Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire

Seeking for honour(s)? The exploitation of *philotimia* and citizen benefactors in classical Athens

Marloes Deene

Abstract

Although the concept of *philotimia* was thought to be not totally unproblematic in ancient Greece and in Athenian society more specifically, the Athenian polis exploited the power of *philotimia* in its own interests, and this from the early beginnings of Athenian democracy onwards. Nevertheless, this exploitation had its limitations when Athenian citizens were concerned. The available evidence concerning the Athenian honours system, which can be considered as one of the most remarkable and most effective examples of the Athenian exploitation of the power of *philotimia*, indicates a serious reluctance on the part of the demos to honour Athenian benefactors officially. Public and private associations at sub-*polis* level, which unlike the polis did officially honour citizen benefactors, might for wealthy citizens have functioned as alternative routes for obtaining honour and status.

Seeking for honour(s)? The exploitation of *philotimia* and citizen benefactors in classical Athens

Marloes DEENE
PhD Fellow of the Research Foundation Flanders/ Ghent University

I

In the early spring of 416/5, so Thucydides tells us, the Athenians decided to send an expedition to Sicily under the joint command of Alkibiades son of Kleinias, Nikias son of Nikeratos, and Lamachos son of Xenophanes. The aim of this expedition was to support the people from Segesta in their struggle against the Selinuntians, to join in restoring Leontini, and to settle all other matters in Sicily as might be considered best for the Athenians (6.8.1-2). Five days later, the assembly met again to discuss the equipment of the ships and other logistics. During this meeting, Nikias, who opposed the expedition but had been elected to the command against his will, not only attempted to advise the Athenians one final time against the expedition, but also questioned the authority of his fellow general and antagonist Alkibiades, who had been the main advocate of the expedition, by attacking the latter's character and motivations (6.9-14). In his subsequent rebuttal, Alkibiades put forward a strong claim to the public office under discussion, based not only on his abilities, but also on his ancestry and the benefits he had done to the city by his remarkable achievements as a chariot-racer in the Olympic Games. "For by general custom such things do indeed mean *time*, and from what is done men also infer power (*dunamis*)" (6.16.2), thus Alkibiades is made to say. Alkibiades' excessive spending on prestige goods and pastimes, attested both anecdotally and epigraphically, is of course legendary.(1) His repeated attempts to win the admiration from his fellow-citizens are known to have caused him financial distress, as can be inferred from Thucydides' comment that Alkibiades indulged his tastes beyond what his real means could bear, both in keeping horses and in the rest of his expenditure (6.15.3; cf. Plut., *Alk.* 17). His fervent struggle for *time*, however, and his belief that his successes entitled him to (political) power and influence, apparently stood in the way of a more prudent management of his financial affairs.

(1) DAVIES, 1971, no. 600 IX.

From Homeric times through the classical period, *time* was considered to be one of the predominant and overriding values in Greek culture.(2) According to the epic tradition, aristocratic leaders continually struggled for *time* in war and in games, thus bringing endless misery to the Greeks. Just as many other values of Homer's landed warrior élite, *time* continued to occupy a central place in the Greek value system of the archaic and classical period. The rise of the democratic *ethos* brought about a democratization of the ancient Greek values, in which the masses expanded the criteria for *time* so as to allow for other means of attaining or maximizing this value in addition to those employed by the noble families. Anything a man did in relation to anyone else was now thought to be a source of (dis)honour, and this both within and outside his own family. The Attic orations teach us that in the fourth century, *time* still counted for much in the values taken for granted by Athenians engaged in public life, and that popular ethics preserved much of the aristocratic scheme of values that centred upon *time*.(3) Thus Aristotle, whose ethics were closer to the beliefs and attitudes of ordinary Athenians than the idealistic morality of Plato, acknowledged that *time* was a principal ingredient in happiness for many - though not all - people (*EN* 1095a14-26). He described *time* as 'the greatest of external goods' (*EN* 1123b15-21), 'a prize for excellence' (*EN* 1123b35), and 'the aim of the majority' (*EN* 1159a16-17).(4)

The level of a man's *time* not only reflected but also determined to a significant extent his social worth and position in the *polis*. The Greek term *time* was even used as a concept to designate the specific political and legal status assigned to the different legal status groups in the *polis*, such as slaves, metics, and citizens. To have political rights was to be *epitimos*, while to hold office was to be *entimos*. To have no political rights - or to be deprived of some - was to be *atimos*. Considering the importance of *time* as an overriding value and social sanction in Athenian society and the undeniable link between *philotimia* - the major force which made a man compete for honour - and the achievement of social status, *philotimia* can rightly be considered as

(2) The Greek concept *time* is usually translated by the English term 'honour', but that does not make the situation any easier. As remarked by Herzfeld, the English concept 'honour' is very "nebulous" (Herzfeld, 1980, p. 340). It covers a wide variety of concepts such as virtue, reputation, esteem, integrity, and veracity, and refers, as observed by Stewart "to things apparently quite different from each other" (Stewart, 1994, p. 21). The Greek concept *time* appears to have been as multifaceted as is its modern English counterpart. In Greek literature, it firstly referred to esteem or respect. In the plural, *timai* mostly referred to privileges and marks of respect, such as are due to gods or to superiors, or bestowed as a reward for services, and civic privileges. *Time* also stood for dignity or authority, as the attribute of gods or kings, and for an office, magistracy, or person in authority. The *time* of something also referred to something's worth, value, or price, while the concept for the purpose of assessment also denoted a valuation or estimate. For a more thorough discussion of the ancient Greek concept of *time*, see Dover, 1974, p. 226-242; Ferguson, 1989, p. 17-33; Engen, 2010, p. 37-74.

(3) For the rejection of honour as a generalized social value, see Ober, 1993, p. 145.

(4) For an analysis of the concept of honour in Greek literature, see Lloyd-Jones, 1990.

among the most powerful and esteemed motivations of action or behaviour.(5) Therefore, it was - as acknowledged by contemporaries - an ideal potential aid for Greek societies and policy makers in influencing the social behaviour of their populace.

This article will argue that, although the concept of *philotimia* was thought to be not totally unproblematic in ancient Greece and in Athenian society more specifically, the Athenian *polis* exploited the power of *philotimia* in its own interests, and this from the early beginnings of Athenian democracy onwards. There will also be argued that this exploitation had its limitations when Athenian citizens were concerned. The available evidence concerning the Athenian honours system, which can be considered as one of the most remarkable and most effective examples of the Athenian exploitation of the power of *philotimia*, indicates to a serious reluctance on the part of the *demos* to officially rank one citizen above the others. The Athenian *polis* was careful to limit the amount of honour conferred on citizen benefactors, as it did not want to disrupt the egalitarian *ethos* of Athenian democracy. In conclusion, there will be suggested that public and private associations at sub-*polis* level, which unlike the *polis* did officially honour citizen benefactors, might for wealthy citizens have functioned as alternative routes for obtaining (formal recognition of) honour and status.

II

The assessment of *philotimia* in Greek literature teaches us that the concept was - just as the associated concepts of *eris* and *philonikia* - from the early stages of Greek history considered as inherently double-sided and ambivalent, constructive and destructive.(6) In fact, as pointed out by Wilson, "the common idea that the competitive pursuit of honour by individuals was, in early Greek societies if not later, the unproblematic engine of social action, is a great oversimplification".(7) Although Homeric writings emphasize the value of the aggressive pursuit of honour in the individual or the family, they at the same time draw attention to all the tensions which such a high-pressure system of social organization naturally brings about. A similar argument might be made for the Hesiodic poetry, where the depicted highly competitive form of social organization appears to be a source of anxiousness. Iconic is Hesiod's attempt in *Work & Days* to distinguish a good from a bad form of strife (11-41). His theory of the 'twin' *Erides* clearly indicates that the possibility of establishing the fine and troubling line between 'healthy' competition within and to the benefit of a social group and the horror of *stasis* or internal discord, was a point of concern for him; an issue which

(5) For an analysis of competitiveness as a major driving force in human history from the Paleolithic onwards, see VAN WEES, 2011. For honour as one of the most powerful incentives affecting social behaviour, see HERMAN, 2006, p. 164ff.

(6) For *philotimia* in Greek culture, see DOVER, 1974, p. 230-234; WHITEHEAD, 1983; WILSON, 2000, p. 187-194.

(7) For the citation, see WILSON, 2000, p. 188.

appears to have been a recurrent difficulty in later periods.[8] In the world of the developing *polis*, the prevailing values were of course of a cooperative rather than competitive nature, which made *philotimia* - a term traditionally believed to be reverberating the Homeric *ethos* of aristocratic competition - occupy a precarious position. A fragment of Pindar (210 Sn-M) unmistakably reflects the feared link at that time between excessive ambition and social instability, when writing: "[most dangerous are] men in the cities bent on excessive *philotimia*, or *stasis*, a glaring source of pain".[9]

In Athenian society more specifically, the nature and desirability of *philotimia* was a matter for debate as of about the middle of the fifth century. According to Diogenes Laertius (*Phil.* 9.55), Protagoras wrote an entire treatise, called *Peri Philotimias*. We know nothing of its contents or of its conclusions, but the title of the treatise indicates that the concept certainly raised issues for discussion. It is not difficult to see how excessive *philotimia* was vulnerable to criticism in fifth-century Athens, since it could easily shade into or be considered as a sign of aggression, pride and boastfulness towards other citizens (e.g. Hdt. 3.53.4; Eur. *Iph. Aul.* 527; Ar. *Frogs* 280-2; Ar. *Thesm*. 383). This could in the light of the prevailing egalitarian *ethos* not be tolerated. Besides, excessive *philotimia* not only had the potential to harm individual Athenians; it also was thought to convey a threat towards the *polis* as a whole, which, of course, was still worse.

The evidence suggests that during the Peloponnesian War, and in particular from 411 BC onwards, a clear awareness developed of the problems posed by traditional *philotimia* - or at least by an excess of it - to society and politics.[10] Thus in Euripides' *Phoenissae,* Iokaste supplicates her son Eteokles to honour Isotes, realizing that the good fortune of many *oikoi* and many *poleis* had been destroyed by ambitious, disruptive *philotimia* (531-548). The possibly harmful effects of *philotimia* are also spelled out by Thucydides. In 2.65.7, Pericles' successors are said to have acted in accordance with their individual *philotimia* and gain, thus crippling the city in the conduct of the war. In 3.82.8, in one of Thucydides' most extended passages of analytical generalization concerning social and political processes, a central role in the causes of *stasis* during the war is ascribed to the hunger for power arising from greed and *philotimia*. In 8.89.3, we are told that when, during the revolution of 411, Theramenes and his associates lobbied for a more equal *politeia*, this was mere propaganda, as most of them were in reality motivated by *philotimia.* Nevertheless, Thucydides realized, just as Hesiod did in his theory of the two varieties of strife, that a distinction had to be made between 'bad' *philotimia*, characterized by an egotistical self-interest which could threaten the life of the community, and 'good' *philotimia*, which was in the interest of and advantageous for the city. Pericles, for instance, is described to have embodied - in contrast to his successors - precisely the kind of *philotimia* motivating action in the interests of the greater glory of the *polis*, both in his

(8) Ibid., p. 187-189.

(9) The fact that Pindar in this text equates an excess of *philotimia* with *stasis*, indicates that he believed a more moderate form of *philotimia* was not inevitably disadvantageous to the social order.

(10) WHITEHEAD, 1983, p. 56-58.

own life (2.65.7) and in the ideology he advocated for the *polis* as a whole (2.44.4).[11] The awareness of the double-sided and ambivalent character of *philotimia* survived through the fourth century, both at an abstract level amongst philosophers (e.g. Isokr. 3.18; 12.81; Pl. Rep. 548c-550b, 586c; Arist. *NE* 1107b29-1108a2, 1125b17-22) and in the law-courts, where it was essentially used for argumentative reasons. After all, especially in court the actions of liturgists, and the nature of the *leitourgiai* themselves, were open to and vulnerable for fundamentally opposed interpretations.[12]

Nevertheless, despite the acknowledgment of the dangers of excessive love of *honour*, Athenian democracy consistently and for various reasons not only employed but also encouraged the *philotimia* and *philonikia* inherent in Geek culture, in order to influence the performance and conduct of both its residents and of outsiders. Whitehead has argued that, since *philotimia* was commonly believed to be a basic feature of the human character, [13] attempts to officially discourage it or to eradicate it altogether, might have been considered out of the question. The only thing to do, then, thus Whitehead, "was to accept and harness it to the profit of the Athenian community as a whole, the embryonic stages of which he identifies in the Pericles' funeral oration in Thucydides".[14] However, in truth, Athenian society not merely made use of some of its inhabitants' *philotimia* because of the necessity to channel the ambitions of the naturally competitive; the *polis* appears to have been more than eager to exploit the power of *philotimia* in its own interests, presumably recognizing that this was the most effective motivation of social action and behaviour which it could bring into play, whenever necessary.

III

Examples of this exploitation are ample, and can be traced back to the absolute beginnings of Athenian democracy. Thus in order to break down the territorial divisions and to create the necessary more cohesive relations between rich and poor, citizen and non-citizen, Kleisthenes (and his successors) created a common goal for both élites and non-élites, thus carefully exploiting their joint desire for victory and honour. In his *Politics*, Aristotle rightly pointed out that among Kleisthenes' major contributions to the Athenian stability were his processes of 'mixing up' the citizens of Athens (1319b19-27), which he initiated within several fields of societal life. Kleisthenes' undertakings in the realm of politics, administration and the

(11) Yet, the fact that Thucydides ascribes to *philotimia* (and to *philonikia*) a central role in the causes of *stasis* (3.82.8), without making any explicit qualification as to the kind of *philotimia* involved, might suggest, as pointed out by WILSON, 2000, p. 190, that he viewed the harmful form of *philotimia* as the principal and most natural, from which the Periclean ideal was a rare deviation.

(12) See Dem. 2.11-18, 8.71, 11.9, 50.54, 59.33, 59.96; Lys. 14.2, 14.21, 14.35, 14.42, 16.20, 19.18, 19.23, 19.56-57, 'Lys. 35' 232A, 234A; Aischin. 2.177, 3.45. See also Men fr. 620.

(13) For one of the best known and most fascinating accounts of *philotimia* as an alleged basic feature of the human character, see Xen., *Hiero* 7.3-4.

(14) WHITEHEAD, 1983, p. 59.

army are well-known,(15) but equally important is the fact that he and his successors, through their creative use of expanded and carefully regulated athletic, musical, dramatic and other Athenian competitions - many of them liturgically funded and based on the Kleisthenic tribal structures - achieved a transformation in cooperative social relations between élite and less-élite members of the community, which made a significant contribution to decreasing the dangers of *stasis* arising both from geographical and status division. Training and competing for these events involved intense collaboration between the rich and the less rich, who were all driven by the competitive desire for collective victory and by *philotimia*.(16)

Philotimia was from the early stages of Athenian democracy on also the driving force behind the success of the liturgical system, which not only extracted necessary revenues from the rich, but also defused - through the redistribution of wealth from the élite to the masses - possible tensions between the different classes; tensions which might otherwise have been caused by the realism of political equality *versus* economic inequality in Athenian society. With this system, which steadily took form in the decades following the Kleisthenic reforms of 508/7 and which may have been based on earlier aristocratic traditions involving honour and competition,(17) the *polis* sought to draw on the wealth of its richest citizens, by redirecting the aristocratic *ethos* of *philotimia* and *philonikia* to serve the needs of the community.(18) After all, liturgies differed from conventional taxes in that they were organized as competitions, thus providing an opportunity to strive for honour - which the compulsorily payment of taxes did not. The system established a relationship between the masses and the élite in which a benefaction from the élite, motivated by *philotimia* and displaying the *arete* of an *aner agathos*, put the city under a debt of *time* and *charis* to them, which could be transformed into public honour and a variety of civic benefits.(19)

Of course, the attractiveness of this ideal had its limits.(20) While public discourse commended *philotimia* in the liturgical sphere, not all men were

(15) For recent discussions, see e.g. ANDERSON, 2003, p. 39-40; OBER, 2008, p. 138-42.

(16) Tribal and choragic victory monuments and poems, honorific decrees, and dedications of tripods attest the tribes' collective pride in victories and their desire to celebrate achievements and to appropriately reward the *philotimia* of their *choregoi* (see e.g. IG I^3 958-977; II^2 138-9, 1147, 3027-3062, 3073-3089, with WILSON, 2000, p. 171-2, 198-244, and 303-5). On victory tripods, see AMANDRY, 1976; Ibid., 1977.

(17) See GABRIELSEN, 1994, p. 19-26; WILSON, 2000, p. 14–17.

(18) On this facet of the liturgical system, see DAVIES, 1981, p. 98–9; SINCLAIR, 1988, p. 188–90; CHRIST, 1990, p. 150; KURKE, 1992, p. 103–6; GABRIELSEN, 1994, p. 48–9.

(19) Cf. OBER, 1989, p. 226-233; ROBERTS, 1986. The precise nature of this debt ànd the terms of its repayment were often subject to contestation and negotiation. See CHRIST, 2006, p. 156-171, for discussion.

(20) See CHRIST, 2006, p. 172-189, for a detailed analysis of the diverse challenges to the ideal of *philotimia* within the liturgical context and of the representations of these challenges in the ancient sources. On the Athenian pursuit of economic and financial interests within social parameters, see CHRISTESEN, 2003, p. 31-34; cf. OSBORNE, 1991, p. 129–32, 135–6; BURKE, 1992; SHIPTON, 1997, p. 411–12; Ibid., 2001; CARTLEDGE, 2002, p. 160–2.

equally drawn to this civic virtue. Even those who were attracted to it are known to have prudently balanced the pursuit of honour with the preservation of personal wealth. Wealthy men naturally weighed costs against rewards and did not always find the latter to counterbalance the former.(21) Athenian literature provides many testimonies by and about citizens from the upper ranges of society being harmfully affected or even almost ruined by the inescapable cost of liturgies and the incidence of *eisphora*-payments.(22) Several of these statements, especially those presented in court, were intended to win the sympathy of the jury and are therefore not trustworthy, but the surviving figures suggest that at least some of them cannot merely be dismissed as grumbling by the Athenian élite. As can be inferred from the evidence, an average festival liturgy cost between 1,200 and 3,000 drachmae, while a sole trierarchy, the most expensive liturgy, had a price-tag from 4,000 to 6,000 drachmae.(23) Weighed against the minimum liturgical census of 3-4 talents, these figures are far from trivial, and might have constituted a major part of a citizen's capital. Presumably only the most wealthy Athenians were capable of meeting extensive public expenditure without breaking into their reserves or running into debt (Is. 6.38; Dem. 28.17-18; 36.41, 47.54; Isokr. 15.108-112; Dion. Hal., *On Isaios* 13).(24) The irregular and unpredictable levying of *eisphora* appears similarly to have implied a financial burden on the upper ranges of Athenian society, as the Athenian élite could apparently be summoned at short notice to pay large sums, as much as 3,000 or 4,000 drachmae (Lys. 19.43, 21.3). Moreover, it occasionally occurred that they were required to pay at the very moment when the equipping of a fleet or the recruitment of the army made further calls on them (e.g. Dem. 50.8-9,13,17). The impact of these liturgies and *eisphorai* can also be inferred from the impressive range of associated references to undervaluing or concealing the ownership of property, and dodging of liturgies, in order to minimize the contribution of their property to the *polis*.(25) Moreover, as noted by Millett, the successive modifications in the organization of the liturgies and *eisphorai*

(21) In an attempt to counter the views of substantivists who propose status as an alternative motivation to profit, COHEN, 1992, p. 199 argues in his study of Athenian banking that wealthy Athenians frequently concealed money in banks to evade their financial obligations to the *polis*. He rejects "the romantic notion that Athenian taxpayers glorified in paying governmental charges and contended in agonistic fervor to advance ever-greater sums". For criticism on this view as going too far in questioning the contemporary significance of *philotimia*, see MILLETT, 1998, p. 246 n. 28; CHRIST, 2006, p. 145.

(22) For lamentations about the inescapable cost of liturgies, see Dem. 47.54, 50.8; Lys. 7.31-32, 19.29, 21.12, 29.4; Isokr. 8.128, 12.145; Xen. Symp. 4.30, *Mem*. 2.1-6. For *eisphora*-payments, see Dem. 24.128, 47.54, 50.8; Lys. 7.31-32, 19.29, 26.22; 28.3; Isokr. 8.128; Xen., *Hell*. 26.2.1, Sym. 4.30, *Mem*. 2.1.6; Theophr. 26.6.

(23) The surviving figures for the costs of various liturgies are set out in DAVIES, 1971, p. xxi-xxii.

(24) MILLETT, 1991, p. 67-71.

(25) DAVIES, 1981, p. 88-90; OBER, 1989, p. 215-216; CHRIST, 2007. For a detailed analysis of the so-called "hidden economy" in classical Athens, see COHEN, 1992, p. 190-215.

might in itself be an indication of dissatisfaction with the way the system spread, or failed to spread, the burdens.(26)

A possible solution for the challenges to the ideal of *philotimia* in the liturgical sphere could had been found in the restoration of the balance between cost and reward: if Athenian society had made an attempt to counterbalance citizen benefactors' costs by granting them more tangible rewards than the vague prospect of *time* and *charis*, namely official Athenian *timai*, the latter might had been even more willing to zealously compete with each other in putting their financial resources to good use on behalf of the *demos*. After all, the symbolic capital which all grants of *timai* entailed provided honorands with important resources which could freely be converted into leveraging advantage within the social sphere (e.g. Dem. 21.62 and 23.130). But this was - when it concerned public benefactions - a path the *polis* did as a rule not choose to follow - at least not in relation to its own citizens (when they were not *in archai*).

IV

Since early times, the Athenian honours system essentially implied a relationship of reciprocity between the honorand and the honouring institution, which was usually the *polis*, but could also be a *phyle*, *deme*, or some other kind of association. Both the epigraphic evidence and the literary sources testify that making generous benefactions or giving some other kind of support was in most cases a *conditio sine qua non* for receiving *timai*, with the magnitude of the benefactions or support being in proportion to the honours offered in return.(27) This reciprocal nature had its origins in a deep-rooted characteristic of Greek culture, namely the principle that gifts entailed the obligation of counter-gifts.(28) Just as gifts incited in the receiver a feeling of indebtedness and dependence, which could only be offset by making counter-gifts, thus benefactions incited *poleis* and associations to compensate their benefactors. And just as having made gifts generated in the givers the expectation of reciprocation, thus benefactors expected - and were entitled to expect - a reward in return.(29)

(26) MILLETT, 1991, p. 68. For the evolution of the liturgies and *eisphorai*, see RHODES, 1982; MACDOWELL, 1986; GABRIELSEN, 1989; Ibid., 1994, p. 173-217; CHRIST, 2007.

(27) For a detailed study of the reciprocal relationship between metic benefactors and the Athenian citizenry, see ADAK, 2003. For collections of fifth- and fourth-century honorary decrees, see HENRY, 1983; VELIGIANNI-TERZI, 1997, p. 14-151; LAMBERT, 2004; Ibid., 2006; Ibid., 2007 (with Ibid., 2012). For an overview of the private dedications recording grants of honours and privileges, see VELIGIANNI-TERZI, 1997, p. 152-162. For the reliefs of *stelai* recording Athenian honorary decrees, see LAWTON, 1995.

(28) For Greek gift-exchange, see FINLEY, 1954; GERNET, 1968; MORRIS, 1976; HUMPHREYS, 1978; HERMAN, 1987, p. 75ff.; MITCHELL, 1997; GILL, POSTLETHWAITE and SEAFORD, 1998; LYONS, 2012. For the occurrence of this principle in other pre-modern societies, see MAUSS, 1923-1924, p. 30-186.

(29) For testimonials of this principle in classical Athens, see Dem. 20.6; 21.171-172; 22.17; 51.7; L. 3.20; cf. Lys. 25.6; Arist. *Rhet*. 2.11.3. The vocabulary used to describe both benefactions and honours points towards even more explicit correlation between

One of the most important consequences of this applied principle of reciprocity was that the Athenian honours system had not only the function of rewarding persons who had rendered services to the Athenian *demos*, but also of stimulating potential benefactors by sending out the message that, if they performed benefactions, their expectations of being rewarded would not be frustrated.(30) Thus in his oration *Against Leptines* (Dem. 20), Demosthenes strongly argues for the continuation of the honours system for citizens and foreigners alike, emphasizing the value of making honorific grants as a means of showing gratitude for support and benefactions received and, more importantly, stimulating others (cf. esp. 20.64).(31)

Despite the fact that the Athenian honours system was a recognized and commonly used means of inciting desired social behaviour, the available evidence suggests that, throughout the fifth and fourth centuries, the *polis* never employed this system in order to incite benefactions from its own citizens. The amount of information we have concerning the grants of *timai* to both citizens and non-citizens is reasonably abundant. Decisions of honour-granting institutions, such as the council or the assembly, to honour individuals for their services towards the state can be traced down in honorary decrees, private dedications established by indebted honorands, and in literary texts. From these sources, it can be determined that expenses made or services provided by citizens in a private capacity towards the *demos* had in the classical period - contrary to the contributions made by non-citizens - never become a reason for being officially honoured by the council or assembly. This is a remarkable finding, which has not received sufficient scholarly attention. Demosthenes informs us about how Nausikles, Diotimos, Charidemos and Neoptolemos were honoured as a reward for their voluntary contributions made from private resources, but most essentially is the fact that these citizens were holding a public office while performing their benefaction (Dem. 18.114, 117). Other citizens had to be content with at one hand the prestige which the quantity or excellence of their benefactions itself brought about, and at the other hand the entitlement to *charis* on the part of the Athenian *demos*, which could be employed in various circumstances. Victorious citizen *choregoi*, for instance, never received honorary decrees from the council or the assembly.(32) They received such official decrees only at the tribal or deme level (cf. below). As a consequence, many Athenians had to turn to self-celebration in order to claim honour and prestige, such as by setting up choregic monuments to celebrate the dithyrambic victories

gift-exchange and Athenian honour system. Cf. Isokr. 18.66; Dem. 20.35; IG II² 212 for examples of the use of δωρεαί for benefactions, and cf. Lys. 21.11; Lys. fr. 1 (*Against Hippotherses* 171-175 (GERNET and BIZOS, 1924-1926); Aesch. 3.236; IG II² 212, for examples of the use of δωρεαί for honours.

(30) In some late instances (e.g. II² 472 (+Add. p. 661) 16-18 (306/5); II² 582.4-6 (late IV)), the award of an honorary decree very explicitly aims at the inciting of further benefactions from the honorand himself, as future benefits are made dependent upon the continued goodwill of the recipient towards Athens. See HENRY, 1983, p. 315-323, for discussion.

(31) For the hortatory intention of honorary decrees in classical Athens, see WHITEHEAD, 1983; HENRY, 1996; SICKINGER, 2009; LURAGHI, 2010; LAMBERT, 2011.

(32) See WILSON, 2000, p. 171, 192, and 198-199, for discussion.

their money had helped to purchase or by boasting about their generous performance of liturgies in the law-courts or the assembly.(33)

Non-citizen benefactors were treated totally differently, so the available evidence indicates. Numerous foreigners are known to have been honoured by the council or assembly in return for financial contributions made towards the *demos* or for the good performance of liturgies.(34) The fact that citizen benefactors never received *timai* as a reward for such benefactions, can easily be accounted for. Although the liturgical system was intended to involve the *demos* and the Athenian citizen élite in a reciprocal relationship in which the former repaid the (often expensive) public services of the latter with tokens of honour, the *demos* was careful to limit the amount of honour conferred on élite citizen benefactors, and on Athenian citizens more generally,(35) and this

(33) Elite litigants regularly emphasized the material benefits they and their ancestors had conferred upon the state, by reciting lengthy and detailed lists of their liturgies (e.g. Is. 5.41-42, 6.60, 7.38-39; Lys. 7.31, 19.58, 21.1-10; Dem. 18.113, 38.26; Antiph. 2.2.12). To be the first to contribute and to have devoted more money than required on liturgies was regularly used as a boast in law-court speeches. Some Athenians even bragged they had gone to the extent of impoverishing themselves and their family. The speaker in Dem. 21 criticizes the behaviour of those citizens who enriched themselves at the *demos'* expense, while he himself has spent nearly all he had on public expenditure (21.189). Similarly, the speaker in Hyp. 1 states how he always has been a keen breeder of horses for the Athenian cavalry, consistently overtaxing his strength and resources (1.16). The defendant in Lys. 21 allegedly did not even care whether he would leave his sons poor through performing public services (21.22; cf. Lys. 7.31-32, 26.22).

(34) During the fifth century, Athenian society had been honouring non-citizens mainly out of diplomatic considerations. Numerous foreigners received honour and privileges, such as *proxenia* and *euergesia*, (juridical) protection, and in rare instances even Athenian citizenship, as a reward for military services, ambassadorial aid, or other (financial) benefactions towards the Athenian *demos*. At a time when Athens wanted to establish a more constant and persistent form of international contact and diplomacy, the Athenian honours system was an effective instrument for bonding with both 'high-level' benefactors, such as kings, satraps or tyrants, and somewhat less prominent individuals who promoted Athenian interests and welfare in their own *polis* or facilitated Athenian relations at a royal or a satrapal court - the honours or privileges awarded customarily being in proportion to the level of their position. While diplomacy continued to be an important motivation for honouring foreigners until well into the fourth century, Athens' most crucial needs changed with the arrival and the end of the Peloponnesian War, which can be seen to have been reverberated in the reasons for honouring non-citizens. For a detailed discussion of the Athenian honours system and the grounds based upon which both citizens and non-citizens were honoured throughout the fifth and fourth centuries, see DEENE, forthcoming.

(35) Until the middle of the fourth century, the Athenian council or assembly had been honouring Athenians only in very extraordinary circumstances, and this for mostly military services. In these exceptional cases, the honorands characteristically received the highest honours, the so-called *megistai timai*, typically including a bronze statue and/or sitesis in the prytaneion. From literary sources, we know that during this period some of these honours were granted to the illustrious strategoi Kleon of Kydathenaion in 425/4 (Arist., *Knights* 167 f., 281 ff., (with Schol.), 575 ff., 709, 766 (with Schol.), 1404) (*sitesis*), Chabrias (376/5) (Dem. 20.75-86; Aischin. 3.243) (statue), to Konon (393) for defeating the Spartans and rebuilding the Long Walls (Dem. 20.70; Schol. Dem. 21.62) (statue), Timotheos (375) (Dem. 20.84; Aischin. 3.243) (statue), and Iphikrates of Rhamnous (371/370) (Dem. 23.130, 136; Schol. Dem. 21.62; [Lys.] fr.7 (Budé)) (statue + *sitesis*). This situation of rarely honouring citizens did not really change until the 440s, when Athens

out of fear of disrupting the egalitarian *ethos* of Athenian democracy. Such a fear, however, was unnecessary when it concerned non-citizens, who were not allowed to participate in Athenian political affairs in the first place. This enabled Athenian society to use the prospect of receiving *timai* to induce support and benefactions from potential non-citizen benefactors without any worries, and put non-citizens in a privileged position to acquire - in return for the right sort of benefaction or support at the right moment in time - precisely the sort of honour which most of their citizen counterparts would never experience.

V

Of course, the supposition that citizen benefactors were, compared to their non-citizen counterparts, clearly discriminated against when it came to being potential candidates for receiving *timai* from the assembly and/or the council, is crucial for any study of the scope of gaining honour and status in classical Athens. Nevertheless, it provides us with only one part of the picture. After all, the Athenian *polis* as a whole was certainly not the only *koinonia* which functioned as a venue of competition for official *timai*. Athenian society was made up of countless communities of honour having their own honours system, some of which are better attested than others. The Athenian honours system in reality consisted of several honour-granting institutions working at the various levels of society. The *boule* and the *ekklesia* were the most important honouring institutions, known to have granted honours and privileges since the end of the sixth century,(36) but *timai* are also known to have been granted at sub-*polis* level - that is at the level of the *phylai*, *demes*, and other associations - from the late fifth century onwards (cf. Table 1).(37)

These communities of honour, both public and private associations, made use of the same range of *timai* that were awarded at *polis* level and appear also to have employed - though not slavishly - the same language used in the honorary decrees moved by the *polis*. Yet, the available evidence indicates that there existed a few major differences between the honorific practice at *polis* level and at sub-*polis* level. One of the most remarkable differences is the fact that, at sub-polis level, wealthy citizens are known to have been honoured for contributions made in a private capacity as early as the end of the fifth century onwards; and this despite the assembly and/or council insisting throughout both the fifth and fourth centuries in not doing so. Thus in 403/2 B.C.E. the *phyle* of Pandionis passed a decree commending the *andragathia* of a certain Nikias, son of Epigenes of Kydathenaion, and

started to regularly pass honorary decrees in favour of public officials. Until then, the Athenians had not found it acceptable to promote on a structural basis one Athenian above another by awarding him with formal honours. Cf. Ibid., for further discussion.

(36) Cf. IG I³ 1357.

(37) The only honorary decree passed in the fifth century at sub-*polis* level is to my knowledge IG II² 1138 (ca. 403-402), passed by the *phyle* Pandionis in favour of Nikias, son of Epigenes of Kydathenaia.

organizing for him to be crowned (IG II² 1138.6-7) and an honorary decree to be set up in the tribe's sanctuary on the Akropolis (7-9; cf. 1139.6-7), and this in return for having been a zealous chorus sponsor for two tribal teams in the same year and for having won at the Dionysia and the Thargelia (1-6). In later years, tribes also gave their victorious chorus sponsors honours of a less purely symbolic character, such as exemption (*ateleia*) from the liturgies of the *enkukioi* (or annual liturgies) for two years, as can, amongst honours as commendation and the award of a crown, be found in a decree from around the middle of the fourth century, passed by the phyle of Erechtheis to Saurias, son of Pythogenes of Lamptrai, for his victorious *choregia* at the Erechtheia and his other successful liturgies (II² 1147.9-11).(38) Along similar lines, demes are known to have passed honorary decrees to citizen benefactors. Thus in an honorary decree passed by the deme Ikarion before the middle of the fourth century, two *choregoi* are honoured by means of commendation and a crown for their performance at the festival of Dionysos (II² 1178). The same honours are known to have been awarded to a certain Philoxenos, son of Phrasikles, by the deme Halai Araphenides, for his provisions as a *choregos* for the Pyrrichechoir and several other liturgies performed in Halai (SEG 34.103.8-12). In addition, he received the right of proedria at the festival of Halai (21-25), and provisions were made for him to make a sacrifice at the deme's expense (13-14). The same way, [Charikles Arreneid?]os and Arreneid[es Charikleies?] were honoured around 350-325 by their phratry as a reward for their donation of money towards the construction of the Temple of Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria (SEG 3.121 + 39.150).

The practice of honouring citizens for their private contributions appears to have been imitated by private associations. At least, this is what two honorary decrees from the second half of the fourth century suggest. These decrees, II² 1252 and II² 1253, were passed by the *orgeones* of Dexion and the *orgeones* of Amynos and Asklepios, each in favour of two fellow *orgeones*members, and this in return for their benefactions. In the first decree, Kalliades and Kysimachides, sons of Philinos of Piraeus, are honoured by means of commendation, *ateleia tou chou* in the two sanctuaries, provisions being made for a sacrifice and a dedication at the association's expense, and an inscribed *stele* in the two sanctuaries. The second decree teaches us that the two honorands were to be commended and to receive a gold crown as a reward for their services.

It is difficult to assess why associations at sub-*polis* level did - at least from a certain point in time on - not have any difficulties with rewarding their citizen benefactors for their contributions and support in their private capacity. It is possible that smaller communities were - or sooner became - more dependent on the benefactions of individuals than larger ones such as the *polis*.(39) This way, they might have been enforced to secure the benefactions of their most wealthy and powerful members by any means available, thus being obliged to embrace a less aggressively egalitarian *ethos* than the one

(38) See also IG II² 1153 (mid-IV) and 1157 (326/5). For tribal honours and honorands in general, see JONES, 1995, p. 531-537.

(39) For the role of wealth in the Athenian demes, see DAVIERO-ROCCHI, 1978; OSBORNE, 1985, p. 88-91; WHITEHEAD, 1986, p. 234-52; Ibid., 1983.

which was still dominating at the level of the *polis*. A second possibility is that, by honouring wealthy *choregoi* and liturgists, associations such as *phylai*, demes, and phratries sought the favour of men influential within the city, who would in the future be able to protect or defend the *phyle*'s, deme's or phratry's interest at the level of the *polis*. That this was of importance to such associations can be inferred from the fact that men are known to have explicitly been honoured for defending their interests at the level of the polis. Thus around the middle of the fourth century, a certain Eugeiton, son of Eukles of Phaleron, received commendation and a gold crown for successfully representing his phratry in court (II² 1238).(40) In addition, the important political figure Xenokles, son of Xeinides of Sphettos,(41) received ca. 334-330 commendation, a crown and the privileges of *prosodos* to the Kerykes (SEG 19.119). At that time, Xenokles had succeeded Lykourgos as financial manager of the *polis*, in which position he had enabled the *genos* of Kerykes to make a sacrifice by means of public funds.

The extent to which the honours awarded by associations at sub-*polis* level were able to compensate the unprivileged position of citizen benefactors within the Athenian honours system at *polis* level is difficult to estimate. In the speech *Against Ktesiphon*, written around 330 BC, Aischines mentions a *polis* decree prohibiting *phylai* and demes from announcing their awards of crowns in the city theatre (Aischin. 3.41-45). According to him, this decree had been passed because *phylai* and demes were thought to engage in unfair competition with the *polis* by showering their honorands with honours that were greater than the ones received by those who were crowned by the people (i.e. the *polis*). After all, thus Aischines, while the awards of crowns by the *polis* were only to be announced in the council or the assembly, with only a restricted audience attending, crowns awarded by *phylai* or demes were proclaimed in city theatre, and thus to be heard by all the Greeks (ἁπάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων, 3.43). Of course, it cannot be ruled out that *timai* received at sub-*polis* level did not convey precisely the same amount of prestige which *timai* rewarded by the council and/or assembly conveyed. Yet, the fact that Aischines portrays the crowns awarded by *phylai* or demes as being able to compete in prestige with crowns awarded by the *polis*, indicates that *timai* granted at sub-*polis* level were not at all regarded as some kind of inferior derivatives of the honours awarded at the level of the *polis*, but that they were held in great esteem.

In conclusion, it can therefore be suggested that, although - or perhaps precisely because - citizen benefactors did not have any prospect of formal recognition by the *polis* (unless their benefactions were made *in archai*), public and private associations at sub-*polis* level were significant venues of competition for prestige, which might for wealthy citizens have functioned as important alternative routes for obtaining honour and status.

(40) See LAMBERT, 1993, p. 335-337, for more information on this honorary decree.

(41) Xenokles was gymnasiarch in 346/5 (IG II² 3019), trierarch in 335/4 (IG II² 1623, line 298), *epimeletes* of the Eleusinian Mysteries in 321/20 (IG II² 1191, SEG 29:132, IG II² 2840, 2841), *agonothetes* in 307/6 (IG II² 3073, 3077, SEG 26:222), and a member of a special commission in 306/5 (IG II² 1492, SEG 32:159, line 100). Cf. DAVIES, 1971, p. 414-415.

Table 1: *Timai* awarded at sub-*polis* level, ordered according to the type of honour-granting institution(42)

HONOUR-GRANTING INSTITUTION	SOURCE	DATE
Phyle		
decision by phyle Pandionis	IG II² 1138 (=1139)	ca. 403-2
decision by a phyle	Agora 15.5.2-8	early IV
decision by phyle Kekropis	IG II² 1143	early IV
decision by phyle Pandionis	IG II² 1140	386/5
decision by phyle Kekropis	IG II² 1141	376/5
decision by phyle Leontis	IG II² 2818	357/6
decision by phyle Kekropis?	IG II² 1145	ca. 353/2
decision by phyle Hippothontis	IG II² 1149	before mid-IV
decision by phyle Pandionis	IG II² 1148	before mid-IV
(decision by a phyle)?	Lawton 186	before mid-IV
decision by phyle Aiantis	IG II² 1151	mid-IV
decision by phyle Erechtheis	IG II² 1147	mid-IV
decision by phyle Hippothontis	IG II² 1153	mid-IV
decision by phyle Aiantis	IG II² 1150	ca. mid-IV
decision by phyle Kekropis?	IG II² 1158	after mid-IV
decision by phyle Antiochis ?	Lawton 145	350-325
decision by phyle kekropis ?	Lawton 138	350-325
decison by a phyle ?	Lawton 148	350-300
decision by a phyle ?	Lawton 173	350-300
decision by phyle Aiantis ?	Lawton 120	346/345 ?
decision by phyle Aiantis	IG II² 1155 II	339/8
decision by phyle Kekropis	IG II² 1156 I	334/3 or 333/2
decision by phyle Akamantis	SEG 23.78 II	ca. 334/3
decision by phyle Leontis	Hesp. 9.59.8	333/2 or 332/1
decision by phyle Kekropis?	SEG 36.155	ca. 332/1
decision by phyle Aiantis	Hesp. 7.94.15	327/6
decision by phyle Pandionis	IG II² 1157	326/5
decision by a phyle	Hesp. 15.189.35	325 ca.
decision by a phyle	Agora 15.53	324/3
decision by a phyle ?	IG II² 2842	321/0 or 318/7
deme		
decision by deme Ikarion	IG II² 1178	before mid-IV
decision by a deme (Acharnia?)	IG II² 1173	before mid-IV
decision by deme Eleusis	IG II² 1188	mid-IV
decision by deme Eleusis	IG II² 1186	mid-IV

(42) With only two exceptions (IG II² 1186; SEG 41.107), all of these grants of *timai* involve merely citizen honorands.

HONOUR-GRANTING INSTITUTION	SOURCE	DATE
decision by deme Ikarion	IG II² 1179	mid-IV
decision by deme Myrrhinous	IG II² 1182	mid-IV
decision by deme Teithras	SEG 24.153	mid-IV
decision by deme Teithras	SEG 24.151	mid-IV
decision by deme Halai Araphenides	SEG 34.103	350-300
decision by deme Kephisia	SEG 32.147 + 36.188	350-300
decision by a deme	IG II² 1208	350-300
decision by a deme ? (Aixone?)	Lawton 176	350-300
(decision by the deme Eleusis) ?	IG II² 1190	350-300
decision by deme Acharnai ?	Lawton 125	350-325
decision by deme Eleusis	IG II² 1187	350-325
decision by deme Eleusis	IG II² 1156 III	334/3 or 333/2
decision by deme Athmonon	IG II² 1156 IV	334/3 or 333/2
decision by deme Eleusis	IG II² 1189	334/3 or 333/2
decision by deme Eitea	SEG 28.102	332/1
decision by deme Eleusis	SEG 28.103 I	332/1
decision by deme Melite	SEG 21.520	331/0 or 330/9
decision by demes Kydantidai and Ionidai	SEG 39.148	331/0
decision by deme Halimous	SEG 2.7	ca. 330-325
decision by deme Aixone	IG II² 1197 (+ Add. p. 672)	ca. 330
decision by deme Ikarion	SEG 22.117	ca. 330
decision by deme Melite	SEG 22.116	ca. 330
decision by deme Aixone	IG II² 1198	326/5
decision by deme Eleusis	IG II² 1193	325-300
decision by deme Athmonon	IG II² 1203	325/4
decision by deme Piraeus	IG II² 1176	324/3
decision by deme Acharnai ?	Lawton 147	323/2 ?
decision by deme Aixone	SEG 36.186	313/2
decision by deme Aixone	Lawton 155	313/2
phratry		
decison by a phratry	IG II² 1238	mid-IV
decision by a phratry	SEG 3.121 + 39.150	ca. 350-325
genos		
decision by genos Krokonidai	IG II² 1229	ca. 350-300
decision by genos Kerykes	SEG 19.119	ca. 334-330
prytaneis		
decision by the prytaneis of Pandionis	IG II² 1748	348/7
decision by the prytaneis of Aigeis	IG II² 1749	341/0
association of office holders		
decision by an association of office holders	IG II² 1251	after mid-IV
decision by the *sullogeis tou demou*	IG II² 1257	324/3

HONOUR-GRANTING INSTITUTION	SOURCE	DATE
association within a military context		
from the soldiers stationed in Rhamnous	SEG 38.175	IV?
from the soldiers stationed in Eleusis	IG II² 2973	IV/III
from the soldiers stationed in Rhamnous	SEG 41.148	ca. 350
from the soldiers stationed in Rhamnous	SEG 37.146	350-300
from the soldiers stationed in Rhamnous	SEG 41.149	340/9?
from the soldiers stationed in Rhamnous	SEG 41.150	338/7
from the ephebai of Akamantis?	SEG 21.681	334/3, 333/2, 332/1 or later
from the ephebai of Pandionis and their sophronistes	IG II² 2976	333/2 or332/1
from the ephebai of Kekropis and their sophronistes	SEG 41.107	333/2 or 332/1
decision by [lochagoi]	Hesp. 9.59.8	333/2 or 332/1
decision by the hippeis of Antiochis	SEG 3.115	ca. 330
decision by the elder Epilektoi	SEG 3.116	ca. 330
from the soldiers stationed in Rhamnous	IG II² 2968	ca. 323
other associations		
decision by an association or club	SEG 32.72 I and II	ca. 350
decision by the orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion	IG II² 1253	after mid-IV
decision by the orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion	IG II² 1252 + 999	after mid-IV
decision by Paraloi?	IG II² 1254	after mid-IV
decision by Paraloi	SEG 21.778	350-300
decision by the orgeones of Bendis	IG II² 1255	337/6
decision by the orgeones of Bendis	IG II² 1256	329/8
decision by the association of the Eikadeis	IG II² 1258	324/3

Bibliography

- ADAK, 2003 = M. ADAK, *Metöken als Wohltäter Athens: Untersuchungen zum Sozialen Austausch zwischen Ortsansässigen Fremden und der Burgergemeinde in Klassischer und Hellenistischer Zeit, ca. 500-150 v. Chr.*, Munich, 2003.
- AMANDRY, 1976 = P. AMANDRY, *Trépieds D'Athènes I: Dionysies* in *BCH*, 100, 1976, p. 15-93.
- AMANDRY, 1977 = P. AMANDRY, *Trépieds d'Athènes II: Thargélies* in *BCH*, 101, 1977, p. 165-202.
- ANDERSON, 2003 = G. ANDERSON, *The Athenian Experiment: Building an Imagined Political Community in Ancient Attica, 508-490 B.C.*, Ann Arbor, 2003.
- BURKE, 1992 = E.M. BURKE, *The Economy of Athens in the Classical Era: Some Adjustments to the Primitivist Model* in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 122, 1992, p. 199-226.
- CARTLEDGE, 2002 = P. CARTLEDGE, *The Political Economy of Greek Slavery* in P. CARTLEDGE, E.E. COHEN, and L. FOXHALL (eds.), *Money, Labour and Land: Approaches to the Economies of Ancient Greece*, London-New York, 2002, p. 156-166.

- CHRIST, 1990 = M.R. CHRIST, *Liturgy Avoidance and Antidosis in Classical Athens* in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 120, 1990, p. 147-169.
- CHRIST, 2006 = M.R. CHRIST, *The Bad Citizen in Classical Athens,* Cambridge, 2006.
- CHRIST, 2007 = M.R. CHRIST, *The Evolution of the Eisphora in Classical Athens* in *Classical Quarterly*, 57 (1), 2007, p. 53-69.
- CHRISTESEN, 2003 = P. CHRISTESEN, *Economic Rationalism in Fourth-Century BCE Athens* in *Greece & Rome*, 50 (1), 2003, p. 31-56.
- COHEN, 1992 = E.E. COHEN, *Athenian Economy and Society: A Banking Perspective*, Princeton, 1992.
- DAVIERO-ROCCHI, 1978 = G. DAVIERO-ROCCHI, *Transformations de rôle dans les institutions d'Athènes au IVe Siècle par rapport aux changements dans la société* in *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne*, 4, 1978, p. 33-50.
- DAVIES, 1971 = J.K. DAVIES, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford, 1971.
- DAVIES, 1981 = J.K. DAVIES, *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*, New York, 1981.
- DEENE, forthcoming = M. DEENE, *Aspects of Social Mobility in Classical Athens*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ghent University, forthcoming.
- DOVER, 1974 = K.J. DOVER, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford, 1974.
- ENGEN, 2010 = D.T. ENGEN, *Honor and Profit: Athenian Trade Policy and the Economy and Society of Greece, 415-307 B.C.E.*, Ann Arbor, 2010.
- FERGUSON, 1989 = J. FERGUSON, *Morals and Values in Ancient Greece*, London, 1989.
- FINLEY, 1954 = M.I. FINLEY, *The World of Odysseus*, New York, 1954.
- GABRIELSEN, 1989 = V. GABRIELSEN, *The Number of Athenian Trierarchs after Ca. 340* in *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 40, 1989, p. 145-159.
- GABRIELSEN, 1994 = V. GABRIELSEN, *Financing the Athenian Fleet: Public Taxation and Social Relations*, Baltimore, 1994.
- GERNET, 1968 = L. GERNET, *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique*, Paris, 1968.
- GERNET and BIZOS, 1924-1926 = L. GERNET and M. BIZOS, *Lysias: Discours*, Paris, 1924-1926.
- GILL *et al.*, 1998 = C. GILL, N. POSTLETHWAITE and R. SEAFORD, *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 1998.
- HENRY, 1983 = A.S. HENRY, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees: The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees*, Hildesheim-New York, 1983.
- HENRY, 1996 = A.S. HENRY, *The Hortatory Intention of Athenian State Decrees* in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 112, 1996, p. 105-117
- HERMAN, 1987 = G. HERMAN, *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*, Cambridge, 1987.
- HERMAN, 2006 = G. HERMAN, *Morality and Behavior in Democratic Athens : A Social History*, Cambridge, 2006.
- HERZFELD, 1980 = M. HERZFELD, *Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems* in *Man*, 15, 1980, p. 339-351.
- HUMPHREYS, 1978 = S.C. HUMPHREYS, *Anthropology and the Greeks*, London, 1978.
- JONES, 1995 = N.F. JONES, *The Athenian Phylai as Associations: Disposition, Function, and Purpose* in *Hesperia*, 64 (4), 1995, p. 503-542.
- KURKE, 1992 = L. JONES, *The Politics of* Αβροσύνη in Archaic Greece in *Classical Antiquity*, 11, 1992, p. 91-120.
- LAMBERT, 1993 = S.D. LAMBERT, *The Phratries of Attica*, Ann Arbor, 1993.

- LAMBERT, 2004 = S.D. LAMBERT, *Athenian State Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1: I. Decrees Honouring Athenians* in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 150, 2004, p. 85-120.
- LAMBERT, 2006 = S.D. LAMBERT, *Athenian State Laws and Decrees, 352/1-322/1: III. Decrees Honouring Foreigners. A. Citizenship, Proxeny and Euergesy* in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 158, 2006, p. 115-158.
- LAMBERT, 2007 = S.D. LAMBERT, *Athenian State Laws and Decrees, 352/1–322/1: III. Decrees Honouring Foreigners. B. Other Awards* in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 159, 2007, p. 101-154.
- LAMBERT, 2011 = S.D. LAMBERT, *What Was the Point of Inscribed Honorific Decrees in Classical Athens* in S.D. LAMBERT (ed.), *Sociable Man. Essays on Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of Nick Fisher*, Swansea, 2011, p. 193-214.
- LAMBERT, 2012 = S.D. LAMBERT, *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1 BC*, Leiden, 2012.
- LAWTON, 1995 = C.L. LAWTON, *Attic Document Reliefs: Art and Politics in Ancient Athens*, Oxford, 1995.
- LLOYD-JONES, 1990 = H. LLOYD-JONES, *Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Culture* in H. LLOYD-JONES (ed.), *Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion, and Miscellanea: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*, Oxford, 1990, p. 253-280.
- LURAGHI, 2010 = N. LURAGHI, *The Demos as Narrator: Public Honours and the Construction of Future and Past* in H.-J. GEHRKE, N. LURAGHI, and L. FOXHALL (eds.), *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, Stuttgart, 2010, p. 247-264.
- LYONS, 2012 = D.J. LYONS, *Dangerous Gifts: Gender and Exchange in Ancient Greece*, Austin, TX, 2012.
- MACDOWELL, 1986 = D.M. MACDOWELL, *The Law of Periandros about Symmories* in *Classical Quarterly*, 36, 1986, p. 438-449.
- MAUSS, 1923-1924 = M. MAUSS, *Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques* in *Année Sociologique,* 2e série, 1, 1923-1924, p. 30-186.
- MILLETT, 1991 = P. MILLETT, *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens,* Cambridge, 1991.
- MILLETT, 1998 = P. MILLETT, *The Rhetoric of Reciprocity in Classical Athens* in C. GILL, N. POSTLETHWAITE and R. SEAFORD (eds.), *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 1998, p. 227-253.
- MITCHELL, 1997 = L.G. MITCHELL, *Greeks Bearing Gifts: The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World, 435-323 BC*, Cambridge, 1997.
- MORRIS, 1976 = I. MORRIS, *Gift and Commodity in Archaic Greece* in *Man*, 21, 1976, p. 1-17.
- OBER, 1989 = J. OBER, *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*, Princeton, 1989.
- OBER, 1993 = J. OBER, *The Polis as a Society. Aristotle, John Rawls and the Athenian Social Contract*, in M.H. HANSEN (ed.), *The Ancient Greek City-State : Symposium on the Occasion of the 250th Anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, July 1-4 1992,* Copenhagen, 1993, p. 129-160.
- OBER, 2008 = J. OBER, *Democracy and Knowledge. Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens*, Princeton, 2008.
- OSBORNE, 1985 = R. OSBORNE, *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika*, Cambridge, 1985.
- OSBORNE, 1991 = R. OSBORNE, *Pride and Prejudice, Sense and Subsistence: Exchange and Society in the Greek City*, in J. RICH and A. WALLACE-HADRILL (eds.), *City and Country in the Ancient World*, London, 1991, p. 119-145.

- RHODES, 1982 = P.J. RHODES, *Problems in Athenian Eisphora and Liturgies* in *American Journal of Ancient History*, 7, 1982, p. 1-19.
- ROBERTS, 1986 = J.T. ROBERTS, *Aristocratic Democracy: The Perseverance of Timocratic Principles in Athenian Government* in *Athenaeum*, 64, 1986, p. 355-369.
- SHIPTON, 1997 = K.M.W. SHIPTON, *The Private Banks in Fourth-Century B.C. Athens: A Reappraisal* in *Classical Quarterly,* 47 (2), 1997, p. 396-422.
- SHIPTON, 2001 = K.M.W. SHIPTON, *Money and the Élite in Classical Athens*, in A. MEADOWS and K.M.W. SHIPTON (eds.), *Money and its Uses in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford, 2001, p. 129-144.
- SICKINGER, 2009 = J.P. SICKINGER, *Nothing to Do with Democracy: "Formulae of Disclosure" And the Athenian Epigraphical Habit* in L.G. MITCHELL and L. RUBINSTEIN (eds.), *Greek History and Epigraphy: Essays in Honour of P.J. Rhodes*, Swansea, 2009, p. 87-102.
- SINCLAIR, 1988 = R.K. SINCLAIR, *Democracy and Participation in Athens,* Cambridge -New York, 1988.
- STEWART, 1994 = F.H. SINCLAIR, *Honor*, Chicago-London, 1994.
- VAN WEES, 2011 = H. VAN WEES, *Rivalry in History; an Introduction*, in N. FISHER and H. VAN WEES (eds.), *Competition in the Ancient World*, Swansea, 2011, p. 1-36.
- VELIGIANNI-TERZI, 1997 = C. VELIGIANNI-TERZI, *Wertbegriffe in den Attischen Ehrendekreten der Klassischen Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1997.
- WHITEHEAD, 1983 = D. WHITEHEAD, *Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: Φιλοτιμία in Democratic Athens* in *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 34, 1983, p. 55-74.
- WHITEHEAD, 1986 = D. WHITEHEAD, *The Demes of Attica, 508/7-Ca. 250 B.C : A Political and Social Study*, Princeton, 1986.
- WILSON, 2000 = P. WILSON, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage*, Cambridge, 2000.

ABSTRACT

Although the concept of *philotimia* was thought to be not totally unproblematic in ancient Greece and in Athenian society more specifically, the Athenian *polis* exploited the power of *philotimia* in its own interests, and this from the early beginnings of Athenian democracy onwards. Nevertheless, this exploitation had its limitations when Athenian citizens were concerned. The available evidence concerning the Athenian honours system, which can be considered as one of the most remarkable and most effective examples of the Athenian exploitation of the power of *philotimia*, indicates a serious reluctance on the part of the demos to honour Athenian benefactors officially. Public and private associations at sub-*polis* level, which unlike the *polis* did officially honour citizen benefactors, might for wealthy citizens have functioned as alternative routes for obtaining honour and status.