

Bram Fauconnier\*

## Some Notes on the Athenian Gymnasiarch

**Summary:** This paper investigates the Athenian gymnasiarchy, an office that remains badly understood. Originally a festival liturgy, the gymnasiarchy was transformed into a magistracy at the end of the fourth century BC. This paper first examines the reasons for the shift and argues that it was connected to broader political currents in late Classical Athens. Secondly, it sheds new light on the nature of the office in the Hellenistic period. Whereas earlier scholars assumed that the Athenian gymnasiarch was a minor official under the *kosmetes*, epigraphic and literary sources reveal that he was a fully-fledged gymnasium director, just as in other *poleis*.

**Keywords:** Gymnasiarchy, Gymnasium, Ephebes, *neoi*, Athens, Liturgy

**\*Kontakt:** Bram Fauconnier, E-Mail: [bram.fauconnier@ugent.be](mailto:bram.fauconnier@ugent.be)

In 1896, G. Glotz wrote that “la question de la gymnasiarchie est une des plus obscures que soulève l’histoire des institutions grecques”.<sup>1</sup> Since then, a lot of new evidence, primarily epigraphic, has surfaced that has deepened our understanding of this important office.<sup>2</sup> The last two decades have seen a renewed scholarly interest in the subject, e.g. the 2007 edited volume “Das hellenistische Gymnasion”, including C. Schuler’s study of the Hellenistic gymnasiarchy, and O. Curty’s recently published catalogue of Hellenistic *polis* decrees in honour of gymnasiarchs.<sup>3</sup> Despite this progress, questions remain about the gymnasiarchy in Hellas’ most famous *polis*, Athens. Originally it was a festival liturgy, but at the end of the fourth century BC it became a single annual magistracy.<sup>4</sup> How can we explain this remarkable shift? This paper argues that the emergence of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Glotz 1896, 1675.

<sup>2</sup> Most importantly the discovery of the gymnasiarchal law of Beroia: SEG 27–261; Gauthier – Hatzopoulos 1993.

<sup>3</sup> Schuler 2007; Curty 2015. See also Vitale 2014.

<sup>4</sup> For the gymnasiarchy as a single and annual magistracy in Hellenistic Athens, see IG II<sup>2</sup> 1303, ll. 6–8 (= I.Eleusis 207): χειροτονηθεὶς [γ]υμνασίαρχος εἰς τὸν ἐν[ιαυτὸν τὸ]ν ἐπ’ Ἀντιφίλου ἄ[ρχ]οντο[ς] τ[ῆ]ς τε κατὰ τ[ῆ]ς γυμνά[σια] [διεξ]ήγα[γε]ν ε[ν] τάκτῳ, “after he had been elected as gymnasiarch in the year when Antiphilos was archon, he managed the affairs of the gymnasia in a well-ordered way and in accordance with the laws”. See also Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 119–120 and the discussion below.

new-style gymnasiarchy in the late fourth century BC was closely connected to the broader political context, marked by changing elite attitudes about their duties and expectations towards the Athenian state. The second research question concerns the responsibilities of the Athenian magistrate-gymnasiarchs of the Hellenistic period. On the basis of limited evidence it has been argued that these fundamentally differed from the magistrate-gymnasiarchs in other *poleis*. Whereas the latter were gymnasium directors, the Athenian gymnasiarchs were considered to be less important officials. This paper investigates the literary and epigraphic evidence anew and argues that the Athenian gymnasiarchs of the Hellenistic period were true gymnasium directors, just as their counterparts in the other *poleis*.

## From Liturgy to Magistracy

The gymnasiarchy in Classical Athens was an important festival liturgy, the holders of which were responsible for the sponsoring and training of a running team in the torch races (*lampadedromiai*).<sup>5</sup> These competitions were held between ten teams representing their own *phyle* and took place during the festivals for Prometheus, Hephaistos and Pan – the latter in the context of the *Panathenaia*<sup>6</sup> – and probably during some other festivals as well.<sup>7</sup> The running teams trained for the races in the gymnasia under the supervision of their respective tribal gymnasiarchs. The gymnasiarchs of the Classical period cannot be considered ‘gymnasium directors’, because their focus was on the training of the athletes from their own tribes in the context of a given festival.<sup>8</sup> Still, they probably held some (shared?) authority in the gymnasia where their athletes exercised.<sup>9</sup> The

---

<sup>5</sup> For the gymnasiarchy in the Classical period, see Davies 1967; Sekunda 1990; Wilson 2000, 35–36; Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 115–118. See also the (now outdated) works of Glotz 1896 and Öhler 1912.

<sup>6</sup> Sekunda 1990, 153–154.

<sup>7</sup> Schol. Patm. on Demosth. Eub. 43: καὶ οὗτοι ἤγοντο Λαμπαδοδρομίαν τὴν ἐορτὴν τῷ τε Προμηθεῖ καὶ τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ καὶ τῷ Πανὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον. Οἱ ἐφηβοί, ἀλειψάμενοι παρὰ τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου, κατὰ διαδοχὴν τρέχοντες ἤπτοντο τὸν βωμόν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἄψας ἐνίκα, καὶ ἡ τοῦτου φυλὴ, “and they used to hold a torch race in the festival for Prometheus, Hephaistos and Pan in this manner. The epebes, supplied with oil by the gymnasiarch, run in relays and touch the altar. The one who touched it first won, and his *phyle* as well”. A law mentioned in Aischin. Tim. 1.12 mentions the *Hermaia*, but this law is a later interpolation and thus no reliable source for the Classical period: Öhler 1912, 1988. See Rhodes 1981, 638 for torch races in other Athenian festivals, but we do not know if those were sponsored by gymnasiarchs. For the role of the epebes in the running teams, see below.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Schuler 2007, 166: “Eher sollte man in Betracht ziehen, den Titel in diesem Fall nicht als ἄρχων τοῦ γυμνασίου, sondern als ἄρχων τῆς γυμνασίας oder τῶν γυμνασίων zu verstehen, eben als ‘Leiter des Trainings’.”

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Glotz 1896, 1676; Wilson 2000, 36.

gymnasiarchs seem to have been nominated by the tribal assemblies, after which the *archon basileus*, the official in charge of the torch races in general, probably confirmed the nominations.<sup>10</sup> As such, there were at least 30 gymnasiarchs each year: one for each *phyle* and for each of the three festivals for which torch races are attested.<sup>11</sup> After the races, the winning *phyle* erected a dedicatory inscription mentioning the gymnasiarch under whose supervision victory was achieved.<sup>12</sup> The liturgical gymnasiarchy of the Classical period had an outspoken ‘democratic’ character: in the words of N. Fisher,

“the liturgical organisation fostered the constant co-operation [...] of elite leaders with large numbers of collective teams, usually from the same tribe, engaged in intense and physically taxing competition. This will have helped to increase tribal solidarity and to break down class suspicions and hostilities”<sup>13</sup>.

There has been some debate on the composition of the running teams in the torch races. A passage from Xenophon’s *Poroi* (350s BC), which speaks of “those assigned to physical training in the gymnasia”, was interpreted by P. Gauthier as a reference to ephebic training, and hence it has been argued that the gymnasiarch played an important role in the *ephebeia* in the decades before the ephebic reforms by the law of Epikrates in 335–334 BC.<sup>14</sup> In two recent monographs, however, J. L. Friend and T. R. Henderson have argued compellingly that there was no institutionalised programme of ephebic training before 335–334 BC and that the term ‘ephebe’ referred to newly-enrolled citizens under the age of 20.<sup>15</sup> The passage in Xenophon in fact does not mention ephebes and can therefore not be used as evidence of an ephebic training programme. Friend argues that the teams in the torch races of Classical Athens consisted of young men – as indicated by

<sup>10</sup> Nomination by the tribes: Demosth. or. 39.7; possible role of the *archon basileus*: Aristot. Ath. pol. 57.1, which states that this magistrate was in charge of the torch races. See also Rhodes 1981, 639; Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 117–118.

<sup>11</sup> Sekunda 1990, 156–157.

<sup>12</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 3017–3021. See also IG II<sup>2</sup> 3023, erected by the gymnasiarch himself, and SEG 40–124 (= IG II<sup>2</sup> 1250), a decree of the *phyle* Aiantis in honour of its gymnasiarch, including a list of the victorious runners.

<sup>13</sup> Fisher 1998, 93; also Henderson 2020, 162. For the democratisation of the use of gymnasia, see [Xen.] Ath. pol. 2.10, with Mann 1998, 13.

<sup>14</sup> Xen. vect. 4.52: οἱ τε γὰρ ταχθέντες γυμνάζεσθαι πολὺ ἂν ἐπιμελέστερον τοῦτο πράττοιεν ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις τὴν τροφὴν ἀπολαμβάνοντες [πλείω] ἢ ἐν ταῖς λαμπάσι γυμνασιαρχούμενοι· οἱ τε φρουρεῖν ἐν τοῖς φρουρίοις οἱ τε πελάζειν καὶ περιπολεῖν τὴν χώραν πάντα ταῦτα μᾶλλον ἂν πράττοιεν, ἐφ’ ἐκάστοις τῶν ἔργων τῆς τροφῆς ἀποδιδόμενης, “For those assigned to physical training in the gymnasia would do this far more attentively by receiving maintenance more than when under the gymnasiarchs in the torch-races: and those [instructed to] garrison duty in the fortresses and those [instructed to] serve as peltasts and [instructed to] patrol the countryside would perform more of all these things, if maintenance were given for each of the tasks” (transl. J. L. Friend). See Gauthier 1976, 191–192; Sekunda 1990, 151; Chankowski 2010, 117–120.

<sup>15</sup> Friend 2019, 8–33, esp. 22–26; Henderson 2020, 36–55.

Aristophanes – but that these need not have been exclusively ephebes (in the sense of new citizens).<sup>16</sup> This seems to be the most likely interpretation of the available evidence, which nowhere reveals an exclusive connection between the gymnasiarchs and ephebes.<sup>17</sup>

At some point in the late fourth century BC, the gymnasiarchy was profoundly reformed. The tribal liturgists made way for a magistrate who was elected annually by the *demos*. How can we explain the drastic change in the gymnasiarchy that replaced the 30 or so *phyle*-liturgists by one single magistrate? In his overview of the gymnasiarchy in the Hellenistic period, C. Schuler offered some explanations for the evolution from liturgy to magistracy, an evolution which seems to have taken place in many Greek *poleis*.<sup>18</sup> Since his explanations concern the entire Greek world, it is necessary to find out whether they are also applicable to Athens.

His first factor is an increase in gymnasial activities in the fourth century BC and the corresponding monumental development of the gymnasia in many *poleis* throughout the Greek world.<sup>19</sup> Although archeological data on the three Athenian gymnasia (Akademia, Lykeion and Kynosarges) are scanty at best, it seems that they too underwent a phase of infrastructural development in the fourth century BC.<sup>20</sup> Schuler's remarks are therefore applicable to Athens as well:

“Mit dem Ausbau der gymnasialen Infrastruktur wuchs zwangsläufig auch der Aufwand für den laufenden Betrieb und den Unterhalt der Plätze und Gebäude, und die Einführung von Gymnasiarchen dürfte zumindest teilweise eine Reaktion auf diese Steigerung der administrativen Anforderungen gewesen sein.”<sup>21</sup>

One can indeed imagine that a single gymnasiarch appointed by the state would be more efficient in managing the affairs of the gymnasia than the 30 odd tribal gymnasiarchs, whose main focus was not on the gymnasium, but the training their respective team of runners. On the other hand, one could equally argue that an increase in gymnasial activities would have required more gymnasiarchs rather than less, let alone a single one

---

<sup>16</sup> Aristoph. Vesp. 1196; Friend 2019, 25–26. See also Humphreys 2004, 115, note 14 for a similar view on the composition of the running teams.

<sup>17</sup> The fact that the *scholion* on Demosthenes in the Byzantine *Lexicon Patmense* cited above (note 7) mentions ephebes, offers no compelling evidence about the actual composition of the teams in the Classical period, as it was written at a much later date.

<sup>18</sup> Schuler 2007, 172–174.

<sup>19</sup> For the early history of gymnasia, see Mann 1998. The first permanent stone gymnasium we know of is the one of Delphi, dating from the fourth century BC.

<sup>20</sup> Lykourgos, for instance, financed building projects in the *Lykeion*: Plut. mor. 841C–D; Paus. 1.29.16. For an overview of the Athenian gymnasia in the fourth century BC, see Knell 2000, 173–203.

<sup>21</sup> Schuler 2007, 173.

only. Therefore, this first reason for the change in statute does not seem to be a decisive argument.

Schuler's second factor in the emergence of the magistrate-gymnasiarchs is an increase in agonistic festivals in the Hellenistic period. As a result, there was a growing demand for participants in processions, competitions and torch races and for an adapted programme of athletic training. Against this background, gymnasia could be the ideal place for a steady supply of participants for those parts of a festival that were reserved for the citizens of the *polis* (as against other parts that were open to citizens from other *poleis*) as well as for athletic training in general.<sup>22</sup> However, for Athens the impact of this factor is harder to assess. Athens had a rich festival life already since the fifth century BC, and there is no evidence for a significant increase in agonistic activities in Attica at the beginning of the Hellenistic period. Continuity is more outspoken than change.<sup>23</sup> Athens was, of course, strongly connected with other *poleis*, so there may have been a growing demand for athletic training in order to compete abroad, leading in turn to an increase in gymnasial activities and the development of gymnasia as described above.

The third factor adduced by Schuler for the change in status is the development of the *ephebeia*. Here we encounter a major difference between Athens and the other *poleis*. In most of the latter, the *ephebeia* came into being after the conquests of Alexander, and a gymnasiarch was put in charge of the institution. In Athens, the *ephebeia* was instituted already in 335 or 334 BC by the law of Epikrates, and it was headed by a *kosmetes* and ten *sophronistai*, who were not liturgists, but elected city officials.<sup>24</sup> Did the institution of the *ephebeia* and the creation of new magistrates have an impact on the liturgical gymnasiarchy in Athens? One inscription may suggest this. It is a dedication by two gymnasiarchs to commemorate the victory of the ephebes of the *phyle* Erechtheis in the torch race of an unnamed festival, possibly the *Nemesia*, including a list of runners. The

---

<sup>22</sup> Schuler 2007, 173–174. The need for participants in the 'international' competitions was met by the associations of artists around Dionysos, which probably came into being in the early third century BC (for which, see Le Guen 2001 and Aneziri 2003) and by individual star athletes. The latter only organised themselves in an association in the late first century BC: Fauconnier 2016. For new *agones* in the Hellenistic period, see Robert 1984, Parker 2004.

<sup>23</sup> For the limited evidence of new agonistic activities in Athens in the late fourth and early third centuries BC, see Parker 1996, 246–247, 267–275. Only in the later third century BC did some new prominent *agones* come into being: the *Diogeneia*, the *Ptolemaia* and the reformed *Eleusinia*: Parker 1996, 274–275.

<sup>24</sup> On the creation of the *ephebeia* in Lykourgan Athens, see now Friend 2019, 34–56; Henderson 2020, 36–55.

inscription was erected between 332 and 330 BC.<sup>25</sup> On the basis of a fragmentary list of ephebes of Erechtheis preserved in another inscription, O. Palagia and D. Lewis have determined that at least one of the gymnasiarchs, and very probably the other one too, was at that time an ephebe himself.<sup>26</sup> This raises important questions: why do we find two gymnasiarchs in one torch race? And how can we explain the fact that these gymnasiarchs were ephebes rather than rich adults as in the earlier sources?

According to A. S. Chankowski, the inscription shows that the old ‘adult’ gymnasiarchy had disappeared after the law of Epikrates on the institution of the *ephebeia* was enacted:

“les gymnasiarques ne pouvaient plus être responsables de l’entraînement des éphèbes et leur rôle devait se limiter à une contribution financière. Force est donc d’admettre une réforme profonde du système de la gymnasiarchie”.<sup>27</sup>

In other words, the gymnasiarchy had become an honorary title for benefactors of the ephebic training. Unfortunately, Chankowski does not explain how this new honorary gymnasiarchy is connected to the magistracy that would emerge later in the fourth century. Anyhow, there are some arguments against his hypothesis. First, as the contest seems to have been held at the sanctuary of Nemesis in Rhamnous, it could well have been a deme festival with an organisation different from the city festivals.<sup>28</sup> The dedication from Rhamnous therefore does not prove that the old liturgical gymnasiarchy had disappeared in the contests organised by the *polis*.<sup>29</sup> Second, a fragmentary list of liturgists from 331–330 BC pieced together by Lewis (not to be confused with the ephebic list of Erechtheis from the previous paragraph) probably mentioned the gymnasiarchs of

---

<sup>25</sup> IG II<sup>3</sup> 4 336 (= Friend 2019, T10). For the identification of the festival as the *Nemesia*, see Palagia and Lewis 1989, 337–344; Friend 2015; Friend 2019, 122.

<sup>26</sup> Palagia – Lewis 1989; Friend 2019, T11, with the discussion on pp. 122–125.

<sup>27</sup> Chankowski 2010, 123.

<sup>28</sup> There is some discussion whether the Nemesis cult of Rhamnous was under *polis* or deme control: Whitehead 1986, 160, note 76. In any case, the administration of the cult was managed by deme officials: I.Rhamnous 182 (late fifth century BC); I.Rhamnous 180 (339–338 BC). On the other hand, there is evidence that the cult was of supra-local importance, as our ephebic dedication shows. Yet as I will argue below, the ephebe-gymnasiarchs did not have a leading function, but only provided their fellows with oil. The fact that the two ephebe-gymnasiarchs were not from Rhamnous therefore does not refute the argument that the festival was organised by the deme. There is nothing that would have prevented the ephebes to participate in a deme festival; one of the tribal regiments were in any case stationed in Rhamnous. Lambert 2010, 168–169 surmises that the Nemesis cult was simply a deme cult that attracted interest from outside, but leaves the possibility open that the *polis* became formally involved after the institution of the *ephebeia* in 335–334. See also Friend 2015 for a similar view.

<sup>29</sup> Conversely, the dedication cannot be used to argue that the traditional liturgical gymnasiarchy still existed, as did Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 121.

the *polis*-festival of the *Hephaistia*, which would imply that the old liturgical gymnasiarchy was still in force in the years after the institution of the *ephebeia*.<sup>30</sup> Third, Chankowski's thesis rests on the assumption that the liturgical gymnasiarchs had an exclusive connection with the ephebes. As shown above, however, there is no convincing evidence that there was an institutionalised programme of ephebic training before 335–334 BC. As such, there is no proof that the institution of the *ephebeia* caused the demise of the classical liturgical gymnasiarchy.

How, then, should we interpret the ephebic gymnasiarchy of the Rhamnous dedication? I agree with Chankowski that it was an honorary function, but not that it replaced the classical liturgy. Rather, it appears that it was a new and different category in connection with the *ephebeia* that coexisted with the classical liturgy and, later, with the Hellenistic magistracy. As opposed to the latter two, it was not a leading function. Neither an office nor a classical liturgy, it was open to wealthy ephebes who wished to supply their fellows with oil, and, in the case of the Rhamnous inscription, to finance dedications. The honorary function frequently recurs in the ephebic inscriptions of the later Hellenistic period, when the Athenian *polis* disengaged from the financing of the ephebic training and when costs were increasingly borne by the *kosmetes* and the ephebes themselves.<sup>31</sup> An inscription from 80/79 BC makes clear what the ephebic gymnasiarchy was about: the *kosmetes*

“guided those (i.e. ephebes) most prominent and most inclined to the finest honour-loving behaviour to undertake gymnasiarchies, and relieved the others in right measure of these expenses”.<sup>32</sup>

In sum, Schuler's three factors do not seem to explain the replacement of the old liturgical gymnasiarchs by an annually elected magistrate-gymnasiarch. It is therefore necessary to investigate yet another factor that earlier studies did not take into consideration: the broader context of growing political pressure on the liturgical system and other democratic institutions by a significant part of the Athenian elite.<sup>33</sup> After all, the

<sup>30</sup> SEG 25–177, l. 29: [γυμνασίαρχο]ι εἰς Ἡφαίσ[τια], with the remarks of Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 121–122. The restoration is based on IG II<sup>2</sup> 3201, ll. 7–11: οἱ φυ[λέται] γυμν[ασι]αρχή[σαν]τα Ἡφ[αί]στια.

<sup>31</sup> Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 256–259.

<sup>32</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1039, ll. 29–30 (= Lambert – Schneider 2019, 7–12): τ[οὺς μὲν προ]υχεῖς καὶ πρ[ὸς τὰ κάλλ]ιστ[α φι]λοτίμως ἔχοντας συνπροτρεψάμενος [εἰς γυ]μνασι[αρχίας, τοὺς δὲ] συμμέτρ[ο]υ[ς κουφίσας τῆς] εἰς ταῦτα δαπάνης (transl. Lambert – Schneider).

<sup>33</sup> Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 119 only mentions “le trasformazioni operate per volontà di Demetrio Falereo”, but does not delve deeper in the political context of late Classical Athens. On the other hand, recent studies

disappearance of the liturgical gymnasiarchy was not an isolated case: it was part of a broader political shift that marked the end of classical liturgies as such. In her paper in this issue, G. Dietze-Mager shows that Aristotle sharply criticised the liturgies, especially the *choregia* and the gymnasiarchy. He considered them unjust compulsory taxes on the rich, which lead to their financial ruin and for which the liturgists received nothing in return. According to Aristotle, this imbalance between the receiving *demos* and the providing liturgist destroyed *homonoia* in the *polis*. In his view, contributions of the rich to the *polis* in the form of liturgies should be voluntary and should be rewarded with political power in the form of exclusive access to high political offices. In a radical democracy, which according to him was prevalent in Athens during his lifetime, such privileges for the rich were in contrast with the principle of absolute political equality. It seems that Aristotle therefore supported the idea that liturgies should be transformed into annual offices with political competence and a public budget. Interestingly, Aristotle mentions the gymnasiarchy as an office in some *poleis* that have “more leisure and prosperity, and also pay attention to good order”.<sup>34</sup> For him, Athens with its liturgical gymnasiarchs clearly did not belong to these *poleis*. The implication is that the Athenian liturgical gymnasiarchs should better make way for a magistracy.<sup>35</sup>

Aristotle by no means represented an isolated opinion. Throughout the fourth century BC, dissatisfaction among the elite increased as the state tried to tighten its control over the contributions of the wealthy.<sup>36</sup> Conflicts about liturgies run like a connective thread through fourth-century forensic oratory. Many sought to evade the compulsory liturgies by hiding their wealth or using procedures like *skepsis* or *antidosis* in order to compel someone else to take on the burden.<sup>37</sup> Those willing to accept liturgies increasingly sought proper compensation for their contributions, even if it were only in

---

on the end of the liturgical *choregia*, which was replaced by the magisterial *agonothesia* at the end of the fourth century BC, explicitly acknowledge the role of elite attitudes in the demise of the liturgy: Wilson 2000, 268–270; Csapo – Wilson 2010, 89–90.

<sup>34</sup> Aristot. pol. 1322a 35 – 1323a 1: ἴδιαι δὲ ταῖς σχολαστικωτέραις καὶ μᾶλλον εὐημερούσαις πόλεσιν, ἔτι δὲ φροντισούσαις εὐκοσμίας, γυναικονομία νομοφυλακία παιδονομία γυμνασιαρχία, “On the other hand, peculiar to the states that have more leisure and prosperity, and also pay attention to good order, are the offices of superintendent of women, guardian of the laws, superintendent of children, and gymnasiarch” (transl. A. Rackham, with some adaptations).

<sup>35</sup> See especially Aristot. pol. 1321a 31–35; 1322b 35–1323a 1–10, with Dietze-Mager 2022, this issue, Klio 104.1, 2022.

<sup>36</sup> There is a relatively large body of literature on elite attitudes towards liturgies and other contributions demanded by the state. The following paragraph gives only a few yet significant examples. For broader studies, see for instance Christ 1990; 2006, 143–204; Domingo Gyax 2016, 199–250.

<sup>37</sup> Gabrielsen 1987; Christ 1990.



the form of public gratitude (*charis*) that might have engendered goodwill towards them in the courts.<sup>38</sup> Stronger criticism is found in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, where Sokrates denounces liturgies, among which the gymnasiarchy, as a too heavy burden imposed by the state on the rich.<sup>39</sup> In his "Characters", Theophrastos sketches an archetypal oligarch whose opinions, however caricatural, must have been instantly recognisable to contemporaries. The oligarch mutters as follows: "when will they have done ruining us with these liturgies and trierarchies?" And in the assembly, when the appointment of *epimeletai* for the procession of the *Dionysia* is being discussed, he

"will come forward and declare that these should have full powers; and, if others propose ten, he will say that 'one is sufficient', but that 'he must be a real man'".<sup>40</sup>

This elite resistance, as Mager reveals, started a gradual process of 'Verstaatlichung' of liturgies in the second half of the fourth century BC. Already in the Lykourgan period it is clear that magistrates were being appointed whose responsibilities at least partly overlapped with those of liturgists,<sup>41</sup> and in the course of the subsequent decades the liturgical system petered out. It is important to note, however, that the new magistracies retained some liturgical characteristics, for their budget did not suffice to cover all costs and the office-holder was expected to contribute money out of his own pocket.<sup>42</sup> Yet these contributions differed fundamentally from the contributions of the classical liturgists, for now the rich could contribute on their own terms rather than on the terms of the *demos*, and they were rewarded with political power, just as Aristotle saw fit. In this way, Hellenistic euergetism was born.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Hakkarainen 1997, 13–15; Christ 2006, 180–184.

<sup>39</sup> Xen. oik. 2.6. A famous fifth-century criticism on the liturgical system is [Xen.] Ath. pol. 1.13, where the author scornfully writes that the rich only empty their pockets while the people enjoy. For more examples, see Domingo Gygax 2016, 201–202, with further literature.

<sup>40</sup> Theophr. char. 26: παρελθὼν ἀποφίνασθαι, ὥς δεῖ αὐτοκράτορας τούτους εἶναι, κἂν ἄλλοι προβάλλωνται δέκα, λέγειν: 'ικανὸς εἷς ἐστὶ, τοῦτον δὲ ὅτι δεῖ ἄνδρα εἶναι'. The passage was also applied to the case of the *choregia* by Csapo – Wilson 2010, 90.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. the *architektones*: Csapo 2007, 108–111; Dietze-Mager 2021, this issue, Klio 104.1, 2022.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. the honorary decree for the poet Philippides (283–282 BC), who "after having been elected *agonothetes* in the archonship of Isaïos (284/3) complied with the People willingly from his own resources (*χειροτον[ηθεῖ]ς ἀγωνοθέτης ἐπὶ Ἰσαίου ἄρχοντος ὑπῆκουσε[ν τῶι δ]ήμῳ εἰς ἑθελοντῆς ἐκ τῶν ιδίων*) and "spent much money from his own resources and rendered accounts according to the laws" (*ἐκ τῶ[ν] ιδίων ἀναλώσας πολλὰ χρ]ήματα τὰς εὐθύνας δέδωκεν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους*): IG II<sup>3</sup> 1 877, ll. 38–40, 46–48.

<sup>43</sup> Dietze-Mager 2021, this issue, Klio 104.1, 2022. Domingo Gygax 2016, 248–249, discussing the origins of Hellenistic euergetism in late Classical Athens, speaks of an 'euergetization' of offices: "officials' donations were honored as benefactions, the kind of transaction the elite preferred. If the *demos*' model was the liturgy, the elite's was euergetism".

We do not know for sure when the liturgical gymnasiarchy was definitively replaced by the single magistrate. The first clear evidence of a magistrate-gymnasiarch dates only from the later third century BC,<sup>44</sup> but an inscription dated paleographically to the later fourth century BC honours a former gymnasiarch in the name of the *demos*, the absence of the *phyle* implying that this was a gymnasiarch of the ‘new style’.<sup>45</sup> Culasso Gastaldi has argued that the reform happened under Demetrios of Phaleron (317–307 BC). She sees a parallel evolution of the *choregia*, which, she postulates, was transformed into the magisterial *agonothesia* in the same period.<sup>46</sup> However, her argument does not seem to be convincing, as the fates of the two liturgies need not have run parallel. Furthermore, Csapo and Wilson argue that the *choregia* was only definitively replaced by the *agonothesia* under the restored democracy in 307 BC, after some experiments in that direction by Demetrios in the late 310s.<sup>47</sup> But then, there is no definitive proof for their late dating either. Some arguments rather plead in favour of an earlier date under Demetrios: as argued above, Aristotle disdained the liturgical gymnasiarchy and positively assessed the magisterial gymnasiarchy of other *poleis*. Demetrios of Phaleron’s policies show remarkable parallels with Aristotle’s ideas on this subject and may have been influenced by Aristotelean thought.<sup>48</sup> But again, a reform under a democratic regime either before or after Demetrios’ rule cannot be entirely ruled out either, as we have seen that the ‘Verstaatlichung’ of liturgies was a gradual process that had already started in the Lykourgan period.

In any case, it is clear that Xenophon and Aristotle as well as Theophrast’s caricatural oligarch would have agreed with the new role of the new gymnasiarchs. The phrase “one is sufficient, but he must be a ‘real man’” can indeed be applied to the case of gymnasiarchy: they were aristocrats from families with a large share of political influence.<sup>49</sup> As we will see, they made contributions from their own pockets – for instance

---

<sup>44</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1299, ll. 53–55 (= I.Eleusis 196); IG II<sup>2</sup> 1303, ll. 6–12 (= I.Eleusis 207).

<sup>45</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 3206, with the comments of Kirchner; Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 122. As the inscription also mentions honours from the Athenian cleruchy Imbros, one could argue that the inscription and hence the creation of the new gymnasiarchy dates from before 314/313 BC, when the Antigonids gained control over the island. As demonstrated by Culasso Gastaldi, however, the inscription could well have listed honours given to the honorand throughout his entire career, so the honours from Imbros may have been (re)inscribed at a later date.

<sup>46</sup> Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 123.

<sup>47</sup> Csapo and Wilson 2010.

<sup>48</sup> Aristot. pol.1323a, with Dietze-Mager 2021, this issue, *Klio* 104.1, 2022, *contra* Gehrke 1978.

<sup>49</sup> See the prosopographical research of Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 129–138

by organising additional gymnasial *agones* – but on their own terms and with the promise of clear political rewards. Quid pro quo: the gymnasiarchy had become part of a kind of *cursus honorum* that could lead up to the office of *strategos*.<sup>50</sup> The liturgical gymnasiarchy had been definitively replaced by a magistracy that was a political and military playground for aristocrats with clear political ambitions. In what follows, the new role of the gymnasiarchs will be further examined.

### **The Gymnasiarch in Hellenistic Athens: Head of the *gymnasium* or Subordinate to the *kosmetes*?**

Although we have evidence for the existence of the Athenian gymnasiarchs in Hellenistic times, a major problem in interpreting their role is the absence of *polis* decrees in their honour in the epigraphic record. Because of this absence, it has been argued that the Athenian gymnasiarchs were not ‘gymnasium directors’ as the gymnasiarchs in the other *poleis*. For instance, O. Curty, in his recent catalogue of decrees for gymnasiarchs differentiated between the Athenian gymnasiarchy “consistant en une magistrature mineure”, and the gymnasiarchy in the rest of Greece “consistant à diriger un gymnase”.<sup>51</sup> According to some scholars, the Athenian counterpart of the gymnasiarch in other *poleis* was the *kosmetes*, the man in charge of the ephebic training, an official well known from a large number of honorary decrees.<sup>52</sup> What, then, were the precise responsibilities of the Athenian gymnasiarch? In her 2009 article, E. Culasso Gastaldi argued that he was subordinate to the *kosmetes* and that he was mainly responsible for the organisation of gymnasial *agones*. Moreover, she claims that the gymnasiarchy was a junior office preparing its incumbent for a military career, possibly leading up to the office of *strategos* (hence Curty’s “magistrature mineure”).<sup>53</sup> Although many of Culasso Gastaldi’s observations are certainly correct – the epigraphic sources discussed below confirm that the gymnasiarchy could lead up to higher military offices – I do not agree that the Athenian gymnasiarch was a subordinate of the *kosmetes*. Her hypothesis is based on the incorrect assumption that the *kosmetes* not only in charge of the ephebes, but also of the

---

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 129 for the use of the term *cursus honorum* in this context, and the discussion in the next section.

<sup>51</sup> Curty 2015, 14.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Charneux – Tréheux 1997, 164; Cordiano 1997, 23, note 9; Fontani 1999, 197, note 14.

<sup>53</sup> Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 123–124, 138–139.

Athenian gymnasia. The *kosmetes* was, of course, the head of the ephebic training. But this training not only took place in the gymnasia, but also in the forts, in the *chora* and on Salamis.<sup>54</sup> In the following discussion I shall try to rehabilitate the Athenian gymnasiarch as a true gymnasium director who had more in common with the gymnasiarchs of other *poleis* than has been previously assumed.

Let us start with the epigraphic evidence. Two decrees from Eleusis from the late third century BC, honouring generals who had been stationed there, mention the gymnasiarchies they had held earlier in their career. In the decree for Aristophanes of Leukonoion (230s BC) we read that

“after he had been elected as gymnasiarch, when the people celebrated [...] for the first time, he directed the gymnasium in a fine and dignified way, doing everything in accordance with the laws and decrees of the *demos*”<sup>55</sup>.

Theophrastos’ gymnasiarchy is similarly described:

“after he had been elected as gymnasiarch in the year when Antiphilos was archon, he managed the affairs of the gymnasia in a well-ordered way and in accordance with the laws”<sup>56</sup>.

The wording προῖσταναι τοῦ γυμνασίου and διεξάγειν τὰ κατὰ τὰ γυμνάσια seems to be quite straightforward about their role as gymnasium directors. Nevertheless, some scholars have argued that Aristophanes was actually not a true Athenian gymnasiarch, but an *Eleusinian* gymnasiarch.<sup>57</sup> These scholars compared the Eleusinian gymnasiarch with the gymnasiarchs in other Athenian dependencies such as Salamis and Delos (under

---

<sup>54</sup> For the duties of the *kosmetes*, see now Henderson 2020, 93–95, 208–209. There is some discussion about the frequency with which the ephebes attended the gymnasia. As for the Lykourgan period, Chankowski 2010, 129–131 argued that they spent most of their time in the forts and the countryside and visited the gymnasia only occasionally, noting that Ath. pol. 42 nowhere mentions their presence in gymnasia. Friend 2019, 79–80 cites Theophr. char. 5.7, which mentions ephebes training in the gymnasia, and assumes a more outspoken connection. See also Henderson 2020, 135–137. As for the Hellenistic period, ephebic inscriptions show that they indeed trained, competed and followed lessons in the gymnasia, but that this was but a part of their activities, which took place across the whole territory of Attica – if at least the political and military circumstances allowed this. See for instance IG II<sup>2</sup> 1006 + 1031 (= Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, T26); Henderson 2020, 211–221.

<sup>55</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1299, ll. 53–55 (= I.Eleusis 196): γυμνασίαρχος τε χειροτονηθεὶς ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον ὁ δῆμος συνετέλ[ε]σε - - -]α πρόεστη τε τοῦ γυμνασίου καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως πάντα πράττω[ν ἀκόλουθα το[ῖς] τε νόμοις καὶ τοῖς τοῦ δήμου ψηφίσμασιν.

<sup>56</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1303, ll. 6–8 (= I.Eleusis 207): καὶ μὲν χειροτονηθεὶς [γ]υμνασίαρχος εἰς τὸν ἐν[αυτὸν τὸ]ν ἐπ’ Ἀντιφίλου ἄ[ρ]χοντο[ς] τ[ῆ]ς τε κατὰ τ[ῆ]ς γυμνά[σια] [διεξ]ήγα[γ]ε[ν] ε[ὑ]τάκτως καὶ ἀκολούθως τοῖς νόμοις.

<sup>57</sup> Roussel 1916, 187; Charneux and Tréheux 1997, 164.

Athenian control after 167 BC), who clearly were gymnasium directors.<sup>58</sup> This is an unlikely interpretation, however, as Salamis and Delos had a statute very much different from Eleusis; the former were dependencies with distinctive administrative structures, whereas Eleusis was as an Attic deme integrated into the Athenian *polis*.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, in the lines in question the decrees seem to be referring to the generals' past benefactions to the Athenian people rather than to Eleusis.

Culasso Gastaldi offered yet another explanation. Using the decrees as evidence for the Athenian gymnasiarchy, she argued that the managing role of the gymnasiarchs was only connected with gymnasial *agones*, and not to the gymnasium as a whole, which would have been the competence of the *kosmetes*:

“Le sue funzioni sembrano nella descrizione avvicinarsi a quelle del cosmeta, ma è sottolineato con evidenza che è l'occasione festiva ad avere consentito al ginnasiarca autorità e compiti direttivi in relazione alla preparazione degli atleti.”<sup>60</sup>

It is true that both decrees mention the celebration of festivals: the gymnasiarch Theophrastos, for instance,

“organised the regular *agones* (i.e. those connected with his office) as well as *agones* on his own initiative in honour of king Ptolemy, after having provided prizes for those of the young men wishing to compete”<sup>61</sup>.

It does not follow, however, that the gymnasiarchs' competences were limited to these *agones*. Theophrastos' role in the organisation of gymnasial *agones* is clearly separated from his general responsibilities as gymnasium director:

χειροτονηθεὶς [γ]υμνασάρχος (...) τ]ά τε κατὰ τ[ᾶ] γυμνά[σια] [διεξ]ήγα[γ]ε[ν] (...) κ[αὶ τοὺς] ἀγῶνας ἔθηκε

“after he had been elected gymnasiarch, he both managed the affairs of the gymnasia and he organised the *agones*”<sup>62</sup>.

<sup>58</sup> Salamis: IG II<sup>2</sup> 1227 (= Curty 2015, no. 4); Delos: SEG 47–1218 (= Curty 2015, no. 16).

<sup>59</sup> Padgug 1972, 146–147. For Salamis, see Taylor 1997.

<sup>60</sup> Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 124.

<sup>61</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1303 (= I.Eleusis 207), ll. 8–12: κ[αὶ τοὺς] ἀγῶνας ἔθηκε τοὺς τε κ[αθ]ήκοντας καὶ [ἰ]δίαι [τῶν] βασιλεῖ Πτολ[ε]μαίῳ, προθεὶς [ᾗ]θλα τοῖς ἀγ[ω]νίζεσ[θαι] [βου]λομένοις τῶν νεανίσκων; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1299, l. 53 (= I.Eleusis 196).

<sup>62</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1303, ll. 6–9 (= I.Eleusis 207).

The remaining epigraphic sources on the Athenian gymnasiarch in the Hellenistic period are less outspoken. A series of inscriptions from the first century BC, mentioning victorious athletes in torch races for *pareutaktoi* and adult men during the *Theseia*, are dated according to the gymnasiarch in office that year.<sup>63</sup> These texts reveal that the connection of the gymnasiarch to torch races was not entirely lost after the abolishment of the classical liturgy. Another inscription from the first century BC is a dedication to Apollo erected by a certain Dionysios, *epimeletes* of the Lykeion, “when Kallikratides was gymnasiarch”<sup>64</sup>. If my argument that gymnasiarchs were fully-fledged gymnasium directors is correct, this inscription may indicate that there was one single gymnasiarch for all the gymnasia, and that he had *epimeletai* under him who each supervised one individual gymnasium.<sup>65</sup> As I will show below, it seems that the gymnasiarch had a special connection with the Lykeion. In other inscriptions of the second and first centuries BC it is often not clear whether the mention of a gymnasiarch refers to the annually elected magistrate or to the honorary function of ephebe-gymnasiarch.<sup>66</sup>

We therefore have to turn to the literary sources for more information.<sup>67</sup> First, there is an anecdote on the cynic philosopher Krates, who lived in Athens in the late fourth and early third centuries BC. Diogenes Laertios, quoting Favorinus, tells us how he boldly took the gymnasiarch by the hips instead of his knees when making a request.<sup>68</sup> The tone suggests that the gymnasiarch was the man in charge one had to turn to when staying in a gymnasium, but as evidence it is not decisive. More information on the authority of the gymnasiarch can be gleaned from the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Eryxias*, written in the early third century BC.<sup>69</sup> In one passage, the sophist Prodikos is ordered by the gymnasiarch to leave the gymnasium “because he was teaching the young men (*neoi*) things that were unsuitable to them, and if they were not suitable, they were clearly bad”<sup>70</sup>.

<sup>63</sup> IG II<sup>3</sup> 4 396; 397; 385; SEG 50–196. For the *pareutaktoi*, see below.

<sup>64</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 2875. Kallikratides is known from other inscriptions, which reveal that he belonged to an wealthy and influential family: Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 132. His son Syndromos is mentioned as gymnasiarch in IG II<sup>2</sup> 2998.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Öhler 1912, col. 1989.

<sup>66</sup> For these, see above, p. ■■■■■■■■

<sup>67</sup> The sources quoted below are also mentioned by Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 128, but she did not discuss them, mentioning only that “una responsabilità morale e comportamentale del ginnasiarca è evocata da allusioni in fonti letterarie [...] ma non trova un suo adeguato riscontro nella documentazione epigrafica”. As a consequence, she refrained from drawing the necessary conclusions from them.

<sup>68</sup> Diog. Laert. 6.89.

<sup>69</sup> Eichholz 1935, 140–148.

<sup>70</sup> [Plat.] Eryx. 399a: εἴτα προσελθὼν ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἀπαλλάττεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ γυμνασίου ἐκέλευεν ὥς οὐκ ἐπιτήδεια τοῖς νέοις διαλεγόμενον, εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐπιτήδεια, δῆλον ὅτι μοχθηρά.

Further, in an anecdote recounted by both Diogenes Laertios and Plutarch we read that a gymnasiarch rebuked the sceptic philosopher Karneades, the head of the Academy in the second century BC, for speaking too loud in the gymnasium.<sup>71</sup>

Then there is a passage from a diatribe of the cynic philosopher Teles, dating from the third century BC. This diatribe was possibly aimed against the hedonists of the Cyrenaic school and argued that pleasure was not the ultimate goal of life, for moments of suffering were much more numerous than moments of pleasure.<sup>72</sup> To illustrate this, Teles summarises the suffering an Athenian had to undergo from cradle to old age. When he becomes an ephebe,

“he again fears the *kosmetes*, the *paidotribes*, the *hoplomachos* and the gymnasiarch. By all of these he is whipped, closely monitored and grabbed by the neck. He leaves the ephebes and he is already twenty years old. Still he fears, and he keeps an eye on both the *gymnasiarch* and the *strategos*. When they have to keep watch somewhere, they keep watch; when they have to perform guard duty without sleep, they guard; when they have to embark in the ships, they embark”<sup>73</sup>.

This passage refutes Culasso Gastaldi’s opinion that the Athenian gymnasiarch was subordinate to the *kosmetes*. Rather, it makes clear that in the gymnasium he had authority over all who were training, the ephebes as well as the *neoi* or *neaniskoi*. The *neoi* were the age-class following the *ephebeia* and consisted of young adult men between 20 and 30 years old.<sup>74</sup> The sentence “still he fears, and he keeps an eye on both the gymnasiarch and the *strategos*” following the mention of the ephebes implies just such an age group of adults in their twenties. The passage from Teles – which by the way was not taken into account by him – also refutes Chankowski’s assertion that the age-class of the *neoi* did not exist in Hellenistic Athens. He bases his assertion essentially on an *argumentum ex silentio*, but absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. Moreover, the *neaniskoi* are in fact attested as an age category in the torch races of the *Theseia* in the second

---

<sup>71</sup> Diog. Laert. 4.63; Plut. mor. 513C.

<sup>72</sup> See the commentary of Fuentes González 1998, 450–465. It is possible that the passage is derived from Krates; see overview of Fuentes González 1998, 453–456, with further references. Still, Fuentes Gonzales assumes that the *ephebeia* in this passage reflects the situation of Teles’ own times, as does Habicht 1992. The latter believes that the diatribe was written in the 260s BC.

<sup>73</sup> Fuentes González 1998, 448: ἔφηβος γέγονεν· ἔμπαλιν τὸν κοσμητὴν φοβεῖται, τὸν παιδοτρίβην, τὸν ὀπλομάχον, τὸν γυμνασίαρχον. ὑπὸ πάντων τούτων μαστιγοῦται, παρατηρεῖται, τραχηλίζεται. ἐξ ἐφήβων ἐστὶ καὶ ἡδὴ εἴκοσι ἐτῶν· ἔτι φοβεῖται καὶ παρατηρεῖ καὶ γυμνασίαρχον καὶ στρατηγόν. παρακοιτεῖν εἴ που δεῖ, οὗτοι παρακοιτοῦσι· φυλάττειν καὶ ἀγρυπνεῖν, οὗτοι φυλάττουσιν. A literary source giving similar information is [Plat.] Ax. 366d–367a, which dates from the late Hellenistic period. See Henderson 2020, 85–90 for a thorough discussion.

<sup>74</sup> For the *neoi*, see Dreyer 2007, 212–217; Chankowski 2010, 253–265; Kennell 2012.

century BC.<sup>75</sup> Chankowski tried to get around this evidence by arguing that the *neaniskoi* were not a permanent group but “créée uniquement en vue de la course aux flambeaux organisée dans le cadre des Thèseia”<sup>76</sup>. This argument does not convince: their description as “the *neaniskoi* from the Lykeion” rather points to a permanent age group training in that gymnasium. In a later chapter, Chankowski offered an additional argument: he noted that several Athenian honorary inscriptions for *kosmetai* were erected by former ephebes without any mention of the *neoi*, whereas in other *poleis* gymnasiarchs were regularly honoured by both ephebes and *neoi*.<sup>77</sup> This takes us to the heart of the problem. Like other authors before him, Chankowski equated the Athenian *kosmetes* with the gymnasiarch of other cities. This comparison falls short, for in a gymnasium the Athenian *kosmetes* was only responsible for the ephebes and not for other gymnasium attendees. The passage of Teles is proof of the existence of a corps of ex-ephebes older than 20, in other words, *neoi*, placed under the command of the gymnasiarch and the *strategos*.<sup>78</sup>

As for the role of the gymnasiarch, it appears that he had a stronger connection with the *neoi* than with the ephebes, for whom the *kosmetes* was the dominant figure in their training, as the ephebic decrees clearly show.<sup>79</sup> An echo of the close relationship between the gymnasiarch and the *neoi* may be found in several sources.<sup>80</sup> First of all I refer to the above passage in the *Eryxias* expressly connecting the *gymnasiarch* with the *neoi*. Furthermore, in the decree for the *strategos* Theophrastos we read that as gymnasiarch he organised *agones* and set prizes “for those of the *neaniskoi* wishing to compete”<sup>81</sup>. Third,

<sup>75</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 956, l. 67; IG II<sup>2</sup> 958, l. 65; IG II<sup>2</sup> 961, ll. 31–32. IG II<sup>2</sup> 957, l. 51 mentions τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν [Λυ]κείου; clearly the same group is referred to, the *neoi* training in the Lykeion. The variation is explained by the fact that two different systems of age groups are used in the catalogues: on the one hand, agonistic age groups (in this case, *paides* in three subdivisions and *andres*) and civic age groups on the other (*paides* connected with a *palaestra*, ephebes and *neaniskoi*). See Kennell 1999, 251.

<sup>76</sup> Chankowski 2010, 96.

<sup>77</sup> Chankowski 2010, 260.

<sup>78</sup> This is not to say that the organisation of the *neoi* in Athens was completely identical to that in other *poleis*. Kennell 1999, 253 remarked that the Athenian *neoi* did not form a kind of institutionalised civic body, a phenomenon well-known from other cities. Still, it must be noted that the corps of the *neoi* were subject to official state regulation, as [Plat.] Ax. 366d–367a mentions a commission of the Areopagos council regarding the *neoi*.

<sup>79</sup> See Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 33–47, 199–248 for a catalogue of ephebic decrees up to the first Mithridatic war. The only gymnasiarchs mentioned in these decrees were ephebic gymnasiarchs who were responsible for providing oil to their fellow ephebes; e.g. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1009 + 2456, 2457 + Meritt 1946, 213–214, no. 42 + Meritt 1947, 170–172, no. 67, ll. 29–30 (= Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, T30).

<sup>80</sup> A caveat must be placed here, as in these sources the words *neoi* and *neaniskoi* could be used in a more general sense, encompassing both the ephebes and the *neoi*: Chankowski 2010, 253–265; Kennell 2012, 232. Yet at least in the Theophrastos decree it seems that the specific age-class of the *neoi* is referred to because of the agonistic context, in which such terms are generally technical rather than general.

<sup>81</sup> See note 61.



in his “Life of Antony” Plutarch wrote that when the triumvir at one point held the gymnasiarchy in Athens, he parted wrestling *neaniskoi* by grabbing them by the neck. The fact that Antony held the gymnasiarchy provides additional proof that it cannot not have been a ‘magistrature mineure’, but that it was an important and prestigious office.<sup>82</sup>

It can furthermore be argued that the gymnasiarch was not only in charge of the athletic training of the *neoi*, but that he was a kind of military commander as well. It is well known that the corps of the *neoi* played an important role in the civil defence of their *polis*, and the passage of Teles clearly stresses their military activities under the command of both the gymnasiarch and the *strategos*. As Kennell has argued, it is likely that the *neoi* obeyed the gymnasiarch when training within the city and the *strategos* when on campaign.<sup>83</sup> It appears from the victory catalogue of the *Theseia* that the Athenian *neoi* trained especially in the Lykeion. Of all the Athenian gymnasia, the Lykeion had the most outspoken military character, and it is not a coincidence that, as we have seen, an inscription explicitly links the gymnasiarch to this gymnasium.<sup>84</sup>

Further evidence for the link between the gymnasiarch, the *neoi* and the military sphere may be found in first-century BC dedications by victors in the torch races of the *Theseia* and the *Epitaphia*, dated according to the gymnasiarch in office. One of these reads as follows:

“Eraton son of Eraton of Aixone, having won the torch-race of the *pareutaktoi* at the *Theseia*, dedicated (this) in the second gymnasiarchy of Leonides of Melite.  
Eraton son of Eraton of Aixone, having won the torch-race of the men (*andres*) at the *Epitaphia*, dedicated (this) in the second gymnasiarchy of Leonides of Melite.”<sup>85</sup>

While in the second-century BC catalogues of the *Theseia* the *neaniskoi* were mentioned as a separate age class in the torch races, in this dedication yet another category appears:

---

<sup>82</sup> Plut. Ant. 33.4. In her discussion of the passage, Fontani 1999, 196–199 assumed that the Athenian gymnasiarch was no gymnasium director (in her view this was the *kosmetes*) but only a sponsor of torch races and other athletic activities. She used this argument to cast doubt on the reliability of the anecdote, maintaining that it originated from sources hostile to Antony that would have stressed his ‘oriental’ and ‘un-Roman’ behaviour. As this paper shows, at least her argument about the Athenian gymnasiarchy is on shaky grounds.

<sup>83</sup> Kennell 2012, 224.

<sup>84</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 2875. For the military character of the Lykeion, see Delorme 1960, 26–27; Chankowski 2010, 129, note 322; also Forbes 1940, 37–39 for the military aspects of gymnasia in general.

<sup>85</sup> IG II<sup>3</sup> 4 396: Ἐράτω[ν] Ἐ[ρ]άτωνος Αἰζωνεὺς τὴν λαμπάδα τῶν παρευτάκτων Θησεΐα νικήσας ἀνέθηκεν, γυμνασιαρχοῦντος τὸ δεύτερον Λεωνίδου Μελιτέως. || Ἐράτων Ἐράτωνος Αἰζωνεὺς τὴν λαμπάδα τῶν ἀνδρῶν Ἐπιτάφια νικήσας ἀνέθηκεν, γυμνασιαρχοῦντος τὸ δεύτερον Λεωνίδου Μελιτέως. (transl. S. M. Kamphorst). See also IG II<sup>3</sup> 4 397.

the *pareutaktoi*. In order to understand the background of the *pareutaktoi* and their relationship with the *neoi*, it is necessary to digress shortly on the age categories in Athenian competitions. In the competitions of the *Theseia*, two different systems were used: first, the civic age classes of *paides* (boys), ephebes – and *neoi/neaniskoi*, mainly used for competitions restricted to *polis* citizens; second, the agonistic age classes of *paides* (with subdivisions) and *andres* (men), used in ‘international’ components.<sup>86</sup> In the *Theseia*, the *neoi* competed in the age class of the *andres* when the agonistic system was used, whereas the ephebes competed in the category of the *paides*.<sup>87</sup> The category of *pareutaktoi*, now, does not seem to fit in either system. As the term implies the notions of discipline, perseverance and military experience, it appears that this was a category linked to specific activities rather than an age group. This can be compared to the competitions of good order (*eutaxia*) and hard training (*philoponia*) held in the gymnasium of Beroia, which were open to gymnasium attendees up to the age of thirty.<sup>88</sup> Therefore, as Perrin-Saminadayar suggested the *pareutaktoi* were probably a group of young men who exercised in the gymnasia focusing especially on military training and for whom specific competitions were organised.<sup>89</sup> The *pareutaktoi* of the Athenian dedications were probably *neoi*, for they also claimed victories in the age class of adult men in the *Epitaphia*. Nevertheless, it cannot be entirely excluded that they were ephebes, for, as Kennell noted, in ‘international’ competitions it was possible for younger men to ‘play up’ into a category for older competitors. Moreover, the *Epitaphia* may have had different rules than the *Theseia* concerning age classes, allowing ephebes to compete with the *andres*.<sup>90</sup>

Whatever the case may be, the military character of the Athenian gymnasiarch seems clear. It thus comes as no surprise that several Athenian gymnasiarchs held high military offices later in their career.<sup>91</sup> The gymnasiarch’s particularly close connection

---

<sup>86</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 956–959, with Kennell 1999, 251–253. The age class of *ageneoi* (‘beardless youth’), well-known from other ‘panhellenic’ *agones*, does not feature in the catalogues of the *Theseia*. *Ageneoi* were instead subsumed under the *paides*.

<sup>87</sup> Kennell 1999, 254–255.

<sup>88</sup> SEG 27–261, side B, l. 47.

<sup>89</sup> Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 481–482.

<sup>90</sup> Kennell 1999, 258. Hellenistic Delos and second-century AD Athens provide clearer evidence for ephebes who were *pareutaktoi*: Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 481; IG II<sup>2</sup> 2094, ll. 52–55.

<sup>91</sup> Apart from the *stratego*i Aristophanes and Theophrastos discussed above, we have a mutilated honorary decree for the ex-gymnasiarch Mneseides who equally became *strategos*: IG II<sup>2</sup> 1309, with Culasso Gastaldi 2009, 130.

with the *neoi* and with military activities is again something which the Athenian gymnasiarchs had in common with their counterparts in the rest of the Greek world.<sup>92</sup> The main difference between Athenian gymnasiarchs and gymnasiarchs in other *poleis* lies in the relationship with the ephebes: whereas in other cities the gymnasiarch was also responsible for the ephebic training, in Athens this was the responsibility of the *kosmetes*. On the basis of the passage of Teles we can however assume that the gymnasiarch held a degree of authority over the ephebes, at least when they trained or followed lessons in one of the gymnasia.<sup>93</sup> In the gymnasia, where the gymnasiarch was the responsible authority for discipline and order, they would have had to obey not only the *kosmetes* and other ephebic officials, but also the gymnasiarch. Probably this was the setting Teles had in mind when writing his diatribe.

To summarise, the hypothesis that the Athenian gymnasiarch in the Hellenistic period was a junior official subordinate to the *kosmetes* should be rejected. Literary and epigraphic evidence shows that the gymnasiarch was the official in charge of the gymnasia where he guarded over discipline and good order. Ephebes as well as *neoi* feared his authority when training in the gymnasium. Of these two groups, it appears that the *neoi* had the stronger connection with the gymnasiarch, who was responsible for their military training in the Lykeion, preparing them for campaigns under the command of the *strategos*. The ephebes, on the other hand, had their own officials, the most important of whom was the *kosmetes*. As such, we can assume that responsibilities were split up between the *kosmetes* and the gymnasiarch: the *kosmetes* was in charge of the ephebic training (wherever it took place), and the gymnasiarch was responsible for order and discipline the gymnasia in general, and in that capacity had authority over all who trained there. The boundaries between their responsibilities were, however, not strictly delineated: as we have seen, the gymnasiarch was at least involved in the ephebic training as far as it took place in the gymnasia, while, as an honorary decree from the late second

---

<sup>92</sup> E.g. Hepding 1907, 273–278, no. 10, ll. 21–22 from Pergamon, honouring the gymnasiarch Metrodoros for ‘commanding the *neaniskoi* in a conspicuous way (διασήμως ἀφηγούμενος τῶν νεανίσκων). For more references and a more detailed discussion, see Dreyer 2007, 220–230; Kennell 2012, 219, 224–225; Curty 2015, 347: “rapports privilégiés unissant le gymnasiarque aux *néoi*”.

<sup>93</sup> See above, note 54.

century BC reveals, the *kosmetes* could contribute from his own resources to the upkeep of a gymnasium.<sup>94</sup>

## Conclusion

This paper investigated two aspects of the Hellenistic gymnasiarchy in Athens, an office which is only sporadically attested in inscriptions and literary sources. First, it tried to show how at the end of the fourth century BC the gymnasiarchy evolved from a liturgy to an office. Second, on the basis of a new analysis of the evidence it has sought to clarify the actual responsibilities of the Athenian gymnasiarch in the Hellenistic period.

As for the first question, Schuler's explanations for the emergence of the magistrate-gymnasiarchs in other Greek *poleis* – the development of gymnasia, the increase in *agones* and the institution of the *ephebeia* – can only partly be applied to the Athenian case. An important explanation that has not featured in earlier discussions is the political context of late fourth-century Athens, which seems to indicate that the replacement of the earlier liturgical gymnasiarchs by a single magistrate-gymnasiarch was part of a broader political shift of 'Verstaatlichung' of liturgies. This shift that was set in motion also by increasing elite resistance against the liturgical system throughout the fourth century BC.

As for the second research question, this paper challenges the view that the Athenian gymnasiarch of the Hellenistic period was subordinate to the *kosmetes*. Literary as well as epigraphic evidence reveals that he should rather be regarded as a fully-fledged gymnasium director, just as his counterparts in other *poleis*. It seems that the gymnasiarch managed the affairs of all the Athenian gymnasia and guarded over good behaviour and order there. One inscription suggests that *epimeletai* represented him in the gymnasia where he could not be physically present. Moreover, the evidence indicates that he had a strong connection with the military sphere and the training of the *neoi*, the young men between 20 and 30 years old. This differentiates him from the *kosmetes*, who was responsible for the training of the ephebes.

---

<sup>94</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1011, ll. 41–42 (= Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, T31), where the *kosmetes* Eudoxos is honoured for repairing a wall of the Diogeneion out of his own pocket.

There is one final question to which at present no satisfying answer can be offered. Why have so many honorary decrees for *kosmetai* come down to us from the Hellenistic period, whereas similar decrees for gymnasiarchs are lacking? Perhaps this has to do with the Athenian epigraphic habit to issue honorary decrees each time an ephebic class had finished its training. This habit did not exist when the gymnasiarch ended his term of office, as he did not supervise an institutionalised and strongly ritualised state programme. Still, this does not seem to be a sufficient explanation, because honorary decrees were an important means with which the city acknowledged its benefactors.<sup>95</sup> We can only hope that new epigraphic evidence will shed light on the elusive office of gymnasiarch in Hellenistic Athens.

**Acknowledgements:** I would like to thank Gertrud Dietze-Mager, Hans Hauben and my colleagues of the ancient history research group at Ghent University for their careful reading of the manuscript and for their valuable feedback and suggestions. Any errors remaining are my own.

## Bibliography

- Aneziri 2003: S. Aneziri, Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte, Organisation und Wirkung der hellenistischen Technitenvereine (Historia Einzelschriften 163), Stuttgart 2003.
- Chankowski 2010: A. S. Chankowski, L'éphébie hellénistique. Étude d'une institution civique dans les cités grecques des îles de la Mer Egée et de l'Asie Mineure (Culture et cité 4), Paris 2010.
- Charneux – Tréheux 1997: P. Charneux – J. Tréheux, Décret du peuple athénien pour Pausanias de Mélitè, gymnasiarque à Délos, BCH 121, 1997, 153–173.
- Christ 1990: M. R. Christ, Liturgy Avoidance and Antidosis in Classical Athens, TAPhA 120, 1990, 147–169.
- Christ 2006: M. R. Christ, The Bad Citizen in Classical Athens, Cambridge 2006.
- Cordiano 1997: G. Cordiano, La ginnasiarchia nelle poleis dell'Occidente mediterraneo antico (Studi e testi di storia antica 7), Pisa 1997.
- Csapo 2007: E. Csapo, The Men Who Built the Theatres. *Theatropolai, theatronai, and arkhitektones*, in: P. Wilson (ed.), The Greek Theatre and Festivals. Documentary Studies, Oxford, 2007, 87–115.
- Csapo – Wilson 2010: E. Csapo – P. J. Wilson, Le passage de la chorégie à l'agonothésie à Athènes à la fin du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle, in: B. Le Guen (ed.), L'argent dans les concours du monde grec, Saint-Denis 2010, 83–105.
- Culasso Gastaldi 2009: E. Culasso Gastaldi, La ginnasiarchia ad Atene. Istituzioni, ruoli e personaggi dal IV sec. all'età ellenistica, in: O. Curty (ed.), L'huile et l'argent. Gymnasiarchie et évergétisme dans la Grèce hellénistique, Freiburg 2009, 115–142.
- Curty 2015: O. Curty, Gymnasiarchika. Recueil et analyse des inscriptions de l'époque hellénistique en l'honneur des gymnasiarques, Paris 2015.
- Davies 1967: J. K. Davies, Demosthenes on Liturgies. A Note, JHS 87, 1967, 33–40.

---

<sup>95</sup> *Agonothetai*, for instance, appear much more frequently in honorary decrees, e.g. IG II<sup>3</sup> 1 857; 877; 985; 991; 995; 1160.

- Delorme 1960: J. Delorme, *Gymnasion. Étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce* (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 196), Paris 1960.
- Dietze-Mager 2021: G. Dietze-Mager, Aristoteles und die athenischen Liturgien, *Klio* 104.1, 2022, ■■■■.
- Domingo Gygas 2016: M. Domingo Gygas, *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City. The Origins of Euergetism*, Cambridge 2016.
- Dreyer 2007: B. Dreyer, Die Neoi im hellenistischen Gymnasion, in: D. Kah – P. Scholz (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasion (Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8)*, Berlin 2007, 211–236.
- Eichholz 1935: D. E. Eichholz, The Pseudo-Platonic Dialogue Eryxias, *CQ* 29, 1935, 129–149.
- Fauconnier 2016: B. Fauconnier, Athletes and Artists in an Expanding World. The Development of Transregional Associations of Competitors in the First Century BC, in: C. Mann – S. Remijsen – S. Scharff (eds.), *Athletics in the Hellenistic World*, Stuttgart 2016, 73–93.
- Fisher 1998: N. Fisher, Gymnasia and the Democratic Values of Leisure, in: P. Cartledge – P. Millett – S. von Reden (eds.), *Kosmos. Essays in Order, Conflict, and Community in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 1998, 84–104.
- Fontani 1999: E. Fontani, Il filellenismo di Antonio tra realtà storica e propaganda politica. Le ginnasiarchie ad Atene e ad Alessandria, in: B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi ellenistici* 12, Pisa 1999, 193–210.
- Forbes 1945: C. A. Forbes, Expanded Uses of the Greek Gymnasium, *CPh* 40, 1945, 32–42.
- Friend 2015: J. L. Friend, The Nemesia in Lycurgan Athens, in: J. Bodel – N. Dimitrova (eds.), *Ancient Documents and their Contexts. First North American Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy 2011 (Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy 5)*, Leiden 2015.
- Friend 2019: J. L. Friend, The Athenian Ephebeia in the Fourth Century BCE (*Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy* 13), Leiden 2019.
- Fuentes González 1998: P. P. Fuentes González, Les diatribes de Télès. Introduction, texte revu, traduction et commentaire des fragments (*Histoire des doctrines de l'antiquité classique* 23), Paris 1998.
- Gabrielsen 1987: V. Gabrielsen, The Antidosis Procedure in Classical Athens, *C&M* 38, 1987, 7–38.
- Gauthier 1976: P. Gauthier, *Un commentaire historique des Poroi de Xénophon (Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 8)*, Genève 1976.
- Gauthier – Hatzopoulos 1993: P. Gauthier – M. B. Hatzopoulos, *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia (Meletemata 16)*, Athens 1993.
- Gehrke 1978: H. J. Gehrke, Das Verhältnis von Politik und Philosophie im Wirken des Demetrios von Phaleron, *Chiron* 8, 1978, 149–193.
- Glötz 1896: G. Glötz, s.v. Gymnasiarchia, in: *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines* II.2, 1896, 1675–1684.
- Habicht 1992: C. Habicht, Der Kyniker Teles und die Reform der athenischen Ephebie, *ZPE* 93, 1992, 47–49.
- Hakkarainen 1997: M. Hakkarainen, Private Wealth in the Athenian Public Sphere during the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Period, in: J. Frösén (ed.), *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 6)*, Helsinki 1997, 1–32.
- 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* 15), Leiden 2020.
- Hepding 1907: H. Hepding, Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1904–1905, *MDAI(A)* 32, 1907, 241–469.
- Humphreys 2004: S. C. Humphreys, *The Strangeness of Gods. Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion*, Oxford 2004.
- Kennell 1999: N. Kennell, Age Categories and Chronology in the Hellenistic Theseia, *Phoenix* 53, 1999, 249–262.
- Kennell 2012: N. Kennell, Who Were the Neoi?, in: P. Martzavou – N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis. Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*, Oxford 2012, 217–232.
- Knell 2000: H. Knell, Athen im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Eine Stadt verändert ihr Gesicht. Archäologisch-kulturgeschichtliche Betrachtungen, Darmstadt 2000.
- Lambert 2010: S. Lambert, A Polis and Its Priests. Athenian Priesthoods before and after Pericles' Citizenship Law, *Historia* 59.2, 2010, 143–175.

- Lambert – Schneider 2019: S. Lambert – J. G. Schneider, The Last Athenian Decrees Honouring Ephebes, AIO Papers 11, 2019 (<https://www.atticinscriptions.com/papers/aio-papers-11/>, last accessed 25.01.2022).
- Le Guen 2001: B. Le Guen, Les associations de technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique (Études d'archéologie classique 11), Nancy 2001.
- Mann 1998: C. Mann, Krieg, Sport und Adelskultur. Zur Entstehung des griechischen Gymnasiums, *Klio* 80.1, 1998, 7–21.
- Meritt 1946: B. D. Meritt, Greek Inscriptions, *Hesperia* 15, 1946, 169–253.
- Meritt 1947: B. D. Meritt, Greek Inscriptions, *Hesperia* 16, 1947, 147–183.
- Öhler 1912: J. Öhler, s.v. Gymnasiarchos, in: *RE* VII.2, 1912, 1969–2004.
- Padgug 1972: R. A. Padgug, Eleusis and the Union of Attika, *GRBS* 13, 1972, 135–150.
- Palagia – Lewis 1989: O. Palagia – D. Lewis, The Ephebes of Erechtheis, 333/2 B.C. and Their Dedication, *ABSA* 84, 1989, 333–344.
- Parker 1996: R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History*, Oxford 1996.
- Parker 2004: R. Parker, New “Panhellenic” Festivals in Hellenistic Greece, in: R. Schlesier – U. Zellmann (eds.), *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, Münster 2004, 9–22.
- Perrin-Saminadayer 2007: É. Perrin-Saminadayer, Éducation, culture et société à Athènes. Les acteurs de la vie culturelle athénienne (229–88). Un tout petit monde, Paris 2007.
- Rhodes 1981: P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford 1981.
- Robert 1984: L. Robert, Discours d'ouverture, in: *Actes du VIII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine à Athènes*, Athens 1982, 35–45 (= *OMS* VI, 709–719).
- Roussel 1916: P. Roussel, Délos, colonie athénienne (*Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 111), Paris 1916.
- Schuler 2007: C. Schuler, Die Gymnasiarchie in hellenistischer Zeit, in: D. Kah – P. Scholz (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasium (Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8)*, Berlin 2007, 163–192.
- Sekunda 1990: N. Sekunda, IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1250: A Decree Concerning the *Lampadephoroi* of the Tribe Aiantis', *ZPE* 83, 1990, 149–182.
- Taylor 1997: M. C. Taylor, Salamis and the Salaminioi. The History of an Unofficial Athenian Demos. (*Archaia Hellas. Monographs on Ancient Greek History and Archaeology* 5), Amsterdam 1997.
- Vitale 2014: M. Vitale, Gymnasiarch über wie viele ‘Gymnasien’, über welches Einzugsgebiet? Zum Kompetenzbereich von Gymnasiarchen in späthellenistischer und römischer Zeit, *ZPE* 188, 2014, 171–180.
- Whitehead 1986: D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica, 508/7–ca. 250 B.C. A Political and Social Study*, Princeton 1986.
- Wilson 2000: P. Wilson, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia. The Chorus, the City and the Stage*, Cambridge 2000.