Marc Domingo Gygax

Proleptic Honours in Greek Euergetism

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **39 • 2009**
Seite / Page **163–192**
https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/413/5021 • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2009-39-p163-192-v5021.5

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor
Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München
Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see **https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron**
ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**
Verlag / Publisher **Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin**

MARC DOMINGO GYGAX

Proleptic Honours in Greek Euergetism

This article approaches the study of Greek inscriptions of the Classical period and, in particular, of the Hellenistic age from a historical and anthropological perspective. Specifically, it seeks to identify – beyond individual cases and exceptions – patterns of behaviour and social practices deeply rooted in Greek society and of very long duration in Greek history. The key object of study here is what we shall call ‹proleptic honours›. By this is meant honours granted by a polis to recompense benefactions that had yet to be carried out. The analysis of this custom and its origins helps shed light on some basic mechanisms of Greek euergetism and its structural and historical relationship with gift-exchange.[1]

A common problem of the Greek polis was the scarcity of public resources.[2] In the event of extraordinary expenditure (usually arising from war, food shortages or building projects) the polis had to rely on royal or private benefactions, public loans and extraordinary taxes (εἰσφοραί).[3] The funds obtained from private benefactions were partly raised through ἐπιδόσεις: voluntary contributions made by citizens (sometimes also by foreign residents) in response to an appeal by the assembly, ratified by decree.[4] There are approximately one hundred testimonies – mostly inscriptions – of such public subscriptions.[5] As one may expect, the majority are lists of contributors, but curiously enough there are also some inscriptions that record lists of people who have just ‹promised› money (the verb is usually ἐπαγγέλλω).[6] In at least eleven cases the

[1] Previous versions of this article were presented at talks at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Princeton University, Universität Münster, University of Pennsylvania, and Yale University. I would like to thank the audiences as well as Tim Duff, Christian Habicht, Rudolf Haensch, Christof Schuler and an anonymous referee for Chiron for their helpful comments.

[2] Migeotte 2002; Reger 2003, 342–345; Schuler 2007.

[3] Thomsen 1964; Veyne 1976; Brun 1983; Migeotte 1984; Gauthier 1985; Garnsey 1988; Quass 1996.

[4] Migeotte 1992.

[5] Most of these are collected in Migeotte 1992. Since the publication of this corpus, various new ἐπίδοσις-inscriptions have come to light, particularly from the island of Cos: see Segre 1993; Migeotte 1998a; Migeotte 1998b. See also Behrwald – Blum – Schuler – Zimmermann 1998, 185–187, and the new text from Pisye (Caria) in Debord – Varinlioğlu 2001, no. 1.

[6] Migeotte 1992, nos. 22, 23, 34, 38, 41, 43, 45, 50, 52, 73, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83. To this evidence should be added nos. 67 and 84, which refer to the act of promising with ὑπισχνέομαι instead of ἐπαγγέλλω, as well as no. 69, which uses ὑποδέχομαι.

publication of the names of the prospective donors is presented as an honorific gesture.[7] This particular detail, which serves as the point of departure for my analysis of proleptic honours, attracted the comment of Léopold Migeotte, who in his monograph on public subscriptions writes: «Should we conclude that sometimes the cities, while usually waiting until the end of the process and the fulfilment of the promise before letting the names of the subscribers be inscribed and displayed, went ahead with honouring the volunteers by virtue of their promise, while risking the possibility that some would default on their commitment? Certainly not, for two reasons. First, the commemorative monument was, by definition, intended to render homage to the benefactors of the city: it would have been paradoxical, and offensive for the other subscribers, to allow the names of the failing subscribers to appear alongside theirs. Second, the wording of the inscriptions indicates that they should not always be interpreted literally.»[8]

Migeotte's solution to the problem is to assume that the verb ἐπαγγέλλω (‹to promise›) and its corresponding substantive ἐπαγγελία, together with other equivalent lexical items found in ἐπίδοσις-inscriptions,[9] «by referring to a solemn promise, could end up including the idea of donation», i.e. that the promise referred to had actually been converted into a donation. A similar conclusion was arrived at by Adolphe Künzi, who thought that these words can refer to «the fulfilment of a promised contribution», and Bernhard Laum, who considered that the decrees dealing with ἐπαγγελίαι are always testimonies of the *fulfilment* of promises.[10]

The question posed by Migeotte – is it conceivable that honorific stelae were granted to people who had only promised contributions? – merits careful consideration by historians interested in Greek euergetism. This question invites us to examine an important aspect of Greek euergetism that has so far been insufficiently explored and constitutes the key focus of this paper: the *proleptic* nature of certain euergetic honours.

I shall argue in this paper that some honours were awarded by the polis for ‹virtual› benefactions, which is to say, for fictive benefactions or for small services pres-

[7] For instance, Migeotte 1992, no. 75: --- ἵνα δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπαγγειλαμέν[ων φιλαγα]θία φανερὰ πᾶσ[ιν ὑ]πάρχῃ, ἀναγραφῆναι τόδε τὸ [ψήφισμ]α ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνεστώτων ταμιῶν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων καθότι ἂν ἐπαγγείλωνται ἐπὶ τοῦ τοίχου τοῦ λιθίνου … («… in order that the benevolence of those who have promised may also be clear to all, this decree shall be inscribed by the treasurers in charge, as well as the names of those who have promised according to whatever they have promised, on the stone wall …»). See also Migeotte 1992, nos. 22, 23, 34, 41, 50, 69, 80, 81, 83 and 84. The inscriptions that consist of a list of potential donors without any prescript phrased in clear honorific language are considered also rewards by Migeotte 1992, 286 and 326, nos. 37, 38, 43, 45, 52, 67, 73, 78, 79.

[8] Migeotte 1992, 326 (my translation; original text in French).

[9] See footnotes 6 and 7.

[10] Migeotte 1992, 209, 326, 399 (quoting Robert 1929, 122–123, n. 4, originally in French); Künzi 1923, 59; Laum 1914, vol. I, 119–120. See also Schuler 2003, 172.

ented by the polis as considerably more important than what they really were perceived to be. The aim of the award of honours for such virtual benefactions was to encourage future ‹real› benefactions. In these cases, the honours awarded, which were actually gifts, certainly served as formal recognition of the virtual benefactions. But in fact, if we consider the intention of the honours – i.e. to generate benefactions – they can be seen to have served also as recompense ‹in advance›. Although this may seem a contradiction in terms, it does seem to correspond to the way these honours were perceived by the Greeks themselves. As we shall see, due to the reciprocity mechanisms of euergetism, which led to expectations that the honours would lead to benefactions, they were to a great extent truly experienced as recompense for benefactions yet to come. I propose to call these ‹proleptic honours›, where ‹prolepsis› implies ‹the assumption that a future event or condition has been realized›.

Depending on the degree to which the virtual benefaction was fictitious and – in cases where it had a real component worthy of reward – on its importance in comparison to the future benefaction which was sought, proleptic honours were anticipatory to varying degrees, that is to say, they functioned to a greater or lesser extent as rewards for a future benefaction. For example, honours awarded for mere goodwill were more proleptic than honours awarded for promises, while honours for promises solemnly made in the assembly were less proleptic than honours for informal promises. I will call honours ‹proleptic› as long as the anticipatory dimension predominates over the function of rewarding the initial benefaction, keeping in mind that within this category there is a range which goes from ‹pure› proleptic honours (those awarded for fictive benefactions) to honours where the proleptic aspect predominates only very slightly. Honours which had the primary function of rewarding an earlier benefaction, even if they were of much greater value than the benefaction, fall outside the category of proleptic honours.

Besides the question of definitions there is another aspect that ought to be addressed from the outset so as to clearly identify our object of study. This is the mechanisms by which proleptic honours sought to prompt benefactions. Here one must distinguish between the main principle on which all proleptic honours were based – the principle that honours functioning as gifts demanded reciprocation – and the subordinated mechanisms that depended on the type of proleptic honour being granted. For instance, in the context of public subscriptions, by inscribing the names of potential donors, a particular polis may, besides indebting individuals with rewards in advance, also have sought to publicize a ‹contract› to be used against those who might fail to fulfil their promise.

Furthermore, proleptic honours awarded to citizens appealed to the citizen's moral duty to assist the polis in time of need. When the citizen was a very wealthy person, proleptic honours reminded him of the rule that rich citizens had a greater responsibility in this respect. Foreigners, for their part, were reminded by proleptic honours that one of the signs of friendship was the exchange of favours, and kings who based

part of their legitimacy on presenting themselves as benefactors were reminded that they had to behave as such.

All these particular aspects that contributed to the efficiency of proleptic honours must be taken into consideration, as well as the possibility that there were situations in which one of those aspects was more influential than the capacity of the honour itself to indebt its recipient. The focus of the paper, however, will be on the reciprocity principle on which proleptic honours relied. This principle is what proleptic honours of all kinds had in common and it is this principle that helps explain the relationship between euergetism and gift-exchange.

In what follows I shall offer evidence indicating that, contrary to what some scholars have suggested, Greek poleis sometimes granted the honour of having their names inscribed on a stele to people who had merely promised contributions, i.e. before the contribution had actually been made. I shall then attempt to demonstrate that this practice, when considered as an instance of proleptic honour, is less contradictory than may seem at first glance. To do this, I shall analyse the rules of reciprocity on which the granting of this type of honour was founded. I shall also present several examples indicating the variety of honours that can be included in the category of proleptic honours. Finally, I shall explain aspects of Greek euergetism that facilitated the emergence and diffusion of proleptic honours: the vocabulary of euergetism, the origins of euergetism, chains of benefactions and honours, and the existence of two different levels of exchange in Greek euergetism – institutional and non-institutional.

Many of the cases under discussion will refer to honourees such as πρόξενοι, royal officers and – above all – Hellenistic kings, whose benefactions, means for performing them and motivations were normally different from those of the participants in public subscriptions. In all these cases, however, the exchange of benefactions and honours follows the same basic rules governing civic euergetism.[11] Discussion of these instances will shed light on what may be less evident for public subscriptions and show, at the same time, the wide spectrum of honours in which the proleptic intention was present, as well as how old the practice of awarding them was.

The paradox of public subscriptions

Let us begin, then, by re-examining the problem of honours in public subscriptions. As a starting point, it is worth considering an inscription from the polis of Crannon in Thessaly. Between the years 168 and 142 BC Crannon sought to eliminate its debts by raising a public subscription, and passed a decree in which it resolved:

[11] On the similarities and differences between the euergetism of foreigners and the euergetism of citizens see Domingo Gygax 2006c.

ἐπαγγέλλασθαι | τᾶ πόλι τὸς δευμένος παρ' ἐκκλεισσίαι | ἕκαστον καττό κε βελλείτει δουρρὰν τᾶ | ⟨τα⟩ πόλι ἐν τὰ διεσαφειμένα δάνεια· | τὰμ μὰ ἐπαγγελλίαν ποιείσασσθα[ι] | ἐν τᾶ Κρατεραίοι στραταγία καὶ τὸς ἐ|παγγελλαμένος ἐπαινεῖσαι τὰν πό|λιν οὕστε φανερὸν εἶ πάντεσσι ὅτι ά | πόλις μναμονεύει τοῦν ἑαυτὰν εὐερ|γετεισάντουν· τὸς μὰ ταμίας φρόντι|σαι οὕστε πὰρ τοῦν ἐπαγγελλαμένουν | γενειθεῖ τᾶ πόλι ά δόσις τοῦν χρειμά|τουν καττὰς ἐπαγγελίας.[12]

This text presents us with a case of honours bestowed in return for the promise of future contributions: the citizens are rewarded with public praise and treated as εὐεργέται in the assembly where they make their promises, before the treasurers set about securing the payment. Evidently this reward is not of the same rank as a stele, but it is symptomatic of a certain attitude of the Greek poleis towards those who promised contributions: they were prepared to respond to these promises with honours.

The same attitude is reflected in an inscription from Cos.[13] Between 205 and 201 this polis asked its inhabitants to make donations for «the defence of the polis». The volunteers had to declare their intention to make a donation in the assembly, and the demos then had to vote in each case for its acceptance. It was decided that the names of «those whose donations had been accepted» would be inscribed on three stelae. This formulation does not contain the word ἐπαγγέλλω and so avoids the ambiguity attributed by some scholars to phrases which refer to the merits of the subscribers through this term or its cognates. It clearly refers to people who have only promised. Moreover, the list includes a few individuals who promised to contribute in kind by means of products that were offered for sale. The value of their contributions corresponds probably to the assembly's estimate before the products were sold since the quantities are given in round numbers.[14] This detail lends further support to the impression that we are dealing with a list of promises and not with the list of

[12] Migeotte 1992, no. 34, lines 20–32: «that those who wish should promise to the polis in the assembly the sum each wishes to contribute as a gift for the aforementioned debts; that the promise should be made while Crateraeus holds the office of general, and that *the polis should praise those who made such a promise so that it should be manifest to all that the polis remembers its benefactors*; *that the treasurers should take care that those who have promised should give the money to the polis as promised*» (tr. by Austin 2006, no. 121).

[13] Migeotte 1992, no. 50, lines 7–37: … δεδόχθαι· ἐ|[π]αγγέλλεσθαι τὸς δηλο|μένος τῶν τε πολιτᾶν καὶ | πολιτίδων καὶ νόθων καὶ πα|[ρ]οίκων καὶ ξένων· τῶν δὲ ἐπαγ|γειλαμένων τὰ ὀνόματα | ἀναγορευσάντω παρα|χρῆμα ἐν τᾶι ἐκκλησίαι· ὁ δ[ὲ] | δᾶμος διαχειροτονείτω | τὰν ἀξίαν τᾶς δωρεᾶς | [κ]αί, εἴ κα δοκῆι, λαμβαν[έ]|[τ]ω· ὅπως δὲ ὑπόμνα[μα] | [ὑπ]άρχῃ τῶν ἐς τὰν σῳ[τη]|[ρί]αν τὰν τᾶς πατρίδος [καὶ] | τῶν συμμάχων συνεπι[δόν]|των ἑαυτούς, τοὶ πωληταὶ | ἐγδόντω στάλας ἐργάξασ|θαι τρεῖς καὶ ἀναθέ[ντω μ]ί|αμ μὲν ἐν τῶι θεάτρω[ι, τὰν δ]ὲ | ἄλλαν ἐν τῶι Ἀσ[κλα]πι|είωι, τὰν δὲ τρίταν ἐν τᾶι ἀγο|ρᾶι παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν τὸν τοῦ | Διονύσου· τῶν δὲ χειροτο|νηθέντων τὰ ὀνόματα ἀν[α]|γραψάντω [ἐς] τὰς στάλας· | καταχρημ[ατι]σάντω δὲ κα[ὶ] | εἴ τινων ἀποχειροτονη|θῇι ἃ ἐπαγγελία· αἱ δέ κά τι|νες ὑστερῶντι τᾶς ἐπαγγελ|[ί]ας, ἐξῆμεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐν τᾶι ἐχομέναι ἐκ|κλησίαι ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι·

[14] Migeotte 1992, 157.

the final contributions, where one would expect to see the value of the completed sales.[15]

What makes this inscription particularly interesting, however, is its statement that the polis decided that those whose promises of gifts had been rejected would be «registered» (καταχρηματίζω).[16] This measure cannot be interpreted as a form of punishment,[17] since it hardly makes sense to punish people for having promised something that the demos simply declined to accept.[18] It should rather be understood, as Migeotte himself observes together with Ivana Savalli, as a reward for the promise, an honorific measure that involved registering the names in the archives or maybe even of exhibiting a temporary public list.[19] Apparently the polis did not want to leave without rewards those volunteers whose contributions were rejected in a system presumably conceived to maximize gains in the public subscription.[20]

If, in a public subscription, people who had promised contributions that had been rejected could be the object of such a distinction, it seems likely that some poleis would inscribe on stelae the names of individuals who had made promises that were most probably going to be fulfilled. Evidence indicating that this was indeed the case is found in the following inscription of Colophon of 311–306 BC:

> ἵνα δὲ καὶ οἱ πολῖται χρήματα | εἰσάρωσιν ὡς πλεῖστα εἰς τὰ τείχη, δεδόχθαι τῶι δήμωι· ὑποδέχεσθαι τῶμ π[ο]|λιτῶν τὸμ βουλόμενον ὅσον ἂν ἕκαστος θέληι καὶ δὴ τοῖς δὲ ἀποδήμο[ι]ς εἶναι | τὴν ὑπόδεξιν ὅταν θέλωσι· περὶ δὲ τῶν ὑποδεξαμένων βουλεῦσαι τὸν δῆμον τοῦ | Ληναιῶνος μηνὸς ἐν τῆι κυρίαι ἐκκλησίαι ὅπος τιμηθήσεται ἕκαστος τῶν ὑπο|δεξαμένων ἀξίως τῆς προθυμίας καθότι ἂν τῶι δήμωι δοκῆι· ἀναγράψαι δὲ τοὺς | ὑποδεξαμένους πάντας καὶ ὅσον ἕκαστος ὑποδέξηται εἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ | [στ]ῆσαι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Μητρὸς ἐνθάδε· τοῦ δὲ ἀργυρίου ὅσον ἂν ὑποδέξωνται | [διδ]όναι αὐτοὺς, ὅταν τὰ ἔργα πραθῆι τῶν τειχῶν, τὸ τρίτομ μέρος ἕκαστον οὗ ἂν | [ὑποδ]έξηται.[21]

---

[15] Otherwise we would have to assume that the polis did not care about the accuracy of the sums or that, by the time it inscribed the names of the contributors that had paid, it had still not sold the products.

[16] On the meaning of this word, see Savalli 1985, 402; Migeotte 1992, 152–154.

[17] This is the interpretation of Sherwin-White 1978, 179–180, based on Is. 5. 36–38.

[18] The Isaeus passage (Is. 5. 36–38) cited by Sherwin-White 1978, 179–180, in support of the view that this is conceivable refers to a very different situation: the display of a public list of names in Athens to punish people who had not fulfilled promises in a public subscription.

[19] See Savalli 1985, 402; Migeotte 1992, 152–154.

[20] The polis may have expected that some people, for fear of their gifts being rejected, decided to donate more than what they would have otherwise donated, and that the increased amount collected by means of this procedure would more than compensate for the rejected contributions.

[21] Maier 1959–1961, no. 69 (Migeotte 1992, no. 69), lines 28–37: «In order that the citizens provide the most possible funds for the walls, the people have decided: that any of the citizens who is willing promise the sum each one wishes to give and that the promise be open to those who are currently absent; as regards those who have promised to make a donation, the

This text leaves little doubt that Colophon decided to honour with a stele those who had promised money before they had made the first payment of a sum scheduled to be paid in instalments.[22] In the light of this evidence, there are other inscriptions which seem to refer to the same practice. For instance, in a list of subscribers from Smyrna containing the names of people who had promised to contribute to the construction or reconstruction of public buildings, mention is made of a subscriber who is said to have *already* made the contribution,[23] while the other subscribers are described only as having promised it. This distinction seems to make sense only if at the time of inscribing the names the persons who are mentioned as having promised to contribute had not yet in fact fulfilled the promise, but were simply expected to do so.[24]

Equally revealing are some honorific inscriptions declaring that the subscribers «have promised and given» (δίδωμι),[25] «have promised and contributed» (συνεισφέρω),[26] or «have fulfilled the commitment in line with their promise» (συνετέλεσαν τὰν ἐπαγγελίαν καθ᾽ ἃ ἐπαγγείλαντο).[27] One might wonder why there is this insistence on the fact that they had not only promised but also paid. In my opinion it is probable that in these cases the poleis concerned believed that it was expedient to add this information. They may have thought that if they were only to write that the citizens «had promised» it might be taken to imply that the achievement of the contributors consisted solely of making the promise, since it was equally proper to set up stelae inscribed with the names of those who had simply promised to make contributions.[28]

We know also that in the second or first century BC the Lycian polis of Hippucome decided to set up a stele with the names of the people who had promised to pay for the construction of a public bath with the intention of encouraging other individuals to contribute to the project. Did the polis wait until all the subscribers (about 80 people) had fulfilled their promise before erecting the stele? It seems more likely that it took the initiative based on the promises, since the stele itself – not the decision to erect it –

---

people shall deliberate in the month of Lenaion, in the main assembly, the best way to honour every individual who has made such a promise, in a manner worthy of their zeal, in the way the people decide; *to inscribe on a stone stele the names of all who have promised and the quantities promised by each individual and to erect the stele* in the sanctuary of Meter here; *of the money promised, each donator shall pay, at the time the works on the walls are assigned, one third of the total sum promised*.»

[22] The way in which Maier 1959–1961, 230, reconstructs the process supports this interpretation.

[23] I.Smyrna 697 (Migeotte 1992, no. 67), lines 43–45: κατεσκευάσθε δὲ καὶ ἡ ἡλιοκάμεινος ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ.

[24] Migeotte 1992, 209, attempts to explain the distinction by means of the following assumption: the person who is said to have contributed had done so before the commencement of the public subscription and perhaps had even been the initiator of the subscription.

[25] Migeotte 1992, nos. 25, 58, 60, 76.

[26] Migeotte 1992, no. 66.

[27] Migeotte 1992, no. 40.

[28] Migeotte 1992, no. 69.

was expected to attract new contributors. Furthermore, in addition to the list of people who had made promises the inscription offers another list of around 65 names written in a different letter style and in irregular lines, which was clearly added once the stele was erected (but not much later, since many letters are similar). This list may contain the names of individuals who contributed during the process of collecting the money originally promised and also the names of people who contributed thereafter, in both cases following the erection of the monument.[29]

Beyond the paradox: the logic of euergetism

If the Greek polis did indeed erect stelae to people who had only made promises, how are we to explain the existence in the Greek world of such a singular practice? As Migeotte has pointed out, the polis ran the risk that some of these individuals would not ultimately fulfil their promises. And those individuals who had fulfilled their promises would surely not wish to see their names on the stele alongside those of the defaulters. What is more, the granting of a stele simply for promises made seems to be a disproportionately high reward on the part of the demos.

The answer to this question is, in principle, simple: it was in the polis' interests to grant honours that, to us, may seem excessive, and at the same time to risk the possibility that at the end of the subscription process the stelae might include the names of people who had not in fact contributed, because, at the end of the day, this practice helped to achieve the main objective of holding a public subscription, i.e. to encourage subscribers to both to make a commitment and to honour that commitment. This was very important if we consider that the people who had promised money – including wealthy landowners – did not always have enough cash available and a relatively long period of time could pass between the promise and its fulfilment (we have seen this in the inscription from Colophon, where the contributions were paid in several instalments).

The first aspect we should consider is the ‹contractual› value of the list of subscribers. The list was a public document of promises made and in that sense a record of contractual obligations that opened the possibility of pursuing individuals for unfulfilled promises. A passage of Demosthenes suggests that in fourth-century Athens the failure to fulfil promises made in the assembly was an offence that could be punished with death.[30] And Isaeus says about a certain Dicaeogenes that since he did not

[29] Migeotte 1992, no. 80. Cf. Tietz 2003, 250–256. Cf. Migeotte 1992, no. 75, an inscription from Olymus which records a subscription that took place in at least three stages. Olymus did not wait until the end of the procedure to inscribe the names of the subscribers but inscribed them already after each stage.

[30] Dem. 20. 100: «You know there is a law making death the penalty for anyone who breaks his promise to the assembly or one of the councils or law-courts. You have our guarantee, our promise. Let the archons record it, and let the matter rest in their hands» (tr. by Vince). Cf. Aristot. Athen. Pol. 43. 5.

pay what he had promised his name was displayed in a list of defaulters in front of the statues of the Eponymous Heroes under the heading: «These are they who voluntarily promised the people that they would contribute money for the salvation of the polis and failed to pay the amounts promised.»[31] In Migeotte's corpus of inscriptions itself we find an example of a provision against possible defaulters accompanying a list of people who had promised to serve for free as ἱεροθύται in Lindos. The inscription states that the defaulters will be prosecuted for impiety.[32] But beyond measures like these, in a world dominated to a great extent by a shame culture, the publication of the promises must already have been a very efficient device to dissuade people from breaking them.[33]

Interesting as this may be for our understanding of public subscriptions, what really matters for our inquiry is that the inscribed lists of names were not only records of promises. This is at least the case in ten inscriptions of Migeotte's corpus, where the texts clearly indicate that the publication of the names represented an honorific measure. In most of these inscriptions the prospective donors are called εὐεργέται or depicted as benefactors – with expressions such as «those who have shown their zeal (φιλοτιμία) towards the people». Sometimes the publication of the names goes hand in hand with rewards such as public praise, crowns and honours «worthy of their zeal», and in one case – that of Hippucome – it was intended to serve as a gesture to stimulate others to emulate the example of those who had already promised.[34] An inscription from Termessus reads: «The people have honoured through this inscription those who have promised.»[35]

The inscription with the names of the subscribers, then, was indeed, as Migeotte has observed, a «commemorative monument» which «intended to render homage to the benefactors of the city».[36] In fact, this may also have been the case with the inscriptions that do not present the publication of the names as constituting a reward.[37] According to Migeotte, the main reward was to have the name inscribed on a durable monument, while the text of the decree ordering the inscription had less honorific sig-

[31] Is. 5. 36–38 (tr. by Forster). Cf. Wyse 1904, 463 and Migeotte 1992, 13 on this passage and other possible cases of publications of names of defaulters.

[32] Migeotte 1992, no. 41.

[33] Hands 1968, 40 adds further arguments: «In the Greek world, of course, the motive for publishing the subscription-lists was, as much as anything, to indicate those who had *not* contributed and remind them of their shocking omission, according to the standard of *homonoia*.»

[34] Migeotte 1992, nos. 22, 23, 34, 41, 69, 75, 80, 81, 83 and 84.

[35] Migeotte 1992, 84: ὁ δῆμος τοὺς ὑπεσχημένους ἐπὶ τῆς Περικλέους Ὀβριμότου Ἑρμαίου Παδαμούριος, φιλοπάτριδος, υἱοῦ πόλεως, πρ(οβουλίας) εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν τῆς βασιλικῆς ὁδοῦ ἐτείμησεν καὶ τῇ ἐπιγραφῇ.

[36] Migeotte 1992, 286 and 326. See also Hands 1968, 40: «The wealthy of the Greek city-state (…) gave ‹gifts›, which, however near-obligatory in character, had their reward in the publicity of the subscription-list, quite apart from any other public honours.»

[37] Migeotte 1992, nos. 37, 38, 43, 45, 52, 67, 73, 78, 79.

nificance and was probably displayed on a wooden panel.[38] This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that some of the inscriptions reproducing names of subscribers who had not only promised but also paid, do not portray the publication of the names as a reward either, although there is no doubt that they had an honorific character.

No matter how threatening the measures against defaulters were (measures for which we admittedly have little evidence) and no matter how binding public promises could be in a shame culture, promises were not equivalent to contributions, as proven by fact that there were individuals who did not keep their promises. So, the scholars who consider promises not worthy of honorific stelae seem to be right. They were awarded, however, because the honours themselves (and not only the record of the commitment) helped bring about the realisation of the promises. In order to explain how this mechanism worked, it will be necessary to devote some space to analysing the key principles of euergetism, of which public subscriptions comprise just one particular manifestation.

In the Greek world, euergetism implied essentially a relationship of reciprocity between a benefactor (εὐεργέτης) and the receiver of his/her benefaction (usually a polis). Although scholars have highlighted the actions of the benefactors (donations of money for public works, distribution of food, financing of embassies and so on) and often use the word euergetism as a synonym for patronage or munificence,[39] it is clear that euergetism was a complex phenomenon and that an integral part of it was the response of the polis in the form of honours (statues, crowns, stelae and so on).[40] In reality, euergetism was more of an *institution* than a *phenomenon*: an institution that involved the twin function of rendering services to the community and raising them to the status of εὐεργεσίαι.

This characteristic of euergetism has its roots in a very old feature of Greek culture: the principle that gifts entailed the obligation of counter-gifts. This principle is not restricted to ancient Greek culture. We find it in other pre-modern societies, as shown by Marcel Mauss in his famous Essai sur le don (1923–1924),[41] a piece of work that has strongly influenced the understanding of Greek gift-exchange of classical scholars such as Moses Finley, Louis Gernet and Sally Humphreys.[42] Although the obligation to reciprocate gifts may be less universal than Mauss imagined (particularly

[38] Migeotte 1992, 286.

[39] See the examples in Domingo Gygax 2003, 181–182.

[40] In the archaic polis, aristocrats customarily performed acts of benefaction for their local communities very much equivalent to the institutionalized Hellenistic practice of later centuries, but their contributions are not normally considered examples of euergetism due to the fact that they are not granted formal public honours in return (cf. Ehrenberg 1957–58, vol. 1, 64; Finley 1973, 151; Kolb 1984, 122; Meier 1986, 25–37; Stahl 1987, 129). The same can be said about the liturgies performed in highly generous fashion in the fifth century by members of the Athenian elite such as Cimon, Nicias and Alcibiades.

[41] Mauss 1923–1924.

[42] Finley 1978 [1954]; Gernet 1968; Humphreys 1978.

in the case of contemporary societies)[43] and his theory (partially criticized and enriched in some aspects by other anthropologists)[44] needs to be contrasted with more recent contributions to the topic by sociologists and philosophers,[45] Mauss' approach to gift-giving remains fundamental for our comprehension of gifts in ancient Greek society.[46]

On the one hand, gifts provoked in the recipients a feeling of indebtedness and dependence, which they could only countervail through counter-gifts. On the other, gifts generated in the donors the expectation of reciprocation, and thus placed pressure on the recipients not to disappoint the donors.

In contrast with a commercial transaction, this type of exchange did not involve a deadline for reciprocation: individuals could, of course, respond immediately,[47] but often the response might only be forthcoming after a much longer interval. While in our society the time which separates a gift from a counter-gift helps to maintain the notion of gratuity attached to the gift,[48] in ancient Greek society, where this notion was not prevalent, it served to present gift-giving as an act of generosity despite the hope for a counter-gift. It allowed the possibility, indeed, that an unforeseen circumstance (such as the death of the recipient) during the intervening period could preclude the giver from being reciprocated.[49] Such a fortuitous event could be accommodated by the rules of gift-exchange, but not the deliberate failure to reciprocate. In other words, the eventuality that a gift might, by chance, not be reciprocated did not contradict the principle that gifts by necessity implied counter-gifts, which is nicely illustrated by Pseudo-Aristotle: «Men always give presents in the hope of receiving some benefit or as a recompense for former benefactions.»[50]

Just as gifts induced individuals to give in return, benefactions to communities compelled them to compensate their benefactors. Demosthenes insists on the importance of Athens showing that it is customary to reward its benefactors, an idea that we find recurring in numerous Hellenistic inscriptions.[51] Thus, the Greek polis usually justifies the granting of honours in its decrees with statements such as: «so that it may

---

[43] Cf. Osteen 2002.

[44] Lévi-Strauss 1969 [1949]; Sahlins 1972; Godelier 1999 [1996].

[45] Bourdieu 1972; Derrida 1992 [1991]; Derrida 1995 [1992].

[46] On Mauss see Godelier 1999; on the importance of reciprocity in Greek society Gill – Postlethwaite – Seaford 1998; on Greek gift-exchange von Reden 1995; on the basic rules of Greek gift-exchange Domingo Gygax 2007.

[47] As Homeric heroes sometimes do (Hom. Il. 6. 219–220; 6. 234–236; 7. 287–305; Od. 21. 31–35).

[48] Bourdieu 1972, 221–227.

[49] See, for instance, Od. 24. 283–286 and Hdt. 1. 70.

[50] Ps.-Aristot. Rh. Al. 1446 b (tr. Rackham). This principle can be clearly seen in the Homeric poems (Finley 1978, 61–62, 64–66, 96–98, 120–123, 137; Austin – Vidal-Naquet 1972, 56–57; Donlan 1981–1982, 137–175; von Reden 1995; Wagner-Hasel 2000). We find it alive and well in later sources, such as Hes. Op. 354; Epich. in Diels 1934, vol. 1, Fr. 30, 203.

[51] Dem. 20. 64.

be manifest to all that the people knows how to return (ἀποδίδωμι) adequate thanks (χάριτες) to benefactors for the services they have performed».[52]

In giving such a gift, the person who made a benefaction to the polis expected something in return. In each of these examples, the polis makes a point of stating that it knows how to reward its benefactors not only so as to demonstrate that it has fulfilled its obligation, but also to send a clear message to potential future benefactors: if they perform benefactions, their expectation of being rewarded will not be frustrated. Some inscriptions do not hesitate to point out that the guarantee of being rewarded is precisely what draws benefactors: between 230 and 220 Histiaea awarded honours to a Rhodian «so that all may know that the people of Histiaea knows how to honour its benefactors and *more people may compete to provide benefits to the polis when they see worthy men being honoured*».[53] The benefactor's awareness of his right to reciprocation could even lead him to ask for a reward. In Athens, at least from the fourth century onwards, citizens could ask the council and the assembly for honours, a procedure that also existed in other poleis in the Hellenistic age.[54] In the Athenian decree promulgated in honour of Phaedrus of Sphettus (mid third century), for example, we find a reference to the «honours that Phaedrus has requested (αἰτέω) to be awarded».[55]

The granting of honours by the polis was more than a simple gesture to express gratitude for the benefaction(s) received. Its purpose, as a counter-gift, was to re-establish the balance in its relationship with the benefactor, and cancel the debt generated by the benefaction. This is the reason why poleis emphasize that they are awarding adequate (ἄξιαι) honours (τιμαί) or thanks (χάριτες), or that they have honoured a worthy (ἄξιος) man: in other words, they have awarded honours that measure up to the level of the benefactions or the benefactor is deemed to be worthy of the level of the honours.[56] They also express their intention «not to fall short (λείπω) in returning gratitude».[57] It is probable that in some cases these declarations were purely rhetorical in nature and that in practice the polis did not achieve its objective. But in other cases – even where we do not find statements of this kind – they surely succeeded: privileges such as citizenship, the right to hold land (ἔγκτησις) and freedom of entry into and exit from the harbour, could be a great benefit to foreigners who resided in the polis or

---

[52] Syll.[3] 374 (Austin 2006, no. 54). Other examples: OGIS 267 II; Wörrle 1975, 59–60; Syll.[3] 317, 354, 493; Herrmann 1965a, 33–36 (Ma 2000, no. 17); Welles 1934, no. 45; SEG II 663; Herrmann 1965b, 73–74 (Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 284 [E 1]); OGIS 339; Robert 1983, 126; Shear 1978, 2–4; IG XII 5. 129; OGIS 10 (I.Ephesos 5. 1453); Syll.[3] 401.

[53] Histiaea: Syll.[3] 493 (Austin 2006, no. 134); Other similar cases: Welles 1934, no. 45; OGIS 213 and 339; Shear 1978, 2–4.

[54] Gauthier 1985, 83–88, 112–120, 127–128.

[55] IG II[2] 682 (Syll.[3] 409). Also see Aesch. 3. 236.

[56] Some examples: SEG II 663; Syll.[3] 374; OGIS 763 (Welles 1934, 52); IG XII 5. 129; Herrmann 1965a, 33–36 (Ma 2000, no. 17); Syll.[3] 493. See also Herrmann 1965b, 73–74 (Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 284 [E 1]).

[57] OGIS 339 (Sestus). Cf. İplikçioğlu 2008, 117–118.

had commercial relations with it. Honours such as stelae, προεδρία and statues, besides satisfying the φιλοτιμία of the recipient, represented a symbolic capital that could often be transformed into political and economic capital.[58]

The correlation between gift-exchange and euergetism is not only apparent in the basic mechanisms of both institutions, but also in terms of vocabulary. Literary texts and, less frequently, inscriptions designate honours and benefactions as «gifts» (δωρεαί). What Phaedrus requested, and what in modern translations of the inscription is rendered «honours» or «rewards», is expressed in the Greek text by the word δωρεά.[59] I shall comment on this point in more detail below when explaining the conditions that led to the appearance of proleptic honours.

Playing with the rules: proleptic honours

In theory, benefactions were gifts, and honours counter-gifts, but the reciprocity of euergetism cannot be reduced to such easy distinctions. Other more complex variants need to be taken into account.

In the time of Ptolemy II, Xanthus granted honours to the chief of the garrison «so that all [could] see that the polis of the Xanthians [was] able to remember those who [had] done good to the polis (…) *and to respond with much bigger favours to its benefactors*». A decree from Teus justifies in similar terms the granting of honours to Antiochus III: «so that we may be seen in every [circumstance] to be returning adequate thanks to the king and to the queen and *to be surpassing* (ὑπερτίθημι) *ourselves in the honours paid to them in proportion to the benefactions received*».[60] These statements are more than just a reflection of the agonistic spirit of the Greek polis – more, that is, than just an indication that in certain cases the polis tried to surpass (or liked to believe it had surpassed) the benefactors in the competition of generosity. They suggest that the polis was sometimes not satisfied with simply re-establishing equilibrium in its relationship with the benefactor, and took pains to swing the balance in its own favour by awarding ‹excessive› honours, which might, in time, lead to a response in the form of new benefactions.

Of course, as we have already seen in the case of expressions of the type ‹worthy honours›, statements such as those from Xanthus and Teus, which I have just cited,

---

[58] On the correlation between the magnitude of the benefaction and the size of the reward see Habicht 1970, 206–213.

[59] IG II² 682 (Syll.³ 409). Bertrand 1992, 181 («honneurs»). Gauthier 1985, 78 («récompense»). Other examples of δωρεαί for honours: Lys. 21. 11; Lys. frag. 1 (Against Hippotherses), 171–175 (Gernet – Bizos); Aesch. 3. 236; Diod. 11. 27. 3 and 20. 100. 1; Plut. Mor. 850–851; IG II² 212 (Syll.³ 206). Examples of δωρεαί for benefactions: Isocr. 18. 66; Dem. 20. 35; IG II² 212 (Syll.³ 206); OGIS 748. Inscriptions refer less frequently to benefactions and rewards as δωρεαί because they tend to mention the particular accomplishments and honours explicitly and not in generic terms.

[60] Xanthus: Robert 1983, 126. Teus: Herrmann 1965a, 33–36 (Ma 2000, no. 17).

were sometimes a matter of pure rhetoric, but nonetheless a rhetoric born of reality: the polis really did seek to obtain benefactions through the process of granting ‹excessive› honours, and frequently it succeeded in attaining its objective. Various inscriptions and some literary sources provide evidence of this. For example, in the year 160/159 Delphi, taking advantage of its pan-Hellenic prestige allowed itself to ask Eumenes II, a patron of Greek culture, to put up cash for the wheat fund and the decoration of a sanctuary.[61] Eumenes promised to fulfil all that had been requested, but made only a donation for the wheat fund (and no more). Delphi responded by granting him honours and sending a new embassy to ask him to fulfil the rest of the promise. Subsequently, Eumenes granted the remaining sum and supplied the cash to create a foundation to finance the festival that Delphi had instituted in his honour. Last, Delphi responded to all this with further honours.

How should we interpret this ‹dialogue›, or better still, ‹negotiation›? Eumenes II did not fulfil his promise merely because Delphi had shown that it was prepared to fulfil its obligation of rewarding a benefactor. Nor did he do it simply out of a desire to amass honours. Although he may have had his own pressing political reasons (both external and internal) for not wanting to disappoint Delphi, to a large extent he acted as he did because Delphi had voted to award him great honours – honours that amounted to gifts as well as counter-gifts and obliged him to reciprocate. He could not be forced to make a gift, of course, but it was the right thing to do if he did not want to break the rules of gift-exchange. A similar sequence of actions was performed by Eumenes with respect to Miletus. Through the Milesian Eirenas, who was on particularly good terms with the court of Eumenes II, Miletus succeeded in securing the king's promise to finance the construction of a new gymnasium. Miletus responded to the royal pledge by introducing a cult and a festivity in his honour and sent Eirenas to the court with the honorific decree. Eumenes II then promised to increase his assistance and thus assume the costs of the received honours. It is evident that these honours, which are qualified as ‹appropriate honours›, were ‹appropriate› only if we consider the benefaction that was yet to come. Their function was double: rewarding the goodwill of the king, but, above all, ensuring that the benefaction would materialize.[62]

But the poleis did not stop at this. They also used the granting of honours to obtain benefactions in situations in which, unlike in the former cases, they did not respond to previous benefactions and their intentions were less veiled. In these cases, the granting of honours was the first step and the honours pure gifts or, viewing them from a for-

[61] Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 93 [E 1] and Syll.[3] 671 B (Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 93 [E 2]).

[62] Herrmann 1965b, 73–74 (Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 284 [E 1]). As to the question of whether Eumenes received cultic honours before or after fulfilling his promise, the text may seem rather ambiguous, but another inscription, Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 284 [E 2], makes it clear that it was before. On the details of these honours see Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 286 [E]. On these documents, see in general: Bringmann 2000, 161.

mal perspective, ‹counter-gifts in advance›, in other words, pure proleptic honours. For instance: between 278 and 246 Erythrae elected to bestow honours on King Antiochus (Antiochus I or II), to which he replied with a letter that was later inscribed in Erythrae. Unfortunately the decree is badly preserved, but from the letter we can reconstruct what took place between Erythrae and Antiochus: Erythrae took the initiative to bestow honours on Antiochus and sent him an embassy with the honorific decree, a crown, gold, and the request to keep the polis autonomous and exempt from tribute. The king conferred these privileges and announced his willingness to grant more benefits in the future. To conclude, here we are dealing with a paradigmatic case of honours in advance and benefaction in response (or benefaction ad hoc).[63]

There are more examples of this type of interaction between poleis and Hellenistic kings. For instance, the League of the Ionians established a festival in honour of Antiochus I and sent him an embassy with the decree and the request to guarantee the freedom and democracy of the poleis of the League. Likewise, Xanthus honoured Ptolemy III and his wife Berenice with crowns, statues and sacrifices in Alexandria. Judging by the king's reaction we know that these honours went hand in hand with petitions. Moreover, Miletus sent an embassy to Seleucus II with a crown. Although the answer of Seleucus II does not mention it, the polis must have accompanied the honours with a petition that, as is indicated by the fact that the king's letter was inscribed, was fulfilled.[64]

In actions such as these, when a polis addressed a king through its envoys (as well as in the case of honorary decrees written to be read to them), it usually referred in a general way to the fact that the king (sometimes also his predecessors) had acted as a benefactor. In the letter to Xanthus the king acknowledges this convention: «We congratulate you for never failing to maintain the same feelings and for acknowledging the benefactions that you have received from me, my father and my grandfather.»[65] It was a pretext for maintaining the fiction that the honours were rewards for benefactions. This did not present particular difficulties when the polis bestowed honours on a king or royal dynasty to whom it had been subject for a long time and whom it had rewarded for benefactions in the past.[66] But why was it necessary? Aside from the fact that this was an uncomplicated way to justify the decision to honour the king, we should consider that in an exchange of gifts the party which does not initiate the exchange occupies a subordinate position,[67] and a polis seeking favours from a king would not wish to put him openly in such an uncomfortable situation. The king, not

[63] Decree: I.Erythrai 30; letter: OGIS 223 (Welles 1934, no. 15).

[64] League of the Ionians: OGIS 222 (I.Erythrai 504); Xanthus: Bousquet 1986, 22–24; Miletus: OGIS 227 (Welles 1934, no. 22).

[65] Bousquet 1986, 22–24.

[66] See Schubart 1937, 21 and Ma 2000, 190.

[67] Godelier 1999, 12: «The one who receives the gift and accepts it places himself in the debt of the one who has given it, thereby becoming indebted to the giver and to a certain extent becoming his ‹dependant›, at least for as long as he has not ‹given back› what he was given.»

the polis, was supposed to be the benefactor in the relationship between a king and a dependent polis. Moreover, a gift that obviously sought to elicit a specific counter-gift (the petitions specified in the polis' letter), that is to say, a gift that was visibly self-interested, would have looked less generous than a reward for benefactions, even if only virtual benefactions. In other words, the official counter-gift (the honours for the king) was, ironically, more of a gift than an official gift would have been, and was, therefore, more effective in obtaining a positive response from the king.

The source that most clearly reveals the ‹gift› (as opposed to ‹counter-gift›) function of honours is preserved in a text by Diodorus Siculus. We lack the polis decree which in all probability referred rhetorically to the king as benefactor. But the events that led to the bestowal of honours leave little doubt as to their real nature: In the year 305 during the course of the war between Antigonus Monophthalmos and Ptolemy I, Antigonus threatened to besiege Rhodes, a state allied to Ptolemy, if it did not change sides. Rhodes responded by electing to bestow great honours on Antigonus. The benefaction that it sought to elicit in exchange from Antigonus, according to Diodorus Siculus, was that he respect the treaties of Rhodes with Ptolemy. Although Antigonus did not do so, it is remarkable that the Rhodians hoped to achieve their objectives by awarding honours to Antigonus before he had rendered any services – a hope that, as we see from the previous examples, was not unfounded.[68]

The scope of proleptic honours

So far I have only discussed examples where the recipients of proleptic honours were Hellenistic kings. The awarding of this type of honour was in part a ploy whose purpose was politely to remind kings, who by definition were εὐεργέται, that they had to act as such. Hellenistic kings endeavoured to legitimize their supremacy by presenting themselves as benefactors, and usually took pains to maintain this image unaltered. The honours accompanying the requests from the poleis increased pressure on kings to respond positively, inasmuch as they underlined the stereotype of the king as benefactor.[69]

The awarding of ‹undeserved› honours to kings, however, also served a much simpler goal: by indebting the kings with gifts they would feel obliged to give something in return.[70] The principles of reciprocity of gift-exchange, and not the manipulation of royal propaganda, lay at the roots of this type of award. For this reason, we also come across such awards, as we shall see next, in cases where the recipients were people other than Hellenistic kings, and in periods before the appearance of the Hellenistic kings.

---

[68] Diod. 20. 82. 2–3.

[69] This aspect has been examined by Billows 1995, 73–75 and Ma 2000, 204–205.

[70] Cf. Ma 2000, 204: «We might consider the honours as (…) an offering to the king, demanding requital in some form, according to the rules of exchange.»

There are many examples involving royal officers. Although they were subordinated to a king, they represent a very different category because they were not benefactors ‹by definition›. For example, Diocleidas, a representative of a certain king Antigonus (Antigonus Gonatas or Antigonus Doson), received honours from Minoa in Amorgus in a decree which justifies the awards as follows: «He has promised (ἐπαγγέλλω) that in the future he will do all the good he can, both in words and acts.» As Philippe Gauthier has remarked, it is clear «that in the time the decree was voted, Diocleidas had not, properly speaking, yet rendered any service to the citizens of Minoa». The reality is that Minoa regarded Diocleidas as a man enjoying the king's confidence, and it hoped to gain some benefit in exchange for the granting of honours. In 299, Nicagoras, an envoy of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Seleucus, received honours from Ephesus for similar reasons, while the same can be said about the two οἰκονόμοι of Lycia, who in the year 282 were nominated εὐεργέται and πρόξενοι and given honours such as πολιτεία, ἔγκτησις and ἀτέλεια by Limyra.[71]

The poleis competed for the favours of such influential people with proleptic honours. This can be understood from a reading of a letter by a governor of Antiochus I to Ilium, which indicates, moreover, that sometimes the potential benefactors even negotiated the type of honours they wanted.

> Μελέαγρος Ἰλιέων τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι χαί|ρειν· ἀπέδωκεν ἡμῖν Ἀριστοδικίδης ὁ Ἄσσιος ἐπι|στολὰς παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου, ὧν ταὐτίγρα|φα ὑμῖν ὑπογεγράφαμεν· ἐνέτυχεν δ' ἡμῖν καὶ αὐ|τὸς φάμενος, πολλῶν αὐτῶι καὶ ἑτέρων διαλε|γομένων καὶ στέφανον διδόντων, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ|μεῖς παρακολουθοῦμεν διὰ τὸ καὶ πρεσβεῦσαι ἀ|πὸ τῶν πόλεών τινας πρὸς ἡμᾶς, βούλεσθαι τὴν | χώραν τὴν δεδομένην αὐτῶι ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀν|τιόχου καὶ διὰ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὔνοι|αν προσενέγκασθαι πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν πόλιν· ἃ | μὲν οὖν ἀξιοῖ γενέσθαι αὐτῶι παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, αὐ|τὸς ὑμῖν δηλώσει· καλῶς δ' ἂν ποήσαιτε ψηφισάμε|νοί τε πάντα τὰ φιλάνθρωπα αὐτῶι καὶ καθ' ὅτι ἄν | συγχωρήσηι τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ποησάμενοι καὶ στη|λώσαντες καὶ θέντες εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ἵνα μένηι ὑμῖν | βεβαίως εἰς πάντα τὸγ χρόνον τὰ συγχωρηθέντα· | ἔρρωσθε.[72]

---

[71] IG XII 7. 221 b (Diocleidas); Gauthier 1985, 142; OGIS 10 (I.Ephesos 5. 1453 [Nicagoras]); Wörrle 1977, 44 (the οἰκονόμοι).

[72] OGIS 221 (Welles 1934, no. 10–13; I.Ilion 33), lines 1–18: «Meleager to the council and people of Ilium, greetings. Aristodicides of Assus has handed to us letters from King Antiochus, copies of which we append below. He also came to us in person and said that although *many others were approaching him and offering him crowns* – and we ourselves have information on this point as embassies have come to us from certain poleis – he wished that the land given to him by King Antiochus should because of the sanctuary and because of his goodwill towards you be attached to your polis. *What he wishes to be granted to him by the polis, he will explain to you himself.* You would do well therefore to vote him all the privileges, to inscribe the terms of the grant he will make to you and exhibit them on a stele to be placed in the sanctuary, so that you may securely preserve for all time the grant that has been made to you. Farewell.» (tr. by Austin 2006, no. 164).

As the rivalry among the poleis indicates, the incorporation of Aristodicides' land was seen as highly beneficial.[73] The best way to obtain this benefit was to vote honours according to the desires of Aristodicides. The text clearly implies that these honours had to be voted before the incorporation of the land – that they were, in fact, a precondition. But of course, formally they would have been awarded as rewards for ‹benefactions›: Aristodicides' ‹goodwill towards the polis› highlighted by the governor.

It is important, on the other hand, to note that the strategy of granting proleptic honours to foreigners was employed by the poleis *prior* to the Hellenistic age. We see, for instance, that in 347/6 Athens passed a decree in honour of Spartocus and Paerisades, the sons of Leucon, the king of Bosphorus, because «they said that they were willing to provide the demos with all that it needed».[74] Obviously, in this case the honours were not only the reward for the promise but also an attempt to encourage these potential benefactors to keep it. Athens was counting on both the debt created by the honours in advance and the fact that these honours put Spartocus and Paerisades under an obligation by evoking the benefactions of their father. We have seen that the same strategy was applied by some Hellenistic poleis in their relationships with kings.

Προξενία *as proleptic honour*

I will conclude this survey of proleptic honours with a particular honour that, from ancient times, the Greek polis frequently granted without prior benefaction and with the clear intention of obtaining something in exchange: the title πρόξενος. As the precise meaning of this title is still a matter of dispute, this thesis has to be explained in some detail. First, the view – widespread among scholars – that the title πρόξενος originally designated (in archaic and classical times) an appointment that was something like an honorary consul, but in the course of time ‹degenerated› into a simple honour (in the Hellenistic period),[75] probably requires serious revision.[76] The title πρόξενος never involved a function comparable to an ἀρχή. As Gauthier has explained, it did not represent any kind of clearly set out obligation. Rather, if a politician received it, he would most probably have tried to act as πρόξενος by using his influence in favour of the interests of the polis that had nominated him, while if the recipient was a doctor, his activity as πρόξενος usually would have involved offering medical assistance to people visiting his polis.[77]

---

[73] See Welles 1934, 70.

[74] IG II² 212 (Syll.³ 206; Rhodes – Osborne 2003, no. 64).

[75] Recently Welwei 2001, 476. Marek 1984, 1–3, cites many other examples.

[76] The same can be said about its most sophisticated variant, by which προξενία was at one and the same time an office, or function (‹Amt›, ‹Aufgabe›), and an honour (‹Ehre›), with a stress on the former in the earlier period, and on the latter in the later period (Gschnitzer 1973, cols. 643–658). In my view, Gauthier 1985, 134–149 has convincingly argued that both theories should be rejected. See also Marek 1984, 388–391.

[77] Marek 1984, 333–381; 390; Gauthier 1985, 142–143.

What, then, does the title πρόξενος imply? Above all, an honour – like the εὐεργέτης title – that generally came with privileges such as, for instance, a commitment by the state to protect the πρόξενος and his family in the face of violent actions.[78] The polis granted the title to a foreigner as a reward for having rendered services to its citizens in their polis or, more often, for services rendered by him to its citizens in his home polis. Its origin may be related to the practice of offering hospitality to foreigners in an act of ritualized friendship (ξενία), a practice which, with the rise of the polis, would have come to be perceived also as a service to the polis rather than as merely a favour to individuals.[79] Consequently the person who performed the service – particularly if he did it frequently and for the benefit of several people of the same polis – came to be considered a benefactor of the polis.

For the purposes of our argument, it is crucial to take into consideration the fact that from the earliest surviving evidence of the granting of the title of πρόξενος it appears to have had the character of a reward. Around 480, Athens awarded the title to Alexander I of Macedonia together with the title of εὐεργέτης, which implies that Alexander I received it for being a benefactor.[80] The same can be said about a certain Aristoteles, son of Chelonius, to whom an early fifth-century decree of Eretria granted the titles πρόξενος and εὐεργέτης.[81] In this light, it is worth noting the conclusions drawn by Michael Walbank in his work on the Athenian proxenies of the fifth century: «Throughout the period of Athens' independence, and well into Hellenistic times, the two titles, *proxenos* and *euergetês*, are usually applied to the same honorand, implying that the proxeny was not awarded unless it had been earned through *euergesia*.»[82]

That the title πρόξενος was a reward for benefactors does not mean, however, that it could not be granted to people who had not so far rendered any service. As in the case of other euergetic honours, the title could be awarded in advance, that is, as a proleptic honour. Indeed, granted the laconism and ambiguity of many decrees that confine their references to the achievements of the people who are nominated πρόξενος to statements such as ‹he has proved to be favourable to the polis›, it seems that the title πρόξενος was frequently awarded as a proleptic honour.[83] We can assume that from its inception it was employed in a way that led easily to proleptic use. That is, even at an

[78] This is not a new idea (see Meier 1843, 6; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1887, 239; Schubert 1881, 4 ff.; Busolt 1920–1926, 1246) and has been confirmed by Gauthier's work, Gauthier 1985, esp. 141–145. On the privileges see Gschnitzer 1973, 710–721, Marek 1984, 151–160.

[79] Herman 1987, 130–142.

[80] Hdt. 8. 136 and 143 (cf. Bowie 2007). It seems that his benefaction consisted of favouring the collection of wood: Wallace 1970, 200; Hammond – Griffith 1979, 69; Gauthier 1985, 155, no. 59.

[81] IG XII Suppl. 549 (van Effenterre – Ruzé 1994–1995, vol. I, 39, lines 10–13).

[82] Walbank 1978, 4–5. On the title of πρόξενος as reward see also Busolt 1920–1926, 1246.

[83] Cf. Marek 1984, 333–381; Domingo Gygax 2006c, 15–16.

early stage it must have been used, beyond the intention of rewarding, in the hope of maintaining the relationship and prompting the benefactor to make new benefactions. The recipient could be expected to act either out of satisfaction from seeing the polis' demonstration of gratitude, or because he was expecting more rewards for new benefactions,[84] or simply because he was interested in keeping the relationship. Moreover, the title of πρόξενος, like that of εὐεργέτης (and in contrast with privileges such as ἔγκτησις, ἀτέλεια and so on, as well as honours such as crowns and statues) could prompt in the recipient the notion that he had to be worthy of the title on a permanent basis. Under these circumstances, the step of awarding the title of πρόξενος to people who were merely potential benefactors must surely have been taken very early on.[85] Although one might have the impression that cases following this pattern constituted ‹appointments› – hence the erroneous modern-day notion that the προξενία is an office – technically speaking they represent instances of proleptic honours.

Explaining proleptic honours

The practice of awarding honours in advance, whether proxeny titles or any of the above mentioned honours, had a clear objective – to prompt a response in the form of a benefaction. It was based on the elementary principle I outlined at the beginning of this article: gifts generated counter-gifts, so that if a benefaction generated a reward in the form of an honour, an honour that was not really a reward generated a benefaction. In order to understand the custom of awarding proleptic honours, however, it is necessary to consider also some other aspects of Greek euergetism. In the final part of this article, I shall address this question. Otherwise one might have the impression that proleptic honours were a ‹perversion› of euergetism and that the practice of awarding them was sustained simply on account of a large dose of cynicism on the part of the polis and the benefactor.

The ancient Greeks, in reality, perceived less difference between benefactions and rewards than we do today. Once again, it is essential to bear in mind the kinship between euergetism and gift-exchange. As I suggested at the beginning, to the Greeks euergetism was to a great extent an exchange of δωρεαί. The following passage of Demosthenes' *Against Leptines* illustrates this point very well: «For surely no one dreams that he will tolerate the cancelling of your gifts (δωρεαί) to him, and let his own gifts to

[84] In the third century the Delians awarded a crown and two statues to the Macedonian Admetus for his services as πρόξενος (IG XI 4. 664–665 and 1053).

[85] Some of the ideas of this reconstruction of the origin and evolution of the title πρόξενος can be found in Monceaux 1886, 2–3, and especially in Busolt 1920–1926, 1246–1247. Herman 1987, 130–142 esp. 139, focuses on highlighting the link between ritualized friendship (ξενία) and προξενία, and presents προξενία as an adaptation of ξενία among individuals to the relationship between communities and foreigners, and sees the obligations of a πρόξενος as being a prolongation of the obligations of the ξένος. Herman sees all this as the result of a pact, and not as the result of an exchange of services and rewards.

you stand good.» The sentence refers to Leucon, the king of Bosphorus; his δωρεαί were his supplies of corn to Athens, while the δωρεαί of the Athenians was the πολιτεία, a golden crown and the exemption from liturgies as well as custom duties at the Piraeus.[86] The same notion can be found in inscriptions. For instance, in the decree of Athens in honour of Leucon's sons: «Since [Spartocus and Paerisades] give to the Athenians the same δωρεαί that Satyrus and Leucon had given to them [to the Athenians], Spartocus and Paerisades must receive the δωρεαί that the people had awarded to Satyrus and Leucon.»[87] Seen in this light, where both benefactions and rewards were δωρεαί, it was not a contradiction – however paradoxical it may seem to us – to initiate the exchange of benefactions and rewards with the rewards.

It would be a mistake to believe that the use of one single word – δωρεά – to refer to benefactions and rewards was due to a lack of range in the Greek vocabulary. As in the Homeric world, where the word δωρεά was used to designate very different things (payments for services rendered, fees, rewards, prizes, bribes, taxes, loans), in euergetism the use of this word reflected the activity to which it was related: gift-exchange.[88] This link is evident if one considers the origins of euergetism. The first benefactors to be honoured with titles, distinctions and privileges were foreigners. They started being honoured in archaic times and euergetic decrees were being issued by poleis not later than the end of the sixth century.[89] The custom of honouring citizens as benefactors, on the other hand, did not catch on until much later (it is not until the end of the fifth century that we find honours comparable to those granted to foreigners),[90] and it did so partly as a consequence of the influence of the honours awarded to foreigners (only victorious citizens in pan-Hellenic games received awards from the archaic age on, but this was exceptional and did not lead to the euergetic institution).[91]

Given this situation, it is possible to envisage the first steps in the practice of honouring foreigners: since the exchange of δωρεαί was a key feature in the relationship between individuals of different communities linked by ξενία, from the moment when people organized in the social unit of the polis felt obliged to reciprocate to foreigners who had rendered services to them as a community, they began to respond by means of δωρεαί. In other words, the honours awarded to the benefactor were nothing less than an adaptation, at the level of the polis, of the δωρεαί of gift-exchange between ξένοι. Gabriel Herman explains this concept very succinctly, but instead of talking of benefactors he talks of πρόξενοι (although, as we have seen, the πρόξενοι

---

[86] Dem. 20. 35 (tr. by Vince).

[87] IG II^2 212 (Syll.^{3} 206).

[88] Finley 1978, 66.

[89] Sixth century: Hdt. 1. 54 (the honours of Delphi to Croesus); Syll.^{3} 4 (van Effenterre – Ruzé 1994–1995, vol. I, no. 32); first half of the fifth century: I.Cret. IV 64 (van Effenterre – Ruzé 1994–1995, vol. I, 8); IG XII Suppl. 549 (van Effenterre – Ruzé 1994–1995, vol. I, 39); Hdt. 8. 136.

[90] Whitehead 1983, 66–68; Gauthier 1985, 95–96; Domingo Gygax 2006a, 290–294.

[91] Domingo Gygax 2006a, 274–278.

were a type of benefactor – an opinion, indeed, shared by Herman): «For what are the privileges conceived of as gifts (*dôreai*) given by a city to a *proxenos*, if not a communal version of private gift-exchange? What is the meaning of the underlying sequence of the key concepts (present explicitly or implicitly in hundreds of decrees) – that *euergesia* engenders a wish to confer a *charis* equivalent to the *euergetêma* – if not that the private etiquette of reciprocity had been transferred to the communal level?»[92]

However, the practice of reversing the logical order of benefaction and reward was facilitated also by other aspects of euergetism: benefactions and rewards were not only elements of the same ‹nature›, i.e. δωρεαί, but also had the same ‹value›. It should be borne in mind that the rewards were granted to re-establish the balance in the relationship with the benefactor, and that in principle (and, as we have seen, often in practice) they were considered equal to the benefactions. Euergetic honours should be distinguished from the honours that modern states award to citizens for having ‹served the homeland›, which are simple manifestations of gratitude aimed merely at symbolizing the debt of the state towards the person being honoured.

Besides these arguments, it should be noted also that often the euergetic exchange did not limit itself only to such acts of giving and counter-giving. Whether the reward aroused in the benefactor a sense of indebtedness or a wish for further honours, or whether the benefactor was merely interested in continuing the relationship with the polis, the fact remains that benefactions could lead to chains of gifts and counter-gifts. And chains such as these helped blur the difference between benefactions and rewards, since in these chains the difference between gifts and counter-gifts could not easily be distinguished. We have seen some examples while commenting on the relationships between poleis and Hellenistic kings.[93] But there are other cases that are even more illustrative. For example, from Cyme, where we find the following sequence: (a) a woman, Archippe, financed a new βουλευτήριον; (b) Cyme, as was proper, rewarded her with a golden crown, a statue that represented the demos crowning her, and an inscription of the decree in her honour; (c) Archippe reciprocated then with a banquet for all Cyme; (d) to this, Cyme replied with praise and an honorific decree; (e) when the statue was erected, Archippe offered again a banquet to her fellow citizens; (f) the polis thanked her again with more praise and a new honorific decree and (g), when Archippe fell ill, just after the festivities, and then recovered, the polis made sacrifices in order to thank the gods for her recovery, which, evidently, was at the same time also a reward for her benefactions.[94]

---

[92] Herman 1987, 135. Regarding the πρόξενος as a benefactor: «above all, he [the *proxenos*] was an *euergetês*, a benefactor.»

[93] Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 93 [E 1] and Syll.[3] 671 B (Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 93 [E 2]); Herrmann 1965b, 73–74 (Bringmann – von Steuben 1995, no. 284 [E 1]).

[94] I.Kyme 13. On the order of the decrees see the commentary by Engelmann 1976, 28. See also Savalli 1993, 230–273, and van Bremen 1996, 13–19.

There is one more aspect that needs to be considered in order to understand the logic of proleptic honours: when it came to benefactions and rewards, the Greeks were accustomed since the beginnings of the polis to act on two levels: an institutional level and a non-institutional one, which to a certain degree corresponded, respectively, to an imaginary level and a real level (since, as we shall see, on the institutional level there developed an image of the exchange of benefactions and rewards, which occasionally did not correspond to the reality).[95] As I noted, in the archaic polis, the aristocrats rendered services similar to those of the elite in the Hellenistic polis. Although they did not receive honours, many of these services were perceived as benefactions.[96] The reasons why the polis did not honour its civic benefactors are various, but among them we find the fact that sometimes their services were regarded – by aristocrats and the demos alike – as compensation for their privileged situation (in response to which the honours would have been out of place), while it was not uncommon, also, for aristocrats to reinforce their benefactions so as to go beyond simple compensations and create a sense of indebtedness in the demos, the effect of which would be to make it accept the social status quo of the archaic polis (the counter-gift of the demos).[97]

In conclusion, in the archaic polis there was, together with the euergetic reciprocity between polis and foreigners, a relationship of informal reciprocity in which the exchanged elements (services to the polis and acceptance of the political and economic status quo), despite being perceived as benefactions and rewards, were not formally recognized as such. In fifth-century Athens this type of relationship can be observed in an even clearer way. As liturgists, politicians such as Cimon, Nicias and Alcibiades made huge contributions that were considered benefactions by the Athenians. Since the liturgies were, a priori, obligations of a good citizen, and, moreover, because during most of the fifth century the Athenian demos was reluctant to recognize any economic dependence on civic benefactors,[98] the services of benefactors such as these did not receive honours. But, as we have already remarked, they aroused a sense of indebtedness. Therefore, the demos gave unofficial rewards in the form of political support – precisely the kind of reward that people such as Cimon, Nicias and Alcibiades

---

[95] Domingo Gygax 2006c.

[96] The archaic polis held the notion of ‹εὐεργεσία to the polis›, as literary and epigraphic sources show by mentioning the awarding of honours to foreign εὐεργέται (not later than the sixth century: Hdt. 1. 54; IG IX 1, 867 [van Effenterre – Ruzé 1994–1995, vol. I, 34]; Syll.^{3} 4 [van Effenterre – Ruzé 1994–1995, vol. I, 32]; van Effenterre – Ruzé 1994–1995, vol. I, 40). The polis was able to honour its fellow citizens for a very specific type of benefaction, the athletic victory (Xenophanes, Fr. 2 [D]; Plut. Sol. 23. 3 and 24. 3; Paus. 8. 40. 1), and in the polis there were even voices (for example Xenophanes, Fr. 2 [D]) that favoured honours to citizens for other services.

[97] von Reden 1995, 79–89; Domingo Gygax 2003, 194.

[98] The famous anecdote in Plutarch about the demos rejecting Pericles' offer to finance the building program (Plut. Per. 14) is thought to reflect this attitude of the demos, an attitude that the so-called ‹springhouse decree› would confirm (ATL II, D. 19, l. 13ff.). See Davies 1971, 459; Nippel 1982, 29; Stadter 1989, 181–182; Podlecki 1998, 86–87.

were looking for.[99] During the Peloponnesian War, however, and particularly after the loss of the empire in the fourth century, the relationship between the polis and its wealthy citizens changed. Their contributions then became indispensable and, with the growth of the custom of rewarding the Athenian generals with honours, these great donors also benefited by being increasingly honoured.[100] But the non-institutional rewards continued. In several speeches of the fourth century, for instance, the defendant asks for acquittal by reason of having contributed financially to the polis.[101]

The coexistence of these two levels of reciprocity in the exchange of benefactions and rewards, i.e. institutional and non-institutional, certainly facilitated the emergence of the award of honours in advance. Just as some benefactions were not officially recognized in spite of being real, benefactions whose reality was yet to materialize started to be presented as real, and the corresponding proactive awarding of honours for such anticipated benefactions – proleptic honours – emerges as an institution.

Whether a service was portrayed by a polis as benefaction or reward depended to a great extent on the circumstances. What in a certain context might be presented as a benefaction, in a different context could be presented as a reward. The following inscription from Smyrna – a decree on the annexation of Magnesia by Sipylus – illustrates this point well:

> ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμωι, στρατηγῶν γνώμη· ἐπειδὴ πρότερόν τε καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος ὑπερ|έβαλεν εἰς τὴν Σελευκίδα, πολλῶν [κ]αὶ μεγάλων κινδύνων περιστάντων τὴμ πόλιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν | χώραν, διεφύλαξεν ὁ δῆμος τὴμ πρὸς αὐτὸν εὔνοιάν τε καὶ φιλίαν, οὐ καταπλαγεὶς τὴν τῶν ἐναντίων ἔφοδον | οὐδὲ φροντίσας τῆς τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀ[π]ωλείας, ἀλλὰ πάντα δεύτερα ἡγησάμενος εἶναι πρὸς τὸ διαμεῖ|ναι ἐν τῆι αἱρέσει καὶ ἀντιλαβέσθαι τῶμ π[ρ]αγμάτων κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν καθότι ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπέστη· διὸ | καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος, εὐσεβῶς τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς διακείμενος καὶ φιλοστόργως τὰ πρὸς τοὺς γονεῖς, μεγα|λόψυχος ὢν καὶ ἐπιστάμενος χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς ἑαυτὸν εὐεργετοῦσιν, ἐτίμησεν τὴμ πόλιν ἡμῶν διά | τε τὴν τοῦ δήμου εὔνοιαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν ἣν ἐπεποίητο εἰς τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸ τὸμ πατέ|ρα αὐτοῦ θεὸν Ἀντίοχον καὶ τὴμ μητέρα τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς θεὰν Στρατονίκην ἱδρῦσθαι παρ' ἡμῖν τιμωμέ|νους τιμαῖς ἀξιολόγοις καὶ κοινῆι ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους καὶ ἰδίαι ὑφ' ἑκάστου τῶμ πολιτῶν …[102]

---

[99] Cimon: Aristot. Athen. Pol. 27. 3–4; Plut. Cim. 10. 3–5 (Gorgias), 7; Athen. 12. 532f-533c (Theopompus); Nicias: Plat. Gorg. 472a; Plut. Nic. 3–4; Alcibiades: Thuc. 6. 16. 3; Isocr. 16. 35; Plut. Alc. 16. 4.

[100] Isocr. 18. 61, provides an early attestation of this practice (see Domingo Gygax 2006b, 491). On the evolution of honours for civic benefactors in the fifth and fourth centuries see Gauthier 1985, 92–103, 106–128, and Domingo Gygax 2006a, 285–295.

[101] Lys. 30. 1: «There have been cases, gentlemen of the jury, of persons who, when brought to trial, have appeared to be guilty, but who, on showing forth their ancestor's virtues and their own benefactions (εὐεργεσίαι), have obtained your pardon» (tr. by Lamb). See also Lys. 25. 13.

[102] OGIS 229 (I.Smyrna 573), lines 1–10: «Resolved by the people, proposal of the generals: since previously at the time when King Seleucus (II) crossed into Seleucis, and many great

As it was in a position of some power, Smyrna could afford to depict the polis/king relationship as a benefactor/beneficiary rapport in terms that were just the reverse of the picture depicted in so many inscriptions before. On the contrary, if Smyrna had needed the king's help, the goodwill of the polis would not have been presented as a benefaction but as a response to royal services[103] and the king's favours not as rewards for the benefactions of the polis but as royal benefactions, which Smyrna would in return have honoured and accompanied with requests. That Smyrna was able, exceptionally, to express itself with a certain freedom does not mean, however, that its version is more ‹real›. Possibly Smyrna's merits were not as great as it would like us to believe, and the favours of the king – including the guarantee of the autonomy and democracy of the polis and a declaration that it is sacred and inviolate – rather than a reward were discretely perceived as a gift to assure the loyalty of the polis in a region of uncertain loyalty.[104] Examples such as this show how fluid the concepts of benefaction and reward were and how unproblematic it must have been to present proleptic honours as recompenses.

Conclusions

The custom of rewarding people who made promises in public subscriptions with the engraving of their names on stelae and other distinctions before they had fulfilled their promises, however peculiar it may seem to some scholars, corresponds to a normal practice in Greek euergetism: the granting of honours that were presented as an official form of recompense, but functioned de facto as gifts. Thanks to the rules of Greek gift-exchange (the obligation to reciprocate gifts) this procedure allowed the polis to anticipate real benefactions, so that these recompenses were to a great extent perceived as recompenses in advance (i.e. proleptic honours). In the case of public subscriptions, they were an effective way to ensure that the promises would be fulfilled.

---

dangers were threatening our polis and territory, the people preserved its goodwill and friendship towards him, and was not daunted at the enemies' invasion and gave no thought to the destruction of its property, but considered everything secondary to the maintenance of its policy of friendship and to defending the king's interests to the best of its ability as it initially promised; and so *King Seleucus*, who shows piety towards the gods and affection towards his parents, *being generous and knowing how to repay gratitude towards his benefactors, honoured our polis because of the goodwill and zeal displayed by the people towards his interests* and because of the establishment in our polis of the cult of his father Antiochus Theos (the god) and his father's mother Stratonice Thea (the goddess), in which are offered to them great honours publicly by the people and in private by each of the citizens …» (tr. by Austin 2006, no. 174).

[103] As we see, for instance, in the letter by Ptolemy III to Xanthus (Bousquet 1986, 22–24).

[104] Moreover, the favours of the king may not at all have been a reward for Smyrna's loyalty during the military conflict if Ihnken 1978, 53–54, is right in his assumption that the section on the honours («and so King Seleucus …») has no relationship with the initial passage, so that the honours would have actually been awarded before the hostilities.

Although the awarding of proleptic honours can be observed most clearly in the relationship between polis and Hellenistic king, it was an old tradition, which probably goes back to the time of the first proxeny titles in the archaic age and is well documented in classical times.

Honours for promises were by no means the most excessive rewards vis-à-vis the services rendered. Honours could be bestowed for much less than just promises or good intentions, simply for fictive benefactions, as in the case of Rhodes and Antigonus Monophthalmos. Honours such as these were purely proleptic, while those for promises had a non-proleptic dimension insofar as they repaid the promises made. On the other hand, the power of proleptic honours to oblige the recipient to perform a benefaction was sometimes based on more than just the ability to indebt him. By publicising and eventually also recording (when the honours included an inscription) a promise they could put the recipient under the pressure from fellow citizens or make him liable to sanctions for default. In other cases they could compel him by reminding him of a status – i.e. that of benefactor – that was part of his identity as king or πρόξενος, or by simply invoking his own previous benefactions or the benefactions of his ancestors.

This system of rewards in advance, virtual benefactions and gifts which were at the same time counter-gifts worked reasonably well thanks to a number of factors. While we normally associate benefactions and honours with, respectively, gifts and rewards, the Greeks saw this relationship in a more flexible way. Benefactions and honours were interchangeable commodities. They were all δωρεαί and had, in principle, the same value; the purpose of the euergetic honours, in contrast with the distinctions granted by modern-day states, was not to symbolize the debt owed to the benefactor but to cancel it. Furthermore, in the chains of benefactions and rewards the distinction between gift and counter-gift tended to become blurred. Finally, in the act of exchanging benefactions and rewards, the Greeks were accustomed, since archaic times, to act on two levels, institutional – i.e. euergetism – and non-institutional, where the communities rewarded benefactions that officially were not acknowledged. The existence of a developed apparatus of rewards coupled with the contradictions between the levels of real exchange and the official discourse of the polis made it much easier to take the step of presenting gifts officially as rewards.

Department of Classics
Princeton University
141 East Pyne
Princeton, NJ 08544
U.S.A.

Bibliography

Austin, M., 2006, The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest, 2nd ed.
Austin, M. – Vidal-Naquet, P., 1972, Économies et sociétés en Grèce ancienne.
Behrwald, R. – Blum, H. – Schuler, Ch. – Zimmermann, M., 1998, Neue Inschriften aus Kyaneai und Umgebung IV, in: F. Kolb (ed.), Lykische Studien 4. Feldforschungen auf dem Gebiet von Kyaneai (Yavu-Bergland), 177–205.
Bertrand, J.-M., 1992, Inscriptions historiques grecques.
Billows, R. A., 1995, Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism.
Bourdieu, P., 1972, Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique.
Bousquet, J., 1986, Lettre de Ptolémée Evergète à Xanthos de Lycie, REG 99, 22–32.
Bowie, A., 2007, Herodotus: Histories. Book VIII.
Bremen, R. van, 1996, The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods.
Bringmann, K. – Steuben, H. von (eds.), 1995, Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer.
Bringmann, K., 2000, Geben und Nehmen. Monarchische Wohltätigkeit und Selbstdarstellung im Zeitalter des Hellenismus.
Brun, P., 1983, Eisphora – syntaxis stratiotika: Recherches sur les finances militaires d'Athènes au IVe siècle av. J.-C.
Busolt, G., 1920–1926, Griechische Staatskunde.
Davies, J. K., 1971, Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B. C.
Debord, P. – Varinlioğlu, E., 2001, Les hautes terres de Carie. Mémoires 4.
Derrida, J., 1992, Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money.
Derrida, J., 1995, The Gift of Death.
Diels, H., 1934, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, vol. 1.
Domingo Gygax, M., 2003, Euergetismus und Gabentausch, Mètis N.S. 1, 181–200.
Domingo Gygax, M., 2006a, Les origines de l'évergétisme. Échanges et identités sociales dans la cité grecque, Mètis N.S. 4, 269–295.
Domingo Gygax, M., 2006b, Plutarch on Alcibiades' Return to Athens, Mnemosyne 59, 481–500.
Domingo Gygax, M., 2006c, Contradictions et asymétrie dans l'évergétisme grec: bienfaiteurs étrangers et citoyens entre image et réalité, DHA 32, 9–23.
Domingo Gygax, M., 2007, El intercambio de dones en el mundo griego: reciprocidad, imprecisión, equivalencia y desequilibrio, Gerión 25, 111–126.
Donlan, W., 1981–1982, Reciprocities in Homer, CW 75, 137–175.
Effenterre, H. van – Ruzé, F., 1994–1995, Nomima. Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec.
Ehrenberg, V., 1957–1958, Der Staat der Griechen.
Engelmann, H., 1976, Die Inschriften von Kyme.
Finley, M. I., 1973, The Ancient Economy.
Finley, M. I., 1978, The World of Odysseus.
Garnsey, P., 1988, Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis.
Gauthier, Ph., 1985, Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs.
Gernet, L., 1968, Anthropologie de la Grèce antique.
Gill, Ch. – Postlethwaite, N. – Seaford, R. (eds.), 1998, Reciprocity in Ancient Greece.
Godelier, M., 1999, The Enigma of the Gift.
Gschnitzer, F., 1973, Proxenos, RE Suppl. 13, cols. 629–730.
Habicht, Chr., 1970, Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte, 2nd ed.

Hammond, N. – Griffith, G., 1979, A History of Macedonia, vol. 2.
Hands, A. R., 1968, Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome.
Herman, G., 1987, Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City.
Herrmann, P., 1965a, Antiochos der Große und Teos, Anadolu 9, 29–159.
Herrmann, P., 1965b, Neue Urkunden zur Geschichte von Milet im 2 Jh. v. Chr., MDAI (I) 15, 71–117.
Humphreys, S., 1978, Anthropology and the Greeks.
Ihnken, Th., 1978, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Sipylos.
İplikcioğlu, B., 2008, Ein neues hellenistisches Ehrendekret aus Arykanda (Lykien), AAWW 143, 117–126.
Kolb, F., 1984, Die Stadt im Altertum.
Künzi, A., 1923, Epidosis. Sammlung freiwilliger Beiträge zu Zeiten der Not in Athen.
Laum, B., 1914, Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike.
Lévi-Strauss, C., 1969, The Elementary Structures of Kinship.
Ma, J., 2000, Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor.
Maier, F. G., 1959–1961, Griechische Mauerbauinschriften.
Marek, Chr., 1984, Die Proxenie.
Mauss, M., 1923–1924, Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques, Année sociologique, 2e série, 1, 30–186.
Meier, M. H. E., 1843, Commentario de proxenia sive de publico Graecorum hospitio.
Meier, Chr., 1986. Wie die Athener ihr Gemeinwesen finanzierten. Die Anfänge der Steuerpolitik in der griechischen Antike, in: U. Schultz (ed.), Mit dem Zehnten fing es an. Eine Kulturgeschichte der Steuer, 25–37.
Migeotte, L., 1984, L'Emprunt public dans les cités grecques: recueil des documents et analyse critique.
Migeotte, L., 1985, Réparation de monuments publics à Messène au temps d'Auguste, BCH 109, 597–607.
Migeotte, L., 1992, Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques.
Migeotte, L., 1998a, Souscriptions publiques et privées à Cos, CEA 34, 103–108.
Migeotte, L., 1998b, Cinq souscriptions féminines à Cos à la période hellénistique, REA 100, 565–578.
Migeotte, L., 2002, L'économie des cités grecques.
Monceaux, P., 1886, Les proxénies grecques.
Nippel, W., 1982, Die Heimkehr der Argonauten aus der Südsee. Ökonomische Anthropologie und die Theorie der griechischen Gesellschaft in klassischer Zeit, Chiron 12, 1–39.
Osteen, M. (ed.), 2002, The Question of the Gift: Essays across Disciplines.
Podlecki, A. J., 1998, Perikles and his Circle.
Quass, F., 1993, Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens: Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit.
Reden, S. von, 1995, Exchange in Ancient Greece.
Reger, G., 2003, The Economy, in: A. Erskine (ed.), A Companion to the Hellenistic World, 331–353.
Rhodes, P. – Osborne, R., 2003, Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 BC.
Robert, L., 1929, Études d'épigraphie grecque, RPh 55, 97–132.
Robert, L., 1969–1990, Opera minora selecta: épigraphie et antiquités grecques.
Robert, J. & L., 1983, Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie.
Sahlins, M. D., 1972, Stone Age Economics.
Savalli, I., 1985, I neocittadini nelle città ellenistiche, Historia 34, 387–431.
Savalli, I., 1993, Archippe di Kyme, la benefattrice, in: N. Loraux (ed.), Grecia al femminile, 230–273.

Schubart, W., 1937, Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri, APF 12, 1–26.
Schubert, J. G., 1881, De proxenia attica.
Schuler, Ch., 2003, Neue Inschriften aus Kyaneai und Umgebung V: Eine Landgemeinde auf dem Territorium von Phellos?, in: F. Kolb (ed.), Lykische Studien 6: Feldforschung auf dem Gebiet der Polis Kyaneai in Zentrallykien, 163–186.
Schuler, Ch., 2007, Tribute und Steuern im hellenistischen Kleinasien, in: H. Klinkott – S. Kubisch (ed.), Geschenke und Steuern, Zölle und Tribute. Antike Abgabeformen in Anspruch und Wirklichkeit, 371–405.
Segre, M., 1993, Iscrizioni di Cos.
Shear, T. L., 1978, Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.
Sherwin-White, S. M., 1978, Ancient Cos.
Stadter, Ph. A., 1989, A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles.
Stahl, M., 1987, Aristokraten und Tyrannen im archaischen Athen.
Thomsen, R., 1964, Eisphora. A Study of Direct Taxation in Ancient Athens.
Tietz, W., 2003, Der Golf von Fethiye. Politische, ethnische und kulturelle Strukturen einer Grenzregion vom Beginn der nachweisbaren Besiedlung bis in die römische Kaiserzeit.
Veyne, P., 1976, Le pain et le cirque: sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique.
Wagner-Hasel, B., 2000, Der Stoff der Gaben. Kultur und Politik des Schenkens und Tauschens im archaischen Griechenland.
Walbank, M. B., 1978, Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century B.C.
Wallace, M. B., 1970, Early Greek Proxenoi, Phoenix 24, 189–208.
Welles, C. B., 1934, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy.
Welwei, K.-W., 2001, Proxenia, Proxenos, DNP 10, col. 476.
Whitehead, D., 1983, Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: Φιλοτιμία in Democratic Athens, C&M 34, 55–74.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, 1887, Demotika der attischen Metoeken. II, Hermes 22, 211–259.
Wörrle, M., 1975, Antiochos I., Achaios der Ältere und die Galater. Eine neue Inschrift in Denizli, Chiron 5, 59–87.
Wörrle, M., 1977, Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens I, Chiron 7, 43–66.
Wyse, W., 1904, The Speeches of Isaeus.