
The aim of this study is to "reconstruct a picture of the ephebia,—its origins, its purpose, its functioning, its development and its place in Greek history" (p. IX). Since the evidence is mainly epigraphical, a large part of this study is devoted to the establishment of a reliable text of the ephebic inscriptions of the 4th century B.C. (20 in number). Each inscription is followed by a detailed commentary, largely, though by no means exclusively, prosopographical.

Inscription nr 15 gives rise to a discussion on the problem of the identification of the strategos Philokles with the kosmetes Philokles and about whether the ephebes, mentioned on this stone, were those of both years or of only one; nr 17 is followed by an exhaustive discussion about the demographic problem of the ephebic enrolments in the 4th century B.C. and about the decrease in enrolment at the end of that century as a result of the reduction of ephebic service to one year and the abolition of its obligatory character. In the Hellenistic-Roman period the ephebeia is no longer the institutionalized biennial period of compulsory service but a kind of fashionable 'public school' for the (non)-Athenian *jeunesse dorée* which enjoys itself with para-military training, sport, intellectual activities and participation in civic ceremonies (cf. R., p. 133). In a final chapter (p. 123-138) R. presents his views on the nature of and developments in the 5th/4th century ephebeia. Elaborate indices facilitate the use of this study. The quality of the plates is superb and to a certain extent justifies the price of the book.

In his long commentary on nr 17 R. discusses the thorny problem of the average size of the ephebic enrolment for one year, the correlation between this number and the total population of Attica in the 4th century B.C. He convincingly defends the view (against e.g. Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'éphebie attique . . .*, 283 ff.; cf. my review in Mnem. 1965, 441-6) that in the period 334-324 B.C. (nearly all available inscriptions date from that period) the 10 tribes 'produced' ca 490 ephebes annually. He combines this piece of evidence with Jones' hypothesis according to which in Athens, just as in Roman Africa and early 20th century India, the number of young men 18 and 19 years of age constituted ca 10% of the adult male population (*Athenian Democracy*, 81 ff.), and ends up with the reasonable conclusion that the ephebes were recruited from the 9000 hoplites which are recorded to have lived in Athens in the decades after Chaeronea. R.'s calculations corroborate the view held by many, though not by all, scholars, that after Chaeronea the ephebes continued to be...
drawn from the hoplite classes (and not from the whole citizen population of 21,000, as e.g. P. Vidal-Naquet assumed in his *La tradition de l'hoplite athénien*, in J.-P. Vernant, *Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne*, 161 ff., esp. 164 and 177). Incidentally, R. (with Jones and Pélédidis) rejects the view that as a result of the new census rating of Antipater in 321 B.C. many of the disenfranchised left Athens for Thrace and that between 321 and the end of the century there was a decline in the Athenian population altogether. Obviously the poor Athenian thetes in majority preferred life in Athens without misthoi to the prospect of an existence outside Athens. R. shrewdly explains the low number of ca 360 ephēboi in 305/4 B.C. by the assumption that (a) ephēbic service was reduced to one year and—more important—(b) enrolment was no longer obligatory.

In his final chapter R. easily discards Wilamowitz’s and Nilsson’s view that the ephēbeia was established after Chaeronea. A well-known passage from Aeschines clearly shows that ca 371/0 B.C. there already was a biennial ephēbeia 1). The question remains which innovations were introduced in an existing organization after Chaeronea. Aeschines says that he was a περιπόλος τῆς χώρας for two years. Aristotle, in his report (*Ath. Pol. 42*) on the ephēbeia in ca 325 B.C., writes that during their first year the ephēbes went to the Peiraeus, guarded Munichia and Akte; in their second year they served on patrol duty in the country and were quartered in frontier forts. A sums up the activity of both years with the statement ΦΡΟΥΡΟΩΣΙ δὲ τὰ δύο ἔτη, and according to R. this is precisely what Aeschines rather casually said. I doubt it. Aeschines was two years ‘on the move’ in the χώρα; Aristotle’s ephēbes spent one quiet year in the Peiraeus and moved around the frontier forts the second year. Aeschines’ περιπόλοι can perhaps be subsumed under the heading φρουρώντες but Aristotle’s φρουρώντες are not to be identified with περιπόλοι. Accordingly, in my view one innovation, introduced after 371/0 B.C., was that the ephēbes spent their first year in the Peiraeus without any περιπόλειν. R. assumes that after Chaeronea ephēbic service was made continuous throughout the two year period of their liability for duty and that on the basis of this continuous service the training program was systematized and intensified: physical education, instruction in specific military branches and a kind of ‘moral rearmament’ were strongly empha-

1) The date (361 B.C.) assigned by R. to his inscription nr. 1 (mutilated honorary decree of the tribe Akamantis for the kosmētēs of the ephēboi) is untenable: cf. D. M. Lewis, CR 1973, 254; the text probably belongs to the period after Chaeronea, like all the other 4th century Athenian ephēbic inscriptions.