

DARIA RUSSO

Dedications of the ephebes, their magistrates and liturgists up to the 4th century BCE: a topographical analysis¹

In the Lykourgan period, after being enrolled in demes at the age of eighteen, Athenian youths had to carry out a tribally organised training, the ephebate, which constituted a crucial step towards full participation in political life². As Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 42, 3-5) says, they started their service with an oath and a tour of sanctuaries; after that, they spent their first year in barracks at Peiraius and the second one in forts in the Attic countryside. They carried out their tasks under officials, such as the *kosmetes*, the *sophonistes*, the *paidotribes* and the *didaskalos*³, and took part in festivals, where they competed in torch race competitions. The Lykourgan organisation of the ephebate was probably the result of a reform, carried out in 335/4, while the existence of an institutionalised training before that

¹ This research stems from the work undertaken for the ELA database. The topic of dedications on the gymnasiarchs and the ephebes also formed a small part of my Ph.D. thesis on the archaeological evidence of civic divisions (now Russo 2022). I initially presented an early version of this paper during the conference “*Le vie come pagine scritte*” (Turin, May 28th 2019). I would like to express my gratitude to the entire team of the Epigraphic Landscape of Attica project, particularly C. Lasagni and D. Marchiandi, for their valuable suggestions on this text. I would also like to acknowledge the anonymous referees whose comments have greatly enhanced this paper. Any remaining errors that may be present are solely my responsibility. All dates in the text are BCE, unless stated otherwise, and those of the inscriptions are presented as in the given edition/bibliography.

² The bibliography on the ephebate in Attica is extensive. Among the most recent contributions, see Chankowski 2010, chapter 1, on the origin of the ephebate; Friend (2019) and Chankowski (2014) on the 4th century; Henderson (2020) on the period between Lykourgos and Augustus; de Lisle 2020 on the Roman period.

³ See Friend 2019, 12, 58-65.

date is a matter of debate⁴. However, it is quite likely that some torch races (i.e. tribal, relay ones) must have been instituted by the *polis* already at the beginning of the democracy (in the first half of the 5th century), and were the prerogative of young people on the threshold of adulthood⁵. In the last quarter of the century, there is evidence of individual sponsors of such tribal events: the gymnasiarchs⁶.

Details about ephebes, their magistrates and gymnasiarchs are, to a large extent, due to their dedications. It is known that the act of dedication shaped the relationship between a group or individual and one or more gods, but it was also a way for humans to express individual or collective pride through the display of personal or collective achievements⁷. Whenever it was performed by officials or sponsors of agonistic festivals, the dedication was a kind of civic duty⁸. In order to reach a divine audience as well as a human one, the topographical location of such objects certainly plays an important role⁹. Since S. Humphreys' article in *Horos* 2004-2009, in which ephebic dedications were grouped into macro-categories according to the reason for their dedication and then according to their original location, new evidence has been published and the subject has not been treated in detail again; as for the gymnasiarchic dedications, essentially related to the torch race, the same aspect is even more overlooked¹⁰. This paper, therefore, presents again those categories of inscriptions (1. dedications of the ephebes and their magistrates; further divided into two parts, according to the reason for which they were set up; 2. dedications of the gymnasiarchs) discussing them by findspot. The aim of the analysis is that of delineating the dedication practice with particular attention to their distribution in the Attic landscape (and within the specific sites), in order to understand the reasons behind the choice of setting places¹¹.

⁴ For the date of the reform, see Chankowski 2014, 18-19. Some scholars (e.g. Christ 2001, esp. 416-418, followed by Chankowski 2014, 19) believe that the birth of the ephebate (perhaps already as a two-year service, though not compulsory) occurred between 386 and the autumn of 372. Others suggest that the ephebate was older: for some references, see Friend 2019, 14 n. 23.

⁵ See e.g. Chankowski 2018, 60.

⁶ On the gymnasiarchy, in general, see Culasso Gastaldi 2009; Fauconnier 2022 (for the Hellenistic period in particular).

⁷ On dedications in general, see Liddel, Low 2022, 8-11.

⁸ Liddel 2007, 198-205.

⁹ See Liddel, Low 2022, 10.

¹⁰ After Humphreys 2004-2009, and as far as the 4th century is concerned, Friend 2019, 41-42 and Henderson 2020, 117-120, 157-159 mention the problem of ephebic document locations (see also the catalogues at the end of both books); a brief discussion of gymnasiarchic and ephebic inscriptions up to 308/7 appears in Russo 2022, 157-158, 160-164, with catalogue.

¹¹ Documents whose findspots are unknown or too vague to be reconstructed have not been included in the research, namely *IG II*³ 4, 334 (end-of-service dedication); *SEG XXXIX* 184 (a list

Dedications of the ephebes

1. Dedications of the ephebes and their magistrates

Dedications set up by ephebes were commonly steles or marble bases with cuttings or dowel holes for fixing an object. Ephebes of each tribe dedicated them on their own or together with their magistrates, especially the *sophronistai*¹². The first class to do so was that enrolled in 334/3: such information is quite significant in itself, as it allows to connect such praxis with the (possibly) newly reformed organization¹³. The inscriptions are all dated to the Lykourgan period, with one exception dating to 305/4. Not coincidentally, the ephebate was probably abolished at the end of 321, perhaps re-established in 318/7, while its fate under Demetrios of Phaleron (who also abolished liturgies) is uncertain¹⁴. After the restoration of democracy in 307, the ephebic service was also restored¹⁵. According to Humphreys, ephebes set up their dedications for two reasons: the end of the service and the victory in the torch race¹⁶. While the latter category cannot be doubted, the identification of all the other documents as end-of-service dedications is perhaps too rigid¹⁷. For this reason, I will discuss dedications for torch race separately, and I will start with the rest.

1.1. For the end of service and other activities

Athens

These ephebic dedications are attested in the *asty* on the Acropolis, in the Agora and near the Dipylon.

IG II² 1156, a stele (“an *anathema*”, ll. 43, 49, 62) dedicated by the ephebes

of ephebes, perhaps also part of an end-of-service dedication); two sculpted bases (whose ephebic nature is uncertain: *IG II³ 4, 333* and Paris, Musée Rodin, no. CO 229), *IG II³ 4, 543* (according to Köhler in *IG II² 3020* a gymnasiarchic inscription, included in the latest *IG* edition among the “*Dedications choregiae incerti generis*”).

¹² In our corpus, *IG II³ 4, 335, 336* (which, however, is a slightly different case, see *infra* 317 with n. 117), 337, 339, 344, 352, *IG II² 1156*, Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 9, *I. Eleusis* 84 one can read or restore the mention of the *sophronistes*, together with the ephebes.

¹³ Liddel 2007, 291-292.

¹⁴ See the discussion in Henderson 2020, 180-185.

¹⁵ See Henderson 2020, 188.

¹⁶ Humphreys 2004-2009, 83-84, 87-90.

¹⁷ The preservation condition of certain texts may not always enable us to determine their function. Nevertheless, some inscriptions contain specific details that suggest occasions of dedication which differed from the conclusion of service. See *infra* 303 and 306 for the cases of Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 9 (or *I.Rhamnous* 452) and *IG II³ 4, 339*.

of tribe Kekropis enrolled in 334/3, was found on the south-western part of the Acropolis¹⁸. As stated in the erection clause (l. 35), it was originally erected in the *hieron* of the eponymous hero of the tribe, which was adjacent to the Erechtheion. It is possible that *IG II³ 4, 329*, a stele with relief, was originally displayed on the Acropolis too, considering that it was found in the Pinacotheca in 1872, where artifacts from the rock were collected¹⁹. The name of the tribe is not preserved, but Antiochis, Erechtheis, or Kekropis would fit in the lacuna. The *helikia* is the one enrolled in 334/3, for which the end-of-service dedication of Kekropis is already known (*IG II² 1156*). According to Chankowski, *IG II³ 4, 329* cannot have been dedicated by the ephebes of Erechtheis, since the *sophronistes* does not match the one mentioned in *IG II³ 4, 336*, set up by the same ephebic class; therefore, *IG II³ 4, 329* must belong to Antiochis²⁰. We might even suggest that the dedication might have been addressed τῆι θεᾷ, rather than τῶι ἥρωι (l. 2); this would better match the goddess represented on the relief (Athena)²¹.

Other documents found in the Agora may have originally been on the Acropolis, such as SEG XXXVI 155, whose categorization as ephebic has been the subject of debate. J. S. Traill published it as a dedication of the ephebes of Kekropis (enrolment year: 332/1 or later on)²², and reconstructed it as a two-stepped base consisting of seven pieces found in the south-eastern part of the Agora, with a decree on the front of the upper stone and a list of names under deme headings on the right-hand sides of both stones²³. According to Humphreys, the fragments belonged to two different dedications: *a-f*, dedicated by the *epilektoi* of the same tribe, and *g*, not necessarily dedicated by them²⁴. Her reasons for disassociating the pieces are quite strong²⁵, and seem convincing to me (although they have not

¹⁸ Lolling 1889, 10-13 no. 3. It contains the catalogue of the ephebes enrolled in 334/3 and separate decrees by the tribe, the Council and the demes of Athmonon and Eleusis honouring them and the *sophronistes*. Based on *IG II² 1156*, Reinmuth (1961, 8 no. 1=SEG XIX 116) restored frg. Agora I 5012 as a tribal decree concerning ephebes (end of the 4th cent). Such decrees were often inscribed on ephebic dedications (as in *IG II² 1156*), but the text is too poorly preserved to be sure that this was the case.

¹⁹ The stone was first edited in Schöne 1872, 33 no. 60 pl. 12. For the use of the Pinacotheca as a storage place for antiquities, see Mallouchou-Tufano 2007, 46-47 fig. 1.

²⁰ Chankowski 2014, 73.

²¹ Russo 2022, 158 n. 31.

²² For the date see also Friend 2019, 234-239, T17.

²³ Traill 1986, 1-7.

²⁴ Humphreys 2010, 81 with n. 37.

²⁵ The two stones do not join, some gaps between the names are difficult to justify and some names are unlikely to belong to ephebes for prosopographical grounds. None of these problems is insurmountable, but together they weaken Traill's reconstruction: see Humphreys 2010, 78-80.

Dedications of the ephebes

convinced all scholars)²⁶. In any case, the provenance of its fragments from the Agora would be consistent with an original location in the *Kekropion* (as suggested by Humphreys for the two separate dedications which she hypothesises), even in the (less likely) possibility that it was indeed ephebic²⁷.

The document Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 9 is certainly an ephebic inscription, likely to have traveled a short distance. The ephebes of Leontis and the *sophronistes* must have dedicated it in the *hieron* of the eponymous hero (it is addressed [τῶι ἦ]ρωι, l. 1; to be set up [ἐν] τῶι ἱερῶι |[τοῦ ἦρω, ll. 32-33)²⁸. The latter was perhaps not far from the findspot of the document (west of the northern end of the Stoa of Attalos)²⁹. Since the same ephebic class (the one enrolled in 333/2) of the same tribe also set up a dedication in Rhamnous (*I.Rhamnous* 452), but the text mentions a different *kosmetes*, it is possible to postulate another occasion for the dedication of one of them (perhaps for the Agora one)³⁰. Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 12, a catalogue of ephebes of the tribe Oineis (enrolment year: ca. 330/29) reused in the post-Herulian wall (west of the Eleusinion, Agora Grid S19), was presumably also part of an end-of-service dedication³¹. The ephebes of this tribe (perhaps based in Acharnai) may have dedicated it in the *asty* (Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 12 may have originally been on the Acropolis or in the Agora)³²; those belonging to the tribe Antiochis may have done the same, when they placed *IG*

²⁶ See Friend 2019, pp. 234-239, T17 (with some hesitation), Henderson 2020, 301, T1.16.

²⁷ See Humphreys 2010, 81 n. 37. Traill 1986, 6 thinks that the *Kekropion* was too distant from the fragments' findspots (Agora Grid P14, Q15, R15), and suggests that the dedication was originally placed in the Eleusinion area. Note that *epilektoi* could place their decrees in tribal shrines: see e.g. Karouzos 1923, *passim* on *SEG* III 116 (of the elder *epilektoi*), honouring a taxiarch in the shrine of Antiochis. A list of people of all tribes (Agora I 6509) found east of the *Odeion* of Agrippa also suffered from the same uncertainties regarding its interpretation: it was tentatively identified by Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 16 as ephebic and possibly a little earlier than 307/6 (see also Henderson 2020, T2.2), while Friend 2019, 174 n. 11 considers it to be a mid-4th century dedication of *epilektoi* (Threatte 1980, 259 dates it to 357).

²⁸ The edition of Alipheri 2015 makes this clear by restoring: ll. 32-33 [ἐν] τῶι ἱε[ρ]ῶι |[τοῦ Λεῶ.

²⁹ The ephebes dedicated after being crowned by the Council, the People and their *phyle*. The headquarters of the Leontis tribe were likely situated to the north of the square, specifically in the deme of Skambonidai: see Berti forthcoming; Camp in Camp - Martens 2020, 633-649; Russo 2022, 65-67.

³⁰ Petrakos (2004, esp. 174-176) suggested that the Agora base celebrated the end of the first year, after which the *kosmetes* may have died and been replaced by a member of the same deme.

³¹ Humphreys 2004-2009, 88.

³² Kellogg 2013, 172-174 for the tribal seat in Acharnai. Humphreys (2004-2009, 88) lists the dedication among those probably placed in the tribal sanctuary.

IG II³ 4, 329 on the Acropolis, although their shrine was not too peripheral³³. Another document, IG II³ 4, 352 (4th-3rd century, or according to Lambert, 335-322), was discovered nearby in a modern house wall, southeast of the Agora³⁴. This document is fragmentary and solely mentions the ephebes and the *sophronistes*. Geagan suggests that it could have been a dedication for the *lampas*³⁵, although the *sophronistes* can also be featured in other kinds of dedications³⁶. From the extant information, it is difficult to take a position: either way, there are many possible places of “original location” in the immediate vicinity (on the Acropolis, in the Agora and in their surroundings).

Another dedication by an anonymous tribe, IG II³ 4, 330 (dedicated by ephebes enrolled in 334/3 or 333/2), from a debris pile south of the propylon of the Pompeion, was published by Habicht as an ephebic inscription of Akamantis because it was found in a deme belonging to that tribe (which is not a safe ground for attribution)³⁷. Not all the scholars are certain of its ephebic nature³⁸, but it seems to me quite likely: if it is an ephebic text, the text resembles end-of-service dedications more than torch race ones³⁹.

Attica

Ephebic inscriptions have been found at Peiraius, Rhamnous, Eleusis, Panakton, and Oropos. Aristotle’s account is not sufficient to determine the number and the position (only in the countryside or also in the *asty*) of the sanctuaries and consequently the duration of the tour at the beginning of the ephebic office⁴⁰. Thus, it is not possible to determine which of the sanctuaries in some of these locations were visited during this occasion. Aristotle explicitly states that they spent their first year in Peiraius, and their second one in fortresses. Fortresses attended by them certainly included Rhamnous, Eleusis, and Panakton⁴¹, while the role of the *Amphiaraiion* of Oropos is more ambiguous, as we shall see.

³³ For the shrine see Billot 1992, 145-153; Russo 2022, 73-75.

³⁴ According to Lambert in AIO_ 1687, letters are compatible with a date to 335-322; IG II³ 4, 352 and Geagan (*Agora XVIII* C125) opt for wider date ranges.

³⁵ See *Agora XVIII* C125.

³⁶ See e.g. Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 9, or IG II³ 4, 339.

³⁷ Habicht 1961, 147-149 no. 3.

³⁸ Chankowski 2014, 69 n. 190 underlines the fact that the text is lacunose.

³⁹ For the interpretation as an end-of-service dedication, see also Friend 2019, 207, while Humphreys (2004, 115, n. 16) proposes the torch race.

⁴⁰ Henderson 2020, 140-141.

⁴¹ The inclusion of Panakton among the fortresses garrisoned by the ephebes is now certain: see Munn 2021, *passim*. Other fortresses, like Phyle (studied in detail by Wrede 1924; see also Ober 1985, 145-147), certainly hosted ephebes, although no dedications have been found.

Dedications of the ephebes

Just like in the ephebic service, I will start with the Peiraieus, where the most recent dedication in our corpus has been discovered. *IG II² 478* was indeed set up by all the ephebes together in 305/4, when there were twelve Athenian tribes⁴². If we accept Sundwall's restoration of the erection clause in l. 30 (στῆσαι ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ τῶν ἐφήβων), it was dedicated in an otherwise unattested gymnasium; nevertheless, the presence of a place for training in Peiraieus would not be surprising⁴³. Since *IG II² 478* is presumably an end-of-service dedication, its location in Peiraieus has generally been interpreted as evidence that the service had been reduced to one year (since the first year was spent there) or that the second year was not feasible because of the Macedonian occupation⁴⁴.

The other dedications are all Lykourgan. Those from Rhamnous are particularly numerous. In the fortress, the ephebes of Akamantis around 330 set up *IG II³ 4, 341* for the end of their service; the inscription was discovered in one of the small rooms northwest of the theatre and south of the citadel wall⁴⁵. The ephebes of the Leontis tribe also dedicated *I.Rhamnous 452* (enrolment year: 333/2, as in the already discussed Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 9) in the fortress; it was discovered in front of one of the rooms in the courtyard of the *synedrion*⁴⁶. *IG II³ 4, 347* is a fragment of a herm that dates back to the second half of the 4th century. It was erected by an anonymous tribe and was discovered 5 meters south of tower C, located at the south gate⁴⁷. Besides of ephebes, also officials might have dedicated in the fortress. *IG II³ 4, 338* is a dedication to Hermes by a man, crowned by the ephebes enrolled in 333/2, 332/1 and 331/0, their *kosmetai* and *sophronistai*⁴⁸. His role is highly debated: according to Petrakos, he might have been a

⁴² The inscription, first published by Köhler 1879, was found east of an old cistern, see Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 17.

⁴³ Sundwall 1907, 22-27; for a discussion of this restoration see Henderson 2020, 135. For Hellenistic dedications in *gymnasia* of the Greek world see also D'Amore 2009.

⁴⁴ For the reduction of the service see Reinmuth, *Eph.Inscr.* no. 17, Friend 2019, 179 and esp. Henderson 2020, 190, who takes into account the impact of the Macedonian occupation.

⁴⁵ For the findspot see McLeod 1959, 121.

⁴⁶ For its findspot see Petrakos 1996, 18. The *synedrion* was built in the 3rd century: see *I.Rhamnous* 10, l.11; Petrakos 1997, 619-620.

⁴⁷ This latter is certainly an ephebic dedication, possibly for the end of service, although it is difficult to be more specific: see Friend 2019, T28. According to Petrakos *I.Rhamnous* 458 (333-324) was also an end-of-service dedication, although the only preserved word is the demotic Θριάσαι. It was found in a building complex north of the eastern gate of the fortress, in a room close to a courtyard (see Petrakos 2000, 7-8, no. 5).

⁴⁸ The inscribed part of the base was found in the area of the semicircular room near the orchestra of the theatre (see Stais 1891b, coll. 14-15; Pouilloux 1954, 72; on the structures, see Petrakos 1999, 137-138). It is clear that the base was reused, as shown by another part (left there or ignored

*didaskalos*⁴⁹. Details about this office are still unclear, but some scholars suggest that the training may have been limited to the first year, when they were based at Peiraeus⁵⁰. The presence of the dedication in Rhamnous may be due to the demotic affiliation of the dedicator, but it is difficult to explain his preference for the fortress, where he may have never worked, over the main sanctuary.

Other dedications were, indeed, set up in the sanctuary of Nemesis. *IG II³ 4, 342* was dedicated by the ephebes of Pandionis around 330⁵¹, while *IG II³ 4, 339* was placed by the ephebes of the Aigeis tribe enrolled in 331/0, along with their *sophronistes*⁵². In ll. 3-4 of *IG II³ 4, 339*, there is a mention of a sacrifice, which was performed either by the *sophronistes* or the ephebes, for the ὑγίεια and the σωτηρία. This detail may suggest that the dedication took place on a different occasion, possibly during a local festival⁵³. Three other documents, *I.Rhamnous 455* (333-324, ephebes of Leontis), *I.Rhamnous 456*, and *I.Rhamnous 457* (anonymous tribes, both 333-324), have recently been published by Petrakos, without any information on their findspot. However, their inventory numbers (respectively 208 N.Σ.; 452 N.Σ.; 515 N.Σ.) can provide some clues, as the letters “N.Σ.” stand for “Νεμέσιον, ἀπὸ τὰ χῶματα τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν Στάη”⁵⁴.

by Stais), found near the gate of the citadel (the walls surrounding the acropolis) and published by Petrakos (1984a, 208 fig. 22, 209 no. 140).

⁴⁹ Petrakos (*I.Rhamnous 100*) noticed that in another (highly fragmentary) inscription (now published as *I.Rhamnous 457*) some details concerning how their name features in the list can suggest that he had such a role. For a discussion of this document, see also Friend 2014, 100-101.

⁵⁰ Ober 1985, 90-91; see also Friend 2019, 77-78 on *didaskaloi*.

⁵¹ Between 1890-1892 Stais excavated the *hieron* of Nemesis, the small *hieron* of Amphiaraios, many funerary *periboloi* of the 4th century and buildings in the fort. Between 1897 and 1909 he excavated at Sounion: see Petrakos 1987, 63. Most of the documents coming from such excavations were inventoried in the Epigraphic Museum (inv. nos 4211 - 4226) without specifying their exact findspot: see Pouilloux (*Rhamnonte*, 108 n. 2). EM 4211 (frg. a of *IG II³ 4, 342*) was inventoried in the National Museum as coming from “*Sunii vel Rhamnunte*”. Petrakos discovered additional fragments (*b-d*) of the same inscription at Rhamnous, confirming its origin from that site (see Petrakos 1982, 161 no. 6, and *IG II³ 4, 342*, which specifies: «*in Nemeseo*»).

⁵² In the *IG II²* edition (*IG II² 1181*), this document is reported to come from Sounion for the reasons mentioned in the note above. With the addition of other fragments, found at Rhamnous (Petrakos 1984b, 336; *IG II³ 4, 339* is more specific: «*in Nemeseo*»), the provenience of the document became clear.

⁵³ See Friend 2019, 159-160, 233, who thinks that, if the subject is only the *sophronistes*, this means that his role also comprised religious responsibility on behalf of his *phyle*.

⁵⁴ Petrakos also publishes *I.Rhamnous 459* (whose inventory number, 440 N.Σ., would recall the same context of *I.Rhamnous 455, 456, 457*) which he tentatively assigns to the 4th century, without providing a commentary, but proposing as a possible restoration for l. 1 the name of a

Dedications of the ephebes

Unlike Rhamnous, where the fortress and sanctuary are separate, in Eleusis the walls encompassed both the sanctuary and a portion of the deme site. Two ephebic dedications come from there: *IG II³ 4, 337*, celebrating the end of service of the ephebes of Kekropis (enrolled in 333/2), found west of the Greater Propylaia⁵⁵, and *I. Eleusis 84* (ephebes enrolled in 334/3; precise findspot unknown), possibly pertaining to Hippothontis and dedicated to Demeter and Kore. Two other Eleusinian documents, *I. Eleusis 82* and *I. Eleusis 89* (respectively dated to possibly ca. 335 and 330-320, precise findspots unknown) have not been unanimously considered as ephebic dedications: they are respectively a roster of members of Oineis and a dedication of some board or institution of Hippothontis, in which the names of the two goddesses have been restored⁵⁶.

Only three documents have been discovered at Panakton⁵⁷. One of them, found in a debris pile just inside the gate of the fortress, was dedicated by the ephebes of Hippothontis (enrolled in 332/1) to the Dioskouroi (who were paradigmatic athletes and travellers and therefore ideal models for the ephebes)⁵⁸. The other two both belong to Leontis (enrolment years 334/3 or 332/1-325/4): one was found in the rubble filling the nave of a church, the other (only featuring a roster) was built into the threshold of a house⁵⁹.

Three ephebic documents are attested in the sanctuary of Amphiaraios of Oropos, which was long contested between Thebes and Athens (with some moments of independence). In the Lykourgan period, it was an Athenian possession. The inscriptions, *IG II³ 4, 344* (enrolment year: 331/0, 330/9 or 328/7), *IG II³ 4, 345* (334/3-324/3) and *I. Orop. 353* (332/1-326/5) were found east of the sanctuary, 3.50 metres south of the pronaos, and behind the base of the statue of Adeia

didaskalos attested by *IG II³ 4, 342, l. 8* (also mentioned in *I. Rhamnous 457, l. 19*). The inscription is the left part of a list, with scant remains of names and patronimics.

⁵⁵ See Friend 2019, 207 (T6); for the findspot see Travlos 1954.

⁵⁶ For the identification of these inscriptions as ephebic, see *I. Eleusis II 82* and 89. On *I. Eleusis 82*, see also Humphreys 2004-2009, 88. Friend 2019, 186, does not include either of them.

⁵⁷ Henderson 2020, 118.

⁵⁸ Munn 2021, 294-313 no. 2 (for the date, see Traill 2021, 78-79). In light of Traill's revised dating of the inscription, Munn's hypothesis (Munn 2021, 306-308, 312-313) proposing that the ephebes of the Hippothontis tribe enrolled in 334/3 erected two dedications in different locations (Panakton, no. 2 of his catalogue, and Eleusis, *I. Eleusis 84*) cannot be regarded as valid.

⁵⁹ Munn 2021, 313-319 no. 3; 319-324 no. 4; Munn also excludes the enrolment year of the ephebes of *I. Oropos 353*, which is nevertheless uncertain.

(and east of a statue of Agrippa) respectively⁶⁰. In *IG II³ 4, 344*, the name of the hero has been restored as recipient of the dedication. The presence of such documents could indicate that Oropos was included among the places where the ephebes were garrisoned⁶¹, that the ephebes only visited the sanctuary during the *Amphiaraia* and held an end-of-service ceremony there⁶², or that they even took part in competitions and set up their dedications there⁶³. *I. Orop. 353*, and *IG II³ 4, 344* seem to me likely to be indeed end-of-service dedications, while *IG II³ 4, 345* is very fragmentary (all that survives is: οἱ ἐφηβ---). In any case, the presence of so many ephebic dedications at Oropos militates against an exceptional occurrence.

1.2 For the torch race

Athens

From the epigraphic and literary dossiers (the latter mostly consisting of later sources), it seems that already in the 430s-420s three *lampades* held in the *asty* (those of the Great *Panathenaia*, the *Prometheia* and the *Hephaistia*) had similar characteristics: competitive character and participation on a tribal basis⁶⁴. Most probably, they all started from the altar of Prometheus (or of Eros) in the Academy⁶⁵. It is not clear whether the Acropolis (and more specifically, the great altar

⁶⁰ Their findspots are reported in *I.Oropos* edition: *IG II³ 4, 344* (= *I.Oropos* 352); *IG II³ 4, 345* (= *I.Oropos* 354); *I. Orop. 353*. For the dates see Friend 2019, 225-231, T15; 240, T18; 252, T27.

⁶¹ See Lambert's commentary to AIO_1679.

⁶² This hypothesis was suggested by Humphreys 2004-2009, 84-85 for *I. Oropos* 353: she believes the ephebes to have been stationed in Rhamnous. She only focuses on this document, albeit mentioning *I.Oropos* 352 (= *IG II³ 4, 344*) at p. 85 n. 7.

⁶³ See Friend 2019, 163. Their participation in competitions would be supported by the presence of *IG II³ 4, 346*, dedicated by an individual for his victory in the ephebic javelin throwing contest. Friend 2019, T26; 120 with n. 107, assumes that it was not dedicated by an ephebe (he thinks that the expression in l. 3 [νικήσας] ἐφήβους ἀκοντίζων means that he defeated the ephebes), while Henderson 2020, 160 takes the accusative as a kind of age category. Not all the scholars agree that the contest was held at Oropos: see Petrakos's commentary in *I.Oropos* 348; Wilding 2022, 97 with n. 153.

⁶⁴ These three *lampades* are often mentioned together in sources: see Capel Badino 2017; *passim*; Marchiandi 2003, 53 with n. 312. It is doubtful whether the competition was held during the Lesser *Panathenaia*: see Davies 1967, 37.

⁶⁵ Pausanias (I 30, 2) refers to the altar of Prometheus as the starting point of torch races (without specifying which ones, so perhaps meaning all those starting from the Academy), while Plutarch (*Sol.* 1, 4) and a *scholium* to Plato (*Herm.* in *Pl. Phdr.* 231e) say that the altar of Eros was the starting point for the *lampades* for Athena (as it is possible to understand from the context). See Marchiandi 2003, 60 with n. 377.

Dedications of the ephebes

of Athena) was the finishing point of the three races in Athens, as suggested by some scholars⁶⁶. Others assume that each one ended at the altar of the celebrated divinity or hero, in order to light the fire: the great altar on the Acropolis during the *Panathenaia*, presumably the altar of the *Hephaisteion* during the homonymous festival while, since the Academy is the only place where a cult of Prometheus is known, it is difficult to say where the *lampas* for the titan finished⁶⁷.

Considering the highly questionable nature of *IG II³ 4, 352*, the only certain ephebic dedication found in the *asty* is *IG II³ 4, 335*, set up by the ephebes of the tribe Aiantis to worship Mounichos, the eponymous of Mounichia (where some of the ephebes were stationed during the first year, according to [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 42, 3, while others were stationed in Akte) and perhaps also of the *helikia* of 333/2⁶⁸. It was found south of the Pompeion, in the same debris pile of *IG II³ 4, 330*. Humphreys suggested that the segment of the Panathenaic Way passing through the Kerameikos was a possible place of display for *IG II³ 4, 335*, which she later assigned to the Acropolis⁶⁹.

Attica

Ephebic torch races were certainly held in Rhamnous too, as testified by several inscriptions. *I.Rhamnous 454* (part of a circular base of a tripod, dedicated by the ephebes of Oineis enrolled in 332/1) was found in a large cistern near the eastern gate of the fortress⁷⁰. From the fortress, *IG II³ 4, 308* bears a 2nd century inscription celebrating individual victories (probably in different years) of a man in the torch race at the *Diogeneia* (a festival celebrated in the *asty*), as well as a 4th century inscription on the right and left sides (respectively letters “ΣΟΙ” and

⁶⁶ Chankowski 2018, 56.

⁶⁷ Marchiandi 2003, 55 with nn. 328-330. Robertson 1985, 284 suggests the Prytaneion both for the *Panathenaia* and for the *Prometheia*, while Billot 1989, 766-767 supposes the presence of an altar in the Agora as the finishing line of the *Prometheia*.

⁶⁸ Habicht 1961, 143-146 no. 2. On Mounichos as eponymous of the 333/2 *helikia*, see also Viscardi 2018, 48-52. The date in l. 2 refers to the year in which the ephebes were enrolled: according to Chankowski 2014, 71 it is likely that this dedication was set up in the first year, because during the second one the ephebes were not in Athens. Henderson (2020, 160-161) has recently stated that the presence of torch races in the three city festivals does not imply ephebic participation, since he considers *IG II² 3006* (1st century CE) to be the only extant document linking ephebes with any of them (the *Hephaistia*). His view is too cautious, also because the inscription *IG II³ 4, 335* must have celebrated a victory in one of the city races.

⁶⁹ Humphreys 2004, 115; Humphreys 2004-2009, 89. Note that the *Etymologicum Magnum* (s.v. *Kerameikos*) explicitly mentions the Kerameikos as the place where the three *lampades* for Athena, Hephaistos and Prometheus took place.

⁷⁰ Petrakos 1993, 30; Friend 2019, T13.

“ἡ φυλή”), suggesting that the base might have been ephebic since its first life⁷¹. *I.Rhamnous* 105 (333-324), a herm found at the south end of on the sacred road, close to the *analemma* wall of the sanctuary, bears the letters “ΣΑΣ”, which can be restored as νικήσας⁷². The singular form of the verb is also appropriate for dedications made by gymnasiarchs.

IG II³ 4, 348, found in Marathon, has been sometimes ascribed to the 4th century (in the *IG II³ 4* edition, to the second half of the century). It is a list of ephebes (mentioned only by name), dedicated ἐ[πι - - -]ωνος παιδοτριβοῦν[τος], found 150 m north of the ‘prehistorical Acropolis’, few hundred metres far from the upper part of a triangular candelabrum, representing *lampadephoroi* on each side⁷³. Leaving aside the association with the candelabrum (and the need to consider it as a torch-race dedication)⁷⁴, the above-mentioned formula would be uncustomary in the Lykourgan period, and much more frequent from the 2nd century onwards⁷⁵. I would be inclined to exclude it from the *corpus* under analysis.

⁷¹ See *Rhamnous* 101, 146; Friend 2019, T29. It was found in the south-eastern part of the fortress, outside of the south-western corner of the OH’ area: see Petrakos 1991, 48 no. 20 (1018). On the *Diogeneia* see Di Cesare 2018, 218 with n. 16, with previous bibliography.

⁷² Petrakos in *I.Rhamnous* 105. The inscription consists of 37 fragments, inventoried as 523+1054 N. Fragments no. inv. 523 were found in 1979 and 1982 (see Petrakos 1982, 129); the excavated area was a sector of the road with the *analemma* wall (which supported the terraced area south of the temples) on its western side: see Petrakos 1979a, 1-2.

⁷³ Mastrokostas 1970, 19.

⁷⁴ The candelabrum has never been properly published, but the available information suggests that it is not a 4th century artifact.

⁷⁵ Henderson 2020, 289 n. 83. Daux 1970, 607 already suggested a dating to the 3rd century. For *IG II³ 4, 348*, several festivals have been suggested. Friend 2019, 125 (who think it is Lykourgan) proposed that it was the *lampas* in honour of Pan (see Hdt. VI 105), which is nonetheless problematic and might have had no competitive character: see Capel Badino 2017, 77-78. Goette - Weber 2004, 98 (who dated it to the 4th century because of paleography) think that a *phiale* sculpted on the base might refer to the *Herakleia*, during which silver *phialai* were awarded, as Pindar says (*Ol.* IX 88-90), albeit not specifically referring to a *lampas*, but to a context for men. On the *Herakleia* see Osborne 2010, 325. The 2nd century dating would support the possibility that the competition took place during the *Epitaphia*: a coeval inscription (*IG II³ 1, 1313*, ll. 15-17) says that ephebes had to perform the *epitaphios agon*, exactly as they did in front of the *polyandron* in the *asty*. On the *Epitaphia* in the Hellenistic period see de Lisle 2020, 36-37.

Dedications of the ephebes

2. Dedications of the gymnasiarchs

The best way to carry out a liturgy related to a competition is to win: not surprisingly, almost all dedications made by gymnasiarchs mention or allude to the victory in the torch race. The earliest ones date back to the late 5th century, with the majority dating to the mid-4th century and the Lykourgan period. These dedications exhibit a wide range of typologies, with designs becoming increasingly elaborate during the Lykourgan period. This includes reliefs and even sculpted bases. No document can be dated with certainty to the post-Lykourgan period, when the office must have changed profoundly. Perhaps under Demetrios of Phaleron the tribally organised gymnasiarchy, like the *choregia*, was abolished and replaced by an annual office of the *polis*. Aside from the gymnasiarchy performed at the *polis* level, there was a version of it at the deme level (which may have persisted for a longer duration)⁷⁶, and the possibility for the ephebes to be gymnasiarchs themselves, as attested by *IG II³ 4, 336*.

Athens

We have several documents relating to the three city torch races, in which the gymnasiarchy was tribally organised⁷⁷. In Athens, ephebic dedications have been found on the Acropolis and in its immediate surroundings (the slopes), in the area of the post-Herulian wall, and in the Kerameikos. The earliest dedicating gymnasiarch, Kallias, son of Telokles, placed a dedication on the Acropolis for the victory of the tribe Pandionis. The husband of Andokides's sister, he was accused of the mutilation of the Herms in 415 but later acquitted of the charges

⁷⁶ See Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 121-123; for the chronology see Öhler 1912, coll. 1987-1988. Note that the date of the abolition of the choregia, which is better documented than the gymnasiarchy, is debated: see e.g. Feyel, *BÉ* 2011, no. 240; Ackermann - Sarrazanas 2020 (who suggest 316/5). An interesting document testifying the change of gymnasiarchy is *IG II² 3206*: see Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 122 n. 30 for a discussion.

⁷⁷ For the tribal organisation of the torch races held at such festivals see Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 116-118. Gymnasiarchs are documented as early as the last quarter of the 5th century. We know that by 421/0 gymnasiarchs of the *Prometheia* were elected (see *IG I³ 82, l. 35*), that between 403 and 400 Andokides (I 132) served as a gymnasiarch at the *Hephaistia*, while the earliest reference to gymnasiarchs sponsoring torch races at the Great *Panathenaia* is *IG II³ 4, 427* (earlier than mid-4th century). *IG I³ 82*, a decree concerning the organization of a festival, could have been very informative about torch races, but the relevant lines (ll. 30-36) are difficult to restore. A recent analysis by Makres 2014 has cast doubt on many of the previous suggestions for filling the *lacunae* (including that at l. 35, concerning the *Prometheia*, which she puts in the *apparatus criticus*) and of the identification of the festival about which the whole inscription is talking. The festival is traditionally thought to be the *Hephaistia*, according to her the *Theseia*, whose *lampas* is attested only by Hellenistic sources.

(And. I 42; 47; 50; 58)⁷⁸. Both *IG I³ 969 bis a*, found in Thebes (Boeotia)⁷⁹, and *IG I³ 969 bis b*, discovered on the Acropolis, north of the Propylaea in 1859⁸⁰ inform us of his gymnasiarchy and contain the same information (with the addition of two lines in the Athenian one, possibly with the name of the sculptor of the dedication)⁸¹. The dedication, set up on the Acropolis, must have been destroyed after the *Hermokopidai* scandal and later replaced⁸². On the Acropolis, several other documents have been found, such as *IG II³ 4, 430*, dedicated for a victory of the tribe Akamantis in the Great *Panathenaia* under the archon Archias (346/5) and reused in the mosque built inside the Parthenon⁸³, and a fragment of a stele of Pentelic marble, *IG II³ 4, 429*, part of a joint dedication set up by several gymnasiarchs after the middle of the 4th cent⁸⁴. This text is highly fragmentary but, as suggested by Makres (*IG II³ 4, 429*), it might have concerned some kinds of honours for the gymnasiarchs⁸⁵.

A very large base (*IG II³ 4, 589*) in the Acropolis Museum was most likely dedicated on the Acropolis too. It is made up of four fragments, but we know the precise findspot only of frg. *a*, the largest one, found by Pittakis in 1858 east of the Propylaea⁸⁶. The base has a figured frieze, presumably originally running all

⁷⁸ Only three individuals named Telokles are attested from a deme of Pandionis: if his father was from Angele, Kallias would be the archon of 406/5. About Kallias, see Davies, *APF* no. 7840.

⁷⁹ Roesch 1973, 142-154.

⁸⁰ Pittakis in «*AEph*» 1859, 1824 no. 3494.

⁸¹ The sculptor, Aristides, was a disciple of Polykleitos: Poursat 1967, 112-113; see also *DNO* 2014, 515-518, no. 1295-1297.

⁸² Agelidis 2009, 185, thinks that it was restored during the archonship; Oikonomides 1980, 19 perhaps a few years later; Poursat 1967, 112-113 maybe even at the very beginning of 4th century. The destroyed dedication was reused as building material and later transported to Thebes under Otto de La Roche: Oikonomides 1980, 19.

⁸³ Pittakis in «*AEph*» 1854, 1101-1102, no. 2079.

⁸⁴ In the *ed. princ.* *IG II² 3024* Kirchner restored [οἱ ἡμερημένοι] in l. 1; the findspot is very generic: («*In arce, nunc EM 2722*»).

⁸⁵ The person in l. 4 has been tentatively identified with the son of two people mentioned in *IG II² 6834*, a funerary stele, see Davies, *APF* no. 15446. The lack of the demotic in l. 3 does not allow us to identify the affiliations of the mentioned people nor to understand their presence on the same monument. Perhaps it is more likely that they belonged to the same tribe (e.g. gymnasiarchs serving in a festival in subsequent years or in the same year in different festivals?), e.g. see the decree of Pandionis (*IG II² 1138+ IG II² 2812*) listing victorious *choregoi* in several festivals from 403/2 onwards.

⁸⁶ We follow the nomenclature of Choremi 2015, 357-362. The fact that Pittakis published the three names of the epebes separately (Pittakis in «*AEph*» 1858, 1771, nos. 3382, 3383, 3384) explains why in bibliography (see e.g. the edition in *IG II³ 4, 589*) he is sometimes reported to have found three pieces, when it is clear from his descriptions (and e.g. those of Michaelis 1862, 208 and

Dedications of the ephebes

around it and depicting young naked “*apoxyomenoi*”, each accompanied by a name and a demotic of the tribe Oineis. They have been interpreted either as torch racers (Rausa)⁸⁷, or participants in the *euandria*, a competition held during the *Panathenaia* (Goette, von den Hoff)⁸⁸. The exact dating spans between the Lykourgan period (especially if it was dedicated by ephebes)⁸⁹ and the last quarter of the 4th century (most probably between 320 and 310)⁹⁰. It has been reconstructed as supporting a plinth with a dedicatory inscription by the gymnasiarch or lampadarch and a bronze statue, perhaps symbolising the tribe (e.g. through its eponymous hero) or that of a god associated with the festival⁹¹. It has also been suggested that it carried multiple statues, one of which could have represented (among other possibilities) the sponsor of the competition⁹². The dedication is often included among the ephebic ones⁹³ but, if it was dedicated for the torch race, it could have also been dedicated by a gymnasiarch⁹⁴. Despite the effort to stress the collective dimension of the victory by adding names of the actual participants to the competition (whatever it was)⁹⁵, the monument is perhaps more similar to

Sybel 1881, 386 no. 6154) that he only found one. Frg. *d* was associated with the base by Woodward 1910, 264 no. 2635, although it was already in the collection of the Acropolis Museum (see Sybel 1881, 381 no. 6109). Frg. *c* was perhaps the last one to join the base: it is visible in Rausa 1998, pl. 35 no. 3; details on it are given by Choremi 2015, 357-358, 361 fig. 51. In 1923, Frg. *b* was already in the collection of the Acropolis Museum (see Walter 1923, 197 no. 401).

⁸⁷ See Rausa 1998, 208, 215-216, who believes that it might have been dedicated for the *Prometheia*.

⁸⁸ Von den Hoff 2003, 181; Goette 2007, 120.

⁸⁹ Humphreys 2004-2009, 89.

⁹⁰ Rausa 1998, 232. Von den Hoff 2003, 181-182 retains Rausa's dating and thinks that the expense of dedications like this, comprising statues and carved marble bases, would not be an obstacle, since after 323 the praxis of dedicating such monuments of the Acropolis did not abruptly stop. Nonetheless, the years of Demetrios of Phaleron might be problematic either we identify the competition with the *lampas* or the *euandria*, as they were both liturgies.

⁹¹ Rausa 1998, 214-217.

⁹² Goette 2007, 120.

⁹³ See e.g. Humphreys 2004-2009, 89.

⁹⁴ A dedication mentioning the *euandria* and the torch race is attested on the Acropolis, but its findspot is less significant because it cannot be considered as choregic *stricto sensu*: *IG* II³ 4, 545 (mid-4th century), found near the Erechtheion (see Pittakis in «*AEph*» 1839, 191 no. 179), mentions victories in the *lampas* and the *euandria* at the *Panathenaia* and (presumably the dithyramb) with the *paidés* at the *Thargelia*. It was included among the “*choregicæ incerti generis*” in the *IG* edition but, if it was choregic, it would closely resemble a personal one (see also Wilson 2000, 216; for a different interpretation see Lambert in *AIO* 2345). *IG* II² 3201 was also dedicated on the Acropolis: it bears several honours carved in crowns (including those received by the *phyle* for the gymnasiarchy at the *Hephaistia*) and it is, most likely, a private dedication.

⁹⁵ The names of the ephebes do not recur on other dedications of gymnasiarchs, with the exclusion of the base from Rhamnous, dedicated by ephebes-gymnasiarchs (see *infra* 317 with n. 117).

other liturgical monuments of the Lykourgan age⁹⁶, although, unlike *choregoi*, we do not know whether the gymnasiarchs had a collective prize to dedicate (we only know of the tribal prize for the Great *Panathenaia*, an ox, thanks to *SEG* LIII 192, l. 137, dated to the 380s)⁹⁷. Certainly, knowing how ephebic dedications were funded would also help identifying the dedicator⁹⁸. In any case, such a base is perhaps too sumptuous when compared to the other dedications of the ephebes, so I doubt that it was dedicated and financed by them⁹⁹.

Although their findspots are less explicit than those of the previously analysed documents, other dedications might have been originally placed on the Acropolis. Specifically, *IG* II³ 4, 428 (mid-4th century), found in the area east of the post-Herulian wall (Agora Grid T24) might have come from there¹⁰⁰. *IG* II³ 4, 331 (330s or later), a partially preserved relief, broken at both sides and with an inscribed architrave, is definitely much problematic¹⁰¹. *CIG* I 257 reports its findspot as follows: «*Athenis prope domum Anast. Turminitae; ex schedis Fourmonti*»¹⁰². Locating this house (which cannot be its original location) is perhaps impossible, nonetheless the information connects the inscription with the city of Athens. The suggestion of an original placement on the Acropolis has been advanced by O. Palagia, based solely on iconographical evidence. On the left, it

⁹⁶ See e.g. the Atarbos Base (Acropolis Museum, no. 1338), made of two blocks, both representing competitions (according to Shear 2003a, two tribal ones, while Makres 2009 thinks that none of them is); the second block is probably a slightly later addition. Despite the representation of the team, such a monument might have had strong 'personal' connotations (and it is certainly a choregic/liturgical dedication, as the text *IG* II³ 4, 435 states).

⁹⁷ Dedications are not helpful in this regard, both because the name of the festival is rarely preserved and the cuttings on the top surface do not always allow to reconstruct the typology of votive. Some (*IG* II³ 4, 428; 430; 427) have circular cuttings, so small votive columns have been suggested (for what concerns *IG* II³ 4, 427, Platonos-Giota 2004, 274 no. 7 has thought of a Panathenaic amphora or a statue, Makres 2004-2009, 143 a votive torch on top of a small pillar). The presence of a statue is suggested by the name of the sculptor in *IG* I³ 969 bis b. It is believed that a statue was also present in *IG* II³ 4, 426, while *IG* II³ 4, 431 (which has a square cut) is thought to have supported a herm.

⁹⁸ Berti forthcoming notes the similarities between prytanic and ephebic dedications. She suggests that prytanic dedications were probably funded by the tribe. It is plausible to consider that the same could be true for ephebic dedications as well.

⁹⁹ See also Russo 2022, 163; Goette 2007, 120 even doubts that it can be considered as "choregic" (in the sense of "liturgical").

¹⁰⁰ For the findspot see Meritt in Meritt - Woodhead - Stamires 1957, 217 no. 70.

¹⁰¹ For the date see Palagia 2000, 404-405.

¹⁰² Hicks 1874, XLI, who published it among the Greek Inscriptions of the British Museum, reports that it belonged to Lord Strangford's Collection. On this inscription, see also Liddel, Low 2022, 29-32 no. 4.

Dedications of the ephebes

pictures four naked athletes: one of them is very partially preserved and other two are bearded. On the right, there is a slightly taller man, putting a ribbon around the head of a young man, who is lighting an altar. According to Palagia, the taller man must have been an eponymous hero and probably Athena should be restored on the right; therefore, the dedication would have been made for a victory in the *Panathenaia*, displayed in the main sanctuary of the *polis*¹⁰³. Given the complex iconography of the scene and the fact that the divinity was depicted in a lost portion of the relief, it is impossible to verify the hypothesis¹⁰⁴.

Fourmont was the first to copy another very controversial inscription, *IG II*³ 4, 431, «*prope arcem*»¹⁰⁵. The inscription says that a victorious gymnasiarch in the Great *Panathenaia* with the tribe Kekropis dedicated it to Hermes *Enagonios* (protector of competitions) after being crowned by the *phyletai* in 338/7. Pittakis published it twice: in 1835, he connected it to the gymnasium of Hermes, which he placed near what was then called the *Theseion* (the *Hephaisteion*)¹⁰⁶. In 1857, he reported he had found it «*ὑπὸ τὸ ἀνατολικὸν μέρος τῆς Ἀκροπόλεως, εἰς τὴν ἐνορίαν τῶν Λιμνῶν*», meaning the general area of Dionysos's theatre, which is compatible with Fourmont's information¹⁰⁷. Another 2nd century inscription (*IG II*³ 4, 537), dedicated after a victory at the City *Dionysia*, was found south-east of the *skene* of the theatre of Dionysos. It is addressed to Dionysos and Nike, but it mentions Hermes *Enagonios* as the recipient of such dedications in the past¹⁰⁸. Therefore, bases dedicated to this god were previously set up in the

¹⁰³ Palagia 2000, 404-406, who proposed that the relief represents two different episodes (maybe a training session on the left and the crowning of the individual winner on the right). She believes that, since the eponymous hero's high headdress (perhaps a spiked crown) did not touch the architrave, it would be possible to hypothesise the presence of Athena, of the same size (there would be enough room to restore her helm). In the *IG II*³ 4 edition, the possibility of the *Panathenaia* is excluded by A. Makres on the ground that ephebes did not take part in the festival, but see Shear 2021, 198-199.

¹⁰⁴ A different interpretation of the scene can be found in Cannistraci 2014, pages 273-275, where the taller man is tentatively identified as the gymnasiarch. According to Friend (2019, 123 n. 119), the dedicator might have been an "ephebic gymnasiarch" (see 29 with n. 117). Liddell and Low (2022, 30) tentatively propose that the young man lighting the altar was both the victor and the ephebic gymnasiarch, although this identification is perhaps too uncertain.

¹⁰⁵ Böckh published it as *CIG I* 251, on the basis of Fourmont's apograph.

¹⁰⁶ Pittakis 1835, 466. Pittakis located the gymnasium of Hermes south-west of the "Theseion": see *APMA* 3, 23.

¹⁰⁷ Pittakis in «*AEph*» 1857, 1650 no. 3214. For the identification of the «*ἐνορία τῶν Λιμνῶν*» with area of the Theatre of Dionysos, see *APMA* 5, 117 n. 64.

¹⁰⁸ Concerning Nike, it recalls the presence of an illustrious precedent (a work of Praxiteles). This inscription has been interpreted in several ways: see e.g. Keesling 2018, 100.

sanctuary of Dionysos and perhaps also along the Street of the Tripods. Another inscription, a mid-4th century base of Hymettian marble (*IG* II³ 4, 1344) mentioning the same god, was found during the same excavations as *IG* II³ 4, 537, near the eastern *parodos*¹⁰⁹, but is nevertheless difficult to contextualize, given the lack of information about its dedicator. The cult of Hermes *Enagonios* is attested also on the Acropolis, by *IG* I³ 840, a base just earlier than the middle of the 5th century¹¹⁰. We can assume that Hermes *Enagonios* patronised different kinds of competitions, and that he was worshiped in both places. Perhaps, it is more likely that this gymnasiarchic inscription fell from the Acropolis, like another gymnasiarchic dedication found the same area, *IG* II³ 4, 426 (earlier than mid-4th century)¹¹¹.

The name of Hermes has also been suggested as a possible restoration in *IG* II³ 4, 332 (after 334/3?), a base, broken on its back and on the right, with remains of a cutting in its top surface. The text is partially preserved (Εὐθετίων - - - - -
-| νικήσας Ε- - - - -): both its findspot (near the church of Ag. Triada, in the Kerameikos) and the possible restoration of the name of Hermes in l. 2 suggest that it was dedicated after a victory in a *lampas*. In *IG* II³ 4, Curbera hypothesised that Εὐθετίων was an ephebe¹¹². It is not possible to exclude that he was the gymnasiarch: either way, the original location could have been in the area¹¹³. While this inscription might be added to the corpus of gymnasiarchic ones, another one must be excluded: *IG* II³ 4, 432 (4th century) identified as gymnasiarchic by A. Makres in the latest *IG* edition, has been recently proven to belong, together with other fragments, to a dedication for the *anthippasia*¹¹⁴.

¹⁰⁹ Koumanoudis 1863, 93, nos. 2-3.

¹¹⁰ *DAA* 163 and *IG* I³ 840 report that time and place of discovery are unknown, while *IG* I² suppl. p. 82, no. 373³⁵ says «*Erutum est olim in arce*». On Hermes *Enagonios* on the Acropolis, see also Kokkinou 2012.

¹¹¹ It seems to have been found in the 1862 excavations of the *Hetaireia* in the skene of the theatre of Dionysos: this is what S. Alipheri assumed, on the basis of the papers of the Greek Archaeological Society (see her commentary in the *IG* II³ edition).

¹¹² [D.] LIX 34 mentions another Εὐθετίων, who might be the same person: see *PAA* no. 431485. Moreover, the verb “to win” as an aorist participle (νικήσας) also occurs in *IG* II³ 4, 427, which is certainly a gymnasiarch’s dedication, and *IG* II³ 4, 331 as well.

¹¹³ Note that a 1st century dedication, *IG* II³ 4, 372, to Hermes and other deities by a gymnasiarch and lampadarch in Delos, was found in the Pompeion area. According to Monaco (2020, 282-284 no 14), *IG* II² 3206, an architrave of a monument, perhaps commemorating the career of a man (who was also a gymnasiarch, after the office was reformed), may have been there because of the role of the area for torch races.

¹¹⁴ Bardani 2019, 114-119.

Dedications of the ephebes

Attica

Dedications for victory after competing in a torch race are attested at Rhamnous and at Acharnai. At the latter, a dedication found in the courtyard of the church of Ag. Ioannis in Menidi celebrated a victory earned in the *asty*, at the Great *Panathenaia* (*IG II³ 4, 427*; earlier than mid-4th century); it was perhaps originally placed in the sanctuary of Athena *Hippia*¹¹⁵. The lack of demotic and even tribal affiliation of the dedicator does not allow certainty, but we might assume that the gymnasiarch was from this deme¹¹⁶.

As we have already mentioned in par. 1.2, dedications in Rhamnous were made to celebrate races held in the deme. For example, *IG II³ 4, 336*, a small base, was dedicated by the *sophronistes* and by two gymnasiarchs (who have been convincingly identified as ephebes) of the tribe Erechtheis after a victory in the torch race earned in 333/2¹¹⁷. It was found together with the dedicated statue, NM 313 (and other heads and herms in short chiton and chlamys), on the sacred road, under the eastern *analemma* of the main sanctuary of the deme¹¹⁸. From the same deme, two reliefs are known. *IG II³ 4, 349*, dated to the 330s, made of 21 fragments and dedicated by a gymnasiarch (the verb *γυμνασιαρχήσας* is convincingly restored), was found in the *hieron* of Nemesis (some fragments in the

¹¹⁵ Makres 2004-2009, 143.

¹¹⁶ The name of the dedicator is not otherwise attested in Acharnai: see Makres, commentary to *IG II³ 4, 427*. Nevertheless, the omission of the demotic would be consistent with what can be seen for other categories of documents, e.g. choregic inscriptions for the Rural *Dionysia* displayed in the demes: see Russo 2022, 174.

¹¹⁷ Palagia - Lewis 1989 suggested that the gymnasiarchs in l. 4 were ephebes, since the name of one of them, together with those of other ephebes of the same inscription, is listed in *SEG XXXIX 184*, an ephebic list. While in service, ephebes were exempted from liturgies and financial services ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 42, 5); according to Friend 2019, 123, this could be an exception, due to the fact that the liturgy was 'internal'. *IG II³ 4, 336* is commonly thought to have been dedicated by the ephebes who started their service under the archon Nikokrates (333/2), but based on the wording of l. 3, Chankowski 2014, 71-72 n. 200 suggested that the archon date refers to the year in which the victory was obtained: in order for the ephebes to be stationed there, they had to be in their second year (and therefore, would have been enrolled in 334/3). See the table in Chankowski 2014, 69, and 71-72 with n. 200. Note that, as underlined by Humphreys 2004-2009, 85 n. 6, each *helikia* of ephebes, by starting in Boedromion, was active in three different archon years.

¹¹⁸ See Stais 1891a, coll. 56-61, tav. 7. Two other fragments from Stais's excavations were part of the same base: see Petrakos 1979b, 69. For the other herms and heads from the same context see Petrakos 1999, 283-286; Henderson 2020, 157-158; see also the list of 4th-century herms found in the sanctuary and in the fortress in Petrakos 2020, 185-187, nos. 26-48, who explicitly attributes to ephebes only no. 26 (NM 313) and 30 (from the eastern *analemma* of the sanctuary). Herms are considered the most common ephebic dedication: their presence is often hypothesised whenever an ephebic document (regardless of its specific typology) has a rectangular or a square cutting.

cella)¹¹⁹. It represents a group of naked runners, together with two figures clad in *himation* (one of them, carrying a torch) approaching three goddesses. While the one on the left is certainly Nike, the identification of the others has been debated: while the most obvious hypothesis would have been Themis and Nemesis, given the findspots, B. Ashmole, after several articles on the topic, ultimately identified them with Demeter and Kore; this seems to have been confirmed by the restoration of the inscription, thanks to the addition of new fragments, although their presence in the *hieron* of Nemesis would be harder to justify¹²⁰. The second, contemporary, relief (Rhamnous inv. no. 531), also found in the *hieron* and broken at both sides, represents two men with a *himation* (one of which holding an object looking like a torch); they are followed by three naked young men, certainly part of a bigger group¹²¹. In the missing part there must have been gods, represented at a larger scale¹²². Although the dedicant is not explicit (the relief is unscribed), he may have been a gymnasiarch.

Unfortunately, there is limited information available regarding the organization of the gymnasiarchy related to the races in Rhamnous. A dedication (*IG* II³ 4, 513) inscribed on the base of a statue of Themis in her temple, was erected by a Rhamnousian, commemorating the bestowal of a crown by the deme for his *dikaiosyne* and a successful gymnasiarchy in the categories of the *andres* and the *paides*, along with a later addition mentioning a choregia. The date of this inscription has been much debated, but recent studies favour the second half of the 4th century¹²³. As noted by Lambert, the honours for his *dikaiosyne* (a concept closely related to Themis) may be due in whole or in part to his gymnasiarchy, although

¹¹⁹ Ashmole 1954, 91, 94 reports that in the *cella* of the “large temple” J.P. Deering found «two pieces of alto rilievo, very much damaged and corroded». New fragments (Petraikos 1976, A.53, no. 13) were found in the *hieron* of Nemesis. For the date see for example Smith 2011, 49.

¹²⁰ See Ashmole 1954; Ashmole 1959; Ashmole 1962; see also Smith 2011, 49, who underlines that the identification as Nemesis and Themis would be anomalous, as the goddesses on the relief do not conform to their iconography. For the hypothesis that they represent Demeter and Kore see also Petraikos, in *I.Rhamnous* 106, followed by Curbera in *IG* II³ 4, 349.

¹²¹ Petraikos (1976, 53) reports that it was found in the *hieron* of Nemesis and a fragment comes from the “χώματα” of Stais’s excavation. In this relief and in *IG* II³ 4, 349, it would be interesting to know who the two people with *himation* are: a joint gymnasiarchy might be suggested (as in *IG* II³ 4, 336) but in the case of *IG* II³ 4, 349, the dedicator is a single gymnasiarch (see also Palagia 2000, 404). The joint gymnasiarchy would not be surprising: in deme contexts, there is evidence of a looser organization of liturgies (e.g. joint choregic services in the Rural *Dionysia*, with the aim of sharing the financial burden, see Csapo - Wilson 2020, 12).

¹²² Palagia - Lewis 1989, 340.

¹²³ *IG* II³ 4, 513: ca 325-300. See also the discussion in Ackermann - Sarrazanas 2020, 37; Lambert in *AIO*_2462, while Csapo - Wilson 2020, 241-242 prefer a date in the first quarter of the 3rd century.

Dedications of the ephebes

the wording is not clear¹²⁴ and does not allow us to list it among the “gymnasiarchic inscriptions” *stricto sensu*. Nonetheless, the inscription is an important attestation of the race, featuring age categories, as well as of the office, which can be considered a “deme gymnasiarchy” associated with celebrations in the deme and certainly assigned through a different mechanism compared to the *polis* gymnasiarchy¹²⁵ (and also to the office performed by the ephebes, attested by *IG II³ 4, 336*).

There is, regrettably, no definitive basis for identifying the name of the festival that encompassed such races. In the mid-3rd century a *gymnikos agon* (*I. Rhamnous* 107, ll. 8-9; hence athletic games, but not explicitly a torch race), was held during the Great *Nemesia*. Thus, torch race inscriptions of the Lykourgan age (*IG II³ 4, 336* being the earliest precisely dated one) have often been associated with the *Nemesia*¹²⁶. According to Friend, between the ephebic reform and the aftermath of the Lamian War, when the ephebate was probably temporarily abolished, ephebes from all *phylai* may have spent a few days in the deme celebrating it¹²⁷. Other scholars are not convinced that the race took place during this festival, since it is not attested until the 3rd century¹²⁸. Nonetheless, the goddesses represented in the relief of *IG II³ 4, 349* certainly must have some kind of link with the ephebate and/or torch races. On the basis of the material from a recently published Thesmophorion (150 m north-west of the sanctuary of Nemesis), the presence of rituals involving both male and female youths at Rhamnous has been suggested¹²⁹. There is also evidence from other sites of the association of the two goddesses with athletic competitions¹³⁰. Given the iconography of the relief, it is difficult not to believe that they were the cultic referents of a race; and the runners could indeed have been ephebes (as in Rhamnous, no. 531).

If *IG II³ 4, 513* refers to roughly the same chronological period and the same competition as the other documents, one would assume that ephebes competed in one of the age categories mentioned above¹³¹. Alternatively, one could speculate

¹²⁴ Lambert in AIO_ 2462.

¹²⁵ See Wilson 2000, 323 n. 129; Culasso Gastaldi 2009; Fauconnier 2022, 140. Is. 2.42 is also proof of a gymnasiarchy held at a deme level.

¹²⁶ For the link between *IG II³ 4, 336* with the *Nemesia*, see Pouilloux 1954, 111-112 no. 2; see also Parker 2005, 476.

¹²⁷ Friend 2014, 105-106. According to Parker 1996, 246, the “agonistic” *Nemesia* (i.e. the festival with a programme of competitions) was of Lykourgan origin; see also Friend (2014, 104), who believes that it was penteteric, just like the Greater *Amphiareia*, founded in the same years.

¹²⁸ See Humphreys 2004-2009, 84 n. 5 (followed by Chankowski 2014, 72 n. 200).

¹²⁹ Kalogeropoulos 2015, 1158. The Thesmophorion was published by Nawracala 2014.

¹³⁰ Bookidis 2010, 269-270 with notes.

¹³¹ Although it would imply a (perhaps too) complex organisation of this contest, it cannot be excluded that there was a third category, that of the beardless youths (who may not have been

about the existence of multiple torch races within the deme, including one specifically for the ephebes, sponsored by them. The possibility that also the dedicators of the *IG II² 4, 349* were ephebes-gymnasiarchs has already been suggested¹³². However, the coincidence between the deme in which the race took place and the demotic of the sponsor in *IG II³ 4, 349* does not allow us to completely dismiss the idea that local adult benefactors could sponsor the ephebic teams and that *IG II³ 4, 336* is somehow an exception. At the present state of our knowledge, we can only propose hypotheses, since the existing evidence is very difficult to reconcile.

3. Conclusions

Despite their close relationship and a common reason for setting their dedications (the torch race), it is clear that the different nature of the offices studied (a compulsory state service and a liturgy) had a great influence on their respective dedication practices.

As far as the ephebes are concerned, apart from *IG II² 478*, which was set by all the *phylai* together, and which perhaps testifies to the beginning of a new “dedicatory era”, no chronological change can be detected, since they all date from the Lykourgan period. Dedications generally follow the path of the ephebic activities, therefore they mostly come from sites on the Attic frontier, where the ephebes patrolled and/or participated in festivals. Those whose tribes were based in the *asty* could place their dedications in their seats, while it seems that, whenever their bases were not central, the Agora or the Acropolis might have been considered as suitable locations. Although our documents (*IG II³ 4, 330*; *IG II³ 4, 335*) have not been found in an archaeological context, another suitable setting place for ephebic inscriptions (whatever their typology) and perhaps also gymnasiarchic ones (*IG II³ 4, 332*) was the Dipylon area. A recent review of the function of the Pompeion has connected the presence of ephebic inscriptions discovered nearby (beginning with *IG II³ 4, 335*) to the building itself, suggesting that it served as a gymnasium for training ephebes in the torch race, even during this early phase¹³³. The hypothesis indeed seductive, but it would imply that at least a

mentioned in *IG II³ 4, 513* because they were not sponsored by Megakles or because he did not win with them). Beardless youths may have been eighteen to twenty years old at the Great *Panathenaia* (see Shear 2021, 181-182), thus coinciding with ephebes.

¹³² See Friend 2019, 123, with n. 119.

¹³³ Monaco 2020 (according to whom the building should be named differently, while the Pompeion, the building for the preparation of the Panathenaic processions, would still be unidentified); see also Henderson 2020, 76 with n. 53 for links between the ephebes and the Pompeion. On

Dedications of the ephebes

part of the training took place in a gymnasium in the *asty*, as it is clearly attested for later periods, when the ephebate was a city-based institution¹³⁴. For the 4th century, it is easier to think that, during their first year, they trained at Peiraieus, maybe in the otherwise unattested gymnasium where *IG II² 478* could have been set up. The Dipylon area, crossed by the Panathenaic Way, might have been, in any case, as a significant location for the ephebes.

The overall distribution of the inscriptions does not allow us to say how the contingents were allocated to the forts, how many of them were stationed in the same place at the same time, how ephebic participation in festivals was regulated (and more specifically, whether festivals in Attica were attended only by ephebes already in loco or attracted those stationed far away)¹³⁵. At Panakton the dedications were placed in the fortress; at Oropos in the sanctuary of Amphiaraos; at Eleusis its main sanctuary, as suggested by the certain or possible mention of the two goddesses on the dedications of Hippothontis (based in the deme)¹³⁶. In Rhamnous, where many categories of ephebic documents are attested, both the sanctuary and the fortress were used to celebrate the end-of-service of the ephebes and of the dedicator identified as *didaskalos*. If *I.Rhamnous 105* is ephebic, the torch race would also have been celebrated in both locations, while the dedication possibly set up after a sacrifice during a local festival (*IG II³ 4, 339*) was placed in the *hieron* of Nemesis. M. Munn has pointed out that at Rhamnous, Eleusis, and Panakton, ephebic dedications are sometimes attested near entrances to sanctuaries and/or fortresses. Furthermore, if we consider the possibility that the Pompeion was not a gymnasium, we can also include the entrance to the city itself, the Dipylon area. He explains this by associating between herms (the most common ephebic dedications) and passages¹³⁷; however, the high visibility that such a

Hellenistic *gymnasia* in Athens see Di Cesare 2018. To Monaco's list of inscriptions to be linked to the area, I would also add *IG II³ 4, 332*.

¹³⁴ See the discussion in Henderson 2020, 136.

¹³⁵ Some information is obtained from crowns or decrees awarded by the demes (see the decree of Eleusis, in *IG II² 1156*). Difficulties are also due to the fact that ephebes generally present themselves by mentioning the archon under whom they were enrolled and rarely the moment in which they dedicated.

¹³⁶ For the tribal shrine (whose exact position and topographical relationship with the main sanctuary of the deme are unknown), see Berti forthcoming; Russo 2022, 71; cfr. also 177 n. 2.

¹³⁷ See Munn 2021, 302-303 with notes 41-43. For the display of *IG II³ 4, 337* at the entrance to the sanctuary (which was also the entrance to the fortified area of the deme) and the importance of such a location see Clinton, *I.Eleusis II*, p. 96 no. 86. One of the inscriptions from Panakton (Munn 2021, 294-313 no. 2) was also found near the gate of the fort. For what concerns Rhamnous, the connection between herms and gates is also emphasised by Petrakos 1999, 323 (in our evidence, it is clear from *IG II³ 4, 347*).

positioning would provide is certainly also an important factor. If the 'audience' at Panakton was limited to fellow ephebes or other members of the army, in other cases, such as the sanctuary at Eleusis, the Dipylon area and the fortress at Rhamnous, it was certainly much wider, including worshippers and/or simple passers-by.

The heroes and gods worshipped are extremely varied: perhaps the eponymous heroes of their own *helikia*, heroes and gods embodying their praiseworthy virtues, such as the Dioskouroi, and the cultic referents of the main sanctuaries of the places where they patrolled or competed (e.g. Amphiaraos or Demeter and Kore). The debt to the eponymous hero and to the tribe seems to have played a role less fundamental than one would have expected in the choice of location. Even the ephebes of the Hippothontis tribe placed their dedications in the main sanctuary of Eleusis instead of their own shrine, which was located within the same deme. The erection of dedications in the collective space of the *asty* by tribes with extra-urban or peripheral shrines is also an important phenomenon, which also accounts for the need of the group to make itself visible by the *polis* community¹³⁸.

In the case of the gymnasiarchic dedications, although they have been attested since the late 5th century, the available evidence also does not allow us to detect a change in dedication practice in relation to the topography, which is less varied than that of the ephebes, with most inscriptions concentrated at only two poles (the Nemeseion of Rhamnous and the Athenian Acropolis). In Athens, the exclusion of *IG II³ 4, 432* from the corpus weakens the hypothesis proposed by some scholars that victory dedications of the gymnasiarchs from the torch race were displayed along the Panathenaic Way, the only evidence (if it is indeed gymnasiarchic) being *IG II³ 4, 332* in the Dipylon area, a location already discussed above¹³⁹.

In Attica, the only other documented site is Acharnai (*IG II³ 4, 427*), where a local gymnasiarch celebrated his victory in the Great *Panathenaia* in the main sanctuary of the deme, dedicated to Athena *Hippia*. The coincidence between the god who patronised the contest and the cultic referent of the sanctuary where the dedication was placed is not always explicit; the name of the deity in the inscriptions is almost always omitted (and it need not be associated with a specific race, as in the case of Hermes *Enagonios*). Among those found on the Acropolis, only *IG II³ 4, 430* and *IG II³ 4, 431* explicitly mention the festival during which the victory was achieved. The absence of this information in the other dedications is not always due to preservation problems (e.g. both 969 bis a and 969 bis b

¹³⁸ The same phenomenon is attested for documents of other tribally organised institutions: see Berti forthcoming, on prytanic dedications.

¹³⁹ E.g. according to A. Makres in *IG II/III³ 4* (p. 164, commentary to section 6, a), most gymnasiarchic inscriptions were dedicated for the *Panathenaia* and along the Panathenaic Way.

Dedications of the ephebes

certainly did not originally contain it). Unless we assign all the available evidence to the torch race *par excellence* for the Athenians, that of the Great *Panathenaia*¹⁴⁰, it is tempting to think that the Acropolis was considered the most prestigious place for a dedication, regardless of the festival in which the victory was awarded (and, perhaps, of the finishing points of the races)¹⁴¹. Tribal affiliation was not important for the placement of the dedications on the Acropolis: out of the four gymnasiarchs whose affiliation is known (*IG I³ 969 bis a-b*, *IG II³ 4, 430*, *IG II³ 4, 431*, *IG II³ 4, 589*, if the latter is indeed a gymnasiarchic inscription) two (those of *IG II³ 4, 589* and *4, 430*) did not belong to a tribe with a shrine on the Acropolis, and one of the others (*IG II³ 4, 431*) was explicitly addressed to Hermes *Enagonios*¹⁴².

The case of Rhamnous is even more complex than the Athenian one, because of all the uncertainties about the torch races that took place there, but the sanctuary of Nemesis can be considered as the only place where gymnasiarchs could have dedicated in the deme (unless the relief dedicated to Demeter and Kore, *IG II³ 4, 349*, is out of context)¹⁴³.

Although the praxis differs in many aspects, it is evident that for both the ephebes and the gymnasiarchs dedicating was a religious act, a civic obligation, and a means to present themselves to the community. Therefore, the significance of visibility in these dedicatory practices cannot be overlooked, as it played a crucial role in shaping their public image.

dariarusso90@yahoo.it

¹⁴⁰ For the torch race of the Great *Panathenaia* as the torch race *par excellence* see Marchiandi 2020, 24.

¹⁴¹ In the hypothesis that *IG II³ 4, 589* celebrates a torch race, this is also suggested by Goette 2007, 120 in order to explain its presence on the Acropolis. If so, perhaps information concerning the festivals might have been conveyed by the dedicated object.

¹⁴² The name of the tribe does not even need to be mentioned: see, for example, *IG II³ 4, 427*, set up in Acharnai; see Shear 2021, 359.

¹⁴³ In the sanctuary of Nemesis a piece of figurative pottery dated to after 430 and perhaps representing Demeter was also found: see Petrakos 1989, 21-22 no. 5. Part of a votive relief representing the two goddesses (Munich, Glyptothek, inv. no. 198) is also thought to come from the sanctuary of Nemesis (see Petrakos 1989, 22 no. 5). Its provenience from Rhamnous is likely (see Vierneisel-Schlörb 1988, no. 1) but perhaps it is better to be cautious about a more specific original location, especially because the relief comes from a collection.

Bibliography

- Ackermann - Sarrazanas 2020: D. Ackermann - C. Sarrazanas, *The abolition of the liturgical chorēgia and the creation of the agōnothesia in Athens: new considerations on a debated issue*, «JHS» 140, 34-68.
- Agelidis 2009: S. Agelidis, *Choregische Weihgeschenke in Griechenland*, Bonn.
- AIO-Attic Inscriptions Online <https://www.atticinscriptions.com/> (last accessed on April 21st, 2023)
- Alipheri 2015: S. Alipheri, Ἀνάθημα ἐφηβῶν στὸν ἥρωα Λεώ, in *AΞON: Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*, ed. by A. P. Matthaiou - N. Papazarkadas, Athens, 425-443.
- Ashmole 1954: B. Ashmole, *A Greek relief re-discovered*, «Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art» 5, 91-100.
- Ashmole 1959: B. Ashmole, *Not by Agoracritus*, «Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art» 10, 1-3.
- Ashmole 1962: B. Ashmole, *Torch-Racing at Rhamnus*, «AJA» 66, 3, 233-234.
- Bardani 2019: V.N. Bardani, Ἀνάθεση ἱππάρχων καὶ φυλάρχων, in ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΙ ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ. Μελέτες εἰς μνήμην Στεφάνου Ν. Κουμανούδη (1931-1987), επιμ. Α.Ρ. Matthaiou - V.N. Bardani, Αθήνα, 99-129.
- Berti forthcoming: I. Berti, *Phyletic inscriptions in phyletic sanctuaries?*
- Billot 1989: M. F. Billot, *Académie (topographie et archéologie)*, in *Dictionnaire des Philologues antiques*, I, éd. par R. Goulet, Paris, 639-789.
- Billot 1992: M.F. Billot, *Le Cynosarges, Antiochos et les tanneurs. Questions de topographie*, «BCH» 116, 119-156.
- Bookidis 2010: N. Bookidis, *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: The Terracotta Sculpture*, (Corinth. Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, vol. XVIII.5), Princeton.
- Camp - Martens 2020: J.McK. Camp II - B. Martens, *Recent Excavations in the Athenian Agora*, 2013-2019, «Hesperia» 89, 593-657.
- Cannistraci 2014: O.S. Cannistraci, *Il lemma XV e le offerte delle phylai nella Cronaca di Lindo. Ricostruire le origini tra realia di età arcaica ed ellenistica*, «ASNP» 6.1, 259-294.
- Capel Badino 2017: R. Capel Badino, *Una fiaccola per Pan. Un riesame delle testimonianze sulle lampadedromie nell'Atene classica*, «Erga-Logoi» 5, 1, 63-85.
- Chankowski 2010: A.S. Chankowski, *L'éphébie hellénistique. Étude d'une institution civique dans les cités grecques des îles de la Mer Égée et de l'Asie Mineure*, (Culture et cité, 4), Paris 2010.
- Chankowski 2014: A.S. Chankowski, *L'éphébie athénienne antérieure à la réforme d'Epikratès: à propos de Reinmuth, Eph.Inscr.1 et de la chronologie des premières inscriptions éphébiques*, «BCH» 138, 15-78.
- Chankowski 2018: A.S. Chankowski, *Torch races in the Hellenistic world: the influence of an Athenian institution?*, «The Journal of Epigraphic Studies» 1, 55-75.

Dedications of the ephebes

- Choremi 2015: I.L. Choremi, Λίθινα ενεπίγραμμα αναθήματα του 4ου αι. π.Χ. από την Ακρόπολη των Αθηνών: ο αναθέτης και το μνημείο, PhD Diss., University of Ioannina.
- Christ 2001: M.R. Christ, *Conscription of Hoplites in Classical Athens*, «CQ» 51, 398-422.
- Csapo - Wilson 2020: E. Csapo - P. Wilson, *A Social and Economic History of the Theatre to 300 BC: vol. 2, Theatre beyond Athens: Documents with Translation and Commentary*, Cambridge.
- Culasso Gastaldi 2009: E. Culasso Gastaldi, *La ginnasiarchia ad Atene. Istituzioni, ruoli e personaggi dal IV sec. all'età ellenistica*, in *L'huile et l'argent, gymnasiarchie et évergétisme dans la Grèce hellénistique. Actes du colloque tenu à Fribourg du 13 au 15 octobre 2005, publiés en l'honneur du Marcel Piérart, à l'occasion de son 60ème anniversaire*, éd. par O. Curty, Fribourg-Paris, 115-142.
- D'Amore 2009: L. D'Amore, *Dediche sacre e ginnasi: la documentazione epigrafica di età ellenistica*, in *Dediche sacre nel mondo greco-romano. Diffusione, funzioni, tipologie*, *Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, American Academy in Rome, 19-20 aprile, 2006, Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae, 35*, a c. di J. Bodel, M. Kajava, Roma, pp. 161-180.
- Davies 1967: J. K. Davies, *Demosthenes on Liturgies: A Note*, «JHS» 87, 33-40.
- Daux 1970: G. Daux, *Notes de lecture*, «BCH» 94, 595-623.
- de Lisle 2020: C. de Lisle, *The Ephebate in Roman Athens: Outline and Catalogue of Inscriptions*, «AIO Papers» 12, <https://www.atticinscriptions.com/papers/aio-papers-12/> (last accessed on May 31st, 2023).
- Di Cesare 2018: R. Di Cesare, *Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Heart of Athens: Change and Continuity*, in *Development of Gymnasia and Graeco-Roman Cityscapes, Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 58*, ed. by U. Mania - M. Trümper, Berlin, 215-235.
- Fauconnier 2022: B. Fauconnier, *Some Notes on the Athenian Gymnasiarchy*, «Klio» 104.1, 135-158.
- Friend 2014: J.L. Friend, *The Nemesis in Lycurgan Athens*, in *Ancient Documents and Their Contexts: First North American Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (2011)*, ed. by J. Bodel - N. Dimitrova, Leiden, 98-110.
- Friend 2019: J.L. Friend, *The Athenian Ephebeia in the Fourth Century BCE*, (Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy, vol. 13), Leiden-Boston.
- Goette 2007: H.R. Goette, "Choregic" or victory monuments of the tribal Panathenaic contests, in *The Panathenaic Games*, ed. by O. Palagia - A. Choremi-Spetsieri, Oxford, 117-126.
- Goette - Weber 2004: H.R. Goette - T.M. Weber, *Marathon. Siedlungskammer und Schlachtfeld-Sommerfrische und Olympische Wettkampfstätte*, Mainz am Rhein.
- Habicht 1961: C.H. Habicht, *Neue Inschriften aus dem Kerameikos*, «MDAI (A)» 76, 127-148.
- Henderson 2020: T.R. Henderson, *The Springtime of the People: The Athenian Ephebeia and Citizen Training from Lykourgos to Augustus*, (Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy, vol. 15), Leiden-Boston.

- Hicks 1874: E.L. Hicks, *Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum. Part I Attika*, Oxford.
- Humphreys 2004: S.C. Humphreys, *The Strangeness of Gods. Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion*, Oxford-New York.
- Humphreys 2004-2009: S.C. Humphreys, *Epheboi at Oropos*, «Horos» 17-21, 83-90.
- Humphreys 2010: S.C. Humphreys, *Some Problematical Attic 'Lists' with Tribe and Deme Headings*, «ZPE» 172, 75-84.
- Kalogeropoulos 2015: Review of R. Nawracala, *Das Thesmophorion von Rhamnous*, «GFA» 18, 1149-1160.
- Karouzos 1923: X.I. Karouzos, Ἀπὸ τὸ Ἡράκλειον τοῦ Κυνοσάργους, «AD» 8, 85-102.
- Keesling 2018: C.M. Keesling, *Epigraphy of Appropriation: retrospective signatures of Greek sculptors in the Roman world*, in *Reuse and Renovation in Roman Material Culture. Functions, Aesthetics, Interpretations*, ed by D.Y Ng - M. Swatnam-Burland, Cambridge, 84-111.
- Kellogg 2013: D.L. Kellogg, *Marathon Fighters and Men of Maple. Ancient Acharnai*, Oxford.
- Köhler 1879: U. Köhler, *Attische Ephebenstele*, «MDAI(A)» 4, 324-336.
- Kokkinou 2012: L. Kokkinou, *Hermes and the Athenian Acropolis: Hermes Enagonios (?) on a Red-figure Miniature Amphora of Panathenaic Shape by the Bulas Group*, in *Approaching the Ancient Artifact*, ed. by A. Avramidou - D. Demetriou, Berlin, 243-254.
- Koumanoudis 1863: S.A. Koumanoudis, Εἰδήσεις περὶ τοῦ θεάτρου τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, αὐτοῦ, ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, «Φιλίστωρ» 4, 85-95.
- Liddel 2007: P. Liddel, *Civic Obligation and individual Liberty in Ancient Athens*, Oxford -New York.
- Liddel, Low 2022: P. Liddel, P. Low, *AIUK vol. 4.5: British Museum. Dedications*, <https://www.atticinscriptions.com/papers/aiuk-45/>
- Lolling 1889: H.G. Lolling, Ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἀκροπόλεως, «AD» 5, 6-21.
- Makres 2004-2009: A.K. Makres, Η χορηγική ανάθεση του Μενετέλους Μένητος Αναγυρασίου (IG II2 3038), «Horos» 17-21, 109-117.
- Makres 2009: A.K. Makres, *The Atarbos Base from the Akropolis of Athens Revisited*, in *Ἀττικά ἐπιγραφικά: Μελέτες πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ Christian Habicht*, επιμ. Ν. Παπαζαρκάδας - Α.Α. Θέμος, Αθήνα, 225-246.
- Makres 2014: A.K. Makres, *IG P 82 Revisited*, in *Athenaion episkopos. Studies in honour of H. B. Mattingly*, ed. by A.P. Matthaiou - R. Pitt, Athens, 185-202.
- Mallouchou-Tufano 2007: F. Mallouchou-Tufano, *The vicissitudes of the Athenian Acropolis in the 19th century. From Castle to Monument*, in *Great Moments in Greek Archaeology*, ed. by P. Valavanis, Los Angeles, 36-57.
- Marchiandi 2003: D.F. Marchiandi, *L'accademia: un capitolo trascurato dell' "Atene dei Tiranni"*, «ASAA» 81, 11-81.
- Marchiandi 2020: D.F. Marchiandi, *In the Shadow of Athena Polias: The Divinities of the Academy, the Training of Politai and Death in Service to Athens*, in *Plato's*

Dedications of the ephebes

- Academy: Its Workings and its History*, ed. by P. Kalligas - C. Balla - E. Baziotopoulou-Valavani - V. Karasmanis, Cambridge, 11-27.
- Mastrokostas 1970: E. Mastrokostas, Προϊστορική ακρόπολις εν Μαραθώνι, «Αρχαιολογικά Ανάλεκτα εξ Αθηνών» 3, 14-20.
- McLeod 1959: W. E. McLeod, *An Ephebic Dedication from Rhamnous*, «Hesperia» 28, 2, 121-126.
- Meritt 1940: B.D. Meritt, *Greek Inscriptions*, «Hesperia» 9, 53-96.
- Meritt - Woodhead - Stamires 1957: B.D. Meritt - A.G. Woodhead - G.A. Stamires, *Greek Inscriptions*, «Hesperia» 26, 198-270.
- Michaelis 1862: A. Michaelis, *Due bassirilievi ateniesi*, «Annali dell'istituto di corrispondenza archeologica», 208-220.
- Mitchel 1964: F.W. Mitchel, *Derkylos of Hagnous and the date of I.G.II², 1187*, «Hesperia» 33, 337-337.
- Monaco 2020: M.C. Monaco, *Il cd. Pompeion del Ceramico: un ginnasio efebico e le lampadedromie*, «ASAA» 98, 259-292.
- Munn 2021: M. Munn, *Inscriptions from Panakton*, «Hesperia» 90, 281-337.
- Nawracala 2014: R. Nawracala, *Das Thesmophorion von Rhamnous*, (Antiquitates, Archäologische Forschungsergebnisse bd. 62), Hamburg.
- Neils 1994: J. Neils, *The Panathenaia and Kleisthenic Ideology*, in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy. Proceedings of an International Conference celebrating 2500 years since the birth of democracy in Greece, held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4-6, 1992*, ed. by W.D.E. Coulson - O. Palagia - T.L. Shear, jr. - H.A. Shapiro - F.J. Frost, Oxford, 151-160.
- Ober 1985: J. Ober, *Fortress Attica: Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier, 404-322 B.C.*, (Mnemosyne, Supplements, vol. 84), Leiden.
- Öhler 1912: J. Öhler, s.v. Gymnasiarchos, *RE* VII, 2, 1912, coll. 1969-2004.
- Oikonomides 1980: A.N. Oikonomidis, *Attic Choregic-Inscriptions: I. Aristides and Cyriacus of Ancona II. The Walls South of the Acropolis and the Pythion III. Four Rich Athenians from the Deme of Thorikos*, «AncW» 3, 17-22.
- Osborne 2010: R. Osborne, *Competitive Festivals and the Polis: a context for dramatic festivals at Athens*, in *Athens and Athenian Democracy*, ed. by R. Osborne, Cambridge, 325-340.
- PAA*: J. S. Traill, *Persons of ancient Athens*, I-XXI, Toronto 1994-2012.
- Palagia 2000: O. Palagia, *A Gymnasiarch's dedication and the Panathenaic Torch-race*, in *Ἄγαθος Δαίμων, Études d'iconographie en l'honneur de Lilly Kahil*, (BCH Suppl. 38), Paris, 403-408.
- Palagia - Lewis 1989: O. Palagia - D. Lewis, *The ephebes of Erechtheis, 333/2 B.C. and their dedication*, «ABSA» 84, 333-344.
- Parker 1996: R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: a History*, Oxford.
- Parker 2005: R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford.
- Petrakos 1976: V.Ch. Petrakos, Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνούντος, «PAAH» 131, vol. 1, 5-60.
- Petrakos 1979a: V.Ch. Petrakos, Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνούντος, «PAAH» 134, 1-25.

- Petrakos 1979b: V.Ch. Petrakos, Νεές έρευνες στο Ραμνούντα, «Αερh», 1-81.
- Petrakos 1982: V.Ch. Petrakos, Άνασκαφή Ραμνούντος, «ΡΑΑΗ» 137, 127-162.
- Petrakos 1984a: V.Ch. Petrakos, Άνασκαφή Ραμνούντος, «ΡΑΑΗ» 140 vol. 1, 146-209.
- Petrakos 1984b: V.Ch. Petrakos, 'Η Έπιγραφικά του Όρωπου και του Ραμνούντος, in Πρακτικά του Η' Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ελληνικής και Λατινικής Επιγραφικής, Αθήνα, 3-9 Οκτωβρίου 1982, vol. I, Αθήνα 1984, 309-338.
- Petrakos 1987: V.Ch. Petrakos, 'Η έν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Έταιρεία: 'Η ιστορία των 150 χρονών της 1835-1987, (Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Έταιρείας 104), Αθήνα.
- Petrakos 1989: V.Ch. Petrakos, Άνασκαφή Ραμνούντος, «ΡΑΑΗ» 144, 1-37.
- Petrakos 1991: V.Ch. Petrakos, Άνασκαφή Ραμνούντος, «ΡΑΑΗ» 146, 1-63.
- Petrakos 1993: V.Ch. Petrakos, Άνασκαφή Ραμνούντος, «ΡΑΑΗ» 148, 1-35.
- Petrakos 1996: V.Ch. Petrakos, Άνασκαφή Ραμνούντος, «ΡΑΑΗ» 151, 1-19.
- Petrakos 1997: V.Ch. Petrakos, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*, in «Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres», 141, 605-630.
- Petrakos 1999: V.Ch. Petrakos, Ο δήμος του Ραμνούντος. Σύνοψη των ανασκαφών και των ερευνών 1813-1998, I. Τοπογραφία, Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Έταιρείας 181, Αθήνα.
- Petrakos 2000: V.Ch. Petrakos, Άνασκαφή Ραμνούντος, «ΡΑΑΗ» 155, 1-31.
- Petrakos 2004: V.Ch. Petrakos, Οί έφηβοι της Λεοντίδος του 333/2 π.Χ., «ΡΑΑ» 79, 67-176.
- Petrakos 2020: V.Ch. Petrakos, Ο δήμος του Ραμνούντος. V, Τα νομίσματα, οι λύχνοι, τα γλυπτά, Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Έταιρείας 326, Αθήνα.
- Pittakis 1835: K.S. Pittakis, *L'ancienne Athènes, ou La description des antiquités d'Athènes et de ses environs*, Athènes.
- Platonos-Giota 2004: M. Platonos-Giota, Αχαρναί. Ιστορική και τοπογραφική επισκόπηση των αρχαίων Αχαρνών των γειτονικών δήμων και των οχυρώσεως της Πάρνηθας, Acharnes.
- Poursat 1967: J.-C. Poursat: *Note à IG² II 3018 : signature d'Aristéidès*, «BCH» 91, 111-113.
- Pritchard 2013: D.M. Pritchard, *Sport, Democracy and War in Classical Athens*, Cambridge-New York.
- Rausa 1998: F. Rausa, *Due donari agonistici dall'Acropoli*, «MDAI (A)» 113, 191-234.
- Reinmuth 1961: O.W. Reinmuth, *Ephobic Texts from Athens*, «Hesperia» 30, 8-22.
- Robertson 1985: N. Robertson, *The origin of the Panathenaia*, «MDAI (R)» 128, 231-295.
- Roesch 1973: P. Roesch, *Une inscription athénienne au Musée de Thèbes*, «Athens Annals of Archaeology» 6, 142-145.
- Russo 2022: D. Russo, *Le ripartizioni civiche di Atene. Una storia archeologica di tribù, trittie, demi e fratrie, 508/7-308/7*, («ASAA» Supplemento 10), Atene-Roma.
- Schöne 1872: R. Schöne, *Griechische Reliefs aus athenischen Sammlungen*, Leipzig.
- Shear 2003a: J.L. Shear, *Atarbos' Base and the Panathenaia*, «JHS» 123, 164-180.

Dedications of the ephebes

- Shear 2021: J.L. Shear, *Serving Athena. The Festival of the Panathenaia and the Construction of Athenian Identities*, Cambridge-New York.
- Smith 2011: A.C. Smith, *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*, (Monumenta Graeca et Romana, 19), Leiden-Boston.
- Sybel 1881: L. von Sybel, *Katalog der Sculpturen zu Athen: Kentrikon mouseion Barba-keion Iykeion. Hagia trias. Theseion. Stoa des Hadrian. Ephoria. Südabhang der Akropolis. Akropolis: mit systematischer Übersicht und epigraphischem Index*, Marburg.
- Stais 1891a: V.N. Stais, Ἀγάλματα ἐκ Ῥαμνοῦντος, «AEph», 45-62.
- Stais 1891b: V.N. Stais, Ἐν Ῥαμνοῦντι, «PAAH» 46, 13-18.
- Sundwall 1907: J. Sundwall, *De institutis rei publicae Atheniensium post Aristotelis aetatem commutatis*, Helsingfors.
- Traill 1986: J.S. Traill, *Demos and Trittys. Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica*, Toronto.
- Traill 2021: J.S. Traill, *Comments on Several New Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora and Panakton*, «Γραμματεῖον» 10, 77-79.
- Travlos 1954: J. Travlos, Ἀνασκαφαὶ ἐν Ἐλευσίῃ, «PAAH» 109, 66-71.
- Vierneisel-Schlörb 1988: B. Vierneisel-Schlörb, *Klassische Grahdenkmäler und Votivreliefs, Glyptothek München-Katalog der Skulpturen*, vol. III, Munich.
- Viscardi 2018: G. P. Viscardi, *Modellare identità, tramandare memoria, riformare la polis. A proposito di Munico: un eroe eponimo tra mito e storia*, in *Héros fondateurs et identités communautaires dans l'Antiquité entre mythe, rite et politique*, (Quaderni di Otium, 3), a c. di M. P. Castiglioni - R. Carboni - M. Giuman - H. Bernier-Farella, Perugia, 36-57.
- von den Hoff 2003: R. von den Hoff, *Tradition and innovation: portraits and dedications on the early Hellenistic Acropolis*, in *The Macedonians in Athens 323-299 B.C.*, ed. by O. Palagia - S. Tracy, Oxford, 173-185.
- Walter 1923: O. Walter, *Beschreibung der Reliefs im kleinen Akropolismuseum in Athen*, Wien.
- Wilding 2022: A. Wilding, *Reinventing the Amphiareion at Oropos*, (Mnemosyne Supplementum, History and Archaeology of Classical Antiquity, 445), Leiden-Boston.
- Wilson 2000: P. Wilson, *The Athenian institution of the Khoregia: the chorus, the city and the stage*, Cambridge.
- Woodward 1910: A. M. Woodward, *Notes on Some Greek Inscriptions, Mainly in Athens*, «JHS» 30, 260-266.
- Wrede 1924: W. Wrede, Phyle, «MDAI(A)» 49, 153-224.

Abstract

Partendo dai loro punti di ritrovamento, il contributo intende ricondurre le dediche effettuate dagli efebi, dai loro ufficiali e dai ginnasiarchi ai loro luoghi di originaria esposizione all'interno del paesaggio attico. Lo studio riguarda le prime dediche attestate per queste categorie, partendo da fine V secolo per i ginnasiarchi e dall'età licurghica per gli efebi e i magistrati, fino alla fine del IV secolo. La stretta connessione tra le categorie di dedicanti oggetto di indagine (che talvolta, nel caso di testi lacunosi, ne rende impossibile l'individuazione precisa) fa sì che la distribuzione topografica delle loro dediche possa essere analizzata in parallelo, permettendo di individuare analogie e differenze, ragioni e implicazioni della presenza di questi documenti (attestazioni di culto, ma anche funzionali a rendersi visibili nel tessuto sociale della *polis*) in determinati luoghi.

The aim of this paper is to identify the original locations of dedications of ephebes, their magistrates and gymnasiarchs in the Attic landscape based on their findspots. The analysis covers the early period of their dedication practice (from the end of the 5th century for the gymnasiarchs and from the time of Lykourgos for the ephebes and magistrates) until the end of the 4th century. The close relationship between the categories of dedicators studied (which, in the case of fragmentary texts, sometimes makes it impossible to identify the actual dedicators) allows a parallel analysis of the topographical distribution of their dedications in order to identify similarities and differences, reasons and implications of the presence of these documents (which testify to a cultic act, but also serve as a means of making oneself visible in the social fabric of the *polis*) in specific locations.