* in Megara.

16 Smith 2008: 111.

17 See Smith 2008: 111-112 for the full history of the office of *gymnasiarch* in Megara and environs.

18 Smith argues (2008: 111) that the presence of a *grammateus* but the absence of any magistracies specific to Megara itself must have meant that Megara simply re-named its local magistracies in accordance with Boiotian federal conventions. The *synedrion*, he notes, is simply another Boiotian term for *boula*, and thus during the period of Boiotian federal membership the *grammateus boulas kai damou* was re-named as the *grammateus* of the *synedrion*. See also Robu's discussion (2014b: 108 note 53) of the notion advanced by Knoepfler and Robu (2010: 769) which dates the institution of the *synedrion* in Megara to after Pydna.

that most young citizen men would have taken part in it.¹⁹ For more precise insights into the organization and structure of the Megarian *ephēbeia* in the third century, we must look to the detailed information which survives on the *ephēbeia* at the nearby Boiotian city of Thespiiai, which in turn allows us to reconstruct its Megarian equivalent.

The Boiotian Context

At some point between roughly 250 and 237 the Boiotian League completely re-organised its military structure after its humiliation at the hands of the Aitolians.²⁰ Although the precise date of the military reform has been a topic of heated debate, the general outcome of the overhaul is clear: a smaller, more responsive, and better trained army was now the League's ideal, and in order to produce such soldiers the League also re-organised its ephebic program with an eye to flexibility and adaptability on the battlefield. The League now mandated the creation of a standing military force composed of infantry and cavalry, while other forces were held in reserve and mobilised at times of need.²¹ Training and maintaining such an army required a massive investment of time and effort, and it comes as little surprise that our evidence for the Boiotian *ephēbeia* blossoms in the decades following these reforms. In order for the federal army to be a cohesive and effective military force, all of its member states had to be training their young men by similar means and according to consistent standards, thus uniformity becomes key to Boiotian military strategy.

Over forty military catalogues have been unearthed in Boiotia which date to after 245 and thus must be related to these mid-century military reforms. Nearly every city in the region provides at least one example: Akraiphia, Chaironea, Thisbe, Kopai, Hyettos, Anthedon,

19 For the demographic ramifications of this number of ephebes, see the discussion of Smith 2008: 105-110 and his review of previous estimations of the overall size of the city's hoplite corps in the third century.

20 Post 2012: 84-85; Pol. 20.4.4-6; Plut. *Arat.* 16.1.

21 Feyerl 1942 provides several contradictory dates for the reform, namely between 250 and 250 at one point (Feyerl 1942: 197) but then later between 245 and 237 (302). On paleographic grounds, Roesch (1988: 309 and 341) dates the reform to some point after 245 but provides no further specification. Chankowski 2010 argues that perhaps some of the ephebic inscriptions pre-date the reform (2011: 163-164). Post 2012 provides an insightful overview of the many aspects of these reforms.

Thebes, Orchomenos, and especially Thespiiai produce military catalogues that align with the Boiotian epigraphic standards that we have seen manifest themselves in Megara.²² This ephebic program was spread across all of Boiotia, and is attested in both coastal and inland communities of greatly varied size.²³ All of this taken together has led Chankowski to conclude that this ephebic regime, ‘s’agit d’un système universellement adopté dans ce koinon’.²⁴ The practical military emphasis of the program is striking, particularly when we bear in mind that by this point in the third century the *ephēbeia* in Athens had become a primarily civic and social institution of increasingly less popularity.²⁵ The sheer number of young men enrolled in the Boiotian *ephēbeia* is similarly impressive: while in 246/245 Athens only had 20 ephebes, even a small community like Thespiiai had between 86 and 92 ephebes at roughly the same time.²⁶ That Megara enrolled up to 28 men in just one year (as in *IG VII.28*) is revelatory and proves that new additions to the koinon were no exception to the trend.

In considering the Boiotian federal *ephēbeia* we are thus dealing with a pervasive system overseen by the koinon which was uniformly implemented in all of its constituent communities according to a fairly specific structure. A famous inscription unearthed in Thespiiai in 1967 and first published by Paul Roesch in 1974 allows us to recreate the specifics of the system.²⁷ Given its bearing on our reconstruction of the Megarian *ephēbeia*, the inscription merits quotation in full, following Emily Mackil’s text and translation:

Φαείνω ἄρχοντος, ἔδοξε τοι δάμοι
 πρόξενον εἶμεν τας πόλιος Θεισ-
 πιείων Σώστρατον Βατράχω Ἀθανα-
 4 ον κῆ αὐτὸν κῆ ἐκγόνως κῆ εἶμεν αὐ-
 [τ]οῖς γας κῆ φοικίας ἔππασιν κῆ φι-
 [σο]τέλειαν κῆ ἀσφάλιαν κῆ ἀσουλί-

22 Roesch 1982: 342-345 for the full catalogue of inscriptions, as well as the Thespiian examples included in *IThesp.* 88-135.

23 See also a broader discussion of the history of the Boiotian *ephēbeia* in McAuley 2015: 302-320.

24 Chankowski 2010: 161.

25 Roesch 1982: 316-319; Chankowski 2010: 114-142.

26 Roesch 1982: 316-319.

27 Roesch 1982: 307-354; *SEG* 32.496; *IThesp.* 29, most recently published as Mackil 2013: Dossier no. 27.

[αν] κῆ πολέμῳ κῆ ἱράνας ἰώσας κῆ κα-
8 τὰ γαν κῆ κατὰ θάλατταν κῆ τάλλα
πάντα καθάπερ κῆ τοῖς ἄλλοις προ-
ξένοις· Ἐπειδεῖ νόμος ἐστὶ ἐν τοῖ κοι-
νοι Βοιωτῶν τὰς πόλεις παρεχόμεν
12 διδασκάλως οἵτινες διδάξονθι
τῶς τε παιδᾶς κῆ τῶς νιανίσκως
τοξευόμεν κῆ ἀκοντιδδέμεν
κῆ τὰ δδεσθη συντάξις τὰς περὶ
16 τὸν πόλεμον, κῆ Σώστροτος φιλο-
τίμως ἐπιμεμέλειτῃ τῶν τε παίδων
κῆ τῶν νεανίσκων, ὑπαρχόμεν Σωσ-
στράτοι τὸ φέργον πᾶρ τὰς πόλιος ἄως
20 κα βείλειτῃ, ἐπιμελομένοι τῶν τε παί-
δων κῆ τῶν νεανίσκων κῆ διδάσκον-
τι καθὰ ὁ νόμος κέλετῃ· μισθὸν δ' εἰ-
μεν αὐτοῖ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ πέτταρας
24 μνας.

Translation:

When Phaeinos was archon, resolved by the people that Sostratos son of Batrachos

the Athenian should be *proxenos* of the polis of Thespiiai, he and his descendants,

and they should have the right to acquire land and houses, along with *i[so]teleia*,

asphaleia, and *asylia* in war and peace, by land and by sea, and all the other rights and

privileges belonging to the other *proxenoi*. Because there is a law of the *koinon* of the

Boiotians that the poleis must provide trainers who will teach the boys and the youths to shoot bows, to hurl javelins and to draw up ranks in battle array for wartime

situations, and because Sostratos zealously took charge of the boys and youths,
it was resolved by the polis for Sostratos to undertake the task, having charge of
the
boys and youths and teaching them as the law requires. Let him be paid
annually
four mnas.

Unsurprisingly, this rich inscription has inspired a great deal of comment and debate ranging from Roesch's initial publication in 1974 and his expanded consideration in 1982 to the more recent analyses of both Chankowski and Post.²⁸ Specifics of the decree, such as the relative value of Sostratos' salary and the question of which age groups are referred to by *neaniskoi* and *paides* have been thoroughly discussed elsewhere and need not detain us here.²⁹ The legal framework of the decree is clear: there is a law in the koinon of the Boiotians (lines 10–12) stating that each city in the federation must provide teachers for the young boys, specifically in the skills of archery and javelin-throwing, as well as maneuvering in formation (lines 12–16). These skills are noteworthy in and of themselves: alongside traditional training in hoplite warfare (lines 15–16), we also find the somewhat unconventional talents of archery and javelin-throwing (τοξευόμεν κῆ ἀκοντιδδέμεν) which Post notes are more reminiscent of a Homeric aristocratic warrior *ethos* than the

28 Roesch 1982: 322–346; Chankowski 2010: 160–164; Post 2012: 98–102.

29 See preceding references, particularly Roesch's (1982: 322–346) detailed summation of the question and the divergent possible responses. Roesch ultimately concludes that the *neaniskoi* must be men of the city aged 20–22 who would have recently completed their ephebic training, though Chankowski (2010: 162–164) counters by noting that this would be the only attestation in epigraphic or literary sources of *neaniskoi* being older the ephebes. Chankowski advances several alternative accounts, including his observation that elsewhere a *neaniskos* is a young man who is near the age of majority but not yet an *ephēbos*, providing a middle ground between a *pais* and an ephebe. His mention that in the Athenian context *neaniskos* is synonymous with ephebe is interesting, though in my opinion this is not applicable to the Thespian case because the inscription clearly refers to the ephebes as being in a distinct and different group, and elsewhere the Thespian tendency is to simply call them the ephebes explicitly, as in *IG VII.1755*; 1750; 1748; 1749; or before 245 they were called simply *oi neoteroi* in *SEG 3.333*, *IG VII.1747*. Further supporting Chankowski's idea that the *neaniskoi* are the group in between the *paides* and the ephebes themselves is the observation that it makes more sense to have one teacher in charge of students between the ages of 12 and 14, and 15 and 17, but it would be illogical for him to have charge of two groups aged 12–14 and 20–22.

traditional skills of a Classical hoplite.³⁰ At any rate, in the combination of all three combat talents we see the reflection of the koinon's new emphasis on the adaptability of its troops on the battlefield, and thus the by-product of the mid-century military reforms. Any one of these skills would have been difficult enough to master; perfecting all three would have taken years of effort. In the end, though, this training program at Thespiai would have produced young men who were highly flexible and responsive fighters, as would other cities throughout the League.

Perhaps the most fascinating aspect of this inscription is that by law throughout the Boiotian koinon these martial skills are supposed to be taught to young men *before* they enter the *ephēbeia* proper from ages 18–20. Sostratos himself, the *didaskalos* who is honoured by this decree, is recognised for his diligence in teaching two groups of young men – the *paides* and the *neaniskoi* – neither of which are the ephebes themselves. The ages referred to by such terms, between 12 and 14 for the *paides* and 15 to 17 for the *neaniskoi*, mean that the Boiotian program of military formation and training began when the boys were twelve and lasted until they completed the *ephēbeia* at age 20 – thus making for an eight-year period of military training. In addition, passing references to philosophers teaching in Boiotian gymnasia during roughly the same period of the League's history lead us to surmise that this program of education was not exclusively military, but also had civic and philosophical components as well.³¹

Between the decree's specific mention of a federal law requiring this throughout the koinon, and the abundance of similar material from all over Boiotia, there does not seem to be any reason to think that Thespiai was an exception to these federal mandates, and neither is there any reason to think that this ephebic program would not have been implemented in Megara as well. Based on the parallel data from elsewhere in the Boiotian League, then, we gain a remarkably clear picture of what civic life would have been like for the Megarid's young aspiring citizens during the period stretching from roughly 224 and 193 in the case of Megara itself, and from 224–146 in Aigosthena. Over the course of

³⁰ Post 2012: 101–102.

³¹ An inscription from Haliartos, *IG VII.2849*, mentions the ephebes of the city being active in the *gymnasion* and attending lectures that were given by a travelling philosopher, a component of the *ephēbeia* which is also discussed by Chankowski 2010: 160–161.

six years stretching from ages 12 to 18, these young men would have been shaped into citizens whose military education can safely be described as downright Homeric in its variety, and whose philosophical formation would have prepared them for the more abstract aspects of civic life. All of this was merely preface to the ephebic program proper which began at age 18 and then continued until their enrolment in the hoplite corps at age 20, when they at last made the transition *eis ta tagmata* and thus to full citizenship. Unfortunately, our parallel Boiotian evidence does not permit extensive insight into the duties or responsibilities of the ephebes themselves, though based on the general military strategy of the League we can perhaps surmise that they were engaged in patrols of the countryside in order to safeguard the League's territorial integrity.³²

Beyond Boiotia: The Longer History of the Megarian Ephēbeia

For this relatively narrow span of time in which the communities of the Megarid were part of the Boiotian League we are quite well-informed on the intricacies of its ephebic training programmes, but based on other observations about our data I argue that the analytical envelope can be pushed somewhat further, and a broader re-construction of the region's citizen training programmes before its adherence to the League is possible. I will address three observations before proposing a few moments in the region's history at which what would later be known as the Megarian *ephēbeia* might have begun to emerge.

First, there is a chronological problem with attributing the Megarian *ephēbeia* entirely to the region's membership in the Boiotian League. By all accounts our literary testimony attests that in 224/3 Megara along with an independent Aigosthena left the Achaian League and joined the Boiotian League, as has been discussed by other contributions to this volume.³³ The first 'Boiotian' ephebic catalogue discussed above (*IG VII.27*) with its reference to the archonship of Potidaichos has been dated to 221/220 according to the

³² A strategy described by Beck and Ganter 2015, and Post 2012: 90–96.

³³ These various shifts in power and allegiance are discussed by Smith 2008: 105–108. See also Plut. *Arat.* 24, Pol. 2.37.10 Strabo 8.7.3, and the condition of the independence of Aigosthena and Pagai at Plut. *Arat.* 24, Pol.2.37.10.

chronology of Étienne and Knoepfler.³⁴ The subsequent inscription with its reference to the archon Andronikos can also be dated to the following year, thus 220/219. Both inscriptions, as mentioned earlier, contain lists of young men who are *leaving* the *ephēbeia* and entering the hoplite ranks.

If indeed the Megarian *ephēbeia* is simply a Boiotian import that was instituted here in the name of federal consistency, then this span of two or three years is a remarkably quick period in which to produce a first graduating class of Megarian ephebes, to the point of being implausible. According to the federal norms mentioned above, the *ephēbeia* proper was at least two years long, and thus Megara would have had to enter the league, ratify its membership, organise trainers and facilities for its men of age for the *ephēbeia*, and then train them to federal standards over two years in this small chronological window. This scenario is particularly implausible when we bear in mind that the ‘full’ Boiotian federal training program as outlined by the Sostratos Decree lasted eight years, and only the last step of this was the *ephēbeia* itself. In short, it does not seem that there is enough time for the adoption and institution of this program from nothing. Even if the chronology of Étienne and Knoepfler is off by a few years, the general point remains.

These two ‘Boiotian’ style catalogues along with their cousins from Aigosthena, all of which feature high numbers of ephebes being attested in the first years of the region’s membership in the koinon, either indicate or at the very least suggest that there must have been a Megarian *ephēbeia* in place before it joined the Boiotian League. The presence of these catalogues and their formulary, then, are just a means of bringing an already-extant ephebic program into line with Boiotian customs of organisation and record-keeping. The Megarian *ephēbeia* persisted, as it were, just with different window dressing.

Second, I do not believe that the Megarian *ephēbeia* can be attributed purely to the region’s membership in the Achaian League either. While the Boiotian federal *ephēbeia* is extremely well-attested with a high degree of consistency among its member states during the third century, an equivalent Achaian federal system is not indicated by the available evidence, neither in the third century nor later. Drawing on Nigel Kennell’s invaluable register of

³⁴ Étienne and Knoepfler 1976: 303 and 337–342 for the dating of this decree to 221 or 220, and the decree mentioning Andronikos to 220 or 219. The broader federal context to all of this is discussed by Robu 2014b: 107–109.

Greek cities with ephebic programmes (2006) along with the database he continues to maintain, there are only a handful of such attestations from cities within the Achaian League whose disparity in terminology and date leads me to conclude that there was no Achaian federal *ephēbeia*. Among its member states, only Tegea and Mycenae have explicit attestations of *ephēboi* and these occur at disparate dates in the second century.³⁵ Pausanias' mention (2.10.7) that Sikyon has a gymnasium for the city's ephebes would suggest an ephebic program there, but any further details of date or structure are unknown. Finally, an inscription from Aigina containing the will of a peripatetic philosopher (DL 5.71) notes that certain revenues of his estate were to be given to the city's *neaniskoi*. The inscription is dated roughly to the second century BCE, though it is unclear whether the *neaniskoi* referred to here are simply young men being educated, or a more specific group of pre-ephebic adolescents as we have seen at Thespiai. Given these scant and idiosyncratic attestations of a later date, it seems safe to conclude that the Achaian League did not have a federal ephebic program instituted consistently among its member states, and thus the Megarian *ephēbeia* cannot simply be an imitation of an Achaian precedent.

Third, thanks to Philip Smith's detailed analysis of Megara's civic bodies and magistracies,³⁶ it becomes clear that these somewhat superficial changes to the city's ephebic program as attested in the epigraphic catalogue fit neatly into an already-established pattern of institutional adaptation. Whenever Megara changed its allegiance to either the Achaian or the Boiotian League, he notes, the city also changed the appearance – though not the substance or duties – of its civic magistracies. *Stratagoi* are renamed *polemarkhoi*, *grammateis boulas kai tou dēmou* are renamed *grammateus tōn synedrion*, *basileus* becomes *archōn*, the body of the *boula* is called the *synedrion*, and so on.³⁷ Again, the functions of these bodies and offices do not substantially change, only their titles and the formulae with which they are recorded. In the same vein, by Smith's estimate Megaris changed allegiance roughly

35 See the relevant entries in Kennell 2006, which is organised alphabetically. For Tegea: *IG* V.2 43 and 44 contain a list of ephebes dated according to a *grammateus* and a *gymnasiarch* from late in the second century BCE, c.125-100. The opening lines of *IG* V.2 44 are heavily fragmentary, and the rest of the inscription provides personal names and patronymics. For Mycenae: *IG* IV 497 contains honours for a certain Protimus who is praised for having saved the city's *ephēboi* from Nabis of Sparta, typically dated to 197-195 BCE. Note that the vastly different format of the inscriptions further leads me to conclude that there was no standardised ephebic program in the Achaian League.

36 Smith 2008: 108-114.

37 See Smith 2008's detailed discussion of each individual magistracy at 110-114.

ten times during the period stretching from 336 to 192.³⁸ This is, it seems, too short of a time span to have seen so many profound reconfigurations of the city's civic structures and traditions, and so instead these changes ought to be considered as fundamentally superficial. Underneath these cosmetic changes to the city's constitution, there is a strong current of continuity in the civic practices of Megara, and it does not seem that the *ephēbeia* should be an exception to this.

If the origins of the Megarian *ephēbeia* cannot be traced to either the Boiotian or Achaian Leagues, then we should turn our attention to the Megarians themselves. While the temptation, here as elsewhere, is to point to a specific moment or crisis in a community's history and surmise that this brought about the rapid creation of an ephebic programme, these types of training regimes and the civic ideology which supports them do not emerge instantaneously. In reconstructing the longer history of this specific *ephēbeia*, it is necessary to bear in mind Lynn Kozak's comments regarding the development of the institution: discussing the third century spread of epigraphically-attested programme, she notes that 'these institutions did not appear *ex nihilo*, but emerged from traditional, community-based forms of civic and military education.'³⁹ By means of conclusion, then, I shall consider certain moments in Megara's local history that may mark the gradual development of the sense of civic participation and military training that later crystallised in the third-century *ephēbeia* that we have encountered above.

Conclusions

Re-constructing the Megarian *ephēbeia* by inference from parallel programmes in Boiotia or elsewhere is only helpful for as long as the region was part of this federation, and in order to identify the unique aspects of its history in this particular region we must turn our attention back to the local level. Besides being another manifestation of the Boiotian *ephēbeia* from 224-193, what else can be said of the local idiosyncrasy of the Megarian regimen?

³⁸ Smith 2008: 105-108.

³⁹ Kozak 2013: 306.

The city's geography may contain the first hints. The cult of Zeus Olympios (or Olympieios) is one of the principal civic cults of Hellenistic Megara, with its sanctuary at the north-west foot of the Karian acropolis.⁴⁰ Epigraphic evidence attests to the presence of the cult and activity at the sanctuary during the fourth and third centuries, and Smith has surmised based on Pausanias that the cult had been popular since the Archaic Period.⁴¹ The sanctuary similarly appears in our ephebic epigraphic catalogue: *IG VII.31* mentions quite specifically a man named Matroxenos, 'gymnasiarch at Olympieios,' at line 2 of the inscription, presumably in order to distinguish him from the other *gymnasiarch* in Megara identified by *IG VII.29* (lines 3-4).⁴² According to the hypothesis of Peter Liddel,⁴³ the blocks on which these ephebic lists were carved formed part of the wall of which the sanctuary was constructed. If this is the case, there is then a clear connection between the city's ephebic program (as well as the ephebes themselves) and the civic cult of Zeus Olympieios, and thus the institution is part of the city's religious traditions as well as its civic and military. Perhaps we can surmise that the Megarian ephebes have the same obligation to honour their ancestral and civic gods as we find in the ephebic oath from Acharnai, for instance, and that there was a religious component to the training programme.⁴⁴ This would certainly be in line with the predominantly religious character of early Greek rituals of initiation and coming-of-age described by Pierre Vidal-Naquet, which we may well consider as the precursors to the formalised institution of the *ephēbeia*.⁴⁵

Regardless, with two gymnasiarchs, each presumably presiding over his own gymnasium, we gain some sense of the scale of the Megarian *ephēbeia* and its religious associations. Also noteworthy is the fact that Megara's other *gymnasion* was located by the gate of the nymphs at the edge of the city, and contained the sanctuary of Apollo Karinos. Again, it is

40 Zeus was a particularly prominent deity in Megara, and is attested with four epithets or aspects. For a full discussion, see Smith 2000: 252-254.

41 Smith 2000: 253-254.

42 Megara, then, according to Smith (2008: 112), must have had more than one gymnasiarch, a pattern which is also attested in cities like Tanagra and Thespiai.

43 Liddel 2009: 430; Robu 2014b: 107.

44 *REO* 88, also discussed by Kozak 2013: 302-310.

45 Vidal-Naquet (1991: 152) sums it up: 'L'éphébie trouve ses racines dans des pratiques anciennes d'apprentissage par les jeunes gens de leur futur rôle de citoyens et de père de famille; bref, de membres de la communauté.'

fitting that this other *gymnasion* for ephebic training would be located near another prominent civic deity, and again we see a connection between the Megarian *ephēbeia* and its particular religious traditions. To add a further level of nuance, at Megara (as many other places) Apollo is often twinned with Artemis and the pair of twins are honoured as the hunter gods – and so perhaps this is an element of the experience of liminality to integral to Greek coming-of-age rituals described by Vidal-Naquet (1991).

And what of Athens? Can the Megarian *ephēbeia* be viewed as simply an imitation of its famous Attic neighbour, as seems to be the case in some cities of Euboeia and elsewhere in the Mainland?⁴⁶ Perhaps, though there is no evidence for this. The presence of the Athenian ephebes at Salamis' annual religious festival of the Aianteia in 213/212 provides a vector of contact, but little else.⁴⁷ There is no concrete attestation that would lead us to think that the Megarians were simply copying the Athenian model in their own ephebic practices.⁴⁸ In this, as elsewhere, I do not see the need to presume that a region of such antiquity and archaic renown would feel the need to imitate the institutions of their neighbours in all things. It is easy to forget what a center of gravity Megara was in its own right in the Archaic Period, and the tendency towards athenocentrism in its constitutional history should be resisted, particularly when we bear in mind that the region's geographical situation exposed it to just as many Peloponnesian influences as Attic.

It is precisely to this southerly direction that we may turn for some hints as to the institutional pedigree of the Megarian *ephēbeia*, or at least the origins of the city's methods of civic and military education that would later be organised into the Hellenistic program as described above. A clue to this all may lie in the prevalence of the number five in Megara's civic structure and magistracies: as Philip Smith has noted, the city had five

46 Chankowski 2010: 164-165 for the Athenian origins of the Boiotian *ephēbeia*. The *ephēbeia* at Eretria in Euboeia, Chankowski concludes, is an imitation of its Athenian cousin as discussed at Chankowski 1993: 18-19 and 2010: 144-158. Considering the athenocentrism of the history of the *ephēbeia* more generally, it is noteworthy that Chankowski's 2010 monograph on the institution begins with an extremely detailed examination of the Athenian program followed by his treatments of its attestations elsewhere. For this, as with many other institutions of Greek government, perhaps undue influence is accorded to Athens.

47 IG II³.1313, 1.21-22, discussed by Robu 2014a: 366-368.

48 We may also note that according to Vidal-Naquet (1991: 153) the Athenian *ephēbeia* is itself a formalised equivalent of the Spartan *krypteia*.

damiourgoi (IG VII.41), five *aisymnatai* (IG VII.15), and five *stratagoi* or *polemarkhoi*, which altogether make fifteen executive magistrates, the same number attested in Byzantion's *pentekaideka*. According to Plutarch (*Mor.* 295b, also Thuc. 4.70.1), the region originally counted five *kōmai*, and there is a third century attestation of a mysterious subdivision, the *hekatostyes* in Megara itself, though previous attestations of the unit in Megarian colonies hints that they had existed for much longer.⁴⁹ The organisation of the civic body into the three traditional Dorian *phylai* is attested in Classical Megara,⁵⁰ and this along with the prevalence of five in the city's constitution has led Roussel and other to conclude that Megara was heavily influence by Argos (and perhaps Sparta as well) in the development of its civic structure.⁵¹ Perhaps, then, the Megarian *hekatostyes* are analogous to the Argive *pentekostyes*.⁵²

The structure of the civic body that emerges, following Smith, is this: each *komē* of Megara's territory provided one member to each of the major colleges of magistrates – *damiourgoi*, *asymnatai*, *statagoi* – and each *komē* may also have been arranged militarily into a *hekatostyes*, a group of 100 men. The *stratagos* from each *komē* would have commanded the unity, and thus we have a standing force of 500 hoplites which would in theory be maintained at all times.⁵³ If this institutional reconstruction is correct, then perhaps the precursor to the Megarian *ephēbeia* was the system designed to train and educate these men on the level of the *komē* for their subsequent service in the city's hoplite corps. In this we would see a similar proto-ephebic dynamic of combined military and civic training on the local level that has been discussed by Lynn Kozak (2013). This training system would then have been formalised over time at the level of the city rather than the individual *komē*, and its mechanisms of record-keeping brought into line with Boiotian standards when the city joined the League in the third century.

49 For the third century *hekatostyes*, see IG IV².1 42.18–21, and for other attestations of *komai* and the city's earlier subdivisions see Legon 2004: 463–464.

50 SEG 39.411, Legon 2004: 464.

51 Roussel 1976: 253, and Piérart 1983 on the relationship between the phratries and *kōmai* of Argos. See also the discussion of Robu 2014: 377–379 on this question of tribes and the prominence of five in Megara.

52 Pentekostyes at Argos: SEG 30.355, or a combination of the two SEG 33.288; Piérart 2000: 297–301.

53 Smith 2008: 114.

The idea of popular (or ‘common’) participation in the city’s military extends further back in Megarian history. According to Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 1357b), the tyrant Theagenes gained the favour of the people and was granted a bodyguard by the common assembly, much to the dismay of the city’s aristocrats.⁵⁴ This confidence of the people based on hostility to the rich, as Aristotle phrases it, may be a very indirect mytho-historical *testimonium* of an early type of civic participation in the military. Speculation, to be sure, but nonetheless I hope it is evident that there are several moments which reveal the motif of the citizen hoplite is a mainstay in Megarian history.

The ideology of civic participation in the life of Megara, and of the engagement of the community in its common affairs, is as old as the literary sources for the region’s history themselves. Theognis (27-30), the Megarian poet *par excellence*, wrote ‘it is as a benefit to you, Kyrnos, that I will give you the lessons which I learned from good men in my own youth. Be wise, and seek neither honour nor virtue nor substance on account of dishonourable or shameful deeds.’⁵⁵ In a sense, perhaps the lessons which Theognis learned from the good men of Archaic Megara were not so different from those imparted in the city’s gymnasia by the *didaskaloi* of the third and second centuries who were charged with forming the community’s next generation of citizen-warriors. The presentation and the appearance of this system of civic and military education may have changed dramatically over the centuries separating the poet from these teachers, but this particular vector of localism, as is the case with so many others in the history of this region, remained strikingly consistent amid the peaks and valleys of its fortunes.

Bibliography

Beck, H. and A. Ganter. 2015. “Boiotia and the Boiotian League.” In: H. Beck and P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: 132-157.

54 See the broader discussion of Smith 2008: 100-103, and Arist. *Pol.* 1305a 22-24.

55 σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ εὖ φρονέων ὑποθήσομαι, οἶά περ αὐτός
Κύρν', ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν παῖς ἔτ' ἐὼν ἔμαθον. πέπνυσο,
μηδ' αἰσχροῖσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασι μηδ' ἀδίκοισιν
τιμὰς μηδ' ἀρετὰς ἔλκεο μηδ' ἄφενος.

- Chankowski, A.S. 1993. "Dates et circonstances de l'institution de l'éphébie à Éréttrie." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, 19: 17-44.
2010. *L'éphébie hellénistique. Étude d'une institution civique dans les cités grecques des Îles de la Mer Égée et de l'Asie Mineure*. Paris.
- Étienne, R. and D. Knoepfler. 1976. *Hyetos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 avant J.-C.* Athens and Paris.
- Feyel, M. 1942. *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie au IIIe siècle avant notre ère*. Paris
- Hansen, M.H. and T.H. Nielsen. (eds.) 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis*. Oxford and New York.
- Kennell, N. 2006. *Ephebeia. A Register of Greek Cities with Citizen Training Systems in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Nikephoros Beihefte 12. Hildesheim.
- Knoepfler, D. and A. Robu. 2010. "Mégaride: Bulletin épigraphique." *Revue des Études grecques* 123: 754-770.
- Kozak, L. 2013. "Greek Government and Education. Re-examining the ephebeia." In: H. Beck (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*. Oxford: 302-316.
- Legon, R.P. 1981. *Megara. The Political History of a Greek City-State to 336 B.C.* Ithaca and London.
2004. "Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia." In: Hansen and Nielsen: 462-471.
- Liddel, P. 2009. "The Decree Culture of the Ancient Megarid." *Classical Quarterly* 59: 411-436.
- Mackil, E. 2013. *Creating a Common Polity. Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon*. Los Angeles and London.
- McAuley, A. 2015. *Basking in the Shadow of Kings*. Diss. McGill University.
- Piérart, M. 1983. "Phratries et 'kômai' d'Argos." *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 107: 269-275.
2000. "Argos: une autre démocratie." In: *Polis and Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History*. Copenhagen: 297-314.
2004. "Argolis." In: Hansen and Nielsen: 599-619.
- Post, R. 2012. *The Military Policy of the Hellenistic Boiotian League*. Diss. McGill University.
- Robu, A. 2014a. *Mégare et les établissements mégariens de Sicile, de la Propontide, et du Pont-Euxin*. Bern.
- 2014b. "Between Macedon, Achaëa, and Boeotia: The Epigraphy of Hellenistic Megara Revisited." In: N. Papazarkadas (ed.), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia. New Finds, New Prospects*. Leiden: 95-118.
- Roesch, P. 1965. *Thespies et la confédération béotienne*. Paris.
1982. *Études béotiennes*. Paris.
- Roussel, D. 1976. *Tribu et cité. Études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique*. Paris.
- Smith, P.J. 2000. *Megaris in Hellenistic and Roman Times. An Archaeological and Epigraphical Study*. Diss. McGill University.
2008. *The Archaeology and Epigraphy of Hellenistic and Roman Megaris, Greece*. Oxford
- Vidal-Naquet, P. 1991. *Le Chasseur Noir*. Paris.