

Some New Considerations about Evergetism in Asia Minor. The Hellenistic Period and the First Century BC

Alina Cantacuz^{*}

PhD. Student, Faculty of History, University Al. I. Cuza, Iași, 700115

Email: alina26cantacuz@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper identifies new perspectives on the phenomenon of evergetism in Asia Minor, during the Hellenistic period and the first century BC. I pointed out, through epigraphic research, how benefactors donated to the city, acted noble, generous and received in exchange honors and privileges, as the Council and the Assembly decided. It was not only about their personal need of recognition it was a way of living rich man with the others, citizens with foreigners, about moral civic behaviors.

Keywords: benefactions; benefactors; finances; honors; privileges; goodwill.

1. Introduction

Antic communities are inexhaustible sources of questions, of fascinating issues. A reader that read at least one volume of epigraphic evidence surely discovered some information of which history books say not much: donation made in antic Greek cities, honors received after donations. If he reads more carefully, he can see a considerable number of inscriptions in which benefactors are publicly honored. For a better understanding of the subject is best to investigate researches about ancient economy, finances, afterwards to corroborate the results with the study of a considerable number of epigraphic testimonials. In this way, he can discover the importance and role of the phenomenon named over 45 years of study: evergetism. In this paper, I will synthesize the most important historic interpretations of evergetism, essential information of Greek finances and expenses. In the second part, I will analyze over 70 inscriptions and extract new considerations about evergetism in Asia Minor, during the Hellenistic period, I will confirm or infirm the historic interpretation on evergetism. The last part will point out the essence of the phenomenon and connect it to the concept of gift.

^{*} Corresponding author.

1.1. Interpretations of historians on evergetism

The term *evergetism* is a French neologism, used more often after 1980 [1]. Gradually, historians associated the phenomenon with words such as, *Wohltäter*, *munificence*, *elite public generosity* [2]. Greeks from ancient world used him in different forms: *euergetes* – city benefactor, *euergetein* – doing good to the city, *euergeteō* – do good, *euergesia*- charity [3].

The subject has been treated in chapters, subsections of economics, antic civilization, specific books and important articles. Paul Veyne established the first interpretation of evergetism. He identified two forms: Greek evergetism - voluntary (with no obligations), *ob honorem* (donations made to determine the election in a magistracy); Roman evergetism- since republican period and afterwards, when the rich Romans donated for public recognition, prestige and for growing up their financial resources. For him evergetism was a custom with the specificity of a governance system, developed from fourth century BC until the end of Roman Empire [4].

Philippe Gauthier was the first historian who defined and realized a systematic study on evergetism, based on epigraphic analysis and antic writings, combined with historical deduction. He argued the fact that evergetism was not a governance system in Hellenistic period, in which the rich were constrained to be generous, as Paul Veyne said. In fact, the evergetism appeared in fifth century BC should not be understood in connection with city organization until the end of second century BC, when the number of the benefactors decreased. Only by that time beneficial citizens started to control the city. The two major elements identified by him, which supposed to have changed evergetism, were the decline of the Hellenistic kings and the entrance of the Romans in the political scene [5].

Léopold Migeotte continued Gauthier's interpretation arguing that in the first part of the Hellenistic period benefactors were kings, queens, princes, their friends. After the disappearance of kings, starting from second century BC, their place was taken by citizens, wealthy foreigners, women. In the Roman period, benefactors were Roman emperors, magistrates, negotiators. He pointed out the fact the evergetism during the centuries took a central place in the public finances, because he answered to the needs of the people presented in the Assembly, because he represented direct interventions. The reason why rich people donate was, as Migeotte said, the need of recognition, the desire of intervention in cases of shortages, military difficulties [6].

In the book dedicated to donations from Roman period, Arjan Zuiderhoek saw in evergetism a gift exchange between rich people and the city from which they were. The public donation and the honors received afterwards were public acts with political and ideological purposes. The phenomenon was indispensable to maintain social harmony, political stability in the cities of the Roman Empire. He was one of the surviving and flourishing ways of Roman imperial system [7].

Dimitriev Sviatoslav, who analysed the characteristics of the public administration of cities from Asia Minor, from plentiful epigraphic sources, carefully selected, recreated the image of local magistrates, described a series of benefactions. He sustained that evergetism was a widespread practice [8].

In 2016, Marc Domingo Gygax presented the origins of evergetism and explained benefactions as ways of

controlling tensions between the ordinary people and elite, between elite and the external powers. From his point of view, evergetism can be framed in different types: Greek evergetism, Roman evergetism, Christian evergetism, religious evergetism, the evergetism of women. He put the origin of evergetism in connection with the rooted Greek tradition of exchanging gifts. The last one offered were honors and privileges, seen as having the same value as the received gifts. The first ones who received public recognition were foreigners, then politicians, most of them in oral public appreciation, then the athletes of Panhellenic games. From fourth century, the practice of honored benefactors was widespread. Cities honored kings, foreigners, citizens, in the need of improving the governing system, the finances. Marc Domingo Gygax sustained that evergetism lasted until the recipients of the benefactions were the poor and the church took the place of wealthy citizens [9].

1.2. Administration, finances and expenses

In the Greek cities, evergetism had a specific form, determined by the administrative structure, needs and existing resources. In a city, there was the demos, composed of the city territory, citizens and those who received citizenship as a privilege. Represented by men citizens, exercised the authority in the Assembly, which had legislative, elective and judicial power, least theoretically. The limits of the Assembly were established through laws in force. They couldn't initiate projects. This action was specific for the Council, Boule. The Council was the deliberative body, chosen by popular vote and held, in most of the Greek cities in Asia Minor, in a limited period, usually for six months. He supervised the city magistrates, the finances, the archives, the buildings, offered citizenship, honors [10].

During the Hellenistic period, cities formed their administration not on administrative fields, but in individual offices, organized/reorganized according to various situations: sacral offices, military, legislative magistrates, social units, and not only this. Priests conducted the sacral offices, were in charge of sacred issues, administrated funds, lands of the temples and attended religious events. If they wanted, they could be part of organizing sacrifices, ceremonies with their own resources. The most important activities of the military offices were defending the interests and the lands of the cities. They could also be responsible for other tasks, such as organizing celebrations. The legal magistrates were part of the Council, and in charge with the specific responsibilities, but also they could set up festivals, proclamations. The judges could be in charge with solving disputes between cities, or could be generals able to clarify conflicts between the city and foreigners. Another category were the agoranomos, who fixed legal disputes of market transaction, and so on. The magistrates, official or not, could be sustained from the incomes of the city or from the resources of the ones who had the office. The attributions were not specific for a only one type of office, they depended also on what the Council and the Assembly asked. Holding a magistracy was not strictly connected to the status of being a citizen. The payments of the magistrates from Asia Minor came from the citizens debts, allocated funds, direct funding from the treasury, donations occurred from kings and other benefactors. Direct payments are recorded only for unofficial, such as teachers, ambassadors, architects, soldiers [11].

The resources of Greek cities were impressive and different from city to city: property-crop lands, lands of elevation, sacred lands, public lands (mines, forests, quarries of stones, aquatic properties, salt pan, fishing); estate of the cities (temples, buildings, monuments from the sanctuaries, markets, ports, streets, fountains,

cemeteries, theaters, gymnasiums); movable property (public slaves, sacred slaves); resources from animals (used for sacrifices or as products, such as milk, wool, cheese). Financial resources were also varied: reserve funds (originating from surpluses of current incomes, donations of the kings, confiscated property of individuals, prey from enemies); credit (treasury funds, foundations, external and internal credits, private loans); contributions, taxes (taxes on agricultural production, land sales, import, export); direct taxes on private properties, on individuals, indirect taxes from external and internal transactions: individual contributions regular or occasional (*eisphora* – taxes especially for rich people- liturgies, subscriptions and evergetism) [12]. Expenses were also diverse as were the resources, if not bigger. First, they ensured the organization of the cults: holidays, sacrifices and contests; common ceremonies between cities; payment of priests and priestess. Second, they build, restored and assured equipment for sanctuaries, theaters, stadiums, racecourses, gymnasiums. Defense and war requested a large sum of money. Hellenistic kings demanded small or higher taxes, most of the times [13]. Cities and sanctuaries had a diversity of financial resources, patrimonial property, diversified taxation and important individual contributions. Of all this, inscriptions light up information about private interventions outside and inside local administration, by recording donations of individuals who were honored publicly. As Dimitriev Sviatoslav said, evergetism was widespread in Asia Minor.

2. Methods and results- benefactors and honors

After analyzing a number of over 100 inscriptions from Asia Minor, Hellenistic period, which refer to evergetism, using historical politic, social, religious information, I confirm and infirm some interpretation already stated. Finally, I will point out some new considerations about the characteristics of evergetism.

2.1. Hellenistic kings- benefactors of Greek cities

As I indicate in the synthesis of administration, there existed a considerable number of donation undertaken by kings in Asia Minor. I will outline some of them:

- In 300/299 BC, king Antiochus promised for the temple of Apollo the building of a *stoa* – covered walkway, for public use [14];
- In 288/7 BC, king Seleucus donated for the temple of Apollo golden pots of different sizes, over 12000 drachmas, spices, 1000 sheep, 12 bulls [15];
- In 285 BC, king Lysimachus praised the fidelity of the Greek city Priene through a letter and offered favors [16];
- In 281 BC, king Seleucus and his son Antiochus offered inviolability, tax exemption, for Pluto's temple in Nysa, Caria, according to *their policy to please the citizens through benefactions* [17];
- In 262/1 BC, king Ptolemy being close to lose control on Miletus, wrote a letter to the city reminding about the gifts offered along the way, stating that he wanted to keep the same positive relations and promising to do other benefactions [18];
- In 246 BC, king Seleucus II, at the beginning of the second Syrian war with Ptolemy III, wrote a letter to Miletus, after he received a golden crown, and remembered to the citizens the benefactions offered for them by his father and promised to increase the privileges [19];

- In 201 BC, king Philip V of Macedon donated for the temple of the city Panamara a jar and bowls [20];
- In 167/6 BC, king Eumenes II, wrote a letter to Ionian League, after receiving a golden crown, mentioned that he accepts the honors offered, promised to continue to ensure incomes for the organization of the celebration in his honor during the Panionion Festival and for the setting up his statue [21].

Of the above examples it can be seen that the gifts offered by kings to Greek cities from Asia Minor were especially securing autonomy, inviolability, tax exemption, object donations, animals for the temple, different funding for buildings or for the organization of dedicated days in their honor. The benefactions did not assume extraordinary expenses. Kings received in exchange crown and equestrian statues, different privileges, such as front seat at the games, priority in consulting the oracle, and in some cases cults in their honor. I conclude that Hellenistic kings did not show impressive generosity to the cities of Asia Minor. Their benefactions had specific purposes: political propaganda, keeping the loyalty and control of the cities, continuing city-favouring policy. Citizens expected contributions from the kings. Through them, cities kept some of their rights, had tax exemption or reduction of the taxes, and received finances for organizing the celebrations, sacrifices, for building and rebuilding. This was the way that they accepted the royal power, to which answered with honors. It was an idea of reciprocal relationship, of mutual respect.

2.2. Citizens, strangers and Romans- benefactors in Hellenistic period

The honorific inscriptions in Asia Minor dated from fourth century BC to first century BC reveal four categories of benefactors: kings, foreigners, citizens and Romans. Conclusions about the evergetic activity of the kings were summed up in 2.1. For a better view of the information and for a better observation of the evolution of evergetism, I inscribed the information revealed in the epigraphic material in tables, I use epigraphic analysis, comparative method and point out some new considerations about evergetism from Asia Minor, during Hellenistic period.

Table 1: Greek benefactors in 4th century- first century BC [a]

| No. | Dating/ The city that honors | Foreigners | Citizens | Statute/Function |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--|------------|------------------|
| IONIA [b] | | | | |
| 1. | 394 î. Hr/ Erythrae | Conon from Atena | | general |
| 2. | mij. 350 BC | Mausolus | | satrap of Caria |
| 3. | 277-275 BC Erythrae | | 9 generals | generals |
| 4. | about 320 BC Chios | From Naxos Epigeniders, son of Hegesimachos Sosilos, son of Hippolytos Xenophantos, son of Archeleos Euchares, son of Eustratos Sopolis, son of Sosias From Andros | | judges |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| | | Pythodoros, son of Pythippos Myrtias, son of Idnades Kleodoros, son of Kleonikos Theagenes, son of Archagorides, Theotimos son of Rhikon Hippodamos from Miletus | | friend of king Lisimah, <i>strategos</i> |
| 5. | about 289 BC Ionian League, Chios | | | |
| 6. | 289/8 BC Ionian League | Hippostratos from Miletus | | friend of king Lisimah, <i>strategos</i> of Ionian cities |
| 7. | 306-301 BC Ephesus | Apollonides | | Hellenistic king and his friend |
| 8. | 302 BC Ephesus | Euphronios from Acarnania | | ambassador |
| 9. | 302-295 BC Ephesus | Citizen from Magnesia | | - |
| 10. | 302/1 BC Ephesus | Archestratos from Macedonia | | king's Demetrios relative, commandander in Klazomenai merchant |
| 11. | 300 BC Ephesus | Agathokles from Rodos | | |
| 12. | 285 BC Ephesus | Nikagoras from Rodos | | envoy of king Demetrios |
| 13. | 294-289 BC Phygela | Melanthios from Theangela | | officer named by king Lisimahus to lead a garrison in Ephesus officer |
| 14. | 280 BC Priene | | Larichos | |
| 15. | 84/01 BC Priene | | Aulus Emilius Zosimos | stephanphor gymnasiarh judges |
| 16. | 280 BC Samos | Judges from Mydnos | | |
| 17. | 243/2 BC Samos | | Boulagoras, son of Alexis | ambassador gymnasiarh |
| 18. | 201/107 BC Samos | | Diodorus | doctor |
| 19. | the beggining of the second century BC Tenos | Apollonios from Miletus | | doctor |
| 20. | the end of the second century BC Colofon | | Menippos | ambassador <i>strategos</i> <i>agonothet</i> |
| | | CARIA [c] | | |
| 21. | 321/0 BC Amyzon | Bgadates, his son Ariarames | | persan envoy |
| 22. | 273 BC Amyzon | Margos | | <i>strategos</i> |
| 23. | about 270-261 BC Bargylia | Tyron from Teos, oamenii from Teos | | judge |
| 24. | 333-323 BC Iasos | | Gorgos and Minnion | ambassadors stephanophori |
| 25. | about 200 BC Samothrace | Dymas from Iasos | | poet of tragedy |
| 26. | 201 and 198 BC Panamara | Asklepiades | | The envoy of the king in Panamara |
| 27. | 201/297 BC Euromos | Alexandros from Macedonia | | friend of Macedonian kings |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 28. | about 220 BC Mylasa | | Olympichos | local dinam of the area around Mylasa; in connection with Hellenistic kings |
| 29. | 187-167 BC Mylasa | | Moschion | priest of Zeus Kretagenes |
| 30. | 175-150 BC Kalliopolis Laodikeia Panamara | Leon from Stratoniceia | | priest |
| 31. | the end of the first century BC Knidos | | Theopompos and his family | ambassador |
| 32. | middle of first century BC Aphrodisias | | C. Iulius Zoilos | ambassador priest |
| MYSIA[d] | | | | |
| 33. | about 300 BC Ilion | sons of Aristoxenos from Tenedos | | - |
| 34. | 317 BC Nasos | | Thersippos | ambasador, friend of kings and generals |
| 35. | 275-268/7 BC Ilion | Metrodoros | | king's doctor |
| 36. | end of 3 rd century BC Liga Ilion | Antikles from Lampsakos | | gymnasiarh |
| 37. | după 200 BC Liga Atenei Ilias | Citizen from Parion | | agoranom |
| 38. | ? 159 BC Nakrason | | Apollonios | agonothet |
| THE REST OF ASIA MINOR [e] | | | | |
| 39. | ?249 BC Limyra | Amyntas and Sosigenes, kaunieni | | <i>oikonomoi</i> named by king Ptolemy (I or II?) |
| 40. | 277 BC Lissa | | Menekrates | ruler |
| 41. | 275/4 BC Lissa | Agepolis from Rhodes | | - |
| 42. | about 250-200 BC Amorgos | | Hegesippos Antipappos | - |
| 43. | about 172 BC Beotia, Byzantium, Kalchedonia, Cizic, Rodos, Argos | Eudamos from Seleukeia | | friend of the king |
| 44. | middle of second century BC Araxa | | Orthagoras | priest military commander, ambassador |
| 45. | second century BC Seleukeia | Askelpiades from Perge | | doctor |
| 46. | about 85-74 BC Pergam | | Diodoros Pasparos | gymnasiarh priest ambassador |
| 47. | 50 BC Sardis | | Iollas | ambassador gymnasiarh priest |

Table 2: Roman benefactors in the first century BC [g]

| No. Crt. | The city that honors | Romans |
|----------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. | Cizicus | Lucius Lucinius Lucullus |
| 2. | Ephesus | Quintus Publicius |
| 3. | Halicarnassus | Lucius Cornelius Sulla |
| 4. | Kaunos | Aulus Afranius |
| 5. | Kaunos | Gaius Scribonius |
| 6. | Kaunos | Wife of Gaius Scribonius |
| 7. | Magnesia | Publius Servilius Isauricus |
| 8. | Miletus | Pompeius |
| 9. | Nysa | Publius Licinius Crassus |
| 10. | Phokaia | Cesar |
| 11. | Priene | Manius Aemilius Lepidus |
| 12. | Stratonice | Marcus Cocceius Nerva |

In Asia Minor, over 165 foreigners were distinguished from 7th century BC until first century BC [22]. In the first century, the number of honored foreigners has dropped, only 15 proxenies in Asia Minor. The Greek cities of Ionia, especially Miletus, offered proxeny to strangers: Sarapiōn, the son of Hērakleidēs, Asklepiades Chairedemou of Elaia, Polemaios of Colophon, Matres of Mydnos, Menedemos Athenaios, Satyros Daphnaiou, Hegemachos of Orthosia, Antipatrou, Aristoteles and Menelaos of Nikomedia, Apollonides, son of Apollonides. In Caria, Theangela honored Minnion from Alabanda and Halikarnassos a stranger whose name was not preserved. On the island of Lesbos, Samothrace honored Archelaos, the son of Aristosanax, Agelaos, the son of Eumedon [h].

Based on the information from the table it can be easy seen that from fourth century until second century BC inscriptions registered foreigners benefactors (F) and citizens benefactors (C). The numbers indicate the fact that there are obvious differences between the numbers of these two types of benefactors: more foreigners were honored: 4th century BC- 32 F, 13 C; 3rd century BC- 30 F, 10 C; 2nd century BC- 33 F, 11 C. During the Hellenistic period, the tradition of rewarding evergets has maintained, without significant changes, related to the numbers of benefactors. In the first century BC, the total number of benefactors was also small, but there have been some changes: some benefactors had Roman citizenship, the number of foreigners dropped, the number of the citizens was almost the same as in the previous centuries and Romans were honored [23].

In conclusion, Greek cities throughout the Hellenistic period and even at the end of this period maintained their tradition of offering honors to individuals who manifested their goodwill towards the community, either foreigners or citizens, Hellenistic kings or Romans. Been benefactors, the Romans proved that they have accepted Greek traditions. This action facilitated the assimilation of Romans customs and the fusion between these two civilizations. The widespread system of benefaction in Greek cities from Asia Minor existed from

fourth century until the end of the first century BC and continued afterwards in the first three centuries AD, through the recognition of the benefactions realized by the roman evergets and the Greeks citizens.

Citizens or strangers, the benefactors have held either offices of general, ambassador, priest, judge, gymnasiarh or were the doctors, merchants, poets, artists, intellectuals. Generals could be citizens of the cities, involved in defence against pirates, payment transmitters or ambassadors (Larichos, Orthagoras, Thersippos [i]). They could be also strangers, sent by Hellenistic kings to guard one or more cities (Conon, the generals from Erythrae, Hippodamos, Hippostratos, Melanthios, Margos, Hippodamos, Apollonides, Archestratos, Nikagoras, Asklepiades – see information in Table 1). The ambassadors, who negotiated the autonomy, the rights, the tax exemptions, inviolability, were generals, friends of kings, priests, or they held another public position (Euphronios, Boulagoras, Menippos, Gorgos and Minnion, Olympichos, Theopompos, C. Iulius Zoilos, Orthagoras, Diodoros Paspáros, Iollas- plus friends of the kings). Priests could be citizens of the city that honored them or not, they were sometimes ambassadors, or they were noticed by financing festivals, sacrifices (Leon, Moschion, C. Iulius Zoilos, Orthagoras, Diodoros Paspáros). Judges were foreigners, sent by kings at the request of the cities (judges from Naxos, from Mydnos, Tyron). They were attested since third century BC, as doctors were [24]. These, citizens or foreigners (Diodoros, Apollonios, Asklepiades), held lectures, carried out their activity without being paid, heal persons. The gymnasiarhs (Zosimos, Antikles, Iollas), chosen by the cities, were responsible with the order and the discipline in the gymnasium, assured in different occasions the organizing of contests, festivals and have supplied the necessary oil for the activities. The poets, the artists, the intellectuals were honored from third century BC (Dymas) [25].

Did the Greek cities honor foreigners in particular? First of all, the city had considerable fees and individual contributions paid by citizens. Because of these payments, which required an important amount of money, there remained a few citizens, which could afford, after paying all the taxes, to donate in the interest of the city. Foreigners, on the other hand, had small taxes, so they their interventions could be easier. Important to point out is the fact that a significant number of foreigners were friends or envoys of the kings during 4th and 3rd century.

The benefactions appeared after the identification of the city needs (lack of funds, military conflicts, and so on), discussed in the meetings of the Council and the General Assembly, where they found solutions. One of the solution was that one of the participants or more than one could solve the problem. Another solution was requesting the intervention of a stranger. Sometimes, the foreigners could act without asking or at the request of the king. After receiving the embassies and other particulars from another city, they could establish contact between the cities, contribute financially, help to free the war prisoners, participate in war, trade, supply shipbuilding with wood [26]. Some evergets asked the honors, for some of them honors were given. The General Assembly and the Council offered honors as they thought it was right and if they agreed. In conclusion, Greek cities did not use to honor especially foreigners. They offered privileges and recognition through crowns, statues only for those they thought they proved themselves magnificent to the city. I support the hypothesis of Domingo Gygax, who said that the benefactions of foreigners were not as expensive as those undertaken by citizens [27], but we have to admit that foreigners had their important role in the benefaction's system. The existence, the position foreigners had, the great number of inscriptions in their honor, the connection with the kings, demonstrates that, during fourth-second century BC, most benefactions towards the Greek cities were

made by foreigners.

If I refer to Migeotte's conclusion, the status of evergets reflects that both categories, foreigners and strangers developed in parallel and differently [28], I conclude the fact that there was no difference in the status of both categories of evergets. No matter of period or task, we see foreigners and citizens that carried embassies, which are doctors, priests, and so on, to which Greek cities were grateful.

2.3. Benefactions and honors during the Hellenistic period and the first century BC

In Ionia, the inscriptions dedicated to Conon from Athens and Maouslus, the satrap of Caria, have not registered why any benefactions. In the same situation were in 4th century BC, 3rd century BC the king's friends, Hippodamos and Hippostratos from Milet, Apollonides, Nikagoras from Rhodos. The inscriptions described them being people who behaved just towards the city, were virtuos and with good will. They were honored as friends of the kings or military strategists. An eloquent exemple is the case of Hippodamos from Milet, named military strategist by king Lisimahus, He was honored in 289 BC by the Ionian League. There were some purposes in the league decision: maintain privileges for the cities, recognizing the leading power who was proving rightness and goodwill. Melanthios from Theangela, named also by Lisimachus, received in 294-289 BC a crown. He defended Phygela, a garnison in Ephesus and helped with the sacrifices.

In the case of Archestratos from Macedonia, relative of king Demetrios, commander in Klazomenai, the inscription stated that he has offered help for the transportation of cereals for the Ephesians. Ephesus was then under the rule of Demetrios. They were attacked by king's enemies and received help from the general, who they honored immediately. In 280 BC, Priene honored Larichos, officer in the command of king Seleucus and Antiochus. We do not know his benefactions because of the mutilation of the inscription.

In Caria, the military strategos Margos and the local dynast Olympichos were honored because they have undertaken benefactions, proved good will. About Olympichos we know that in the letter he wrote to Mylasa he specified he wishes to be honored properly. Alexandros from Macedonia, honored by Euromos, was an influential friend of Philip V. He took over the city, put it under the rule of his king, brought back exiled citizens and resolved other problems created by the Second war of Rome with the Hellenistic king. Amyntas and Sosigenes, *the oikonomoi* -financial officers- named by Ptolemy II, were honored in 249 BC by Limyra. They were honorable, fair and just. In this period, cities from Lycia were under the Ptolemaic rule, in continuing growing of the administration and peace keeping. Menekrates, ruler, official of the same king, in Lissa, 277 BC, was honored because he conducted with good will. Ageopolis from Rhodes, son of Lampon, was also honored few years later, in 275/4 BC, because he acted noble towards the citizens.

Eudamos from Seleukeia, at the beginning of 2nd century, was friend of King Antiochus IV and intermediary for the Greek cities. He was honored in Beotia, Kalchedonia, Cyzicus, Argos, Rhodos. Eudamos received privileges such as proxeny, tax exemption, inviolability, front seat. The cities had specific purposes in this case. They wanted to win the king on their side in the Roman and Macedonian war. Three of his inscriptions mentioned Eudamos acted with good will towards the people.

Most of the benefactors distinguished, in 4th and 3rd centuries BC, were people in the entourage of the kings. They were rewarded when they were involved in solving a military conflict or when a Hellenistic King took control of a new territory, in sustaining the causes of the city in which they were named financial responsible, military strategists and because they were appreciated for the rightness of their rule. Their benefactions were less about financing the constructions, reconstruction of a building or food supply.

Did the position or political status influence the honors offered by Greek cities to friends, messengers of kings? Greek cities provided honors and privileges to benefactors, referring to how useful they were during the events in which they were engaged and according to their status. Conon and Mausolus, benefactors prior to the Hellenistic period, were honored with privileges and bronze statues, distinctions worthy of their function. Hippostratos of Miletus was exempt from taxes and received a bronze statue. Larichos was also honored with a bronze statue. Apollonides and Archestratos have received only a crown and a series of privileges: citizenship, privileged gaming, tax exemption. To Nikagoras and Eudamos only privileges were given. Alexandros of Macedonia and Olympichos, involved in the liberation of the cities Euromos and Mylasa, received statue and crown. Menekrates was honored with a crown of olive branches.

On the one hand, political position and the friendship with kings had an influence in honoring benefactors. On the other hand the Council and the People's Assembly decided the types of honors they offered, depending on the circumstances. As we have seen, not all the kings' friends have been rewarded the same way. It was about an exchange system: because the city received help in military conflicts or needed to maintain privileges under the leadership of another Hellenistic King, when the leadership was changing, he honored their intermediaries with kings or kings themselves.

What happened when a citizen or a foreigner was not in touch with the Hellenistic kings? How was he honored? Inscriptions listed the benefits made by them and in most cases involved financing of construction and/or food supply. Cities have also honored them differently.

The generals, citizens of the city of Erythrae, honored in 277-275 BC, ensured that the payment would reach Leonoris, the leader of a gala group, supplied weapons and supplemented supplies for mercenaries from their own resources, when needed. For this, everyone received a golden crown.

Of the six ambassadors identified from the evergets of the Greek cities, from table 1, the 4th century until the 2nd century BC., two were foreigners. Euphronios of Acarnania took over the case sent by Ephesus, the city that honored him. He obtained from the general of Lisimah, Perpelaos, tax exemption for the temple of goddess Artemis and helped the Ephesians from to his city. He received citizenship. Ephesus also offered citizenship in the context of the conflict between Lisimah and Demetrios. The citizen of Magnesia, whose name has not been preserved, received citizenship for help in releasing and sending prisoners of war safely home.

Thersippos, due to his good ties with Antigonos, because he was a high-ranking officer of Alexander, he obtained from Polyperchon the reduction of Nasos taxes. He also imported wheat during the famine and offered money to supply the citizens who needed it. For this, he received a bronze statue and a golden crown from

Nasos. The citizens of Iasos, Gorgos and Minnion, sent as ambassadors to Alexander, when they recovered the small sea, were given tax exemption and privileged seats at games.

The evergets who have occupied an administrative position have received gold or olive crown. About the citizen of Parion, agoranom, honored by the League of Athena Ilias, we do not know his honors or privileges. He had fulfilled his duties, secured the supply of wheat at a reduced price and assured the presence of a doctor for the festival. Apollonios, agonothe and general in Nakrason, in 159 BC, was concerned about the organization of the Basilea Festival, received the sacred ambassadors, theoroi, foreigners and promised to dedicate two cups of 100 Alexandrian drachmas. The city honored him with a crown and offered free meals in the prytaneum. Hegesippos, Antipappos, citizens in Amorgos, about which the inscription writes that they offered themselves prisoners to pirates, for releasing the captured citizens of the city, received an olive crown.

The judges of Naxos and Andros were honored by Chios for righteous judgment. Those in Mydnos, sent by King Philocles, around 280 BC, judged the dispute between the citizens and according to the inscription, proved to be zealous and devoted to Samos. They have received a number of privileges: the right to citizenship, privileged places in the contest, the right to access the council, tax exemption, inviolability. A gold crown was also offered to each judge in Mydnos and a crown for the judges in Naxos and Andros. In 270 BC, Tyron of Teos, sent by the King Antiochus I to resolve Bargylia's cases, was named proxen and benefactor of the city and received citizenship, access to the council for him and his descendants, a golden crown.

Metrodorus, a physician, was honored especially because he treated King Antiochus I. At king's request and after the positive information provided by the strategist Meleagros, Metrodorus was honored as a proxen and benefactor of the city of Sardes and was granted citizenship. The relationship with the king favored the fact that he obtained bronze crown and statue. Asklepiades, a doctor from Perge, was granted citizenship, a golden crown and a bronze statue, in the 2nd century BC. It was honored by the Seleukeia, in Pamphilia. His beneficial activity was marked by lectures, demonstrations, donations of small sums, saving citizens and sick residents. He was also appreciated by other cities. Apollonios of Miletus was honored by Tenos at the beginning of the same century. He held public demonstrations and took care of the disabled, without receiving funding for 6 months. He was a public doctor in other islands. The city offered him a crown of olive branches.

Diodorus, the son of Dioscurides was honored by Samos, his home city, in 201-197 BC. The doctor helped the wounded during the siege, when the city returned to Ptolemaic rule during the time of Ptolemy V. He healed along the time the sick ones and after the earthquake, he took care of the sick judges and injured citizens. No privileges and honors are known.

In 300 BC, Agathokles of Rhodes was convinced by the agoranoms of Rhodes to sell the corn he had brought at a lower price. He received citizenship. Dymas, poet of Iasos, was honored by Samothrace, around 200 BC. He received in a first decree citizenship and a gold crown, and in the second decree, a second crown. The city esteemed him for his writings to the sanctuary, to the city and the people, and for pious behavior towards the gods and the city. Leon of Stratoniceia, the priest in Panamara, was honored between 175-150 BC by three cities of Caria: Kalliopolis, Laodikeia and Panamara. Because he helped the citizens of Kalliopolis and the city of

Laodikeia, because he came to the Panamara temple, where he was a priest, where he prayed and solved their cases of oaths without spending money, he received two crowns from olive. The city in which he served as priest, Panamara, honored him with a golden crown, a bronze statue, and gave him citizenship on the ground that he persuaded people to offer great sacrifices, and he supported the cause of the city and the citizens. The priest's conduct was in line with his duties. The judgment of Panamara was also influenced by the other inscriptions, through which Leon's works in Stratoniceia were highlighted and remembered.

Most of the benefits of the 4th-2nd century BC obtained from the magistrates, ambassadors, priests and doctors, poets, merchants, were among the most diverse, but specific to the function they occupied. The generals have defended the city, ambassadors have obtained tax exemptions, the release of the prisoners, doctors have lectured and healed the sick. The poets wrote about the city and his heroes. City officials, ambassadors, have been honored by Greek cities by reference to their actions and the moment they have shown their goodwill. Thus, the generals received the golden crown, the ambassadors received either only privileges, or privileges, statues and crowns, as was the case of Thersippos. It is not excluded that the decision of the Council was influenced by the relationship with Antigonos. Judges received gold crowns. Doctors were honored either with a golden crown or a crown and a statue or even a crown of olive branches. A crown of olive branches was also received by the two citizens who offered themselves to the pirates in exchange for the release of the prisoners. The merchant who sold the corn at a lower price received the citizenship, and the poet a golden crown.

It turns out that benefits did not happen at a set time, but at certain times: when cities were in siege, in or after a military conflict, in a supply and finance deficit, following an earthquake or in welfare periods. The honors received by the evergets could be influenced to a degree by their relationship with kings. When there were no such connections, the Senate and the People's Assembly could take into account what kind of benefactions were made, what kind of honors they can and should offer, according also to the financial situation of the city at that moment.

So, I would explain how doctor Apollonios of Miletus was honored by Tenos with an olive wreath, although he has not received payment for 6 months and why Asklepiades of Perge received from Seleukeia in Pamphilia a golden crown and a bronze statue, though he did not take extraordinary benefactions. The inscriptions do not indicate in any case that the cities were in a military conflict. I tend to think that the financial situation of Tenos was not the most favorable when Apollonios was a doctor.

There are also cases when the benefactors had different tasks, which did not correspond to their office, or when they had more than one office in charge. In 243/2 BC, Boulagoras, a gymnasiarh in Samos, was also ambassador to King Antiochus II's friends. He has undertaken numerous public services, supported with his own resources the movement of a theory to Alexandria, offered good advice to the council, secured the supply of grain, helped with loans to low-income people. For all this, he was honored with a crown. The inscription attests not only the involvement of an official in a series of tasks that do not relate to the specificity of the magistracy held, but also the financial precariousness of the city of Samos.

Antikles of Lampaskos, a gymnasiarh honored by the Ilion League, at the end of the third century, fulfilled the

duties of the magistracy, financed festivals organized in the gymnasium and received in exchange golden crown and bronze statue. From here, it can be deduced that at that moment the Greek cities of the League were in a prosperous period. Most likely because the gymnasiarh funded from its own resources the festivals, attended by the citizens of all the cities, the Assembly and the Council decided to give him both honors.

Moschion, the priest of Zeus, was honored by Mylasa, between 187-167 BC, for the proper leadership of the religious office, but also for solving the conflict with the people of Heraclea, from the position of ambassador. He also solved the case of Philippos, the son of Dipohantes, whose slave was kidnapped. We do not know what honors were offered for his services to the city, because the inscription is mutilated.

At the end of the 2nd century BC, Menippos, son by the adoption of Apollonides, of the natural father Eumedes, was honored by Colophon, the native city where he was ambassador, hoplitian strategist and agonothet. Menippos was noticed through many benefactions: participated in political activities, has been ambassador to the Romans and the Attalids, has taken a series of expenses, organized public banquets, weekly meetings in prytaneum, paid the sums owed by the city at the arrival of Roman Governor Quintus Mucius, paid some other expenses he had promised to the people. He received for them a crown of gold and a bronze statue in the temple of Apollo. The statue was raised from its own expense. Menippos' goodwill manifested itself in the context of the city's shortcomings, which at that time could pay only for the gold crown. For the benefits he had made, according to tradition, he could also receive a statue, as was the case of Antikles of Lampaskos, the gymnasiarh honored by the Ionia League, at the end of the third century BC. Because Menippos promised to secure the funds for the statue the city Colophon could honor him with a gold crown and a bronze statue.

What conclusions can be drawn from the cases recorded in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC? As I have already mentioned, benefits were not regular. They appeared when the cities were in siege, in or after a military conflict, in a supply and finance deficit, following an earthquake or even in a period of welfare. In cases where the financial situation of the city was precarious, the citizens of the city intervened and supported through various benefits. For this, they were rewarded from the resources of the city: Boulagoras in 243/2 BC with a crown, Menippos, at the end of the 2nd century, with a crown and a statue he personally paid.

Why people made donations during the Hellenistic period? We could see that goodwill was recorded among generals, ambassadors, priests, judges, gymnasts, doctors, traders, even poets, artists, intellectuals. On the one hand, they were animated by need for glory, the glory of being among the benefactors of the city through public recognition, once at Senate meetings, the People's Assembly, and secondly by having inscribed their names in stones. The judgment could have been accompanied, after the Council's decision, if the benefits were considered useful to the city, by public coronation with golden crowns or olive branches, sometimes with setting up bronze or gold statues. The statues were, until the end of the 2nd century, the highest forms of honor offered to citizens or foreigners. On the other hand, it was a way of being for the *evergetes*, a feature specific to moral civic behavior.

What kind of relationships did benefactors have with the inhabitants of the Greek cities? The relations that have emerged have been of reciprocity in the perception of the citizens. *Evergetes* donated and cities offered privileges

and honors. They motivated in the honorable inscriptions that, according to ancient customs, the city distinguished the devoted men by showing well-deserved gratitude, so that the others manifest itself the same.

In the first century BC the number of esteemed foreigners decreased, Romans were honored in inscriptions, as we can see in table no. 2, and citizens continued to manifest their good will towards the city. In Priene, Pergam, Mitylene, Sardis, Knidos and Aphrodisias, seven citizens were honored for their extraordinary benefits, in the first century BC.

Aulus Emilius Zosimos, son of Sextus, Roman, received citizenship in Priene, in 84/1 BC, and was honored with a golden crown, a portrait and three statues, one gold, one bronze and one marble. He held two offices: secretary of the Council and gymnasiarh. The inscription mentioned that he took over the leadership of the educational institution when nobody wanted it and when the building was in degradation. As a gymnasiarh, he donated oil, from morning till evening. He also furnished perfumed oil for gymnasiums and baths. He assured weapons, a teacher for the ephebus, organized fights and singing competitions. Zosimos decorated the place with statues. The oil donation extended to the rest of the city, to the public baths, in the days of the panegyric. He did more: established a new form of contest, offered cattle and meat for sacrifices. His position of Secretary of the Council may be considered to be influential [29].

To Diodoros Paspáros, ambassador to Rome, gymnasiarh and priest of Zeus Megistos, were dedicated 11 inscriptions, around 85-74 BC. He was part of a family recognized in Pergamon for civic and religious life. The city lost its freedom in 85 BC. It was occupied by the Romans ruled by Lucius Cornelius Sulla and was subject to taxes for pro-mithridatic position, abuses of the Roman army. Diodoros, through the negotiations to Rome, managed to recover the rights and privileges of the city. He has taken many expenses on organizing numerous public ceremonies, donated oil, helped to complete the construction of the affected gymnasium during the war. He financed the 29th edition of the annual Nikephoria, festival introduced in Pergamon by Attalus I. For these, he received series of privileges and honors that Greeks used to offer to kings: ceremonies and sacrifices in his honor, a privileged place for all processions, the right to be buried in agora, an eponymous priest, often crowned in public ceremonies, temenos - a sacred place, where he would be buried [30].

In the 80s BC, Mitylene joined Mithridates in the fight against the Romans, but lost his freedom. The city was occupied by Romans, under the leaders of the generals Lucullus and Thermus. His rights were recovered by Theophanes of Mitylene, for which he was honored in 67-62 BC. He was an ambitious and educated Greek, an important political man known in Rome. He met Pompey in the pirates campaign. At that time, Mitylene had become an important naval base for Roman expeditions. In the year 66 BC, when Pompey was called to fight against Mithridates, Theophanes was his counsellor, chronicler, and historian of the facts. In 62 BC, he became a writer, counsellor of Cicero. At that time, he received Roman citizenship. In his home town, he was part of the wealthy citizens and held the function of the eponym of the city. Because he contributed to the reproduction of the city's rights and restored the ancestral cults, he was honored in four inscriptions, received statues of marble and an altar. His son, Pompey Macer, was named procurator of Asia [31].

Around 50 BC, Sardis honored Iollas, the son of Metrodorus. He was from a wealthy family and held many

offices: ambassador, strategist, gymnasiarh, agonothet, priest of Rome. Iollas did several important benefactions: was often ambassador to Rome, solved cases, conflicts, assured for the athletes the necessary daily oil, organized games, offered numerous sacrifices to the gods. He was honored with two golden crowns and 14 portraits of gold, bronze, marble [32].

Also in Sardis, in the 5th century, the people of Asia and the gerousia honored Menogenes, the son of Isidorus with 13 portraits painted, two marble statues, face on a coin and a bronze portrait. He was ambassador, often sent to Rome, once went with Iollas. He was a representative of the city at Augustus, Octavianus, member of the gerousia, lawyer of the Asian people, priest in Pergamon [33].

Knidos honored C. Iulius Theopompos and his family. Women from his family were noticed for the prudent life they have led, and Theopompos and his sons for the preservation of the city's freedom, autonomy and democracy, through the embassy in Rome from 45 BC. They have received privileged seats for games, post-mortem public funerals, grave in the gymnasium. To Theopompos was given a portrait and to his son, C. Iulius Artemidoros, named priest in the temple of the Artemis goddess, nine bronze, golden, marble portraits of statue, altar, processions and the organization of an athletic competition once in 4 years, Artemidoreia [34].

The Roman emperor Octavianus released C. Iulius Zoilos in 44 BC. When Zoilos returned to his the city, he was ambassador, stephanophor, and appointed priest of Aphrodite for life. He also obtained for Aphrodisias freedom and autonomy, privileges and inviolability for the temple of Aphrodite, when he went to Rome with other ambassadors. He financed constructions for the theater and temple. Other positions he did not hold, which may lead us to think that he was not well seen by the official magistrates. Since a series of inscriptions and a funeral monument were dedicated to him, it means that the community appreciated Zoilos [35].

Mithradates, the son of a citizen of Pergamon and the Galatian princess Adobogiona, very well seen by Caesar, obtained the restoration of the city's rights. He was honored with statues, was awarded the title of New Founder, seen as being equated with the local heroes Pergamus and Philetaerus, the first ones from their dynasty [36].

From all the above information, we can see that citizens benefactors acted other than ambassies and solving cases, by financing different cultural, religious, educational activities, necessary for their cities. It is important to underline that the economic situation of the Greek cities in the 80-70 BC was not a good one, due to the second and third Mithridatic war and pirate raids. The cities, that revolted and entered the king's part against Romans, were forced to pay large fines. The pirates, settled in the Cilicia region, kidnapped and sold people, robbed the seaside towns [37]. During this time, Pergamum could not organize Heracles's festival. Two festivals celebrated at the temple of Apollo in Milet were cancelled for a few years. In the middle of the 1st century BC, Mylasa, Alabanda, Heracleia, Bargylia, Kaunos, cities of Caria, were indebted to an Italian banker [38]. After campaigning with Octavianus against Brutus and Cassius and defeating the first one, Antonius set off with his army to Asia, with the aim of gathering as much money as possible. He imposed in one year the collection of taxes for the next 10 years. He received with solemnities, but the cities were ruined and robbed [39]. In this context, wealthy citizens of cities have played their part. Their tasks were rewarded by the cities.

Citizens benefactors from the first century have helped communities in essential ways: obtaining and preserving the rights of the city or maintaining the safety, fulfilling the tasks of the magistrates or other functions they have received, financing constructions, furnishing oil, maintaining positive relations with the Romans. From the seven honored citizens, four had Roman citizenship. They all were ambassadors to Rome. The extraordinary honors they received (the multitude of statues, the dedication of monuments, the organization of processions) were influenced by their role-played in liberating the cities and gaining advantages for it, their closeness to the Roman rulers and the benefits city had from them.

3. Conclusions

Recounting briefly some stated conclusions of historians in over 45 years of studying evergetism:

- First point – For Paul Veyne the Greek evergetism was about contests of spending and receiving honors, of perpetuating personal merit through votive gifts, statues, buildings and about the pleasure of giving and the moral duty of giving [40].
- Second point - For Philippe Gauthier evergetism became an institutional government at the end of the Hellenistic period, when the number of benefactors decreases. Those who donated controlled the city [41].
- Third point –Léopold Migeotte saw in evergetism the contributions came from rich citizens who preferred to pay the many public expenditures in exchange for gratitude and prestige [42].
- Fourth point – Friedemann Quass, Christian Habicht, Pierre Fröhlich pleaded that the number of honored citizens maintained from Classical Age to the end of the Roman Empire (as I demonstrated in 2.1., pp. 9 – for the Hellenistic period, according to the information gathered) [43].

After analyzing inscription information, some characteristics of euergetism from the Hellenistic period, Asia Minor were:

- First point - Honorary inscriptions attest benefactors from four categories: kings, citizens, foreigners and Romans. Although the importance of the foreigners' benefactions has been challenged and minimized, the inscriptions show that they made most donations during the (we consider foreigners friends, envoys of the kings, even Romans were foreigners).
- Second point – In 4th century – 3rd century most of the evergets were people in the entourage of the kings. Their benefactions were not donations of supplies or building constructions.
- Third point – During the period benefactors had functions such as: generals, ambassadors, priests, judges, gymnasiarhs, doctors, merchants, poets or artist, Roman generals, Roman magistrates.
- Fourth point - Kings' benefactions and the rewards came from the people were a way of relationship with the cities and a way of acceptance the royal power.
- Fifth point – From Classical Age to the end of first century BC the number of the citizen maintained. The number of foreigners started to decree at the end of Hellenistic period. From first century BC the number of the Romans honored of Greek cities in Asia Minor increased.

- Sixth point - There was no law that established how honors were granted. The Council and the Assembly decided what kind of honors or privileges will give, depending on the city income, the importance of the aid received from the evergets or the advantages that could be gained later.
- Seventh point - The reason benefactors were rewarded is found in most of the inscriptions: for all to see that the benefactors are honored by the people and to act as good as they did.

Evergetism was a way of obtaining resources for city, maintaining harmonious relations between wealthy and poor citizens, perpetuating the interaction between assemblies, magistrates, elites, and also about moral civic behavior. Due to different relations created, when the benefactors donated or acted positive in the interest of the city, their actions were retained and transmitted in public recognition and through inscriptions.

Epigraphic testimonies which record benefactors hold important institutional, political, economic, religious and social historical information. The Gift, seen as an exchange system in the primitive communities, as Marcel Mauss had established, in which existed three types of obligations, to give, to receive, to give back, and the one who gave back could keep his authority [44], took other different forms in Antiquity. One of them was evergetism, a phenomenon with also a gift exchange system, as rich people donated and received something back.

The gift, in Antiquity, did not take place only during the rites (birth, puberty, marriage), but also in other moments. One other moment was when gifts were offered to the city, not to individuals. After offering gifts, there was an official process of awarding honors and privileges as an answer to the positive behavior. Public recognition completed through inscribing all the information on inscriptions.

Evergetism is an evolved form of the gift from primitive/prehistoric communities. I will quote Pierre Fröhlich, who, in my opinion, summed up a complete interpretation of evergetism: *It seems to me that this spirit is largely based on their (magistrates) own initiative, although naturally the attitude of some had consequences for other job holders, who would have been forced to spend at least as much as their predecessors. This could have created a kind of general constraint* [45].

4. Recommendations

[a] Translated inscriptions used in this paper and abbreviations can be found in M. Austin. The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest. A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006; M. Sartre. L'Asie Mineure et l'Anatolie d'Alexandre à Dioclétien. I^{er} siècle av. J.-C./III^e siècle après J.-C., Paris, 1995. (see the list of epigraphical documents, pp. 351-352); P. J. Rhodes, R. Osborne, Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007 and on-line at <http://www.attalus.org/docs/inscriptions.html>, [july-december 2016]; <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/>, [march 2015 - december 2016].

[b] I. Didyma 479; SEG 3, 126; SEG 3, 168; I. Didyma 480; I. Eph. 1449; I. Eph. 1450; I. Eph. 1452; I. Eph. 2001; I. Eph. 1455; I. Eph. 1453; I. Eph. 1408; I. Eph. 1448; SIG 3, 126; I. Ery 24; Syll 3, 368; I.

Priene 18; I. Priene 14; ; I. Priene 112; MDAI (A), 44, 1919, no. 9; J. Pouilloux, pp. 27-23; Ch. Habicht, AM 72 (1957), 233-241; Chios, RPh, 1949, no. 2; SEG 35, 926; IG XII, 5, 824; IG XII, 3, 331; L. et J. Robert, Claros I, pp. 63-104.

[c] Syll 426; Amyzon 2; Amyzon 3; Iasos 30; Iasos 153; I. Myl. 102; I. Strat. 5; SEG 43, 706; I. Strat. 7; ILabraunda 134.

[d] OGIS 268; IMT 186; IMT 191; IMT 192; IMT 732; OGIS 220; SEG 53, 1373.

[e] IG XII 7, 386; Syll 645; IK Perge 12; IKyme 1; SEG 27, 929; SEG 59, 1406A; TAM 2, 158; TAM 2, 159, I Sardis 27.

[f] For the inscriptions' abbreviations see: <http://www.attalus.org/docs/inscriptions.html>, [july-december 2016]. Nine of the inscriptions were translated from Greek to Romanian by lecturer dr. M. Paraschiv, University Al. Ioan Cuza.

[g] SEG 33, 933; I. Kaunos 2, I. Kaunos 107, BCH 1980, 231-32, no. 3; I. Str. 509; Hula & Szanto 29, no. 1; SEG 14, 642; I. Str. 509; I. Magnesia 142; SEG 14, 644; I. Priene 244; SEG 4, 604; I. Milet I 7, 253, SEG. 15, 748; SEG 44, 896.

[h] Milet I 3, 118, 112, 113, 119a, 115, 116, SEG 38, 1208, ZPE 34, 1979, p. 213, nr. 2; SEG 26, 1224, Dunst., Acts 5th Cong., pp. 101-2, no. 3.

[i] The citizens are written in this paragraph with bold.

References

- [1] S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth. The Oxford Classical Dictionary, Third edition. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 566.
- [2] M. Sartre, J. Leclant. Dictionnaire de l'Antiquité. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2005, pp. 866; A. Sartre-Fauriat et P. Brun, Dictionnaire du Monde grec antique, La Rousse in extenso, 2009, pp. 225.
- [3] A. Cantacuz. „Evergetism/Benefactors and oil donation in Ionia in the Hellenistic and Roman period”, in Some Studies of Economics Changes, 2016, pp. 245–52.
- [4] P. Veyne. Bread and circuses. Historical sociology and political pluralism, translated by B. Pearce, with an Introduction by O. Murray. London: Penguin Books, 1990, pp. 10-11, 34-35, 42, 202-3.
- [5] Ph. Gauthier. Les cites grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IVe-Ier s. av. J. C) Contribution à l'histoire des institutions. Paris, 1985, pp. 2-3, 83.
- [6] L. Migeotte. Les Finances des Cités Grecques aux Périodes Classique et Hellénistique. Paris: Les Belles

Lettres, 2014, pp. 295-98.

- [7] A. Zuiderhoek. *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire. Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: University Press, pp. 6-9.
- [8] D. Sviatoslav. *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford: University Press, 2005, pp. 43-4.
- [9] D. M. Gyax. *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City. The Origins of Euergetism*. Cambridge: University Press, 2016, pp. 52-7, 258.
- [10] M. Gramatopol. *Civilizația elenistică*, second edition. Brașov: Orientul Latin, Brașov, 2011, pp. 316-17. P. Devambez. *Enciclopedia civilizației grecești*, trad. I. Stati, S. Stati. București: Meridiane, 1970, pp. 22-3, 179.
- [11] See [8] pp. 18-9, 31-3, 36-40. D. Magie. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor. To the end of the third century after Christ*, vol. I. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950, pp. 56.
- [12] See [6] pp. 135-49.
- [13] See [6] pp. 175-300.
- [14] I. Dydimă 479.
- [15] C. B. Walles. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: a Study in Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934, 5, pp. 33-7.
- [16] See [15] 6, pp. 42-3.
- [17] See [15] 9, pp. 55.
- [18] See [15] 14, pp. 71-9.
- [19] See [15] 22, pp. 107-8.
- [20] Panamara 5.
- [21] See [15] 22, pp. 212-14.
- [22] For all the inscriptions that attest proxenies (foreigners) honored by Greek cities see *Proxeny Networks of the Ancient World* (a database of proxeny networks of the Greek-city-states), <http://proxenies.csad.ox.ac.uk/places/home> [20.06.2016].

- [23]. D. Magie, *Roman rule in Asia Minor: to the end of the third century after Christ*, vol. I, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950, pp. 131-32, 327-30, 473-4.
- [24] A. Magonetto. „Interstate arbitration and Foreign Judges”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*, 2016, pp. 2 from 46. E. Samama. *Le Médecins dans le Monde Grec. Sources Épigraphiques sur la Naissance d'un Corps Medical*. Paris: Librairie Droz, 2003.
- [25] I. Rutherford. „Theoria and Theater at Samothrace: The Dardanos by Dymas of Iasos”, in *The Greek Theater and Festivals Documentary Studies*, 2007, pp. 279-293.
- [26] B. Paarmann. „L'évergétisme des étrangers à l'époque classique. Recherches sur la nature des services rendus et l'identité des bienfaiteurs”, in *Citoyenneté et Participation a la Basse Époque Hellénistique. Actes de la table ronde des 22 et 23 mai 2004*, BNF organisée par le groupe de recherche dirigé par P. Gauthier de l'UMR 8585 (Centre Gustave Glotz), 2005, pp. 9-36.
- [27] M. G. Gygas. „Contradictions et asymétrie dans l'évergétisme grec: bienfaiteurs étrangers et citoyens entre image et réalité”. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 9-23, 2006.
- [28] L. Migeotte. „L'évergétisme des citoyens aux périodes classique et hellénistique”. *Actes du Xe Congrès International d'Épigraphie grecque et latine*, Nîmes, 4-9 octobre 1992, 1997, p. 183-197.
- [29] I Priene, 112-114. P. Fröhlich. „Les activités évergétiques des gymnasiarques à l'époque hellénistique tardive: la fourniture de l'huile”. *L'huile et l'argent. Actes du colloque tenu à Fribourg du 13 au 15 octobre 2005*, publiés en l'honneur du Prof. Marcel Piérart à l'occasion de son 60ème anniversaire, 2009, pp. 57-94.
- [30] F. Santangelo. *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire. A study of Roman Policies in Italy and the Greek East*, Leiden: Brill, 2007, p. 60-65; See [23] pp. 162. R. L. Barr, „Honors for Late Hellenistic Civic Benefactors in Western Asia Minor, Cincinnati”, M.A. thesis, University of Cincinnati, 1995, pp. 7-31.
- [31] See [30] (Barr) pp. 32-34. See [23] pp. 490.
- [32] See [30] (Barr) pp. 44-52.
- [33]. See [30] (Barr) pp. 90-103.
- [34]. See [30] (Barr) pp. 53-65.
- [35]. See [23] pp. 418.
- [36]. See [23] pp. 406.
- [37] Plutarh, „Sylla”, „Pompeius”, in *Oameni iluștri ai Greciei*, translated by Gh. Ghiriță and V. Guțu,

Chişinău, 1997 pp. 165-166, pp. 225.

[38] See [37] Marcus Brutus, pp. 307. See [23] pp. 239, 258.

[39] See [37] Marcus Brutus, pp. 325-326; See [23] pp. 427.

[40] See [4] pp. 101, 102, 104.

[41] See [5] pp. 2-3.

[42] See [6] pp. 298.

[43] F. Quass. Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens: Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit. Stuttgart, 1993, pp. 15-6. See [29] (Fröhlich) pp. 228-9. Ph. Gauthier. „Introduction”. See [26], pp. 1-8, especially the page 2.

[44] M. Mauss. The Gift. The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies. London, New York, (1950, 1954), 1990.

[45] See [29] (Fröhlich) pp. 225.