

# Manly Youth

From the age of thirty on, free adult males stood at the pinnacle of the social and political hierarchy of Athens; younger adults ranked lower, as did older men. Yet the precise age that separated young from mature adults (in the singular, both may be called *anēr*), as well as the ages that separated various categories of youth, are difficult to pin down. The rituals by which the Athenians marked the incorporation of a male baby into the household (*amphidromia*) and the young man's coming of age are of little help here.<sup>1</sup>

Broadly speaking, an Athenian male was considered a boy (usually called a *pais*) until puberty; a *hebē* until the age of fourteen; a youngster (usually, *meirakion*) until about age twenty-one; an *ephēbos* from roughly eighteen to nineteen or twenty, a period that corresponded to military service in the *ephēbeia*; a young man (usually *neos* or *neaniskos*) until he reached mature adulthood around thirty; and an old man (*gerōn*) from approximately sixty years old on. The separations were imprecise, however. Xenophon writes that Socrates was ordered by one of the Thirty (a group of oligarchs who ruled Athens in a tyrannical fash-

1. For ages and their loosely defined terms, see Nash 1978, esp. 4–5; Garland 1990, passim, esp. 1–16, 242–43; Golden 1990, 14–16; and Strauss 1993, 89–97; cf. Dover 1974, 102–6 (esp. on youth). The division of Athenian males into age classes for the purpose of conscription is a special case: *Ath. Pol.* 53.4, 7. *Amphidromia*: Garland 1990, 93–96; Strauss 1993, 1–2. For the ritual of admission into the phratry: Lambert 1993, 163–68; and generally, Rudhardt 1962.

ion in 404–403) not to converse with the young. The philosopher retorted with a typically subversive question: what age is considered young?<sup>2</sup>

In ancient Athens, as in the modern world, age was not only a biological but also a culturally constructed social category. In the speeches, as elsewhere in Greek literature, age is characterized not so much in terms of chronology as of physical appearance, mental development, and behavior.<sup>3</sup>

This chapter discusses the Athenians' perceptions of youth and the orators' use of those perceptions with the same chronological ambiguity and behavioral emphasis that the Greeks brought to this age group.

#### NEGATIVE STEREOTYPES AND REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* offers a concise depiction of youth that conveys the mixed feelings with which the ancient Greeks evidently regarded this age group. He describes youths (*neoi*) as young men who cannot master their appetites and emotions; they are impulsive and prone to excess, although also competitive, courageous, and sensitive to honor. Owing to their lack of experience, they are also naïve, optimistic, friendly, magnanimous, and uncalculating (Arist. *Rhet.* 2.12.3–16 1389a3–1389b12). The orators' attributions are similar, only in a different mix. Although they occasionally describe a young man as brave or magnanimous, public-spirited, and free of pettiness and self-interest, more often they measure the young against the ideal of the mature adult male and find them lacking.<sup>4</sup>

The ideal youth was a young man with adult qualities. This ideal was embedded in an oath taken by those enrolled in the institution of the *ephēbeia*. Young Athenian men, eighteen through nineteen years old, of various classes, although probably not the poor, enrolled in a group of *ephēbeioi* as part of state-sponsored education toward becoming soldiers, citizens, and men.<sup>5</sup> They took an oath that emphasized the virtues

2. Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.35. For the ill-defined age category of *neaniskos*, see Golden 1990, 14–15; Kleijwegt 1991, 56, with bibliography; Cantarella 1992, 29–32. For the links between the systems of age groups and male power: Bernardi 1985, esp. 132–42.

3. See Lys. 10.29; Dem. 21.18; Aristoxenus fr. 35 (Wehrli); Robertson 2000.

4. Kind or bold young men: [Dem.] 53.12; Lys. 2.51–52; Arist. *Rhet.* 2.12.12.1389a30–35, 13.15.1389b18–20. Public-spirited and self-restrained: Dem. 54 (passim and pp. 000–00 below); cf. Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.26; Golden 1984, 313.

5. *Ath. Pol.* 42.2–5; Tod 1947, 2, no. 204. I share the scholarly view that the *ephēbeia* existed in Athens throughout the fourth century in one form or another. For the institution, see Pélékidis 1962; Reinmuth 1971, esp. 123–38; Vidal-Naquet 1986a, 106–28; 1986b; Winkler 1990b, esp. 20–22, 50 with n. 91. For reservations on interpreting the

of conformity, competitiveness, cooperation, discipline, and obedience in the military, civic, and religious spheres—all traits that the Athenians wished to see in adult males.<sup>6</sup>

Few of the young men referred to in the orations seem to have possessed these qualities. It is indicative of the speakers' largely unfavorable attitude toward the young that the positive attributes of a youth are most fully described not in the public addresses or court speeches but in an erotic work attributed to Demosthenes (Dem. 61). In contrast to most of the orations, this erotic composition—an address by an *erastēs* (male lover) to a prospective male beloved (*erōmenos*), probably in his teens—is full of praise for its youthful subject.<sup>7</sup>

The speaker lauds the youth for exhibiting traits that go beyond his age. He praises his caution in entertaining propositions for love affairs, his graceful and dignified speech, his *sōphrosunē* (moderation) and mature prudence. To be sure, the speaker also praises his courage and athletic skills, which the Athenians found meritorious in the young. In the main, however, the young man's excellence is depicted as consisting of his rare ability to overcome the faults of youth.<sup>8</sup>

In the orations, the ideal is present in the negative. A clear example can be found in a Lysian speech against Alcibiades the Younger, the son of the Athenian general and politician, whose unruly, debauched conduct had become notorious. The speaker describes Alcibiades the Younger as a child (*pais*) who had lived in the home of a discredited politician, drinking and sharing his host's cloak—a probable allusion to indecent intimacy. Although still beardless (*anēbos*), he reveled and had a *hetaira* (courtesan; Lys. 14.25). As a young man, he had surrendered an Athenian stronghold to his father's enemy, who abused him in the bloom of his youth (*hubrizen auton hōraion onta*) and held him for ransom. Alcibiades then went on to gamble away his fortune (Lys. 14.26–27). This depiction of a man who was disloyal to his father and polis, sexually incontinent, stupid, reckless, profligate, and unproductive was the antithesis of the ideal youth.<sup>9</sup>

---

*ephēbeia* as a rite of passage from boyhood to adulthood, see Kleijwegt 1991, 44; Burckhardt 1996, esp. 53–57; Hesk 2000, 29–30, 86–89. *Thētes* (poor) and the *ephēbeia*: Rhodes 1993, esp. 502–10, 768; Hansen 1991, 108–9; cf. Raaflaub 1994, 140–41.

6. Tod 1947, vol. 2, no. 204; Lyc. 1.76–77. The ephebic oath: Siewert 1977; cf. Humphreys 1985b, 206–9; Kleijwegt 1991, 50; pp. 000–00 below.

7. Dem. 61 and its author: pp. 000–00 below with n. 3.

8. Dem. 61.5, 8, 13, 17, 21, 27–28, *passim*.

9. Gribble 1999, 94 for this portrait, and see pp. 000–00 for the negative portrait of young Timarchus (Aes. 1.39–71).

Speakers often describe young men as aggressive, haughty, disrespectful of their betters, full of bravado, and preoccupied with drinking, gambling, and sex.<sup>10</sup> The young use their physical strength to bully and insult innocent people (Lys. fr. 75 [Thalheim]); they squander their resources in the pursuit of honor and bodily satisfaction and are rash, thoughtless, and overly ambitious to make a name for themselves; they lack self-control and often cannot tell right from wrong. Like Aristotle's youth, they are dominated by their passions, but, unlike Aristotle, the orators fail to give equal place to redeeming qualities. They emphasize the danger of such youthful behavior to the youths themselves, their families, friends, innocent third parties, and the polis. Even when young persons did no wrong, the assumption was that they were impressionable and easily corruptible.<sup>11</sup>

Terms frequently applied to the young include *hubris*: insult, attack, or brutish, insolent behavior (depending on the context); *aselgeia*: aggressiveness or licentiousness; *anoia*: thoughtlessness; *akratēs*: lacking control; *akolasia*: lacking discipline; lack of *sōphrosunē*: self-restraint and proper conduct, or moderation; lack of *aiskhunē*: respect (especially for one's elders); *neanieuomai* or *neanikeuesthai*: when used in the negative sense, acting like a juvenile or brutally; *thrasus*: fresh or rash; *iskhuein*: having physical strength; and *philotimia*: ambition for honor (in both positive and negative senses).<sup>12</sup>

This criticism implies that Athenians measured young men by high standards. The attitude is expressed in the erotic composition discussed above, which follows elaborate praise with the assertion that the best that the young man's peers could wish for was that they do no wrong (Dem. 61.22).

10. Youthful characteristics: Dover 1974, 102–5; Fisher 1992, esp. 97–99; MacDowell 1990, 18–23; Murray 1990d, 139–40, 142; Halliwell 1991a, 284–86; Sommerstein 1998, 109–10; Ferrari 2002, esp. 87–93, 121–26. Pierce 1998, 130–36 has distinguished between pre- and post-matrimonial young masculinities, a distinction that the orators seem to have ignored, to judge by the extant texts.

11. Harmful young men: Ant. 4.3.2; Aes. 1.94–95; cf. Dem. 19.229; 38.27; Aes. 1.65. Rash, insolent, and excessively ambitious: Lys. 20.3; Is. fr. 6 (Forster); Hyp. 4.27; cf. Din. fr. 14.2 (Burtt). Lacking in control, thoughtless, and indiscriminate: Is. 3.16–17; Isoc. 7.43; cf. [Aristotle] *Rhetoric to Alexander* 35 1441a16–18. Impressionable youth: Aes. 3.245–46; cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 2.12.7 1389a16–18.

12. The following references are just a sample. *Hubris*: Dem. 54.4; *aselgeia*: [And.] 4.21, 39; Dem. 40.57; *anoia* and *akratēs*: n. 11 above; *akolasia*: Ant. 3.3.6; 4.1.6; Isoc. 7.50; lacking *sōphrosunē*: Dem. 61.3; *neanieuomai* or *neanikeuesthai*: Dem. 19.242; 21.201; Isoc. 20.17; *philotimia*: Dem. 42.24; *thrasus*: cf. Dem. 51.19; *iskhuein*: Dem. 21.223; cf. 59.40; Theophrastus *Characters* 27. For the young as busy with the pursuit of ephemeral pleasures see pp. 000–00 below.

Yet the Athenians also seem to have been ready to recognize that boys will be boys.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the high place that Athenians accorded honor, which Aristotle defines as a key motive of young men (Arist. *Rhet.* 2.12.5–6 1389a9–16), did not always sit well with the values of moderation and self-control. Honor was closely associated in Greek thought with besting one's rivals, often through competitive displays of wealth and strength. And honor often required one to respond to an inimical action by inflicting harm. Failure to do so was perceived as cowardly and unmanly. The result was ambivalence about violence in general and youthful aggression in particular. Youthful aggression was intimidating because of young men's physical strength and because of the challenge that every new generation posed to the norms of the previous one. On the other hand, aggressiveness could be confused with a claim to superior manhood, and the community tolerated (although not officially condoning) acts of violence by youths forcibly defending their personal honor, as they often did.<sup>14</sup> Thus, while speakers often disapproved of youthful spending, luxury, and violence, there was a tendency to mitigate disapproval of these vices when they were committed by the young.

#### EDUCATING AND SUPERVISING THE YOUNG

Even so, the descriptions of youth in the orations suggest that ancient Athenians viewed young men as a potential threat to the social order, and took pains to ensure that they did not put the city at risk (Lyc. fr. 1 [Burt]) or undermine adult supremacy. They barred males under eighteen (or twenty) from admission to the *ekklesia* (Assembly), and men under thirty from other decision-making bodies and public offices.<sup>15</sup>

The Athenians also placed a great deal of emphasis on the socialization of the young through education. They used education to keep the volatility of youth in check by inculcating the ideals of civic and personal behavior, teaching deference and obedience to adults, protecting the young from bad influences, and, especially, ensuring that the young were closely supervised and controlled. They sought as well to produce men of excellence (*aretē*), pinning on youths their hopes for a better future for Athens, and expecting them to continue the legacy of their elders and

13. Lys. 24.17; And. 2.7; cf. [Arist.] *Rhetoric to Alexander* 7.1428b38; Pierce 1998, 131. Cf. Dover 1974, 102–3; Cantarella 1992, 32.

14. Cf. Forrest 1975, 46–48; Cantarella 1990; Strauss 1993, 98–99, 148–53, cf. 186.

15. Roussel 1951, 133–40, 153; Hansen 1991, esp. 88–90. Restrictions on youth participation in sports events might have served a similar purpose: Golden 1998, esp. 139–40.

even to improve upon it.<sup>16</sup> To these two ends, the Athenians tried to shape the behavior of young men through schools, *ephēbeia*, and gymnasia, and they closely supervised the functions of these institutions through laws and regulations (cf. Hyp. 6.8; Aes. 1.6–7).

Formal education was supplemented with informal education. Adults were expected to serve as positive role models for the young. Socrates' trial is perhaps the most famous example of the prevalent ideology that stressed the need to protect the city's youth from corrupting influences. A similar concern informs the aforementioned erotic address, which discusses at length how the older partner in a homosexual relationship should supervise the conduct of the young *erōmenos* (Dem. 61; cf. Aes. 1.138–39). Speakers in forensic orations often claimed that they were prosecuting someone in order to teach the young moderation, or warned juries that acquitting a defendant would set a bad example for youths.<sup>17</sup>

The education of the young through precept and example was the concern of the entire city. Adults took it upon themselves to watch over the young in order to curb their excesses (Lys. 20.3; cf. Dem. 54.22–23; Isoc. 7.47–49). The educational ideal was used by a Demosthenean speaker to illustrate how harmony was attained in Athens (Dem. 25.87–89). The ideal, illustrated in a three-generational household, was predicated on the understanding that “the young are different from the old in word and deed.” The young, if they behaved properly (literally, were *metrioi*: modest or moderate); they did not call attention to their actions or, if that was impossible, indicated their intention. The old pretended not to see them wasting money, drinking, or amusing themselves to excess—that is, they refrained from the heavy-handed exercise of their superior status and power to shame.<sup>18</sup>

Behind the elders' tact, however, were the expectation that the young would not flaunt their excesses, on the one hand, and an unequal relationship, tight social control, and the assumption that adults were always in the right, on the other. In Athens, men were constantly watched, and

16. On schooling children in excellence: Plato *Protagoras* 325c–326d. For similar attitudes in early modern England, cf. Ben-Amos 1994, 36–37.

17. E.g., Dem. 19.285; Isoc. 16.4; 20.21; Lyc. 1.10; cf. [And.] 4.21; Hyp. 5.21–22. See Ober 1989, 170–71, on the didactic value of popular resolutions.

18. Cf. Dem. 10.39–40; Thuc. 2.37; Strauss 1993, 47–48; D. Cohen 1991c, 93; Bailey 1991, 33. The city as an imaginary family or kinship group: Plato *Menexenus* 249b–c; Isoc. 4.24; Goldhill 1990, 112–13; Loraux 1993, 65, 119–20. The question of who authored Dem. 25 is not very relevant to the issue at hand; see Hansen 1976, 144–52 (Demosthenes or a contemporary); Sealey 1993, 237–39, argues for a later rhetorician, but this is disputed by Rubinstein 2000, 30–32.

verbal or nonverbal signs were perceived as meaningful comments on other people's conduct.

#### YOUNG MEN IN COURT

To a large extent, the perceptions of youth that emerge from the orations are stereotypes, and some ancient Greeks recognized them as such. A series of speeches written by Antiphon in the last quarter of the fifth century for a hypothetical case in which an old man is killed by a younger man following a drunken brawl is revealing in this respect (Ant. 4).<sup>19</sup> The young defendant argues that it is wrong to make an indisputable law of nature out of the commonly held opinion that the young commit hubris and the old behave with restraint and moderation. Such a law, he points out, obviates the need to render judgment, because the young are convicted by their age alone. There are many temperate young men and many drunk old men, he observes (Ant. 4.4.2; cf. Isoc. 6.4; Eurip. *Electra* 367–90).

The defendant's logic is impeccable, but the need to make the point suggests that the stereotype had power. Clearly, the orators related to it, whether because they felt that it would be useful to do so or because they had to. In several speeches, it plays a significant role.

#### *Ariston against Conon (Dem. 54)*

Of all of the speeches in the orators' corpus, the oration *Against Conon*, written by Demosthenes for Ariston (Dem. 54), makes the most extensive use of images of youth. The case involved a charge of assault by the young claimant Ariston against Conon and his sons.<sup>20</sup> Ariston charged that when he was doing garrison duty, Conon's sons had set about abusing the slaves attached to his company and then attacked him and his companions.<sup>21</sup> After they returned to the city, Conon and his sons fell upon him as he was taking a walk, stripped him, and beat him to within an inch of his life. Ariston was therefore suing.

19. Regarding the *Tetralogies*, I agree with Michael Gagarin that they are Antiphon's work or of a contemporary: Gagarin 1997, 8–9; 2002, 52–62, citing earlier bibliography for and against their authenticity. Carawan 1998, 171–77, opts for a later generation.

20. The speech has been commented on by Gernet *Démosthène* III (1959); Carey and Reid (1985) 69–105, and D. Cohen (1995a) 119–130.

21. Dem. 54.3. Against the assumption that they were ephebes at the time (Carlier 1990, 50), see Carey and Reid 1985, 69, 78; Burckhardt 1996, 244 n. 329.

The claimant labored under two handicaps. He himself was a young man, by definition suspected of engaging in the same excesses as his adversaries. He suffered as well from the Athenians' tolerance of youthful excess in general and of youthful violence in particular. In anticipation of the defense that he expected Conon to make, Ariston suggested to the jury that Conon would trivialize the matter by presenting the fight as an affair over a woman and claim that "things of this sort are typical of young men" and quite common among the sons of Athens's social elite—*kaloī k'agathoi* (literally, the beautiful and the good; Dem. 54.14).<sup>22</sup> In addition, Ariston said, Conon would charge him and his friends with being "drunken and insolent fellows," as well as "unreasonable and vindictive" (*agnōmonas de kai pikrous*) in bringing the matter to court (Dem. 54.14; cf. 54.16; Aes. 1.58–62). Ariston's suit was constructed not only to refute these claims but more broadly to overcome the liabilities of his youth.

The claim was lodged against Conon, the father, rather than Ctesias, the son. The reason Ariston gave was that Conon had struck him first (Dem. 54.8, 33). This argument was based on the Athenian law of battery, which punished the man who initiated hostilities. But in his description, Ariston indicated that the three attackers had worked in concert, and he described Ctesias, Conon's son, as the most active of the assailants. Had Ariston so wished, he could have charged Ctesias with the assault and produced witnesses to prove it.<sup>23</sup>

The probable motive for not charging Ctesias, suggested in the text of the speech, was that youth could be a mitigating circumstance in the jury's decision. Ariston himself pointed out that youth was the only legitimate ground for pleading for a reduced sentence (Dem. 54.21). At over fifty, Conon was doubly guilty because, as a mature male, he should have avoided participating in the crime and prevented it (Dem. 54.22). Ariston's argument, like the legal and rhetorical strategies he pursued, reflected the Athenians' expectation that men act their age (Lys. 24.17–18; cf. Dem. 21.18).

22. For the commonality of such conflicts in Athens, see Dem. 21.36, 38; Lys. 3.43. The remark about the youth's social position attributed to Conon might have been designed to prejudice the audience against him: Ober 1989, 258–59; Millett 1998a, 227–28. Conon's defense: 54.22–23; Halliwell 1991a.

23. For striking first as a proof of guilt of assault: Dem. 23.50; 47.47; cf. Lys. 4.11; Isoc. 20.1; Menander *Samia* 576; Scafuro 1997, 101–2. Ctesias's involvement: Dem. 54.8, cf. 54.35; *contra*: Davidson 1997, 224. Cf. D. Cohen 1995a, 128–30. Testimonies in the service of a litigant: Humphreys 1985c, esp. 322–27, 344, 346; 1986, 59, 65; Todd 1990b; 1993, 96–97, 261–62; cf. Thür 1995, 325–31, but also Eder 1995b, 332–33.

The speechwriter uses the positive and negative stereotypes of youth to present Ariston as the innocent victim of an unprovoked hubristic attack by drunken, violent, and dangerous assailants. Ariston consistently depicts himself as a *metrios* young man—temperate, moderate, and self-controlled—and his attackers as the antithesis.<sup>24</sup>

Ariston presents himself as a young man of limited capacities who had been advised by friends and relatives that he should avoid appearing too ambitious for his age. He is suing only for battery, a lesser charge than was warranted by the seriousness of his injuries.<sup>25</sup> To dispel any notion that he may be looking for a confrontation, as young men are wont to do, or taking up the court's time with a trivial matter, he repeats several times that he pressed charges only after his assailants had almost killed him.<sup>26</sup>

At camp, according to Ariston, Conon's sons had spent their days drinking; he and his fellow servicemen had not. Conon's sons had "behaved with every sort of licentious brutality [*aselgeia*] and hubris": they had struck the slaves, emptied their chamber pots on them, and urinated on them (Dem. 54.4); and they had then gone on to attack Ariston and his men under the cover of night. He and his men had never raised a hand against them, but had rather "expostulated" with them to stop their abusive conduct and complained to the general. Although Ariston admitted that the abuse had produced anger and hate, he stressed that on his return home, he had not sought revenge or pressed charges, but had simply resolved to keep his distance from "people of this sort" (Dem. 54.6).

The account of the events at camp was not material to the case. Its aim was to contrast Ariston's conduct and character with the conduct and character of his assailants for the jury. To overcome the suspicion that he too might be a hothead, Ariston depicted himself as a self-controlled young man who had tried to avoid escalating the conflict. But because Athenians expected young men not to accept insults passively, he had to justify his failure to defend himself.<sup>27</sup> He thus showed his effort to curb

24. On *metrios* as a valued attribute, see pp. 000–00 below. See Carey and Reid 1985, 73–74, for the speaker's effort to present a consistent character.

25. The choice of a lesser charge could have been motivated by practical considerations: Carey and Reid 1985, 74–76. D. Cohen 1995a, 122, has suggested that Ariston picked a suit befitting his self-proclaimed identity as a man hesitant to initiate a heavy legal battle; cf. Is. fr. 6 (Forster); Dem. 44.1

26. Dem. 54.6, 12–13, 24. The case was a private action of injury (*aikēias dikē*), but Ariston refers constantly to the graver charge and public action of *hubris* (*hubreōs graphē*): MacDowell 1978, 131–32; Carey and Reid 1985, 69–72.

27. D. Cohen 1995a, 123–24.

Ctesias and his friends and pointed out that his superiors had stopped the attack before he had to put up his fists. In other words, he presented himself as an innocent victim but not a passive one, and as a mature and self-controlled young man, yet mindful of his honor.<sup>28</sup>

The description of the attack in the city was the key to Ariston's case. He sought to show that the attackers' conduct greatly exceeded youthful boisterousness or harmless masculine aggression. Ariston framed his account so as to persuade the jury that his attackers were not only badly behaved and abusive but also posed a danger to the social order.

It was not enough to charge that Conon, his son Ctesias, and another young man had attacked him on their way home from a *sumposion* (banquet), where they had been drinking.<sup>29</sup> There is evidence that the phenomenon of young men leaving a *sumposion* drunk and picking a fight was neither rare nor unequivocally condemned in ancient Athens. Drunken violence could be depicted as either deviant or excusable behavior, depending on the circumstances and the speaker's needs.

To present the assault as an unmanly conflict, Ariston stressed that it was totally unprovoked and had occurred as he was strolling along peaceably minding his own business; that it was an unequal attack of three against one; and, by implication, that his adversaries' conduct had been dishonorable. He described in vivid detail how Conon, Ctesias, and another young man had pulled off his clothing, pushed him into the mud, jumped on him, and so pummeled him that he had to be carried home on a litter and barely recovered. He drew a picture of himself at the scene of the attack lying helpless, injured, and humiliatingly exposed in the mud of the *agora*, unable to move or utter a sound, while his assailants cursed and Conon mimicked a cock that had won a fight and was encouraged by his companions to flap his elbows like wings against his sides (Dem. 54.9). Conon's crowing act, set against his victim's unwarranted humiliation, revealed a degraded, swaggering, and immature masculinity. It was an undignified gesture, more characteristic of a callow youth, and certainly unbecoming in an older man.<sup>30</sup>

In his characterization of Conon's sons, Ariston plays on the Atheni-

28. Pace Herman 1993; 1994; 1995, esp. 45.

29. Dem. 54.7. For the rhetorical use of topography in Dem. 54: Millett 1998a, 203-4, 227-28.

30. On the cock as symbol: Csapo 1993, esp. 20-21. D. Cohen 1995a, 125-26, detects in Conon's conduct an attempt to humiliate Ariston sexually; cf. Winkler 1990a, 48, 224 n. 3; Halperin 1990, 96. The description alludes as well to military disgrace: Jackson 1991, 242; cf. Carey and Reid 1985, 83-84. For the humiliation of forced (semi-) nakedness, cf. Osborne 1997, 506-7; Geddes 1987; Bassi 1995.

ans' fears of unbridled young men who defied the polis's social and religious norms. He claims that Conon's sons belong to two mysterious groups called *ithuphalloi* and *autolēkuthoi* (Dem. 54.14, 16–17)—respectively “erect phalluses” and “carrying their own oil flask.”<sup>31</sup> Ariston leaves it to the jury to conjure up what took place at the meetings of these groups, but his accusation reminds jurors that youthful gangs, which were not uncommon in ancient Athens, evoked trepidation in ordinary citizens.<sup>32</sup>

A little later in the speech, Ariston mentioned Conon's misbehavior as a youngster (*meirakion*), when he and his friends had called themselves “Triballians”—a name denoting a wild, lawless people—and that they committed such outrages as eating food left as sacrifice at Hekate's altars and pigs' testicles used for purification rituals.<sup>33</sup> These deeds were adduced to show Conon's current contempt for all that was sacred and to convince the jury that there was thus no lie or perjury to which he would not stoop.

Scholars have questioned the veracity of Ariston's version of events and his characterization of his attackers.<sup>34</sup> What is important to this discussion, however, is the use of stereotypes of youth to try to win the jury over to his side. Ariston presents himself as a mature, civic-minded adult, young only in years, who is seeking to benefit the city by bringing criminals to justice, and who, despite his youth, has performed many services for the city (Dem. 54.42–44). Ctesias, in contrast, is presented as an unbridled youth, and Conon as adult with all the vices of the young.

### *Epichares against Theocrines (Dem. 58)*

The stereotypes of youth, which played a central role in Ariston's claim against Conon, are not as well-developed in other orations. But young

31. *Ithuphalloi*: Dover 1989, 38; Carey and Reid 1985, 86–87; N. Jones 1999, 225–26. *Autolēkuthoi*: Carey and Reid 1985, 87; Borthwick 1993. The oil flask distinguishes males from females in Aristophanes' *Women at the Thesmophoria* 139–40; Golden 1998, 124.

32. Cf. Dover 1989, 38. Earlier associations of similar nature: And. 1.61, and cf. Lys. fr. 53 (Thalheim) about the poet Cinesias's membership in a group called the *kakodaimonistoi* (evil-spirit men); Cf. Peristiany 1992, 124. For comparable social activity in modern Greece, which the actors described as *kefi* (party-spirit), see Papataxiarchis 1991, 172.

33. *Triballoi*: Dover 1989, 38; Carey and Reid 1985, 101. Their actions bring to mind the notorious Hermai and Mysteries affairs, on which see, e.g., MacDowell 1962.

34. Reid and Carey 1985, 80–81; Humphreys 1985c, 331–32.

plaintiffs did contend with and manipulate Athenians' perceptions of youth.

The speechwriter for Epichares (Dem. 58) turned the supposed weakness of youth to his client's advantage. At his father's behest, young Epichares had brought a case against Theocrines, his senior, who had won a case against Epichares' father for making an illegal proposal. The defendant was heavily fined and partially deprived of his rights as a citizen (i.e., suffered partial *atimia*), including the right to speak for himself in court. Epichares' case was a legal procedure called an *endeixis*, in which the plaintiff charged the defendant with criminal activity for the purpose of having him tried or arrested. Its aim, Epichares informed the jury, was to make Theocrines liable to legal punishment and thereby to avenge the former's father.<sup>35</sup>

Most of the case consisted of highly detailed proofs of the various criminal acts with which Epichares charged Theocrines. Several times, however, Epichares drew the jury's attention to his youth in order to win their sympathy. While Ariston presented himself as mature for his years, Epichares highlighted those aspects of youth—vulnerability, naïveté, guilelessness, inexperience, and inferiority to adults—that might evoke the sympathy and protective urges of the mature men who made up the jury.

He placed himself where Athenians liked their young men to stand: respectful, unthreatening, and in need of adult help (cf. Dem. 44.1–3). He portrayed himself as a dutiful son pressed by his father and the exigencies of time into this action. In fact, his motives included a good dose of self-interest. According to Athenian law, should the father die, the fine and deprivation of the right to speak would fall upon the son. Epichares briefly referred to his sharing his father's misfortune (Dem. 58.59) but stressed his filial piety. As he told it, his father had exhorted him to press charges while he was still living and Epichares could still “take vengeance” (Dem. 58.1–2, 52, 58).

Before proceeding to Theocrines' criminal acts, Epichares referred to his own youth three times: he claimed that he must take it upon himself to lodge a legal complaint, “without taking into account my youth”; that his father regarded it important that he, Epichares, did not “make an excuse of my inexperience and my young age” to let Theocrines get

35. Dem. 58.1–3; cf. Lys. 13.41–42. For *atimia*, see Hansen 1976, 55–90; MacDowell 1978, 73–74; Todd 1993, 142–43. For the political background of the speech: Osborne 1985b, 49.

away with criminal acts; and that the jury should extend its goodwill to someone who was “both young and inexperienced” (Dem. 58.1–3). These references efface the image of the litigating youth as brash, aspiring, and overweening. Later in his speech (58.40–43), he played on the Athenian association of youth with candor and naïveté and essentially told the jury that, faced with a young claimant, they needed not be suspicious.<sup>36</sup>

When Epichares asked the jury for justice, he observed that there were some who might criticize his suit as inappropriate to his age (Dem. 58.57–59; cf. *Lys.* 13.42). He did not spell out the criticisms, but one may assume that they included the suspicion that the suit was motivated by a typically excessive agonistic drive, attendant on youth, or by an improper search for notoriety at the expense of an elder and better.

To refute these suspicions, Epichares referred to his youthful vulnerability to reinforce his argument that the contest was uneven (Dem. 58.61) and might require the jury to level the playing field. He also reemphasized his filial duty to avenge his father, hoping that the jury would approve his efforts as the proper behavior for a young man with a sense of masculine honor. Bidding for sympathy, he reminded the jurors that his father could speak in court only through the voice of a male representative or guardian (*kurios*).<sup>37</sup> He had to speak on his father’s behalf, even though he was unequal to the task. While other men his age were aided and guided by their fathers, his father was dependent on him (Dem. 58.60; cf. 58.3, but also 58.5). The image of a vulnerable youth prematurely forced into a man’s role made Theocrines an utter villain who had inverted the normal familial hierarchy. In addition, it invited the jurors to stand in for Epichares’ father and become his protectors, and, by implication, to mete out the punishment that Theocrines deserved.

### *In Defense of Mantitheus at his Dokimasia (Lys. 16)*

In the speech that he wrote for Mantitheus to present at a *dokimasia* (review) of his qualifications for membership in the Council of Five Hun-

36. In the corpus of Demosthenes’ speeches, the claim of youth and inexperience is almost a commonplace: Dem. 21.78, 80; 27.2–3; 34.1; 53.12–13; 55.7; 59.14–15, and cf. *Lys.* fr. 16 (Thalheim); Arist. *Rhet.* 2.12.7 1389A17–18; Dion. Hal. *Isaeus* 10–11. If the speaker of Hyperides’ *Against Athenogenes* (*Hyp.* 3) was a young man (his father was still alive), his youth strengthened his self-portrait as a naïve and inexperienced man.

37. Cf. Winkler 1990b, 27; Scafuro 1997, 28. For a similar rhetorical ploy: Ant. 5.79, and for silence in court: Dem. 21.95.

dred (*boulē*), Lysias manipulated the positive stereotypes of both youth and mature adulthood on his client's behalf (Lys. 16).<sup>38</sup>

Mantitheus's right to take office was challenged on basis of his service in the cavalry in his youth, which exposed him to the charge of having supported the tyrannical rule of the Thirty. Mantitheus also had to refute criticisms of his long hair, which supposedly made him look like a young oligarch, and his address to the Assembly as a young man, which marked him as overly greedy for honor and power.<sup>39</sup>

Although Mantitheus had to be over thirty to be elected to the Council, his exact age is not known. The speech suggests that his status as a full adult was still in question. For at the close of his defense, he refers to those who object to his speaking before the people "when he was too young" (Lys. 16.20)<sup>40</sup> In the defense Lysias wrote, Mantitheus straddles the world of the young man and the mature adult, adapting elements of each role as it suits him.

Mantitheus denied that he had served in the cavalry and asserted that, even if he had, it should not disqualify him from serving on the Council. The bulk of the speech, however, consists of Mantitheus's account of his life's history. Adopting a somewhat cocky manner, which was frowned on in adults, but tolerated in young men, he extols his own virtues and elaborates on his service to the polis.<sup>41</sup>

In relating his client's career, Lysias drew on the Athenian perception of young men as fearless and courageous in battle (Aristotle *Rhet.* 2.12.9 1389a25–29; cf. Lys. 2.50–51). Mantitheus stressed that while fighting in the military on behalf of democracy, he had always volunteered for the most dangerous assignments, and that he was among the first to enter every battle and the last to leave (Lys. 16.13–18).

Interspersed with his military record, Mantitheus told his hearers of his virtues. He depicted himself as free of the vices of youth and then as a mature manly adult. That he was slandered by younger men (*neōteroi*)

38. *Dokimasia*: see pp. 000–00 below.

39. I am unconvinced by the objections of Craik 1999, 626–27, to the emendation of *tolma* (boldness) to *komai* (having long hair) in Lys. 16.18, especially in view of Lys. 16.19, which calls on the audience not to judge him by his appearance. *Pace* Craik, oratorical references to appearances are not general but refer to specific physical attributes: see chapter 4, n. 40.

40. Resentful reception of young speakers: [Aristotle] *Rhetoric to Alexander* 29 1437a 32–34. Councilor's age: Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.35; *Ath. Pol.* 4.3, 30.2, 31.1, and Rhodes 1985, 1, 172. Hansen 1985, 55–56, estimates that the average age of a councilor was forty.

41. See Lys. 16.2 and Edwards and Usher 1985, 253; Weissenberger 1987, esp. 76–79; cf. 57–71; Craik 1999.

who spent their time drinking and gambling was evidence of his *epieikeia* (temperance or goodness) (Lys. 16.11).<sup>42</sup> The image of temperance that he tried to project was similar to that which we have seen in Ariston. He was profligate neither as a youth nor as an adult, and despite limited means, he had fulfilled his duties as a male guardian (*kurios*) and a dedicated patriot.<sup>43</sup> As a guardian, he had arranged marriages for his sisters (Lys. 16.10). As a patriot, he had initiated donations of money to impetuous soldiers of his deme (local community) and donated money himself (Lys. 16.14).

As for his long hair, Mantitheus argued that appearances could be deceiving, that what counted was conduct, and that he was a man of honor and orderliness (*philotimōs kai kosmiōs*; Lys. 16.18–19; cf. 16.3). He conceded that his political activity might have been somewhat too ambitious but claimed that such activity was required to protect his interests, was entirely in keeping with his family tradition of service to the city, and was generally deemed worthy by the people who were sitting in judgment on him (Lys. 16.19–21). In short, he told his hearers that the manly values they espoused were responsible for his conduct.

The orations reveal two largely antithetical images of youth. One is that of the self-controlled, obedient, mature young men, ready to learn from adults, in whom Athenian men placed their hopes for the future of their society. The other is that of young men who threaten adult power, institutions, and conventions. Such youths might turn their good looks, wealth, and strength against adults.

The inclusiveness of the images, and the contradictions and ambivalences that inhered in them, left a great deal of room for manipulation. As we have seen, skilled writers took advantage of that space in the service of their clients. With the help of a clever speechwriter, a young man in court could adopt the positive image of youth to contrast with the negative ones to win the sympathy of the jury and to support his claims.

42. Cf. Dover 1974, 61–63, 191; Ghiggia 1995, 221–23.

43. On young men and wastefulness: Arist. *Rhet.* 2.12.6 1389A13–15; Dem. 42.4; Aes. 1.42.