The Discourses of Identity in Hellenistic Erythrai: Institutions, Rhetoric, Honour and Reciprocity

Peter Liddel

Senior Lecturer in Ancient History, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
peter.liddel@manchester.ac.uk

Abstract

Recent research in the field of New Institutional analysis has developed the view that institutions are grounded not only upon authoritative rules but also upon accepted practices and narratives. In this paper I am interested in the ways in which honorific practices and accounts of identity set out in ancient Greek inscriptions contribute towards the persistence of *polis* institutions in the Hellenistic period. A diachronic survey of Erythraian inscriptions of the classical and Hellenistic periods gives an impression of the adaptation and proliferation of forms of discourse established in the classical period. It demonstrates the ongoing prominence of the rhetoric of identity in conversations that went on not only between peer polities and within real or imagined kinship groups but also in negotiations between powerful and weak state entities and in inward-facing discourses on euergetism.

Keywords

identity – rhetoric – euergetism – institutionalism – reciprocity – honours – *eunoia* – Erythrai

1 Introduction. Identity and Practices: the Case of Reciprocity¹

In a recent and important monograph, M. Ehala argues that identities (both collectively and individual) can be viewed as a set of performative ‘signs’

¹ I am grateful to the organisers of the 2017 Kraków conference and especially Jakub Filonik for giving me the opportunity to present a paper on this theme, for their warm hospitality and for their helpful comments on this paper. I owe thanks to Madalina Dana for inviting me

and can therefore be fruitfully explored through the study of their expression in language and communication.² What makes language so important to the study of identity is that it is performed by individuals but it is also a key form of collective expression. Such perspectives will not surprise historians of the ancient world, who have long taken the view that identity can be studied through investigation of language, literary traditions and the remains of material culture; they have realised the complexity and fluidity of identity as a social construction.³ In this paper, my methodology will be to use the language of epigraphical publication to explore what practices (primarily, but not exclusively, honorific) can tell us about the expression of collective ethnicity.

In the ancient Greek world, statements of identity – both within and between communities – were frequently underscored by a rhetoric which highlights the existence of shared practices or customs. This principle was expressed in the message of the Athenians to the Spartans when dissuading

to discuss this topic in Paris at a DIKTYNNA workshop in December 2015. I benefitted greatly from discussion at both events and also from conversation with Michael Metcalfe on the subject of early Hellenistic Ionia.

Abbreviations used:

I. Didyma: A. Rehm and R. Harder (eds.) *Didyma II. Die Inschriften* (Berlin: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1958);

I. Erythrai: H. Engelmann, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*, 1–11 (Bonn: R. Habelt, 1972–3);

IG: *Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin: Berlin Academy, 1873–);

ML: R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC*. Revised Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988);

RO: P.J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003);

OR: R. Osborne and P.J. Rhodes, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 478–404 BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017);

SEG: *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecarum* (Leiden: Brill, 1923–);

Welles: C. Bradford Welles: *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy* (Prague: Kondakov Institute; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934).

All ancient dates are BC unless stated.

- 2 M. Ehala, *Signs of Identity: The Anatomy of Belonging* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017).
- 3 See, for instance, S. Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscape, Monuments, and Memories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); J.M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); J.M. Hall, *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002); J.M. Hall, 'Ancient Greek ethnicities: towards a reassessment', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 58 (2015), pp. 15–29; J. Skinner, *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); J. McNerney (ed.), *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2014); K. Vlassopoulos, 'Ethnicity and Greek history: re-examining our assumptions', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 58 (2015), pp. 1–13.

them from accepting terms with Xerxes: 'There is the phenomenon of being Greek (*to Hellenikon*): sharing blood and speaking one language, with temples to the gods and religious rites in common and a shared way of life' (Hdt. 8.144.2).

In this Herodotean view, the three practices identified as unifying the Greeks are language, religious rites and the way of life; indeed, modern analyses have identified practices (in the sense of individual and shared actions) as one way in which groups create cultural identity.⁴ When we move into *polis*-level rhetoric, we encounter claims made about the significance for collective identity of practices involving the return of favours by way of honorific recognition. Over the course of his argument that the Athenians should revoke Leptines' law abolishing honorific exemption from taxes (*ateleia*), Demosthenes claimed that Athenian honorific inscriptions were a memorial of the city's character (τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἥθους μνημεῖον) which was threatened by the legislation he was challenging (Dem. 20.64). Elsewhere in the same speech Demosthenes promoted the idea that the return of good favours was an element of Athenian character (20.11–12). Demosthenes, of course, was aiming to persuade an audience of Athenians into voting against Leptines' law by drawing them into a web of beliefs about the distinctively Athenian nature of its honorific system. But as we shall see over the course of this paper, claims about the practice of euergetic reciprocity were deployed not only to strengthen inward-facing bonds of collective identity, but also to foster links with the outside world.

In this paper I explore the role played by accounts of the honorific system and the rhetoric of reciprocity in a remarkable historical phenomenon: the persistence of *polis*-identity and *polis*-institutions of small- and medium-sized Greek city-states in the Hellenistic period. To this end I will focus upon the Ionian city of Erythrai in the fourth century and early Hellenistic period, though my conclusions are foreshadowed by analysis of the fifth-century epigraphical legacy of the city. Extant classical literature, as is well known, is Athenocentric; accordingly, in order to get a sense of the nature of the rhetoric of honorific practice beyond Athens, it is necessary to look at the evidence of inscriptions and the language that they use.⁵ For Erythrai, such a line of

4 For the 'cultural practice' approach to identity, see H. Tajfel (ed.), *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); G.C. Bentley, 'Ethnicity and Practice', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 29 (1987), pp. 24–55; S. Jones, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity. Constructing Identities in the Past and Present* (London and New York: Routledge, 1987); the critique of Hall, *Hellenicity*, pp. 21–2, distinguishes cultural from ethnic identity. On the significance of the invention of traditions about collective practices, see E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

5 Cf. I. Savalli-Lestrade, 'Remarques sur les "grandes" et les "petites" cités aux époques classique et hellénistique d'après les sources littéraires et épigraphiques', in *Actes du II^e Atelier DIKTYNNA* (Paris, ANHIMA, 19/11/2011), *Topoi* 18 (2013), pp. 117–29.

research is made possible by the two-volume publication of *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai* of 1972–3 (henceforth, *I. Erythrai*),⁶ which preserves a sufficient concentration of inscribed documents to allow us to probe into the expressions of identity of the community of Erythraians in the classical and Hellenistic period.⁷ This epigraphical record enables a view into the ways in which such communities used rhetoric to meet the political realities of the Hellenistic period. The question of audience and readership of inscriptions is pertinent to this analysis, but even if we envisage that inscriptions were not read closely,⁸ it is safe to assume that epigraphical publication – which habitually presented its decrees as the consensus of a democratic community or a *polis* – was a medium through which the collective identity of the communities and their institutions was publicly enunciated and promoted through language.

The perspective that rhetoric plays a role in supporting and nurturing institutions is one which has resonance with some contemporary theoretical perspectives. In the field of comparative institutional analysis, some scholars see institutions as defined by rules, formal or informal, which provide stability and meaning to an entity, and which are the product of the historical aggregation of multiple human actions.⁹ Recent work in the field of New Institutional analysis has developed the view that institutions might be

6 The inscriptions are published on the Packard Humanities Institute website (<https://inscriptions.packhum.org>), but the online version uses a different system of numeration.

7 Notices of inscriptions published since the appearance of *I. Erythrai* appear in subsequent volumes of *SEG*.

8 Against the view that public inscriptions were closely read, see R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 35, 41; for the argument that the Athenians did in fact read their inscriptions, see R. Stroud, *The Athenian Grain Tax Law of 374/3 BC*. *Hesperia* Supplement 29 (Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1988), pp. 46–7; M. Gagarin, *Writing Greek Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 67–92. J. Shear, *Polis and Revolution. Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 3–14 argues convincingly that reading was important for the commemorative function of inscriptions.

9 D.C. North, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 3: 'Institutions are the rules of the game in society'; cf. North, *Institutions*, pp. 36–53; R.L. Jepperson, 'Institutions, Institutional Effects, and Institutionalism', in W.W. Powell and P.J. DiMaggio (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp. 143–63, p. 145 argues that the word 'Institution' 'represents a social order or pattern that has attained a certain state or property' which 'when chronically reproduced, owe their survival to relatively self-activating social processes'. Jepperson 'Institutions', p. 149 writes that 'institutions are socially constructed, routinely-reproduced (*ceteribus paribus*), program or rule systems'. See also, on institutional perspectives, M.-L. Djelic, 'Institutional perspectives: working towards coherence or irreconcilable diversity?' in G. Morgan, J.L. Campbell, C. Crouch, O. Kaj Pedersen, and R. Whitley (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Institutional Analysis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 1–40, p. 33.

grounded also in narratives and discourses¹⁰ and that discourses are an important way of the exchange and reproduction of ideas and practices;¹¹ we shall expand upon these perspectives, in the Erythraian context, over the course of this paper, by proposing that institutional narratives and discourses contribute to the promotion of collective identity.

Within the Hellenistic Greek city, one prominent system of institutional morality which appears to have been habitually reproduced – through the medium of public epigraphy – was that by which communities made public declarations of *euergetai* ('benefactors'), honouring them with crowns, statues or other privileges. At Erythrai there is evidence for this institution stretching from the early fourth century until the third century AD.¹² I suggest that the epigraphically-expressed rhetoric of such practices was central to the Erythraians' publicly-enunciated identity and was significant in terms of the institutional survival of their *polis*. Accounts of honorific grants – starting from the fourth century and with increased frequency during the Hellenistic period – were enunciated in decrees as a way of appealing to those with resources; this audience included both members of the community and those outsiders identified as potential supporters of the community's interests. This article engages with the themes of this collection of papers by combining a chronological survey of what can broadly be characterised as public inscriptions (see Appendix, *passim*) with discussion of specific texts; it attempts to draw out their implications for an understanding of the deployment of the rhetoric of collective identity. The methodological challenge of this approach must be acknowledged: any perspectives that arise are likely to be conditioned by the vagaries of survival, discovery and publication; the language of these

10 J.G. March and J.P. Olsen, 'The New Institutionalism: organizational factors in political life', *American Political Science Review* 78 (1984), pp. 734–49; V. Lowndes and M. Roberts, *Why Institutions Matter: The New Institutionalism in Political Science* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2013).

11 V.A. Schmidt, 'Discursive Institutionalism: the explanatory power of ideas and discourse', *Annual Review of Political Science* 11 (2008), pp. 303–26; V.A. Schmidt 'Taking ideas and discourse seriously: explaining change through discursive institutionalism as the fourth New Institutionalism', *European Political Science Review* 2 (2010), pp. 1–25.

12 At Erythrai, the practice of granting honours is first attested in 394 with the award for Konon (*I. Erythrai* 6); the longevity of the practice is suggested by the evidence of honours for *agoranomoi* ('market officials') from the imperial period (*I. Erythrai* 104–5) and those for Romans dated to the second and third centuries AD (*I. Erythrai* 63–4). On the role of *agoranomoi*, see now A. Bresson, *The Making of the Ancient Greek Economy: Institutions, Markets, and Growth in the City-States* (trans. S. Rendall) (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), pp. 239–42, 246–50; L. Capdetrey and C. Hasenohr (eds.), *Agoranomes et édiles. Institutions des marches antiques* (Paris: Ausonius, 2012).

documents is often quite concise and reductionist, making the extraction of ideas about identity quite challenging. Moreover, we must bear in mind that the results of such a survey reflect on epigraphical rather than decree-making practice, which means that our conclusions must pertain very much to the question of the relationship between the expression of identity and the 'epigraphical habit'.

Erythrai appears to have been one of the more prominent Ionian cities of the west coast of Asia Minor during the archaic and classical periods;¹³ the survival of a relatively large number of classical public inscriptions – more than other cities of the same area – is a reflection of this.¹⁴ This is what makes it an ideal case-study for the assessment of the proliferation of *polis*-identity in the Hellenistic period, though some of the traits that it exhibits (publishing honorific inscriptions for both insiders and outsiders) are shared with other Hellenistic cities. It is possible to identify three streams in Erythraian public epigraphy in the era before Alexander the Great: inscribed directives concerning secular matters, inscriptions with religious significance, and third, honorific decrees; I shall focus upon the first and third categories over the course of this paper.¹⁵

-
- 13 Erythrai was described as 'the most powerful of the Ionians' (Plu. *Mor.* 244f) at the time of their war with the Chians (probably in the late sixth century: Hdt. 1.18.3) and 'most zealous' (254c) during their war with the Naxians. The size and population of the city are generally thought to have been substantial: L. Rubinstein, 'Ionia', in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 1053–1107, p. 1073 and M.H. Hansen, *The Shotgun Method. The Demography of the Ancient Greek City-State Culture* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2006), pp. 105 and 115 designate it as a 'size 5' *polis*, whose walls enclosed 135 hectares. The fact that Erythrai paid between 7 and 12 talents' tribute per annum in the fifth century, the highest of any Ionian city (G. Bean, *Aegean Turkey. An Archaeological Guide* (London: Benn, 1966), p. 154; cf. Rubinstein, 'Ionia', p. 1074) has been used to estimate its wealth and population: E. Ruschenbusch, 'Tribut und Bürgerzahl im ersten athenischen Seebund', *ZPE* 53 (1983), pp. 125–43, p. 143 suggests a population of 5600 adult males. However, L. Nixon and S. Price, 'The size and resources of Greek cities', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990) pp. 137–70 dispute Ruschenbusch's methodology, suggesting that calculations based on Erythrai's relatively large contribution of *phoros* exaggerate the size of the population. Its wealth was based probably on trade (Bean, *Aegean Turkey*, pp. 137, 155).
- 14 For the numbers of Erythraian public documents, see Appendix 1. They amount to substantially more than those for any other Ionian city: see P.J. Rhodes with D.M. Lewis, *Decrees of the Greek States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 355–97.
- 15 The first of these two categories are, of course, neither exhaustive nor mutually-exclusive.

2 Institutional Authority as Identity

In the classical Greek world, individual *poleis* possessed their own constitutions and laws; accordingly the rhetoric that surrounded institutions potentially served as an expression of collective identity: inscribed laws and decrees presented themselves as decisions taken on behalf of a consensus of *polis*-institutions.¹⁶ As we turn attention first to the inscribed directives (Appendix Tables 1 and 2),¹⁷ we note that the earliest three Erythraian public documents (*I. Erythrai* 2, 1, 17) – perhaps produced at a time of Athenian hegemony and under Athenian influence –¹⁸ share a concern with the regulation of magistrates or restrictions on office-holding.¹⁹ They suggest an emphasis on collective law-abidingness in fifth-century Erythrai; this becomes particularly clear in the directive protecting constitutional arrangements as it outlines the procedures concerning the trial of a magistrate who has been prosecuted for violating a law:

- 16 On consensus-attainment in ancient Greek politics, see M. Canevaro, 'Majority rule vs. consensus: the practice of deliberation in the Greek poleis', in M. Canevaro, A. Erskine, B. Gray and J. Ober (eds.), *Ancient Greek History and Contemporary Social Science* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), pp. 101–56.
- 17 Owing to the lack of space in the current publication, we set aside detailed discussion of the religious enactments of the city-state (see Appendix Table 2).
- 18 Fifth-century Athenian regulations concerning the Erythraians: *IG* I³ 14 (*I. Erythrai* 4 = OR 121, the famous 'Erythrai decree'), 15 (*I. Erythrai* 5: concerning the stationing of an Athenian garrison and inspector), and possibly 16 (cf. ML p. 94 and OR p. 116; concerning *phrourarchoi*) with G. Malachou, 'A second facsimile of the Erythrai Decree (*IG* I³ 14)', in A.P. Matthaiou and R.K. Pitt (eds.), *'Αθηναίων Ἐπίσκοπος: Studies in Honour of Harold B. Mattingly* (Athens: Epigraphical Society, 2014), pp. 73–95 and A. Moroo, 'The Erythrai decrees reconsidered: *IG* I³ 14, 15 & 16', in Matthaiou and Pitt, *'Αθηναίων Ἐπίσκοπος*, pp. 97–119. Of the fifth-century decrees for the Erythraians, *IG* I³ 15 was to be set up at Erythrai on the acropolis (line 27). Fourth-century Athenian intervention (after an appeal by Erythraian ambassadors): *SEG* XXVI 1282 = RO 17, with S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 108–9 and A.P. Matthaiou, 'Παρατηρήσεις εἰς ἐκδεδομένα Ἀττικά ψηφίσματα (70 τεύχος)', *Grammateion* 6 (2017), pp. 11–19. On the possibility of Athenian influence on Erythraian classical institutions, see D.M. Lewis, *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History*, edited by P.J. Rhodes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 51–59; P. Liddel, 'Epigraphy, legislation, and power within the Athenian empire', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 53 (2010), pp. 99–128, p. 117; see also M. Simonton, 'The Local History of Hippias of Erythrai: Politics, Place, Memory, and Monumentality', *Hesperia* 87 (2018), pp. 497–543, pp. 510–12 and 535.
- 19 For the possibility that the prohibition of holding the office of secretary to a city-official more than once was a regulation that may have been influenced by Athenian practice, see S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 31, 32, 75 with *I. Erythrai* 1 lines 1–5.

δικάζεν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶμ φυλέων ἄνδρας ἐννέα ἀπ' ἐκάστης οἷσιν ἐστίν μὴ ἐλάττονος ἄξια ἢ τριήκοντα στατήρων, ὁμόσαντας τὸν αὐτὸν ὅρκον τῇ βολῇ δικᾶν κατὰ νόμος καὶ ψηφίσματα· πληρὸν δὲ τὸ δικαστήριον μὴ ἐλά[σ]σονας ἢ ἐξήκο[ντ]α καὶ ἕνα· δικάζεν [δὲ π]λησίον τιθέντα κατὰ τὸν νόμον.

Judgement shall be given by nine men from each of the tribes, who have property worth not less than thirty staters, swearing the same oath as the council, to judge **in accordance with the laws and decrees**. The court shall be convened by not fewer than sixty-one men: they shall judge having placed it (?the law?) nearby,²⁰ **in accordance with the law**.

I. Erythrai 2 (= OR 122) A lines 13–27; cf. B 18–20); trans. OR 122, adapted

This and two other inscribed documents outline a range of sanctions, including fines (*I. Erythrai* 1 lines 12–13; 2 A 4–5, 9–10, 22–5; 17.5–18), *atimia* (disenfranchisement: 1 line 12), legal procedure (2 lines 5–22, 3 lines 8–10) and enforcement by magistrates (1 lines 13–15; 2 lines 27–31); they demonstrate the significance of the use of oath (2 lines 18–22) and the putting of proposals to the vote (*I. Erythrai* 1 lines 10–11). Overall, they are concerned with legal and constitutional bureaucracy, but make no substantive statements about the identity of the Erythraian community or its *polis*: they say little about the authority that enacted the inscribed arrangements.²¹ Yet regardless of the anonymity of these enactments, the writing down on stone of such regulations represents a process that not only aspires to the communication of instructions to a collective audience, but also is one which makes their directives regular and publicly formulates institutional authority: by this line of reasoning, epigraphical publication itself plays an important role in the formation and development of institutions; these institutions are ones that underscore collective identity, though one that was perhaps not as strongly enunciated as that which we see from the end of the fourth century BC. It is possible that the invisibility of explicitly Erythraian *polis*-identity in their fifth-century inscriptions was a reflection of their subordinate position in the hegemonic Athenian Empire (see above, note 18). The tendency to inscribe documents pertaining to

20 If this translation is correct, the law is placed nearby the court where the case is judged (as Osborne and Rhodes (OR, p. 123) suggest); it may have been written upon a wooden board, which would have been a more mobile format than a stone *stèle*.

21 Indeed, the identity of the Peproioi of *I. Erythrai* 17 lines 15–16 is unresolved; they seem to be the controllers of swamp-lands; cf. N. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece. A Documentary Study* (Philadelphia: Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 1987), pp. 304–5.

the regulation of the work of magistrates and the imposition of fines continues at Erythrai into the fourth century: it is illustrated in *I. Erythrai* 15 (regulating the sale of wool and the conduct of civic magistrates) and *I. Erythrai* 10 (recalling exiles and establishing an amnesty). Once again, neither of these texts mentions the community of Erythraians: their rhetoric is technical and pertains to specific situations.

3 Encouraging Benefaction: Honorific Decrees

At this point we turn to the honorary decrees of the classical period (see Appendix Table 3) with a view to their rhetoric on the formulation of collective identity. It is possible to discern an emphasis on the passing of honours for influential foreigners: in the early and mid fourth century, the Erythraians, under an administration that appears to have moved from democracy to oligarchy, honoured those – Conon the Athenian and two Carian (Hekatomnid) dynasts (Mausolus and Idricus)²² – who were in a position to do things in their interests (*I. Erythrai* 6 = RO 8; *I. Erythrai* 8 = RO 56; *SEG* XXXI 969); in the case of the Hekatomnids, the rewards were explained on the grounds that the honoree had been a good man (ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός) as concerns the city of Erythrai (*I. Erythrai* 8 = RO 56 lines 3–5; *SEG* XXXI 969 lines 5–6).²³ Unlike the earlier inscribed regulations, they leave us with little doubt about the Erythraian identity of the body making the honours, each of them mentioning ‘the Erythraians’ or ‘the city of the Erythraians’, a choice of expression which may reflect the constitutional arrangements of the time,²⁴ or perhaps even the termination of Athenian hegemony. What is significant for our purposes is that in the case of an honorific decree, the statement of the identity of the

22 On Hekatomnid influence over the Erythraians, see Hornblower, *Mausolus*, pp. 107–10. For the possibility that the Hekatomnids physically moved the site of Erythrai during the fourth century, see Hornblower, *Mausolus*, p. 110.

23 On the language of approbation in Athenian honorific decrees, see D. Whitehead, ‘Cardinal virtues: the language of public approbation in democratic Athens’, *Classica et Mediaevalia* 44 (1993), 37–75.

24 Conon was described as *euergetes* and *proxenos* specifically of the Erythraians (*I. Erythrai* 6 lines 3–4), perhaps suggesting a democratic constitution; the decree for Mausolus describes him as *euergetes*, *proxenos* and citizen of the city (*I. Erythrai* 8 lines 5–6), suggesting a non-democratic constitution; cf. RO p. 266. For a brief survey of Erythraian democracy and upheaval related to constitutional change, see Rubinstein, ‘Ionia’, pp. 1074–75; D. Teegarden, *Death to Tyrants! Ancient Greek Democracy and the Struggle against Tyranny* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014), p. 142. See also Simonton, ‘The Local History’, pp. 510–29.

community making the grant (sc. the city or the people of Erythrai) was an important aspect of the transaction for it to have the desired effect of gratifying the honorand, corroborating his connection with the awarding community and incentivising readers of the inscription to emulate his behaviour towards the Erythraians.

From the surviving evidence, Erythraian inscriptions of the fourth century appear not to epigraphically document interaction with what might be thought of as peer polities, by which I refer to other city-state communities of the Asia Minor sea-board or beyond;²⁵ epigraphical publication tends to commemorate their dealings with more substantial political entities.²⁶ But in the late 330s BC a new power came onto the scene as the Macedonians arrived in Ionia: according to Arrian, in 334, after the battle of Granikos and his march on Ephesos, Alexander ordered oligarchies to be overthrown and democracies to be established in Ionian cities, the restoration of laws and the remit of tribute that they had paid in previous times to the 'barbarians' (*Anab.* 1.18.2). Under the influence of the Diadochi in the Hellenistic period, the city appears to have flourished;²⁷ Erythraian epigraphical publication appears to focus yet more intensively upon the rhetoric of honours, and for the first time we start to see awards being granted to Erythraians (Table 4). There is also a growing tendency – in tune with wider trends across the Greek world²⁸ – to

25 At the same time, external evidence does bear witness to Erythraian relations with 'peer' communities of comparable size: Kallias of Erythrai appears, for instance, on a Chian catalogue of *proxenoi* from the fourth or early third century BC: W. Mack, *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 300–30; in the fourth century the Erythraians received proxeny status from Kolophon: Rubinstein, 'Ionia', p. 1075. A proxeny award was made by the Gortynians to an Erythraian and an Iasian in the period 225–200: *SEG* LVIII 937.

26 Moreover, the inscribed agreement between the Erythraians and Hermias of Atarneus – an agreement which seems to be made on equal terms and mutual promises of assistance – also demonstrates the Erythraian tendency to write up on inscriptions dealings with ambitious political entities: *I. Erythrai* 9.

27 Hornblower, *Mausolus*, p. 331 n. 306 takes the view that the proliferation of Erythraian coinage in the Hellenistic period demonstrates its economic prosperity. The distribution of stamped amphorae from Erythrai suggests medium-scale participation in trade networks: T. Panagou, 'Patterns of amphora stamp distribution. Tracking down export tendencies', in E.M. Harris, D.M. Lewis and M. Woolmer (eds.), *The Ancient Greek Economy. Markets, Households and City-States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp. 207–29, pp. 217–8, 228–9; cf. *SEG* LXIII 948.

28 On the increased level of detail in honorific decrees from the end of the fourth century BC see N. Luraghi, 'The Demos as Narrator. Public Honors and the Construction of Future and Past', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, N. Luraghi (eds.), *Intentional History. Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner), pp. 247–63 and P. Low, 'Lives from stone: epigraphy and biography in classical Greece', in R. Fletcher and J. Hanink (eds.), *Creative Lives in*

elaborate in more detail the good deeds behind the reward and also the specific intention of the honorific decree. An example that is intermediate (in the sense that it is more detailed than earlier decrees but less than later ones) is the reward for Phanes (presumably of Erythrai) son of Mnesitheos, of the 330s BC:

- [ἔδ]οξ[ε]ν [τῇ] βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ
 [πρυτάν]εων, στρατηγῶν, ἐξεταστῶ-
 ν γ[νώ]μη· ἐπειδὴ Φανῆς Μνησιθέου
 [ἀ]νὴ[ρ] ἀγαθὸς ὢν καὶ εὖνους διατε-
 5 [λ]εῖ εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἐρυθραίων
 [π]ᾶσαν προθυμίαν ἐνδεικνύμενο-
 [ς], χρήματά τε ἐσῆν[ε]γκεν ἄτοκα κα-
 [ι] εἰς τὴν ἔκπεμψι[ν τ]ῶν στρατιωτ-
 [ῶν] καὶ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τὴν κατα[σ]-
 10 [κα]φὴν, δεδόχθαι τῇ [βο]υλῇ, στε[φ]-
 [α]νώσαι Φανῆν Μνησιθέου χρυσῶι
 [σ]τεφάνῳι στατήρων Φιλιππείων
 [π]εντήκοντα, καὶ ἀναγγεῖλαι τοῖ-
 [ς] Διονυσίοις· ὅπως δὲ ἀναγγεληθή-
 15 σεται, ἐπιμεληθῆναι Ζηνόδοτον
 τὸν ἀγωνοθέτην· δεδόσθαι δὲ αὐτ-
 ῶι καὶ ἑμ πρυτανείῳι σίτησιν· ἀν-
 αγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τότε εἰς σ-
 τήλας δύο, καὶ θεῖναι μίαν μὲν εἰ-
 20 ς τὸ Ἀθήναιον, μίαν δὲ εἰς τὸ Ἡράκ-
 λεον, ἵνα ἅπαντες εἰδῶσιν ὅτι ἐπ-
 ῖσταται ὁ δῆμος χάριτας ἀποδι[δ]-
 ὶναι κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν εὐ[ε]-
 ργετημάτων.

Resolved by the council and the demos. A proposal of the presidents, generals and examiners. Since Phanes son of Mnesitheos is a good man and he acts with goodwill towards the people, showing all willingness (*prothymia*), and since has given loans without interest for the dispatch of the army for the razing of the acropolis, be it resolved by the council

Classical Antiquity: Poets, Artists and Biography (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp. 147–74.

to crown Phanes son of Mnesitheos with a gold crown of 50 Philippeian staters, and to announce it at the Dionysia. The president of the games Zenodotos is to take care of it so that it will be announced; he is to be given maintenance in the office of the presidents. Write up this decree on two *stelai*, and place one at the sanctuary of Athena, the other at sanctuary of Heracles so that all might know that the *demos* knows how to repay favours worthily for the benefits conferred on it.

I. Erythrai 21; cf. F. Millar, 'Epigraphy', in M. Crawford (ed.) *Sources for Ancient History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 80–136, pp. 118–19

The reward of a gold crown was granted for Phanes' ongoing goodwill (εὖνους διατε[λ]εῖ: lines 4–5) to the *demos*, but also explicitly because he made interest-free donations both towards the dispatch of soldiers and towards the dismantling of the acropolis when it was held by hostile forces.²⁹ Moreover, in this decree we see, for the first time, a hortatory clause in an extant Erythraian decree, which says (lines 21–4) that it is to be set up 'so that all might know that the *demos* knows how to repay favours worthily for the benefits conferred on it'. Such statements – known initially from Athens and then from elsewhere in the Greek world –³⁰ are made also on Erythraian decrees of the third century BC to varying degrees of detail with broadly similar implications: so that the *demos* might appear to repay good deeds, or so that others might know that it does so.³¹ This protreptic emphasis of the rhetoric here is, I suggest, in tune with the Erythraians' interest in drawing out the capital of their honorific decrees and shines light upon the collective identity that they wanted to project. It is relevant to our understanding of the dissemination of identity to note that the inscription with this message

29 Presumably, as A.W. McNicoll, *Hellenistic Fortifications from the Aegean to the Euphrates*. With revisions and an additional chapter by N.P. Milner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 64–5 reasons, the acropolis was held by forces rival to the *demos* of the Erythraians. For inscriptions concerning wall-building, see *I. Erythrai* 22 and 23.

30 For the hortatory intention in Athenian decrees, see J. Miller, 'Euergetism, agonism, and democracy: the hortatory intention in late classical and early Hellenistic Athenian honorific decrees', *Hesperia*, 85 (2016) pp. 385–435 and S.D. Lambert, *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees in the Age of Demosthenes. Historical Essays* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 71–89; for its appearance on inscriptions beyond Athens, see W. Larfeld, *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik. Einleitungs- und Hilfsdisziplinen. Die nicht-attischen Inschriften* (Leipzig: Beck, 1907), pp. 504–8.

31 *I. Erythrai* 27 lines 16–20; *I. Erythrai* 28 lines 48–9; *I. Erythrai* 35 lines 7–8; *I. Erythrai* 36 lines 6–7.

was to be set up at two sanctuaries at Erythrai, where they might be seen by those who visited them.

After Alexander, Ionia was dominated at first by Antigonos, then Lysimachos. In 281 BC, Seleukos' victory and Lysimachos' defeat at the battle of Koroupedion left his family influential over much of western Asia Minor. It seems to have been in this context that a number of exceptionally detailed epigraphic documents were published, probably in the 270s and 260s respectively.³² Of these, the honorary decree for the benefactor Polykritos (*I. Erythrai* 28) is, at 52 lines, the longest honorific decree in existence from Erythrai. It states that among Polykritos' motivations was to 'oblige the *demos*' and to become useful to them (εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ δῆμῳ βουλόμενος Πολύκριτος ἄλλα τε πολλὰ πάλιν χρήσιμος ἐγενήθη: lines 34–5). At lines 48–9 we read a clause which tells us why the honours were to be enacted by the Council (*boule*) and the people (*demos*) at the Assembly: 'so that the people appears to repay worthy favours done by good men' (ὅπως οὖν ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς των ἀνδρῶν χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδούς). The statement that a statue – for the sake of his *eunoia* (goodwill) towards the people ([ἐν]εκε καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον: line 52) – is to be set up next to the honours previously written up for him demonstrates, then, that this was not the sole occasion on which Polykritos was honoured with physical commemoration in the city.

So far, therefore, we have seen the Erythraians projecting an image of their community as ready to repay internal benefactors; such a process could have contributed to the bonds between mass and elite within the city and strengthened the whole community's collective identity. But how far was this image projected also to outsiders? This brings us to the exchanges that the Erythraians undertook with the Seleucid monarchs; the evidence consists of an inscribed letter (*I. Erythrai* 31) and an associated decree (*I. Erythrai* 30). For the purposes of this paper, I leave untouched the debates about whether these exchanges were undertaken with Antiochos I (281–61) or II (261–46), and follow Welles' view that they pertain to the latter.³³

32 Documents of interest not discussed here include the honours for Hekatas (*I. Erythrai* 27, probably of the 270s, as P. Fröhlich, *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IV^e–I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.)* (Geneva: Droz, 2004), p. 544 argues), *I. Erythrai* 29 for the generals, *I. Erythrai* 114 for Kallikrates. See also Appendix Table 4.

33 Welles, pp. 78–82 prefers Antiochos II; C. Habicht, *Divine Honors for Moral Men in Greek Cities: the Early Cases*. Trans. J.N. Dillon (Michigan: Michigan Classical Press, 2017), pp. 71–2 prefers Antiochos I. Piejko (cf. *SEG* XLI 984) associates the letter with Antiochos III.

4 The Economy of Goodwill and Gratitude as a Discourse of Identity: The Correspondence with Antiochos

The fragmentary state of the honorific decree for Antiochos (*I. Erythrai* 30) means that we cannot be certain about its substance.³⁴ But enough remains of the designation Βασιλέα Ἀντίοχον (King Antiochos) in line 20 for us to be relatively confident that it concerns a Seleucid monarch. Significant portions of the decree have been restored on the basis of the text of the extant inscribed letter of Antiochos to the Erythraians (*I. Erythrai* 31); accordingly, it appears to praise Antiochos and to crown him for the sake of his goodwill (*eunoia*) towards the people (*demos*) (lines 20–2). Noteworthy too for our understanding of Erythraian attitudes is the plausibly-restored reference to their own gratitude ([– εὐχ]αρστίας) in line 4, an idea which is presented also in the king's inscribed letter as a characteristic of Erythraian behaviour (*I. Erythrai* 31 lines 7–8, 14–5).

The inscribed letter (*I. Erythrai* 31), discovered on the site of Erythrai in the 1870s, set out a communication from King Antiochos in which he pledged to continue the autonomy and freedom from taxes that the city had enjoyed since the time of Alexander and Antigonos (lines 21–8). The text of the letter, which is substantially intact, appears to have been followed on the stone by a (now highly fragmentary) decree of the Erythraians, presumably one which offered thanks to the Seleucid making the grant. The letter tells the story of ambassadors coming from Erythrai, bringing with them a decree for Antiochos bestowing honours, a crown, and gold in the form of a gift (τὸ χρυσίον τὸ εἰς τὰ ξένια: line 5).³⁵ According to the narrative presented, the envoys gave an account (ἀπολογισάμενοι: line 6) of their long-standing (διὰ παντός) goodwill (*eunoia*) with the royal family (lines 6–7), an account of the gratitude (*eucharistia*) of the Erythraian multitude (*plethos*)³⁶ which it shows towards all its benefactors (*euergetai*) (lines 7–9), and the esteem (*proagoge*) which the city had enjoyed under previous kings (lines 9–10). These claims were used in an appeal to the king that he should be friendly and should promote the interests of the city

34 For Piejko's restorations of *I. Erythrai* 30, see *SEG* XXXVII 923 and XLI 984, taking the view that it was a decree for Antiochos III.

35 On such gifts, in particular those which were used to welcome foreigners to cities, see now A. Cinalli, *Τὰ ξένια: la cerimonia di ospitalità cittadina. Studi e Ricerche, 27. Studi umanistici – Antichistica*. (Roma: Sapienza Università Editrice, 2015).

36 The term *plethos* is one that emphasises the multitude of Erythraians offering gratitude; it is to be distinguished in Hellenistic inscriptions from *demos*, which refers to the people at the assembly. In this case it might be seen as emphasising that the great mass of Erythraians felt gratitude towards the King.

(lines 10–12). The reported Seleucid response was to accept the awards of the Erythraians, to praise their gratitude (lines 12–5), to remind the Erythraians of the fact that their family had, ‘since the beginning’, sustained goodwill towards their community (lines 15–6): goodwill (*eunoia*), it seems, was a common currency in the exchange. We read also that the envoys reminded the kings of their autonomy and freedom from tax under Alexander and Antigonos and that the royal ancestors (*progonoi*) were always zealous towards them (lines 21–4). The king, accordingly, accepted the honours and praised the Erythraians, apparently convinced by the decree delivered to them and the words of the envoys, and pledged to help the city maintain its autonomy and its exemption from taxes.

The Erythraian ambassadors appear, therefore, to have made a well-informed speech at the court. In this account, the invocation of ideas about goodwill, its reciprocal relationship with gratitude and the past are central to the Erythraian appeal, and characteristic of a certain type of rhetoric of Hellenistic ambassadors, to whom local history was an important tool in the creation of identity, persuasion, and inter-community negotiations.³⁷ Invoking an account of a common history was important to the development of a collective identity: we see discourses on, and shared attitudes towards, goodwill and gratitude being used for diplomatic purposes in claims made by cities to Kings (and vice versa), a tendency which we encounter in inscribed correspondence from elsewhere in the Greek world (see Appendix Tables 5 and 6). Such appeals could be based, in both epideictic and persuasive modes, upon the evidence of decrees, and I have listed examples of such claims at Appendix

37 Most recently on appeals to the past made by ambassadors and other representatives of the communities to outsiders in the Hellenistic period, see H.-J. Gehrke, ‘Myth, history and collective identity: uses of the past in ancient Greece and beyond’, in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 286–313; J. Ma, ‘Peer polity interaction in the Hellenistic age’, *Past & Present* 180 (2003), pp. 9–39; A. Chaniotis, ‘Ein missverstandenes Ritual der griechischen Diplomatie: Geschichte als Argument’, in C. Ambos, S. Hotz, G. Schwedler, S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft Academic, 2005), pp. 106–9; R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, ‘Look and listen: history performed and inscribed’, in R. Scodel (ed.), *Between Orality and Literacy: Communication and Adaptation in Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 175–96; L. Rubinstein, ‘Spoken words, written submissions, and diplomatic conventions: The importance and impact of oral performance in Hellenistic inter-polis relations’, in C. Kremmydas and K. Tempest (eds.), *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 165–99. For the *polis* in Hellenistic rhetoric, see A. Erskine, ‘Rhetoric and persuasion in the Hellenistic world: speaking up for the polis’, in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 272–85.

Table 7.³⁸ This practice is perhaps to be associated with the tendency during this period for inscribed versions of decrees to become fuller, more substantiated, and to make expressions about their specific intentions. Luraghi has recently argued that in the third century the Athenians introduced historical detail into their honorific decrees when they realised the usefulness of inscriptions as sources for historical narratives;³⁹ in the case of Erythrai, we might consider the possibility that increased detail was set out with a view to appealing to future domestic and foreign benefactors. The act of inscribing a decree lodged it in the public memory and would, in due course, have contributed to the reproduction of collective identity.

It is worth reflecting on the claim, put into the mouth of the ambassadors by the writer of the letter, that the Erythraian multitude displays goodwill towards all of its benefactors (lines 8–9). It is, perhaps, just possible to imagine the Erythraian ambassadors making speeches at the court reciting not only their community's goodwill towards the Seleucids but also that towards previous patrons such as the Hekatomnids and the Athenians; whatever the details, they appear to have replayed the history of their city to their patrons as a way of appealing to them for support.⁴⁰

But before we move on we must also remember that in this particular case the inscription – as an inscribed piece of royal correspondence – was written up in the words of the King's letter. And so the account of Erythraian gratitude

38 On the use of decrees in the context of diplomatic appeals, see J.-M. Bertrand, 'Formes de discours politiques: décrets des cites grecques et correspondance des rois hellénistiques', in C. Nicolet (ed.), *Du pouvoir dans l'antiquité: mots et réalités* (Paris and Geneva: Droz, 1990), pp. 101–15; Rubinstein, 'Spoken words', p. 179; A. Chaniotis, 'Paradoxon, enargeia, empathy: Hellenistic decrees and Hellenistic oratory', in Kremmydas and Tempest, *Hellenistic Oratory*, pp. 201–16; A. Chaniotis, 'History as an argument in Hellenistic oratory: the evidence of Hellenistic decrees', in P. Derron (ed.), *La rhétorique du pouvoir. Une exploration de l'art oratoire délibératif grec* (Vandoeuvres: Fondation Hardt Entretiens 62, 2016), pp. 129–74 (especially pp. 152–62 for the 'past services oblige' argument). For the view that the Erythraian ambassadors made references to the past to encourage Antiochos to live up to the generosity of his predecessors, see S. Wallace, 'Alexander the Great and Democracy in the Hellenistic World', in B. Gray and M. Canevaro (eds.), *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Democracy and Political Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 45–72, p. 65.

39 See Luraghi, 'The demos'. Shear, *Polis and Revolution* and B. Steinbock, *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse: Uses and Meanings of the Past* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013), pp. 90–4 emphasise the role of inscriptions in the manufacture of public memory in Athens.

40 A restored reference in the classical-period document of Erythrai concerning the cult of Aphrodite Pandemos to something contained in an archive (ἐμ βυβλίοις] δη[μοσίοις], SEG XXXVI 1039 line 18; cf. XXXIX 1238) suggests that a range of such materials might have been available to the Erythraians.

(*charis*) and goodwill is given additional authority by the fact it is enunciated in the Royal voice whilst also reminding them that their ambassadors recognised the moral virtues of the Seleucids. This rhetoric of harmony and mutual benefit (as well as collective Erythraian interests), though, may conceal a more complicated set of underlying negotiations that involved self-interest and other factors.

5 Identity and Benefaction on the Philites *stele*

Further honorific decrees of Hellenistic Erythrai are listed in Appendix Tables 4 and 8,⁴¹ but the next document to be discussed offers a slightly different perspective on the Erythraian public rhetoric of identity. An inscription which may, possibly, be contemporary with Antiochos' letter is the *stele* containing two decrees of the council and people of the Erythraians concerning the repair and maintenance of the statue of Philites the tyrannicide;⁴² the stone was discovered nearby on the island of Chios but a cogent case has been made for its original derivation from Erythrai (*I. Erythrai* 503).⁴³

The first of the two decrees, proposed by Zoilos son of Chiades, specifies that bids were to be invited for the restoration of the statue to its condition before the removal of a sword by those serving the oligarchy (*hoi en tei oligarchiai*: lines 10–4); it added that the market officials (*agoranomoi*) were to ensure that the statue was free of verdigris and that it be crowned at the time of festivals (lines 14–7). The second decree added that the treasurers of the month were to contribute to the costs incurred by the crowning and polishing of the statue (lines 22–7), but added that in the future the cost of the crowns was to be added to the conditions of the contract sold by the *agoranomoi* (lines 27–9).

41 For discussion of a third-century decree from Erythrai honouring jury service, see Walser A.V. Walser, 'DIKASTERIA. Rechtsprechung und Demokratie in den hellenistischen Poleis', in C. Mann and P. Scholz (eds.), *"Demokratie" im Hellenismus: Von der Herrschaft des Volkes zur Herrschaft der Honoratioren? Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform*, 2. (Mainz: Verlag Antike, 2012), pp. 74–108.

42 It was dated by Engelmann and Merkelbach, on the basis of letter-forms, to the period after the battle of Koroupedion (*I. Erythrai* 503) of 281; Teegarden, *Death to Tyrants!*, pp. 153–64 follows this dating. For a date in the middle of the fourth century, based on letter forms, see also Fröhlich, *Les cités grecques*, pp. 543–4.

43 For the argument that the *stele* derives from Erythrai, see A. Heisserer, 'The Philites Stele', *Hesperia* 48 (1979), pp. 281–93, followed by J.P. Gauthier, *Les cités grecques et leurs bien-faiteurs. IV^e–I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.* (Athens and Paris: French School at Athens, 1985), p. 32 and Teegarden, *Death to Tyrants!*, pp. 142–72. Engelmann and Merkelbach suggest that its place of origin was nearby Klazomenai.

There have been several explanations of the damage and subsequent refurbishment of the statue, but the implication is that restored democrats blamed the neglect of the statue on a previous regime that it branded oligarchic.⁴⁴ Recently Teegarden suggests that ‘the creation and subsequent manipulation of the statue of Philites played an important role in the foundation, contestation, and ultimate securement of the democracy that was established in Erythrai in the wake of Alexander’s conquest of western Asia Minor’.⁴⁵ There is certainly an element of politically-motivated ideology behind the proposal to have such a statue repaired. Notably, though, the costs of the activity had evidently to be contracted out to some wealthy bidder who was willing to put forward the money; from the second decree, it appears that in this first year the treasurers of the month were to cover the costs, but there appears to be uncertainty about whether this could happen on subsequent occasions (lines 22–9). There is, in the inscription, then, little convincing indication of community-sponsored democratic partisanship. For one thing, there is no mention of *demokratia* in the text, though it is a term which is epigraphically represented at Erythrai elsewhere (*I. Erythrai* 29 line 12). But the motivation of the decree is expressed in the hortatory clause of the first decree, which states that it is to be resolved ‘so that it is apparent that the people takes great care and constantly remembers its benefactors (*euergetai*) both living and dead ...’ (ὅπως ἂν ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται πολλὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιούμενος καὶ μνημονεύων αἰεὶ τῶν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ζώντων καὶ τετελευτηκότων: lines 6–9).⁴⁶ As with the honorific material we have looked at, looking to the future and thinking about the appeal to benefactors was the rhetoric being most clearly enunciated in this decree, and it was underscored by an expression of shared identity.

6 The Discourses of Identity in Sub-polis Units: the Phrikyladai *stele*

Finally we come to a newly-discovered inscription at the World Museum, Liverpool, in which an association – involving individuals prosopographically attested as from Erythrai – honours officials known as wine-commissioners (*oinonai*) for their services to the community. Observations have already been

44 Teegarden, *Death to Tyrants!*, pp. 147–50, discussing a range of interpretations of the decrees.

45 Teegarden, *Death to Tyrants!*, p. 146; cf. V. Azoulay, *Les tyrannicides d'Athènes. Vie et mort de deux statues* (Paris: Le Seuil, 2014), pp. 94–6.

46 For a view of the text as essentially commemorative, see Heisserer, ‘The Philites Stele’, pp. 286–7, p. 290, using this point to explain what he thinks of as the abbreviated formulae of the *stele*.

made about the similarity of the language of this decree to that of Erythraian public decrees;⁴⁷ the sentiment of reciprocation behind the hortatory clause which states ‘so that if anyone else wants to act with *philotimia* (zeal), they might see that the association (*koinon*) of the Phrikladai knows how to pay back due gratitude for those things of which it might be benefitted’ (ὅπω[ς] δὲ καὶ ἐάν [τι]νες ἄλλοι βούλωνται φι[λο][τι]μεῖσθαι, εἰδῶσιν ὅτι ἐπίσταται τὸ [κοι]- γὸν τὸ Φρικυλαδῶν ἀποδιδόναι [ἀξ]ίας χάριτας ὧν ἄ[ν] εὖ]εργετηθῇ[ι]: lines 14–8) is reminiscent of the types of claim we have already observed in inscriptions associated with the city.

As Taylor and Vlassopoulos have recently observed,⁴⁸ it used to be the case that the flourishing and growing visibility of private associations was seen as a reflection of the crisis and collapse of the *polis* as an institution in the Hellenistic period. But at third-century Erythrai, we can hypothesise that the rhetoric of honorific culture found expression not only in the community’s dealings with the big external powers and in her interactions with local *euergetai*, but surfaces also in sub-*polis* communities. And at the same time, it is in this era, that of the successors, that we see the resurfacing of the Ionian League as a political entity, which had texts of honorary decrees (e.g. *I. Didyma* 1; *I. Erythrai* 348) and other arrangements (*I. Erythrai* 16, 504) written up in its constituent cities.⁴⁹ It is clear, then, that the rhetoric of honorific

47 P. Liddel and P. Low, ‘An inscribed *gnome* of the Phrikladai from the World Museum, Liverpool’, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 110 (2015), pp. 263–84, pp. 268–70.

48 C. Taylor and K. Vlassopoulos, ‘Introduction: an agenda for the study of Greek history’, in C. Taylor and K. Vlassopoulos (eds.), *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 1–31, p. 17.

49 On the scope and powers of the Ionian League, see M.O.B. Caspari, ‘The Ionian Confederacy’, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 35 (1915), 35, pp. 175–88, pp. 184–8; P. Herrmann, ‘Das κοινὸν τῶν Ἰώνων unter römischer Herrschaft’ in N. Ehrhardt and L.-M. Günther (eds.), *Widerstand – Anpassung – Integration. Die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom. Festschrift für Jürgen Deininger zum 56. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2002), pp. 223–40, underlining its lack of political significance in the period of Roman rule. For the possibility that it was revived by the Hekatomnids, see P. Debord, *L’Asie Mineure au IV^e siècle (413–323 a.C.): Pouvoir et jeux politiques* (Bordeaux: De Boccard, 1999), pp. 176–8. M. Metcalfe, ‘Reaffirming Regional Identity. Cohesive Institutions and Local Interactions in Ionia 386–129 BC’. PhD thesis, London University (2005), pp. 102–6 makes the important point that individuals would have made proposals of honours in the Ionian League when they aimed to heighten the honour for a particular individual: decrees of the Ionian *koinon* had validity in all thirteen members of the league; Metcalfe, ‘Reaffirming’, p. 194 emphasises also that the association facilitated the existence of regional identity even as conflicts went on between them. On the cult of Antiochos I of the Ionian League, see Habicht, *Divine Honors*, pp. 66–7.

culture proliferates among the Ionian communities on at least three different corporate levels: the association, the city and the Ionian League; in all three cases it contributes to the manufacture and reproduction of collective identities.

7 Conclusion

It seems to be the case that the Erythraian public epigraphical habit became increasingly geared towards the exhibition and reward of euergetic behaviour, and less towards institutional regulation; arguably, this change gives us some insight into the rhetorical expression of the identities of the Erythraians of the early Hellenistic period. So, even when, like other Ionian communities (Klazomenai: *I. Erythrai* 504) the Erythraians were calling themselves a democracy (*demokratia*: *I. Erythrai* 29 line 12) which enjoyed the condition of freedom (*eleutheria*: *I. Erythrai* 29 line 13),⁵⁰ they were no longer investing in the epigraphical display of regulations, though, as the work of Fröhlich demonstrates, institutions and magistrates continued to play an important role in civic life in this period.⁵¹

Perhaps it was the case that two centuries of fluctuation between oligarchic and democratic forms of government discouraged them from investing in epigraphically-published accounts of constitutional detail; it may also be the case that, in a political world less polarised by a democratic-oligarchic dichotomy, the Erythraians did not expect their Seleucid overlords, unlike the fifth-century Athenians, to make a connection between the stability of political institutions and the loyalty of their subjects. In other words, geopolitical changes gave rise, at Erythrai, to a shift in the relative prominence of administrative and honorific transactions.

⁵⁰ On claims about *demokratia*, *eleutheria*, and *autonomia* in the Hellenistic period, see W. Grieb, *Hellenistische Demokratie. Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Grossen*. *Historia Einzelschriften* 199 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2008), pp. 177–93, 320–34, 360–78. See now P. Hamon, ‘Ungleichheit und Euergetismus: die isotes in den kleinasiatischen Poleis der hellenistischen Zeit’, in Mann and Scholz “*Demokratie*”, pp. 56–73, arguing that many cities in the Hellenistic period maintained the type of political institutions which supported democratic equality.

⁵¹ For political institutions in Hellenistic Erythrai and the proposal of measures by the *strategoi*, *prytaneis* and *exetastai*; the offices of the *agoranomos* and *agonothetes*, financial administration (*διοικησις*), see Fröhlich *Les cités grecques*, pp. 135–43, 369–70, 553–6; Dmitriev, *City Government*, pp. 19, 27–8, 56, 297.

Honorific transactions, and the discourses of goodwill and generosity in which they were remembered and redeployed, were, we must acknowledge, not the only means by which the Erythraians ensured the security of their *polis* in the early Hellenistic period: they celebrated the ruler cult⁵² and defended themselves using military means (*I. Erythrai* 24) and fortifications.⁵³ But honorific practices loom large in the epigraphy. As we noted, when we move through the fourth century, the collective identity of the Erythraians becomes more important in their inscribed documents. Perhaps this was because in the Hellenistic period communities needed not only administrative institutions to ensure the existence of their communities, but also strong rhetorical negotiating tools which were supported (and also reproduced) by a sense of collective identity: the Erythraians were ready to deploy narratives about their identity and history of their goodwill and gratitude in appeals to potential benefactors, and they drew on them in order to obtain assistance in maintaining their autonomy (*I. Erythrai* 31 line 26).

One modernist analysis of institutional competitiveness says that political entities compete by constructing and manipulating institutions in what they perceive to be their best interests;⁵⁴ in the case of Erythrai, we might reasonably assert that the Erythraians expanded the rhetoric of honorific transactions and epigraphical publication as a means – which was in tune with long-standing

52 See Habicht, *Divine Honors*, pp. 67–72. In the literary record, a passage of Strabo (17.1.43) reports that, according to Kallisthenes in an account of portents that pointed to Alexander's divine roots (*FGrH* 124 F 14), an Erythraian woman, Athenaïs, who was like an Erythraian sibyl, talked of Alexander's *eugeneia*. The treatment of Alexander, though, is potentially exceptional, and the authenticity of Kallisthenes' claim not demonstrable. Other examples of ruler cults at Erythrai: *I. Erythrai* 201 mentions a cult of Alexander; *I. Erythrai* 64 a priest of Alexander; *I. Erythrai* 205 lines 74–6 a cult of Apollo son of Seleukos. Metcalfe, 'Reaffirming', p. 112 suggests that the Erythraians administered the Ionian *koinon* festival for Antiochos.

53 Investment in fortifications (McNicoll, *Hellenistic Fortifications*, pp. 60–6; S. Carlsson, *Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States. Historia Einzelschriften* 206 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2010), pp. 116–9). Teegarden, *Death to Tyrants!*, p. 157 n. 37 collects evidence for wall building in the aftermath of Alexander's conquest. Fortifications of Erythrai are discussed also by Hornblower, *Mausolus*, pp. 330–1. There was also military resistance and, in 302 BC, the Erythraians were able to prevent the general of Lysimachos, Prepelaos, from taking their city (Diod. Sic. 20.107.5). For the view that fighting was an important expression of identity for Hellenistic cities, see J. Ma, 'Fighting poleis of the Hellenistic world', in H. van Wees (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece* (Swansea: University of Wales Press, 2000), pp. 337–76.

54 O.K. Pedersen, 'Institutional Competitiveness: how nations came to compete', in G. Morgan, J.L. Campbell, C. Crouch, O.K. Pedersen, and R. Whitley (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Institutional Analysis*. Electronic Publication (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 648–9.

norms –⁵⁵ of effecting their geopolitical survival and group affiliation. But it would of course be intellectually lazy to accept that this is the only reason why they expressed this rhetoric of political honours epigraphically. Nor must we accept straightforwardly that the Erythraians themselves passed honours simply on the basis of well-informed rational choice. It is likely that behind the epigraphical expression of such rhetoric there was a more complicated web of causation, involving a spectrum of perceived incentives, emotional factors,⁵⁶ aspiration, altruism, and ideas about of past practice, which are elements of what Jon Elster, in his critique of rational choice theory, calls ‘collective belief formation’.⁵⁷ What we can say is that in the Hellenistic period, the proliferation of awards made by cities and other communities of honours and their epigraphical publication represented an expansion of forms of interaction between weak and the powerful communities. One conclusion to draw is that, therefore, is that of an impression not of innovation in the rhetoric in third-century Erythrai, but of the adaptation and substantiation of an already-established narrative about Erythraian identity and of *euergesia* and its consequences; it was something that lies in what Kuba Filonik calls ‘the field of ideological manipulation’. As well as reinforcing internal social structures they helped shape the Erythraians’ interactions with other, larger, political entities in Western Asia Minor.

We close by returning to the core theme of this collection of papers: identity. The rhetoric which identified the Erythraians as exhibiting worthy gratitude to those who treated them with *eunoia* was one which was manufactured to appeal to both insiders and outsiders and at the same time promoted the rhetoric of Erythraian *polis*-identity. As with any other small community in the ancient world, we can never really know what Erythraians thought about their collective identity, but the study of the language of their inscribed public documents may help us realise the deployment of its rhetoric in both domestic and diplomatic contexts.

55 For classical-period claims about how *eunoia* holds alliances together, see P. Low, *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) pp. 52, pp. 138–9. For the archaic and classical heritage of euergetism, see M. Domingo Gygax, *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

56 Cf. A. Chaniotis, ‘Moving stones. The study of emotions in Greek inscriptions’, in A. Chaniotis (ed.), *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2012), pp. 91–129; A. Chaniotis, ‘Displaying emotional Community – the epigraphic evidence’, in E. Sanders and M. Johncock (eds.), *Emotion and Persuasion in Classical Antiquity* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2016), pp. 237–62.

57 J. Elster, *Explaining Social Behaviour. More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. 2nd Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Appendix

TABLE 1 Inscribed directives of Erythrai

Reference	Date	Type of decree	Content	Place of publication	Physical aspects
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 2 (trans. Arnaoutoglou 69)	Before 454? (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	No indication.	Monitoring magistrates and those who are entitled to prosecute them.	None stated.	<i>Stele</i> of trachyte.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 1 (=Nomima 1.84 = OR 122)	5th cent. or early 4th (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Proposal of Apellias, perhaps with rider added by resolution of boule.	Restriction on the office-holding of former <i>grammateis</i>	None stated.	<i>Stele</i> of red trachyte.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 17 (=Nomima 1.85)	5th cent. or 1st 1/2 of 4th (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Lines 16–7 show it was decreed: <i>tauta epsephisthe</i> .	Restriction on office-holding among the <i>Peptoi</i> .	None stated.	<i>Stele</i> of trachyte.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 15 (=Arnaoutoglou 38)	2nd 1/3rd of 4th (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Not stated.	Regulation of wool sales, <i>agoranomoi</i> and <i>prytaneis</i> .	Not extant/none stated.	Fragment of light-grey marble with red deposits.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 10	Between 350 and 332	Described as a <i>psephisma</i> (A line 13); rider (<i>ta men alla kathaper</i> : B line 17); heavily restored as a [proposal of the <i>stratego</i> i, <i>prytaneis</i> and <i>ex[etastai]</i> (C lines 1–2). Not stated.	Recalling exiles and establishing amnesty.	One at the Athenaion, one in the agora (A lines 13–6, cf. B lines 12–3).	Two <i>stelai</i> , one of which is inscribed on both sides.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 9 (RO 68)	350–44 or 342 (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Not stated.	Agreement with Hermias of Atarneus, with oath.	The Erythraians are to set one up in the sanctuary of Athena; Hermias one in the sanctuary of Atarneus (lines 30–3). None stated.	<i>Stele</i> of white marble.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 503	Early third century? (Wilhelm)	Resolution of council and assembly; proposal of Zoilos.	Philites <i>stele</i> , organising repair of statue.		

TABLE 2 Regulations with religious relevance, to the end of the fourth century

Reference	Date	Type of document	Content	Place of publication	Physical aspects
SEG XXXVI 1039	c. 400 (Merkelbach)	Resolution of the people and council; mentioning (line 8) a decree of the council.	Concerning the construction of a temple of Aphrodite.	Not extant /none stated.	Marble stele broken on all sides.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 208	Early 4th century (Keil)	Sacred calendar lacking enactment formulae.		None stated; discovered in later context.	'Platte aus weichem Kalkstein' (<i>I. Erythrai</i>).
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 203	Probably mid 4th century (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Sacred regulation lacking enactment formulae.	Regulation of sacrifices.	None stated.	Fragment of blue-grey marble.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 204	Mid fourth century (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Sacred regulation lacking enactment formulae.	Regulation of sacrifices.	None stated.	Fragment of blue-grey marble.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 205	380–60 or later (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Sacred regulation lacking enactment formulae.	Statutes for the Asklepios cult, containing hymn.	None stated.	Marble stele.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 206	2nd 1/2 of 4th century (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Sacred law lacking enactment formulae.	Regulations for the purchaser of the Kyrbantēs priesthood.	None stated, but found on the southern slope of the akropolis.	Stele.
SEG XLVII 1628; LII 1147	c. 350–300		Regulation concerning the cult of Kyrbantēs.	None stated.	Fragment of grey marble stele.
SEG XXXVII 921	4th century		List of priesthods.		Fragment.
SEG LI 1146	2nd century?	Not preserved.	Concerning a sold priesthood.	Not preserved.	Right part of a block, perhaps from a wall.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 201	300–260 (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	State document.	List of priesthods sold.		Inscribed block.

TABLE 3 Honorific decrees of Erythrai, to c. 334

Reference	Date	Type of decree	Honorand	Awards
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 6 (=RO 8)	394 (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Resolution of the <i>boule</i> and the [<i>demos</i>] (lines 1–2).	Konon of Athens	Euergesy, proxeny, <i>prohedria</i> , <i>ateleia</i> of all commodities (both for import and export, both in war and peace), citizenship for him and descendant, a [gilded] statue.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 8 (=RO 56)	Mid 350s?	Resolution of the <i>boule</i> ; a <i>gnome</i> of the <i>strategoí</i> / <i>prytaneis</i> (?).	Mausolos of Mylasa	Euergesy, proxeny, citizenship, the right to sail in and out both in war and in peace (inviolably and without a treaty), immunity, <i>prohedria</i> , and bronze statues of Mausolos and Artemisia.
SEG XXXI 969	Mid 350s	Resolution of the <i>boule</i> ; a <i>gnome</i> of the <i>strategoí</i> , <i>prytaneis</i> and <i>epimenioi</i> .	Idrieus of Mylasa	Euergesy, proxeny, <i>ateleia</i> from taxation for imports and exports, <i>prohedria</i> , the right to sail in and out both in war and in peace (inviolably and without a treaty), immunity, priority in lawsuits, citizenship and clan-membership for self and descendants.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 11	2nd 1/2 of 4th century	Fragmentary.	Not preserved	Right to sail in and out both in war and in peace (inviolably and without a treaty), priority in lawsuits.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 12	4th century, probably before 340	Fragmentary.	Not preserved	Right to sail in and out both in war and in peace (inviolably and without a treaty), priority in <i>dikai</i> , <i>prohedria</i> .
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 13	4th or 3rd centuries	Fragmentary.	Not preserved	Not preserved.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 14 SEG XXXVII 922	4th BC Fourth century?	Fragmentary. Fragmentary.	Fragmentary Not preserved; it is a plural award	Citizenship. Proxeny and euergesy and citizenship if they wish.

Deeds	Intention	Place of publication	Physical aspects
Not stated.	None stated.	Statue to be set up [wherever] Konon [decides] (lines 15–6). Discovered to south of Erythrai.	
Being a good man concerning the city of the Erythraians.	None stated.	<i>Stele</i> is to be set up at the Athenaion; the statues at the agora and the Athenaion (lines 11–9).	<i>Stele</i> .
Being a good man concerning the city of the Erythraians.	None stated.	None stated/not preserved.	
Unknown.	Not stated/not preserved.	Not stated/not preserved.	Fragment.
Unknown.	Not stated/not preserved.	At the Athenaion (lines 8–9).	Fragment.
Unknown.	Not preserved.	Not stated/not preserved.	Fragment of grey limestone.
Fragmentary. Being good men in matters concerning the <i>polis</i> of the Erythraians.	Fragmentary. Not preserved.	Fragmentary. Not preserved.	Fragmentary. Fragment of <i>stele</i> of blue-grey Erythraian marble.

TABLE 4 Honoric decrees of Erythrai c. 334–200 BC

Reference	Date	Type of decree	Honorand	Awards
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 21	Probably between 334 and 332 or post-323 (<i>SEG</i> XL 1012)	Resolved by the council and the people, a proposal of the <i>prytaneis</i> , generals and the <i>exetastai</i> , describes itself as a decree.	Phanes, son of Mnesitheus	Gold crown to be proclaimed at the Dionysia, maintenance at the <i>prytaneion</i> .
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 34	Late 4th or early 3rd	Resolved by the boule and [the demos], a proposal of the <i>strategoi</i> , <i>prytaneis</i> and the auditors.	Telesidromos Theudoros <i>Chalkideus</i> .	Praise and crown.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 119	c. 280	Described as a <i>psephisma</i> (lines 7–8).	Honours for a judge from Rhodes	Statue, announcement at the Dionysia and Seleukeia.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 24; cf. <i>SEG</i> XXXIX 1239	c. 277/275	Resolved by the people; a proposal of Polykritos.	9 named generals	Gold crown, [<i>prohedria</i> in all games], proclamation.
<i>SEG</i> XXXVII 935	Third century?	Enacted by the [<i>demos</i>]; a <i>gnome</i> of the [general, <i>prytaneis</i> and auditors].	Generals	
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 27	c. 274 (<i>I. Erythrai</i>); 270s, as Fröhlich 2004: 544.	Enacted by the <i>bo[ule]</i> and the <i>demos</i> ; proposal of [Aristokl]-es son of Adeimant[os] calls on the <i>demos</i> to resolve the decree.	Hekatas son of Gnotos (also honoured in <i>I. Erythrai</i> 24); he was the <i>agoranomos</i> (lines 6–7)	Gold crown, <i>prohedria</i> in the games in which the <i>polis</i> participates; announcement at the Dionysia and the Seleukeia.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 28	c. 275	The <i>boule</i> and <i>demos</i> are to resolve it (lines 49–50).	Polykritos (proposer of <i>I. Erythrai</i> 24)	Praise, gold crown, a bronze statue, which is to be set up in the agora; contains reference to other awards he received.
<i>SEG</i> XXXIII 963	c. 275	Perhaps two decrees, the second of which is restored as an enactment of the <i>boule</i> and <i>demos</i> .	Perhaps for Polykritos or his son?	Statue in the agora.

Deeds	Intention	Place of publication	Physical aspects
Being a good man, and is constantly well-disposed to the <i>demos</i> of Erythrai, contributing money without interest to the sending away of soldiers and the razing of the akropolis.	It is inscribed 'so that all may know that the people knows how to return appropriate thanks for the benefits (<i>euergetemata</i>) conferred on it' (lines 21–4). Not preserved.	On two <i>stelai</i> , one at the Athenaion, and the other in the Herakleion (lines 19–21).	
Good-minded (<i>eunoos</i>) towards the [<i>demos</i>] and the bringing of provisions.		Not preserved.	'Colourful limestone' (<i>I. Erythrai</i>).
For the sake of his <i>arete</i> and <i>eunoia</i> towards the <i>demos</i> .		To be set up in Rhodes; the statue was to be set up [in the ago]ra (lines 1–2). In th[e agora] (line 34).	On a stone built into the city walls of Rhodes.
Military and financial contributions to the defence of the city.	None stated.		
He was <i>eunoos</i> to the <i>demos</i> and he was good and moderate at a time of need and was appointed <i>agoranomos</i> and he held his office justly and equally and followed the laws.	So that everyone might know that the <i>demos</i> knows how to repay worthy thanks and on account of the gratitude of the people more might be eager to do us favours (lines 16–20).	Not stated/none preserved.	Fragmentary.
Detailed military and financial contributions.	So that the <i>demos</i> appears to pay back worthy thanks to good men (lines 48–9).	Not stated, but his previous honours were written up on a <i>stele</i> in the agora (lines 53–4)	<i>Stele</i> .
Making donation; the <i>demos</i> is described as <i>eucharistos</i> (B line 4).	'[So that the <i>demos</i>] might appear ...' (B line 9).	Not preserved.	Fragment of grey-white marble.

TABLE 4 Honoric decrees of Erythrai c. 334–200 BC (*cont.*)

Reference	Date	Type of decree	Honorand	Awards
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 29	c. 270–60	Enacted by the people, a proposal of the <i>strategoí</i> , <i>prytaneis</i> and auditors; the people are called on to make the resolution.	Generals.	Golden crowns; <i>prohedria</i> in all the games in which the city participates.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 30 (cf. <i>SEG</i> XXXVII 923)	c. 270–60	The council and people are instructed to resolve (line 6).	King Antiochos (II ?).	[Praise], golden crown, [announcement at the games] (lines 19–22); the crown and a golden gift was to be taken to him by ambassadors (lines 24–5). Not preserved.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 31 lines 39–43.	c. 270–60	The council and people resolve (line 39); a proposal of the generals, [<i>prytaneis</i> , and auditors].	King An[tiochos].	
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 35	Mid 3rd century	Resolved by the <i>boule</i> and <i>demos</i> ; a proposal of the generals and <i>prytaneis</i> and the auditors.	Neoptolemos son of Physkos of Aetolia, a <i>proxenos</i> and citizen of Erythraians.	Praise and golden crown.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 36	Mid 3rd century	Resolved by the <i>boule</i> and <i>demos</i> ; a proposal of the generals and <i>prytaneis</i> and the auditors.	Timokrates son of Timeas of Erythrai.	Praise and golden crown.
<i>SEG</i> XXXVII 934	3rd century?	Describes itself as a decree (line 2), probably of the <i>demos</i> (line 11).	Not preserved.	Not preserved.

Deeds	Intention	Place of publication	Physical aspects
For holding office <i>kalos kai endoxos</i> ; they did not submit to danger or fear when the city was at war; contributed zealously by speaking and doing things in the interest of the city, preserving democracy for the people and they handed over the city to their successors free. In return for ensuring that the city was <i>autonomos</i> and <i>aphorologetos</i> (lines 34–5).	Not preserved.	Not preserved.	On a block of grey marble.
	So that the <i>demos</i> might appear to repay worthy thanks to those who wish to do it good services (lines 18–9).	Not preserved, though there is mention of the sanctuary of Athena (lines 15–16).	Four fragments of a <i>stele</i> of grey Erythraian marble (<i>I. Erythrai</i>).
Not preserved	Not preserved.	Not preserved.	<i>Stele</i> .
Offered advice to the Erythraians about sending an embassy to appeal to the Aetolian league, and assisting the city in resisting the misfortunates; for the sake of his <i>arete</i> and <i>eunoia</i> towards the people (lines 9–10).	So that the <i>demos</i> might be seen to honour those who choose to act favourably towards their city (lines 7–8).	At Delphi in the temple of Apollo (lines 10–11).	From Delphi; discovered in the Polygonal wall.
Speaking and acting in the interests of the city as an ambassador at Delphi; for the sake of his virtue and <i>eunoia</i> towards the people (lines 8–9).	So that the <i>demos</i> might be seen to honour those who choose to act favourably towards their city (lines 6–7)	At Delphi in the temple of Apollo (lines 9–10).	From Delphi.
Not preserved.	Not preserved	At [a to-be-decided by the people place] (line 7).	Fragment.

TABLE 4 Honoric decrees of Erythrai c. 334–200 BC (*cont.*)

Reference	Date	Type of decree	Honorand	Awards
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 76	Hellenistic (<i>I. Erythrai</i>); perhaps third century (prosopography)	Describes itself as a <i>psephisma</i> .	Not preserved.	Not preserved.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 114	3rd century (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Resolution of the <i>boule</i> and <i>demos</i> ; proposal of the <i>strategoi</i> , <i>prytaneis</i> and auditors.	Honours for the judge Kallikrates son of Leagoras.	Crown (line 28).
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 115	Hellenistic (<i>I. Erythrai</i>)	Resolution of the <i>demos</i> .	Honours for <i>epistatai</i> .	Crown with foliage at the Dionysia, <i>prohedria</i> .
<i>SEG</i> XXXVII 927	3rd century?	Describes self as a <i>psephisma</i> (line 1).	Honours for an anonymous judge.	Not preserved.
<i>I. Erythrai</i> 431 (cf. <i>SEG</i> LIII 528)	Late 3rd century	Resolution of the [<i>boule</i>] and <i>demos</i> (lines 1–2); describes self as a <i>gnome</i> <i>pry[taneon....]</i> (lines 5–6).	Honours for [Eud]oros son of Glaukos.	Not preserved.

Deeds	Intention	Place of publication	Physical aspects
Not preserved.	Not preserved.	Not preserved.	Lower fragment of <i>stele</i> .
For serving as a judge.		The <i>demos</i> is to choose a place (line 29).	Two marble slabs.
For <i>eunoia</i> to the <i>demos</i> (line 9).	‘[So that we might be seen to repay the accustomed honours ...]’ (lines 1–2).	<i>Demos</i> is to choose a place; lines 7–8 suggest that a place ‘in front of the stoa [in the agora]’ was chosen.	
Perhaps for a public doctor.	Not preserved.	Discovered in Thessaly.	Fragment.

TABLE 5 *Eunoia* in royal correspondence

-
- Welles 6 line 10: the Prienians made clear their *eunoia* to Lysimachos in a decree.
 - Welles 11 line 14: Antiochos has given land to Aristodikos of Assos on the grounds of his *eunoia* and *prothymia*.
 - Welles 13 line 10: Melaeger tells the Ileians that Aristodikos wishes to join their city to the land given him by Antiochos because of the *eunoia* he has towards them.
 - Welles 14 line 10: Kallikrates has written to Ptolemy about the *eunoia* that the Milesians have towards them.
 - *I. Erythrai* 31: line 6 the Erythraians have offered an account of the *eunoia* which they have towards the Seleukids; 16 that the Seleukids have entertained *eunoia* from the beginning to the Erythraians; 32: appears to be a fragmentary reference to the Seleukids' *eunoia*.
 - Welles 25 line 28: Ziaelas of Bithynia responds to the account of *eunoia* which the people of Cos have given him.
 - Welles 31 line 18: Antiochos says that he has had kind feelings to the Magnesians because of the *eunoia* they have shown towards him and their state on all occasions.
 - Welles 45 lines 4 9: Seleukos refers to Aristolochos' *eunoia* in the award of a bronze statue.
 - Welles 52 line 41: Eumenes refers to the fact that the Ionians have spoken a decree declaring the *eunoia* of the whole people towards him; this is reiterated at line 69.
 - Welles 63 line 8: Opophrenes reports to the Prienians that the envoys have made proofs of their reliability and *eunoia* on the most urgent of occasions.
 - Welles 66 line 11: Attalos III has made awards to Sosander on the grounds of his *eunoia* and *pistis* (faith).
 - Welles 71 line 6: reference to the ongoing *eunoia* of the people of Seleukeia to the Seleukids.
-

TABLE 6 *Eucharistia/eucharistos* in royal correspondence

-
- *I. Erythrai* 31: lines 7–8 Antiochos talks of the *eucharistia* (gratitude) of the Erythraian people that they have pointed to in requesting the friendship of the king; 14–15 Antiochos praises Erythrai being *eucharistoi* in every way.
 - SEG XXXIII 963: the Erythraian *demos* is described as *eucharistos* (B line 4) towards its benefactor.
 - Welles 22 line 6: King Seleukos says that his ancestors have given benefactions to Miletos because of their gratitude (*eucharistia*).
 - Welles 52: lines 22 Eumenes talks of the *eucharistia* of the *koinon* of the Ionians; and lines 32–6 reports that the Ionian League has urged him, given the *eucharistia* of the people, to ensure that their interests are promoted.
-

TABLE 7 Decrees brought by communities to kings/used in the appeal to kings

<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Welles 2 line 12: Eresians are reported to have read a decree to Antigonos.– Welles 6: line 4 Prienians deliver a decree to Lysimachos; line 9 it announced the goodwill of the people towards the Antigonids.– <i>I. Erythrai</i> 31: line 3 the Erythraians read a decree containing honours to Antiochos; line 19 Antiochos says that it demonstrates that they are <i>eugenes</i>.– Welles 31 lines 10, 13: Antiochos refers to the decree which the Magnesians have given to Antiochos about Artemis Leukophrene.– Welles 32 line 10: ditto.– Welles 33 line 7: ditto, from Ptolemy to Magnesians.– Welles 34 line 5: ditto, from Attalos to Magnesians.– Welles 35 line 4: Theodoros and Amynder to the Teans responding to a decree brought by their envoys.– Welles 52 line 5: Eumenes refers to the decree sent to him by the Ionians.– Welles 53 I C line 13: Eumenes II acknowledges a letter from the Teans.– Welles 64 line 3: a king responds to the decree brought by envoys from Nysa.– Welles 68 line 7: Attalos III responds to a Lydian appeal on the basis of a decree.
--

TABLE 8 Some other third- and second-century Erythraian honorific decrees

<ul style="list-style-type: none">– <i>I. Erythrai</i> 35: Neoptolemos of Aetolia honoured as a <i>proxenos</i> with <i>stele</i> set up at Delphi (third century BC).– <i>I. Erythrai</i> 111–25: honours for judges both Erythraian and others (second century BC; some, but not all are Erythraian decrees).– <i>I. Erythrai</i> 431: for a public doctor (late third century BC), discovered in Thessaly.– Other Hellenistic honours: <i>SEG</i> XXXIII 963 (for Polykritos or his son); XXXVII 922 (proxeny award); <i>SEG</i> XXXVII 933 (for a magistrate); <i>SEG</i> XXXVII 934 and 935 (fragmentary).
--