PAUL'S ENDANGERED BENEFACTOR: GALATIANS IN ITS BENEFACTION CONTEXT

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

David Michael Wyman

December 2022

APPROVAL SHEET

PAUL'S ENDANGERED BENEFACTOR: GALATIANS IN ITS BENEFACTION CONTEXT

David Michael Wyman

Read and Approved by:

_____
Jarvis J. Williams (Chair)

_____
Thomas R. Schreiner

_____
Jonathan T. Pennington

Date_____

For Emma and Frederick

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	The Anchor Bible
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review*
ACNT	Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament
AGRW	Ascough, Richard S., Philip A. Harland, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *Associations in the Greco-Roman World: A Sourcebook*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012
AIO	*Attic Inscription Online*, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/
A.J.	*Antiquitates judaicae*
Ant. rom.	*Antiquitates romanae*
Austin^2	Austin, Michel. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006
BAR	British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BD^2	Bagnall, Roger S., and Peter Derow, eds. *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Danker. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
Ben.	*On Benefits*
BGU	*Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen* (later *Staatlichen*) *Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden.* Berlin, 1895–2005
BibAn	*The Biblical Annals*
Bib. hist.	*Bibliotheca historica*
B.J.	*Bellum judaicum*

Braund	Braund, David C. *Augustus to Nero: A Sourcebook to Roman History, 31 BC–AD 68*. New York: Routledge, 1985
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
Burstein	Burstein, Stanley M., ed. and trans. *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsos to the Death of Cleopatra VII*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985
CGRN	Carbon, Jan-Mathieu, Saskia Peels, and Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge, eds. *A Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (CGRN)*. Liège, Belgium, 2016–. http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be
Choix ID	Durrbach, Félix, ed. *Choix D'Inscriptions de Délos*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1976
CID 4	Lefèvre, François, Didier Laroche, and Olivier Masson, eds. *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes. Tome IV, Documents amphictioniques.* Paris: École française d'Athènes, 2002
CIG	Boeckh, August, Johannes Franz, Ernst Curtius, and Adolf Kirchoff, eds. *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Berlin, 1828–1877. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1977
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin, 1863–
Comp.	*De Compositione verborum*, Dionysios of Halikarnassos
Danker	Danker, Frederick W. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*. St. Louis: Clayton, 1982
DFHG	Berti, Monica. *Digital Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Leipzig: University of Leipzig. https://www.dfhg-project.org/
DGE	Adrados, Francisco R., and Juan Rodríguez Somolinos, eds. *Diccionario Griego Español.* http://dge.cchs.csic.es/xdge/
Diod. Sic.	Diodoros of Sicily
Disc.	*Discourses*
Ep.	*Epistulae morales*
Epitome	*Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*
FD III	Bourget, Émile, Gaston Colin, Georges Daux, Théophile Homolle, and André Plassart, eds. *Fouilles de Delphes*. Vol. 3, *Épigraphie*. Paris: École Française d'Athènes, 1909–1976
FGrH	Jakoby, Felix, ed. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. 15 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923–1962

GEI035	Fanucchi, Stefano. *Greek Economic Inscriptions 035: Kyparissia. Regulations on Pentecoste Collection*. https://geionline.sns.it/search/document/GEI035
Hands	Hands, A. R. *Charities and Social in Greece and Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1968
Harding	Harding, Philip, ed. and trans. *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985
Hist.	*Histories*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
I.Aph2007	Reynolds, Joyce, Charlotte Roueché, and Gabriel Bodard, eds. *Inscriptions of Aphrodisias*. https://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/insaph/
IC	Guarducci, Margarita, ed. *Inscriptiones Creticae*. Rome: National Institute of Archaeology and History of Art, 1935–1950
ID	Durrbach, Félix, Pierre Roussel, and Marcel Launey, eds. *Inscriptions de Délos*. Paris: Champion, 1926–1972
I.Eleus	Clinton, Kevin, ed. *Eleusis*. *The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme*. Athens: Athens Archaeological Society, 2008
I.Eph	*Die Inschriften von Ephesos*. Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1979–1984
I.Erythr	Engelmann, Helmut, and Reinhold Merkelbach, eds. *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*. Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1972–1973
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae*. Berlin: 1873–
IGBulg I^2	Mihailov, Georgi, ed. *Inscriptiones graecae in Bulgaria repertae*. Vol. 1, *Inscriptiones orae Ponti Euxini*. 2nd ed. Sofia, Bulgaria: Institutum Archaeologicum, 1970
IGLSyria 3.1	Jalabert, Louis, and René Mouterde, eds. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*. Vol. 3.1, *Région de l'Amanus, Antioche, Nos. 699–988*. Paris: Geuthner, 1950
IGRR	Cagnat, René, Jules Toutain, Pierre Jonguet, and George Lafaye, eds. *Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes*. 3 vols. Paris: Leroux, 1906–1927
I.GCyr	Dobias-Lalou, Catherin. *Inscriptions of Greek Cyrenaica*. Bologna: CRR-MM, Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna, 2017. http://doi.org/10.6092/UNIBO/IGCYRGVCYR

I.Iasos	Blümel, Walter, ed. *Die Inschriften von Iasos*. Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1985
I.Keramos	Varinlioglu, Ender, ed. *Die Inschriften von Keramos*. Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1986
I.Knidos	Blümel, Wolfgang, ed. *Die Inschriften von Knidos*. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1992–2010
I.Kyme	Engelmann, Helmut, ed. *Die Inschriften von Kyme*. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1976
I.Labraunda	Crampa, Jonas. *Swedish Excavations and Researches*, vol. III, part 1, *The Greek Inscriptions, Part I:1–12 (Period of Olympichus)*. Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1969
I.Milet I 3	Rehm, Albert, ed. *Milet: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899*. Vol. 1.3, *Das Delphinion in Milet*. Berlin: Reimer, 1914
I.Myl.	Blümel, Wolfgang, ed. *Die Inschriften von Mylasa*. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1987
IOSPE I^2	Latyschen, Vasilii, ed. *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae*. Vol. 1, *Inscriptiones Tyriae, Olbiae, Chersonesi Tauricae*. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg: 1916
I.Perge	Sahlin, Sencer. *Die Inschriften von Perge*. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1999–2004
I.Priene	Hiller von Gärtringen, Friedrich. *Inschriften von Priene*. Berlin: Reimer, 1906
I.RCyr2020	Reynolds, Joyce, Charlotte Roueché, and Gabriel Bodard, eds. *Inscriptions of Roman Cyrenaica 2020*. Society for Libyan Studies, 2020. https://ircyr2020.inslib.kcl.ac.uk/en/
I.Rhamnous	Vasileios, Petrakos, ed. *Ho demos tou Ramnountos. Synopsē tōn anaskophōn kai tōn ereunōn (1813–1998)*. Vol. 2, *Hoi epigraphes*. Athens: The Archaeological Society of Athens, 1999
I.ScM I	Pippidi, Dionisie, M, ed. *Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae*. Vol. 1, *Inscriptiones Histriae et vicinia*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1983
I.ScM II	Stoian, Iorgu, ed. *Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae*. Vol. 2, *Tomis et territorium*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1987
I.Stratonikeia	Sahin, Mehmet, ed. *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia*. Vols. 1–3. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1981–2010

IVP	InterVarsity Press
IvP	Fränkel, Max. *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*. Vols. 1–2. Berlin: W. Spemann, 1890–1895
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JGRChJ	*Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*
JJMJS	*Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JTS	*The Journal of Theological Studies*
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996
Ma	Ma, John. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999
MAAR	*Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*
MAMA 8	Calder, William, and James Maxwell Ross Cormack. *Monuments from Lycaonia, the Pisido-Phrygian Borderland, Aphrodisias*. Vol. 8 in *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* (*MAMA*). Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1962
NA28	Aland, Barbara, and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster/Westphalia, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012
NewDocs 9	Llewelyn, S. R., ed. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 9, *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1986–87*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002
NewDocs 10	Llewelyn, S. R., and J. R. Harrison, eds. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 10, *A Review of the Greek and Other Published Inscriptions and Papyri Published between 1988 and 1992*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NTL	New Testament Library
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OGIS	Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae: supplementum Sylloges inscriptionum graecarum*. 1903–1905. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag AG, 1960

PCNT	Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament
PH	Packard Humanities
PHI	PHI Greek Documentary Texts. CD ROM #7. Software Database. Los Altos, CA: Packard Humanities Institute, 1991–1996. https://epigraphy.packhum.org.
PI	Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte. Edited by P. M. S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte. Rev. 4th ed. West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009
P.Münch. 3	Hagedorn, Ursula, Dieter Hagedorn, Robert Hübner, and John C. Shelton, eds. *Die Papyri der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*.Vol. 3, *Griechische Urkundenpapyri der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*, Part I. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1986
Polyb.	Polybios
PSI 10	*Papiri greci e latini*. Vol. 10. Florence: Italian Society for the Study of Greek and Latin Papyri in Egypt, 1932
P.Tebt. 2	Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. *The Tebtunis Papyri*. Vol. 2. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1907
P.Yadin	Lewis, Naphtali, ed. *The Documents from the Bar Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989
RC	Welles, C. Bradford. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1934
RDGE	Sherk, Robert K. *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969
Reynolds	Reynolds, Joyce. *Aphrodisias and Rome*. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1982
RGDA	*Res Gestae Divi Augusti*
Rom. Hist.	*Roman History*
RPC I	Burnett, Andrew, Michel Amandry, and Pere Pau Ripollès, eds. *Roman Provincial Coinage*. Vol. 1, *From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 BC–AD 69)*. London: The British Museum, 1992
RPC IV.3	*Roman Provincial Coinage*. Vol. 4.3, *The Antonine Period (AD 138–192): Lycia-Pamphilia to Arabia*. *RPC Online*. https://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/

SB	Priesigke, Friedrich, Friedrich Bilabel, Emil Kiessling, Hans-Albert Rupprecht, eds. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten*. Vols. 1–21. Heidelberg: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1915–2001
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. 66 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1923–
Sherk [1984]	Sherk, Robert K, ed. and trans. *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984
Sherk [1988]	Sherk, Robert K, ed. and trans. *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988
Spec. Laws 2	*On the Special Laws* 2
Syll.^{3}	Dittenberger, Wilhelm, Friedrich Hiller von Gärtingen, Johannes Kirchner, Hans Rudolf Pomtow, and Erich Ziebarth, eds. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. 4 vols. 3rd ed. Leipzig: 1915–1925
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narratives
TDGR	Translated Documents of Greece and Rome
THGNT	Jongkind, Dirk, Peter J. Williams, Peter M. Head, and Patrick James, eds. *The Greek New Testament, Produced at Tyndale House Cambridge*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2017.
TLG	*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*® Digital Library. Edited by Maria C. Pantelia. University of California, Irvine. http://www.tlg.uci.edu
UPZ	Wilcken, Ulrich. *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde)*. 2 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1927–1957
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

PREFACE

Writing this dissertation would not have been possible without the help of numerous people. I hope here to return gratitude to those who have benefited me throughout my education and who enabled me to write this work. First, I would like to thank my first supervisor, Daniel Gurtner, for his constant encouragement and helpful and timely feedback throughout the doctoral and dissertation processes. His guidance has shaped me into a much better scholar than I otherwise would be. Second, I owe thanks to Jarvis Williams, my second supervisor, who kindly took it upon himself to supervise me after the faculty cuts at the onset of COVID-19 in early 2020. His doctoral seminars on Pauline Soteriology and Galatians provided the context for the emergence of this dissertation. Further, I would like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee, Jonathan Pennington and Tom Schreiner, as well as my external examiner James R. Harrison, for their encouraging comments and feedback. Gratitude is also due to the New Testament faculty and PhD students of SBTS who have directed and participated in seminars and enabled me to present research and refine my thinking. Thanks is due to Jonathan Pennington and Trey Moss, who led the Research Doctoral Studies office during the bulk of my time at SBTS, for creating an effective learning environment. Moreover, Jonathan Pennington's seminar on Translation Theory provided me the opportunity to work out some of the material in chapter 1 of this dissertation. I would also like to thank the Inter-Library Loan staff at the SBTS library, led by Emilee Smith, for providing access to numerous articles and books. During my time at SBTS I was also afforded the opportunity to study the virtually unknown and unstudied Greek and Coptic papyri and ostraca in the SBTS Archives. In this endeavor I am grateful to Daniel Gurtner, archivist Adam Winters, Charles Loder, Roberto Carrera, and the School

of Theology. Thanks is also due to Torey Teer, the style reader for this dissertation, for his keen eye and helpful feedback. Before I came to SBTS, I had the pleasure to learn biblical studies at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. I owe a debt of gratitude to their faculty, including my MA thesis supervisor Sean McDonough, as well as professors Roy Ciampa, Douglas Stuart, Mark Jennings, Adonis Vidu, Eckhard Schnabel, Gordon Hugenberger, Donna Petter, Carol Kaminski, and Aída Besançon Spencer. At Gordon-Conwell I encountered the varied complexities of understanding the biblical texts in their own historical and cultural contexts and translating their messages into the present day. I would be remiss if I did not also mention my undergraduate thesis supervisor at Bridgewater State University, Michael Ierardi. His courses on Hellenistic and Roman history, directed studies in Greek, and supervision of my BA thesis introduced me the world of ancient history and academic biblical studies. I have been fascinated with antiquity ever since. Further, I owe much gratitude to my parents. They have supported me in countless ways over the last three decades. Finally, and most of all, I am grateful to my wife, Emma. She has supported me throughout my many years of graduate education and I am profoundly thankful for her.

David Wyman

Louisville, Kentucky
December 2022

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

All languages are firmly embedded in culture. Ludwig Wittgenstein notes that "to imagine a language means to imagine a form of life."[1] Meaning in language is integrated into the activities and shared spaces of human (embodied) interaction and getting along together in the world. Wittgenstein uses the term "language-game" (Sprachspiel) "to emphasize the fact that the *speaking* of language is part of an activity, or of a form of life."[2] The field of Cognitive Linguistics explains that "meaning is encyclopedic in nature," that is, "word meaning cannot be understood independently of the vast repository of encyclopedic knowledge to which it is linked."[3] A word is like a node in a network that gives access to a large cultural storehouse of practices, customs, institutions, attitudes, emotions, values, concepts, know-how, hierarchies, stories, domains, schemas, frames, scripts, and more in any given usage.[4] As Umberto Eco similarly observes, "every text (even the most simple sentence) describes or presupposes

---

[1] "Und eine Sprache vorstellen heißt, sich eine Lebensform vorstellen." Wittgenstein, *PI*, §19.

[2] Wittgenstein, *PI*, §23. He categorizes a fairly comprehensive list of language games: "Giving orders, and acting on them," "Describing an object by its appearance, or by its measurements," "Constructing an object from a description (a drawing)," "Reporting an event," "Speculating about the event," "Forming and testing a hypothesis," "Presenting the results of an experiment in tables and diagrams," "Making up a story; and reading one," "Acting in a play," "Singing rounds," "Guessing riddles," "Cracking a joke; telling one," "Solving a problem in applied arithmetic," "Translating from one language into another," "Requesting, thanking, cursing, greeting, praying."

[3] Vyvyan Evans and Melanie Green, *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 206. Bolded text removed.

[4] For domains, schemas, frames, and scripts, see John R. Taylor, *Linguistic Categorization*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 87–95. Taylor states, "Word meanings are cognitive structures, embedded patterns of knowledge and belief; the context against which meanings are characterized extends beyond the language system as such." Thus, the term *toothbrush* gains its meaning "from the role of toothbrushes in dental hygiene, and not from paradigmatic contrasts with other terms in the language system" (87).

a possible world."[5] So, for example, the English word *Monday* can only be understood as a part of a seven-day week, which is itself understood only with the temporal concept of "the recurring night-day cycle."[6] The week constitutes the domain within which *Monday* is comprehensible, and the night-day cycle of time the domain for the concept of the seven-day week.[7] But *Monday* also needs to be understood as a part of the regular work week that is divided into five days of work and two days of rest—Monday being the day that begins the work week and ends the leisure period.[8] If a someone asks a coworker, "How are you?," and they respond, "It's Monday," the response is only comprehensible in the context of the attitudes associated with the transition from leisure to work in the seven-day week. So, the answer, "It's Monday," would likely communicate an unenthusiastic or pessimistic attitude.[9] To take an example in Greek during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, the term χαίρειν creates a greeting frame from the sender to the recipient.[10] The simple term prompts the recipient to construe their interaction in a certain way, sets their expectations, and guides their response.[11] Words are a door into a language-game and a wider cultural frame. As a result, understanding Paul's use of certain terms in his letter to the Galatians opens the door to his cultural context—the ancient cultural encyclopedia—to help determine the sense of each word and what broader cultural scripts, practices, and institutions Paul is invoking for his auditors.

---

[5] Umberto Eco, *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation* (London: Phoenix, 2003), 19.

[6] Taylor, *Linguistic Categorization*, 87.

[7] Taylor, *Linguistic Categorization*, 87.

[8] Taylor, *Linguistic Categorization*, 89.

[9] Nevertheless, the opposite attitude could be understood, depending on the person, the parties involved, the speaker's general attitude toward their job, the tone of voice, shared knowledge of that particular weekend, or other local circumstances or relationships.

[10] E.g., *OGIS* 223.2 (late 4th–mid 3rd c. BC); 2 Macc 1:1; *BGU* 6.1296.2 (210 BC); *BGU* 6.1248.2 (137 BC); *P.Tebt*. 2.519.1 (AD 11); *BGU* 7.1660.3 (AD 41); *BGU* 1.37.2 (AD 50). Unless otherwise noted, for the text of the LXX this dissertation uses Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta*, rev. ed. (Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

[11] Evans and Green, *Cognitive Linguistics*, 11.

New Testament scholarship in the last few decades has shown that Paul uses language and concepts drawn from the domain of civic benefaction and that understanding the reciprocity systems of patronage and benefaction helps contextualize Paul's portrayal of divine generosity and the proper human response(s).[12] Chiefly, the term χάρις is embedded in the benefactor-recipient relationship in the ancient Greco-Roman Mediterranean society of which Paul and his Christ-associations were a part. The term χάρις carries a different sense based on the context in which it occurs: the sense of (1) generosity or favorable disposition (usually of the benefactor), (2) a concrete benefaction or favor in the form of deeds or items, or (3) the return favor or response of gratitude and thanks to the benefactor(s).[13]

Of the three senses of χάρις that Paul uses in his letters, sense three (gratitude) proves easiest to identify. Paul uses this sense regularly with the phrase χάρις τῷ θεῷ. The same usage of giving χάρις to God, who is conceptualized as the divine benefactor, occurs in Philo of Alexandria (*Spec. Laws* 2.60) and the Stoic philosopher Epictetus

---

[12] The two most significant studies in this regard are by Frederick Danker and James Harrison. See Frederick W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982); James R. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003). For further bibliography, see the history of research section below. Another significant study, though not as focused on the institution of euergetism, is John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015).

[13] Several people describe the senses of χάρις similarly. BDAG: "a beneficent disposition toward someone" (sense 1), "practical application of goodwill" (sense 2), and "response to generosity or beneficence" (sense 3). BDAG, "χάρις," 1079–1081. LSJ: "on the part of the doer, *grace, kindness, goodwill*, τινος *for* or *towards* one" (sense 1; LSJ, "χάρις," A.II.1), "in concrete sense, a *favor* done or returned, *boon*" (sense 2; LSJ, "χάρις," A.III), "on the part of the receiver, sense of *favor* received, *thankfulness*, *gratitude* (sense 3; LSJ, "χάρις," A.II.2). Zeller: "Die Gunst," whether "als Gesinnung" (sense 1) or "konkret als Gunsterwies, Gab" (sense 2), "der darauf antwortende Dank" (sense 3). Dieter Zeller, *Charis bei Philon und Paulus* (Stuttgart, Germany: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1990), 13–14. Crook: "virtue of generosity" (sense 1), "act or item of generosity" (sense 2), "gratitude for generosity" (sense 3). Zeba A. Crook, "Grace as Benefaction in Galatians 2:9, 1 Corinthians 3:10, and Romans 12:3; 15:15," in *The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation*, ed. Dietmar Neufeld (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 25–38. deSilva: "the disposition to show "favor"" (sense 1), "the "gift" or "assistance" given" (sense 2), "the response to the favor received, hence "gratitude" or "thanks"" (sense 3). David A. deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018), 255. The other main sense of χάρις, "of the object of favor, *the quality of charm or agreeableness*," occurs outside the benefaction frame and does not occur in Galatians. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 576–577; cf. Crook, "Grace as Benefaction." BDAG posits another sense, "exceptional effect produced by generosity" (BDAG, "χάρις," 1080). Others do not follow this additional sense.

(*Disc*. 4.7.9).[14] In this usage, the beneficiary or recipient of divine generosity (Paul) renders gratitude (χάρις) to the divine benefactor (God). Paul responds to God with gratitude as a response to the deeds and gifts of his great benefactor for liberation from slavery to sin (Rom 6:17–18), deliverance from "this body of death" (Rom 7:24–25), and victory over death (1 Cor 15:54–57).[15] Further, Paul thanks God for making his "scent" known abroad (2 Cor 2:14), giving the benefactor's virtue of enthusiasm (σπουδή) to Titus (2 Cor 8:16), and for giving "his indescribable gift" (τῇ ἀνεκδιηγήτῳ αὐτοῦ δωρεᾷ; 2 Cor 9:15).[16]

Determining whether χάρις refers to the generous disposition of the benefactor (sense 1) or to the concrete manifestation of the benefactor's generous disposition (sense 2) can be difficult. The most determinative factor is that when χάρις is the object of giving (e.g., δοῦναι) or receiving (e.g., λαβεῖν, δέχεσθαι), then it more likely refers to a concrete object (a deed or item).[17] Typically, God is the giver and Paul and/or other

---

[14] Speaking about Noah's nakedness (which was contrary to virtue), Philo states, "But, thanks be to God (χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ), (ὅτι) the change of condition and the stripping of the mind which ensued upon the deprivation of virtue, did not spread out abroad and reach those outside, but stayed in the house" (Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation*, 2.60 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]). Epictetus, speaking about the truly free person, says that "he will be free, serene, happy, unharmed, high-minded, reverent, giving thanks for all things to God (χάριν ἔχον ὑπὲρ πάντων τῷ θεῷ), under no circumstances finding fault with anything that has happened, nor blaming anything" (Epictetus, *Disc*., 4.7.9 [Oldfather, LCL]; cf. 4.4.7).

[15] Rom 6:17 (χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς); Rom 7:25 (χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν); 1 Cor 15:57 (τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ διδόντι ἡμῖν τὸ νῖκος διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).

[16] 2 Cor 2:14 (τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τὴν ὀσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ); 2 Cor 8:16 (χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ τῷ δόντι τὴν αὐτὴν σπουδὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ Τίτου); 2 Cor 9:15 (χάρις τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνεκδιηγήτῳ αὐτοῦ δωρεᾷ). The term σπουδή is characteristic of benefactors. In 2 Corinthians 8:16, Paul is thanking God for providing the Corinthians with the same attribute of σπουδή (enthusiasm). In honorific inscriptions, σπουδή and its cognates are the most common ways to describe "the enthusiasm with which benefactors approach their responsibilities." Danker, *Benefactor*, 320. For examples of σπουδή in honorific inscriptions, see, e.g., *IG* XI.4.687.4 (3rd c. BC, Delos); *IG* XII 4.135.20 (280 BC, Kos); *IGBulg* I^2 13.41 (48 BC, Dionysopolis). Another identifiable instance of this sense of χάρις occur in 1 Corinthians 10:30 in which Paul speaks about partaking in a meal "with gratitude" (ἐν χάριτι). So, BDAG translates, "in thanksgiving." BDAG, "χάρις," 1080.

[17] Rom 1:5 (δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ); Rom 12:3 (λέγω γὰρ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως), Rom 12:6 (ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα, εἴτε προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως); Rom 15:15 (τολμηρότερον δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἀπὸ μέρους ὡς ἐπαναμιμνήσκων ὑμᾶς διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ); 1 Cor 1:4 (εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου

people are the recipients.[18] Thus, χάρις in these contexts refers to the giving and receiving of a concrete object rather than the disposition or virtue that characterizes the benefactor.

The χάρις-language in Roman political displays of generosity or in local displays of gratitude for benefits helps contextualize Paul's uses of χάρις. For instance, Sulla informs the Guild of Dionysiac Artists that they are granted exemption from liturgies, military service, and taxes by the Senate's "generosity/favor" (χάριτι; *RDGE* 49B.6; 84 BC), in Ephesus a partial tax-reduction or immunity was enacted "by the generosity/favor of Imperator Caesar Augustus" (χάρι<τι> Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ; *SEG* 36.1027.92–93), a road was constructed in Ephesus "by the generosity/favor of Casaer Augustus" ([τ]ῇι Καίσαρος τοῦ Σεβαστο[ῦ| χάριτ]ι; 22/21 BC; *SEG* 41.971.1–2; see also *NewDocs* 10 §11), in Egypt Tiberius Ilius Alexander reaffirmed a tax-immunity that was enacted "by the generosity/favor of the god Claudius" (τῆι τοῦ θεοῦ Κλαυδίου χάριτι; *OGIS* 669.28–29; AD 68; see Sherk [1988] §80), the prefect of Egypt is lauded for "his godlike benefactions" (αἱ ἰσόθεοι αὐτοῦ χάριτες; *OGIS* 666.21; AD 55–59; see Sherk [1988] §63), and the Aphrodisians attributed their longtime "freedom and autonomy" to "the generosity/favor of the Augustii" (τῇ τῶν Σε[βασ]τῶν χάριτι; Reynolds §42.8–9; AD 89–90).[19] An inscription from Kyzikos remarks how local kings thanked Gaius for his benefactions, saying, "the kings, even if they racked their

---

πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ); 1 Cor 3:10 (κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα, ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ. ἕκαστος δὲ βλεπέτω πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ); 2 Cor 6:1 (συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν μὴ εἰς κενὸν τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς); 2 Cor 8:1 (γνωρίζομεν δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δεδομένην ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Μακεδονίας); Gal 2:9 (γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι); cf. Eph 3:2, 7, 8; 4:7, 29. *DGE* gives χάριτας δέχεσθαι the gloss "aceptar favores." *DGE*, "δέχομαι." A particular stock usage of χάρις pairs it with ἀποδοῦναι (and cognates) and occurs in manifesto clauses of honorific inscriptions to indicate a reciprocal act with which the beneficiaries give a favor (χάρις) to the benefactor in return for his or her deed(s) or gifts. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 40–43. Such a construction, though, does not occur in the Pauline letters. See, e.g., *IG* II^3 1 400.9–10 (ca. 350–339 BC; ὁ δῆμος χάριτας ἀποδ[ί]δωσιν τοῖς ε|ἰς ἑαυτὸν φιλοτι[μο]υμένοις).

[18] A possible exception to God being the subject is Romans 1:5, where Christ may be the subject. In this case, it appears that Christ (a benefactor himself) is acting as an intermediary between God and Paul and whoever he includes in the "we." The διά may suggest this arrangement.

[19] References to *OGIS* 669 and *SEG* 24.1108 thanks to Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 48. On the customs law of Asia (*SEG* 36.1027), see *NewDocs* 10 §16.

brains, were not able to find appropriate ways of repaying their benefactions to express their gratitude to such a great god."[20] The inscription remarks how the kings were "reaping the abundant fruits of his [i.e., Gaius's] immortal favor" (οἱ <δὲ> τῆς ἀθανάτου χάριτος τὴν ἀφθονίαν καρπούμενοι; *IGR* 4 145.7–8) and enjoying their royal station "as a result of the favor of Gaius Caesar" (ἐ<κ> τῆς Γαίου Καίσαρος χάριτος; *IGR* 4 145.9).[21] It is no surprise then that in an inscription from Sardis (AD 41–54) the *demos* displays their "piety and thanksgiving" (εὐσέβεια καὶ εὐχαριστία) to Tiberius Caesar by hailing him as "benefactor of the world" for his benefits (εὐεργέτης τοῦ κόσμου; *SEG* 36.1092.11–13).[22]

In Galatians, Paul highlights the generosity/favor and benefaction of God and Christ. Not only does Paul open and close his letter to the Galatians by wishing upon them the generosity/favor or benefaction (χάρις) of God and Christ (Gal 1:3; 6:18), he invokes χάρις at key points in his letter to strengthen the persuasive force of his arguments. He remarks how the Galatian assemblies were "called" (καλῆσαι) "by the generosity/favor of Christ" (ἐν χάριτι χριστοῦ; Gal 1:6) and how accepting circumcision will cut them off from Christ's generosity/favor or benefaction (τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε; Gal 5:4). Paul claims that he himself is the recipient of a divine benefaction from God (τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι; Gal 2:9) and that he was called by God's generosity/favor to herald God's Messiah to the nations (καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ; Gal 1:15). Further, Paul asserts that his understanding of δικαιοσύνη does not nullify God's benefaction (οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ; Gal 2:21). It is beyond the limit of the present study to exhaustively catalogue the senses of χάρις—this study is not a study of the term χάρις—

---

[20] κἂν πάνυ ἐπινοῶσιν, εἰς εὐχαριστίαν τηλικούτου θεοῦ εὑρεῖν ἴσας ἀμοιβὰς οἷς εὐεργέτηνται μὴ δυναμέων (*IGR* 4 145.5–6). *IGR* 4 145 = *Syll.*[3] 798 = PH288719. Translation from Simon Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 244. See also, Sherk [1988] §42B.

[21] Translation from Price, *Rituals and Power*, 244.

[22] Translation from *NewDocs* 9 §10.

but others have attempted to categorize the whole range of New Testament or Pauline χάρις usage.[23] Their categorizations indicate that Paul comfortably uses the word χάρις with its several normal uses within the civic benefaction framework. In Galatians, Paul's uses of χάρις suggests that he is operating in the broad cultural domain of benefaction (Gal 1:3, 6, 15; 2:9, 21; 5:4; 6:18; cf. χαρίζεσθαι in 3:18). But his use of χάρις points beyond the term itself to a broader cultural encyclopedia of the domain of civic benefaction. In this study, the focus is not limited to the word χάρις itself; rather, the term χάρις is merely the entry point into the wider cultural scripts and motifs of benefaction.

The institution of civic benefaction, or euergetism, was widespread across the Greek-speaking cityscape in the centuries surrounding Paul's letters.[24] Civic benefaction typically consisted of a prominent local or foreign individual benefitting a civic body and in return the city, in gratitude, memorialized the benefactor's deeds by giving public praise, prestige, and rewards. The benefactor(s) might help conclude a treaty (*IG* II^3 227), assist in the liberation of a city (*IG* I^3 98), supply food during a famine (*OGIS* 194), defend a city (*OGIS* 765), complete a building project (*IG* II^2 505), provide medical services (*OGIS* 220; *SEG* 27.513), relieve debt (*SEG* 49.1041), act as an envoy to secure an advantageous alliance (*Syll.*^{3} 591), ransom captives (*IG* II^3 1 430, 875), or benefit the

---

[23] E.g., Zeba A. Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty, and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004), 143; Crook, "Grace as Benefaction," 36; BDAG, χάρις, 1079–1081.

[24] For the origins and early development of euergetism, see Marco Domingo Gygax, *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City: The Origins of Euergetism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016). On its development in the Hellenistic period, see Philippe Gauthier, *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV^e–I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.): contribution à l'histoire des institutions* (Paris: Ecole Française d'Athènes, 1985). On euergetism in the early Roman Empire in Asia Minor, see Arjan Zuiderhoek, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). On different aspects of Roman civic patronage, see, e.g., Claude Eilers, *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), and John Nicols, *Civic Patronage in the Roman Empire* (Leiden: Brill, 2014). For benefactor-kings in the Hellenistic period, see Klaus Bringmann, "The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism," in *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. Anthony W. Bulloch, Erich S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and Andrew Stewart (Berkeley: University of California Pres), 7–24; cf. Gauthier, *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, 39–53. By the early second century BC at the latest, euergetism had made its way into Judea. On Jewish familiarity with Greek benefaction and how Judeans implemented a modified version of Greek-style civic benefaction, see Gregg Gardner, "Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Civic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E.," *JBL* 126, no. 2 (2007): 327–343.

community in other ways.[25] A public inscription in a prominent place like the acropolis, agora, or temple publicized the benefactions and rewards and in so doing enshrined the benefactor's civic service(s) and virtues into public memory.[26] For a civic community the act of publicly bestowing praise (ἔπαινος) and rewards to benefactors functioned as a signal to would-be benefactors that the community returns appropriate gratitude to those who would do it good. With these public rewards the community sought to stimulate further generosity from the benefactor or from others.

Despite the various studies in New Testament scholarship devoted to contextualizing the various documents in their benefaction context, the phenomenon of endangered benefaction and Paul's letter to the Galatians have featured less in the scholarship compared to other topics related to benefaction.[27] Endangered benefaction occurs in two distinct but often overlapping forms. The first expression of endangered benefaction focuses on the benefactor himself. In this form a benefactor voluntarily risks his or her life to benefit another person or a group, whether it be a king (e.g., *OGIS* 220), emperor (e.g., *SEG* 54.1625), or a city (e.g., *I.Priene* 17; *SEG* 28.60; *I.ScM* I 15; *IG* II^3 I 1147). This pattern of endangered benefaction forms a part of a wider cross-cultural motif of self-endangerment in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods (e.g., Diodoros of Sicily, *Bib. hist*., 18.34.2; Theophrastus, *Characters*, 25.6; Josephus, *Life*, 14–16). In the second expression of endangered benefaction an individual or group is in some sort of dangerous situation or crisis that a benefactor addresses through acts of service that deliver the

---

[25] See also the succinct list of benefaction types in W. W. Tarn and G. T. Griffith, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 3rd ed. (Cleveland, OH: World, 1952), 108–109.

[26] The rewards could include various packages of the following (among others): inviolability of possessions, public announcement of the crown at a festival like the Dionysia, freedom from certain taxes, free public meals, priority access to the city Council, citizenship, the right of import/export in war and peace, front seat privileges at games, statue(s), equestrian statue(s), a golden or leaf crown.

[27] The phrase "endangered benefaction" and its first formulation as a distinct motif comes from Frederick Danker. See Frederick W. Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: SBL Press, 1981), 39–48; Danker, *Benefactor*, 417–435; Frederick W. Danker, "Imaged Through Beneficence," in *Reimagining the Death of the Lukan Jesus*, ed. Dennis D. Sylva (Frankfurt, Germany: Anton Hain, 1990), 57–67, 184–186.

imperiled person or group from the oppressive circumstances (e.g., *I.ScM* I 54). Not infrequently the benefactor's service also involves self-endangerment on the recipient's behalf (e.g., *SEG* 28.60; *I.ScM* I 15; *SEG* 54.1625).

Paul's portrayal of Christ's self-endangerment unto death for the benefit of his constituents in Galatians (e.g., Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13) opens the possibility for comparing Christ with the wider phenomenon of endangered benefaction. Moreover, other cultural norms of gift-giving and reciprocity could use a fresh evaluation based on examples of gift-events and specific benefaction relationships in the historical records of the Hellenistic and early Roman periods—roughly the period of "the long Hellenistic Age" from Alexander to Marcus Aurelius.[28] The aim of such an evaluation is not to offer a comprehensive reconceptualization of ancient reciprocity systems nor is it to simply restate what other New Testament scholars have already stated; rather, the goal is to survey the ancient sources for select dynamics and motifs that find prominent expression in Galatians and to focus on historical examples that can help calibrate likely cultural scripts and expectations for Paul and his audience. For example—to take some of the more noted themes from Galatians—the topics of freedom, enslavement, promise, fidelity, defection, and imitation all feature in the varied examples of benefaction and gifting. Thus, when these and other related topics are combined with the motifs of danger, self-endangerment, and benefaction, they come together to produce a more full-orbed account of the benefaction dynamics in Galatians.

Paul's description of divine generosity in Galatians is a variation within the broader cultural expressions of benefaction in the Hellenistic world in a way that shows similarities and differences. The ensuing chapters detail how examining a rich panoply of benefaction-events and attendant motifs affords one with conceptual resources to

---

[28] On the phrase "the long Hellenistic Age," see Angelos Chaniotis, *Age of Conquests: The Greek World from Alexander to Hadrian* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018), 3–9, 386–400. The present dissertation also includes some sources from the late Classical period (ca. 400–323 BC).

understand Galatians in its historical-cultural context.

Thesis

Paul's depiction of divine benefaction in Galatians contains continuities and discontinuities with the wider corpus of benefaction-events in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. The complexity of the comparative process can be seen as analogous to describing variation within populations in the field of biology. While each individual member of a (variable, open-ended) population bears certain phenotypic structures and family resemblances with the rest of the population to varying degrees and at different levels, so too each individual constitutes its own unique phenotype distinct from every other individual in the population. For all the resemblances Paul's portrayal of benefaction has with the larger population of benefaction-events, his expression of its details reveals its individuality. To clarify, this study does not assert a "unique Paul" over against an undifferentiated mass of "pagan," "Greco-Roman," or "Jewish" cultural sameness, nor does it imply superiority or inferiority. Rather, Paul's expression of benefaction in Galatians exhibits individuality just like any other textualized expression of benefaction. The basic thesis of this dissertation is that in Galatians Paul operates in continuity with the wider corpus of benefaction-events by using language, motifs, concepts, and social scripts from the socio-lexical domain of benefaction but varies with his specific configuration and combination of those various elements.

Survey of Post-1980 Research on Benefaction in Galatians

Several studies have made comparisons between how Paul's language and concepts in Galatians compare with other concepts or practices in his environment to better understand his message. For example, the topics of noble death, the Greek *pharmakos* ritual, Jewish Martyrology, and the Roman *devotio* have all featured in comparative works devoted to or involving Paul's portrayal of the death of Christ in

Galatians.[29] Lacking from the corpus of comparative studies is one that thoroughly investigates how Paul's language of benefaction and endangered benefaction in Galatians compares to the wider cultural context.[30]

Benefaction Studies and New Testament Studies

Modern English scholarship on Greek and Roman reciprocity systems in relation to Second Temple Judaism and the New Testament has proliferated since the 1980s. The most seminal works that devote significant attention to Pauline studies are probably those of Frederick Danker, James Harrison, and John Barclay.[31] Numerous other

---

[29] E.g., David Seeley, *The Noble Death: Greco-Roman Martyrology and Paul's Concept of Salvation* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); B. Hudson McLean, *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); Basil S. Davis, *Christ as Devotio: The Argument of Galatians 3:1–14* (New York: University Press of America, 2002); Jarvis J. Williams, *Maccabean Martyr Traditions in Paul's Theology of Atonement: Did Martyr Theology Shape Paul's Conception of Jesus's Death?* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 112–113; *Christ Redeemed 'Us' from the Curse of the Law: A Jewish Martyrological Reading of Galatians 3:13* (London: T & T Clark, 2019); Joel L. Watts, *Jesus as Divine Suicide* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2019). See also Christina Eschner's significant study, *Gestorben und hingegeben „für" die Sünder: Die griechische Konzeption des Unheil abwendenden Sterbens und deren paulinische Aufnahme für die Deutung des Todes Jesu Christi*, 2 vols (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchen Verlag, 2010), esp. 1:383–413, 421–422, 423–445, 476–483.

[30] Ferdinand Okorie recently examined Galatians in its benefaction context, but his study leaves room for a study that more closely attends to ancient sources and has a more detailed analysis of ancient Greek civic benefaction in relation to Galatians. Ferdinand Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians: An Analysis of Paul's Language of God's Favor in Its Greco-Roman Context" (PhD diss., Loyola University Chicago, 2018). See now a revised and updated version of his dissertation in Ferdinand Okorie, *Favor and Gratitude: Reading Galatians in Its Greco-Roman Context* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2021). The updated published version was published too late to incorporate into the present dissertation.

[31] Danker, *Benefactor*; Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*. See also Danker's additional work on Paul that take benefaction into account, e.g., Frederick W. Danker, *2 Corinthians* (Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989). John Barclay has a companion volume, *Paul and the Power of Grace* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020). James Harrison has continued unabated with a large volume of studies on benefaction and epigraphy in relation to the Pauline letters. See e.g., James R. Harrison, "Paul, Theologian of Electing Grace," in *Paul and His Theology*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 77–108; "Paul and the Gymnasiarchs: Two Approaches to Pastoral Formation in Antiquity," in *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 141–178; "Paul and the Athletic Ideal in Antiquity: A Case Study in Wrestling with Word and Image," in *Paul's World*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 81–109; "The Brothers as the 'Glory of Christ' (2 Cor 8.23): Paul's *Doxa* Terminology in Its Ancient Benefaction Context," *NovT* 52 (2010): 156–188; "The Imitation of the "Great Man" in Antiquity: Paul's Inversion of a Cultural Icon," in *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 213–254; "Augustan Rome and the Body of Christ: A Comparison of the Social Vision of the *Res Gestae* and Paul's Letter to the Romans," *HTR* 106 (2013): 161–184; "Paul the 'Paradoxical' Parent: The Politics of Family Beneficence in First-Century Context (2 Cor 12:14–16)," in *Theologizing in the Corinthian Conflict: Studies in the Exegesis and Theology of 2 Corinthians*, ed. Reimund Bieringer, Ma Marilous S. Ibita, Dominika A. Kurek-Chomycz, and Thomas A. Vollmer

monographs and articles contribute to the topic, including the notable contributions of David deSilva, Stephan Joubert, Zeba Crook, Orrey McFarland, and others.[32] Yet, as

(Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2013), 399–425; "Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics: Redefining the Canon of Honour in the Graeco-Roman World," in *Paul's Graeco-Roman Context*, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2015), 75–118; "The First Urban Churches: Introduction," in *The First Urban Churches*, vol. 1, *Methodological Foundations*, ed. James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 1–40; "Paul and the Agōnothetai at Corinth: Engaging the Civic Values of Antiquity," in *The First Urban Churches*, vol. 2, *Roman Corinth*, ed. James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 271–326; "Sponsors of Paideia: Ephesian Benefactors, Civic Virtue and the New Testament," *Early Christianity* 7 (2016): 346–367; "Negotiating the Seduction of Imperial 'Peace' and 'Security' in Galatians, Thessalonians, and Philippians," in *Introduction to Empire in the New Testament*, ed. Adam Winn (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 165–184; "Ephesian Cultic Officials, Their Benefactors, and the Quest for Civic Virtue: Paul's Alternative Quest for Status in the Epistle to the Ephesians," in *The First Urban Churches*, vol. 3, *Ephesus*, ed. James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018), 253–298; "From Rome to the Colony of Philippi: Roman Boasting in Philippians 3:4–6 in Its Latin West and Philippian Epigraphic Context," in *The First Urban Churches*, vol. 4, *Roman Philippi*, ed. James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018), 307–370; *Paul and the Ancient Celebrity Circuit: The Cross and Moral Transformation*, WUNT 430 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019). See also his studies on the Gospels, James R. Harrison, "The Social Context," in *The Content and Setting of the Gospel Tradition*, ed. Mark Harding and Alanna Nobbs (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 105–126; "Beneficence to the Poor in Luke's Gospel in its Mediterranean Context: A Visual and Documentary Perspective," *ABR* 65 (2017): 30–46.

[32] E.g., Stephan J. Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy, and Theological Reflection on Paul's Collection* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Stephan J. Joubert, "One Form of Social Exchange or Two? 'Euergetism,' Patronage, and Testament Studies," *BTB* 31, no. 1 (2001): 17–25; Stephan J. Joubert, "Patrocinium and Euergetism: Similar or Different Reciprocal Relationships. Eavesdropping on the Current Debate amongst Biblical Scholars," in *The New Testament in the Graeco-Roman World: Articles in Honour of Abe Malherbe*, ed. Marius Nel, Jan G. van der Watt, and Fika J. van Rensburg (Zürich, Switzerland: LIT Verlag, 2015), 171–196; Tessa Rajak, "Benefactors in the Greco-Jewish Diaspora" in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 373–391; David A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000); Zeba A. Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*; "The Divine Benefactions of Paul the Client," *JGRChJ* 2 (2001–2005): 9–26; "Grace as Benefaction in Galatians 2:9, 1 Corinthians 3:10, and Romans 12:3; 15:15," 25–38; Jerome H. Neyrey, *Render to God: New Testament Understanding of the Divine* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004); Bruce J. Malina, "God, Benefactor and Patron: The Major Cultural Model for Interpreting the Deity in Greco-Roman Antiquity," *JSNT* 27, no. 4 (2005): 465–492; David J. Downs, *The Offering of the Gentiles: Paul's Collection for Jerusalem in its Chronological, Cultural, and Cultic Contexts*, WUNT 2.248 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Jonathan Marshall, *Jesus, Patrons, and Benefactors: Roman Palestine and the Gospel of Luke*, WUNT 2.259 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009); Mark A. Jennings, "Patronage and Rebuke in Paul's Persuasion in 2 Corinthians 8–9," *JGRChJ* 6 (2009): 107–127; Erlend D. MacGillivray, "Re-evaluating Patronage and Reciprocity in Antiquity and New Testament Studies," *JGRChJ* 6 (2009): 37–81; Carolyn Osiek, "The Politics of Patronage and the Politics of Kinship: The Meeting of Ways," *BTB* 39, no. 3 (2009): 143–152; David J. Downs, "Is God Paul's Patron? The Economy of Patronage in Pauline Theology," in *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker and Kelly D. Liebengood (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 129–156; Cilliers Breytenbach, "'Charis' and 'Eleos' in Paul's Letter to the Romans," in *Grace, Reconciliation, Concord: The Death of Christ in Greco-Roman Metaphors* (Leiden: Brill, 2010): 207–238; Seth Schwartz, *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society? Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010); David Briones, "Mutual Brokers of Grace: A Study in 2 Corinthians 1.3–11," *NTS* 56 (2010): 536–556; "Paul's Intentional 'Thankless Thanks' in Philippians 4.10–20," *JSNT* 34, no. 1 (2011): 47–69; Joshua Rice, *Paul and Patronage: The Dynamics of Power in 1 Corinthians* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2013); Brian J. Tucker, "The Jerusalem Collection, Economic Inequality, and Human Flourishing: Is Paul's Concern the Redistribution of Wealth, or a Relationship of Mutuality (or Both)?," *Canadian Theological Review* 3, no. 2 (2014): 52–70; B. J. Oropeza, "The Expectation of Grace: Paul on Benefaction and the Corinthians' Ingratitude (2 Corinthians 6:1)," *BBR* 24, no. 2 (2014): 207–227; Nathan Eubank, "Justice Endures Forever: Paul's Grammar of Generosity," *Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters* 5, no. 2 (2015): 169–187; Orrey McFarland, *God and Grace in Philo and Paul* (Leiden: Brill, 2016); Peter Lampe, "Paul, Patrons, and Clients," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (Rev. ed.; London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 2:204–238;

much as the scholarship on reciprocity in Paul has multiplied and shown that benefaction and gift practices provide a critical interpretive cultural context for understanding many aspects of Paul's letters and theology, still only a few scholars have engaged the particular theme of endangered benefaction or attempted an understanding of Paul's benefaction language in Galatians. The present study seeks to understand Galatians in its benefaction context in general but also pays special attention to the sub-theme of the endangered benefactor because, as will be seen in the following survey, scholars have not given attention to it in sufficient depth.

Frederick W. Danker

Frederick Danker provides the most direct and original contribution to the study of benefaction and the New Testament as well as the phenomenon of endangered benefaction in particular.[33] His original description of endangered benefaction employs the phrase "peristatic narration" to characterize the phenomenon as "laudable performance in perilous circumstances."[34] Continuing, he notes that such narratives "may describe perilous circumstances that require the generous services of a deity or of an

---

Thomas Blanton IV, *A Spiritual Economy: Gift Exchange in the Letters of Paul of Tarsus* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017); Thomas R. Blanton IV and Raymond Pickett, eds., *Paul and Economics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017); Marcin Kowalski, "God the Benefactor and His Human Clients in Rom. 5–8," *BibAn* 8, no. 1 (2018): 47–69; Ryan S. Schellenberg, "Subsistence, Swapping, and Paul's Rhetoric of Generosity," *JBL* 137, no. 1 (2018): 215–234; Jennifer Eyl, *Signs, Wonders, and Gifts: Divination in the Letters of Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

[33] Danker, *Benefactor*; Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 39–48. Mention should be made of Stephen C. Mott's study that preceded Danker's work. Mott examined the language of σωτήρ in the Greco-Roman world, the popular moralists, the Greek Old Testament, Philo, and the New Testament letter Titus. He focuses on the term σωτήρ (and related terms) by mapping it from the normal usage with respect to a benefactor, monarch, or deity who delivers a group or individual from distress onto the moral psyche from which one could be delivered from the attacks of the passions or bodily desires, ignorance, a defective will, vice, or other maladies of "the πολιτεία of the soul." In this moral realm, "the benefaction may now be deliverance from the passions rather than the Persians." Stephen C. Mott, "The Greek Benefactor and Deliverance from Moral Distress," (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1971), quotes from 257, 378.

[34] Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 39. Danker's neologism "peristatic narration" bases itself on the term περίστασις ("crisis") that sometimes occurs in ancient texts to characterize the dire situation that a benefactor addresses with his service. Danker further explains that the term περίστασις need not be present for his descriptive category of "peristatic" to apply to an ancient text. Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 39.

influential citizen" or "explicitly alert the public to the fact that a benefactor has personally undergone risk or danger in performing his or her service."[35] Furthermore, Danker saw how widespread this phenomenon of the endangered benefactor was in the Hellenistic world, calling it a "deeply rooted cultural phenomenon" that is so widespread that it constitutes "public property in the Hellenistic world."[36] He furnishes a barrage of relevant and suggestive examples, but his comments tend to be brief summaries with a single, thematically significant quotation from the ancient source. A typical example from his brief 1981 article reads, "about the year 42/41, an administrator named Kallimachos received awards from the city of Thebes for bringing it through a most perilous period. The inscription in his honor states that he "brought aid and comfort to the city when it was on the verge of collapse in a variety of adverse circumstances.""[37] These short summaries allow Danker to fit numerous examples in a tightly packed manner to effectively illustrate his contention that endangered benefaction covers the length and breadth of the Hellenistic world in time and space.

Danker conceptually organizes his examples of peristatic narration into four categories: (1) danger incurred by beneficiaries, (2) danger incurred by benefactors, (3) ultimate hazard—death, and (4) benefactors benefited.[38] First, peristatic narration can highlight the jeopardy in which a community finds itself.[39] Danker furnishes the cases of Tomi (*Syll.*[3] 731; 1st c. BC), Thebes (*OGIS* 194; 42/41 BC), and Sestos (*OGIS* 339; 2nd

---

[35] Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 39.

[36] Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 39, 41. Danker elsewhere aptly remarks that the various "terms, phrases, formulations, and themes" that appear in the textual sources for benefaction "serve as signals that are well understood across the centuries in the Graeco-Roman world of religion, business, and politics. They function with unerring force in bringing to noetic surface the distinctive cultural significance of people and deities who are praised for their contributions to the welfare of a smaller or a larger segment of humanity." Danker, *Benefactor*, 317.

[37] Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 40.

[38] Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 40–43.

[39] Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 40.

c. BC), which all experience a crisis out of which their benefactors deliver them. Second, an account of endangered benefaction may recount the dangers that benefactors, whether an individual or a group, undergo in order to benefit others.[40] Danker produces nine instances of this variety from a range of locales and time periods.[41] Third, death provides the hazard par excellence and the willingness to experience death shows the lengths to which someone might go in order to benefit another.[42] The seven examples that Danker relays, drawn from poets and orators, show how giving up one's life to serve a beneficiary merits the designation "the supreme mark of ἀρετή."[43] Fourth, benefactors themselves on occasion find themselves in peril and receive aid from deities.[44] Such an abundance of examples merits further exploration in terms of both the depth of analysis in the particulars and the quantity of examples that one can furnish from the ancient sources of the Hellenistic and early Roman periods.

Danker's 1982 volume (*Benefactor*) devotes a section to the motif of the endangered benefactor in the New Testament.[45] In Paul, Danker proposes that Romans

---

[40] Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 40–41.

[41] Demetrios Poliorketes (*SEG* 25.149), Antiochos I of Kommagene (*OGIS* 383), Eumenes II (*OGIS* 763), Akornion (*Syll.*^{3} 762), Menas (*OGIS* 339), Kallisthenes (*IOSPE* I^2 43), Aglaos (*Choix ID* 92), Seleukos of Rhosos (*IGLSyria* 3.1.718), the people of Smyrna (*OGIS* 229). Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 40–41. See also, Danker, "Imaged Through Beneficence," 62. Elsewhere Danker adds another brief example from Cyrene, that of Phaos (*OGIS* 767). Danker, *2 Corinthians*, 35.

[42] Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 41–43.

[43] Alkestis (Hyginus, *Fabulae*, §51; Euripides, *Alcestis*, 644–645); Phintias (Iamblichus, *Pythagoras*, 33.234–236; Lucian, *Toxaris*, 20); Eukritos (Polyaenus, *Stratagems of War*, 5.2.22); Pseudo-Demades 4[179]; Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, 100; Lysias 6.40 (*Against Andocides*). Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 41–43; quote from Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 43.

[44] Attalos III extols Zeus Sabazios for his aid (*OGIS* 331.50–52), Augustus has the Senate thank the gods (*Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 1.4.24–26), Nero thanks the gods (*Syll.*^{3} 814.22–24). Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," 43.

[45] Danker, *Benefactor*. For the sections that discuss endangered benefaction, see Danker, *Benefactor*, 363–366, 390–391, 417–435; cf. 321–323 (διδόναι ἑαυτὸν). His examples include overlap substantially with his brief 1981 article (see above) and includes the following: Akornion (*Syll.*^{3} 762 = Danker §12), Simon son of Mattathias (1 Macc 14:27–49 = Danker no. 13), Demetrios Poliorketes (Danker no. 30; cf. *OGIS* 229), Menas (*OGIS* 339 = Danker §17), Eumenes II (*OGIS* 763), Antiochos I of Kommagene (Danker §41), Aglaos (*Choix ID* 92), Moschion (*I.Priene* 108), people of Smyrna (*OGIS* 229), *OGIS* 273, *OGIS* 328, *OGIS* 331 (= *RC* §67), Euphron (*Syll.*^{3} 317), Phaidros (*Syll.*^{3} 409).

5:6–8 and Philippians 2:6–11 especially reflect the endangered benefactor motif with reference to Christ.[46] He also suggests that Paul portrays himself (Phil 1:12–26) and Epaphroditus (Phil 2:25–30; cf. *IosPE* I^2 39; *Syll.*^{3} 762.29–32) as endangered benefactors.[47] Danker makes further comments on Pauline peristatic narrations in 2 Corinthians that illustrate Paul's self-portrayal as an endangered benefactor.[48] For example, he remarks that "Paul poses himself as an endangered benefactor, who experiences perils on behalf of his clients" in 2 Corinthians 1:6.[49] Additionally, Paul employs an extended peristatic narrative in 2 Corinthians 11:16–33 that reveals his own life's considerable travails whose number and severity credential him for his apostolic task to a far greater extent than the "super-apostles."[50] Danker's insightful work in 2 Corinthians encourages similar work for Pauline letters like Galatians that remain underexplored in terms of endangered benefaction.

In *Benefactor*, Danker also offers studies on the terminology, benefits, and rewards of the institution of benefaction and their relevance to New Testament documents.[51] With respect to Galatians, he does not examine the letter's use of the lexicon of benefaction or the motif of endangered benefaction in a comprehensive way. The valuable resonances between Galatians and benefaction to which he draws attention

---

[46] Danker, *Benefactor*, 417–418. 2 Cor 5:11–15 also portrays Christ as an endangered benefactor who "went to the outer limits of beneficence on behalf of humanity" and whose death "solve[s] the problem of humanity's common malady—death in alienation from God." Danker, *2 Corinthians*, 78–81 (quote from 79 and 80, respectively).

[47] Danker, *Benefactor*, 424–426. James Harrison also notes Paul's portrayal of Epaphroditus as an endangered benefactor. See Harrison, "Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics," 105.

[48] Danker, *2 Corinthians*, 35 (2 Cor 1:6), 66–68 (2 Cor 4:7–12), 89–91 (2 Cor 6:3–10), 150 (2 Cor 10:1–18), 167–169 (2 Cor 11:5–9), 180–186 (2 Cor 11:22–33), 193 (2 Cor 12:5 –7), 198–199 (2 Cor 12:12).

[49] Danker, *2 Corinthians*, 35. εἴτε δὲ θλιβόμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας· εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν (2 Cor 1:6).

[50] Danker, *2 Corinthians*, 180–186.

[51] Danker, *Benefactor*, 317–392, 393–413, 436–486.

come by way of either terse commentary or lists of references that illustrate Paul's use of benefaction language across his corpus.[52] For instance, he underscores Paul's engagement with the obligation for beneficiaries to respond with appropriate behavior towards one's benefactor in Galatians 2:20–21 in which he artfully suggests that the Galatians will turn God's benefaction (χάρις) into a wasted gift if they reinstate νόμος as the agent through which δικαιοσύνη flows.[53] Similarly, Paul omits his usual remark of gratitude (Rom 1:8; 1 Cor 1:4; Phil 1:3; Col 1:3; 1 Thess 1:2; 2 Thess 1:2) in order to chastise the Galatians for their shocking ingratitude to their benefactor Christ (Gal 1:6).[54] In as much as Danker's work has illuminated the social and linguistic domain of benefaction in Paul's letters, the brevity of his passing references and comments on Galatians warrants a more concentrated approach to Galatians itself. This is not to take away from Danker's perceptive work, merely to suggest that more can be done.

James R. Harrison

James Harrison's 2003 work, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, studies the term χάρις and attendant terminology and social contexts.[55] He examines inscriptions, papyri, Greco-Roman popular philosophers, and Jewish usage before moving on to Paul. Harrison argues that Paul's understanding of God's χάρις to its human recipients displays an array of characteristics.

For Harrison, Paul's description of God highlights the commitment, scope, and abundance of his benefaction in Christ. God's action in giving up his Son for his constituents shows that he operates on their behalf with an "unswerving commitment to

---

[52] Danker, *Benefactor*, 74 (Gal 1:8), 199 (Gal 4:3, 9–10), 321 (Gal 2:10), 323 (Gal 1:4), 326 (Gal 5:22), 332 (Gal 3:3, 5), 334 (Gal 2:20, 21), 358 (Gal 1:13–14), 372 (Gal 6:10), 382 (Gal 2:6), 397 (Gal 3:23, 24; 5:1), 410 (Gal 6:11), 412 (Gal 5:22–23), 441 (Gal 1:6), 444 (Gal 4:15), 451 (Gal 2:20–21).

[53] Danker, *Benefactor*, 451; cf. 334.

[54] Danker, *Benefactor*, 441.

[55] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*.

beneficence" (Rom 8:32).[56] Christ's participation in God's benefaction reveals his own role as a benefactor who deliberately acted to secure righteousness (Rom 5:15a, 16b [cf. 6:23]; 15b; 16a).[57] Further, God's gift of righteousness announces and commences a new reign of God's eschatological beneficence (Rom 5:18–19; Gal 4:4) in a manner that is "simultaneously theocentric and christocentric" (Rom 5:12–21).[58] This new reign of God's generosity initiates God's full dominion over sin and death (Rom 5:17, 21; 6:14).[59] In addition, the scope of Christ's benefits is cosmic (Rom 5:12–21; 8:18, 22, 23, 29, 35–39; Col 1:18; 1 Cor 15:21–22, 45–48).[60] Moreover, the significance of "the language of abundance" in Paul's descriptions of divine generosity comes to the fore in his letters (Rom 5:15, 17, 20; cf. 6:20; 2 Cor 4:15; 8:7; 9:8; Eph 1:7b–8; 1 Tim 1:14).[61] Yet, God's abundant generosity stands out in Paul's Greco-Roman context because it is "conditioned by ἀγάπη rather than by reciprocity" and thus "surpasses in scope all contemporary Greco-Roman beneficence."[62] Such cruciform love provides an unusual counterpart to contemporary displays of beneficence.

For Harrison, Paul also depicts God as acting prior to human initiative and despite human ingratitude and unworthiness. God gives the Christ-gift prior to human solicitation or any formal cultic petition (e.g., Gal 1:6, 15, 16; 2:9).[63] That is, Christ initiated reconciliation instead of waiting for his constituents to supplicate God for his

---

[56] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 223.

[57] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 226.

[58] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 226.

[59] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 278.

[60] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 233–234.

[61] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 227.

[62] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 225; cf. 267–268 on ἀγαπῆσαι.

[63] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 277–278; cf. 225, 267–268; Harrison, "Negotiating the Seduction of Imperial "Peace and Security" in Galatians, Thessalonians, and Philippians," 174.

benefits.[64] Paul's auditors who heard his message of unconditioned divine χάρις would have, or at least could have, understood it as a contrast and rival to Augustan beneficence that only showed clemency to those who had the wherewithal to submit to terms with Octavian.[65] Moreover, God's generosity is impartial and generous to the ungrateful and unworthy (e.g., Rom 1–3; 5:6–8, 10).[66]

Questions remain about the conditionality and mutual obligations of the divine-human relationship that the Christ-gift inaugurated. Harrison contends that Paul eschews, at least in some sense, the dynamic of reciprocity and mutual conditionality that typically holds together a benefaction relationship.[67] For Harrison, Paul's portrayal of divine beneficence reveals God's fidelity to his people is not operative on the condition that his people are loyal to him; rather, "the acceptance (Eph 2:8–9) and maintenance of salvation (1 Cor 1:4, 8–9; cf. Phil 1:6) originates solely in the grace of God" and "is effected by the faith-union of believers with their Lord and by the continuous work of His Spirit in their lives."[68] Still, recipients of the Christ-gift are obligated to return thanks to their benefactor-God even though they are not able to render commensurate gratitude for such a bounteous gift.[69]

Instead of returning gratitude with the typical variety of gift-inducements in the form of offerings or sacrifices, the Christ-gift "imposes an obligation to live worthily of the Benefactor" and a certain "moral indebtedness to God as Benefactor" for having

---

[64] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 230.

[65] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 226–234, esp. 230.

[66] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 218–219, 224–226, 266–267.

[67] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 284–285; cf. 215.

[68] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 241. Emphasis removed.

[69] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 270–271. Besides incommensurability, Paul's vision of gratitude differs from his Greco-Roman context in that "the unity of Christ's church" rather than "the judgement of posterity" motivates thanksgiving to God. Also, the gratitude has an intense focus on God are the locus of all honor (2 Cor 4:15; 9:12b–13). Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 270–272.

"expended everything on his dependents" (Rom 1:14; 1 Cor 15:1, 10; 2 Cor 5:15; 6:1; Gal 1:6–9, 15–16; 2:21; 3:1, 4–5; 4:6; 5:13–15, 16–24; 6:2–4, 6, 14–15).[70] For the Corinthians this "moral indebtedness" to God entails that the recipients of divine benefaction model their ethics, at least in some important respects, after Christ's pattern of self-divestment to enrich others (2 Cor 8:9; cf. 2 Cor 6:10; 8:1–2, 9:11).[71] Moreover, Paul strongly harps on the theme of moral obligation to the divine benefactor in Galatians.[72] In fact, Galatians reveals how the divine gift puts into effect "a radical social reordering" that upturns the contemporary cultural standards and Roman imperial ideology that can be seen exemplified in North and South Galatia (especially through the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* and the Augustan triple-arched propylaion).[73] In contrast to agonistic culture of self-advertisement in the quest for honor and the ideology of Roman imperial benefaction and subjugation of barbarians to Roman hegemony, Paul elevates the values of "self-effacement" (Gal 6:3b) and "mutual commitment" (Gal 6:2a), evidences an "unqualified extension of benefits "to all,"" and exhorts his audience to live in accordance with a cruciform new creation that nullifies old societal divisions (Gal 6:15).[74] As a result, Harrison's forays into Galatians reveal the potential benefits that a more concentrated systematic discussion of the themes of benefaction in Galatians might yield.

Finally, the motif of endangered benefaction also features in Harrison's work.

---

[70] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 247, 248, 249.

[71] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 250–251.

[72] Gal 1:6–9, 15–16; 2:21; 3:1, 4–5; 4:6; 5:13–15, 16–24; 6:2–4, 6, 14–15. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 248–249.

[73] Harrison, "Negotiating the Seduction of Imperial "Peace and Security" in Galatians, Thessalonians, and Philippians," 165–176, quote from 175. On Paul's ethics as inverting "the canons of honor" in the Greek East, see also, Harrison, "Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics," 75–118, and Harrison, *Paul and the Ancient Celebrity Circuit*.

[74] Harrison, "Negotiating the Seduction of Imperial "Peace and Security" in Galatians, Thessalonians, and Philippians," 173–175.

He appends a few additional examples of endangered benefactors and coins the related categories of the impoverished benefactor (a benefactor who impoverishes himself to benefit his constituents; e.g., 2 Cor 8:9), the enslaved leader (e.g., Odysseus and Herakles as representing to Cynics "the ideal slave king who endured suffering and privation for the sake of others"), and the cowardly benefactor (a would-be benefactor who abandons his duties in time of crisis; e.g., Demosthenes according to Aeschines; cf. 2 Cor 11).[75] Although Harrison has continued Danker's research program into endangered benefaction, a more extensive study remains to be undertaken.

John Barclay

John Barclay examines Galatians with the aid of historical and anthropological studies of the domain of gift and in conversation with a variety of Second Temple Jewish texts.[76] He employs the concept of "perfections" (i.e., taking an idea to its logical end-point) and analyzes Galatians with the six categories he has generated: superabundance (size, significance, permanence), singularity (sole/exclusive spirit of the giver), priority (timing prior to the recipient's initiative), incongruity (not taking the recipient's worth into account), efficacy (the degree to which the gift accomplishes its purpose), and non-circularity (the degree to which the gift escapes reciprocation).[77] In this analytical

---

[75] Quote from Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 257. For Harrison on the endangered benefactor motif, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 246 (1 Cor 11:16–33), 259 (Odysseus), 332–342 (mainly 2 Cor 11:19–29), esp. 334 (1 Cor 15:30 [cf. Rom 15:31]; 2 Cor 11:26), 338, 338n157 (Aesch., *Ctes*., 170), and 339–340 (2 Cor 11:23–29). See also, Harrison, "Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics," 91, in which he cites *AGRW* §74, *Syll.*^{3} 613A (= Austin^{2} §88; 184–183 BC), *Syll.*^{3} 528 (= Austin^{2} §144; 221–219 BC), Reynolds, §§28, 31, and Jean Pouilloux, *Choix d'inscriptions grecques* (Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 2003), §§4, 34; Harrison, *Paul and the Ancient Celebrity Circuit*, 89–90 (*Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 5). For enslaved leader, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 256–268, 297n30, 350. For impoverished benefactor, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 250–256, 350. For cowardly benefactor, 335–340. He also notes the theme of "deliverance in pressing times." See Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 338. See also Harrison's entry entitled "Times of Necessity" in, *NewDocs* 9 §4 [= *SEG* 37.957], and Harrison, *Paul and the Ancient Celebrity Circuit*, 89.

[76] Barclay also compares Pauline notions of (divine) gift in Galatians and Romans with some key theologians of the Western Christian tradition.

[77] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 66–78, esp. 70–75.

framework, Barclay's reading advances the notion that Paul in Galatians focuses on the incongruity of God's beneficence.

In Galatians, Barclay's core argument centers on the notion that Paul understands that God has given the Christ-gift "without regard to worth."[78] That is, Paul highlights the incongruity of divine benefaction, places the Christ-event at the top of the hierarchy of values—"the Archimedean point from which everything is judged" or the "single point of reference" that "reconfigures every other map" (Gal 6:14–15)—and thereby relativizes all Jewish and non-Jewish systems of inscribing social or ethnic honor, status, or rightness (e.g., Gal 2:19; 3:1–5, 26–28; 4:12–20; 5:2–6; 6:11–16).[79] The result of Paul's reasoning is that whether males are circumcised or not belongs to the level of values secondary to the Christ-event.[80] This incongruous dynamic of the Christ-gift becomes the argumentative grounds by which Paul contends against the requirement for non-Jews to receive circumcision.[81] At the same time, the Christ-gift nullifies the zero-sum quest for honor endemic in Greco-Roman cities and instead fuels an alternative series of community norms organized around non-rivalrous mutual service and love according to the "law of Christ."[82] Thus, for Paul divine benefaction has immediate and strong social implications for the Galatian assemblies.

With respect to the other five perfections, Barclay suggests that superabundance, singularity, and efficacy do not feature in any significant way in

---

[78] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 350.

[79] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 394, 400; broadly 389–400.

[80] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 394.

[81] Barclay states with respect to Torah, "The Christ-gift was not a Torah-event: it was not enacted, distributed, or experienced within the criteria of value established by the Torah" (Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 390; Gal 3:1–5). As a result, for the Galatians to submit to circumcision would go against the entire logic of the Christ-gift, which was given not on the basis of pre-constituted norms like circumcision or Torah in general (Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 391–393; Gal 5:2–6). Neither does male non-circumcision possess any significance, since Paul "subverts any form of symbolic capital [i.e., circumcision or non-circumcision] that operates independently of Christ" (Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 393).

[82] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 430–442.

Galatians.[83] Further, Paul presupposes rather than explicates divine priority of the Christ-gift in terms of how God "calls" believers.[84] Whereas incongruity stands out in Galatians, Paul's language strongly resists notions of non-circularity; rather, "practice arising from and aligned to the truth of the good news is integral to what Paul means by "faith.""[85] In other words, the Christ-gift imposes an obligation for recipients to respond appropriately to God and Paul insists as much throughout his letter. Barclay's categories afford conceptual clarity in some key aspects of a benefaction relationship, but they will not drive the analysis of this dissertation. In general, although *Paul and the Gift* explores the domain of gift in Galatians with valuable categories, more attention to the particular benefaction examples, themes, and language in the epigraphic and literary sources provides a different, more ground-level angle with which to approach the domain of benefaction.

David A. deSilva

David deSilva places Galatians in its benefaction context and also mentions the endangered benefactor motif in his studies on benefaction and patronage in the New Testament.[86] With respect to the endangered benefactor theme he closely follows the prior work of Danker.[87] For deSilva, because Paul portrays Christ in like manner to

---

[83] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 446.

[84] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 446.

[85] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 446.

[86] For some of deSilva's work on benefaction and patronage in the New Testament in general, see David A. deSilva, "Patronage and Reciprocity: The Context of Grace in the New Testament," *Ashland Theological Journal* 31 (1999): 32–84; *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity*, 95–156. On Galatians, see deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*.

[87] deSilva *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity*, 136–137. Elsewhere deSilva remarks that "Paul presented Christ's crucifixion in terms of a benefactor who poured himself out completely in order to bring benefit to his clients" and that as a result "the shameful death of the cross was thus transformed into a noble act of supreme generosity and beneficence." deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 5; cf. 248, 250–252. Other virtuous death traditions receive brief mention in deSilva's commentary as well, e.g., military leaders, soldiers, Jewish martyrs (2 Macc 7:1–8:5; 4 Macc 6:28–30; 17:21–22), characters from Greek tragedies. deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 118–119.

benefactors who jeopardize themselves for their constituents, it enables him to invert Christ's shameful death by crucifixion into an honorable death that brought abundant benefits and that merits gratitude from those who have reaped those benefits.[88] Moreover, deSilva analyzes Galatians with sensitivity to a variety of aspects of benefaction. For example, he draws attention to the χάρις of God and Christ (Gal 1:3–4) from which the Galatians are, according to Paul, on the verge of severing themselves and thus losing the relationship of favor (Gal 5:2–4).[89] Thus, significant in Galatians is the theme of returning proper gratitude to one's benefactor (e.g., Gal 2:19–20; 5:1–6).[90] Furthermore, recipients of God's benefaction in Christ are obligated to pattern their own behavior in imitation of the model of Christ's self-giving love for them (Gal 5:13–6:10).[91]

As a result, along with Danker, Harrison, and Barclay, deSilva also highlights Paul's concern for the Galatians to avoid ingratitude and instead return gratitude to God and Christ in response to their beneficence. Nevertheless, a similar lacuna exists in deSilva's work on endangered benefaction as in other scholars in that the study of Galatians would benefit from a larger evidential basis of the epigraphical and literary evidence for endangered benefaction and certain other themes of benefaction that find expression in Galatians (e.g., freedom, promise, defection, fidelity). Likewise, an attempt to correlate the span of benefaction language and dynamics in Galatians in a concentrated way could help contribute to the study of Galatians.

---

[88] deSilva *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity*, 136–137.

[89] deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 117–119, 124–125, 133, 293, 414–420.

[90] deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 247–248, 254–262, 412, 416.

[91] deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 443–499, esp. 466 (Gal 5:22), 476–477 (Gal 4:19; 2:19–20; 5:13–26), 484–485 (Gal 6:2); cf. 448 (Gal 5:13). So, deSilva comments on the term ἀγάπη in Galatians 5:22 (ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη…), saying that the word in early Christian usage takes on the significance "of other-centered self-giving love that Christ demonstrated and disciples are called to imitate." Similarly, in Galatians 6:2 (ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ χριστοῦ), he says, "Christ's other-centered, self-giving love is their law, and mutual burden-bearing is a day-to-day expression of living by the norm of Christ." deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 466, 485.

Ferdinand Okorie

In a recent doctoral dissertation Ferdinand Okorie has attempted to comprehensively situate Galatians in its benefaction context.[92] The appearance of such a study suggests that research on benefaction in Galatians has been lacking and that additional studies could help fill the void. Okorie uses as a foil to his own study the fact that the term χάρις has largely featured in Galatians commentaries in the context of modern Christian theological concerns about various understandings of divine "grace."[93] To avoid these modern theological discourses and to focus on the Greco-Roman context of χάρις and reciprocity he understandably prefers to use the term "favor" when talking about χάρις.[94]

A prominent aim of Okorie's study is to contrast his own analysis of benefaction in Paul and Galatians with that of Harrison. In this vein, he distinguishes himself from Harrison by insisting that Paul requires recipients of divine favor to reciprocate the gift.[95] Although Harrison affirms that Paul requires recipients of God's beneficence to respond appropriately to their benefactor God by living in a morally appropriate manner, some of Harrison's statements about how Paul portrays divine benefaction as non-reciprocal and "unilateral" prompt Okorie to question the adequacy of

---

[92] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians."

[93] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 9–56.

[94] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 73. This is not to say Okorie denigrates modern theological readings, but that he suggests these readings would be deepened by understanding Paul's own cultural context. Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 70–71.

[95] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 72–156; cf. 6. Okorie also argues that Paul insists on reciprocating favors among the Galatian assemblies (Gal 4:12–16, 19; 5:13, 14, 15, 26; 6:1, 2, 6, 9–10) and between the larger family of God as evidenced in the Jerusalem collection (Gal 2:1–10; 2 Cor 8–9; Rom 15:25–27). Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 157–220. For Harrison's comments on the differences he sees between the wider reciprocity systems and Paul, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 211–352, esp. 283–288, 348–352. Other scholars criticize Harrison for his account of the non-reciprocal nature of the Christ-gift. In this regard, see McFarland's criticism of Harrison on the grounds that (1) Harrison does not give close enough attention to Paul's own concerns, (2) Harrison uses the term "unilateral" and wrongly purges Paul's understanding of divine and human χάρις of any reciprocity, and (3) he limits what Paul is allowed to say by a pre-conceived background (though this final critique is more directed at Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*). McFarland, *God and Grace in Philo and Paul*, 16–19. Similarly, Barclay criticizes Harrison for a lack of clarity in some of his concepts and language, especially around the terminology of "unilateral," "unconditional," and reciprocity. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 180–182.

Harrison's argument at this point.[96] So, he argues that "Paul's appeal to Greco-Roman benefaction conventions is more complex than suggesting that he overturns the ethos of reciprocity for his gentile audience" and that "Paul expects his auditors to practice reciprocity, although perhaps not exactly as the Greco-Roman world understands reciprocity."[97] At this point Okorie's reasoning seems like it is struggling with a similar problem as Harrison. That is, they both recognize that in important respects Paul maintains continuity with his benefaction context by insisting that recipients of divine favor respond in gratitude, yet at the same time they want to say that Paul realizes this return of gratitude in certain ways that are peculiar to himself and out of step with reciprocity conventions.

Harrison is mainly concerned with contrasting Paul with what he sees as a prevailing ethos of reciprocity in civic benefaction and in the relationship between humans and the gods. With respect to civic benefaction, Harrison sees reciprocity play out in the expectation that the recipients of a benefactor's generosity are supposed to remunerate the favor with commensurate, albeit lesser, favor(s).[98] Regarding the divine-human relationship he observes a circular ritual system, which he describes as *do ut des* ("I give that you may give") and "a mere business transaction," whereby (1) humans offer sacrifices and various offerings to the gods in order to manipulate and obligate the gods to show favor, (2) the deity, dutifully obliged, bestows benefactions, (3) the

---

[96] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 68–70.

[97] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 69.

[98] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 40–43. Harrison makes a distinction between gratitude and reciprocity, saying, "the dynamic behind the manifesto clause [of honorific inscriptions] is more than the gratitude of the beneficiary (although that is present): it also involves the ethos of reciprocity—the return of favors for favors done." Harrison refers to the rewards that benefactors received for their services as a counter-gift or return favor. An example of a manifesto clause can be seen from when Athens honored Kallias of Sphettos (270/269 BC): "Thus, so that all who seek to act with love of honor for the city would know that the Demos remembers forever those who benefit it and return favor to each of them" (ὅπως ἂν οὖν εἰδῶσι πάντες [οἱ βο]|υλόμενοι φιλοτιμεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν πόλιν διότι ὁ δῆμος [ἀε-]|ὶ μέμνηται τῶν εὐεργετησάντων ἑαυτὸν καὶ χάριν ἑκάστοις ἀποδίδωσιν; *SEG* 28.60.83–86). Translation my own. On this inscription, see T. Leslie Shear, Jr., *Hesperia Supplements* 17*: Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.* (Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1978).

recipients respond with gratitude through service to the god, and (4) the deity in return shows gratitude.[99]

With this understanding of what reciprocity means Harrison then contrasts the relational dynamic he sees in Paul's letters regarding the Christ-gift and the response that Paul expects. As noted earlier, he affirms that Paul expects and requires recipients of the God's Christ-benefaction to respond appropriately to their benefactor-God, but at the same time he argues Paul differs from the Greco-Roman religious system by rejecting any attempt to manipulate divine favor with gift-inducements and to constrain God to show generosity; rather, the relationship is "unilateral" in the sense that Paul directs no attention to reciprocating God for the Christ-gift with favors or services that will in turn constrain him to show gratitude to his human devotees. Paul so exclusively zeroes in on the abundance and sufficiency of the Christ-gift that he drops all pretensions of reciprocity and human effort and instead conceives of a life of total devotion and commitment to live worthily of his benefactor God as the only appropriate response.[100] In this sense, Paul expects his recipients to show a non-reciprocal gratitude to God and Christ.

Whereas Harrison acknowledges that Paul expects the Galatians to show

---

[99] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 50–57, 284 (quote from 284). Harrison draws a fine line between reciprocating favors to gods in response to divine benefaction on the one hand, which he argues Paul strongly rejects in favor of highlighting divine abundance and "divine love" or "unconditional love" in a "non-cultic" or non-mechanistic relationship between humans and God, and on the other hand one's moral obligation to behave worthily of their benefactor God (Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 348–351). The seeming contradictions Harrison vacillates between—a non-reciprocal human-divine relationship out of step with his cultural environment and the obligation of proper response to one's benefactor God—might be eliminated in part by understanding the divine-human relationship in the wider Greek-speaking world as not one of *do ut des* (I give so that you might give) in a mechanical favor for favor operation. Instead, both deities and humans had a choice in the exchange of favors in an ongoing relationship. The relationship was not a financial or gift contract in which human devotees purchase the favor of the gods; rather, the ritual system is concerned with "creating goodwill from which humans might hope to benefit in the future." Simon Price, *Religions of the Ancient Greeks* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 38–39. In this understanding of the divine-human gift relationship in the Greek world Paul's portrayal of divine benefaction and human response is less (or not at all) at odds in the basic dynamic (e.g., Rom 12:1–2; 15:15–16; Phil 2:25–30; 4:18; cf. 1 Tim 4:6–8).

[100] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*, 285.

gratitude to God but directs them to express their gratitude not with gift-inducements to put the deity in their debt (i.e., "reciprocity") but with a life of moral uprightness according to the deity's stipulations, Okorie throughout his own work tends to equate "gratitude" with "reciprocity." For Okorie, the obligation to show gratitude to God and Christ, to maintain πίστις to them, and to live a life of grateful obedience renders the divine-human relationship reciprocal.[101] So, both Harrison and Okorie acknowledge that Paul expects the recipient of divine favor to return gratitude and to live an obedient life, but they seem to operate with different understandings of the term "reciprocity" and what makes a relationship reciprocal. As a result, Okorie's criticism and correction of Harrison regarding whether Paul construes the divine-human relationship in terms of reciprocity seem to be more semantic than substantive. That is, Harrison affirms reciprocity according to Okorie's definition (gratitude, worthy response), but Okorie fails to adequately address reciprocity according to Harrison's definition (mechanistic, ongoing *do ut des* ritual exchange of favors).

For Okorie, Galatians has other differences and similarities to Greco-Roman reciprocity systems. He contends that the kinship language in Galatians 4:1–9 that speaks of the Galatians as adopted members of God's family who know and are known by God "undermines [the] Greco-Roman patron-client relationship that generally characterizes the experience of benefaction in the ancient world."[102] Such a claim that pits kinship against benefaction will receive scrutiny later in this dissertation, since benefaction occurs not infrequently through the medium of kinship diplomacy between Greek cities.

---

[101] Okorie's equation of reciprocity and gratitude is evident when he states that "just as the relationships of benefaction in the Greco-Roman world demand reciprocation, so too Paul expects the gentile Christians of Galatia to practice reciprocity in their relationship with God. In other words, Paul expects them to show gratitude for the gratuitous gift of God's favor that has been granted to them." Later, speaking about how for Paul freedom entails an obligation to live responsibly toward their benefactor God, he states that "the language of obligation connotes reciprocity." Elsewhere he connects πίστις with gratitude and reciprocity, saying, "as a client, the believer's faith is the proof of gratitude and reciprocity." Thus, for Okorie, gratitude and obligation are sufficient to deem a relationship reciprocal. Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 74, 97, 153; cf. 110, 130, 137–138, 140, 147, 217.

[102] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 106; cf. 281.

Further, Okorie suggests that Paul engages a friendship *topos* in Galatians 4:12–20 that "subverts the patronal system of benefaction," by which he means an asymmetrical social relation between a superior patron and inferior, obligated client.[103] For him Paul speaks of the Galatians as friends who, in contrast to patronage, advocates "love, fellowship and equality" with respect to giving and receiving.[104] Okorie draws attention to God's impartiality in distinguishing between Jews and non-Jews in the Christ-gift as similar to Seneca's understanding of the gods as impartial in certain of their benefits to humanity.[105] But for Paul the gods of the nations are incapable of delivering benefactions; instead, they are enslaving powers.[106] Still, Okorie leaves a variety of benefaction themes underdeveloped by neglecting to provide a thick evidentiary basis for prominent and interrelated Galatian motifs like freedom and enslavement, promise, time, fidelity and defection, and kinship language.

With respect to endangered benefaction, Okorie follows Danker by citing two of his examples (Akornion and Menas) and also mentions Herakles.[107] Here he discerns the similarity of Paul's Christ with these figures who risk their lives to benefit their constituents.[108] He states, following Danker, that the phrase παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν (Gal 2:20) is drawn from the common stock of benefaction terms.[109] On the contrary, although linguistically close to the normal benefaction terminology of ἐπιδοῦναι ἑαυτόν and

---

[103] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 157; cf. 295–296.

[104] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 157.

[105] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 107–110. Okorie cites Seneca's *On Benefits*, 4.28.3 and 7.31.4. For God's impartiality in Paul, he cites several verses (Gal 2:6; Rom 3:22; Rom 2:11; cf. Gal 6:7).

[106] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 245–255. Okorie understands the references to τὰ στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου (Gal 4:3) and τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα (Gal 4:9) to be unknown "deities of the Greco-Roman world to whom they, i.e., the Galatian Christians belong[ed] prior to their present life of fidelity and trust in Christ." Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 245–246; see 245–255 for his wider discussion.

[107] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 126–129.

[108] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 129.

[109] Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians," 126.

δοῦναι ἑαυτόν, the phrase παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν has a different nuance and is, as far as the present author is aware, never used in honorific inscriptions for benefactors.[110] Such a discontinuity from the normal lexical stock of benefaction suggests that Paul's choice of expression constitutes a distinctively Pauline variation on the endangered benefactor theme. His treatment of endangered benefaction reflects the wider need of the post-Danker, post-Harrison scholarship to build on their significant and pioneering studies rather than just rely on them.

Conclusions

A few results emerge from this survey of research. First, in many ways Danker's initial studies in the early 1980s with respect to endangered benefaction have yet to receive a more comprehensive treatment in scholarship. The lack of post-Danker development of endangered benefaction research suggests a need for a study that analyzes the various instances of endangered benefactors in more depth by paying close attention to the family of circumstances, themes, vocabulary, and cultural scripts that accompany endangered benefaction. Such a study can also draw on a much larger corpus of examples than Danker and Harrison have so far accessed. Second, there is a need for a comprehensive study devoted to Galatians in its benefaction context. The above scholars agree that in Galatians Paul exhorts the Galatians to return gratitude and respond appropriately to their divine benefactors. Still, their accounts can be improved in different ways, but especially with closer attention to ancient literary and epigraphical sources that provide the primary data for the practice of benefaction in comparison with Galatians. The present study seeks to address these gaps in New Testament benefaction research by (1) providing a deeper study of endangered benefaction by offering closer attention to a

[110] A search of epigraphy.packhum.org with the entries παραδο, παρεδωκε ἑαυτον, ἑαυτον παρεδωκε, and παραδι yielded no relevant instances of παραδοῦναι with self-reference as the object. The only example was a fifth to sixth century AD inscription that requires reconstruction (*SEG* 36.1179). One reconstruction reads ἑ[αυτὸν ὅλον]| παραδοὺς (PH267762) and another reads ἑ[αυτὸν)]| παραδοὺς PH267761). See chapter 7 for further discussion of παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν.

wider corpus of examples, and (2) comparing a wide variety of examples of benefaction with how Galatians reflects the language and norms of benefaction.

The Course of the Argument

Broadly, the study proceeds in as follows. First, chapters 2 through 4 introduce the basics of benefaction and explore select dynamics and motifs that will resurface in chapter 7 on Galatians. From chapter 2 through 4 emerge culturally appropriate categories from a wide array of benefaction and gift-events from the epigraphical and literary sources.[111] Chapter 2 overviews the basic operation and social scripts of benefaction, including the importance of gratitude, what considerations people took when deciding to give a benefaction (or not), what motivated people to reject a benefaction, considerations of how to return proper gratitude, how cultural misunderstanding might occur in a gift-event, and how taking advantage of others by means of a benefaction might occur through a "gift as bait" scheme. Next, chapter 3 delves into several themes, relational dynamics, and practices associated with benefaction that are especially relevant to Galatians. So, in the first section this chapter examines topics under the heading of benefits and patterns of benefaction: civic freedom, promises, starting and completing a

[111] Inscriptions provide a valuable direct source of linguistic, historical, and cultural knowledge that provides evidence that literary sources such as historians, poets, philosophers do not and cannot provide. The main source of primary evidence for benefaction in Greek-speaking cities comes in the form of honorific inscriptions (often in decree form), which record a benefaction event with varying degrees of detail. In this dissertation, literary sources provide complementary and additional evidence for benefaction and gift-norms. No doubt one must take care when using inscriptions as evidence, since they are not a "neutral" source. Nevertheless, their value is especially felt in (1) their public and widespread nature across the Greek-speaking cityscape, and (2) for New Testament studies they are largely neglected. One might object that inscriptions are not that valuable of a source because literacy rates were low and people would not care to read them anyways. In response are at least three points: (1) that objection applies to the literary record as well, (2) all honorific inscriptions were read aloud in draft form before the city assembly and subject to the approval of the city council (the *boule*) and the citizens (the *demos*); (3) if a passerby wanted to read the inscription, he or she could ask a literate person to read it or summarize it for them. Presumably it would not be unusual for an illiterate person (i.e., most people) to know how the citizen body returned gratitude to the local benefactor who fought off the barbarians threatening their existence, provided affordable grain for the populace during a shortage, or relieved the city's massive outstanding debt from his own pockets. In any case, honorific inscriptions also attest to the contemporary linguistic repertoire for civic virtue and the ever-changing cultural expressions of gift and gratitude. On the value of using inscriptions to understand aspects of the New Testament, see, e.g., D. Clint Burnett, *Studying the New Testament through Inscriptions: An Introduction* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Academic, 2020).

benefaction, word-deed congruence on the part of a benefactor, how benefits were expected to be dispensed to worthy recipients but also how clemency and pardon were highly valued, how people represented prototypical and abundant generosity, and certain temporal themes of benefaction. Next, chapter 3 looks at relational dynamics like ingratitude, fidelity and disloyalty, and benefaction within kinship diplomacy. The final section of this chapter discusses the themes of memory, imitation, and community survival as they relate to benefaction. Chapter 4 then shows how many of these previously examined motifs of benefaction cohere together and find expression in a single historical episode, the First Mithridatic War (89–85 BC).

Next, chapters 5 and 6 describe and analyze in detail the phenomenon of the endangered benefactor as attested in epigraphical and literary sources. These chapters provide lexical and conceptual resources with which to understand and compare how Paul portrays Christ's beneficence in Galatians (esp. Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13). Chapter 5 focuses on how people represented the gods with respect to dangerous situations, the martial virtue of self-endangerment for the sake of others, and endangered benefaction. Chapter 6 examines how 1 Maccabees and Josephus in his *Life* adapted the endangered benefactor motif. Together chapters 5 and 6 address the need in New Testament studies for post-Danker research on endangered benefaction by exploring the varied patterns of civic virtue through self-endangerment in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods.

Finally, chapter 7 analyzes Paul's language of benefaction in Galatians. This final chapter seeks to address the lack of comprehensive treatment of benefaction in Galatians by using the material in the previous chapters to contextualize Paul's use of various themes and social scripts of benefaction. Chapter 7 discusses the role of Christ as a benefactor who hazards his own life to liberate his constituents. Further, Paul's invocation of God's promise and his use of kinship language is contextualized by a wider understanding of promise and intercity kinship diplomacy. Moreover, other passages are informed by their benefaction context: Paul's representation of the Antioch incident (Gal

2:11–14), God's role as ongoing benefactor (Gal 3:1–5), the possibility of the Galatians displaying ingratitude, the incongruity of God's generosity, Paul's recounting of his past (Gal 1:13–14, 23), and his use of πίστις and the theme of imitation. In all these ways, Paul's language of benefaction is informed by the wider culture of benefaction within which he is situated.

CHAPTER 2

BENEFACTION: GRATITUDE AND DECISIONS

Gratitude

The previous chapter delineated the basic character of civic benefaction. That is, an individual or group renders a service or provides something beneficial to a civic body and in return the city confers rewards in gratitude.[1] As a result of the benefactor's deeds and the city's conferral of honors, the benefactor gains prestige for himself or herself and one's descendants. Requitting proper gratitude to one's benefactor forms a vital part of any benefaction relationship. Indeed, the benefaction-gratitude dynamic in the "culture of gratitude" of civic benefaction also operates in relationships between individuals.[2] Xenophon's Socrates asks, "Is it not everywhere a custom to return those who do good a favor?"[3] Moreover, neither is the benefaction-gratitude custom limited to Greeks and Romans. Diodoros of Sicily remarks how even Spartacus, a Thracian, knew

---

[1] Malcolm Errington describes this widespread "culture of gratitude" in the Hellenistic period as "in effect the oil that kept the local political machine running." R. Malcolm Errington, *A History of the Hellenistic World 323–30 BC* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008), 312. For some of the major treatments of euergetism, patronage, and gifting in antiquity, see Philippe Gauthier, *Les cites grecques et leur bienfaiteurs (IVe-ler s. av. J.-C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions* (Paris: École Française d'Athènes, 1985); Christopher Gill, Norman Postlethwaite, and Richard Seaford, eds., *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Claude Eilers, *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Arjan Zuiderhoek, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Michael Satlow, ed., *The Gift in Antiquity* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013); John Nicols, *Civic Patronage in the Roman Empire* (Leiden: Brill, 2014); Marc Domingo Gygax, *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Mark Beck, *Der politische Euergetismus und dessen vor allem nichtbürgerliche Rezipienten im hellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien sowie dem ägäischen Raum* (Rahden/Westfalia: Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH, 2015); Marc Domingo Gygax and Arjan Zuiderhoek, eds., *Benefactors and the Polis: The Public Gift in the Greek Cities from the Homeric World to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

[2] Also note the well-known position of Seneca, who considers giving and receiving benefits "the chief bond of human society" (*Ben.*, 1.4 [Basore, LCL]).

[3] τοὺς εὖ ποιοῦντας ἀντευεργετεῖν οὐ πανταχοῦ νόμιμόν ἐστι (Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 4.4.24).

to return gratitude to someone who conferred a favor on him.[4] Cities too can confer benefits and express gratitude to other cities, not just to individuals. In this vein Polybios, after describing how the city of Byzantion facilitates mutually advantageous trade networks between Greek cities and the Black Sea region, conceptualizes the Byzantines as "common benefactors of all" (εὐεργέται) whom the Greeks owe gratitude (χάρις) and support during perilous circumstances (περιστάσεις) brought on by "barbarians."[5] A similar dynamic involves the city of Rhodes when an earthquake levelled the city (including the Kolossos) around 227 BC. Rhodian envoys persuaded numerous cities and dynasts of the gravity of the situation, which induced them to give Rhodes gifts and promises in money, in kind, and in labor for the relief and rebuilding effort.[6]

The benefaction-gratitude dynamic also characterized the relationship between the gods and humans.[7] In this ongoing relationship of reciprocal benefits between the god(s) and the individual worshipper or civic population, people offered sacrifices, gave offerings (in the form of dedications), built buildings and statues, sang hymns, and voiced

---

[4] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 38/39.21. He writes, "The barbarian Spartacus, on receiving a certain favor from someone, showed him his gratitude. Indeed, nature is self-schooled, even among barbarians, to repay kindness for kindness to those who give assistance" (ὅτι ὁ Σπάρτακος ὁ βάρβαρος εὐεργετηθεὶς παρά τινος εὐχάριστος ἐφάνη πρὸς αὐτόν· αὐτοδίδακτος γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς βαρβάροις ἡ φύσις πρὸς ἀμοιβὴν χάριτος τοῖς εὐεργέταις; 38/39.21 [Walton, LCL]). The fact that an individual not schooled in the discrete Greek institution of benefaction is familiar with the cultural custom of returning gratitude/favor in return for a favor should not be surprising. The ritual of exchange of favors is a custom with deep bio-cultural evolutionary roots that, coupled with sanction against individuals who exhibit "non-cooperative behavior," help a population with such cooperation-favoring norms survive and flourish more than populations who lack such norms. See Aafke Komter, "The Evolutionary Origins of Human Generosity," *International Sociology* 25, no. 3 (2010): 443–464.

[5] Polyb., *Hist*., 4.38.1–10. Polybios remarks, "…yet, as I said, they are of great service to other peoples. Therefore, as being the common benefactors of all, they naturally not only should meet with gratitude from the Greeks, but with general support when they are exposed to peril from the barbarians" (πολλά γε μὴν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις εὔχρηστα δι᾽ ἐκείνους, ὡς εἰρήκαμεν, ἅπαντᾷ. διὸ καὶ κοινοί τινες ὡς εὐεργέται πάντων ὑπάρχοντες εἰκότως ἂν οὐ μόνον χάριτος ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπικουρίας κοινῆς τυγχάνοιεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κατὰ τὰς ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων περιστάσεις; Polyb., *Hist*., 4.38.10 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[6] Polyb., *Hist*., 5.88–90.4.

[7] See Robert Parker, "Pleasing Thighs: Reciprocity in Greek Religion," in *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, ed. Christopher Gill, Norman Postlethwaite, and Richard Seaford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 105–126; Jan-Maarten Bremer, "The Reciprocity and Thanksgiving in Greek Worship," in Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford, *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, 127–137; Simon Price, *Religions of the Ancient Greeks* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 38–39.

prayers to the deity and the deity provided (if the god so chose) various services that afforded well-being, health, and success (e.g., healing, prosperous marriage, business success, deliverance or protection from enemies or harsh weather, military victory).[8]

The significance of gratitude pervades the variety of social realms in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. At the civic and international levels populations broadcast their awareness of the importance of public gratitude to those who acted to their advantage.[9] A typical feature of honorific inscriptions includes some variety of the "hortatory intention" of the decree. The hortatory intention highlights that one of the reasons a city publicly rewards benefactors is to motivate other would-be benefactors to likewise benefit the population.[10] In this way, gratitude in the form of awards and prestige

---

[8] Note also that people did not always perceive the relationship between gods and humans as mutually beneficial or successfully reciprocal. For instance, Diodoros of Sicily narrates the imprisonment of a certain Carthaginian Hamilcar by the wife of the Roman commander Regulus. Her cruelty towards him prompts Hamilcar to supplicate Zeus Xenios (Protector of Foreigners) for pity (ἔλεος) and he asks why he is receiving such unendurable torture rather than a fitting return of χάρις (Diod., Sic., *Bib. hist*., 24.12.2). See also the complaints against the gods for being suspected ingrates and the "thankless thanks" or "an unreciprocated χάρις" (ἄχαρις χάρις) of individuals to the gods for their lack of care towards their human counterparts. See Parker, "Pleasing Thighs," 114–118, citing, among others, Homer, *Odyssey,* 19.363–369 and Herodotus, *Histories*, 1.90.4 and 3.38; James R. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 249, citing a mid-third century AD inscription in Stephen Mitchell, *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor. The Ankara District: The Inscriptions of North Galatia II* (Oxford: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1982), §392. Further, an interesting fable (Babrius 119) illustrates a situation in which a pious man serves his wooden image of Hermes faithfully but fares badly in life. Angry at his destitution, he smashes the image, and it pours out gold for him. The man castigates Hermes for his strange inversion of the reciprocity system, saying, "Hermes, who is mischievous and ungrateful to friends, who when worshipped you benefit us nothing, yet many blessings you reciprocate when insulted. This new piety was not known to me" (Ἑρμεία, σκαιός τίς ἐσσι καὶ φίλοισιν ἀγνώμων, ὃς προσκυνοῦντας οὐδὲν ὠφέλεις ἥμας, ἀγαθοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς ὑβρίσαντας ἠμείψω. τὴν εἰς σὲ καινὴν εὐσέβειαν οὐκ ᾔδειν; Babrius 119.6–10).

[9] On the interconnectedness and shared ways of getting along in Hellenistic cities, see John Ma's important article, "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age," *Past & Present* 180 (2003): 9–39.

[10] A variety of examples of hortatory intentions across the Hellenistic period include: *IG* II^3 1 313.29–34 (340/339 BC, Athens; English translation in Harding §97); *IG*^{3} 1 378.17–20 (323/322 BC, Athens; English translation in Austin^2 §32); *IG* II^2 505.41–43 (301 BC, Athens; English translation in Harding §139); *I.Eph* 1455.9–10 (ca. 300 BC, Ephesus; English translation in Austin^2 §130); *I.Eph* 5.1453.17–19 (300/299 BC, Ephesus; English translation in Burstein §1); *OGIS* 213.27–30 (300/299 BC, Miletos; English translation in Burstein §2); *IG* II^3 1.844.23–25 (299/298 BC, Athens); *SIG*^{3} 368.14–17 (289/288 BC, Miletos; English translation in Burstein §8; cf. Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 20.107.4); *IG* II^3 1 877.50–52 (283–282 BC, Athens; English translation in Austin^2 §54, Burstein §11); SEG 33.1183. (260/259 BC, Xanthos [Lycia]); PH256418.40–44 (ca. 204/203 BC, Teos; English translations in Austin §191, Burstein §33); *IG* XII.1 761.46–47 (3rd c., Lindos [Rhodes]); *IG* II^3 1 1323.22–27 (shortly after 175 BC, Pergamon; orig., Athens; English translation in Burstein §38); *SEG* 36.1046.8–13 (167–160 BC, Miletos; English translation in Burstein §40); *IG* XII.3 167.3–5 (ca. 2nd c. BC, Astypalaia); *IG* XIV 952.20–22 (late 2nd/early 1st c. BC, Rome); *IG* V.1 1146.51–52 (71 BC, Gytheion [Laconia]; English translation in Sherk [1984] §74).

serves as a reputational signal that gives important information to prospective benefactors. Thus, publicly visible gratitude acts as part of an imperfect and rough information feedback system that facilitates an adaptive learning process which prospective benefactors can consider when making decisions about whether or whom to benefit. That is, prospective benefactors can learn about what types of services certain cities have awarded with thanks (so they might roughly imitate them) and whether cities award benefactors with appropriately prestigious favors. In this way, public gratitude tends to be mutually advantageous to a civic body and individual benefactors alike by affording prestige (in different ways to each) and communicating other valuable information like the specific strategies that result in success and/or prosperity.[11]

Roman philosophers of the late Republic and Julio-Claudian imperial period also highlight the significance of gratitude in the proper maintenance of relationships. Cicero remarks that "no duty is more imperative than that of proving one's gratitude."[12] Indeed, failing to return a kindness violates the canons of generosity. Cicero states, "Whether we do the kindness or not is optional; but to fail to requite one is not allowable to a good man, provided he can make the requital without violating the rights of others."[13] He likens returning gratitude for an unsolicited benefit to "fruitful fields" that ought to "return more than they receive."[14] Cicero's insistence on the moral obligation of gratitude is reflected in the multitude of examples that Valerius Maximus includes in his *Memorable Doings and Sayings* (ca. AD 14–27). Valerius highlights conspicuous examples of appropriate gratitude for benefactions in Roman history as models for

---

[11] Reputation signals and competition among benefactors function together to help cities and benefactors communicate and coordinate to adapt to ever-changing circumstances. One can also think of the system as a cultural evolutionary adaptive institution of Greek-style cities.

[12] Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.47 [Miller, LCL].

[13] Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.48 [Miller, LCL].

[14] Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.48 [Miller, LCL].

emulation.[15] For instance, Valerius draws attention to the exceptional gratitude M. Minucius displayed towards Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus.[16] Minucius's gratitude came in the form of deference by referring to his rescuer Fabius as "father" and "patron" and subordinating his own command of Master of Horse to Fabius's status of Dictator.[17]

Memory plays an important role in gratitude, because the relative value of a benefaction to the recipient(s) correlates on the one hand to the gravity of the gift and on the other hand to the degree of gratitude a recipient might return to a benefactor. That is, a weightier benefaction tends to be more memorable and tends to be met with requisite gratitude (whether more frequent, longer lasting, or proportionally weighty). For instance, Valerius Maximus says that Numidian king Massinissa (d. 149 BC), who lived an unusually long ninety years, displayed lifelong gratitude for the immense benefaction of Scipio and Rome that enlarged his territorial sovereignty in North Africa.[18] Valerius Maximus remarks that for Massinissa the memory of benefaction translated into undying loyalty even such that he placed "regard for a former benefaction above present jeopardy."[19] Thus, memory of a benefaction can motivate one's behavior and influence one's choices in the present. Especially large benefactions can form especially strong memories and elicit a deep sense of gratitude.

Seneca (ca. 4 BC–AD 65) has rightly received much attention in New Testament studies for his contribution to understanding reciprocity and gifting practices in the mid-first century Roman world with his treatise *On Benefits* and his *Letter* 81. His primary maxim with respect to reciprocity invokes a responsibility for memory on both

---

[15] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings* 5.2.

[16] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings* 5.2.4; cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 22.25–30.

[17] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 5.2.4.

[18] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 5.2.ext. 4. On Massinissa, see, e.g., Polyb., *Hist*., 15.12.6; 21.21.2; 31.21; 36.16.

[19] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 5.2.ext. 4 [Shackleton Bailey, LCL].

sides of the relationship: the giver of the benefit should immediately forget that he gave it, and the recipient should never forget it.[20] Memory enables the recipient to recall a benefaction and stoke sentiments of gratitude toward the giver.[21] In Seneca's understanding of reciprocity, it is more important that the recipient receive a benefit with gratitude than that the recipient makes a return. Indeed, showing gratitude upon receipt of a benefit is a sort of first return payment.[22] Such a grateful reception, even though Seneca does insist ultimately that a recipient reciprocate the favor, is in a sense already a return for the benefit.[23] For Seneca gratitude is a good in itself and constitutes its own reward.[24]

Greek authors also stress the propriety and benefits of gratitude. Xenophon (ca. 430–354 BC), in his biographical work *Agesilaos*, praises Agesilaos for his δικαιοσύνη.[25] For Xenophon Agesilaos displayed his δικαιοσύνη in giving and receiving benefits because, among other things, he benefitted many people, showed generosity in his benefactions, avoided ill-repute, and judged it unjust to not repay favors (τὸ μὴ ἀποδιδόναι χάριτας ἄδικον ἔκρινεν).[26] Elsewhere, Xenophon recognizes the role that displaying gratitude plays in acting as a signal to would-be benefactors that helps in the selection process, that is, a benefactor is more likely to render aid to those who are known

---

[20] Seneca, *Ben.*, 2.10.4; cf. 1.4.3.

[21] Seneca, *Ben.*, 2.24.1.

[22] Seneca, *Ben.*, 2.22.

[23] Seneca, *Ben.*, 2.31.1; 2.35.5.

[24] Seneca, *Ep.* 81.19.

[25] Xenophon, *Agesilaus*, 4.1–6.

[26] Xenophon, *Agesilaus*, 4.1–6. Instructive is Xenophon's defensive strategy to clear Agesilaos from blame: "For had he been in the habit of selling his favors or taking payment for his benefactions, no one would have felt that he owed him anything. It is the recipient of unbought, gratuitous benefits who is always glad to oblige his benefactor in return for the kindness he has received and in acknowledgment of the trust reposed in him as a worthy and faithful guardian of a favor" (εἰ γὰρ ἐπώλει τὰς χάριτας ἢ μισθοῦ εὐεργέτει, οὐδεὶς ἂν οὐδὲν ὀφείλειν αὐτῷ ἐνόμισεν· ἀλλ᾽ οἱ προῖκα εὖ πεπονθότες, οὗτοι ἀεὶ ἡδέως ὑπηρετοῦσι τῷ εὐεργέτῃ καὶ διότι εὖ ἔπαθον καὶ διότι προεπιστεύθησαν ἄξιοι εἶναι παρακαταθήκην χάριτος φυλάττειν; Xenophon, *Agesilaus*, 4.4 [Marchant and Bowersock, LCL]; cf. Xenophon, *Symposium*, 8.36).

for repaying due gratitude.[27]

Beyond civic etiquette, benefaction and gratitude are expected in the relationship between parents and children. Aelius Aristides opens his Panathenaic Oration reminding his audience that "it is a time-honored custom among the Greeks—and I think among most foreign peoples too—to repay as completely as possible the debt of gratitude owed to those who have raised us."[28] In publicly broadcasting itself as the quintessential harmonious family, one in which the children show proper gratitude to their parents, the family of Attalos I (269–197 BC) and Apollonis (ca. 240–175/4–159 BC) shows how the Attalids broadcasted themselves in contrast to more longstanding but filicidal and fratricidal regimes like the Ptolemies and Seleukids.[29] Apollonis had a favorable reputation for her role as queen-mother. Polybios's laudatory account of Apollonis describes her as "worthy of memory and honorable mention" (ἀξία μνήμης καὶ παρασημασίας).[30] An Athenian inscription (*IG* II^3 1 1323 = *OGIS* 248) praises the Attalid family for helping Antiochos IV maintain the Seleukid throne and commends Attalos I

---

[27] Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 4.4.17.

[28] Aelius Aristides, *Panathenaic Oration*, 1 [Trapp, LCL]; Νόμος ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησι παλαιός, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων τοῖς πλείστοις, τροφεῦσι χάριν ἐκτίνειν ἅπασαν, ὅση δυνατή).

[29] E.g., Polyb., *Hist*., 18.41.8; 22.20.1–8; 23.11. The Attalid family getting along in harmony is in stark contrast to the interfamilial strife of the Seleukid and Ptolemaic families. Seleukid kinship conflict can be seen in the bloody struggle between Seleukos II and Antiochos Hierax (see Strabo 16.2.4 = Austin^2 §176) and the post-Antiochos IV Seleukid dynasty that was marred by infighting. See especially Justin's account (following Pompeius Trogus) in his *Epitome* (40.1–2). His explanation for the disintegration of the Seleukid dynasty highlights internecine conflict. He opens his account saying, "the mutual hatred of the brothers, and then of sons who inherited their parents' antagonisms, left the kings and the kingdom of Syria exhausted by implacable conflict (Justin, *Epitome*, 40.1.1). He closes by saying, "Accordingly, Pompey reduced Syria to a province and, little by little, the East, through the quarrels of its kings, who were all of the same blood, became the territory of Rome" (40.2.5). Translations of Justin are from Justin, *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*, trans. J. C. Yardley (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994). Conflict within the Ptolemaic dynasty can be seen in the struggle between Ptolemy VIII and Ptolemy VI (e.g., Polyb., *Hist*., 31.10) after their earlier concord (Diod., *Bib. hist*., 31.15a). Subsequent dynastic infighting was common (e.g., Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra II, Cleopatra III, Ptolemy IX, Ptolemy X; see Justin, *Epitome*, 38.8.2–9.1; 39.4–5; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 34/35.14). The Antigonids did not end well either, with their final decades marred by inter-familial strife. Philip V killed his younger son Demetrios on suspicion that he was colluding with the Romans and seeking to seize the throne, accusations brought to him by his eldest son Perseus (Justin, *Epitome*, 32.2.3–10; Polyb., *Hist*., 23.1–3, 7; cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 39.46.6–48.1; 39.53). Likewise, Lysimachos, in the first generation of Alexander's successors, killed his son Agathokles and ruined any hope of dynastic succession (Justin, *Epitome*, 17.1).

[30] Polyb., *Hist*., 22.20.1.

and Apollonis for the education they provided for their children.[31] After Apollonis's death the city of Teos established a cult for her as a god (θεά) (*OGIS* 309). Polybios commends two of her sons for showing appropriate gratitude to their virtuous and affectionate mother.[32] A decree from Hierapolis expresses similar sentiments (*OGIS* 308).[33] The decree highlights the Attalid ruling family's filial virtues, among which is concord (ὁμόνοια). The Hieropolitan decree states that Apollonis "interacted with her children with total concord" (προσενενηνέχθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις μετὰ πάσης ὁμονοίας) and she "received distinguished tokens of gratitude from her children" (τὰς παρὰ τῶν τέκνων ἐπιφανεῖς {ἐ}κομισαμένη χάριτ[ας]).[34] Her piety to the gods and virtuous conduct within her family earns her "immortal honor" (τιμῆς ἀθανάτου).[35] Whether or not such ideal harmony existed between Apollonis and her children, their filial affection was real enough to merit the attention and praise from historians and populations alike.

Based on this brief survey of sources, the notion that gratitude is the appropriate and even obliged response to a benefaction or gift should be considered a deeply intrenched norm across all levels of society and all types of relationships across Greek and Roman cultures (individual–city, individual–individual, city–city, gods–humans, parents–children). Indeed, it is likely that such a norm is a human cultural universal due to its ability to scale up cooperation between individuals and facilitate the formation of extended societies. In the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, the hyper-networked Greek cities inherited and modified certain cultural institutions and ways of performing the benefaction-gratitude ritual like civic benefaction (euergetism). Furthermore, memory plays an important role in a benefactor-recipient relationship, since

[31] *IG* II^3 1 1323.43–48.

[32] Polyb., *Hist*., 22.20.2–8.

[33] For an English translation of *OGIS* 308, see Austin^2 §240a.

[34] *OGIS* 308.7–8 (cf. 16–18), 11.

[35] *OGIS* 308.22.

it has the power to recall the benefit (or forget it) and motivate one to either give more or to return with gratitude/favor commensurate with the benefaction (on memory, see more below). Seneca's injunction that benefactors should forget they gave a benefit and that recipients should never forget they received one is a Stoic stance that, although it does seem to reflect good face to face etiquette (see Polyb., *Hist*., 16.26.2), was not always followed—whether by ingrates forgetting a benefaction or by benefactors calling attention to their prior benefactions (e.g., Polyb., *Hist*., 16.26.5; 18.6.5; 29.24.4, 13–16; Babrius 50). Moreover, the proper performance of reciprocity—whether in the form of benefitting many, being generous, always returning gratitude/favor—could constitute a particular form of δικαιοσύνη. Finally, and importantly, the performance of gratitude served as a signal to others, whatever the cultural realm (euergetism, inter-city, individual, and close kin), that would-be benefactors could rely on that person to return appropriate thanks to those who give benefits.

The Calculus of Giving, Receiving, and Thanking

The mere presence of the cultural norm of benefaction–gratitude does not address the complex choices individual agents must make in deciding which relationships to enter and how to act in a world in which individuals possess different and contradictory bits of knowledge in an ever-changing social landscape. Knowing who to benefit, what to give (and how much), whether to receive or not, and how to thank are all calculations that enter any benefaction or gift event. Reputation plays a crucial role in distributing relevant knowledge to those who seek it. In civic benefaction publicizing the benefaction-event, usually on stone and in at least one prominent location, plays a part in signaling relevant information. This section will look at some instances that highlight some aspects of the calculations that go on in making decisions about giving, receiving, and thanking and the crucial role communication (or failure thereof) plays in the process.

Calculus of Giving

The expectation of gratitude in the form of heightened prestige and commensurate rewards comes into consideration for a benefactor in his or her decision to render a benefaction. A benefactor would consider not just a random city or person but a city or person with which the benefactor has perceived prior connections or a strategic future. As noted above, a benefaction is more forthcoming when the person anticipates that the recipient will make a good return.[36] In some instances, one might initiate a reciprocity relationship by giving a benefaction to somebody in the hopes that one might receive a return. So, one might first invite that person to dinner in the hopes that they will invite you to dinner in return.[37]

One might avoid giving a benefit if giving it would harm another person or group that is tied to the giver. In 167 BC, shortly after Rome defeated the Antigonid king Perseus at Pydna (168 BC), the Bithynian king Prusias II travelled to Rome to offer congratulations to the gods, senators, and people of Rome on their victory.[38] During his address to the senate he also recounted his wartime services in support of Rome and asked for the senate to renew their alliance with him and that they gift him land that they had seized from the Seleukids and that was currently under Galatian control.[39] The senate, while happy to renew the alliance and offer Prusias and his son various gifts, did not grant the land request.[40] Instead they offered to send a fact-finding mission to inquire about the ownership of the land so that they would avoid wronging the Galatians by giving Prusias land that is rightfully theirs.[41] For, "a gift, said the senate, could not be

---

[36] Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 4.4.17; cf. Sir 12.1–7.

[37] Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 2.3.11–12.

[38] Livy, *History of Rome*, 45.44.4–5.

[39] Livy, *History of Rome*, 45.44.8–9.

[40] Livy, *History of Rome*, 45.44.10–17.

[41] Livy, *History of Rome*, 45.44.10–11.

pleasing even to the recipient, if he knew that the giver would take it away again whenever he pleased."[42]

Calculus of Receiving or Rejecting

For every offer of a benefaction or gift, the would-be recipient had the option to reject it. A rejection of a gift almost invariably revolved around the issue of reputation. That is, the would-be recipient must ask how (relevant) others will view the act of reception or rejection. One might reject the offer of gifts out of fidelity to the would-be giver's rivals, like when Andronikos, the Antigonid garrison commander of Tyre in 312 BC, rejected Ptolemy I's promise of gifts and honors in exchange for handing over the city and defecting from Antigonos and Demetrios.[43] Andronikos rejected Ptolemy's offer out of commitment to "the trust [or trusteeship] given by Antigonos and Demetrios" (τὴν δεδομένην ὑπ᾽ Ἀντιγόνου καὶ Δημητρίου πίστιν).[44] Yet Andronikos's rejection earned him a good repute with Ptolemy. When Ptolemy captured Andronikos he gave him gifts and advanced him in honor.[45] Diodoros attributes Andronikos's favorable reception to Ptolemy's personal moral character, citing his abundant reasonableness (ἐπιεικής), inclination to pardon (συγγνωμονικός), and beneficence (εὐεργετικός), but Andronikos's faithfulness to Antigonos and Demetrios was probably an attractive quality that Ptolemy might find useful if he brought Andronikos into his own court.[46]

The Roman envoy and later consul Fabricius famously rejected the gifts of Pyrrhos of Epiros several times. Perhaps the most notable of his rejections is when he rejected the offer from Pyhrros's physician to poison Pyhrros in exchange for a χάρις (to

---

[42] Livy, *History of Rome*, 45.44.12 [Schlesinger, LCL].

[43] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.86.

[44] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.86.2.

[45] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.86.2.

[46] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.86.3.

ostensibly end the war with no further bloodshed).[47] Instead, Fabricius warned Pyhrros of the plot so that he would not be seen as ending the war through trickery (δόλος) rather than virtue (ἀρετή).[48] When Pyhrros sent prisoners of war back to the Romans without ransom to reciprocate the favor, Fabricius also sent prisoners of war back to Pyhrros so that he would not get the reputation of having refrained from injustice for a wage (μισθός).[49]

Shortly after Scipio Africanus wrested control of New Carthage from the Carthaginians in 210 BC, he rejected the "gift" of a captured girl whom his soldiers tried to give to him.[50] In Polybios's version Scipio politely (with gratitude) declined their gift, explaining that he could not accept the gift because he was acting in his official capacity as general rather than as a private person (in which case such a gift would be most welcome to him).[51] In Livy's "elaborated and romanticized" version Scipio rejected the gift as a favor to the captive female's betrothed, a young Celtiberian chieftain named Allucius.[52] Livy frames Scipio's return of the captive girl to her fiancée as an act of goodwill (in the form of a gift) toward forging a friendly relationship between the Roman state and Allucius.[53] Further, when the girl's parents vehemently insisted on giving Scipio a large sum of gold as a ransom payment in exchange for their undefiled daughter, he

---

[47] Plutarch, *Pyrrhus*, 21.1–4. The rejections by Fabricius get recounted frequently as moral examples. See Plutarch, *Moralia*, 195B = *Sayings of the Romans*, *Fabricius*, 4–5; Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.13 (40); Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 6.5.1d; Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*, 3.8; Frontinus, *Strategems*, 4.4.2.

[48] Plutarch, *Pyrrhus*, 21.3.

[49] Plutarch, *Pyrrhus*, 21.4.

[50] Polyb., *Hist*., 10.19.3–7; cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 26.50.1–13. Aulus Gellius preserves, alongside the tradition that Scipio returned the girl to her father (per Polybios), a tradition that Scipio in fact kept the captive woman for his own pleasure (Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*, 7.8.3–6).

[51] Polyb., *Hist*., 10.19.4–6.

[52] Frank W. Walbank, *Historical Commentary Polybius, Volume II, Commentary on Books VII–XVIII* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 219.

[53] Livy, *History of Rome*, 26.50.7–8.

accepted the gold but immediately gave it to Allucius as a wedding gift.[54] Allucius went home singing Scipio's praises and comparing him to the gods for his generosity as much as his ability to wage war.[55]

A fascinating episode involving the Achaian League and Hellenistic kings highlights the deliberative process of whether to accept a benefaction or not (ca. 188–185 BC).[56] King Eumenes of Pergamon sent envoys to the Achaian League to promise the League 120 talents so that the League could lend the money at interest and pay the members of the League's council with the money made from the interest.[57] A certain Apollonidas of Sikyon arose and vociferously opposed accepting Eumenes's gift offer on the grounds the (1) it is completely illegal for private citizens to accept gifts from kings, (2) it is a disgrace to accept such a blatant bribe, (3) the gift is an obvious piece of bait to entrap the Achaian League into acting in the interests of Eumenes and thus opens up the entire League to act according to the interests of whichever potentate who pays them rather than in the League's own interest, and (4) if the Achaians do not act in the interests of their paymasters then they will be regarded as ingrates.[58] After Apollonidas spoke, a certain Kassander of Aigina gave a speech also advocating that the League reject the gift.[59] His argument appealed to the sentiments of the Achaians toward the people of Aigina, who were members of the League at the time of their suffering and enslavement at the hand of the Romans and Aitolians (210 BC), who in turn sold control of Aigina to the Attalids.[60] By accepting the gift from Eumenes, they would be "removing the hopes

---

[54] Livy, *History of Rome*, 26.50.10–12.

[55] Livy, *History of Rome*, 26.50.13.

[56] Polyb., *Hist*., 22.7–8.

[57] Polyb., *Hist*., 22.7.3.

[58] Polyb., *Hist*., 22.8.1–8.

[59] Polyb., *Hist*., 22.8.9–12.

[60] Polyb., *Hist*., 22.8.9–11.

for the deliverance of the Aigenitans in the future" (τὰς εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐλπίδας ἀφαιρούμενοι τῆς Αἰγινητῶν σωτηρίας).[61] Polybios remarks that the members of the League were so moved by the speeches of Apollinidas and Kassander that, although Euemenes offered them such a hefty and nearly irresistible sum, they loudly rejected the gift.[62] As a result, a combination of law, shame, precedent, and positive affectation towards an in-group population swayed the Achaian League to decline an apparently sizeable gift.

Calculus of Gratitude

For the recipient of a benefaction, the proper calculation of gratitude is a crucial aspect of one's response. If a recipient accepts a benefaction but is unable to repay commensurate gratitude, one could invoke the gods on one's behalf to repay it. In Livy's extended version of the episode between Scipio and the gift of the captive girl (see above), the fiancée of the girl "called on all the gods to show him gratitude on his behalf, since he himself had nothing like the means to express his thanks as he might wish or as Scipio's kindness to him deserved."[63] One can see a similar dynamic in a Jewish author like Ben Sira who advises that one should give to the pious and humble but that if they cannot repay, God will do so on their behalf (Sir. 12:1–7, esp. 12:2).[64]

A display of shameless deference could successfully gratify the other party, but outsiders might look in disgust at such behavior. Two of the "characters" of Theophrastos, "the Toady" (ὁ κόλαξ) and "the Obsequious Man" (ὁ ἄρεσκος), exhibit

---

[61] Polyb. *Hist*., 22.8.12.

[62] Polyb. *Hist*., 22.8.13.

[63] Livy, *History of Rome*, 26.50.9 [Yardley, LCL].

[64] Ben Sira 12:2 reads: "Do good to the pious person, and you will find a return, and if not from him then from the Most High" (εὖ ποίησον εὐσεβεῖ, καὶ εὑρήσεις ἀνταπόδομα, καὶ εἰ μὴ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ ὑψίστου).

characteristic people-pleasing.[65] One of the most prominent examples of shameless deference in the Hellenistic period involves King Prusias II of Bithynia (r. 182–149 BC). Prusias's behavior disgusted the historian Polybios (who is echoed by Diodoros) with his obsequiousness toward the Roman senate.[66] On one occasion when Roman envoys visited him, Prusias donned the garb of a freed slave (*libertus*) in an attempt to ingratiate himself to them by showing his servility and their superiority.[67] Later, when he visited Rome to congratulate the senate and Roman generals on their victory over the Antigonid king Perseus (167 BC), Prusias prostrated himself to the ground (προεσκύνησε) and hailed the senators as θεοὶ σωτῆρες.[68] Polybios, repulsed at Prusias's conduct, comments that Prusias's genuflection makes "it impossible for anyone after him to surpass him in unmanliness, womanlishness, and servility."[69] But Polybios's harsh judgment was not shared by the Roman envoys, since they apparently gave Prusias a favorable response despite (or because) of his self-abnegation.[70] Thus, obsequiousness might cause non-participants to regard the display as disgraceful, but it might also be an effective enough show of deference to the superior party.

---

[65] Theophrastos, *Characters*, 2, 5, respectively. On these two of Theophrastos's *Characters*, see James Diggle, *Theophrastus: Characters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 69–71 and 181–198 ("the Toady"), 79–82 and 222–249 ("the Obsequious Man"). Diggle explains that the "toady" (κόλαξ) "panders and toadies for his own advantage, and not only with words." The "Obsequious Man" (ἄρεσκος) "tries to please all, for no other motive than desire for popularity." Diggle explains that the two figures are related but the κόλαξ fixes his attentions on try to gain favor from a single patron but the ἄρεσκος widens his efforts and seeks popularity among many. Diggle, *Theophrastus*, 181–182, 222.

[66] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.18; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 31.15; cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 45.44.19–20.

[67] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.18.3–4; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 31.15.2.

[68] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.18.5; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 31.15.3.

[69] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.18.5 [Olson, Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL] (ὑπερβολὴν οὐ καταλιπὼν ἀνανδρίας, ἅμα δὲ καὶ γυναικισμοῦ καὶ κολακείας οὐδενὶ τῶν ἐπιγινομένων). Cf. Diod. Sic.,*Bib. hist*., 31.15.3.

[70] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.18.7 (φανεὶς δὲ τελέως εὐκαταφρόνητος ἀπόκρισιν ἔλαβε δι᾽ αὐτὸ τοῦτο φιλάνθρωπον).

Cultural Misunderstanding

Cultural misunderstanding can occur regarding benefaction that results in relational tension between two parties with clashing benefaction cultural scripts. For example, after Flamininus defeated Philip V of Macedon in battle at Kynoskephalai in 197 BC, Polybios relays the account of how the Aitolians suspected the Romans of accepting Macedonian bribes.[71] The Aitolians, who had supported Rome against the Macedonians, became incensed because Flamininus had grown cold to them and had begun to treat Philip (their recent shared enemy) with courtesy.[72] Such unexpected reversal of conduct on the part of Flamininus provoked suspicions among the Aitolians that he had been receiving bribes from Philip. Polybios explains how Flamininus conducted his meeting with Philip's envoys in a "humane" (φιλάνθρωπος) manner confirmed in the minds of the Aitolians their suspicions, "For since by this time bribery and the notion that no one should do anything gratis were very prevalent in Greece, and so to speak quite current coin among the Aitolians, they could not believe that Flamininus' complete change of attitude toward Philip could have been brought about without a bribe."[73] Not only did their own cultural script regarding gifts blind them from understanding Flamininus's conduct, their own ignorance of Roman customs (i.e., a commander does not act in personal capacity on behalf of the Senate) further prevented them from understanding why Flamininus treated Philip favorably.[74] Thus a sort of bind

---

[71] Polyb., *Hist*., 18.34.1–8.

[72] Flamininus did not approve of the post-war conduct of the Aitolians. Polybios mentions their conduct regarding the war booty and their boastfulness (ἀλαζονεία). See Polyb., *Hist*., 18.34.1–2. Some epigrams evidence Aitolians boasting (*AP* 7.247; *AP* 16.5). Epigram references thanks to W. R. Paton, Frank W. Walbank, Christian Habicht, *The Histories, Volume V: Books 16–27*, LCL 160 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 182–183n93, citing A. S. F Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1965), 1.4, nos. 4–5 and 2.11–12.

[73] Polyb., *Hist*., 18.34.7 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL] (ἤδη γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τῆς δωροδοκίας ἐπιπολαζούσης καὶ τοῦ μηδένα μηδὲν δωρεὰν πράττειν, καὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τούτου νομιστευομένου παρὰ τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς, οὐκ ἐδύναντο πιστεύειν διότι χωρὶς δώρων ἡ τηλικαύτη μεταβολὴ γέγονε τοῦ Τίτου πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον.

[74] Polybios, continuing his remark on the Aitolians, says that the Aitolians "were ignorant of the Roman principles and practice in this matter, but judged from their own, and calculated that it was probable that Philip would offer a very large sum owing to his actual situation and Flamininus would not be

and blind phenomenon can occur when trying to understand another culture's reciprocity customs that results in one party interpreting the events according to the wrong cultural script.

Gift as Bait

If the calculus of benefaction relies on the participants or would-be participants having access to certain bits of relevant knowledge, knowledge which is "given" to no one single person but dispersed, contingent, imperfect, and contradictory, then participants can take advantage of the process by hiding their relevant knowledge and using their own knowledge against (rather than in cooperation with) the other participant(s). In Polybios's *Histories* a recurring motif is the notion of "gift as bait." That is, an individual offers another person a gift as a trick to bait the other party into a gift-arrangement that advantages the giver and disadvantages the recipient. One can see how the above story of Eumenes and the Achaians (Polyb., *Hist*., 22.7–8) highlights this theme, yet other instances also pepper Polybios's historical narrative and his personal commentary. For instance, Polybios describes the city of Kios as falling prey to a χάρις-bait of certain politicians advocating for a particular confiscation-redistribution scheme.[75] Furthermore, the gift as bait motif finds expression in the fable tradition in Babrius 130. In this fable a fox, unsure what to do with the trapped meal he found, yields his find to a wolf by performing a deceitful display of friendship. After getting caught in the trap, the wolf realizes the fox's duplicity, saying, "if you will give such gifts to your friends, how will anyone embrace you as a friend?"[76] This fable puts the tactic in rather concrete terms of a physical trap with bait and nicely shows the potential dangers of accepting gifts

---

able to resist the temptation" (*Hist*., 18.34.8).

[75] Polyb., *Hist*., 15.21–22.

[76] Babrius 130.10–11 (ἀλλ᾽ εἰ τοιαῦτα...τοῖς φίλοις δώσεις τὰ δῶρα, πῶς σοί τις φίλος συναντήσει).

without due caution. The following examples— Philopoimen and the Spartans, Kritolaos and the Achaians, and Perseus and Eumenes—illustrate different aspects of the gift as bait motif.

Philopoimen (ca. 253–182 BC), the famed *strategos* of the Achaian League, invaded Sparta and through a combination of compulsion and persuasion brought the city into the Achaian League.[77] The Spartans decided to offer him a gift (χάρις, δωρεά), since, according to Polybios, they thought it advantageous to get in Philopoimen's favor.[78] But Philopoimen, receiving the proposal of a gift in a cordial manner (φιλανθρώπως), went before the Spartan Council and advised them that one should refrain from giving gifts to friends lest they lose their ability to speak freely to one another (παρρησία) and as result lose the ability to trust (πιστεύειν).[79] Instead, they should offer gifts and honors to enemies (ἐχθροί), so that, having swallowed "the bait" (τὸ δέλεαρ), their enemies would be obligated to support their proposals or stay silent.[80] This episode illustrates how people could be aware of the power of a gift or favor (δωρεά, χάρις) to set the terms of a relationship by imposing obligations that nullify potential disagreement and dissent. In this way gifts could not only create a positive, mutually beneficial relationship but could also be leveraged to disadvantage one party to the benefit of the other.

In 146 BC, the Roman general Mummius levelled Corinth and subsequently Rome seized for itself hegemony over Greece.[81] Polybios partly lays blame on Kritolaos,

---

[77] Plutarch, *Philopoimen*, 15.2; cf. Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 8.51.1. On this episode from 192 or 191 BC between Philopoimen and the Spartans, see Polyb., *Hist*., 20.12; Plutarch, *Philopoimen*, 15; Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 8.51.1–2.

[78] Polyb., *Hist*., 20.12.1–2. Plutarch reports that prominent Spartans saw an opportunity to use a gift to create a stronger attachment between Philopoimen and Sparta, since "they hoped to have him as a guard of their freedom" (φύλακα τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐκεῖνον ἐλπίσαντας ἕξειν). Plutarch, *Philopoimen*, 15.3.

[79] Polyb., *Hist*., 20.12.7.

[80] Polyb., *Hist*., 20.12.7.

[81] On the origins of the Achaian War, which disagrees with Polybios's analysis at many points and argues for a less intentional and more haphazard course of events, see Erich S. Gruen, "The Origins of the Achaean War," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 96 (1976): 46–69.

the Achaian *strategos* of 147/146, saying that he used the "gift as bait" trick to rile up the populace to go to war with Rome (war with Sparta only being the nominal target). According to Polybios, Kritolaos deceived the Achaian populace into war with Rome by lying about his conversations with Roman and Spartan negotiators (accusing them of wrongdoing) and ordering temporary debt-relief measures.[82] Polybios criticizes him harshly, saying, "As a result of such appeals to the rabble everything he said was accepted as true, and the people were ready to do anything he ordered, incapable as they were of taking thought for the future, and enticed by the bait of present favor and ease" (τῇ δὲ παρ᾽ αὐτὰ χάριτι καὶ ῥᾳστώνῃ δελεαζόμενον).[83] In reality, it is unlikely Kritolaos actually used the "gift as bait" tactic to lure the Achaians into war with Rome, but Polybios's own recourse to the motif to explain events illustrates its apparent usefulness as an explanatory category for himself and his audience.[84]

In another episode, the Antigonid king Perseus and the Attalid king Eumenes II negotiated a potential deal during Perseus's war with Rome (Polyb., *Hist*., 29.5–9). Eumenes was trying to position himself in the role of arbiter in the conflict between Perseus and Rome (Polyb., Hist., 29.7).[85] Whether or not Polybios correctly discerns the motives of Perseus and Eumenes, his account of the interaction illustrates the complexity of gifting and how two parties of an exchange can recognize and negotiate in full recognition that gifts can serve as "bait" under certain conditions. At the outset of the interaction Eumenes attempts to get Perseus to latch onto some promises to bait him into giving him money, proposing that Perseus either (1) give him 500 talents to stay neutral

---

[82] Polyb., *Hist*., 38.11.7–10.

[83] Polyb., *Hist*., 38.11.11 [Olson, Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

[84] For a non-Polybian explanation for Kritolaos's actions as reasonable but miscalculated rather than deliberately and maliciously anti-Roman, see Gruen, "The Origins of the Achaean War," 62–65.

[85] It should be noted that Polybios describes the relationship of Perseus and Eumenes as one of strong distrust (ἀπιστία), jealousy (ζηλοτυπία), and hostility (ἀλλότριος), so Eumenes's offer to be a mediator would be a hard sell (Polyb., *Hist*., 29.7.2).

and not support Rome militarily, or (2) give him 1500 talents to put an end to the war itself.[86] Perseus, recognizing the baiting tactic, "pretended to rush at these offers and to be coming to an agreement, but could never persuade himself to swallow any of the baits to the extent of making a sacrifice of money."[87] He questioned the exchange, saying that "it was disgraceful for the giver and still more so for the receiver to be thought to be hired to keep neutral."[88] Although Perseus made partial gestures toward accepting the deal, Eumenes ultimately backed out of the arrangement.[89] Polybios admonishes Eumenes for thinking that Perseus would trust him and that Rome would not find out about the deal and thus relieve him of his kingdom.[90] Likewise, he faults Perseus for not following through with the payment that, in Polybios's eyes, would benefit him by either ending the war or entrapping his enemy Eumenes in the ire of Rome.[91] This episode shows (1) how participants, being aware of how gifts can be used to entrap, may exercise caution in gift-exchange negotiations, and (2) that Polybios does not outright condemn the tactic of using a gift as bait; rather, he judges people's use of the tactic based on whether the strategy fits his own moral values (i.e., he critiques Eumenes for attempting it but faults Perseus for not using it).

From these examples one can conclude that the "gift as bait" tactic would have been part of the cultural encyclopedia of Greeks and recognizable. The strategy could be used to create a power asymmetry by dampening παρρησία in favor of one party, participants' awareness of the tactic could put pressure on parties to exercise caution

---

[86] Polyb., *Hist*., 29.8.5–6. Eumenes also promised to send hostages as pledge of good faith to Perseus.

[87] Polyb., *Hist*., 29.8.4 [Olson, Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

[88] Polyb., *Hist*., 29.8.7 [Olson, Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL] (αἰχρὸν ἔφησεν εἶναι καὶ τῷ διδόντι καὶ μᾶλλον ἔτι τῷ λαμβάνοντι τὸ δοκεῖν μισθοῦ τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἔχειν.

[89] Polyb., *Hist*., 29.8.5–10.

[90] Polyb., *Hist*., 29.9.1–6.

[91] Polyb., *Hist*., 29.9.7–11.

especially when negotiating with someone whom one distrusts, and its moral appropriateness could depend on one's perspective and the specific circumstances.

CHAPTER 3

BENEFACTION: SELECT MOTIFS

In order to calibrate legitimate cultural expectations and discern cultural scripts related to benefaction, this section explores discrete dynamics and motifs of benefaction that are especially relevant to Paul's letter to the Galatians: civic freedom, promise, starting and completing, word-deed congruency, benefits to the worthy and unworthy, generosity and abundance, time, ingratitude, fidelity and defection, kinship language, memory, imitation, and community survival.

Benefits and Patterns of Benefaction

Across the array of Greek cities in the Mediterranean and beyond, the deeds of benefactors afforded their recipients with a panoply of benefits. The meaningful deeds of personal service and the results of their services would feature in the landscape of public places in the form of inscriptions (e.g., temple, agora), be commemorated at festivals, and be awarded with praise and tokens of gratitude. This section explores salient benefits and services that benefactors provided for cities that contextualize Paul's language at several points in Galatians surrounding specific motifs: civic freedom, promise, starting and completing a benefaction, the congruity of one's words and deeds, expressions of generosity and abundance, the varied dynamics of giving benefits to worthy or unworthy people, and the language of time.

Civic Freedom

For Greek *poleis* in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods civic freedom (ἐλευθερία) generally entailed a certain level of political independence of the *polis* with an emphasis on internal democratic governance according to its native laws, constitution,

and ancestral customs as well as a lack of external constraints on that governance and on the city's population (e.g., compulsory payments, occupying garrisons, foreign governor, or a native or foreign-propped tyrant).[1] That is, civic freedom was generally conceived of in terms of freedom from external forceful constraint and freedom to operate with internal self-governance.[2] Yet each freedom-event or usage of the term ἐλευθερία (or ἐλευθερός) could highlight different motifs and specific elements relevant to its own local context.

The importance of freedom is revealed in how ἐλεύθερία is described in inscriptions and in the vehemence with which some cities fought to maintain it. Freedom is called "the first and [greatest] benefaction" (*RC* 71.11–12) and one of "the greatest goods" (*I.Stratonikeia* 512.9–10).[3] Augustus called it "the greatest privilege of all" and one of "the most highly prized privileges" that should not be given out in vain or without

---

[1] A brief but useful description of a Hellenistic *polis* is that it was "a corporate body of citizens, organized in a decision-making community, structured by norms and essentially democratic institutions whose authority regulated the common life" (i.e., a state), but it was also "a monumental urban center and a territory; a descent group with its myths; a system of participatory rituals; a sense of place and of past, and hence an identity; a locus of human interaction, and hence a society." John Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 150–151.

[2] It is useful to distinguish between primary and secondary freedom as outlined by Shane Wallace, who highlights the malleability of the meaning of civic freedom in the relationship between kings and Greek cities. He argues that ἐλευθερία "operated either as a point of unity or discord depending on the politics of its application: kings employed it to bind the city to the empire under royal patronage (Secondary freedom), while cities outwith the empire asserted it as a point of discord against royal control (Primary freedom." Otherwise phrased, the distinction is "freedom as granted by one power and conditional upon its goodwill (Secondary freedom) and freedom as a self-guaranteed right often asserted against another's control (Primary freedom)." Shane Wallace, "The Freedom of the Greek in the Early Hellenistic Period (337–262 BC). A Study in Ruler-City Relations" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2011), 14, 44. On complexity and variability of civic freedom in the late Classical and early Hellenistic world in general, see Wallace, "The Freedom of the Greek in the Early Hellenistic Period (337–262 BC)."

[3] "Now, being anxious to reward them fittingly with the first [and greatest] benefaction, [we have decided that they be] for all time free" (καὶ νυνὶ δὲ τῆς πρώ-|[της καὶ μεγίστης εὐεργ]εσίας καταξιῶσαι σπουδάζοντες| [αὐτούς, ἐκρίναμεν εἰ]ς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἐλευθέρους|[εἶναι]; *RC* 71.11–14; translation from *RC*). "Since through everything the *demos*, making known its piety to the deity as well as its thankfulness and on account of these things, to its advantage, obtained the notice of the gods, was itself delivered from the dangers and from the critical moment, and became free and autonomous and was appointed possessor of the greatest goods" (ἐπειδὴ διὰ παντὸς ὁ δῆμος ἀποδεικνύμενος‖ τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσέβιάν τε καὶ εὐχαριστίαν| καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῶι συμφέροντι τυγχάνων| τῆς παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἐπισημασίας διεσώθη ἐ|κ τῶν κινδύνων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ περιστάντος αὐτὸν καιροῦ| καὶ ἐλεύθερος καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο καὶ τῶν με‖γίστων ἀγαθῶν κύριος κατεστάθη; *I.Stratonikeia* 512.4–10).

good cause (Reynolds §13.4, 7).[4] It is no wonder, then, that the cities of Isauria and Abydos on separate occasions over a hundred years apart, in attempts to preserve their freedom, collectively fought to the point of committing themselves to death in a mass murder-suicide rather than submitting to the yoke of foreign dominion.[5] Each situation that involves freedom has its own local circumstances, particular shape, and accompanying motifs. A survey of some of the more significant instances that involve freedom of populations from the death of Alexander to the reign of Nero illustrates its enduring importance and highlights its significance(s) in order to accurately contextualize the notion of freedom in Paul's letter to the Galatians.

One of the most significant elements frequently attesting to a city's freedom is its ability to conduct its affairs without an occupying garrison.[6] In the wars of Alexander's successors, Antigonos I Monophthalmos and his son Demetrios I Poliorketes took it upon themselves to campaign for the freedom of Greek cities so that they might gain the favor of the *poleis*.[7] In 315 BC Antigonos publicized his campaign by sending decrees to Greek cities, saying "all the Greeks are free, ungarrisoned, and autonomous."[8]

---

[4] "Imperator Caesar Augustus, son of *divus* Julius, wrote to the Samians underneath their petition: You yourselves can see that I have given the privilege of freedom to no people except the Aphrodisians, who took my side in the war and were capture by storm because of their devotion to us. For it is not right to give the favor of the greatest privilege of all at random and without cause. I am well-disposed to you and should like to do a favor to my wife who is active in your behalf, but not to the point of breaking my custom. For I am not concerned for the money which you pay towards the tribute, but I am not willing to give the most highly prized privileges to anyone without good cause" (ἔξεστιν ὑμεῖν αὐτοῖς ὁρᾶν ὅτι τὸ φιλάνθρωπον τῆς ἐλευθερίας οὐδένι δέδωκα δήμῳ πλὴν τῷ τῶν| Ἀφροδεισιέων ὃς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τὰ ἐμὰ φρονήσας δοριάλωτος διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὔνοιαν ἐγένετο·| οὐ γάρ ἐστιν δίκαιον τὸ πάντων μέγιστον φιλάνθρωπον εἰκῇ καὶ χωρὶς αἰτίας χαρίζεσθαι. Ἐγὼ δὲ|| ὑμεῖν εὐνοῶ καὶ βουλοίμην ἂν τῇ γυναικί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν σπουδαζούσῃ χαρίζεσθαι ἀλλὰ| οὐχ ὥστε καταλῦσαι τὴν συνήθειάν μου· οὐδε γὰρ τῶν χρημάτων μοι μέλει ἃ εἰς τὸν φόρον τελεῖτε| *vac. star* ἀλλὰ τὰ τειμιώτατα φιλάνθρωπα χωρὶς αἰτίας εὐλόγου δεδωκένα *ν*. ι οὐδένι βούλομαι *star*; Reynolds §13.2–7; translation from Reynolds §13).

[5] For Isauria, see Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.22. For Abydos, see Polyb., *Hist*., 16.30–34; cf. *I.Priene* 19.7–20.

[6] On the variety of ways garrisons and occupied populations interacted in Hellenistic cities, see Angelos Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 88–93.

[7] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.61.3–4.

[8] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.61.3 (εἶναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἅπαντας ἐλευθέρους, ἀφρουρητούς, αὐτονόμους).

In the same year, Alexander son of Polyperchon, in the employ of Antigonos I, set about campaigning in the Peloponnesos to cast out Kassander's garrisons and "to reestablish for the cities their freedom."[9] In 313/312 BC Ptolemaios, *strategos* of Antigonos, freed the strategically significant city of Chalkis and left it ungarrisoned, a deliberate move by Antigonos to show that he was genuinely seeking the freedom of the Greek cities in contrast to the rival Kassander.[10] Apparently, though, Chalkis was not entirely freed at this time. Some years later (304 BC), after the death of the Antigonid *strategos* Ptolemaios (or Polemaios), the unknown honorand of an Athenian inscription completed the process of freeing Chalkis by removing the garrison guarding the Euripos (the channel between Boiotia and Euboia, of which Chalkis was the chief port).[11] The inscription reads: "Since . . . when he was appointed over the guard of the Euripos by Polemaios, when he (Polemaios) died he returned the Euripos to the Chalkidians and was responsible for the freedom of their city according to the purpose of the kings Antigonos and Demetrios."[12]

From 315 to 311 BC Antigonos freed many other cities from their occupying Macedonian garrisons and in the peace of 311 he was able to get the concession (however

---

[9] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.64.2 (τούτου δὲ χωρισθέντος Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπιὼν τὰς ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ πόλεις μετ᾽ Ἀριστοδήμου τὰς μὲν ὑπὸ Κασάνδρου καθεσταμένας φρουρὰς ἐκβαλεῖν ἐπειρᾶτο, ταῖς δὲ πόλεσιν ἀποκαθιστᾶν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν).

[10] "When Kassander had departed, the *strategos* of Antigonos, Ptolemaios, terrified those holding under garrison Chalkis and took the city and left the Chalkidians ungarrisoned, so that it would be evident that Antigonos genuinely had chosen to free the Greeks (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.78.2; ὁ δ᾽ Ἀντιγόνου στρατηγὸς Πτολεμαῖος χωρισθέντος εἰς Μακεδονίαν Κασάνδρου καταπληξάμενος τοὺς φρουροῦντας τὴν Χαλκίδα παρέλαβε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς Χαλκιδεῖς ἀφῆκεν ἀφρουρήτους, ὥστε γενέσθαι φανερὸν ὡς πρὸς ἀλήθειαν Ἀντίγονος ἐλευθεροῦν προήρηται τοὺς Ἕλληνας· ἐπίκαιρος γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἐστὶ τοῖς βουλομένοις ἔχειν ὁρμητήριον πρὸς τὸ διαπολεμεῖν περὶ τῶν ὅλων). Cassander had maintained a garrison at Chalkis with a certain Pleistarchos in command (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.77.5–6). On Chalkis as one of the three "fetters of Greece," important control points for occupying powers, see Polyb, *Hist*., 18.11; Livy, *History of Rome*, 32.37.3.

[11] *IG* II^2 469.

[12] ἐ[πειδὴ…]|…κατασταθεὶ[ς ἐπὶ τὴν| τ]οῦ Εὐρίπου φυλακὴν ὑπὸ Πολεμα[ίου, τελευ|τ]ήσαντος ἐκείνου ἀπέδωκε Χα[λκιδεῦσιν τ||ὸν Ε]ὔριπον κα[ὶ] α[ὐ]τιος ἐγένετο [τοῦ τὴν πόλ|ιν] αὐτῶν ἐλευθέραν γενέσθαι κα[τὰ τὴν προ|α]ίρεσιν τῶν βασιλέων Ἀντιγόνο[υ καὶ Δημη|τρ]ίου (*IG* II^2 469.1–8).

poorly abided) that the Greeks would be autonomous.[13] The city of Skepsis replied to Antigonos with gratitude, awarding divine honors and instituting a "glad tidings" (εὐαγγελία) offering for the news that Antigonos secured that "being free and autonomous, in good order they will continue into the future."[14] In 307 BC, Athens famously awarded divine honors to Antigonos and Demetrios for liberating the city from Kassander's garrison and from his hand-picked governor Demetrios of Phaleron.[15]

After Demetrios had left Athens, Kassander ventured to retake Attika and besieged Athens, but once again found himself repelled by Demetrios, who had returned to the Greek mainland after his siege of Rhodes.[16] Demetrios expelled several of Kassander's garrisons and restored freedom to several Greek polities.[17] An inscription set up by volunteers from Athens who were serving in Demetrios's army lauds him for his liberative self-endangerment and awards him with public praise, an equestrian statue in

---

[13] On Antigonos's campaign freeing Greek cities in 314–313, see Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.66, 73–75, 77–78. In 313/312 Antigonos freed Miletos. An inscription attests that in that year "the city became free and autonomous by (the agency of) Antigonos and the democracy was returned" (ἡ πόλις| ἐλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο ὑπὸ| Ἀντιγόνου καὶ ἡ δημοκρατία ἀπεδόθη; *I.Milet* I 3.123.2–4). On the peace of 311 between Kassander, Lysimachos, Ptolemy, and Antigonos that agreed about territorial sovereignty, see Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.105.1; *OGIS* 5 and 6 (for English translations and comments, see BD^2 §6; Austin^2 §38–39; *RC* §1). See also an inscription from Kolophon in which the city's *demos* decided to construct new walls and mentions its freedom secured by Alexander and Antigonos. Benjamin D. Meritt, "Inscriptions of Colophon," *The American Journal of Philology* 56, no. 4 (1935): 359–372, no. 1, lines 6–7. The inscription from Kolophon reads in part: "Since Alexander the king and Antigonos returned its freedom to it" (ἐπειδὴ παρέδωκεν αὐτῶι Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ βασιλεὺς| τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ Ἀντίγονος; ll. 6–7). For a brief discussion contextualizing this inscription in its historical context, see Getzel M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements of Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 183–187.

[14] ἐλεύθ-||[ρ]οι καὶ αὐτόνομοι ὄντες ἐν εἰρήνηι| [εἰς] τὸ λοιπὸν διάξουσιν (*OGIS* 6.15–17). For a English translation of *OGIS* 6, see BD^2 §6. On the relationship between Antigonos and Skepsis in relation to divine honors, see Christian Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities: The Early Cases*, trans. John Noël Dillon (Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Classical Press, 2017), 30–31. On the term εἰρήνη as referring to "good order", see Michael Dormandy, "How to Understand What Passes All Understanding: Using the Documentary Papyri to Understand in Paul," *NTS* 67 (2021): 220–240, who argues that "εἰρήνη is a public, political concept" that "describes a well-ordered, well-governed, socially and commercially well-functioning society, in which everything happens as it should, or at least as rulers decree it should" (235–236).

[15] On Demetrios's first liberation and stay in Athens, see Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 8.1–15.1. On the liberation of Athens, see especially Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 10.1.

[16] Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 23.1–2.

[17] Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 23.1–2.

the agora next to the statue of Democracy, and sacrifices to Demetrios Soter.[18] Demetrios's campaign of 303 BC in mainland Greece also afforded liberation to cities in the Peloponnesos.[19] He released from Macedonian control the cities of Argos, Sikyon, and Corinth by paying their occupying garrisons 100 talents to leave.[20] An inscription from Halikarnassos honors one of its own citizens, Zenodotos Baukideos, for his participation in the liberation of Troizen in the Peloponnesos from its Macedonian garrison during Demetrios's campaign.[21] It states, "having arrived at the right time he helped and struggled together with them for the freedom of the city and the expulsion of the garrison in a manner worthy of the fatherland and kinship and goodwill that the city (of Halikarnassos) has towards the Trozenians."[22] Ties of kinship between cities in this case facilitated cooperation toward the goal of freedom.

Other of Alexander's successors took note of the Antigonid strategy of Greek freedom.[23] Around 309–305 BC, Ptolemy I agreed to a treaty with the city of Iasos with the agreement that it be "free and autonomous and ungarrisoned and not subject to tribute."[24] Demetrios himself lost favor in Athens as his power in Macedonia crumbled

---

[18] *SEG* 25.149. For an English translation and background, see Jon D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 84–85.

[19] Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 25.

[20] Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 25.1.

[21] PH258005. On this inscription and its circumstances, see E. L. Hicks, "On an Inscription at Cambridge: Boechkh, *C. I. G*. 106," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 2 (1881): 98–101; Richard A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 440.

[22] καὶ κατὰ καιρὸν ἀφικόμενος| ἐβοήθησε καὶ συνηγωνίσατο αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὴν ἐξαγωγὴν| τῆς φρουρᾶς ἀξίως τῆς τε πατρίδος καὶ τῆς|| οἰκειότητος καὶ εὐνοίσας τῆς ὑπαρχούσης| τῆι πόλει πρὸς Τροζηνίους (PH258005.6–11).

[23] Diodoros notes that Antigonos's campaign for the freedom of Greek cities ignited a benefaction competition between Antigonos and other Diadochi like Ptolemy. He states, "While these things were going on, Ptolemy, who had heard what had been decreed by the Macedonians with Antigonos in regard to the freedom of the Greeks, published a similar decree himself, since he wished the Greeks to know that he was no less interested in their autonomy than was Antigonos. Each of them, indeed, perceiving that it was a matter of no little moment to gain the goodwill of the Greeks, rivalled the other in conferring favors upon this people" (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.62.1–2 [Geer, LCL]).

[24] ἐλεύθερος καὶ αὐτόνομος καὶ ἀφρούρητος καὶ ἀφορολόγητος (*I.Iasos* 2.6–7, 30–31, 50–51,

and in 287 BC the Athenians ousted his garrison at the Mouseion hill with the help of one of his own garrison commanders named Strombichos.[25] The honorific decree in his honor, with which the people and council awarded him praise, citizenship, and a gold grown, recounts his role in the events:

> Since Strombichos, who formerly served on campaign with Demetrios, when he had been left behind in the town with Spintharos, and the People had taken up arms for freedom and appealed that he place his soldiers in the service of the city, he put himself at the service of the People for their freedom and placed his armory on the side of the city, thinking that he should not stand in the way of what was in the interests of the city but share responsibility for its preservation, and he joined the People in the siege of the Mouseion, and after affairs had been concluded in favor of the city he has continued to provide unstintingly its remaining needs and has remained steadfast in his good will for the People.[26]

The inscription highlights Strombichos's role by crafting a narrative of service to the "interests of the city" (τὰ συμφέροντα), its preservation/deliverance (σωτηρία), and his continuous committed concern and provision for the Athenian people even after the liberation event.

A fascinating instance of liberation from a foreign garrison comes from the city of Eretria (ca. 285 BC) in which the city attributes their freedom to an act of the god Dionysos due to the garrison's sudden departure without a fight during the festival of Dionysos.[27] The text reads:

54–55).

[25] *IG* II^3 1 918–919 (the two surviving inscriptions from 266/265 BC combine to reconstruct part of the single decree that relays events from 287 BC). Demetrios maintained garrisons in Athens (including the Peiraios) after peace negotiations but officially conceded Athenian freedom. On the whole episode between Athens and Demetrios in 287 BC, see Christian Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, trans. Deborah Lucas Schneider (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 95–97.

[26] ἐπειδὴ Στρόμβιχος στρατευόμενος πρότερο[ν]| παρὰ Δημητρίωι καὶ καταλειφθεὶς ἐν τῶι ἄστει μετὰ Σ[πι-]|νθάρου, λαβόντος τοῦ δήμου τὰ ὅπλα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθ[ερ-||ί]ας καὶ παρακαλοῦ[ν]τος καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας τίθεσθα[ι π-]|ρὸς τὴμ πόλιν ὑπέκουσεν τῶι δήμωι εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν [κ|α]ὶ ἔθετο τὰ ὅπλα μετὰ τῆς πόλεως οἰόμενος δεῖν μὴ ἐνίσ[τ-]|ασθαι τῶι τῆς πόλεως συμφέροντι ἀλλὰ συναίτιος γενέσ[θ|α]ι τεῖ σωτηρίαι, συνεπολιόρκει δὲ καὶ τὸ Μουσ[εῖ]ον μετὰ [το-]||ῦ δήμου καὶ συντ[ε]λεσθέ[ντ]ων τεῖ πόει τῶν πρ[α]γμάτω[ν κ-]|αὶ τὰς λοιπὰς χρείας ἀπροφασίστως παρασχόμενο[ς διατ]|ετέλεκεν καὶ διαμεμένηκεν ἐν τεῖ τοῦ δήμου εὐ[νοίαι] (*IG* II^3 1 918.7–17). Translation by Sean Byrne, "Citizenship for Strombichos," Attic Inscriptions Online, last updated June 16, 2019, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII31/918. For Strombichos's awards, see *IG* II^3 1 919.17–26.

[27] *SEG* 64.778. See Anne-Françoise Jaccottet, "La Lierre de la Liberté," *ZPE* 80 (1990): 150–156; Denis Knoepfler, "ΕΧΘΟΝΔΕ ΤΑΣ ΒΟΙΩΤΙΑΣ. The Expansion of the Boeotian Koinon towards

> Since during the procession of Dionysos the garrison departed, and the People were liberated, and the ancestral laws and the democracy were recovered. So that it would be a memorial on this day, it was decided by the Council and the People: to crown every Eretrian and the inhabitants [with] an ivy crown at the procession of Dionysos.[28]

Interestingly, the inscription portrays Dionysos liberating each of the inhabitants of Eretria individually rather than the entire city as a collective political unit.[29]

After the first generation of the Diadochi, freedom continued to be realized by the removal of garrisons even to the time of Augustus. So, a certain Kleonymos "expelled the garrison and cast out the pirates and returned freedom to the city" of Alipheira in the Peloponnesos.[30] In 243/242 BC the *strategos* of the Achaian League, Aratos of Sikyon, expelled the Macedonian garrison from the Akrocorinthos.[31] Around 235 BC Olympichos, a local dynast, wrote to the city of Mylasa:

> Olympichos to the *boule* and *demos*, greetings. Since we have aimed at every opportunity to bestow the greatest benefits on your fatherland, we have never shrunk from anything that might lead to (your) repute and honor and have undergone great dangers on your behalf. For when we took over your city, we removed the garrison from the citadel and restored (the city) to you to be free and democratically governed. Since we have chosen to be in no respect second to the previous benefactors of your city, we wish to favor you by improving (the status) of the temples in your fatherland.[32]

Central Euboia in the Early Third Century BC," in *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects*, ed. Nikolaos Papzarkadas (Leiden: Brill, 2014): 68–94. For the longstanding association of Dionysos with liberation, see Jaccottet, "La Lierre de la Liberté," 151–153.

[28]ἐπειδὴ τῆι πομπῆι τῆι Διονύσου ἥ τε|| φρου⟨ρ⟩ὰ ἀπῆλθεν ὅ τε δῆμος ἠλευθερώθη κ[αὶ]| [τοὺς π]ατ⟨ρί⟩ους ⟨νόμ⟩ους καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν| ἐκομίσατο· ὅπως ὑπόμνημα τῆς| ἡμέρας ταύτης| ἦι, ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι· στεφανη|φορεῖν Ἐρετριεῖς πάντας καὶ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας|| κιττοῦ στέφανον τῆι πομπῆι τοῦ Διονύσου (*SEG* 64.778.4–10).

[29] Jaccottet, "La Lierre de la Liberté," 156.

[30] [ἐπεὶ] Κλεώνυμος ἐξάγαγε τὰν πρωρὰν καὶ τὸς πειρατὰς ἐξέ-|[βαλ]ε καὶ ἐλευθέραν τὰν πόλιν ἀπέδωκε (*SEG* 25.447.3–4). On various proposals of the date and occasion of this inscription, see W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography: Part VI* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 45–46.

[31] Later in the mid-220's BC Aratos would turn to Antigonos Doson (r. 229–221 BC) to save the Achaian League from the Spartan Kleomenes. Polybios's account is apologetic towards Aratos's seemingly contradictory actions two decades apart (*Hist*., 2.46–55) but Plutarch's account finds fault with him (*Kleomenes*, 16).

[32] Ὀλύππιχος τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι χ[αίρειν· προαιρούμενοι| ε]ὐεργετεῖν ἐν παντὶ καιρῶι τὰ μέγιστα τῆν πα[τρίδα οὐθενὸς εὐδέποτε]| ἀπέστημεν τῶν εἰς δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἀνηκόν[των μεγάλους ὑποστάντες ὐ]|πὲρ ὑμῶν κινδύνους· παραλαβόντες γὰρ τὴν [ὑμετέραν πόλιν τὴν φρου]|ρὰν ἐκ τῆς ἄρκας ἐξαγαγόντες ἐλεύθεραν [καὶ] δημοκρτουμένην ἀπο||κατεστήσαμεν ὑμῖν· αἱρούμ[μ]ενοι[οι δ᾽ ἐν οὐθε]νὶ

In Athens around 215 BC, the people honored a certain Eurykleides for his long career of service and benefaction to the city in previous decades, in which, among many other deeds, "he restored the freedom of the city with his brother Mikion" by helping pay the occupying royal Macedonian garrisons to leave.[33]

With the coming of Roman involvement and eventual hegemony over the Mediterranean, ἐλευθερία continued to be expressed in part as being ungarrisoned. When Rome defeated Philip V, Flamininus announced at the Isthmian games in 196 BC that a large number of Greek cities would now be "free, ungarrisoned, without tribute, subject to their ancestral laws."[34] Plutarch reasons that Flamininus convinced the ten Roman envoys to free the whole of Greece by removing all the garrisons rather than keeping Corinth, Chalkis, and Demetrias under garrisons "so that the benefaction (ἡ χάρις) would be whole (rather than partial) from him to the Greeks."[35] For this act of deliverance, Flamininus received voluminous gratitude, being hailed as σωτήρ and given divine honors by several cities.[36] Later, during the mid-first century BC, the city of Plarasa-

---

δ[ε]ύτεροι εἶναι τῶν εὐεργετη|σάντων πρ̣ο̣[τὲ τὴν πό]λιν, τ̣ά̣δ̣ε βουλόμενοι ὑμῖν τε χαρίζεσθαι καὶ τὰ ἱε|[ρὰ τὰ ἐν τ]ῇι πατρίδι αὔξειν (*I.Labraunda* 8.10–17); translation modified from "Letter of Olympichos to Mylasa, Concerning Dedicated Land," Translations of Hellenistic Inscriptions: 33, accessed July 10, 2021, http://www.attalus.org/docs/other/inscr_33.html). On the sacred land leasing scheme mentioned in *I.Labraunda* 8b, see Beate Dignas, "The Leases of Sacred Property at Mylasa: An Alimentary Scheme for the Gods," *Kernos* 13 (2000): 117–126.

[33] τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀποκατέστησ[εν τῆι πόλει με]|τὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Μικίωνος (*IG* II^3 1 1160.10–12). When Demetrios II (r. 239–229) died, the Athenians "started to vie for their freedom" (ὥρμησαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν; Plutarch, *Aratos*, 34.4). A sickly Aratos helped convince Diogenes the garrison commander "to return the Peiraios, Mounychia, Salamis, and Sounion to the Athenians for a hundred and fifty talents, of which Aratos himself contributed twenty to the city" (Plutarch, *Aratos*, 34.4). After the garrisons left, the Athenians strengthened their fortifications in an effort to ensure their newly free status (*IG* II^3 1 1160.14–16). On this episode, see Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, 173–174.

[34] ἐλευθέρους, ἀφρουρήτους, ἀφορολογήτους, νόμοις χρωμένους τοῖς πατρίοις (Polyb., *Hist*., 18.46.5). On the whole episode, see Polyb., *Hist*., 18.44–46.

[35] ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἀχθόμενος ὁ Τίτος καὶ βαρέως φέρων, καὶ δεόμενος τοῦ συνεδρίου, τέλος ἐξέπεισε καὶ ταύτας τὰς πόλεις ἀνεῖναι τῆς φρουρᾶς, ὅπως ὁλόκληρος ἡ χάρις ὑπάρξῃ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 10.2.

[36] Polyb., *Hist*., 18.46.10–12. Polybios remarks that "however excessive their gratitude may seem to have been, one may confidently say that it was far inferior to the greatness of the event," which "by a single proclamation all the Greeks inhabiting Asia and Europe became free, ungarrisoned, subject to no tribute and governed by their own laws" (Polyb., *Hist*., 18.46.13, 15 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]). For various responses of gratitude, see Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 10–12. For Flamininus's liberation of Gytheion from Sparta, the *demos* of Gytheion erected a statue (195 BC) that hails Flamininus as its σωτήρ

Aphrodisias (soon to be simply known as Aphrodisias) enjoyed free status, which included being ungarrisoned and without a Roman commander.[37]

In addition to freedom from garrisons, freedom could be realized when a city was free from control of a foreign governor or from tyrants.[38] One can note how Klaros honored a certain benefactor Menippos, since, among other things, "he freed those inhabiting the city from the taking of pledges and the governing control."[39] Elsewhere, the city of Priene celebrated its liberation from a certain Hieron, a tyrant who had controlled the city for some three years, and instituted a festival to commemorate the occasion.[40] Polybios remarks that the Antigonos II Gonatas (r. 283–239 BC) imposed tyrannical governance upon certain Greek cities.[41] During the formation of the Achaian League in the mid-third century BC, some Achaian cities expelled occupying garrisons or killed (or forced to abdicate) Macedonian-propped tyrants in order to join the federation.[42] According to Polybios's idealistic description of the Achaian League's goals, they sought to live in a state of mutual aid, liberty (ἐλευθερία), and common harmony of the Peloponnesians (ἡ κοινὴ ὁμόνοια Πελοποννησίων).[43] In this way, civic

---

(Τίτον Τίτου Κοΐγκτιον στραταγὸν ὕπατον Ῥωμαίων ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Γυθεατᾶν τὸν αὐτοῦ σωτῆρα; *Syll*.[3] 592; English translation in BD[2] §37 and Sherk [1984] §6B; cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 34.29.13 in which Flamininus makes a deal to remove the garrison from Gytheion). Cities and individuals thanked Flamininus: Corinth (*SEG* 22.214), Eretria (*IG* XII 9.233), Delphi (*Syll*.[3] 616), Scotussa in Thessaly (*SEG* 23.412), Gytheion (*SEG* 11.923), Argos (*SEG* 22.266.13–14), and Chalkis (Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 16.3–4; *IG* XII 9.931). For English translations of some of the documents, see Sherk [1984] §6. On *SEG* 22.266 and the novel honor of a Roman having a competition named after him, see Georges Daux, "Concours des Titeia dans un décret d'Argos," *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 88, no. 2 (1964): 569–576.

[37] Reynolds §9.

[38] Polybios constructs a speech for the Aitolian envoy to Sparta named Chlaineas in which the speaker considers foreign garrisons and foreign-propped tyrants as a form of enslavement (δουλεία; Polyb., *Hist*., 9.29.6).

[39] τοὺς δὲ κατοι|κοῦντας τὴν πόλιν ἠλευθέρωσε κατεγγυήσεων| καὶ στρατηγικῆς ἐξουσίας (*SEG* 39.1244, Col. I.37–39; after 120/119 BC).

[40] *I.Priene* 11 (297 BC); cf. *I.Priene* 37.65–83.

[41] Polyb., *Hist*., 2.41.10.

[42] Polyb., *Hist*., 2.41.13–15; 2.43.3, 8–9; 2.43.3–6.

[43] Polyb., *Hist*., 2.42.5–6.

freedom of independent but cooperatively interconnected democratically governed cities stands together over against a monarchic, centralized power structure subject to a single human mind and will.[44]

Not being subject to tribute or taxes also constituted a form of freedom. So, a treaty between Iasos, Ptolemy I, and certain others stipulates that the city of Iasos be "free and autonomous and ungarrisoned and not subject to tribute (ἀφορολόγητος)."[45] A decree from the League of Islanders (ca. 280 BC) recognizes Ptolemy I Soter's benefactions to it, since he "has been responsible for many great blessings to the Islanders and the other Greeks, having liberated the cities [310–308 BC], restored their laws, re-established to all their ancestral constitution and remitted their taxes."[46] The Seleukid king Antiochos II confirmed that he would maintain the autonomy of Erythrai by maintaining it as "free from tribute" (ἀφορολόγητος).[47] As noted above, when Flamininus announced freedom in 196 BC to the Greeks, he included the stipulation of tribute exemption (ἀφορολόγητος).[48] In 189 BC the Roman Spurius Postumius (consul 186 BC) wrote to Delphi twice to confirm the inviolability of the city and the temple of Apollo as well as the city's freedom and exemption from tribute. He wrote to the

---

[44] See also Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 16.65–70, 72–73, 77–83, 90.

[45] ἐλεύθερος καὶ αὐτόνομος καὶ ἀφρούρητος καὶ ἀφορολόγητος (*I.Iasos* 2.7–8, 30–31, 50–51, 54–55; 309–305 BC). Cf. *I.Iasos* 3 (ca. 305–295 BC).

[46] ἐπειδὴ ὁ| [β]ασιλεὺς καὶ σωτὴρ Πτολεμαῖος πολλῶν| καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος ἐγένετο τοῖς| [τ]ε νησιώταις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἕλλησιν, τάς τε π[ό|λ]εις ἐλευθερώσας καὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀποδοὺς|| [κ]αὶ τὴμ πάτριομ πολιτείαμ πᾶσιγ καταστήσα[ς| κ]αὶ τῶν εἰσφορῶγ κουφίσας (*IG* XII 7 506.10–16).

[47] "And since Tharsynon and Pythes and Bottas have shown that under Alexander and Antigonus your city was autonomous and free from tribute, while our ancestors were always zealous on its behalf; since we see that their judgement was just, and since we ourselves wish not to lag behind in conferring benefits, we shall help you to maintain your autonomy and we grant you exemption not only from other tribute but even from [the] contributions [to] the Gallic fund" (καὶ ἐπειδὴ οἱ Θαρσύνοντα καὶ Πυθῆν καὶ Βοτ|τᾶν ἀπέφαινον διότι ἐπί τε Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ἀντιγόνου αὐτό|[ν]ομος ἦν καὶ ἀφορολόγητος ἡ πόλις ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι πρόγο|[νοι] ἔσπευδον ἀεί ποτε περὶ αὐτῆς, θεωροῦ<ν>τες τούτους τε κρί||[ναν]τας δικαίως καὶ αὐτοὶ βουλόμενοι μὴ λείπεσθαι ταῖς εὐερ|[γεσ]ίαις, τήν τε αὐτονομίαν ὑμῖν συνδιατηρήσομεν καὶ ἀφορο|[λογ]ήτους εἶναι συγχωροῦμεν τῶν τε ἄλλων ἁπάντων καὶ| [τῶν εἰς] τὰ Γαλατικὰ συναγομένων; *I.Erythr.* 31.21–28 [= *RC* 15; *OGIS* 223]; translation from BD^2 §22; see also English translations in Austin^2 §170 and Burstein §23).

[48] Polyb., *Hist*., 18.46.5.

Delphians that they "shall be autonomous and free and exempt from tribute, dwelling and conducting governance according to their own (laws) and ruling the sacred land and the sacred harbor as was their ancestral custom from of old."[49] In 55 BC the city of Mytilene, which had joined Mithradates in 88 BC and participated in the mass slaughter of the Romans in Asia, and was subsequently subject to Rome as a *civitas stipendiaria* and opened to the *publicani*, received pardon and freedom from Pompey that included exemption from taxes.[50] In 39 BC the Roman senate granted Plarasa-Aphrodisias freedom that included tax exemption and the ability to be governed by their own ancestral laws.[51] Finally, in AD 67 Nero personally announced "freedom" (ἐλευθερία) and "tax exemption" (ἀνεισφορία) for Greek cities.[52] Thus, tax- and tribute-exemption, which release a city from the coercive subjection of tax and tribute, were additional occasions for celebrating freedom.

The freedom of non-inference, that is, freedom from all manner of compelled subjection like garrisons, foreign governors, tyrants, and tribute or taxes, was complemented by the positive aspects of freedom, which entailed freedom to conduct

---

[49] [καὶ]‖ τὴν πόλιν τῶν Δελφῶν καὶ τὴν χώραν καὶ Δ[ελφοὺ]ς αὐτονόμους καὶ ἐλευθέρους κ̣[αὶ ἀνεισφόρους, οἰκοῦν]‖τας καὶ πολιτεύοντας αὐτοὺς καθ᾽ αὐ[τοὺς καὶ] κυριεύοντας τῆς τε ἱερᾶς χώρ[ας καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ λι-]‖μένος καθὼς πάτριον αὐτοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς [ἦν] (*FD* III 4 353.11–14; cf. ll. 4–7; translation my own; one can find a full English translation in Sherk [1984] §15; Cf. *Syll*.[3] 609 [190 BC]).

[50] *RDGE* §25 and commentary (pp. 144–145).

[51] Reynolds §8.58–62. It reads, "…and (it is agreed) that the community, and the citizens of Plarasa and Aphrodisias are to have, hold, use and enjoy all those lands, places, buildings, villages, estates, strongpoints, pastures, revenues which they had when they entered the friendship of the Roman People, and are to be free, and immune from taxation and the presence of tax-contractors. Neither are any of them obliged on any account to give or contribute (anything) but they are to be free in all respects and immune from taxation and are to enjoy their own traditional laws and those which they pass among themselves hereafter" (ὅπως τε ἡ πολειτήα, οἱ πολεῖται οἱ Πλαρασέων καὶ Ἀφροδεισιέων μεθ᾽ ὧν ἀγρῶν, τόπων,| οἰκοδομιῶν, κωμῶν, χωρίων, ὀχυρωμάτων, ὀρῶν, προσόδων πρὸς τὴν φιλίαν το[ῦ] δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων προσῆλθον ταῦτα‖ πάντας ἔχω[σ]ιν, κρατῶσιν, χρῶνται, καρπίζωνται τε, πάντων τῶν πραγμάτων ⟦Ν⟧ ἐ[λ]εύθεροι ἀτελεῖς τε καὶ ἀδημοσιώνητοι ὦσιν| Μήτε μην τιγ[ες δ]ιά τινα αἰτίαν ἐκείνων δ<ι>δόναι (?τι) μηδὲ <σ>υνεισφέρειν ὀφείλωσιν, [ἀ]λλὰ ἐλεύθεροι καὶ ἀτελεῖς ὦσιν, νόμοις| τε ἰδίοις π[ατρί]οις καὶ οὓς ἂν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν ἑαυτοῖς κυρ<ώ>σ<ω>σιν χρῶν[ται]; translation from Reynolds §8). Cf. Reynolds §9, §13. For a similar grant of freedom see *CIL* I[2] 589 (English translation in Sherk [1984] §72).

[52] πάντες οἱ τὴν Ἀχαΐαν καὶ τὴν ἕως| νῦν Πελοπόννησον κατοικοῦντες Ἕλληνες| λάβετ᾽ ἐλευθερίαν ἀνισφορίαν, ἣν οὐδ᾽ ἐν τοῖς εὐτυ-‖χεστάτοις ὑμῶν πάντες χρόνοις ἔσχετε (*IG* VII 2713.13–15; English translations in Danker §44 and Braund §261; cf. Suetonius, *Nero*, 24; *RPC* I.1203–1206).

affairs according to the city's own laws and ancestral (often democratic) constitution. Hence, when Demetrios Poliorketes liberated Athens in 307 BC his program involved both expelling the Macedonian garrison and restoring the laws and ancestral (democratic) constitution.[53] Examples previously mentioned feature similar expressions of freedom: Miletos (democratic governance; 313/312 BC), Eretria (ancestral laws, democratic governance; ca. 285 BC), League of Islanders (restored laws, ancestral constitution; ca. 280 BC), Mylasa (democratic governance; ca. 235 BC), various Greek cities (ancestral laws; 196 BC), Delphi (govern selves with own laws, control of ancestral land and harbor possessions; 189 BC), Plarasa-Aphrodisias (ancestral laws; 39 BC).[54] Examples could be multiplied across time and space.[55] A brief mention of a few additional instances can be illustrative.

Around 255/254 BC, Athens honored as their benefactor Phaidros of Sphettos. Phaidros served as *strategos* (296/295 BC), served successfully as envoy to Ptolemy, *strategos* for hoplites (288/287 BC), protected the countryside, provided corn and other produce to Athens from the countryside, served as *agonothetes* twice (282/281 BC and another time), and overall acted in word and deed to benefit the city throughout his life.[56]

---

[53] γενομένου δὲ τούτου κήρυκα παραστησάμενος ἀνεῖπεν ὅτι πέμψειεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐλευθερώσοντα καὶ τὴν φρουρὰν ἐκβαλοῦντα καὶ τοὺς νόμους αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν πάτριον ἀποδώσοντα πολιτείαν. Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 8.5. See also Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 10.1.

[54] References: Miletos (*I.Milet* I 3.123.2–4), Eretria (*SEG* 64.778.4–10), League of Islanders (*IG* XII 7 506.10–16), Mylasa (*I.Labraunda* 8.10–17), various Greek cities freed by Flamininus (Polyb., *Hist*., 18.46.5), Delphi (*FD* III 4 353.11–14; cf. ll. 4–7), Plarasa-Aphrodisias (Reynolds §8.58–62).

[55] Freedom expressed as the ability to conduct affairs according to their own/ancestral laws and/or ancestral constitution, and/or democratic governance being facilitated, maintained, or restored includes the following additional instances: *IG* XII 4 132.37–39 (306–301 BC); *IOSPE* 1^2 401 (2nd half of 4th–early 3rd c. BC); *I.Priene* 11.7–15 (297 BC), cf. *I.Priene* 37.65–83; probably *SEG* 59.1406A (281 BC); *IG* II^3 1 912.7–18 (265/264 BC); *I.Erythr.* 504.14–20 (268–262 BC); *SEG* 58.1220 (150–100 BC copy of inscription from 240–200 BC); *I.Iasos* 4.1–32 = Ma §26A (ca. 196/195 BC); *Syll*.^{3} 591.32–35, 70–75 (196/195 BC); *IC* 4 176 (195–168 BC), cf. *IC* 1 8.9; *Syll*.^{3} 618.10–17 (190 BC); *SEG* 39.1244 (after 120/119 BC); *OGIS* 449 (46–44 BC); *I.Knidos* 51.3–8 (ca. 45 BC); *I.Knidos* 52.7–11 (ca. 45 BC and later); *I.Knidos* 54.9–11 (ca. 45 BC and later); *I.Knidos* 55.6–11 (ca. 45 BC and later), cf. *I.Knidos* 53 (ca. 45 BC and later).

[56] *IG* II^3 1 985. On the career of Phaidros, see T. Leslie Shear, Jr., *Hesperia Supplements* 17*: Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.* (Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1978), 9–11; Phillip E. Harding, *Athens Transformed, 404–262 BC: From Popular Sovereignty to Dominion of Wealth* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 96–97.

The honorific decree for Phaidros also notes that "he handed over the city free, democratic and autonomous, and under the rule of law to those after him."[57] Similarly, some two hundred years later in 36 BC the *demos* of Stratonikeia set up an honorific decree for Marcus Cocceius Nerva for his role in the city's freedom.[58] The *demos* of Stratonikeia awarded Cocceius Nerva various honors because "he restored to us both our ancestral freedom and constitution."[59] Each expression of freedom over the long time period the spans the Hellenistic and early Roman periods showed its own complex of concepts in light of their particular situations, but the two most prevalent and significant elements were (1) freedom from external compulsion and (2) freedom to internal governance according to the city's own ancestral laws and constitution.

A few discrete motifs present in freedom events deserve mention as a part of the repertoire of cultural scripts that could be invoked during a textual expression of a freedom event. One important adjunctive script alongside freedom was to explicitly contrast freedom with enslavement. When Chremonides proposed a decree to the Athenian people to ally Athens with Sparta and with the aid of Ptolemy II to fight Antigonas II Gonatas (who had gained the Macedonian throne in 277/276 BC), he invoked the script of freedom in contrast to enslavement.[60] Chremonides invokes the past analogically to persuade the Athenians in the present. He mentions the past alliances of

---

[57] καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ δημοκρατουμένην αὐ|τόνομον παρέδωκεν καὶ τοὺς νόμους κυρίους τοῖς μεθ'|| ἑαυτὸν (*IG* II^3 1 985.38–40). Translation from Sean Byrne, "Honours for Phaidros of Sphettos," Attic Inscriptions Online, last updated March 6, 2018, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII31/985.

[58] *I.Stratonikeia* 509 (found at Lagina). The inscription in full reads: ὁ δῆμος ἐτείμησεν ταῖς δευτέραις| τιμαῖς Μᾶρκον Κοκκήϊον Νέρουαν| τὸν αὐτοκράτορα ὕπατόν τε ἀποδεδει|γμένον, εὐεργέτην καὶ πάτρωνα καὶ σω-||τῆρα γεγονότα τῆς πόλεως, ἀποκαθεστα|κότα δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὴν πάτριον ἐλευθερί|αν τε καὶ πολειτείαν, ἐπαίνωι, χρυσῶι| στεφάνωι ἀριστείωι, εἰκόκνι χαλκῆι ἐφίπ|πωι, προεδρίαι ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν, ἀρετῆς|| ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας καὶ εὐεργεσίας τῆς| εἰς ἑαυτόν; The *demos* honored for a second time with honors Marcus Cocceius Nerva, imperator, appointed consul, who became benefactor and patron and preserver of the city, he restored to us both our ancestral freedom and constitution, with praise, a gold crown of valor, a bronze equestrian statue, front seat at the games, on account of the excellence and goodwill and beneficence that is in himself.

[59] *I.Stratonikeia* 509.5–7.

[60] *IG* II^3 1 912 (265/264 BC). For English translation see BD^2 §19 and Austin^2 §61.

Athens and Sparta and how "in former times" they "together fought many noble struggles alongside one another against those who were trying to enslave (καταδουλοῦσθαι) the cities, from which deeds they both won for themselves fair reputation and brought about freedom for the rest of the Greeks."[61] The decree continues, "and (whereas) now, when similar circumstances have overtaken all Greece on account of those who are trying to overthrow the laws and the ancestral institutions of each (of the cities), King Ptolemy, in accordance with the policy of his ancestors and his sister, shows clearly his concern for the common freedom of the Greeks."[62] By comparing the past alliances and threat of enslavement of the shared (constructed) past Chremonides brings that shared cultural memory to conceptualize the present and persuade his community to action.

According to Polybios, when Philopoimen led the Achaians into battle against the Spartan tyrant Machanidas (208/207 BC) he motivated his soldiers with a speech to the effect of, "the present battle has been engaged by those [who fight] on behalf of dishonorable and shameful slavery and by those [who fight] on behalf of eternally memorable and radiant freedom."[63] At the prospects of Roman garrisons replacing the Macedonian ones in Greece after Flamininus defeated Philip V (196 BC), the Aitolians objected that such a state of affairs would be simply a "change of masters" (μεθάρμοσις δεσποτῶν) rather than freedom.[64] A few decades later (171–170 BC) the Roman senate

---

[61] Χρεμωνίδης Ἐτεοκλέους Αὐθαλίδης εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ| πρότερομ μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχ|οι οἱ ἑκατέρων φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν κοινὴν ποιησάμενο-||ι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ καλοὺς ἀγῶνας ἠγωνίσαντο με|τ᾽ ἀλλήλων πρὸς τοὺς καταδουλοῦσθαι τὰς πόλεις ἐπιχειρ|οῦντας, ἐξ ὧν ἑαυτοῖς τε δόξαν ἐκτήσαντο καὶ τοῖς ἄλλ[ο]ις| Ἕλλησιν παρασκεύασαν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν (*IG* II^3 1 912.7–13). Translation from BD^2 §19.

[62] καὶ νῦν δὲ κ[α]ρῶν| καθειληφότων ὁμοίων τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν διὰ το[ὺς κ]αταλύε||ιν ἐπιχειροῦντας τούς τε νόμους καὶ τὰς πατρίους ἑκάστ|οις πολιτείας ὅ τε βασιελεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ἀκολούθως τεῖ τ|ῶν προγόνων καὶ τεῖ τῆς ἀδελφῆς προ[α]ιρέσει φανερός ἐστ|ιν σπουδάζων ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς τ[ῶν] Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας (*IG* II^3 1 912.13–18). Translation from BD^2 §19.

[63] Polyb., *Hist*., 11.12.3. ὅτι τοῖς μὲν ὑπὲρ αἰσχρᾶς καὶ ἐπονειδίστου δουλείας, τοῖς δ᾽ ὑπὲρ ἀειμνήστου καὶ λαμπρᾶς ἐλευθερίας συνέστηκεν ὁ παρὼν κίνδυνος. Translation mine, consulting Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL.

[64] Polyb., *Hist*., 18.45.6. On the whole episode, see Polyb., *Hist*., 18.44–46. See also Plutarch's description of the Aitolian complaint, which elaborates on the "change of masters" metaphor. Plutarch describes how the Aitolians called upon the Greek cities to push back and demanded Titus remove "the

wrote to the Delphic Amphyktyony and accused Perseus of attempting to destroy the freedom its commanders afforded the Greek cities and of trying to enslave them.[65]

The early imperial period also exhibits the freedom-enslavement contrast. Thus, the beginning of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (AD 14) opens with the dramatic deliverance that Augustus enacted for Rome and frames his defeat of his opponents in terms of liberation from enslavement, saying, "When I was nineteen years old, I got ready on my own initiative and at my own expense the army by means of which I set the state free from the slavery (ἐκ τῆς…δουλήας [ἠλευ]θέ[ρωσα]) imposed by the conspirators."[66] Decades later Nero embedded his own proclamation of Greece's tax-exemption and liberation in the context of Greece's history of subjection to others and to one another, saying that their present reception of freedom by his hand is "something that none of you experienced even in your finest days, for you were either slaves to others or to one another."[67] Nero's comparison of past and present highlights his own comparative generosity (χάρις) by heightening the long-enduring subjection and precarity of the Greeks.[68] The rhetorical positioning of civic freedom in contrast to civic enslavement

---

fetters of Greece" (Chalkis, Corinth, and Demetrias), and asked "the Greeks whether they were glad to have a fetter now which was smoother than the one they had worn before, but heavier; and whether they admired Titus as a benefactor because he had unshackled the foot of Greece and put a collar round her neck" (Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 10.1–2 [Perrin, LCL]).

[65] *RDGE* 40B. Part of the inscription reads, "And, desiring [a great] war, so that, [finding you] unaided, he (Perseus) might quickly enslave [all the Greek cities" ([τάχα τὰς ἑλλη|νίδας πό]λεις καταδουλώσηται π[άσης] (*RDGE* 40B.27–28). Cf. *RDGE* 40B.11, which reads "but instead for the enslavement [of Greece]" (ἐπὶ καταδουλώσει δὲ [τῆς Ἑλλάδος]), speaking of how Perseus brought Gallic soldiers to Delphi, like the ones who previously attempted to enslave Greece but whom the gods rebuked at Delphi. Translation from BD^2 §44. For other English translations, see Sherk [1984] §19 and Austin^2 §93. Cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 42.13 (Eumenes's accusations against Perseus).

[66] *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 1.1. Translation from Alison E. Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 59.

[67] πάντες οἱ τὴν Ἀχαΐαν καὶ τὴν ἕως| νῦν Πελοπόννησον κατοικοῦντες Ἕλληνες| λάβετ' ἐλευθερίαν ἀνισφορίαν, ἣν οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς εὐτυ-||χεστάτοις ὑμῶν πάντες χρόνοις ἔσχετε·| ἢ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίοις ἢ ἀλλήλοις ἐδουλεύσατε (*IG* VII 2713.12–16; AD 67). Translation from Danker §44. Cf. Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 12.8; Suetonius, *Nero*, 24.2.

[68] "If only I had been able to grant this gift while Hellas was in its prime. How many more could then have benefited from my generosity (χάρις)! As it is, I can only blame the passage of time that has exhausted before me such magnitude of generosity (χάρις)…. Other commanders have liberated cities, [but Nero] an entire province" (πόλεις μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλοι ἠλευθέρωσαν ἡγεμόνες| [Νέρων δὲ ὅλη]ν

strengthens the emotional weight of the freedom, could bolster the liberator's reputation, or could help provide a persuasive emotional buttress for or against a certain course of actions.

On certain occasions the discourse of freedom is embedded in a peristatic narration. That is, the freedom was achieved amid dangerous circumstances with existential implications for a city or at the cost of great personal risk on the part of a benefactor. Here the motifs of endangered benefaction and freedom coalesce. So, in an honorific inscription Athens highlights the self-endangerment of the benefactor-king Demetrios I Poliorketes who "himself enduring [every] danger and labor" liberated the city.[69] When the city of Priene expelled its tyrant Hieron they honored their citizens who "hazarded danger" (κινδυνεύσαι) to restore its ancestral constitution and freedom.[70] After Olympichos restored Mylasa's freedom and democratic governance he wrote to them describing his service to them by highlighting that he had undertaken dangers (κίνδυνοι) in a manner that never neglected their "repute and honor" (δόξα καὶ τιμή).[71] Polybios explains that the excessive praise and gratitude of the freed Greek cities in 196 BC was because of the amazing (θαυμαστόν) undertaking of Rome and Flamininus "to endure

---

ἐπαρχείαν; *IG* VII 2713.17–26). Translation from Danker §44, slightly modified.

[69] κίνδυνον καὶ πόν[ον αὐτὸς μὲν πάντα ὑπομένων] (*SEG* 25.149.7; ca. 303/302 BC). Translation from Jon D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 84.

[70] *I.Priene* 11.7–15 (297 BC); cf. *I.Priene* 37.65–83.

[71] *I.Labraunda* 8.10–15 (ca. 235 BC): Olympichos to the Council and the People, greetings. We, having purposed to benefit your fatherland with great things at every moment, [never] avoided [anything] that leads toward repute and honor, [having endured] on your behalf great dangers. We, having taken your city and ejected the garrison from the citadel, restored freedom and democratic governance to you. (Ὀλύππιχος τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι χ[αίρειν· προαιρούμενοι| ε]ὐεργετεῖν ἐν παντὶ καιρῶι τὰ μέγιστα τὴν πα[τρίδα οὐθενὸς οὐδέποτε]| ἀπέστημεν τῶν εἰς δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἀνηκόν[των μεγάλους ὑποστάντες ὑ-]||πὲρ ὑμῶν κινδύνους· παραλαβόντες γὰρ τὴν [ὑμερτέραν πόλιν τὴν φρου-]||ρὰν ἐκ τῆς ἄκρας ἐξαγαγόντες ἐλευθέραν [καὶ] δημοκρατουμένην ἀπο-||κατεστήσαμεν ὑμῖν). Cf. *SEG* 50.1116; *SEG* 58.1220. For commentary on the various documents related to Olympichos found in the temple at Labraunda, see Signe Isager and Lars Karlsson, "A New Inscription from Labraunda. Honorary Decree for Olympichos: *I.Labraunda* No. 134 (and No. 49)," *Epigraphica Anatolica* 41 (2008): 39–52; Damien Aubriet, "Olympichos et le Sanctuaire de Zeus à Labraunda (Caire): Autour de Quelques Documents Épigraphiques," in *Communautés Locales et Pouvoir Central dans l'Orient Hellénistique et Romain*, ed. Christophe Feyel, Julien Fournier, Laëtitia Graslin-Thomé, François Kirbilher (Paris: Nancy, 2012), 185–209.

every expense and every danger for the freedom of the Greeks."[72] At some point in the late second or early first century BC the people of Stratonikeia attributed their newfound "free and autonomous" status to the agency of the gods, for they "were delivered from the dangers and from the critical moment."[73] Finally, Plutarch lauds Brutus for his principled self-endangerment for the sake of Roman freedom for his personally risky opposition to his benefactor Caesar.[74] These liberation narratives that include risk and danger heighten the emotional weight of a liberative event and focus attention on the depths to which a benefactor went to secure freedom. By mentioning risk and danger peristatic narrations increase the prestige of a benefactor and the significance of a benefaction.

As in the aforementioned inscription from Stratonikeia (*I.Stratonikeia* 512), some achievements of freedom were attributed to divine agency. When the people of Priene ousted Hieron the tyrant, they praised their brave citizens who accomplished the freedom "with the foresight of the gods" ([μετὰ| τῆ]ς τῶν θεῶμ προνοίας).[75] Since the occupying garrison left the city of Eretria without a fight during the festival of Dionysos, the city attributed their freedom to the agency of Dionysos himself.[76] Some cities awarded divine honors to a benefactor who was instrumental in enacting a city's freedom.

---

[72] θαυμαστὸν γὰρ ἦν καὶ τὸ Ῥωμαίους ἐπὶ ταύτης γενέσθαι τῆς προαιρέσεως καὶ τὸν ἡγούμενον αὐτῶν Τίτον, ὥστε πᾶσαν ὑπομεῖναι δαπάνην καὶ πάντα κίνδυνον χάριν τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας (Polyb., *Hist*., 18.46.14).

[73] "Since through everything the *demos*, making known its piety to the deity as well as its thankfulness and on account of these things, to its advantage, obtained the notice of the gods, was itself delivered from the dangers and from the critical moment, and became free and autonomous and was appointed possessor of the greatest goods" (ἐπειδὴ διὰ παντὸς ὁ δῆμος ἀποδεικνύμενος‖ τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείαν τε καὶ εὐχαριστίαν| καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῶι συμφέροντι τυγχάννω| τῆς παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἐπισημασίας διεσώθη ἐ|κ τῶν κινδύνων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ περιστάντος αὐτὸν καιροῦ| καὶ ἐλεύθερος καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο καὶ τῶν με-‖γίστων ἀγαθῶν κύριος κατεστάθη; *I.Stratonikeia* 512.4–10; 133–129 BC or 88–85 BC). For text and commentary, see Riet van Bremen, "The Inscribed Documents on the Temple of Hekate at Lagina and the Date and Meaning of the Temple Frieze," in *Hellenistic Karia: Proceedings of the International Conference on Hellenistic Karia, Oxford, 29 June–2 July 2006*, ed. Riet van Bremen and Jan-Mathieu Carbon (Pessac, France: Ausonius Éditions, 2010), 483–503.

[74] Plutarch, *Comp. Dion. Brut.*, 3.6–9 (in contrast to Dion, who according to Plutarch, was motivated by personal grievance rather than the principle of freedom); cf. Plutarch, *Brutus*, 10.

[75] *I.Priene* 11.10–11.

[76] *SEG* 64.778 (see above).

An inscription from Aigai attests to how the city granted Seleukos I and Antiochos I divine honors for their role in liberating the city, calling them "gods who have manifested themselves" (θεοὶ οἱ ἐ[πι]φα[ν|έν]τες).[77] The Athenians greeted their liberator Demetrios I Poliorketes in 291 or 290 with a hymn highlighting the realness and proximity of Demetrios's deliverance and power compared to the unliving and distant power of the gods: "For other gods are either far away, or they do not have ears, or they do not exist, or do not take any notice of us, but you we can see present here, not made of wood or stone, but real."[78] Finally, The Knidians honored Iulius Theopompos's son Artimedorus with significant honors, which, among many other things, included divine honors (τιμαὶ ἰσοθέοι) like a temple-sharing (σύνναος) gold statue alongside Artemis Hiakynthtrophos and Epiphanes.[79]

On other occasions freedom is paired with the notion of community concord. For instance, the *demos* of Telos honored arbitrators from Kos that it requested to settle an internal dispute "in order that they might conduct their political life in a democracy, being of one mind, free, and autonomous."[80] Once the Koans decided the dispute, the Telians (18 years or older), in order to ensure civic concord, were required to swear an

---

[77] *SEG* 59.1406A.4–5 (281 BC). Text and translation from Hasan Malay and Marijana Ricl, "Two New Hellenistic Decrees from Aigai in Aiolis," *Epigraphica Anatolica* 42 (2009): 39–60. See also *CGRN* §137.

[78] ἄλλοι μὲν ἢ μακρὰν γὰρ ἀπέχουσιν θεοί, ἢ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὦτα, ἢ οὐκ εἰσίν, ἢ οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ἕν, σὲ δὲ παρόνθ' ὁρῶμεν, οὐ ξύλινον οὐδὲ λίθινον, ἀλλ' ἀληθινόν; lines 15–19. For text, translation, and commentary, see Angelos Chaniotis, "The Ithyphallic Hymn for Demetrios Poliorketes and Hellenistic Religious Mentality," in *More than Men, Less than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship*, ed. Panagiotis P. Iossif, Andrzej S. Chankowski, and Catharine C. Lorber (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011), 157–195. The translation is from Chaniotis, "The Ithyphallic Hymn for Demetrios Poliorketes and Hellenistic Religious Mentality," 160.

[79] *I.Knidos* 59 (ca. 45 BC or later). On temple sharing ("the erection of a cultic statue of a god or human into another deity's temple near their cultic statue"), see D. Clint Burnett, *Christ's Enthronement at God's Right Hand and Its Greco-Roman Cultural Context* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 45.

[80] *IG* XII 4 132. 38–39; cf. ll. 4–5 (306–301 BC). On this document, see Matthew Simonton, "The Telos Reconciliation Dossier (*IG* XII.4.132): Democracy, Demagogues and Stasis in an Early Hellenistic Polis," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 139 (2019): 187–209. Text and translations from Simonton, "The Telos Reconciliation Dossier."

oath to "abide by the established constitution" (πολίτευμα) and "guard the democracy."[81] In another instance, the citizens of Chersonesos took a similar oath that exhibits a collective commitment to "preservation and freedom" (σωτηρία καὶ ἐλευθερία), against betrayal within the community, to preserve democracy and to act against those who seek to dissolve it, and to act and judge justly and according to the laws when serving as magistrate.[82] Elsewhere, the city of Melanippion (Lycia) honored Apollonios of Phaselis for his exemplary conduct that ensured their acceptance into "the friendship and alliance of the *demos* of the Rhodians."[83] As a result, the city praised him for securing "that we are free, in peace and with concord conducting civic affairs, controlling our own property."[84] In these instances, community concord was seen to be conditional upon maintaining freedom and the practices and rules that supported such freedom.

A not uncommon practice in Hellenistic cities was to embed liberative events into the cultural memory and practices of the city. When Demetrios Poliorketes expelled the Macedonian garrisons and returned to Athens its ancestral democratic constitution, the city responded in gratitude by hailing Antigonos and Demetrios as kings and preserver-gods, changed their system for accounting years from annual archons to annual

---

[81] ὅπως δὲ Τήλιοι καὶ εἰς τὸν ἐπίλοι-|[π]ον χρόνον ὁμονοεῦντες διατελῶντι, ὀμοσάντω τοὶ γεγενημέ-|[ν]οι ἀπό τε ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἐτέων πάντες θεὸς τὸς ὁρκίος [κ]ατὰ ἱερῶν νε[ο|κ]αύτων τὸν ὅρκον τόνδε· ἐμμενέω ἐν τῶι πολιτεύματι τῶι καθεστακό|τι καὶ διαφυλαξέω τὰν δαμοκρατίαν…(*IG* XII 4 132.125–129).

[82] *IOSPE* 1^2 401. On this document, see Vladimir F. Stolba, "The Oath of Chersonesos and the Chersonesean Economy in the Early Hellenistic Period," in *Making, Moving, and Managing the New World of Ancient Economies, 323–31 BC*, ed. Zofia H. Archibald, John K. Davies, and Vincent Gabrielsen (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2005): 298–321; Igor A. Makarov, "Towards an Interpretation of the Civic Oath of the Chersonesites (*IOSPE* I^2 401)," *Ancient Civilization from Scythia to Siberia* 20 (2014): 1–38; Christina G. Williamson, "As God is my witness. Civic oaths in ritual space as a means towards rational cooperation in the Hellenistic *polis*," in *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, ed. Richard Alston, Onno M. van Nijf, and Christina G. Williamson (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2013), 119–174.

[83] *SEG* 57.1663 (shortly after 188 BC). For Greek text, German translation, and commentary, see Mustafa Adak, "Die rhodische Herrschaft in Lykien und die rechtliche Stellung der Städte Xanthos, Phaselis un Melanippion," *Historia* 56, no. 3 (2007): 251–279.

[84] δι᾽ ἃ κα[ὶ συνβέ-]|βηκεν ἐλευθέρους ἡμᾶς ὄντας ἐν ε[ἰρήνηι]| μεθ᾽ ὁμονοίας πολιτεύεσθαι κυριεύ[οντας]| τῶν ἰδίων (*SEG* 57.1663.5–8). Translation my own, consulting Adak, "Die rhodische Herrschaft."

priests of the preserver-gods, embroidered the names of Demetrios and Antigonos into the sacred robe with the names of the gods, constructed an altar of Demetrios, added two eponymous tribes Demetrias and Antigonis and thus increased council membership, and changed the name of the month of Mounychion to Demetrion and the final day of the month to Demetria.[85] Shortly after the Seleukid victory at Koroupedion (281 BC) the city of Aigai re-organized its civic structure, calendar, transformed the space of the city, and instituted a cultic ritual around their newfound freedom and the agents of deliverance.[86] They integrated the memory of the gift of freedom by adding two eponymous tribes (Seleukis and Antiochis), instituting a cult for Seleukos and Antiochos with two monthly sacrifices on the day they became freedom, adding a new eponymous month (Seleukeon), constructing a temple and statues, renaming buildings after the benefactors, and sang a hymn. With these changes Aigai invested significant resources to establish an enduring cultural memory in gratitude for benefactions.[87] As a final example, a city (probably Mylasa) honored Olympichos with similarly extensive honors: bronze statue in the sacred agora, a bronze statue of the People crowning his statue, an altar, an annual procession and a sacrifice for him (2 bulls) on the anniversary of the city recovering its "freedom and democracy" (ἐλευθερία καὶ δημοκρατία), a banquet, praise with a hymn, Taureia (quadrennial) like the city founders, proclamation of his deeds in the "gymnic games," a gold crown and equestrian statue, and stone stele inscription placed in temple of Zeus Labraundos.[88] As a result, one can see how a city could respond in public gratitude to

---

[85] Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 10.3–11.1.

[86] *SEG* 59.1406A. For commentary, see Malay and Ricl, "Two New Hellenistic Decrees from Aigai in Aiolis," and *CGRN* §137.

[87] The people of Aigai themselves state their desire that Seleukos know "that we will pass on to posterity his never-forgotten beneficence and we will proclaim his beautiful crown of glory to all humankind" (ὅτι ἀΐμνηστον τὴν ἐκείνου εὐεργε-||[σ]ίαν τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις παραδώσομεν καὶ π-||ᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀναγγελοῦμεν, καλὸν στέφαν[ο|ν] τῆς εὐκλείας περιτιθέντες αὐτοῖς; *SEG* 59.1406A.58–61); translation from Stefano Caneva and Jan-Mathieu Carbon, "*CGRN* §137," accessed April 21, 2021, http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be/file/137/).

[88] *SEG* 58.1220 (150–100 BC copy of inscription from 240–200 BC). Regarding the annual

events of liberation in a way that transforms its civic life and embeds the event and the agents of liberation into its civic cultural practices and memory.

This survey of civic freedom in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods highlights the core concept of freedom as well as several occasional motifs that accompanied realizations of freedom. Generally, civic freedom for Greek cities involved independent governance according to democratic ancestral customs and laws as well as a lack of constraints upon that governance structure and process, whether that be from foreign garrisons or governors, or from foreign or homegrown tyrants whose presence and rule restricted autarkic governance. Local circumstances and the specific occasions allowed different textual expressions of freedom to draw from an open-ended repertoire of motifs to highlight certain features of a benefaction or benefactor, create emotional resonance, and shape the city's cultural memory through texts, rituals, images, and edifices.

Promise

The notion of promise has several cultural scripts associated with it. The normal expectation was that a person should, of course, fulfill their promise by doing what the individual promiser vowed to do.[89] Persons were duly praised for following through on a promise. But one could also use a promise to gain or maintain power. Alternatively, one might make a promise to rouse the bravery of soldiers. A promiser might purposely manipulate somebody to act a certain way. Moreover, a promise could

---

celebration of liberation and democracy the inscription reads: "In his honor a procession and an offering shall be arranged every year at the 14th of the month of Apellaios, the day on which the people regained its freedom and democracy" (ll. 11–14; [μην]ὸς ἐν ᾗι ἡμέραι ὁ δῆμος ἐκομίσατο τήν| [τε ἐλευθερία]ν καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν; ll. 13–14; text and translation from Isager and Karlsson, "A New Inscription from Labraunda," 39–52).

[89] Cicero make fidelity to promises a default for just conduct (*On Duties*, 1.23) but admits exceptions in the case that fulfilling one's promise brought more harm than benefit (*On Duties*, 1.32). Diodoros of Sicily praises M. Livius Drusus (tribune 91 BC) for, among other things, being "highly trustworthy, and most faithful to his promises" (μεγάλην δὲ ἀξιοπιστίαν ἔχων καὶ κατὰ τὰς ὑποσχέσεις ὢν βεβαιότατος; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 37.10.1 [Walton, LCL]).

go awry if an individual over-promised or broke a promise.

Monarchs and elites were accustomed to making promises to benefit cities, other groups, or individuals, but whether they would fulfill their promise was not a guarantee.[90] Those who made good on their promise(s) were accorded grateful honors from the recipients in acknowledgement of the good repute of the benefactor. For example, Athens awarded their benefactor Eudamos with praise, a leaf crown, and other honors because he made good on his promise to help fund certain construction projects.[91] When Eumenes of Kardia paid his soldiers as promised, it earned him their affection.[92] The city of Teos, in an honorific decree for Antiochos III (probably 203 BC), notes how during his stay in the city he "promised that we would be freed through his agency" from the compulsory payments the Teians had been paying to King Attalos.[93] Antiochos followed through on his promise and in response the Teians generously returned gratitude for his benefactions.[94]

A benefactor might even surpass what he or she promised. Thus, a certain Menippos, a benefactor honored by Kolophon, exceeded his own promise to build a doorway to a *pronaos* for one silver talent and received due recognition that drew attention to his above-and-beyond provision.[95] Trust was an important element to a

---

[90] An extensive catalog and analysis of royal gifts to cities can be found in Klaus Bringmann, Walter Ameling, and Barbara Schmidt-Dounas, *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*, 2 vols (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995).

[91] *IG* II^3 1 352 (330/329 BC).

[92] ὁ Εὐμένης ἠγαπᾶτο (Plutarch, *Eumenes*, 8.5–7).

[93] κ[αὶ] τῶν ἄλλων ὧν ἐφέρομεν συντάξεων βασιλεῖ Ἀττά|λωι ὑπεδέξατο ἀπολυθήσεσθαι ἡμᾶς δι᾽ αὐτοῦ; Ma §17.19–20. Translation from Ma §17.

[94] Ma §17.40–55.

[95] "Then when he was also appointed Agonothetes, he promised a silver talent to construct the doorway of the *pronaos* to the leader of the city, Apollo; then he surpassed himself, he built more than the promise with more, not less, money" (χειροτονηθεὶς δὲ καὶ ἀγωνοθέτης|| ἐπηγγείλατο μὲν ἀπὸ ἀργυρίου ταλάντου τὰ θύ|ρετρα τοῦ προνάου τῶι καθηγεμόνι τῆς πόλεως| Ἀπόλλωνι κατασευάσειν· ὑπερθέμενος δὲ ἐ|αυτὸν μείζονα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας κατεσκεύακεν| ἀπὸ πλείονος οὐ ὀλίωι χρήματος; *SEG* 39.1244.Col. II.24–29).

relationship built on a promise, since each party lacks knowledge and familiarity with the other to varying degrees. When two parties were not especially familiar with one another, a show of good faith might be necessary for successful cooperation. For instance, when herders promised to aid Titus Flamininus against Philip V by showing him an unguarded passage, they brought an Epirot nobleman "in whom Titus put his trust" (ᾧ πιστεύσας ὁ Τίτος).[96] Plutarch explains their offer of the Epirot "as surety and voucher for their good faith" (πίστις).[97] A royal promise could engender goodwill in the recipient, like when Eumenes II gained the goodwill (εὔνοια) of his mercenary soldiers by paying them, honoring some with gifts, and making promises (ἐπαγγελίαι) to all.[98] An appropriate promise could also help maintain the fidelity of another party and hedge against defection. Thus, when Syracusan mercenaries had secured promises from Rome in exchange for defecting from the Carthaginian general Himilco, Himilco himself proclaimed his own counter-promises so that Syracusans would keep faith with him.[99] In other cases, promises of reward by a commander could serve to rouse the bravery of the soldiery in hazardous situations like when Himilco "roused [his soldiers] to great enthusiasm by his lavish promises of reward to those who distinguished themselves personally" and assured them that all the soldiers would receive favors (χάριτες) and gifts (δωρεά) from the Carthaginian government.[100]

Sometimes a purported benefactor would use a gift or promise to manipulate another or to convince someone to act a certain way. In 285 BC Lysimachos promised to give Seleukos I 2,000 talents in an attempt to convince him to kill Demetrios I, who was

---

[96] Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 4.2–3.

[97] γνώστην τῆς πίστεως καὶ βεβαιωτὴν (Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 4.3 [Perrin, LCL]).

[98] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 30.14.

[99] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.43.1–8.

[100] παραστήσας ὁρμὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν διά τε τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῖς κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἀνδραγαθήσασι καὶ τὰς κατὰ κοινὸν ἐσομένας χάριτας αὐτοῖς καὶ δωρεὰς παρὰ Καρχηδονίων (Polyb., *Hist*., 1.45.3–4 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

in Seleukid captivity.[101] The first Attalid monarch Philetairos deftly used promises to powerful people in order to secure for himself greater power.[102] Eumenes II, during his siege of the city of Abdera (170 BC), used promises to successfully persuade a certain native Abderite named Python to defect and give Eumenes's soldiers access to the city.[103] Cicero recognizes the power of promise when he lists "the hope of gifts of money and by liberal promises" as a reason for why some people submit to another's authority.[104]

On the opposite end of the spectrum from benefactors who surpass their own promise is when individuals fail to live up to their lofty promises, whether it is because they promised more than they could give, or they simply broke the promise outright. A person who did not follow through on their promise was typical enough that Theosphrastos portrayed the περίεργος ("busybody") in his *Characters* as a person who "stands up to promise things he is not able [to do]."[105] The Macedonian king Perseus failed to fulfill his promises by refusing a promised reward (for helping him), which Diodoros says points to Perseus's avarice (φιλαργυρία).[106] If a king failed to live up to his promise, a wealthy local might step up to make up for the royal failure as in the case of Moschion who, when the promise of certain kings to contribute to the construction of a gymnasion failed to materialize, helped his city (Priene) with the expenditure.[107] Failure

[101] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 21.20; cf. Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 51.3. Seleukos refused the offer, since his son Antiochos had just married the daughter of Demetrios, Stratonike.

[102] Strabo, *Geography*, 13.4.1. Strabo writes that Philetairos "continued to be in charge of the fortress and to manage things through promises and courtesies in general, always catering to any man who was powerful or near at hand" (διεγένετο μένων ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐρύματος ὁ εὐνοῦχος καὶ πολιτευόμενος δι᾽ ὑποσχέσεων καὶ τῆς ἄλλης θεραπείας ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸν ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἐγγὺς παρόντα; Strabo, *Geography*, 13.4.1).

[103] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 30.6 (ψυχαγωγήσαντες οὖν αὐτὸν ἐπαγγελίαις διὰ τούτου παρεισήχθησαν ἐντὸς τοῦ τείχους καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἐκυρίευσαν). Python lived out his days in shame.

[104] Cicero, *On Duties*, 2.22 [Miller, LCL].

[105] Theophrastos, *Characters*, 13.2.

[106] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 30.21.1–2. Cf. Plutarch, *Aemilius Paulus*, 23.7–11, who says that Perseus was "playing the Cretan against the Cretans" because the objects of his deception were Cretans (κρητίζων πρὸς Κρῆτας; 23.10 [Perrin, LCL]).

[107] *I.Priene* 108.111–116 (plus lacuna). Reference thanks to Klaus Bringmann, "The King as

to adhere to a promise could provoke violent conflict. In 241 BC, Libyan and other mercenaries expected their promised pay, but the Carthaginian commander refused to fulfill his promises.[108] The Carthaginian refusal to uphold its promise angered the mercenaries and provoked the subsequent Libyan-Carthaginian War.

Starting and Completing

In Greek cities it was important that once somebody started a benefaction, they completed it. Honorific inscriptions could call attention to the theme of starting and completing, which highlighted how the populace valued how the individual benefactor continued their service until completion. An inscription from Miletos (ca. AD 50) posthumously honors Caius Iulius Epikrates, who was a high priest for life, agonothetes for life, and gymnasiarch.[109] According to the inscription, Epikrates "completed (ἐπιτελέσαντα) all the liturgies and through word and deed and dedications and gifts he arranged (for) the fatherland and supplied."[110] In another instance, the Delphians honored a certain Nikostratos in part because as an envoy to Rome on behalf of the Amphiktyonians "he completed all things advantageous in common to the Amphiktyonians and the other Greeks who chose freedom and democratic governance."[111] If a would-be benefactor failed to complete a task they had already

---

Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism," in *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. Anthony W. Bulloch, Erich S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and Andrew Stewart (Berkeley: University of California Pres), 12.

[108] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.66–68. Polybios remarks, "The whole force remembered the promises (τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν) the general had made to them in critical situations, and had great hopes and indeed great expectations concerning the gain that was due to come to them" (πάντες δ᾽ ἀναμιμνησκόμενοι τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν, ὧν οἱ στρατηγοὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐπισφαλεῖς τῶν καιρῶν παρακαλοῦντες σφᾶς ἐπεποίηντο, μεγάλας εἶχον ἐλπίδας καὶ μεγάλην προσδοκίαν τῆς ἐσομένης περὶ αὐτοὺς ἐπανορθώσεως; Polyb., *Hist*., 1.66.12 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[109] *SEG* 44.938. Cf. e.g., *OGIS* 339.10–12; *SEG* 4.425.6–8 (χορηγήσαντα πάσας| καὶ τὰς ἄλλας λητουργί|ας ἐπιτελέσαντα θεοῖς πᾶσι); PH315261.2–3 (τὰς ἀρχὰς πάσας ἐπιτελέσαντα καλῶς,| καὶ ἄρξαντα ἴσως καὶ δικαίως); *IG* IV 714.8–9 (λιτουργίας ἐπιτε|λέσαντα ἐπιφανῶς).

[110] πάσας τὰς λειτουργίας ἐπιτελέσαν|τα καὶ διά τε λόγων καὶ ἔργων καὶ ἀναθη|μάτων καὶ δωρεῶν κοσμήσαντα τὴν πατρίδα καὶ ἐποχ[ορηγή]σαντα; *SEG* 44.938.11–14 (mid-1st c. AD).

[111] ἐπετέλεσεν πάντα τὰ κοινῇ συμφέρον[τα]| τοῖς τε Ἀμφικτίοσιν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἕλλησιν

begun, he or she would lose prestige. For Plutarch one of the faults displayed by the Spartan king Agis IV was that he broke his promise to the citizens of Sparta for land redistribution and failed to complete his publicly proclaimed reform program.[112]

Word-Deed Congruence

Significant to the proper conduct of a benefactor is that one's words would be congruent with one's deeds. In other words, a good person is expected to match their words with actions that conform to them. Cities made sure to note a benefactor's word-deed congruency in honorific inscriptions by including phrases like "saying and doing" (λέγειν καὶ πράσσειν) and "in word and deed" (λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ) in the common laudatory lexicon of Greek cities. For example, Epikrates (above) "completed all the liturgies and through word and deed" (διά τε λόγων καὶ ἔργων).[113] Ktesiphon proposed honors for Demosthenes for acting always in word and deed for the good of the city.[114] An Athenian honorific decree brings attention to how the poet Phillipides "continued saying and doing (λέγων καὶ πράττων) what is advantageous to the preservation of the city" and he "never did anything contrary to democratic governance either in word or deed" ([ο]ὔτ[ε λόγωι οὔτ᾽] ἔργωι).[115] Polybios explains the significance (to him) of word-deed congruence in his praise of Philopoimen, "and when the speaker can reinforce his advice by the example of a life which follows it, it is impossible not to give the fullest credit to his words."[116]

τοῖς αἱρου|μένοις τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ δημοκρατίαν (*Syll.*[3] 613.17–19 = PH303291.17–19).

[112] Plutarch, *Comparison of Agis and Cleomenes with Tiberius and Gaius Grachus*, 4.1. Plutarch attributes Agis's failure to youthful cowardice (ἀτολμία).

[113] *SEG* 44.938.12 (mid-1st c. AD).

[114] Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, 57 (πράττοντα καὶ λέγοντα τὰ βέλτιστά με τῷ δήμῳ διατελεῖν).

[115] *IG* II[2] 657.31–33, 48–50 (283/282 BC): διατ|ετέλεκε λέγων καὶ πράττων τὰ συμφέροντα τεῖ τῆς| πόλεως σωτηρίαι…κα[ὶ οὐ]θὲν ὑπεναντίον πρὸ[ς δ-]|ημοκρατίαν οὐδεπώποτε [ἐποίησ]ε[ν ο]ὔτ[ε λόγωι οὔτ᾽] ἔργωι. On Phillipides's career, see the full inscription (*IG* II[2] 657) and Hardin, *Athens Transformed*, 93–94. For a similar praise of a benefactor (Phaidros of Sphettos), see, e.g., *IG* II[3] 1 985.41–42; *SEG* 57.1082.15.

[116] ὅταν δὲ καὶ τὸν ἴδιον βίον ἀκόλουθον εἰσφέρηται τοῖς εἰρημένοις ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἀνάγκη

That is, if a person's deeds show that they follow their own words, it lends credibility to the speaker as a trustworthy person for having skin in the game with their own advice.

One can see an example of a word-deed mismatch with the example of the Roman politician Marius, at least according to Plutarch's evaluation. Plutarch contrasts Marius with virtuous Metellus by casting Marius as a man who regards deception as a part of virtue and Metellus who considers truth as virtue's foundation.[117] According to Plutarch, Marius publicly and vociferously opposed a requirement in an agrarian law proposed by Saturninus that required senators to vow with an oath not to violate the stipulations that the people vote for, but when it came time to take the oath he complied.[118] Marius merely baited Metellus, a principled man of his word (as opposed to Marius), into having to reject the oath and suffer exile as a punishment.[119] Plutarch judges that Marius's actions resulted in his shame (αἰσχύνη/αἰσχρός), but the exiled Metellus earned for himself goodwill (εὔνοια) and honor (τιμή).[120] Thus, for Plutarch a life whose deeds do not supplement one's words is shameful.

The Greek fable tradition preserves a story relating to word-deed mismatch. In Babrius 50, when a hunter asks a woodcutter for the whereabouts of a certain fox, the woodcutter tries to betray the fox by pointing at its hiding place but at the same time saying, "I did not see."[121] Fortunately for the hiding fox, the hunter does not recognize the woodcutter's hint and as a result the fox escapes. In an attempt to reap some return of

---

λαμβάνειν τὴν πρώτην πίστιν τὴν παραίνεσιν (Polyb., *Hist*., 11.10.2 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]). For Polybios, the words of Philopoimen garnered so much trust from his fellows because he spoke truth (ἀληθεύειν) and lived his own life as a paradigm (παράδειγμα) that reflected his words. Polyb., *Hist*., 11.10.1–6.

[117] Plutarch, *Marius*, 29.

[118] Plutarch, *Marius*, 29.1–4.

[119] Plutarch, *Marius*, 29.4.

[120] Plutarch, *Marius*, 29.4, 7–8.

[121] Babrius, 50.1–10.

gratitude from the fox (thinking the fox did not witness his failed deception), the woodcutter demands a requital for his ostensive favor.[122] The fox, who witnessed the deception, refuses to return with favors, saying, "you delivered me in voice but killed me with a finger."[123] As a result, one can see a general admiration for the harmony between an individual's words and actions and a general disdain for people who speak in one way but act out of step with their words.

Benefits to the Worthy and Unworthy

In normal operation, benefactors give to worthy people and those from whom they expect commensurate reward or gratitude. So, Theophrastos castigates those who befriend and patronize scoundrels, Cicero advises his audience to give to the upright rather than the fortunate, and Seneca advises that benefactors should have a policy of refusing to give to known ingrates.[124] Moreover, friends should have precedence over enemies as recipients of benefits. In a speech crafted by the historian Polybios, Eumenes II beseeches Rome to give the Greek cities of Asia Minor to himself rather than giving them to Rhodes or setting them free to govern themselves.[125] The reasoning that buttresses his request includes two related themes (among others): (1) if Rome gives the cities to Rhodes, they would risk benefiting (εὐεργετεῖν) enemies (the cities) and neglecting "true friends" (Eumenes), and (2) "it is far finer to give your true friends a fitting token of you gratitude than to confer favors on those who were your enemies."[126]

---

[122] "He said, "You owe me favors of gratitude for saving (your) life"" (ζωαγρίους μοι χάριτας, εἶπεν ὀφλήσεις; Babrius, 50.15).

[123] φωνῇ με σώσας, δακτύλῳ δ᾽ ἀποκτείνας (Babrius, 50.18).

[124] Theophrastos, *Characters*, 29; Cicero, *On Duties*, 2.69–71; Seneca, *Ben.*, 4.34. Elsewhere Seneca advises that giving to ingrates might win their gratitude (*Ben.*, 1.2.4; 1.2.4–1.3.1; 1.10.4–5).

[125] Polyb., *Hist*., 21.19–21.

[126] "Therefore, I beg you, sirs, to be suspicious on this point, in case unawares you strengthen some of your friends more than is meet and unwisely weaken others, at the same time conferring favors on your enemies and neglecting and making light of those who are truly your friends" (…ἅμα δὲ τούτοις τοὺς μὲν πολεμίους γεγονότας εὐεργετοῦντες, τοὺς δ᾽ ἀληθινοὺς φίλους παρορῶντες καὶ κατολιγωροῦντες τούτων; Polyb., *Hist*., 21.19.11 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]); πολλῷ κάλλιον τὸ τοῖς ἀληθινοῖς

Thus, two criteria that a benefactor might take into account for dispensing favors and benefits are the good reputation of the recipient and the historic relationship of the benefactor and recipient (friends favored over foes).

Furthermore, benefactors were apt to give for discernable reasons rather than on a whim or for self-indulgent generosity. Writing to the people of Samos, Augustus explains that he granted freedom to Aphrodisias because they supported him in the war and suffered for it. He is at pains to make clear to the Samians that he benefits cities not arbitrarily but for explicable and proper reasons. He explains that he granted them freedom because "it is not right to give the favor of the greatest privilege of all [i.e., freedom] at random and without cause."[127] He elaborates that he is doing a favor for his wife who has advocated on their behalf, reiterating that "I am not concerned for the money which you pay towards the tribute, but I am not willing to give the most highly prized privileges to anyone without good cause."[128] Moreover, a benefactor could regard recipients as worthy of favor (χάρις) on the basis of unjust or tragic suffering and plight undergone by the recipients. Mylasa had suffered grievously when Quintus Labienus, partisan of Brutus and Cassius, invaded Karia and devastated several cities, including Mylasa.[129] Upon his reception of Mylasan envoys who sought support, Octavian recognized their grave misfortune and as a result deemed them "[men worthy] of every honor and favor."[130] Benefits, in the normal operation of benefaction and gratitude, were

---

φίλοις τὰς ἁρμοζούσας χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι μᾶλλον ἢ τοὺς πολεμίους γεγονότας εὐεργετεῖν (Polyb., *Hist*., 21.21.11 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[127] οὐ γάρ ἐστιν δίκαιον τὸ πάντων μέγιστον φιλάνθρωπον εἰκῇ καὶ χωρὶς αἰτίας χαρίζεσθαι; Reynolds §13.4; translation from Reynolds §13.

[128] Reynolds §13.4–7; translation from Reynolds §13.

[129] Dio Cassius, *Hist*., 26.3–5. Dio writes that Mylasa revolted from Labienus's occupying garrison to which he responded by razing the city, imposing levies, and looting the temples. A letter from Octavian recounts further details of Mylasa's war plight, which details how Mylasans were taken captive as war prisoners, others were killed, some burned to death with the city itself, shrines and temples were looted, the countryside pillaged, and buildings burned (*I.Myl*. 602.11–19).

[130] ἐφ᾽ οἷς πᾶσιν συνε|[–]Α [τ]αῦτα πάσης τειμῆς καὶ χάρι-|[τος ἀξίους ἄνδρας γενομέν]ους ὑμᾶς (*I.Myl*. 602.20–22; 31 BC). See also *RDGE* §60 for commentary. Translation from Sherk [1984] §91.

given to people or cities of known good repute, for friends and allies more so than adversaries, and for explicable reasons.

A group of similar stories from the Greek fable tradition also illustrate the impropriety and lack of forethought in benefitting scoundrels (κακοί) or those who are apt to do you harm. In Babrius 94 (cf. Phaedrus 1.8) a heron helps a wolf get a bone out of its throat for an appropriate fee (μισθὸν ἄξιον) as promised by the wolf. When the heron completes the procedure it asks for the fee, but the wolf responds with bared teeth, saying that it should suffice as a fee if he refrains from eating the heron.[131] The lesson in this fable is that "you'll get no good in return for giving aid to scoundrels, and you'll do well not to suffer some injury yourself in the process."[132]

In Babrius 115 a turtle yearns to be able to fly like the birds. An eagle asks the turtle how much he would give as a fee (μισθός) to make the turtle fly.[133] Excited at the prospects of having his wish fulfilled, the turtle enthusiastically proclaims that "I will give you all the gifts of the Red Sea."[134] So, the eagle picks him up, flies him into the sky, and drops the turtle to the ground, breaking its shell. Reeling and having realized his folly, the dying turtle laments, "I am dying with a justifiable cause."[135] Similarly, Babrius 143 (cf. Phaedrus 4.20) cautions against helping the wicked person (ὁ πονηρός). It is short enough to quote in full:

> A farmer picked up a viper that was almost dead from the cold, and warmed it. But the viper, after stretching himself out, clung to the man's hand and bit him incurably, thus killing (the very one who wanted to save him). Dying, the man uttered these words, worthy to be remembered: "I suffer what I deserve, for showing pity to the

---

For another English translation, see Braund §535.

[131] Babrius 94.6–8.

[132] κακοῖς βοηθῶν μισθὸν ἀγαθὸν οὐ λήψῃ, ἀλλ᾽ ἀρκέσει σοι μή τι <καὶ> κακὸν πάσχειν (Babrius 94.9–10 [Perry, LCL]).

[133] Babrius 115.1–6.

[134] τὰ τῆς Ἐρυθρῆς πάντα δῶρά σοι δώσω (Babrius 115.7).

[135] σὺν δίκῃ θνήσκω (Babrius 115.11).

wicked" (δίκαια πάσχω τὸν πονηρὸν οἰκτείρας).[136]

Finally, in Babrius 122 a donkey is afflicted by a thorn and, seeing a wolf approaching, knows the end of its life is near. The donkey remarks that he is glad the wolf is the one to eat him (as opposed to a carrion bird), but requests that the wolf do him a favor (χάρις) by removing the thorn from his foot so that he can die without pain.[137] The wolf obliges but the donkey, free of the thorn in his flesh, kicks the wolf in the face and flees.[138] As a result, the wolf acknowledges that he deserves to suffer for acting like a doctor rather than a butcher as he normally does.[139] Therefore, as with the elite gift-giving protocols reflected in Theophrastos, Cicero, Seneca, Polybios's Eumenes, and Octavian, the more popular-level morality of the fables reflects a concern for careful and discriminating benefaction to appropriate recipients.

Cities or individuals that received benefits normally gave appropriate returns to their benefactors, which in turn built a good reputation that signaled to prospective benefactors that their benefactions would not be lost on them. If a benefactor strayed from benefitting reputable cities or people, they could come into censure from others. So, Polybios criticizes the Egyptian regent Tlepolemos's maladministration (202–201 BC) by focusing on his excessive and inappropriate giving.[140] According to Polybios, Tlepolemos's gifting ran afoul for indiscriminately "scattering" (διαρρίπτειν) royal funds, not being able to refuse a request, and being easily swayed by expressions of gratitude like eulogies, toasts, inscriptions, and music in his honor.[141] Polybios also comments on the allegedly eccentric generosity of Antiochos IV Epiphanes, saying, "to some people he

---

[136] Babrius 143.1–6 [Perry, LCL].

[137] Babrius 122.5–8.

[138] Babrius 122.9–13.

[139] Babrius 122.14–16. Note the identical phraseology to Babrius 115.11 (σὺν δίκῃ θνήσκω) with which the wolf uses to acknowledge how he deserves his pain (σὺν δίκῃ πάσχω; Babrius 122.14).

[140] Polyb., *Hist*., 16.21–22.

[141] Polyb., *Hist*., 16.21.8–12.

used to give gazelles' knucklebones, to others dates, and to others money" and "occasionally he used to address people he had never seen before when he met them, and make them the most unexpected kind of presents."[142] Whether or not Antiochos actually acted as transgressively with his benefactions to individuals as Polybios reports is less important than the existence of these stories of unusual gifting that could harm Antiochos's reputation.[143]

If the general benefaction protocol involved doing good to those who are worthy and refraining from giving to unfit or undeserving recipients, people nevertheless recognized and utilized the power of a benefaction to produce a positive relationship where one was lacking. Thus, Diodoros of Sicily reasons that because fortune (τύχη) is unpredictable and ever-changing, benefaction (εὐεργεσία), clemency (ἐπιείκεια), and mercy (ἔλεος) to a defeated foe are more appropriate than cruelty or destruction.[144] For, mercy (ἔλεος) can transform an enemy into a friend and considerateness towards the weaker party affords goodwill (εὔνοια).[145] For Diodoros the examples of Philip, Alexander, and Rome illustrate how successful clemency and moderation is as a strategy for conquerors to extend their hegemony (ἡγεμονία), with the Romans most of all acting "like benefactors and friends" toward the conquered.[146] Furthermore, Diodoros endorses the principle of "being judged by the standard with which one judges others." He states

---

[142] ἐδίδου γὰρ τοῖς μὲν ἀστραγάλους δορκαδείους, τοῖς δὲ φοινικοβαλάνους, ἄλλοις δὲ χρυσίον. Καὶ ἐξ ἀπαντήσεως δέ τισιν ἐντυγχάνων, οὓς μὴ ἑωράκει ποτέ, ἐδίδου δωρεὰς ἀπροσδοκήτους (Polyb., *Hist*. 26.1.8–9 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]; at this point the text of Polybios is derived from Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 5.193d).

[143] It should be noted that Polybios also calls attention to Antiochos IV's notable generosity to cities and temples that surpassed other Seleukid kings (Polyb., *Hist*., 26.1.10–11).

[144] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 27.15.

[145] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 27.15.3; 27.16.2. Diodoros here is talking particularly about clemency and mercy toward "those who give themselves over voluntarily" (οἱ ἑαυτοὺς ἑκουσίως παραδίδοντες; 27.16.2).

[146] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 32.4. Diodoros's three-step theory of hegemony is that "those whose object is to gain dominion (ἡγεμονία) over others use courage and intelligence to get it, moderation and consideration (ἐπειίκεια καὶ φιλανθρωπία) for others to extend it widely, and paralyzing terror to secure it against attack" (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 32.2 [Walton, LCL]).

the principle in this way: "to apply to each the law that he has set for others is no more than just."[147] So, if one sows brutality, one should not expect any pity or mercy when fortune turns the other way, since that person has put themself beyond the pale of human sentiment by treating others as such.[148]

An offense against a superior could potentially be overlooked if it was small enough. For example, after Pydna and the defeat of Perseus, Rome was considering war with Rhodes for its conduct in the war.[149] The Rhodian envoys, Philophron and Astymedes, begged for clemency and were narrowly able to avoid harsh treatment.[150] According to Polybios, Astymedes's rhetorical strategy involved comparing the helpful aspects of the conduct of the Rhodians over against other states in order to paint Rhodes in a good light and the other states in a negative light. He tried to portray Rhodes's "offenses" (τὰ ἁμαρτήματα) in a way that when the two groups were compared "the offenses of Rhodes might seem to be small and deserving of pardon" (τὰ μὴν οἰκεῖα μικρὰ καὶ συγγνώμης ἄξια).[151] To whatever degree Rhodes actually violated Roman or international standards of proper conduct, the point to note in this passage is that Astymedes (or Polybios's recounting of him) pursued a strategy of gaining clemency on the basis of the modesty of the offense.

Similar sentiments to Diodoros on the propriety of clemency toward enemies are expressed by others. According to Plutarch, the tyrant Dion of Syracuse believed that mercy toward those who wrong you to be the true mark of virtue, saying that "it was no

---

[147] δίκαιον γάρ ἐστιν, ὃν καθ᾽ ἑτέων τις νόμον ἐθηκε, τούτῳ κεχρῆσθαι (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 27.18.1 [Walton, LCL]).

[148] "It is impossible that one who has proved cruel towards others should meet with compassion when he in turn blunders and falls, or that one who has done all in his power to abolish pity among men should find refuge in the moderation of others" (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 27.18.1 [Walton, LCL]).

[149] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.4.1–5. For Rhodian conduct Rome found suspicious, see, e.g., Polyb., *Hist*., 29.19 (cf. Livy., *History of Rome*, 45.3.3).

[150] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.4.5–9.

[151] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.4.13; Polyb., *Hist*., 30.4.14.

manifestation of such self-mastery . . . when one was kind to friends and benefactors, but when one who had been wronged was merciful and mild towards the erring."[152] Flamininus, in response to Aitolian calls to depose Philip V after his defeat at Kynoskephalai, refused their proposal and countered that good men should be harsh in battle but humane in victory.[153] On another occasion, to ensure future loyalty the Roman senate showed their "mildness and magnanimity" (πραότης καὶ μεγαλοψυχία) to the Thracian King Kotys, who fought alongside Perseus against Rome in the Third Macedonian War.[154] Moreover, the Macedonian king Perseus began his reign with series of pardons to people who were out of favor with the royal house: he enacted large-scale pardon for fugitive Macedonian debtors, a general relief of debt for Macedonians who owed money to the crown, and a release of people imprisoned for "offenses against the crown."[155] His actions fostered hopeful sentiments among Greeks for his reign, according to Polybios.[156] Finally, Ptolemy VI Philometer (d. 145 BC), instead of enacting vengeance upon his brother Ptolemy VIII who was responsible for his brief dethronement and his loss of Cyprus, showered him with gifts and offered (though ultimately failed) to

---

[152] ὧν ἐπίδειξίς ἐστιν οὐχ ἡ πρὸς φίλους καὶ χρηστοὺς μετριότης ἀλλ᾽ εἴ τις ἀδικούμενος εὐπαραίτητος εἴη καὶ πρᾷος τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι (Plutarch, *Dion*, 47.5 [Perrin, LCL]). Dion released Heracleides and Theodotes, his personal enemies (Plutarch, *Dion*, 48.1). Diodoros also mentions Dion's acts of mercy to his personal enemies, saying that after the Syracusan assembly expressed their gratitude to Dion by electing him as general, ceding to him control, and awarding him heroic honors, "Dion in harmony with his former conduct generously absolved all his personal enemies of the charges outstanding against them and having reassured the populace brought them to a state of general harmony. The Syracusans with universal praises and with elaborate testimonials of approval honored their benefactor as the one and only savior of their native land" (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 16.20.6 [Sherman, LCL]).

[153] Polybios has Flamininus say, "Brave men should be hard on their foes and wroth with them in battle, when conquered they should be courageous and high-minded, but when they conquer, moderate, gentle and humane (πολεμοῦντας γὰρ δεῖ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας βαρεῖς εἶναι καὶ θυμικούς, ἡττωμένους δὲ γενναίους καὶ μεγαλόφρονας, νικῶντάς γε μὴν μετρίους καὶ πραεῖς καὶ φιλανθρώπους; Polyb., *Hist*., 18.37.7 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]). For the Aitolian envoy's speech as represented by Polybios, see Polyb., *Hist*., 18.36.5–9.

[154] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.17; cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 45.42.6; *Syll.*[3] 656 = *SEG* 32.1206 = PH256424 (English translation in Sherk [1984] §26).

[155] Polyb., *Hist*., 25.3.1–3 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

[156] Polyb., *Hist*., 25.3.4–5.

give his daughter to him in marriage.[157] These examples above show how leniency, humaneness, and pardon could all be pursued as a virtuous (and no doubt tactical) alternative strategy to a strict policy of benefit according to worth and harshness toward enemies.

Nevertheless, offers of leniency may not always be trusted without question. After a victory in battle (240–239 BC) during the Mercenary War the victorious Carthaginian general Hamilcar gave pardon (συγγνώμη) to the prisoners of war who were unwilling to accept his call to join his army.[158] The leaders of the mercenaries—Mathos, Spendius, and Autaritus the Gaul—grew worried that such humane treatment (φιλανθρωπία) might sway their forces to trust Carthaginian leniency and give up, so they devised a plot to foster distrust toward Carthage's offers of pardon.[159] Spendius and Autaritus used the pretext of falsified letters to accuse Hamilcar of using their release as bait to gain power over the entirety of their forces.[160] Their plan worked and the mercenary army tortured and executed a number of Carthaginian prisoners, destroying any goodwill they might have had by inciting the fury of the Carthaginians.[161] In this case, the offer of pardon for wrongdoing initiated a strategic struggle between the warring generals for control of the soldiers.

Although people of small means would have been less able to repay favors, they were not entirely neglected as recipients of benefits. Diodoros relates how Kratesipolis, the wife of Alexander the son of Polyperchon, was beloved (ἀγαπωμένη) by the Macedonian soldiers because she would help the less fortunate and those who lacked

---

[157] Polyb., *Hist*., 39.7.

[158] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.78.13–14.

[159] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.79.8–9.

[160] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.79.10–1.80.3.

[161] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.80.4–1.81.2.

resources.[162] One fable of the Babrius tradition highlights how benefiting the poor can sometimes result in unexpected returns. In this story a lion catches a mouse, but the mouse begs to be let free, promising that he will surely repay the favor (χάρις).[163] The Lion acquiesces to the request.[164] Then one day the lion gets caught in the net of some hunters and, as a return of life for life, the mouse gnawed the ropes and set the lion free.[165] These examples show that the principle of giving to "worthy" recipient did not necessarily exclude people of small means.

Generosity and Abundance

Prototypical generosity for a benefactor entailed giving from one's own resources for the good of the recipient(s) and doing so despite the hardship, risk, toil, or cost. A text that highlights a package of the types of deeds and virtues for which cities praised a generous benefactor can be seen in an honorary decree for a certain Kleandros, "a man accomplished in virtue" (ἀνὴρ τετελεωμένος εἰς ἀρετὴν).[166] It is unclear what were the apparently numerous specific benefits Kleandros rendered to his city, but he was responsible for at least one benefaction (χάρις) having to do with a joint sacrifice in Athens.[167] The council and people displayed their gratitude to Kleandros for surpassing his own laudatory ancestors in benefactions, for the frequency (καθ᾽ ἡμέραν) and constancy (ἀεὶ) of his earnestness (σπουδή), for outdoing officials in his personal capacity and then outdoing his private contributions in his official capacity, and doing it all in spite of the toil (πόνος) accompanying his services:

---

[162] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.67.1. Kratesipolis's penchant for helping the less fortunate did not prevent her from also committing acts of brutality. See Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.67.2.

[163] Babrius 107.1–8.

[164] Babrius 107.9.

[165] Babrius 107.10–15.

[166] *SEG* 57.1198.11 (17/16 BC).

[167] *SEG* 57.1198.33–34.

> Kleandros, son of Mogetes, a man having attained perfection in virtue, has surpassed, by his high-minded soul, his ancestors' first-rate position in conferring all kind of benefits. Even though nobody can be compared to their especial virtue, nevertheless even their achievements seem incapable of being compared with this. Outdoing himself each day in his enthusiasm for his native city, he is eager to over-fulfil all requirements of welfare, being a private person in a more ambitious way than an official, being an official in a more zealous way than himself. And he always puts forward the most excellent proposals in the interest of his native city, in such a way that it does not appear that his proposition could (be thwarted, reduced?) by the trouble involved. But, in fact, he joins in carrying out his proposals so that his trouble achieves more than intended by him.[168]

The text then highlights how Kleandros embodies the civic virtues of trustworthiness (πίστις), uprightness (δικαιοσύνη), humaneness (φιλανθρωπία), and gentleness (πραΰτης) that render benefits to all:

> His brilliant achievements for the community are complemented by the virtues of his soul directed with respect to individuals. For he is endowed with honesty and righteousness and benevolence and decency of gentleness and -to sum it all up- with all qualities by which the soul in its ambition contributes to welfare (?). And if we wished to testify by him more than this, words would soon fail us in view of the very highest quality of his achievements.[169]

The honorific inscription for Kleandros points to some of the aspects of generosity that got the attention of the populations of Greek cities, such as frequency, enthusiasm, commitment, and a suite of civic virtues.

Other aspects of generosity could merit attention in the ancient sources. Various texts bring attention to (1) the power of generosity, whether to attract others into a positive relationship, to draw friends, to turn an enemy into a friend, or to garner good repute, (2) the scale of generosity, whether it is beyond one's means, godlike, or even beyond the gifts of the gods, (3) how competitive generosity emerges from the system of euergetism, (4) skepticism of generosity, and (5) when someone displays a conspicuous lack of generosity.

A story related by Diodoros illustrates the power of generosity to bind the

---

[168] *SEG* 57.1198.10–25. Translation from Peter Herrmann and Hasan Malay, *New Documents from Lydia* (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007), no. 58.

[169] *SEG* 57.1198.25–32. Translation from Herrmann and Malay, *New Documents from Lydia*, no. 58.

recipients with affection beyond the grave.[170] The young male Pisidians of the city of Termessos showed incredible loyalty to their benefactor Alketas. Alketas, looking for trustworthy allies in Asia for the battle against Antigonos I, chose to give generous benefactions to the Pisidians. When war eventually came, the younger Pisidian men strongly supported Alketas, but the older Pisidians favored surrender to the stronger Antingonos so that they could avoid war. Secretly, the elder Pisidians betrayed their forces during the battle and attacked Alketas (who committed suicide to avoid capture) and thus won the battle for Antigonos. But the younger Pisidians, after devoting themselves to plunder and brigandage, maintained their goodwill to their deceased benefactor by honoring the body of Alketas. Diodoros explains their devotion to their benefaction in this manner: "Thus kindness in its very nature possesses the peculiar power of a love charm in behalf of benefactors, preserving unchanged men's goodwill toward them."[171]

Other examples show the power of a benefaction to attract others to ally themselves with a benefactor or to gain a good international reputation and bind others to oneself. Ptolemy I's generosity even to those enemies who insulted him helped him draw "friends" from around the world.[172] Rome did a favor (χάρις) for Kotys, the Thracian ally of Perseus, by allowing him to take back his hostage son after the Third Macedonian War (171–168 BC), so that they could gain prestige (a reputation for generosity/kindness) and attach Kotys to themselves.[173]

Certain people were honored because they were reputed to have given beyond their resources. So, Plutarch describes Dion of Syracuse as someone whose magnanimity

---

[170] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.46–47.

[171] οὕτως ἡ τῆς εὐεργεσίας φύσις, ἴδιόν τι φίλτρον ἔχουσα πρὸς τοὺς εὖ πεποιηκότας, ἀμετάθετον διαφυλάττει τὴν εἰς αὐτοὺς εὔνοιαν (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.47.3 [Geer, LCL].

[172] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.86.

[173] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.17; cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 45.42.6.

surpassed his ability.[174] An honorific inscription from Cyrenaica attests to how the Cyrenians praised Phaos of Cyrene because "he carried out his duties towards the gods with energy and piety and his duties towards men with generosity and lavishness beyond his means."[175]

Certain individuals were especially renowned for their generosity in the historical tradition. For example, Eumenes II, according to Polybios, "was most eager to win reputations, and not only conferred more benefits than any king of his time on Greek cities, but established the fortunes of more individual men."[176] Another figure with a reputation for liberality was Scipio Aemillianus (185–129 BC).[177] Polybios refers to his reputation for "magnanimity and cleanhandedness in money matters" and produces five examples of his noteworthy generosity: (1) he helped his mother so she would not fall below his own social station, (2) gave his adoptive sisters their twenty-five talents due to them years earlier than required, (3) when his father Aemilius died he gave his entire inheritance to his comparatively less-off brother Fabius, (4) helped pay for gladiatorial games in honor of his late father that Fabius could not afford, and (5) after his mother's death he gave her property to his sisters despite their lack of legal claim to it.[178]

The quest for good repute through generosity sometimes led to competitive euergetism in which one or more benefactors found themselves in competition with another. After Rhodes withstood the siege of Demetrios Poliorketes in 304 BC with the help of several foreign powers, they desired to return favor to their most supportive ally

---

[174] τῇ μεγαλοψυχίᾳ τὴν δύναμιν ὑπερβαλλόμενος (Plutarch, *Dion*, 52.1).

[175] καὶ τὰ πρὸς θεὸς ἐκτε|νῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶ<ι>ς ἐτέλ[ε]σεν κ(αὶ)| τὰ ποτὶ τὸς ἀνθρώπος μεγαλ[ο]ψύ(χ)ως καὶ πλουσίως ὑπὲρ δ(ύ)|ναμιν (*OGIS* 767.15–17; translation from Braund §51).

[176] δεύτερον φιλοδοξότατος ἐγενήθη καὶ πλείστας μὲν τῶν καθ᾽ αὑτὸν βασιλέων πόλεις Ἑλληνίδας εὐεργέτησε, πλείστους δὲ κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἀνθρώπους ἐσωματοποίησε (Polyb., *Hist*., 32.8.5 [Olson, Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[177] Polyb., *Hist*., 31.25–29.

[178] Examples from Polyb., *Hist*., 31.26–28; quote from Polyb., *Hist*., 31.25.9 [Olson, Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

Ptolemy but in a manner that surpassed what he did for them.[179] Antiochos IV tried to outdo Aemilius Paullus in magnificence by hosting games that rivaled those put on by the Roman general (167/166 BC).[180] Much to the chagrin of Seleukos III, Rome, not he, became reputed for setting the cities of Greece free from Macedonian rule. Incensed, Seleukos III told the Roman embassy that "regarding the autonomous cities of Asia it was not proper for them to receive their liberty by order of the Romans, but by his own act of beneficence."[181] Furthermore, Flamininus—who declared liberty to the Greeks at the Isthmian Games—displayed jealousy that the Achaian *strategos* Philopoimen received a similar repute and gratitude as himself for what he considered a lesser benefaction.[182] Later, Nero boasted to the Greeks that his benefaction of freedom exceeded all those before him, since his gift was whole rather than partial.[183]

Rulers and citizens could be described as having rendered godlike benefactions. After an earthquake devastated certain cities in western Asia Minor in 26 BC, the city of Chios honored Augustus for his aid to help the city recovery in an honorific decree (*SEG* 65.300).[184] The decree begins with a declaration that "Imperator

---

[179] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 20.100.3–4.

[180] Polyb., *Hist*., 30.25–26 (from Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 5.194; 10.439).

[181] τὰς δ᾽ αὐτονόμους τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν πόλεως οὐ διὰ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐπιταγῆς δέον εἶναι τυγχάνειν τῆς ἐλευθερίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ χάριτος (Polyb., *Hist*., 18.51.9 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL, slightly modified]).

[182] "In consequence of this exploit Philopoimen was beloved by the Greeks and conspicuously honoured by them in their theatres, thus giving secret umbrage to Titus Flamininus, who was an ambitious man. For as Roman consul he thought himself more worthy of the Achaians' admiration than a man of Arcadia, and he considered that his benefactions far exceeded those of Philopoimen, since by a single proclamation he had set free all those parts of Greece which had been subject to Philip and the Macedonians" (Ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀγαπώμενος καὶ τιμώμενος ἐκπρεπῶς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις φιλότιμον ὄντα τὸν Τίτον ἠσυχῇ παρελύπει. καὶ γὰρ ὡς Ῥωμαίων ὕπατος ἀνδρὸς Ἀρκάδος ἠξίου θαυμάζεσθαι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, καὶ ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις ὑπερβάλλειν οὐ παρὰ μικρὸν ἡγεῖτο, δι᾽ ἑνὸς κηρύγματος ἐλευθερώσας τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ὅση Φιλίππῳ καὶ Μακεδόσιν ἐδούλευσεν; Plutarch, *Philopoimen*, 15.1 [Perrin, LCL]).

[183] *IG* VII 2713.17–26.

[184] On this inscription, see Christopher P. Jones, "The Earthquake of 26 BC in Decrees of Mytilene and Chios," *Chiron* 45 (2015): 101–122. Note also that the decree likely honors another, non-imperial, benefactor. Jones, "The Earthquake of 26 BC in Decrees of Mytilene and Chios," 120.

Caesar, son of the God, the God Augustus, by his benefactions to all mankind having surpassed even the Olympian gods."[185] Augustus, according to the decree, was responsible for "a new beginning (παλιγγενεσία) to those who were destroyed" after the "the crisis of the earthquakes [ended?]."[186] One finds other expressions of praise to Augustus likening his services to those of the gods in the Calendar Decree of 9 BC and in an inscription from Halikarnassos.[187] At Bousiris (Egypt), the people praised Nero "the good deity of the inhabited world" (ὁ ἀγαθὸς δαίμων τῆς οἰκουμένης) and the governor Tiberius Claudius Babillus for "his godlike benefactions" (αἱ ἰσοθέοι αὐτοῦ χάριτες) that resulted in the sacred Nile river giving copious gifts for the populace.[188] Citizens could be recipients of "godlike honors" too, like when Pergamon honored Diodoros Pasparos with "godlike honors" (ἰσόθεοι τιμαί) for his extensive services to the city.[189] Finally, the Hellenistic poet Kallimachos lauded Berenike, wife of Ptolemy III, as among the three Graces, saying, "four are the Graces; for beside those three another has been fashioned lately and is yet wet with perfume. Happy Berenike and resplendent among all—without

---

[185] ἐπ<ε>ὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ, θεοῦ υἱός, θεὸς [Σεβαστός, ταῖς]| εἰς ἁπάντας ἀ[νθρ]ώπους εὐεργεσίαις ὑπερτεθεικὼς καὶ τοὺς Ὀλυμπίους| θεούς (*SEG* 65.300.a.2–4). Translation from Jones, "The Earthquake of 26 BC in Decrees of Mytilene and Chios," 111. The praise of Augustus as surpassing the gods in his benefactions resembles in some ways the hymn to Demetrios I Polioketes that highlights the tangible presence, power, and benefits of the human benefactor as opposed to the distant gods (see n110).

[186] *SEG* 65.300.a.7–8. τῆς δὲ τῶν σεισμῶν περιστάσε[ως πεπαυμένης - - - - -]…παλινγενεσίαν τοῖς ἀπολ{λ}<ω>λόσι κα[τέταξε].

[187] *SEG* 56.1233.41–42 (Providence brought Augustus to humanity "as if a god in place of herself" [ὥσπερ…ἀνθ' ἑα(υ)τῆς [θ]εόν]; translation from Jones, "The Earthquake of 26 BC in Decrees of Mytilene and Chios," 113); PH257992.6–7 (calling Augustus "Zeus patron and preserver of the common race of humanity" [Δία πατρῷον καὶ σωτῆρα τοὺ κοινοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπων γένους]). References from Jones, "The Earthquake of 26 BC in Decrees of Mytilene and Chios," 112–113.

[188] *OGIS* 666.3–4, 21 (AD 55–59). One can find an English translation in Sherk [1988] §63. On this inscription, see Christina Kokkinia, "The God-emperor. Fragments of a Discourse between Greek Cities and Provincial Governors," in *Communautés locales et pouvoir central dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain*, ed. Christophe Feyel, Julien Fournier, Laëtitia Graslin-Thomé, and François Kirbihler (Nancy: Association pour la diffusion de la recherche sur l'Antiquité, 2012), 499–516.

[189] "And now, having been found worthy of godlike honors, he might be more eager in his willingness, having acquired worthy recompenses of his benefactions" (καὶ νῦν ἰσοθέων ἠξιώμενος τιμῶν ἐκτενέστερος γίνη-||ται τῇ προθυμίᾳ κομιζόμενος τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν ἀξίας τὰς ἀμοιβάς; *IGRR* 4.293.Col. II.39–40).

whom even the Graces themselves are not Graces."[190] Thus, the significance of a benefaction could result in a person or population praising a benefactor by declaring him or her to be among the gods and even being a condition upon which the reality of the gods themselves depends, by speaking of them as having rendered benefits like or surpassing the gods, or saying that they are worthy of honors like the gods.

Generosity was usually valued and received warmly but could also raise suspicions about the giver in certain circumstances. Or generosity could be noticeably absent. Excessive kindness might signal weakness like when the kindness (φιλανθρωπία) of the Romans leads the Rhodians to think that Rome was weak and in danger.[191] Conspicuous lack of generosity would garner negative attention. Theophrastos describes the person who lacks liberality.[192] The ungenerous or "illiberal" person (ὁ ἀνελεύθερος) is the type of person to dedicate a tiny plaque to Dionysos upon winning the tragedy competition, to stay silent or leave during a city's call for funds in an emergency, to pretend his children are sick so he can keep them home from school on a day they are required to bring gifts, to awkwardly carry his meat and produce home himself rather than cheaply hiring a carrier, to change his route home to avoid a friend who wants a loan, and to rent an enslaved-girl as-needed for his wife rather than buy one.[193] Furthermore, paltry gifts did not go unnoticed when comparisons from the past were readily available. Around 227 BC Rhodes experienced an earthquake that devastated the city.[194] In response to the event many cities and dynasts offered abundant aid to Rhodes to help rebuild it, whether it was 75 or 300 talents of silver, provision of oil for the

---

[190] Τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες· ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρισὶ τήναις ἄρτι ποτεπλάσθη κἤτι μύροισι νοτεῖ. εὐαίων ἐν πᾶσιν ἀρίζαλος Βερενίκα, ἅς ἄτερ οὐδ᾽ αὐταὶ ταὶ Χάριτες Χάριτες (Callimachus, *Epigram* 52 [Mair and Mair, LCL].

[191] Polyb., *Hist*., 28.16–17.

[192] Theophrastos, *Characters*, 22.

[193] Theophrastos, *Characters*, 22.2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10.

[194] Polyb., *Hist*., 5.88.1.

gymnasion, corn, timber, other goods, quinqueremes, or exemption from customs duties.[195] Polybios points out the comparative lack of abundance in the gifts of the dynasts of his own time (mid-second century BC). He suggests that kings should not consider their four or five-talent gifts as significant and that cities should remember those ample gifts of the past and refrain from giving the same distinctions and honors to the meager present-day gifts as they did for the more generous benefactions of prior generations.[196]

Time

The notion of time is an important part of the process of rendering a benefaction. Themes that feature regularly in the epigraphic record include a well-timed benefaction and continuous and prolonged service. Halikarnassos honored its citizen Zenodotos Baukideos, "a good man" (ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς) concerning the city of Troizen, for his participation in the struggle for the freedom of Troizen for which he arrived "at the right moment" (κατὰ καιρὸν).[197] In the early first century AD Cyrene honored a certain Phaos son of Klearchos for "having acted as envoy during the Marmaric War, in winter, putting himself in danger and bringing military aid which was most timely and sufficient for the safety of the city."[198] Dangerous situations that threatened the well-being, autonomy and liberty, or even existence of a city provided the dire circumstances into which a benefactor could render timely services for the city. Yet proper timing was not

[195] Polyb., *Hist*., 5.88.1–90.8.

[196] Polyb., *Hist*., 5.90.5–8. Bringmann, based on his catalog of royal donations in the Hellenistic period, contends that Polybios was correct in his assessment that dynasts were more generous in the past than during his own time of the mid-second century BC. Bringmann, "The King as Benefactor," 11.

[197] PH258005.5–11 (ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γέγονε περὶ τὸν δῆμον| τὸν Τροζηνίων καὶ κατὰ καιρὸν ἀφικόμενος| ἐβοήθησε καὶ συνηγωνίσατο αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν| ἐλευθερίαν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὴν ἐξαγωγὴν| τῆς φρουρᾶς ἀξίως τῆς τε πατρίδος καὶ τῆς|| εἰκειότητος καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς ὑπαρχούσης| τῆι πόλει πρὸς Τροζηνίους).

[198] [καὶ] πρεσβεύσας ἐν τῷ Μαρμα|ρικῷ πολέμῳ ἐν χειμῶσι ἑαυ|τὸν ἐς τὸς κινδύνος ἐπιδὸς|| καὶ τὰν ἐπικαιροτάταν συμμα-|[χ]ίαν καὶ πρὸς σωτηρίαν τ[ὰ]ς πό-|[λ]εος ἀνηκοίσαν ἀγαγὼν (*I.RCyr2020* C.416.a.7–12; other editions include *OGIS* 767; *IGRR* I.1041; *SEG* 9.6. Translation from Braund §51.

the only temporal aspect of a benefaction that cities appreciated. Duration of service received due attention in honorific decrees.

Various expressions like ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ, διατελεῖν, ἀεί, and καθ᾽ ἡμέραν communicated a benefactor's continuous service. Athen's honorific decree for Phaidros of Sphettos repeatedly invokes the theme of constancy of service with the verb διατελεῖν: "Phaidros himself has continued (διατετελέκεν) to have the same preference as his ancestors, presenting himself as worthy of the good will of the People," as strategos "he continued (διετέλεσεν) to strive for the common preservation," "he continued (διετέλεσε) to speak and do what good he could for the People," and "he continued (διετέλεσε) to do everything in accordance with the laws and the decrees of the Council and People."[199] The Athenenians resolved to praise Phaidros and award him a gold crown "for the excellence and good will he continues (διατελεῖ) to have for the Athenian People."[200]

The phrase ἐν παντὶ καιρῶι frequents the honorific inscriptions to highlight how a benefactor "at every opportunity" maintained a disposition of service and took each opportunity to render benefits to the city and to individuals. So, Athens honored Philippides because "he has continued at every opportunity to display his goodwill for the people."[201] In Kallatis (Scythia), a Dionysian Thiasos honored a certain benefactor Ariston who, conforming to (στοιχεῖν) his father's love of good repute (φιλοδοξία), engaged in "preserving the city at every opportunity (ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ) from the events that

---

[199] καὶ αὐ|τῶς δὲ Φαῖδρος τὴν αὐτὴν αἵρεσιν ἔχων τοῖς προγό|[[γο]]νοις διατετελέκεν ἑαυτὸν ἄξιον παρασκευάζω|ν τῆς πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὐνοίας…χεροτονηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἐπὶ τὰ| ὅπλα στρατηγὸς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Κίμωνος ἄρχοντ|ος διετέλεσεν ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας, καὶ περιστάντων τεῖ χώραι ἀποφαινόμενος ἀεὶ τὰ κράτ-||ιστα…διετέλεσε καὶ λέγων καὶ πράττων ἀγαθ|ὸν ὅτι ἠδύνατο ὑπὲρ τοὺ δήμου…διετὲλεσε πάντα πράττων ἀκολούθως τοῖς τε νόμοις κα|ὶ τοῖς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου ψηφίσμασιν… (*IG* II^3 1 985.18–21, 30–35, 41–42, 46–47). Translation from Sean Byre, "Honours for Phaidros of Sphettos," (Last updated 6 March 2018).

[200] ἐπαινέσαι Φαῖδρο|ν Θυμοχάρου Σφήττιον καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν| χρυσῶι στεφάνωι κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἀρετῆς ἕνεκ-|[α] καὶ εὐνοίας ἣν ἔχων διατελεῖ περὶ τὸν δῆμον τ-||ὸν Ἀθηναίων (*IG* II^3 1 985. 71–75).

[201] διετετέλεκεν ἐν παντὶ καιρῶ[ι]| ἀποδεικνύμενος τὴν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὔνοιαν (*IG* II^3 1 877.8–9; 283/282 BC).

happened to it."[202] The people of Lykosoura (Arkadia) made known their desire for Nikosippos's continued benefits, and having honored him for his services they encouraged him and his wife to keep "the same stance in future, always (ἀεί) to be responsible for some benefit to the gods and to the city of the Lykosourans, in the knowledge that the city is grateful and has never lapsed in the bestowal of gratitude."[203] The Antigoneans (later "Mantineans") and a group of Roman businessmen honored Euphrosynus son of Titus because, among other things, he was "every day (καθ' ἡμέραν) contriving to furnish something more for the city."[204] These phrases sometimes come together in a single honorific inscription to draw close attention to a benefactor's constancy of service. For instance, the city of Abdera honored a certain Philon for "eagerly seeking always (ἀεί) to be a cause of some good and in public to the city and to those of the citizens who meet (him) in private, he continues (διατελεῖ) to display at every opportunity (ἐν παντὶ καιρῶι) his own goodwill he has for our people."[205] The effect of this terminology is to draw attention to the prolonged service with the implication that the benefactor did not offer a one-off or momentary benefit to the group of recipients but consistent care.

A past-present discourse construction like πρότερον-νῦν could also communicate continuity of a benefactor's past performance and current care for the city.

---

[202] ἐπειδὴ Ἀρίσ||τον Ἀρίστωνος, πατρὸς ἐὼν εὐεργέτα| καὶ δέυτερον γενομένου μὲν κτί|στα τᾶς πόλιος, φιλοτείμου δὲ τοὺ| θιάσου ἀμῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς φαίν|εται τὰν αὐτὰν ἔχων αἵρεσιν,| στοιχῶν τᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς φιλοδο|ξίᾳ, τάν τε πόλιν σῴζων ἐν παντὶ| καιρῷ ἐκ τῶν συνβαινόντων αὐ|τᾷ πραγμάτων (*SEG* 27.384.3–12 = PH173613.4–13; shortly after AD 15).

[203] παρακαλεῖν δὲ αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς τὰ μετὰ τοῦα μέν<ον>τας ἐπὶ τὰς| αὐτας ὑποστάσιος ἀεί τινος ἀγαθοῦ παραιτίους γείνεσθαι| τοῖς τε θεοῖς καὶ τᾶι πόλει τῶν Λυκουρασίων, γεινώσκον|τας ὅτι καὶ ἁ πόλις εὐχάριστος οὖσα οὐδέποτε μὴ λειφθῆ ἐν χάρι-||τος ἀποδόσει (*IG* V.2 576.26–30). Translation from Braund §677.

[204] καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπινοῶν τῇ πόλει πλεῖόν τι παρέχεσθαι (*IG* V.2 268.10; 10 BC–AD 10). On this inscription, which dileneates the various benefactions of Euphrosynus and his wife Epigone, see A. J. S. Spawforth, *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 224–228.

[205] [ἐπειδὴ Φίλων Πύθωνος Ἀκάνθιος| σ]πεύδων ἀεί τινος ἀγ[αθοῦ παραίτιος γίνεται]| καὶ κοινῆ τῆι πόλει καὶ τοῖς κατ' ἰδίαν ἐντυγχά[νου-]|σι τῶν πολιτῶν, ἀποδικνύμενος ἐν παντὶ καιρῶι|| τὴν καθ' αὑτὸν εὔνοιαν ἣν ἔχων διατελεῖ πρὸς| τὸν δῆμον ἡμῶν (PH295274.1–6; 2nd c. BC).

Kos honored the doctor Xenotimos with a gold crown for his past and present medical services:

> Since Xenotimos, son of Timoxenos, in previous times (ἔν τε τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις) took care of the citizens according to his medical skill, showing himself eager to save the sick and now ([κ]αὶ [νῦ]ν), in the face of the onset of many virulent diseases and the illness of the public doctors in the city resulting from the ill effects of their attendance upon their patients, he of his own volition has been unfailing in his provision of help for those in need, taking it upon himself to provide a remedy for every illness, and allowing to no one undue favor but saving men's lives by his ready service of all equally.[206]

The reason the city of Myous honored Apollodoros son of Metrophanos has similar phraseology: "in previous times (ἔν τε τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις) he inclined [himself] favorably, he continues to furnish in public and in private to those of the Myesians who meet with him and now having the same inclination dedicates to Apollo Terminthos four bowls each carrying a weight of a hundred Milesian drachmas."[207] In this instance the benefactor Apollodoros receives praise for his past care for the people of Myous and for his current piety to the god Apollo Terminthos. The πρότερον-νῦν construction in honorific decrees backgrounds the past event(s) (πρότερον) and foregrounds the current event for which the benefactor is receiving praise. In normal practice the past and present are presented as consistent and coherent such that the benefactor shows continuity in his or her disposition and performance to aid the recipient(s).

Relational Dynamics of Benefactors and Recipients

In a benefaction relationship, the recipient(s) are normally expected to display their gratitude (χάρις, εὐχαριστία) to their benefactor(s). Nevertheless, in various times and ways recipients did not necessarily abide by proper conventions of gratitude. Moreover, a benefactor and his or her recipients tended to expect each other to maintain a

---

[206] PH349601.1–15 (3rd c. BC). Translation from Hands §63.

[207] [ἐπειδὴ]| Ἀπολλόδωρος Μητροφάνου προαιρ[ούμενος - - ca. 15 - - τῶι δή-]|μωι ἔν τε τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις εὔνου[ν ἑαυτὸν διε]τέ[λ]ει παρεχό[μ]ε|νος κοινῆι τε καὶ ἰδίαι τοῖς ἀπαντῶσιν αὐτῶι Μυησίων καὶ νῦν τὴν αὐ|τῆν αἵρεσιν ἔχων ἀνατίθησι τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Τερμινθεῖ φιάλας τέσ|σερας ὁλκὴν ἄγουσαν ἑκάστην δραχμὰς Μιλησίας ἑκατόν (*SEG* 36.1047.1–6; end of 3rd c. BC).

certain level of fidelity (πίστις) and goodwill (εὔνοια) to one another. A city did not always need to choose one benefactor over another, since they would happily receive benefits from many different local and foreign people and repay gratitude to them all as they saw fit. But sometimes a zero-sum rivalry between benefactors could arise and test the fidelity of a city. For various reasons the recipients might find themselves in a situation in which their fidelity to a benefactor requires reconsideration or a decisive choice between rival alternatives. Additionally, benefactors and recipients might find themselves bound to each other through real or imagined ancestral ties. Cities related to one another through the mythical past, through colonization, or other historical ties. Strong historical and cultural ties could draw on that shared identity for decision-making and cooperation in the present, including rendering aid to one another in times of trouble. The following section explores the three relational dynamics of ingratitude, fidelity/defection, and kinship within the framework of benefaction.

Ingratitude

Ingratitude—failure to show proper thanks to one's benefactor—manifests itself in several ways in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. As a rule, ingratitude was supposed to be avoided. Failing to show adequate thanks for a benefit in a civic or individual benefaction relationship was a basic social transgression. Gratitude is such a significant aspect of benefaction relationships that Seneca famously calls ingrates worse than murderers.[208] To engage in behavior that demonstrated ingratitude (as commonly understood) would result in a degradation of one's reputation and thus limit one's chances of being a recipient of benefits in the future from the pool of potential benefactors. Social disdain for ingrates makes sense, since such a signal was able to sanction people who did not play by the evolved rules of just conduct in the game of

[208] Seneca, *Ben.*, 1.10.3–4.

giving and receiving benefits. In the selection process for dispensing a benefit a benefactor would tend to avoid giving to ingrates as a general principle.[209] A partial survey of Greek and Roman literature shows the deeply enculturated sanction and contempt for ingratitude.[210] Since the topic of ingratitude has been so widely discussed in the scholarly literature, the present section focuses on some discrete themes that occur within the wider category of ingratitude, namely, the topics of avoiding ingratitude, responding to ingratitude, and killing one's benefactor.

The prospects of shame for acting with ingratitude could affect how people conducted themselves. In 229 BC, the Aitolian League avoided initiating outright warfare against the Achaian League. Polybios explains that the Aitolians were ashamed to aggress against the Achaians because the Achaians had recently benefited them in the war against the Antigonid king Demetrios II.[211] To take a Roman example, a certain man who was about to kill Caius Marius refrained from the deed because he did not want to show ingratitude to Marius for all he had done for Italy.[212] Thus, the anticipation of shame could prevent transgression of the normal gift-gratitude social script.

One could press the scripts of ingratitude and gratitude into service to persuade

---

[209] Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 2.6.4–5; Seneca, *Ben.*, 4.34. The practice of avoiding giving to a person with a reputation for ingratitude also makes sense in terms of the emergence of the cultural institutions of benefaction with its repute mechanisms that signal to others that a recipient is thankful.

[210] E.g., Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 2.2; 2.6.4–5; 2.6.19; 4.4.24; Theophrastos, *Characters*, 17; Sir. 29:15–17; Polyb., *Hist*., 2.6; 3.16.2–4; 4.49.1; 22.11.1–12.10; 23.17.5–18.5; 27.9–10; Cicero, *On Duties*, 2.63; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 33.7.1; 32.2.3–10; 33.17; Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Sayings and Doings*, 5.2–3; Seneca, *Ben.*, 1.1.1–2; 2.26.1–2; 2.29.1–6; 2.30.1; 3.1.1; 3.14.3; 4.18, 24, 34; 5.17; 7.26, 31; *Letter* 81; Justin, *Epitome*, 21.6; 32.2.3–10; 35.1.2–3; Plutarch, *Gaius Gracchus*, 16.5; *Phocion*, 30.4–6; *Dion*, 42.1; *Brutus*, 11.2; *Comparison of Dion and Brutus*, 3.4; *Marius*, 10.1; 28.4; 39; *Alexander*, 41.1; 71.4.

[211] Polyb., *Hist*. 2.46.1–2; cf. 2.6.1.

[212] Plutarch, *Marius*, 39. Plutarch writes, "At once, then, the Barbarian fled from the room, threw his sword down on the ground, and dashed out of doors, with this one cry: "I cannot kill Caius Marius"" (οὐ δύναμαι Γάϊον Μάριον ἀποκτεῖναι). Plutarch continues, "Consternation reigned, of course, and then came pity, a change of heart, and self-reproach for having come to so unlawful and ungrateful a decision against a man who had been the savior [or preserver] of Italy, and who ought in all decency to be helped" ([Perrin, LCL]; πάντας οὖν ἔκπληξις ἔσχεν, εἶτα οἶκτος καὶ μετάνοια τῆς γνώμης καὶ κατάμεμψις ἑαυτῶν ὡς βούλευμα βεβουλευκότων ἄνομον καὶ ἀχάριστον ἐπ᾽ ἀνδρὶ σωτῆρι τῆς Ἰταλίας, ᾧ μὴ βοηθῆσαι δεινὸν ἦν).

others to act a certain way. For instance, a certain Roman general Aemilius during the Second Punic War, in a speech to his soldiers who were about to fight Hannibal's army, used the rhetoric of gratitude to induce them to fight with more enthusiasm and courage than any ordinary battle.[213] The implication of Aemilius's rhetoric was that, if his soldiers do not fight as if Rome's existence were at stake, then they would be ingrates to their benefactor (Rome). A benefactor knew that when the thankfulness of the recipients might be in question, and he or she could call attention to past benefactions or to the lack of honors the recipients have bestowed to prick the sense of shame that accompanies ungrateful behavior. Such was the case with Philip V at the conference at Lokris when he called attention to the numerous benefits that he and his ancestors rendered toward the Achaians and how their defection to Rome was out of step with proper gratitude.[214]

In addition to calling attention to one's past benefactions, outright ingratitude could be met with several other responses. According to Polybios, the Spartans showed ingratitude to the Antigonid dynasty and the Achaians by trying to make a secret alliance with the Aitolians, since "though they had been so recently set free (ἠλευθερωμένοι) through Antigonos and through the spirited action of the Achaians, and should not have in any way acted against the Macedonians and Philip, they sent privately to the Aitolians and made a secret alliance with them."[215] Thus, even spurning those whose ancestors liberated and faithfully aided them is still considered, at least to some observers,

---

[213] Polyb., *Hist*., 3.109.10–12. Polybios's Aemilius says to his soldiers, "…and enter on this battle as if not your country's legions but her existence were at stake. For if the issue of the day be adverse, she has no further resources to overcome her foes; but she [Rome] has centered all her power and spirit in you, and in you lies her sole hope of safety." He continues, "Do not cheat her, then, of this hope, but now pay the debt of gratitude you owe to her (ἀλλ᾽ ἀπόδοτε μὲν τῇ πατρίδι τὰς ἁρμούσας χάριτας), and make it clear to all men that our former defeats were not due to the Romans being less brave than the Carthaginians, but to the inexperience of those who fought for us then and to the force of circumstances" (Polyb., *Hist*., 2.109.10–12 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[214] Polyb., *Hist*., 18.6.5–8. On other instances of calling attention to past benefactions, see Bringmann, "King as Benefactor, 17–18, who also cites Polyb., *Hist*., 29.24.11–16 and Polyb., *Hist*., 16.26.1–6 (Livy, *History of Rome*, 31.15.1–4).

[215] Polyb., *Hist*., 4.16.5 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

ingratitude. When Sparta debated whether to maintain their alliance to the Macedonians or join the Aitolians, a crucial factor in their decision to maintain allegiance to the Antigonids was that the Macedonian dynasty had benefited Sparta in the past and that the Aitolians had recently (roughly two decades prior in 240 BC) used force to attack Laconia in an attempt to control Sparta.[216] The argument persuaded enough Spartans for them to decide to side with Macedon, but the pro-Aitolian faction violently and forcibly took control to impose their own viewpoint.[217] Polybios described the pro-Aitolian faction's move as motivated by, among other things, ingratitude (ἀχαριστία) to the Macedonians.[218]

Ingratitude of a superior to the services an inferior might inspire a change of loyalties. The Aitolian governor of Coele-Syria, Theodotos, rendered important services to Ptolemy IV when Antiochos III attempted to take possession of the region, but Polybios states that "he not only received no thanks (χάρις) for this but on the contrary had been recalled to Alexandria and had barely escaped with his life."[219] In response to such flagrant ingratitude, Theodotos decided to make overtures to defect to the Seleukid king.[220] Eventually, Theodotos did switch loyalties to Antiochos and he seized and handed over the cities of Tyre and Ptolemais to him.[221]

Ill-will could be fomented on account of ingratitude. Thus, when Opimius and the opponents of Gaius Gracchus had killed Marcus Fulvius Flaccus and his son and were hunting down Gaius, he prayed to the gods that the Roman people would be in perpetual servitude (μηδέποτε παύσασθαι δουλεύοντα) on account of their ingratitude (ἀχαριστία)

---

[216] Polyb., *Hist*., 4.34.9–10.

[217] Polyb., *Hist*., 4.34.10–35.5.

[218] Polyb., *Hist*., 4.35.6.

[219] Polyb., *Hist*., 5.40.1–2 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]; cf. 5.61.4.

[220] Polyb., *Hist*., 5.40.3.

[221] Polyb., *Hist*., 5.61.5–62.6.

and treachery (προδοσία).[222] An incensed benefactor could respond to ingrates in a drastic manner by killing someone for their ingratitude. When Antipater was regent of Macedon after the death of Alexander III, the people of Athens requested the prominent man Phokion to serve as envoy to Antipater so that they might convince him to remove the occupying Macedonian garrison. He refused the request, but a certain Demades accepted the call in his stead. Demades was received by Antipater's son Kassander, since Antipater had fallen ill, but Kassander had come across a letter from Demades who had written it to Antigonos asking him to invade Greece and Macedonia. When Demades arrived, Kassander arrested him and his son, killed his son in front of him, and then killed him for his ingratitude (ἀχαριστία).[223]

Killing one's benefactor was considered the height of ingratitude. Both Plutarch and Dio Cassius cast the assassination of Julius Caesar as a case of benefactor-killing. Plutarch remarks that the worst charge one could make against Brutus is that despite the fact that Caesar's generosity (χάρις) had preserved his life, still Brutus with his own hand participated in the killing of his preserver (σωτήρ).[224] Dio Cassius invokes the script of ingratitude in his comments on the death of Brutus and Cassius, saying, "For justice and the Divine Will seem to have led to suffer death themselves men who had killed their benefactor, one who had attained such eminence in both virtue and good fortune."[225]

The historian Memnon describes Ptolemy Keraunos's killing of Seleukos I in terms of killing one's benefactor:

> But while he [Ptolemy Keraunos] was treated with such care [i.e., "enjoying the

[222] Plutarch, *Gaius Gracchus*, 16.5.

[223] Plutarch, *Phokion*, 30.4–6.

[224] Plutarch, *Comp. Dion. Brut.*, 3.4.

[225] ὥς που τό τε δίκαιον ἔφερε καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἦγεν ἄνδρα αὐτοὺς εὐεργέτην σφῶν, ἐς τοσοῦτον καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ τῆς τύχης προχωρήσαντα, ἀποκτείναντας παθεῖν (Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, 48.1.1 [Cary and Foster, LCL]).

> honor and esteem of a king's son"], the benefactions he enjoyed did not make his wickedness any better: he plotted against Seleukos, attacked his benefactor and killed him. He mounted a horse and fled to Lysimachea, where he put on a diadem and presented himself before the army with a splendid guard: they were forced to accept him and proclaimed him king, after previously obeying Seleukos.[226]

Memnon notes that the benefits Ptolemy Keraunos received from Seleukos did not improve his character or instill a sense of gratitude; rather, those benefits heighten the treachery of his regicide. Perhaps the most striking and detailed example benefactor-killing happened to a certain Carthaginian named Gesco.

The example of Gesco offers a stark contrast to the normal and consistent pattern of rewarding benefactors with praise and gratitude and committing their person and deeds to public memory. In this instance former beneficiaries arrested, mutilated, and executed their benefactor. During the Mercenary War between Carthage and their mercenaries (ca. 240–237 BC), the Carthaginian commander at Lilybaeum, Gesco, acted as a mediator in the attempt to broker a deal between the two opposing parties.[227] Before the war broke out, Gesco had tried to ensure that Carthage would pay the mercenaries by sending them in detachments to provide Carthage enough time to hand over their arrears.[228] His plan did not work, and after the agitation had begun and the mercenaries had camped out at Tunis near the capital to demand their arrears, the mercenaries, who

---

[226] Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ Κεραυνός, τῶν Λυσιμάχου πραγμάτων ὑπὸ Σελεύκῳ γεγενημένων, καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐτέλει, οὐχ ὡς αἰχμάλωτος παρορώμενος, ἀλλ᾽ οἷα δὴ παῖς βασιλέως τιμῆς τε καὶ προνοίας ἀξιούμενος, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑποσχέσεσι λαμπρυνόμενος, ἃς αὐτῷ Σέλευκος προὔτεινεν, εἰ τελευτήσειεν ὁ γεινάμενος, [αὐτὸνς εἰς] τὴν Αὔγυπτον, πατρῴαν οὖσαν ἀρχὴν, καταγαγεῖν. (3) Ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μὲν τοιαύτης κηδεμονιάς ἠξίωτο· κακὸν δὲ ἄρα αἱ εὐεργεσίαι οὐκ ἐβελτίουν. Ἐπιβουλήν γὰρ συστήσας, προσπεσὼν τὸν εὐεργέτην ἀναιρεῖ, καὶ ἵππου ἐπιβὰς πρὸς Λυσιμαχίαν φεύγει, ἐν ᾗ διάδημα περιθέμενος μετὰ λαμπρᾶς δορυφορίας κατέβαινεν εἰς τὸ στράτευμα, δεχομένων αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης, καὶ βασιλέα καλούντων, οἳ πρότερον Σελεύκῳ ὑπήκουον (Memnon of Heraclea, *DFHG* XII.2–3; translation from Austin[2] §159 [FGrH 434 F 11 §8.2–3]; cf. Burstein §16).

[227] Gesco as *strategos* of Lilybaeum, see Polyb., *Hist*., 1.66.1. The war had started over a dispute about withheld payment of arrears. On the war generally, see Polyb., *Hist*., 1.65–88; Diod. Sic, *Bib. hist*., 25; Frank W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume I, Commentary on Books I–VI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 130–150. Gesco is mentioned by Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 24.13. Reference thanks to Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume I*, 132.

[228] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.66.2–3. Unfortunately, Polybios states that Carthage was neither monetarily well-off (having just come off the two-decades long war with Rome) nor inclined to pay the mercenaries the amount that they had promised (presuming the mercenaries would not demand the full portion). Polyb., *Hist*., 1.66.5–6.

were “very favorably (φιλανθρώπως) inclined to Gesco” because of his past attention towards them, referred their disputed points to him.[229] He brought the money to dole out to each nation accordingly.[230] During Gesco’s stay in Tunis, the Libyan contingent, led by Spendius and Mathos, grew frightened of Carthage’s potential anger at them and so they “began to traduce and accuse Gesco and the Carthaginians.”[231] Even after Gesco had realized the gravity of the growing threat to himself and the Carthaginians with him, "valuing more than anything the interest of his country” and observing that Carthage might “be in the gravest danger, he persisted, at great personal risk, in his conciliatory efforts."[232] Nevertheless, because Gesco told off the Libyan representatives who came to ask for their overdue pay, the mercenaries arrested him, plundered the Carthaginians present with him, and initiated the military conflict.[233]

Later in the war, Hamilcar Barcas successfully prosecuted battles, gained the friendship of the Numidian Navaras, and strategically rewarded mercenaries who defected to Carthage and pardoned those who wished to go free.[234] The mercenaries were now in dire straits and the leaders of the mercenaries worried about Hamilcar’s leniency toward mercenary prisoners.[235] As a result, they convinced their soldiers that they could

---

[229] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.68.13.

[230] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.69.1–3.

[231] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.69.4–14.

[232] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.70.1. ὁ δὲ Γέσκον…περὶ πλείστου δὲ ποιούμενος τὸ τῇ πατρίδι συμφέρον, καὶ θεωρῶν ὅτι τούτων ἀποθηριωθέντων κινδυνεύουσι προφανῶς οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι τοῖς ὅλοις πράγμασι, παρεβάλλετο καὶ προσεκαρτέρι….

[233] Polyb., Hist., 1.70.3–9.

[234] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.75–78. After a victory, “Hamilcar gave permission to those of the prisoners who chose to join his own army, arming them with the spoils of the fallen enemies; those who were unwilling to do so he collected and addressed saying that up to now he pardoned their offenses (συγγνώμην αὐτοῖς ἔχειν τῶν ἡμαρτημένων), and therefore they were free to go their several ways, wherever each man chose” but that they should not expect any leniency if they took up arms against Carthage again. Polyb., *Hist*., 1.78.13–15.

[235] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.79.8.

not trust Carthage to be clement to them.[236] Autaritus the Gaul further added that those who hoped for their clemency were traitors.[237] He suggested that they should torture and kill Gesco and all Carthaginian prisoners.[238] Yet other speakers countered that they should spare the prisoners or at least spare them torture, because Gesco had previously benefited them.[239] Their voices were drowned out and the mercenaries stoned the pro-Gesco speakers to death and cut off the hands of Gesco and the Carthaginian prisoners, "beginning with Gesco, that very Gesco whom a short time previously they had selected from all the Carthaginians, proclaiming him their benefactor (εὐεργέτην αὐτῶν) and referring the points in dispute to him."[240] After that, they cut off other bodily extremities, broke their legs, and "threw them still alive into a trench."[241] To a Greek like Polybios, how the mercenaries treated Gesco amounts to mutilating and executing one's benefactor—an act contrary to all justice that demonstrates two of his four core aims in recounting the Mercenary War: the folly of relying on mercenary soldiers and the savagery of barbarians in contrast to civilized peoples.[242] What the events surrounding Gesco's death also show is the contingency and constantly changing nature of relationships, even those formerly characterized by goodwill and mutual benefit.

Fidelity and Disloyalty

Certain situations arose that put a strain on a benefactor-recipient relationship. In a benefactor-recipient relationship the normal expectation between parties was that

---

[236] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.79.9–14.

[237] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.80.1–3.

[238] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.80.4.

[239] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.80.8 (διὰ τὰς γεγενημένας ἐκ τοῦ Γέσκωνος εἰς αὐτοὺς εὐεργεσίας).

[240] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.80.12.

[241] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.80.13.

[242] Polyb., *Hist*., 1.65.7–8. His other aims involve describing "the nature and character" of a "truceless war" and how the war is instructive regarding the causes of the Second Punic War. Polyb., *Hist*., 1.65.6–8. See also, Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume I*, 131–132.

each would hold goodwill and fidelity toward one another. Trustworthy and reliable people were sought for advice, entrusted with important missions or positions of power, and expected to keep their promises and reject bribes.[243] Fear of garnering a reputation for being untrustworthy could motivate a person to keep their word, even if being faithless would be arguably more advantageous in the short term.[244] In times of trouble and public crisis fidelity would be put to the test and individuals would be provided with the opportunity to prove themselves true or false. A striking example that shows this connection of fidelity and dangerous and critical situations occurs in a letter from the Kappadocian king Orophernes to the city of Priene.[245] The King praised and commended his envoys to Priene, mentioning "[the] valor of those who have with us incurred danger, for they have given clear proofs of their reliability (πίστις) and good-will (εὔνοια) on the most urgent occasions."[246] The envoys demonstrated their πίστις and εὔνοια by sharing in danger alongside the king and providing services in difficult times.

Trust was a strongly valued attribute, especially when a person was so reliable that they would endure pain and risk themselves even to the point of death to maintain their fidelity.[247] The historian Polybios remarks that people who endure suffering for the sake of maintaining fidelity to those who trust them are more well-regarded and praiseworthy than those who betray that trust out of fear or suffering.[248] Among

---

[243] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 18.29.2 (position of power); Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 18.46.7 (important mission); Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 18.54.2 (consulted); Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 18.58.2 (only reliable person left); Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 19.36.6 (reject bribes); Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 19.65.1–2 (expected to keep promise but failed); Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 20.19.2 (position of power; but see betrayal in 20.107.5), Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 37.10.1 (kept promises).

[244] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 18.66.2.

[245] *RC* §63 = *SEG* 1.438 = *I.Priene* 25.

[246] [τῆς ἀν]δραγαθίας τῶν συγκεκινδυνευκότων ἡ[μῖν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀναγ|καιο]τάτοις καιροῖς πίστεως καὶ εὐνοίας ἀποδε[ίξεις φαν]ερὰ[ς| ἀπ]οδείξ[α]ντας (*RC* §64.7–9).

[247] With respect to πίστις in general, Arrian reports that Epictetus said that "man is born to fidelity" (ὁ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς πίστιν γέγονεν) and "the man who overthrows this is overthrowing the characteristic quality of man" (Epictetus, *Disc*., 2.4.1 [Oldfather, LCL]).

[248] "We do not praise those who either from fear or suffering turn informers and betray

Alexander III's successors, Eumenes was the most loyal to the Argead dynasty and "he believed that it was incumbent upon himself to run every risk for the safety of the kings" (Alexander IV and Philip Arrhidaios).[249] Betraying or keeping one's trust was potentially a life and death decision for either party, so those who risked their own lives and endured suffering in order to maintain their trust were highly valued.

Another reason trust was valued is because it was not uncommon for somebody give up their loyalty and switch sides. A variety of reasons might induce somebody to change loyalties. Some individuals defected to a rival due to promises, an offer of money, gifts, a position of authority and power, or immunity.[250] Others changed sides to fight for the cause of liberty and still others simply to survive.[251] A reversal of fortune or a realization about which side had the upper hand might prompt people to switch loyalties, too.[252] Moreover, defection of one person or city could have a cascade effect in which others followed.[253] Sometimes the prospects of gifts and promises failed to prevent defection, like when Macedonian soldiers left the employ of Eurydike despite her gifts and promises to them.[254] On other occasions one's loyalty to someone was so

---

confidences, but we applaud and regard as brave men those who endure the extremity of torture and punishment without being the cause of suffering to their accomplices" (Polyb., *Hist*., 30.4.16; [Olson, Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[249] διέλαβεν ἅρμόζειν ἑαυτῷ πάντα κίνδυνον ἀναδέχεσθαι τῆς τῶν βασιλέων σωτηρίας ἕνεκα (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 18.58.4). See the connection ancient authors made between willingness to endure suffering or danger as indicative of somebody's trustworthiness elsewhere in, e.g., Justin, *Epitome*, 1.1.20; Plutarch, *Brutus*, 50; Plutarch, *Antony*, 68.3; Plutarch, *Comparison of Demetrios and Antony*, 6.1.

[250] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 18.40.5 ("great promises"); 19.64.3–4 (position as *strategos*, honors); 20.113 (gifts and matching pay); 36.2, 2a (immunity); Plutarch, *Antony*, 74.3 (prestige goods). Relatedly, the Silver Shields betrayed Eumenes and joined Antiochos to get their stolen baggage returned (Plutarch, *Eumenes*, 17–18).

[251] Xenophon, *Agesilaus*, 1.35 (liberty); Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 18.12.3 (liberty); Plutarch, *Dion*, 57.3 (survival).

[252] Justin, *Epitome*, 22.6.11–12; 39.2.4.

[253] Justin, *Epitome*, 41.4.5.

[254] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 19.11.1–9. The soldiers left Eurydike for Alexander the III's mother Olympias in part to honor the memory of Alexander's benefactions to them. See also how many Greek cities kept faith with Rome when Antiochos III arrived on Greek shores in 192 BC (Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 15).

strong that any overtures to defect proved unpersuasive.[255] Each situation in which fidelity and defection were in question had its own local factors that swayed an individual or city to maintain its faith or to abandon it for a new allegiance.

Kinship Language

In 205 BC, the city of Kytenion was in a state of disrepair and vulnerability.[256] Their walls and fortifications had been destroyed through war and an earthquake. As a result, the citizens sought donations to rebuild its dilapidated defensive structures by sending out envoys who would appeal to the mythological kinship (συγγένεια) the Kytenians shared with other Dorian-related polities (*SEG* 38.1476).[257] The people of Xanthos recognized their mythological kinship with the Kytenians through the gods and distant heroic past and they recognized that they owed a debt of gratitude to Kytenion because a legendary ancestor of theirs received help from a Xanthian ancestor:

> The ambassadors (of Kytenion) most zealously and eagerly exhort us to remember our kinship-relations (συγγένεια) with them, that originate from the gods and heroes, and hence to refuse to tolerate that the walls of their homeland lie destroyed—since, they said, Leto, our city's founding deity, gave birth to Artemis and Apollo in our land and Asklepios was born in Doris to Apollo and Koronis daughter of Phlegyos son of Doros, and therefore, having established through this genealogy that they possess such divinely originated kinship-relations with us, they enjoy an interwoven kinship and relationship with us that derived from the heroes, as they showed by establishing the genealogy from Ailos and Doros; and since, they also demonstrated, when colonists led by Chrysaor son of Glaukos son of Hippolochos left our land, Aletes, one of the Herakleidai, took care of them, because, they said, Aletes set out from Doris to help the settlers when they were being reduced by war, drove away the danger, and married the daughter of Aor son

---

[255] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist.*, 38/39.14.

[256] On this incident, see John Ma, "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age," *Past and Present* 180 (2003), 9–12; Jean Bousquet, "La Stèle des Kyténiens au Létôon de Xanthos," *Revue des Études Grecques* 101 (1988): 12–53; Lee E. Patterson, *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010), 118–123, 207–208. Patterson contends that the Kytenians were "shamelessly putting a spin on Xanthus' local myth" to persuade them to contribute funds to their city's rebuilding project. Patterson, *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*, 123.

[257] For text and commentary, see Bousquet, "La Stèle des Kyténiens au Létôon de Xanthos," *Revue des Études Grecques* 101 (1988): 12–53. Though, see different interpretations in Patterson, *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*, 118–123, 207–208.

of Chrysaor.[258]

Due to financial constraints upon the city funds, Xanthos only donated a modest sum of 500 silver drachmas.[259] The Xanthians not unjustifiably framed the donation in terms of being generous out of their own poverty and paltry resources:

> Since the public monies have been spent, since a great mass of debts has arisen, since a levy cannot be imposed on the citizens because of voting of the nine-year budget, and since the richest of the citizens have recently made great contributions—in these current circumstances…the city, for all these reasons, has no resources; but nevertheless thinks it terrible to tolerate that kinsmen should have fallen into such misfortune.[260]

In a different situation about a decade later, the Xanthians hosted and generously honored a certain Ilian rhetor named Themistokles "for his performance and his behavior which proved 'worthy of the kinship between us and the Ilians'" (ἡμῖν πρὸς Ἰλιεῖς συγγενείας ἄξιος; *SEG* 33.1184.15).[261] These incidents illustrate the strong ties between the networked *poleis* throughout the Greek world. Across the wide stretch of the Hellenistic world, the array of autonomous cities, "densely interconnected by a civic culture which sustained and depended on connections," would regularly invoke, request, help, and operate based on their kinship ties.[262]

The relationship between Teos and Abdera illustrates how kinship bonds can

---

[258] *SEG* 38.1476.13–30. Translation from Ma, "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age," 10.

[259] *SEG* 38.1476.62–64.

[260] ἐπεὶ δ᾽ οὐ μόνον τὰ κοινὰ κατανήλωτα<ι> καὶ δανείων| δὲ πλῆθος ὑπογέγονεν, ἐπιβαλεῖν τε τοῖς πολίταις| οὐδεμίαν ἔξεστιν ἐπιβολὴν διὰ τὴν γεγενημένην οἰ-||κονομίαν μετὰ ψηφίσματος εἰς ἔτη ἐννέα, οἵ τε δυ|νατώτατοι τῶν πολιτῶν μεγάλας εἰσὶν εἰσφορὰς πε|ποιημένοι προσφάτως διὰ τοὺς περιστάντας καιρ[ούς],| ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀπελογισάμεθα καὶ τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς· διὰ| ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας τῆς πόλεως πόρομ μὲν οὐθένα|| ἐχούσης, δεινὸν δ᾽ ἡγουμένης εἶναι τοὺς συγγε|νεῖς ἐπταικότας περιδεῖν ἐν τηλικούτοις ἀκληρή|μασιν (*SEG* 38.1476.52–62). Translation from Ma, "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age," 12.

[261] Ma, "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age," 18. As his reward for his services Themistokles received from the Xanthians 400 *drachmai*, an inscribed decree, and a copy of the decree (on stone) to take to Ilion. Note how Xanthos's monetary gift to this individual for his performance and conduct nearly equals that given to the entire city of Kytenion to relieve their distress.

[262] Quote from Ma, "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age," 13–14. For further reading on kinship language in Hellenistic diplomacy and inter-city relations, see Olivier Curty, *Les Parentés Légendaires entre Cites Grecques: Catalogue Raisonné des Inscriptions Contenant le Terme συγγένεια et Analyse Critique* (Geneva: Droz, 1995); Christopher P. Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); Patterson, *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*.

affect intercity relations in an even more successful manner than the Kytenians' appeal to Xanthos. The two cities exhibited strong ties, since they were not only linked by the distant mythological past but had historic and regular interaction.[263] In 170 BC the Roman *praeter* Hortensius destroyed the (free) city of Abdera, murdered their leading male citizens, and enslaved its population after they refused to immediately comply with his demand for money and food supplies.[264] The Roman Senate did not approve of Hortensius's actions and they restored Abdera to its freedom, but much work was left to be done to locate and return enslaved inhabitants and rebuild the city from complete ruin. It is here that Teos came to the aid of Adbera time and again in unparalleled fashion.

A newly discovered inscription details the Teian generosity toward its kin city Abdera.[265] The Teians, described by the Abderite inscription as "fathers of our city" (πατέρες τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν), dedicated themselves to aid Abdera: they sought out the enslaved Abderites and returned them to their freedom, homes, and citizenship, donated a large amount of money (without the need to repay) for the reconstruction of the city walls and the temples of the gods, funded without interest the Abderites purchase of oxen to help remedy their lack of agricultural productivity after their destruction, and provided a

---

[263] On the history of Teos and Abdera, see A. J. Graham, "Abdera and Teos," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112 (1992): 44–73. Teos was the mother city of Abdera, but sometime shortly after Teos was evacuated (at the onset of Persian invaders) Teian residents of Abdera repopulated and refounded the city of Teos. So, in a sense both cities acted as mother cities to each other at different points in their histories. A mid-third century Teian inscription (*SEG* 26.1306 [+ *SEG* 30.1376]; Burstein §28) attests to the close relationship of Teos and Abdera. The texts contain a provision that should a person illegitimately commandeer the fortress of Kyrbissos and fail to hand it over to the garrison commander, that person would be accursed and exiled not only from Teos but also from Abdera (*SEG* 26.1306.21–26). Graham writes, "We have seen that in the case of Abdera and Teos this relationship was so close as to bring the separate political existence of the two cities into question" and "the relationship between the colony and mother city is not only very close, it persisted over centuries" (at minimum from the 6th c. to 2nd c. BC). Graham, "Abdera and Teos," 68–69.

[264] Livy, *History of Rome*, 43.4.8–13.

[265] Peter Thonemann, ""An eternal memorial of goodwill towards their kinsmen": Abdera and Teos after the Third Macedonian War" (unpublished lecture handout), 1–5. Permission to use secured via email correspondence with author. For the full text, see Mustafa Adak and Peter Thonemann, *Teos and Abdera: Two Greek Cities in Peace and War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022). One can find the corresponding lecture about the inscription on the YouTube page of the British School at Athens at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=id36ilUtPqU. For a previous edition of the first fragment of the inscription, discovered in 1966 at Teos, see *SEG* 49.1536.

judge (i.e., lawyer) of their own and funded a judge from Miletos to help in a (ultimately successful) lawsuit against the city of Maroneia because the nearby city had seized Abderite territory after its destruction.[266] The remarkable generosity of the Teians at some points finds resemblance with the apostle Paul's description of the Macedonian assemblies in 2 Corinthians 8:1–5 who gave to the collection out of their poverty:

> When time had passed, and our city was now returning to a better condition because of the fact that a moderately large body of citizens had now been gathered together, but great expense was being incurred for the cultivation of the territory, and for this reason the people were being oppressed in their livelihoods and had no revenues, the *dēmos* sent once again to the Teians and called on them to advance us a sum of money for the purchase of oxen, the Teians, although lacking in wealth (Τήϊοι τῶι μὲν πλουτεῖν λειπόμενοι), but outstripping all other men in goodwill, advanced us five talents without interest over five years, wishing that in no respect our *dēmos* should be lacking in what is beneficial.[267]

In response, the awards of gratitude from Abdera to Teos were extraordinary: praise, a colossal bronze statue of the *demos* of the Teians in the agora (with Nike crowning the Teian *demos* with an ivy wreath), an altar in front of the statue and newly instituted annual sacrifice to the *demos* of the Teians, a newly instituted contest (torch-race), front seat privileges to the contest, a gold crown and a public announcement of the awards, and 1000 *medimnoi* of wheat.[268] Where the people of Xanthos donated a modest sum to help rebuild the marginally kin city of Kytenion, Teos went above and beyond repeatedly to help their closely related kin-city Abdera during its greatest point of misery and in its profound suffering.

---

[266] Thonemann, ""An eternal memorial of goodwill towards their kinsmen": Abdera and Teos after the Third Macedonian War," A. ll. 1 (*SEG* 49.1536.B.1); B. ll.1–52. The inscription also describes the two peoples of Abdera and Teos as "kinsmen" (συγγενείς; *SEG* 49.1536.B.10–11).

[267] τοῦ χρόνου δὲπροκόψαντος καὶ τῆ[ς]| πόλεως ἡμῶν ἤδη πρὸς βελτίονα κατάστασιν ἐρχομένης διὰ τὸ κα[ὶ]| πλῆθος ἤδη μέτριον ἠθροῖσθαι πολιτῶν, πολλῆς τε δαπάνης γινομέ-||νης εἰς τὴν τῆς χώρας ἐξεργασίαν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θλιβομένων τοῖς| βιοις τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀπροσόδων γινομένων, πέμψαντος πά|λιν πρὸς Τηΐους τοῦ δήμου καὶ παρακαλοῦντος εἰς βοῶν καταγορασ|μὸν ἑαυτῶι προχορηγῆσαι διάφορα, Τήϊοι τῶι μὲν πλουτεῖν λειπόμε|νοι, τῶι δὲ εὐνοεῖν πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὑπεράγοντες, προέχρησαν ἄτο-||κα τάλαντα πέντε εἰς ἔτη πέντε, βουλόμενοι κατὰ μηθὲν ἐλλιπῆ τῶν| συμφερόντων τὸν δῆμον ἡμῶν γενέσθαι. Text and translation from Thonemann, ""An eternal memorial of goodwill towards their kinsmen": Abdera and Teos after the Third Macedonian War," B. ll.22–31.

[268] Thonemann, ""An eternal memorial of goodwill towards their kinsmen": Abdera and Teos after the Third Macedonian War," B. ll.54–79.

Despite the disparity in their services, both Xanthos and Teos are praised for giving out of their poverty. These two examples, Kytenion-Xanthos and Abdera-Teos, shows the spectrum of goodwill and assistance that kinship between groups could produce, different motivations for asserting kinship (appeal to the heroic past, or rely on longstanding historical relations), and an aspect of the rhetoric of benefaction that highlights a benefactor city's generosity despite its own lack of resources.

Memory, Imitation, and Survival

Memory

A benefactor's deeds and accomplishments not only merited prestige goods and awards like free meals and front seats at the games, but one of the most prominent themes in civic benefaction is the concern for a benefactor's memory to be honored and perpetuated.[269] Indeed, the thousands and thousands of stone stele that survive from Greek and Roman antiquity attests to the durability of the medium and the suitability of inscribing the generous deeds of a well-reputed person.

An inscription from Teos illustrates the close connection between benefaction, gratitude, and memory. In response to benefactions rendered and promised from Antiochos III and his wife Laodike, the Teians instituted a new festival (the Antiocheia and Laodikeia) and erected a cult site consisting of "the *bouleuterion* adorned with a sacred statue (ἄγαλμα) of Antiochos, as a memorial of his benefactions."[270] On the first day of the month of Leukatheon, "the principal magistrates (*strategoi*, *timouchoi*, *tamiai*) sacrificed on the common hearth of the city, to the king, the *Charites*, and *Mneme*, the euergetical values of reciprocal gratitude and memory."[271] Likewise, the graduating

---

[269] On how certain cities integrated the memory of events of liberation into their civic culture see the Freedom section above.

[270] Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, 220–221.

[271] Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, 221.

ephebes offered a sacrifice, which functioned to reinforce to the young men the city's commitment to the practice of giving an appropriate return of gratitude to its benefactors.[272]

No less in smaller scale institutions like associations than in the broader civic scale of the *polis* did groups construct identity through public acts of remembrance. The Artists of Dionysos praised their former leader Dionysios with posthumous honors for his services.[273] At two points in the inscription the Dionysiasts invoke the notion of memory:

> On account of these things, the Dionysiasts, recognizing them [i.e., Dionysios's services], have honored him as being worthy and have crowned him in accordance with the law, so that the members who bring the synod together for the god might be seen to remember him, both while he was alive and after he died, remembering his beneficence and his goodwill toward them. Because of these things, they have publicly honored his children, since it happened that he has left behind successors to the things he possessed with glory and honor.[274]
>
> Furthermore, the sacrificing associates resolved to recognize that Dionysios has been canonized as a hero and to set up a statue of him in the temple beside the statue of the gods, where there is also a statue of his father, so that he may have the most beautiful memory for all time.[275]

Not only do the Dionysiasts praise the man Dionysios for his life of service to them, but by erecting this honorific inscription and statue and canonizing Dionyios as a hero they also publicly position themselves as a group that pays due respect to the memory of

---

[272] Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, 221. The inscription Ma §18.38–44 reads, "so that they [the *ephebes*] do not start to undertake anything concerning the community before returning gratitude to the benefactors and so that we should accustom our progeny to value everything less than the returning of gratitude" (ἵνα μηθὲν πρότερον ἄρξωνται πράσσειν τῶν κοινῶν πρὶν ἢ χάρ[ιτα]ς ἀποδ[ο]ῦναι τοῖς εὐεργέταις καὶ ἐθίζωμεν τοὺς ἐξ ἡαυτῶν πά[ντα] ὕστερα καὶ ἐν ἐλλάσσοντι τίθεσθαι πρὸς ἀποκατάστασιν χάριτος).

[273] *IG* II^2 1326; English translation in *AGRW* §21. For some other examples of posthumous honors for benefactors, see *MAMA* 8.407–410, 412, 414, 417; *SEG* 45.1502; *SEG* 54.1020. References thanks to Angelos Chaniotis, "New Inscriptions from Aphrodisias (1995–2001)," *American Journal of Archaeology* 108, no. 3 (2004): 379.

[274] ἀνθ᾽ ὧν ἐπιγνόντες οἱ Διονυσιασταὶ ἐτίμησαν| αὐτὸν ἄξιον ὄντα καὶ ἐστεφάνωσαν κατὰ τὸν| νόμον· ἵνα ο[ὖ]ν φαίνωντα οἱ τὴν σύνοδον φέρον|τες μεμνη[μ]έμοι αὐτοῦ καὶ ζῶντος καὶ μετηλλα-||χότος τὸν β[ίο]ν τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς μεγαλοψυχίας| καὶ εὐ[νοίας κ]αὶ ἀντὶ τούτων φανεροὶ ὦσιν τιμῶν|τες τοὺς ἐξ [ἐκ]είνου γεγονότας, ἐπειδὴ συμβαί|νει διαδόχους αὐτὸν κ[α]ταλελοιπέναι πάντων τῶν ἐν δόξ[ε]ι καὶ τιμεῖ αὐτῶι ὑπ[α]ρχόντων (*IG* II^2 1326.21–29; translation from *AGRW* §21, underline added).

[275] Φροντίσαι δὲ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας ὅπως ἀφηρωϊσθεῖ Δι[ο-]|νύσιος καὶ ἀ[ν]ατεθεῖ ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι παρὰ τὸν θεόν, ὅπου κα[ὶ]| ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ὑπάρχει κάλλιστον ὑπόμνημα αὐτοῦ| εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον (*IG* II^2 1326.45–48; translation from *AGRW* §21).

worthy people. The importance of being seen by others to be the type of people who remember benefactors is a manifestation of the culture of gratitude that especially puts a premium on visible forms of gratitude. Furthermore, this practice of visible memorialization reinforces the selection mechanism of the *polis* or other group that praises conduct advantageous to the group, which over time creates a repository of exemplars whom other individuals might pattern themselves after.

Exceptional performances were worth remembering. So, Polybios regards the valiant effort of the Abydians against Philip V's siege as "worthy of remembrance and handing down" (μνήμης ἀξία καὶ παραδόσεως).[276] Cities were sometimes motivated to award benefactors with praise and gratitude so that their reputation or memory would be "immortal" (ἀθάνατος) or "eternal" (αἰώνιος). After Antigonos Doson briefly occupied Sparta, the Achaian League and other cities praised him at the Nemean games, which Polybios says was "for immortal fame and honor" (πρὸς ἀθάνατον δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν).[277] On another occasion the Achaian League posthumously honored their long-time *strategos* Aratos with fitting honors because of the frequency (τὸ πλῆθος) and magnitude (τὸ μέγεθος) of his benefactions to the Achaians.[278] The Achaians voted him heroic honors and "what is fitting for an eternal memory."[279] Populations did not exclusively engage the

---

[276] Polyb., *Hist*., 16.29.3–4. In a letter, king Eumenes II wrote to the Ionians League (167/166 BC) that the Myletians "performed many famous and memorable actions (ἔνδοξα δὲ πολλὰ καὶ ἄξια μνήμης) on behalf of the Ionians," which helps qualify them as a suitable location for a statue of him (*OGIS* 763.66–67; translation from Austin[2] §239; for other English translations, see also *RC* §52; Burstein §88; BD[2] §47)

[277] Polyb., *Hist*., 2.70.1, 4–5. ἐν ᾗ τυχὼν πάντων τῶν πρὸς ἀθάνατον δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἀνηκόντων ὑπὸ τε τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἑκάστης τῶν πόλεμων, ὥρμησε κατὰ σπουδὴν εἰς Μακεδονίαν (Polyb., *Hist*., 2.70.5). Polybios states that the Spartans proclaimed Antigonos Doson as σωτήρ and εὐεργέτης (Polyb., *Hist*., 9.36.5). Geronthrai honored him as σωτήρ: *IG* V.1 1122 (βασιλέος| Ἀντιγόνου| Σωτῆρος). On Antigonos Doson's defeat of Sparta, see also Justin, *Epitome*, 29.4; Polyb., *Hist*., 9.29, 36. For further on the honors awared to Antigonos Doson by Greeks, see Sylvie Le Bohec, *Antigone Dôsôn roi de Macédoine* (Nancy, France: Nancy University Press, 1993): 454–465.

[278] Polyb., *Hist*., 8.12.7. On Aratos's death and the honors paid to him, see also Plutarch, *Aratos*, 53, which details how the Sikyonians gave him the titles of σωτήρ (deliverer/preserver) and οἰκιστής (founder), instituted a festival on his birth month in his honor with songs and a procession, and made annual sacrifices to Aratos.

[279] Polyb., *Hist*., 8.12.8.

constructive aspects of memory formation by building monuments and instituting festivals to the worthy, but also concerned themselves with censuring the unworthy.

Present circumstances could cause a population to erase the public memory of past benefactions. A notable example is when the Athenians decided to erase from memory the Antigonid dynasty. Previously, Athens had heaped unprecedented honors upon the Antigonid kings, especially Antigonos I and Demetrios I, for their role in expelling the garrison of Kassander and his puppet Demetrios of Phaleron from the city. Divine honors were awarded, and the Athenians integrated the names of Antigonos and Demetrios into the civic calendar, sacred robes, tribal structure, and worship life of the city.[280] But at the outset of the Second Macedonian War in 200 BC the Athenians, allied with the Romans against the Antigonid dynasty, had a change of heart strong enough to override the previous exalted honors they bestowed. As a part of a comprehensive program to erase the Antigonid name from their civic culture, they scratched out the names of Antigonos and Demetrios from inscriptions that honored them and removed their names from the calendar and tribes.[281] One can see the erasure of favorable references to the Antigonids, for instance, in the honorific inscription to Phaidros of Sphettos.[282] Romans too used the practice of memory erasure to blot out any good reputation that a now censured individual might have had.[283] The power to blot out the memory of somebody by removing statues from public display, defacing paintings, scratching out the offender's name from honorific inscriptions or coins, or revoking other honors was an important mechanism that could be wielded to signal to other would-be power-brokers that they should be careful not to transgress certain rules or to reverse their

---

[280] Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 10.3–11.1.

[281] Livy, *History of Rome*, 31.44.2–9.

[282] *IG* II^3 985.1–2, 37, 38, 40–43, 47–52.

[283] See Eric R. Varner, "Portraits, Plots, and Politics: *Damnatio Memoriae* and the Images of Women," *MAAR* 46 (2001): 41–93.

liberal disposition.

Imitation

Imitation is a deeply embedded tendency in human cognition that facilitates social learning.[284] People tend to do what they see other people doing, which powers human learning and rule-following. Thus, the practice of imitation facilitates the functioning of the suite of ways of getting along together such as shared language and rules of morality like negative rules of just conduct (e.g., "do not kill," "do not steal," "do not harm," "do not defraud"). In human social hierarchies, lower status people tend to pay attention to the words and actions of high-prestige individuals and display "preferential, automatic, and unconscious imitation" of them.[285] One can consider imitation an embodied form of memory in which one person translates, however imperfectly, into their own bodily movements the conduct or procedures he or she sees another model for them. In the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, in both the Latin West and Greek East, social institutions like civic benefaction and the *cursus honorum* that had emerged over the prior centuries were the cultural vehicles for populations to signal prestige and provide publicly accessible repositories of beneficial deeds so that others could attend to the example of prestigious individuals and emulate them.[286] In short, the institution of civic benefaction in Greek cities was geared toward producing emulators of advantageous deeds.

---

[284] Joseph Henrich, *The Secret of Our Success: How Culture is Driving Human Evolution, Domesticating Our Species, and Making Us Smarter* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016) 20.

[285] Henrich, *The Secret of Our Success*, 123–126 (quote from 123). Henrich notes, in contrast, that people do not show a bias to imitate people who display dominance except to the degree that imitation satiates the dominant person's will. Similarly, they only pay attention to dominant individuals in order to avoid their gaze or outbursts of violence.

[286] On the "imitation of the great man" motif in the Greco-Roman period exhibited by a wide variety of sources from the Latin West and Greek East, which shows how the use of high-status elites as exemplars for civic virtue was widespread and deeply embedded in Greek and Roman cultures, see James R. Harrison, "The Imitation of the 'Great Man' in Antiquity: Paul's Inversion of a Cultural Icon," in *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 213–254.

The historian Polybios himself recognizes the practice of imitation as a sort of selection mechanism for preserving honorable conduct and eliminating dishonorable conduct within a population, saying, "From this again some idea of what is base (αἰσχροῦ) and what is noble (καλοῦ) and of what constitutes the difference is likely to arise among the people; and noble conduct will be admired and imitated because it is advantageous, while base conduct will be avoided."[287] Polybios's comment expresses a common truth in the domain of Greek civic virtues: those who do good for the city and its people are worthy of imitation because they prove advantageous for the survival and flourishing of the population. For instance, Attalos II praises a teacher in a letter to the city of Ephesus for his quality instruction, saying that "it is clear to all that young men endowed with a natural excellence of character imitate (ζηλοῦσι) the manners of those in charge of them."[288] In this case, quality teachers are models for their students to imitate.

Elsewhere, the city of Sestos praised its benefactor Menas for his service as envoy (many times), gymnasiarch (twice), and his consistent integrity and generosity towards the people of Sestos throughout his services.[289] In the motivation clause, Sestos spells out that they are honoring Menas "so that others seeing the honors which are paid by the people to excellent men, should emulate the finest deeds and be encouraged towards excellence, and public interests should be furthered when all are striving to achieve glory and are always securing some benefit to their native city."[290] The city lays

---

[287] ἐξ οὗ πάλιν εὔλογον ὑπογίνεστθαί τινα θεωρίαν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς αἰσχροῦ καὶ καλοῦ καὶ τῆς καὶ τῆς τούτων πρὸς ἄλληλα διαφορᾶς, καὶ τὸ μὲν ζήλου καὶ μιμήσεως τυγχάνειν διὰ τὸ συμφέρον, τὸ δὲ φυγῆς (Polyb., *Hist*., 6.6.9 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[288] ὅτι γὰρ ζηλοῦσι τὰς ἀγωγὰς |[τῶν ἐ]πιστάτων οἱ ἐκ φύσεως καλοκἀγαθκοὶ τῶν νέων, παντὶ πρόδηλόν ἐστιν (*SEG* 26.1239.6–7; *I.Eph*. 202; see also comments in *SEG* 47.1625; ca. 150–140 BC; translation from Austin[2] §246).

[289] *OGIS* 339 (ca. 133–120 BC; translation in Austin[2] §252).

[290] θεωροῦντες τε καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τὰς περιγινομενας τιμὰς ἐκ τοῦ δήμου|| τοῖς καλοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῖς, ζηλωταὶ μὲν τῶν καλλίστων γίνωνται, προτρέπωνται δὲ πρὸς ἀρετήν,| ἐπαύξηται δὲ τὰ κοινὰ παραρμωμένων πάντων πρὸς τὸ φιλοδοξεῖν καὶ περιποιούντων ἀεί τι τῆι Παρτρίδι τῶν καλῶν (*OGIS* 339.89–92; translation from Austin[2] §252). Cf. *Syll*.[3] 675.25–29 (translation in Austin[2] §157); *I.Cret*. I xix 1.44–49 (ὁ[μοίως]|| δὲ καὶ <ἀ> ἐξ ἀμίων γινομένα φιλά[νθρω-]|πος ἀποδοχὰ ἐς τὸς ἀμὸς εὐε[ργέ-]|τας, καὶ πολλοὶ τούτων μιμηταὶ κ[αὶ ἐς]| τὸν ὕστερον χρόνον τᾶς καλοκἀγα[θίας]| ὑπάρχωσιν).

out the mechanism of the repute system which fosters imitation to those who gain good repute for their deeds, which in turn serves as a mechanism to produce quality people who perform benefits for the fatherland.

The epitaphs of prominent Roman families illustrate the practice of imitating virtuous ancestors in Republican Rome. One of the Scipionic epitaphs spells out the theme of ancestral imitation especially well. In the epitaph honoring Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio Hispanus, who achieved several ranks in the *cursus honorum*, the inscription remarks that he contributed to the family's prestige, followed the pattern of his father, and lived up to his ancestor's repute: "By my good conduct I heaped virtues on the virtues of my clan; I begat a family and sought to equal the exploits of my father. I upheld the praise of my ancestors, so that they are glad that I was created of their line. My honors have ennobled my stock."[291] If local benefactors who served as priests, gymnasiarchs, or other civic capacities, and the Roman elites of the Republic and early Empire were held in honor and served as models of virtue for imitation, in the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* Augustus presents himself as paragon of civic virtue and unsurpassable worldwide beneficence.[292] His own monumental and epigraphic celebration of his accomplishments relativized any previous benefactors in terms of the number and scale of the benefits.[293] As such, Augustus created for himself the role of the ultimate human

---

[291] E. H. Warmington, trans., *Remains of Old Latin, Volume IV: Archaic Inscriptions.* (LCL 359; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940), 9 (§10).

[292] The *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (*RGDA*) records his benefactions: freed the world from enslavement (*RGDA* 1), defeated his father's (Caesar's) murderers (*RGDA* 2), conducted wars of expansion and acted magnanimously toward submissive foreign groups (*RGDA* 3), (humbly) refused perpetual consulship (*RGDA* 5), became high priest (*RGDA* 7), increased patrician numbers and conducted censuses (*RGDA* 8), gave money to plebs and soldiers who settled in colonies, as well as other relief ventures at his own expense (*RGDA* 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24), built temples, buildings, and aqueducts for the good of Rome (*RGDA* 19, 20, 21), put on public games of gladiators and naval battles (*RGDA* 22, 23), defeated pirates and received allegiance from across the Mediterranean (*RGDA* 24), extended Roman borders and increased its territorial control (*RGDA* 25, 26, 29, 30), founded colonies (*RGDA* 27), and received emissaries from foreign peoples for "friendship" (*RGDA* 31, 32, 33). The senate duly rewarded him with the title Augustus and other honors (e.g., crowns), including the title *pater patriae* ("father of the fatherland") (*RGDA* 34–35).

[293] On Augustus's monumental and epigraphic propaganda, see Harrison, "Imitation of the "Great Man" in Antiquity," 228–233.

moral exemplar after which everyone else (particularly high-prestige individuals) should pattern their conduct.

Community Survival

The institution of benefaction facilitated the very survival of the *polis*. When a crisis rocked the city—whether earthquake, invasion, plague, or famine—civic benefaction acted as one of the institutions that afforded the city a fighting chance. Its development was not the result of the deliberation or plan of any single conscious mind with the end goal of survival; rather, the spontaneous interaction of individual persons in local contingent circumstances and incremental changes to existing informal social institutions moved toward a more formalized institution. The reputation system selected for people who garnered good repute by serving the people and benefiting the population. By publicizing their beneficial deeds, the benefactors became publicly accessible models for imitation as long as the stone on which they were inscribed remained open to view. Moreover, honorific inscriptions enabled corporate memory of adaptive patterns of behavior for the survival and flourishing of the *polis* by inscribing the deeds of benefactors in public places to serve as a repository of advantageous deeds.

In the following chapter, the events of the First Mithridatic War between the Pontic king Mithradates and Rome will give an opportunity to see how many of the benefaction dynamics and motifs covered in this chapter converge in a single historical episode. Moreover, the events of the war will also provide an opportunity to introduce the importance of self-endangerment as a theme in benefaction.

CHAPTER 4

BENEFACTION: CONVERGENCE OF MOTIFS

The First Mithridatic War

The events of the First Mithridatic War (89–85 BC) can help illustrate the confluence of benefaction, freedom, time, promise, fidelity and defection, endangered benefaction, word-deed congruency, memory, and community risk and preservation—issues which also converge in Paul's letter to the Galatians. Sometime between 87 and 85 BC during Rome's first war with Mithradates VI Eupator of Pontus the people of the city of Daulis (in Phokis) issued an honorific decree to express their gratitude toward a certain Hermias from Stratonikeia for his services to their city during the crisis that the war brought upon the city.[1] Greek cities in Greece and Asia Minor had to navigate allegiances in the hazardous war between the two powerful military forces of Rome and Pontus. Each city had to adjust its loyalties based on the constantly changing information available to it and they had to weigh the potential costs and benefits of maintaining existing loyalties or if they should forsake their prior allegiances to forge new, possibly more advantageous bonds of trust with another party. Any individual city might face severe reprieve if they maintained fidelity to or defected to the wrong side at the wrong moment during the shifting tides of war. At the same time, fidelity to the ultimate victor could result in significant benefits for the city. A few examples will illustrate the precarious situation these cities faced, after which we will return to the crisis at Daulis.[2]

---

[1] *FD* III 4.69. For a narrative of the events of the First Mithridatic War, see, e.g., Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 30–240; Plutarch, *Sulla*, 11–26; Memnon (*FGrHist* 434 F 22.1–10).

[2] Individuals could also be targeted on account of their fidelity to one of the warring parties. For example, Mithradates specifically targeted Chaeremon of Nysa for supporting the Romans. Mithradates put a price on his head and the heads of his sons (forty talents if alive, twenty if dead). See *RC* §73/74.

Just prior to the outbreak of war the city of Ephesus had shown a decidedly more congenial relationship with Rome and its magistrates, even registering as an official friend of Rome, but they changed course and sided with Mithradates.[3] In the early phases of the conflict, Ephesus welcomed Mithradates into their city with enthusiasm and toppled the statues of Romans.[4] Upon Mithradates's order to massacre Italian-born residents throughout Asia Minor, the Ephesians participated in the slaughter and even killed the Italians who fled for sacred asylum at the temple of Artemis.[5] But subsequent developments in the course of the war prompted Ephesus to adjust its loyalties once again. After Sulla's victory against the Pontic forces at the Battle of Chaironeia (86 BC), Mithradates and his general Zenobius, incensed at the presence of Roman sympathizers in the city of Chios, seized and disarmed the city, took hostages from its prominent families, imposed a massive fine of two thousand talents, and forcibly deported the population.[6] The fate of Chios cooled Ephesus's support for Mithradates. Accordingly, when Zenobius came to Ephesus, the now wary Ephesians required that he enter the city unarmed and only with a small contingent of soldiers.[7] They then kill him and prepared the city for defense against the Pontic forces.[8]

Having thus broken from its short-lived allegiance to Mithradates, Ephesus returned to support Rome in 86 or early 85 BC with a public decree.[9] The decree

---

[3] On Ephesus as having φιλία with Rome, see *OGIS* 437 (98/97 or 94/95 BC) = PH301915. For an English translation, see Sherk [1984] §57.

[4] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 81.

[5] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 85–88.

[6] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 181–186; cf. Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 6.266e–f (citing Nikolaos and Posidonius).

[7] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 187.

[8] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 188.

[9] *I.Eph.* 8. An English translation of lines 1–19 of *I.Eph.* 8 can be found in Sherk [1984] §61. For a translation of the entire inscription, see Ilias Arnaoutoglou, *Ancient Greek Laws: A Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1998), §90.

conspicuously omits any mention of its recent participation in the mass slaughter of Romans. In it the Ephesians issued a declaration of war against Mithradates in which the Ephesian *demos* states how they are keeping their longstanding goodwill and obedience to the Romans and have decided to join Rome and declare war with Mithradates "on behalf of Roman hegemony and the common freedom."[10] Moreover, Ephesus states that they acceded to Mithradates only because of his deceit, unexpected arrival, and superior numbers.[11] Furthermore, the decree attempts to surreptitiously cover over their grave transgressions against Rome by saying that the *demos* had in fact "guarded their goodwill toward the Romans from the beginning" and they had simply waited for the right moment to help Rome.[12] Despite their best efforts, though, their decision to join Rome late in the war did not help Ephesus avoid Sulla's twenty thousand talent indemnity upon Asia for their ingratitude toward Rome's historical benefits to them.[13]

Elsewhere, Roman military leaders exacted retribution against cities whose fidelity lacked constancy, like when Sulla let his army pillage the region of Boiotia and destroy its cities of Anthedon, Larymna, and Halae.[14] More extensively documented are the events in Athens, which exemplify the reasons why some cities opted to defect to Mithradates but also the serious consequences for doing so. Athens initially joined Mithradates and revolted against Rome, thinking that Roman hegemony had lost its force

---

[10] *I.Eph.* 8.1–19 (86–85 BC). Lines 9–12: [ὁ] δὲ δῆμος ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς συνφυλάσσων τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαί|ους εὔνοιαν, ἐσχηκὼς καιρὸν πρὸς τὸ βοηθεῖν τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμα|σιν, κέκρικεν ἀναδεῖξαι τὸν πρὸς Μιθραδάτην πόλεμον ὑπέρ| τε τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας καὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας.

[11] *I.Eph.*8.7–8.

[12] *I.Eph.* 8.9–11.

[13] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 251–261; Plutarch, *Sulla*, 25.2; Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 4.1; cf. Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, 32. The surviving fragments of the Roman historian Granius Licinianus attests that Sulla also executed the leaders of the anti-Roman revolt in Ephesus. Granius Licinianus, *Annales* 35.28. In his reconstruction of Sulla's speech at Ephesus to the Asian envoys, Appian has Sulla invoke the script of ingratitude against the Asian defectors on the basis of the aid Rome rendered them against Antiochos III, how Rome freed Lycia from Rhodian control, and the peace brought by Rome that enabled Asia to achieve flourishing and wealthy societies. Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 253–255.

[14] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 203; Plutarch, *Sulla*, 26.4.

and that attaching to Mithradates held good prospects for the city's political recovery and financial prosperity.[15] The city sent an envoy to Mithradates, Athenion, who persuaded the Athenians by letter that he himself had exceptional influence with Mithradates and the people of Athens would be able to escape their onerous debts (τῶν ἐπιφερονένων ὀφλημάτων ἀπολυθέντας), "live in harmony" (ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ζῆν), and receive large private and public gifts (δωρεῶν μεγάλων τυχεῖν ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ) if they sided with Mithradates.[16] The Athenians, in turn, already convinced that Rome's power had waned into oblivion, concurred when Athenion returned and reported the conquests of Mithradates, his support from Armenia and Persia, the subjugation and humiliation of Roman commanders like Quintus Oppius and Munius Aquilius, peoples hailing king Mithradates as θεός, the oracles predicting his success, and the Italians and Carthaginians positioning themselves to defect to Mithradates.[17] Aside from a number of Athenians who still supported Rome, Athens officially broke faith with Rome and joined Mithradates and received Pontic forces led by the general Archelaus.

Athens's choice to display infidelity to Rome, with whom they had had a more or less mutually beneficial relationship ever since Athens joined Rome against Philip V of Macedon in 200 BC, proved ill-advised. Sulla defeated the Athenian and Pontic forces in the city and in the Peiraios and as a result Athens suffered significant structural, financial, cultural, and human losses.[18] Enticed by the prospects of the benefits of defection from Rome in favor Mithradates and the potential costs of remaining loyal,

---

[15] Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 5.212a–515e; cf. Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 108–111. For Athens during the First Mithridatic War, see Christian Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, trans. Deborah Lucas Schneider (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 297–314.

[16] Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 5.212a–b.

[17] Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 5.213a–c. Plutarch downplays the willingness of the Athenians in their defection to Mithradates by highlighting the role of Aristion the tyrant. Plutarch, *Sulla*, 12.1.

[18] Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, 304–314. For Sulla and Athens, see, e.g., Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 116–155.

Athens's choice, which indeed could have ended in rich reward from the Pontic king had he been victorious, led them to receive the ruinous lot of an unfaithful ally.

These cities—Ephesus, those of Boiotia, and Athens—each adjusting their loyalties based on their varied local knowledge during situations of crisis, defected from Rome to Mithradates but ultimately found their calculations ill-timed and ill-informed. As a result, Sulla remunerated their disloyalty with the punishment he thought appropriate. On the other hand, Rome could also reward cities for fidelity in the face of dangers.

Early in the war (88 BC), the city of Plarasa-Aphrodisias decided to aid Rome in the struggle against Mithradates. An inscription attests to their official vote to support the Roman proconsul Quintus Oppius in his siege of Laodicea on the Lycus river by sending him troops.[19] The Aphrodisians selected honorable and trusted (ἄνδρας τῶν τειμ|ωμένων καὶ πίστιν ἐχόντων; *I.Aph2007* 8.3.b.i.5–6) envoys who were "well-disposed to the Romans" (εὐνοϊκῶς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους; *I.Aph2007* 8.3.b.i.6) to send to Oppius so that "they will explain to him that our entire People, with our wives and children and our entire means of livelihood, are ready to take our chances on behalf of Quintus and the Roman cause, and that without the Roman leadership we do not even choose to live."[20] Oppius successfully gained control of Laodicea, but when Mithradates came to the city the Laodiceans handed him over into the custody of the king in exchange for immunity.[21] After the war, Oppius wrote to Plarasa-Aphrodisias to commend their envoys and the city for its enthusiastic support of him during a critical time.[22] As a return for the service the

---

[19] *I.Aph2007* 8.3 (88 BC) = Reynolds §2. An English translation can be found in Sherk [1984] §59a.

[20] *I.Aph2007* 8.3.b.ii.11–14. ἐνφανιοῦσιν δὲ αὐτῷ ὅτι πᾶς ὁ δῆμος ἡμῶν σὺν γυναιξὶ| καὶ τέκνοις καὶ τῷ παντὶ βίῳ ΕΤΥΜΟΣ παραβάλλεσθαι ὑπὲρ| Κοΐντου καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων πραγμάτων καὶ ὅτι χωρὶς τῆς| Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας οὐδὲ ζῆν προαιρούμεθα. Translation from Sherk [1984] §59a.

[21] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 78–79.

[22] *I.Aph2007* 8.2 = Reynolds §3. An English translation can also be found in Sherk [1984] §59b.

city rendered to him, Oppius says that he will keep his "fidelity" (πίστις) with them as he aids them in their public affairs in his official and private capacity and that he has accepted their request for him to be their patron (πάτρων).[23] So, because Plarasa-Aphrodisias maintained their trust with Rome by providing services in a time of necessity, they strengthened their relational bond with Rome and forged a new sort of (patronal) relationship with Oppius that emerged during the trust-keeping process. The sort of positive reciprocity exhibited in this incident—service for service, gratitude for benefit, fidelity for goodwill—illustrates the value of maintaining trust with constancy in word and deed when an opportunity arises.

As noted above, the population of Chios suffered grievously at the hands of Mithradates during the war for their fidelity towards Rome.[24] To explain their strong pro-Roman stance, one must understand the recent history of the relationship between Chios and Rome. Before the war with Mithradates, the Chians had a mutually beneficial relationship with Rome. During Rome's conflict with Antiochos III in the early second century BC (192–188 BC), Chios rendered aid to Rome by acting as a granary and naval base for them.[25] In consequence, in the Treaty of Apamea (189/188 BC) Rome included benefits for Chios. Polybios reveals that Rome "advanced in many ways Chios, Smyrna, and Erythrae, and assigned to them the districts which they desired to acquire at the time and considered to belong to them by rights, out of regard for the goodwill and activity they had displayed during the war."[26] A Chian inscription from shortly after the Treaty of

---

[23] *I.Aph2007* 8.2.b.i.28–ii.24.

[24] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 181–186; cf. Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 6.266e–f (citing Nicolaus and Posidonius).

[25] Livy, *History of Rome*, 37.27.1.

[26] Polyb., *Hist*., 21.46.6 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]. Χίους δὲ καὶ Σμυρναίους, ἔτι δ᾽ Ἐρυθραίους, ἔν τε τοῖς ἄλλοις προῆγον καὶ χώραν προσένειμαν, ἧς ἕκαστοι κατὰ τὸ παρὸν ἐπεθύμουν καὶ σφίσι καθήκειν ὑπελάμβανον, ἐντρεπόμενοι τὴν εὔνοιαν καὶ σπουδὴν, ἣν παρέσχηντο κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον αὐτοῖς. Cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 38.39.11. For the events of the Treaty of Apamea, see Polyb., *Hist*., 21.41–46; Livy, *History of Rome*, 38.37–39; Appian, *The Syrian Book*, 193–205. On the passage (Polyb., *Hist*., 21.46.6), see Frank W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume III, Commentary on*

Apamea reveals that Chios honored Rome in a variety of ways in gratitude for the benefits they received.[27] Among the honors given to Rome were a festival to the goddess Roma, hospitality and a banquet for Romans who attended the festival, and an offering to the goddess Roma herself along with a narration of Rome's founding myth of Romulus and Remus.[28] Establishing the cult of Roma at Chios created a durable cultural space within which Chios and Rome could engage in mutually advantageous reciprocity to one another.[29] This mutual relationship becomes evident during the First Mithridatic War.

The prior hundred years of cooperation and mutual support helps explain the ardent fidelity the Chians displayed to Rome even when their city was under Mithradates's control. This fidelity in turn prompted Mithradates to cause Chios significant suffering by means of confiscations, seizure of the city walls and fortifications, armed occupation, a stay-at-home order for *xenoi*, disarmament of the populace, seizure of hostages from notable families, an indemnity, and forced deportation.[30] But their faithful suffering paid off with respect to their relationship with

---

Books XIX–XL (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 170.

[27] *SEG* 30.1073 = PH24694; see also the edition and further bibliography in Irene Salvo, "Romulus and Remus at Chios Revisited: A Re-examination of *SEG* XXX 1073," in *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*, ed. Paraskevi Martzavou and Nikolaos Papazarkadas (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 125–137. English translations can be found in BD^2 §42; Salvo, "Romulus and Remus at Chios Revisited," 127. The Chians spell out their motivation for the honors they gave to Rome as one of gratitude (*SEG* 30.1073.7–8). The Chians note also that the motivation of the honorand of the inscription, an unnamed Agonothetes who was chiefly responsible for the sacred festival and the hospitality, as making the Chians' gratitude and goodwill visible (*SEG* 30.1073.22–24). On the worship of Dea Roma see Salvo, "Romulus and Remus at Chios Revisited," 136; Erich S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 177–179, 187; Simon Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 40–43; Mary Beard, John North, and Simon Price, *Religions of Rome: Volume 1: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 156–160.

[28] *SEG* 30.1073. For a recent discussion on what exactly Chios offered as a votive offering to goddess Roma, see Salvo, "Romulus and Remus at Chios Revisited," in which she reasonably conjectures that it was "a votive relief representing Romulus and Remus as newborn babies (with Rea Silvia or with the she-wolf) on an upper register, and on a lower register a text summing up the relief above and what happened after the represented scene, narrating the foundation of Rome" (Salvo, "Romulus and Remus at Chios Revisited," 132).

[29] Salvo, "Romulus and Remus at Chios Revisited," 136.

[30] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 180–186; cf. Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 6.266e–f (citing Nicolaus and Posidonius).

Rome. After the defeated Mithradates agreed to terms with Rome, Sulla set Chios free (ἐλευθέρους ἠφίει) and registered them as a friend (φίλος) of Rome as recompense for their eager support (προθυμία) amid suffering.[31] The Roman senate issued a *senatus consultum*, approved by Sulla, that gave Chios freedom (ἐλευθερία) that entailed living by their own laws, customs, and rights (νόμοις τε καὶ ἔθεσιν καὶ δικαίοις), that they would not be under the jurisdiction of a Roman magistrate, and that even Roman residents were subject to Chian laws.[32]

A final example will suffice before returning to the inscription at Daulis. When Mithradates swept across Asia Minor, the city of Stratonikeia (in Karia) resisted him. Their defiance could not hold out, though, and he overcame them and subjected them to a garrison and a fine.[33] During its occupation some Stratonikeians apparently continued to aid the Roman cause, which provoked Mithradates to put on trial those in Stratonikeia accused of plotting to kill him, promoting revolt, or aiding Romans.[34] Some years after the war in 81 BC, Sulla wrote to Stratonikeia to confirm to them that the Senate had granted numerous benefits to the city for its support in the crisis. The inscription that bears Sulla's communications with the city was written on a section of the wall of the temple of Hekate in the nearby town of Lagina.[35] In it, Sulla recognizes how the Stratonikeians "at every moment with sincerity kept fidelity (πίστις) toward us [i.e., the Romans]" and that they were the first to oppose Mithradates, which precipitated the

---

[31] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 250. Αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Ἀσίαν καθιστάμενος, Ἰλιέας μὲν καὶ Χίους καὶ Λυκίους καὶ Ῥοδίους καὶ Μαγνησίαν και τινας ἄλλους, ἢ συμμαχίας ἀμειβόμενος, ἢ ὧν διὰ προθυμίαν ἐπεπόνθεσαν οὗ ἕνεκα, ἐλευθέρους ἠφίει καὶ Ῥωμαίων ἀνέγραφε φίλους, ἐς δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα στρατιὰν περιέπεμπεν.

[32] *SEG* 22.507, esp. 10–18, 20; see also *RDGE* §70. For English translation, see Sherk [1984] §108. This document is from the beginning of the first century AD during the time of Augustus, but it refers to the prior (80 BC) *senatus consultum* that outlined Chios's freedom.

[33] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 82.

[34] Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 107.

[35] PH260252 = *OGIS* 441. An English translation can be found in Sherk [1984] §63.

"many dangers" that accompanied the war.[36] For their loyalty to Rome in times of danger, the Roman Senate issued a series of decrees that delineated a package of benefits in gratitude to the city, which included the restoration of property and captives of war (*OGIS* 441.63–64, 114–119), re-affirmation of "favor, friendship, and alliance" (χάριτα φιλίαν συμμαχίαν) between Rome and Stratonikeia (l. 69), recognition of their envoys as "honorable and good men, our friends and allies from an honorable and good people, our friend and ally" (ll. 70–72), the ability to live according to their own laws (ll. 91–92), additional territory and its attendant revenue (ll.97–112), and inviolability of the temple of Hecate (ll. 59, 113). Like Plarasa-Aphrodisias, the course of the war proved that Stratonikeia had made an advantageous choice to maintain fidelity to Rome despite the severe pressure put upon it from Mithradates.

It is in this situation of warfare and divided loyalties that the relatively small community of Daulis in Phokis found itself. The role of Daulis in the conflict is not fully known, but the information on one of their public inscriptions regarding the events of the First Mithridatic War is instructive.[37] At some point between 87–85 BC, Daulis felt its territory threatened and feared for its safety.[38] Sulla had arrived in Greece in 87 BC, requisitioned funds, allied soldiers, and supplies from cities in Aitolia and Thessaly, besieged Athens and the Peiraios in 87–86 BC, fought the battles of Chaeronea (86 BC) and Orchomenus (85 BC), and then ravaged some Boiotian cities. Any of these events could have occasioned the legitimate fears of the Daulians for their survival. During one of these critical moments in which "great dangers" (κινδύνων μεγάλων) surrounded

---

[36] *OGIS* 441.5, 7. Lines 3–14 read: [οὐκ ἀγνοοῦμεν ὑμᾶς] διὰ προ[γ]όνων πάντα τὰ δίκαια| [πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέρα]ν ἡγεμ[ον]ίαν πεποιηκότας καὶ ἐν|| [παντὶ καιρῶι τὴν πρὸς ἡ]μᾶς πί[σ]τιν εἰλικρινῶς τετηρηκότας| [ἔν τε τῶι πρὸς Μιθραδά]την π[ο]λέμωι πρώτους τῶι εν τῆι| [Ἀσίαι αντιτεταγμένους κα]ὶ διὰ ταῦτα κινδύνους πολλούς| [τε καὶ παντοδαποὺς] ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων δημοσίων| [πραγμάτων προθυμό]τατα ἀ[ν]αδεδεγμένους|| [–] καὶ τ[οὺς κοινοὺς] καὶ τοὺς ἰδιωτικοὺς| [φιλίας ἕ]νε[κεν π]ρὸς ἡμᾶς εὔνοϊάς τε| [χάριτος, καὶ ἐν τῶι τοῦ πολέ]μου καιρῶι προς τε| [τὰς ἄλλας τῆς Ἀσίας πόλεις πεπρ]εσβευκότας καὶ πρ[ὸ]ς [τὰς τῆς Ἑλλάδος –].

[37] *FD* III 4.69 (87–85 BC).

[38] περιστ[άντων τ]ὰν| [χώραν ἀμῶν φό]βων κα<ὶ> κινδύνων μεγάλων (*FD* III 4.69.1–2).

Daulis, the city appealed to Hermias, a citizen of Stratonikeia, a city much in the favor of Sulla for its fidelity.[39] Hermias, in response to their appeal, "devoted himself and with alacrity did all things advantageous to the city."[40] That is, he successfully advocated to Sulla to ensure the safety of the Daulians from the Roman military.[41] For Hermias's benefaction, Daulis as a display of gratitude decided to praise (ἐπαινέσαι) him, make him a *proxenos* (public friend), award him *ateleia* (immunity from duties) and *asylia* (inviolability), to publicly crown him with a gold crown at the agora during the Pythian games, and to set up portraits on gold shields at the temple of Apollo in Delphi and the temple of Hecate in Stratonikeia bearing an inscription commemorating Hermias as a "noble and good man" (ἄνδρα καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν) and "its preserver and benefactor" (τὸν αὐτᾶς σωτῆρα καὶ εὐ[εργέταν]).[42] Hermias received this package of rewards for his service that ensured the safety and preservation of Daulis. Moreover, the corporate memory of his service occurred in a public crowning ceremony and became enshrined in stone to broadcast his good repute for future generations. Such gratitude for personal service that benefits a city during a time of crisis, as exemplified by Hermias, appeared in various forms throughout the Greek-speaking cities of the eastern Mediterranean.

The situation in Daulis simultaneously illustrates the "culture of gratitude" broadly characteristic of the Hellenistic period—benefits and rewards, gifts and gratitude, services and public praise—and the regard cities had for a benefactor whose personal exemplary conduct ensured the safety of their city in emergencies. At the same time, the

---

[39] *FD* III 4.69.1–6. The nature of pre-existing relationship between Daulis and Hermias the Stratonikeian is unknown.

[40] ἐπέδωκε αὐτοσαυτόν καὶ πάντα τὰ συμ|φέροντα τᾶι πόλει ἔπρασσε προθύμως (*FD* III 4.69.6–7).

[41] *FD* III 4.69.4–6, 18–19.

[42] *FD* III 4.69.7–21. The privilege of *asylia* refers to "immunity from reprisal and seizure" to a foreigner, so that "when a foreign city had some claim against his own [i.e., the foreigner who is granted *asylia*], or when the two states were at war, he was nonetheless immune from seizure by the foreign city." Kent J. Rigsby, *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 31–32.

events of the First Mithridatic War in Greek-speaking cities more broadly show how ever-changing information about power, risks and benefits, the proximity of danger, and community survival motivated fidelity or defection. Almost a century and a half after the crisis at Daulis, Paul and those with him sent a letter to several assemblies of Galatians in Asia Minor. In his letter Paul invokes the scripts of benefaction and gratitude, defection and fidelity, compulsion/danger, and service through self-endangerment. By understanding these and related cultural scripts in the Greco-Roman world, Paul's own engagement with them can illuminate his letter to the Galatians. But before seeing how the categories explored in this chapter relate to Paul's benefaction language (chap. 7), the chapter will see how benefaction events that involve self-endangerment took shape in Greek cities (chap. 5) and how certain Jewish writings adapted the endangered benefaction motif (chap. 6).

CHAPTER 5

ENDANGERED BENEFACTION

> "Everything that is good and admired among men is gained through toil and danger."[1]

When individuals or cities faced the prospects of death, destruction, or harm, the occasion provided the opportunity for certain people to show their virtue by rising to the moment so that they could render aid. In some instances, an individual helped their fellows even to the point of risking their own life and resources. Broadly considered, the motif of self-endangerment for the sake of others features strongly in military contexts in the literature of the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman worlds. Interestingly, the divine realm also shows up in the textual documentation of critical times. Moreover, a rather underexplored source of documentation of crises in New Testament scholarship, Greek inscriptions provide a rich body of sources for understanding how civic benefactors would risk their lives and resources to serve a city in desperate need. Whether they conducted embassies, ousted foreign garrisons, rendered military aid to fend off threats, or helped during times of plague, famine, or financial straits, these benefactors received praise and gratitude for their services in times of danger. This chapter explores various aspects of endangered benefaction based on a large pool of examples from approximately 350 BC to AD 150 to further situate Paul's language of benefaction in Galatians within its historical and cultural contexts.

Danger and the Gods

When circumstances and survival seem out of human control, people

[1] Seleukos I, according to Diodoros of Sicily. Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.90.5 (πάντα γίνεται τὰ καλὰ καὶ παρ᾽ ἀνθρώποις θαυμαζόμενα διὰ πόνων καὶ κινδύνων; Geer, LCL).

understood that the gods had a role in ensuring protection during times of acute vulnerability. Xenophon emphasizes the need for cavalry commanders to serve the gods and consult them for advice, since through sacrifices, omens, voices, and dreams, they can warn someone of dangerous plots.[2] The people of Kos erected an inscription on the occasion of the repulsion of the Gallic invaders of 280–278 BC at Delphi, saying that "the aggressors of the sanctuary have been punished by the god (Apollo)" and that the *demos* "is repaying thank-offerings to the god for manifesting himself during the perils (τοῖς κινδύνοις) which confronted the sanctuary and for the safety of the Greeks."[3] Elsewhere, the people of Lete inscribed that Marcus Annius achieved victory over the Gallic armies "with the providence of the gods" (μετὰ τῆς τῶν θεῶν προνοίας).[4] The people of Kyme attributed the deliverance (σωτηρία) of their benefactress Archippe from illness to divine agency and they offered "the proper thanksgivings" (τὰ πρέποντα χαριστήρια) to the gods for seeing her through to restored health.[5] Around 39 BC, the people of Stratonikeia praised Zeus Panamaros for protecting his temple and warding off Parthian invaders with lightning bolts and confusion-inducing fog.[6] Finally, some

---

[2] Xenophon, *Cavalry Commander*, 9.8–9.

[3] ἐπειδὴ τῶν βαρ|βάρων στρατείαν ποιησαμένων ἐπὶ| τοὺς Ἕλλανας καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν| Δελφοῖς, ἀναγγέλλεται τὸς μὲν ἐλ-||θόντας ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τιμωρίας τετεύ|χεν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν| τῶν ἐπιβοαθησάντων τῶι ἱερῶι ἐν τᾶι| τῶν βαρβάρων ἐφόδωι, τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν διαπ|φυλάχθαι τε καὶ ἐπικεκοσμῆσθαι τοῖς|| ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιστρατευσάντων ὅπλοις,|| τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν τῶν στρατευσάντων τοὺς πλείστους ἀπολώλεν ἐν τοῖς γε|νομένοις ἀγῶσι ποτὶ τοὺς Ἕλλανας| αὐτοῖς· *νννν* ὅπως οὖν ὁ δᾶμος φαν-||ρὸς ἦι συναδόμενος ἐπὶ τᾶι γεγενημέ|ναι νίκαι τοῖς Ἕλλασι καὶ τῶι θεῶι χαρισ|τήρια ἀποδιδοὺς τᾶς τε ἐπιφανείας τᾶς γεγενημένας ἕνεκεν ἐν τοῖς περὶ| τὸ ἱερὸν κινδύνοις καὶ τᾶς τῶν Ἑλλά-||νων σωτηρίας (*Syll.*[3] 398.1–20; 278 BC; translation from Austin[2] §60; see also BD[2] §17). On the attack and repulsion of the Gauls at Delphi, see also, Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*, 22.9.5; Justin, *Epitome*, 24.8. See also, Craige Champion, "The Soteria at Delphi: Aetolian Propaganda in the Epigraphical Record," *The American Journal of Philology* 116, no. 2 (1995): 213–220.

[4] *Syll.*[3] 700.29 (119 BC, Lete).

[5] ἐπειδὴ Ἀρχίππης τῆς Δι|καιογένου εἰς ἐπισφαλῆ καὶ ἐπικίνδυνον ἐνπε|σούσης ἀσθένειαν ἠγωνίασεν ὁ δῆμος διὰ τὸ ἐ-||κτενῶς διακεῖσθαι πρὸς αὐτήν, ὑπάρχουσαν| εὔτακτον καὶ σώφρονα καὶ ἀξίαν τῆς τε ἰδίας| καὶ τῆς τῶν προγόνων καλοκἀγαθίας, καὶ πολ|λας καὶ μεγάλας ἀποδείξεις πεποιῆσθαι τῆς| πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα εὔνοίας τε καὶ φιλαγαθίας, νῦν|| δὲ σὺν τῇ τῶν θεῶν προνοίᾳ ἐν βελτίονι ὑπαρ|χούση<ς> διαθέσει ἡδόμενος μεγάλως ὁ δῆμος ἐπὶ| τῇ σωτηρίᾳ αὐτῆς καλῶς ἔχον ἡγεῖται καὶ οἰκεῖ|ον τῆς οὔσης αὐτῷ πρὸς Ἀρχίππην εὐνοίας ἐπιτε|λέσαι τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπὶ τούτοις τὰ πρέποντα χαρισ-||τήρια (*I.Kyme* 13.82–95; cf. 100–109; 170–150 BC, Kyme).

[6] *I.Stratonikeia* 10. For the wider phenomenon of divine epiphanies during a crisis, see Georgia

individuals showed their gratitude to "the most high God" (θεός ὕψιστος) for seeing them through various kinds of dangers. For instance, Gaius Julius Proclus thanked the high God for protection from the dangers of war and Gaius Julius Orius thanked the high God for protection from dangers at sea.[7]

In their textual traditions Jewish scribes incorporated the role of Israel's God in events of deliverance from danger. To cite a few of the most obvious examples, the Joseph cycle in Genesis (Gen 37–50), the exodus from enslavement in Egypt through Moses (Exod 1–15), God's deliverer-judges in pre-monarchic Israel (Judges), and the stories in Daniel (Dan 3, 6) all highlight the role of divine agency in acts of deliverance from perilous situations. Furthermore, in 2 Maccabees the God of Israel is the benefactor of Israel and ally of Judas and his army. The book narrates a series of crises that befall Israel using common Hellenistic vocabulary for critical times that befall cities. The crises of Judea are described as "affliction" (θλῖψις), "great dangers" (μεγάλοι κινδύνοι), a "grave crisis" (χαλεπὴ περίστασις) (2 Macc 1:7–8, 11–12; 4:16). God delivers them from these dangers and they show their gratitude in response.[8] The preface to the main narrative summarizes the plot, noting that divine epiphanies (ἐπιφανείαι) aided those fighting for ἰουδαϊσμός, which resulted in the liberation of the city and re-establishment

---

Petridou, *Divine Epiphanies in Greek Literature and Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 107–170. On the episode at Panamara, see Petridou, *Divine Epiphanies in Greek Literature and Culture*, 99–100, 138–141.

[7] θεῶι ἁγίωι ὑψίστωι| ὑπὲρ τῆς Ῥοιμη|τάκλου καὶ Πυθο|δωρίδος ἐκ τοῦ κα-||τὰ τὸν Κοιλα[λ]ητικὸν| πόλεμον κινδύνου| σωτηρίας εὐξάμενος| καὶ ἐπιτυχὼν Γάϊος| Ἰούλιος Πρόκ<λ>ος χαρι-||στ[ήρι]ον (PH166341; AD 21). Θεῶι ὑψίστωι| μεγίστῳ σωτῆρι| Γ(άϊος) Ἰούλιος Ὧριος| κατ᾽ ὄνειριον χρη-||ματισθεὶς καὶ σω|θεὶς ἐκ μεγάλου κιν|δύνου τοῦ κατὰ θα|λασσαν εὐχαριστήριον.| ἐπὶ ἱερέως|| Μ(άρκου) Οὐητίου Πρόκλου| ἔτους βκσ (*IG* X.2 1 67; AD 74/75).

[8] ἐκ μεγάλων κινδύνων ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σεσῳμένοι μεγάλως εὐχαριστοῦμεν αὐτῷ ὡς ἂν πρὸς βασιλέα παρατασσόμενοι· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐξέβρασεν τοὺς παραταξαμένους ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει (2 Macc 1:11–12); ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὁ σώσας τὸν πάντα λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποδοὺς τὴν κληρονομίαν πᾶσιν καὶ τὸ βασίλειον καὶ τὸ ἱεράτευμα καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν καθὼς ἐπηγγείλατο διὰ τοῦ νόμου…ἐξείλατο γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐκ μεγάλων κακῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκαθάρισεν (2 Macc 2:17–18). Also note Jonathan's prayer, which lauds the God of Israel as the supreme benefactor of Israel who delivers his people and which petitions God to set free enslaved Israelites abroad (2 Macc 1:24–29). When Judas and his army defeated Nikanor's army, they were "praising and making grateful acknowledgements beyond measure to the Lord who delivered for that day" (περισσῶς εὐλογοῦντες καὶ ἐξομολογούμενοι τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ διασώσαντι εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην; 2 Macc 8:27). Cf. 2 Macc 10:7.

of their ancestral laws (2 Macc 2:21–22).[9] In one instance, like Zeus Panamaros at Stratonikeia, the God of Israel showered lightning bolts on the enemy army and threw them into disorder to afford his people victory in battle (2 Macc 10:29–31). In response to God's deliverance and a successful mop-up operation Judas and his army "with hymns and thanksgivings were praising the Lord who abundantly benefits Israel and gives them victory" (2 Macc 10:38).[10]

Additionally, the book of 3 Maccabees features divine deliverance from peril. When Ptolemy IV decides to enter the holy of holies in the Jerusalem temple, Simon the high priest petitions God to intervene to prevent the sacrilege, recalling God's past deliverances of his people during times of distress (3 Macc 2:1–20). Simon recalls the past to urge similar action in the present, saying, "and whereas many times when our ancestors were being afflicted (θλιβέντων), you [God] helped them in their lowliness and rescued them from great evils (ἐρρύσω αὐτοὺς ἐκ μεγάλων κακῶν)."[11] God responds to the people of Israel by striking Ptolemy with paralysis to prevent him from entering the sacred grounds (3 Macc 2:21–22). As the king's hubris and wickedness continues, Israel's God with his ἐναργείαι flummoxes and thwarts his designs time and again: causing paper and writing instruments to run out during the census (3 Macc 4:17–21), causing the king to oversleep so that he missed the scheduled time of the mass-slaughter

---

[9] Note how freedom in 2 Maccabees is construed similar to other Hellenistic accounts of freedom as freedom from external compulsion/control as well as freedom to live under one's ancestral laws and customs (καὶ τὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένας ἐπιφανείας τοῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ιουδαϊσμοῦ φιλοτίμως ἀνδραγαθήσασιν, ὥστε τὴν ὅλην χώραν ὀλίγους ὄντας λεηλατεῖν καὶ τὰ βάρβαρα πλήθη διώκειν, καὶ τὸ περιβόητον καθ᾽ ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην ἱερὸν ἀνακομίσασθαι καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθερῶσαι καὶ τοὺς μέλλοντας καταλύεσθαι νόμους ἐπανορθῶσαι, τοῦ κυρίου μετὰ πάσης ἐπιεικείας ἵλεω γενομένου αὐτοῖς; 2 Macc 2:21–22). For the various epiphanies in the book, see 2 Macc 3:24–28, 33–34; 8:20, 23–24; 10:29–31; 12:22; 15:20–36. For other attributions of divine agency and relationality, see, e.g., 2 Macc 4:38; 7:6, 9, 14, 16–17, 18–19, 20, 22–23, 28–29, 31–38; 8:2–4, 5, 11, 13, 14, 18, 29, 35, 36; 9:5, 8–12, 13, 17, 18; 10:1, 4, 7, 16, 28; 11:4, 6, 9–10, 13; 12:6, 11, 15–16, 28, 36–37, 41–45; 13:4, 10–17; 14:34–36, 46; 15:2–5, 7–8, 14, 16, 20–36.

[10] μεθ᾽ ὑμνων καὶ ἐξομολογήσεων εὐλόγουν τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ μεγάλως εὐεργετοῦντι τὸν Ισραηλ καὶ τὸ νῖκος αὐτοῖς διδόντι.

[11] ἐπεὶ δὲ πλεονάκις θλιβέντων τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἐβοήθησας αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει καὶ ἐρρύσω αὐτοὺς ἐκ μεγάλων κακῶν (3 Macc 2:12). See also how the prayer of Eleazar likewise recounts God's past deliverances to prompt God to act in the affliction of the present (3 Macc 6:1–15).

(via elephants) of the Jewish population (3 Macc 5:11–13), changing the king's disposition and mind about the slaughter (3 Macc 5:28–35), and sending heavenly messengers to fight the enemy army in the culminating battle (3 Macc 6:17–21).[12] In these variety of documents, Jewish and non-Jewish sources alike express through the medium of text the agency of the gods or God in effecting deliverance from a momentous crisis (historical or fictional) or from dangers outside individual human control like the sea, bad weather, sickness, war, and death.

Self-Endangerment in the Greco-Roman World

In battle, sometimes the courage of commanders to imperil themselves spurred on the courage of others in the army.[13] During Perdikkas's Egyptian campaign (321 BC), Ptolemy (I) led by example by personally initiating the attack when the Perdikkan forces were scaling the walls and the mounted elephants were attacking the palisades of his fortifications.[14] He "put out the eyes of the leading elephant…and wounded its Indian mahout."[15] After that, "with utter contempt of the danger" (καταπεφρονηκότως), he repelled the ascending enemies.[16] On another occasion, Ptolemy and Seleukos jointly invaded Antigonid-controlled Syria (312 BC) and they squared off with Demetrios Poliorketes (The Besieger) at Gaza.[17] In the initial melee the combatting sides fought

---

[12] Cf. the divine ἐναργείαι in *I.Stratonikeia* 517.27 and *I.Stratonikeia* 1101.4.

[13] See also the contrasting and humorous take on cowards by Theophrastos (writing ca. 325–315 BC). Theophrastos, *Characters*, 25. One example describes someone who pretends to have saved a friend in a perilous situation to gain the prestige of noble self-endangerment without the attendant risks of actually doing so. Theophrastos writes, "drenched in blood from another man's wound, he [the coward] meets the men returning from battle and tells the story as if he'd been in danger (ὡς κινδυνεύσας): "I saved one of our friends." Then he leads the members of his tribe inside to view him lying there, while he tells each one that he personally brought him into the tent with his own hands" (Theophrastos, *Characters*, 25.6 [Rustein and Cunningham, LCL]). Yet sometimes it may be deemed appropriate to avoid danger (e.g., *IOSPE* I^2 352.35–36, escaping assassination).

[14] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.34.2.

[15] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.34.2 [Geer, LCL].

[16] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.34.2 [Geer, LCL].

[17] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.80.3–84.8.

relatively evenly and had similar casualty rates.[18] The commanders (ἡγεμόνες) themselves risked their own lives, "endangering themselves (κινδυνεύοντες) in front of all."[19] The act of risking their own lives "encouraged those under their command to withstand the danger stoutly" (ὑπομένειν τὸ δεινόν).[20] The opposing cavalries, who had all been selected for their excellence (ἀρετή), were motivated to act with valor (ἀνδρεία) by the presence of their "commanders who were sharing the struggle" (τοὺς συναγωνιζομένους στρατηγούς).[21]

On another occasion, Seleukos left Egypt with a small contingent of infantry and cavalry. He departed with the eager expectation that he would easily regain control of Babylon because of his former good relations with the Babylonians. His soldiers did not share his confidence.[22] To persuade them to enter their campaign with a more enthusiastic attitude, he recounted his own skill during his campaigns with Alexander, his favorable oracle from the gods, and a dream he had in which Alexander confirmed his future leadership.[23] Next, he motivated them with the prospects of moral approval of humanity, because their dangerous undertaking constituted honorable and admirable conduct.[24] Finally, he conducted himself in a way that "put himself on an equality" with his soldiers with the result that "each man respected him and willingly accepted the risk of the daring

---

[18] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.83.5.

[19] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.83.5 [Geer, LCL].

[20] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.83.5 [Geer, LCL].

[21] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.83.5 [Geer, LCL].

[22] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.90.1–2. Diodoros gives the number of soldiers as 800 or less infantry and around 200 in the cavalry, but Appian records 1000 infantry and 300 cavalry troops. Either way, the size of the army is significantly smaller than average during the Diadochi wars. Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*. 19.90.1; Appian, *Syrian Wars*, 9.54. Appian reference thanks to Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History, Volume X: Books 19.66–20*, trans. Russel M. Geer (LCL 390; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954), 77n4.

[23] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.90.3–4.

[24] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.90.5. As quoted above, Seleukos states that "everything that is good and admired among men is gained through toil and danger" (πάντα γίνεται τὰ καλὰ καὶ παρ᾽ ἀνθρώποις θαυμαζόμενα διὰ πόνων καὶ κινδύνων; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.90.5 [Geer, LCL]).

venture."[25] Similar to the in-battle example of the commanders who "were sharing the struggle" with the other soldiers during the battle of Gaza, Seleukos puts himself on equal footing with his soldiers in a pre-battle context. In both cases, the sight of or expectation that one's commander will share the perilous situation spurs on the rest of the soldiers to participate in the danger. In the examples of the Perdikkan invasion and the battle of Gaza especially, the mechanism of imitation operates to stimulate the subordinate persons into participating in the self-endangering deed that the commander initiates.

Polybios recounts with moral approval two choice examples of Carthaginians who endanger themselves and die nobly. After Carthage dealt with the Mercenary crisis that followed the First Punic War, the Carthaginians dispatched Hamilcar Barca (father of Hannibal) to regain lost territory in Spain.[26] Polybios characterizes his death in laudatory terms. After successfully campaigning by force or by diplomacy for nine years (238–229 BC), Hamilcar "finally met with an end worthy of his high achievements, dying bravely in a battle against one of the most warlike and powerful tribes, after freely exposing his person to danger on the field."[27] Hamilcar's enemy does not even merit specification. What matters is their description as dangerous and formidable opponents, so that the readers would see Hamilcar's self-endangerment in its rightful nobility and appropriate timing. What constitutes fitting moment to endanger oneself, according to Polybios, is reflected in the next example.

On another occasion, Polybios reflects on the death of a different Carthaginian general, Hasdrubal (d. 207 BC), to comment upon the appropriate occasion to fully

---

[25] ἐπολιτεύετο δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς συστρατεύοντας καὶ κατεσκεύαζεν αὑτὸν ἴσον ἅπασιν, ὥσθ' ἕκαστον αἰδεῖσθαι καὶ τὸ παράβολον τῆς τόλμης ἑκουσίως ὑπομένειν (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.90.5 [Geer, LCL]).

[26] Polyb., *Hist.*, 2.1.

[27] κατέστρεψε τὸν βίον ἀξίως τῶν προγεγενημένων πράξεων. πρὸς γὰρ τοὺς ἀνδρωδεστάτους καὶ μεγίστην δύναμιν ἔχοντας παραταττόμενος, καὶ χρώμενος τολμηρῶς καὶ παραβόλως ἑαυτῷ κατὰ τὸν κινδύνον καιρόν, ἐρρωμένως τὸν βίον μετήλλαξε (Polyb., *Hist.*, 2.1.7–8 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

endanger oneself during battle.[28] His moral tone is one of both exhortation and warning. Polybios praises Hasdrubal as an ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός from first to last, for facing defeat well (καλῶς) and courageously (γενναίως) and acting worthily with respect to his father Barcas (ἀξίως τοῦ πατρὸς Βάρκα).[29] Other generals tend to neglect thinking about how they can attain a noble death when all hope is lost; rather, they solely focus on prospects of victory. In this way they ruin an otherwise upstanding life with a disgraceful death.[30] On the contrary, Hasdrubal, although careful to look out for his own safety (σωτηρία), had considered the contingency of failure and how to act nobly in accord with his whole life even when hope of safety was lost.[31] To Polybios, such deeds merit him as "worthy of our respect and emulation."[32] Polybios explains his purpose in commenting upon Hasdrubal's manner of death, saying, "What I have said here may serve to warn all who direct public affairs neither by rashly exposing themselves to cheat the hopes of those who trust in them nor by clinging to life when duty forbids it to add to their own disasters disgrace and reproach."[33] In other words, a general should not jump into unnecessary danger too quickly for the sake of those who rely on you, but also one should not, when clearly defeated, vainly and shamefully cling to one's life. These two Carthaginian

---

[28] Polyb., *Hist.*, 11.2.1–11.

[29] Polyb., *Hist.*, 11.1–3.

[30] Polyb., *Hist.*, 11.5–8.

[31] Polyb., *Hist.*, 11.9–10.

[32] ἡμῖν ἄξιος ἐπιστάσεως εἰναι καὶ ζήλου (Polyb., *Hist.*, 11.5 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[33] ἵνα μήτε προπετῶς κινδυνεύοντες σφάλλωσι τὰς τῶν πιστευσάντων ἐλπίδας μήτε φιλοζωοῦντες παρὰ τὸ δέον αἰσχρὰς καὶ ἐπονειδίστους ποιῶσι τὰς αὐτῶν περιπετείας (Polyb., *Hist.*, 11.2.11 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]). An example of not rashly exposing oneself and keeping proper protection in battle can be seen in Scipio (Africanus) during his assault of New Carthage (Polyb., *Hist.*, 10.13.1). It reads, "Scipio took part in the battle, but consulted for his safety as far as possible; for he had with him three men carrying large shields, who holding these close covered the surface exposed to the wall and thus afforded him protection" (Ὁ δὲ Πόπλιος ἐδίδου μὲν αὑτὸν εἰς τὸν κίνδυνον, ἐποίει δὲ τοῦτο κατὰ δύναμιν ἀσφαλῶς. εἶχε γὰρ μεθ' αὑτοῦ τρεῖς ἄνδρας θυρεοφοροῦντας, οἳ παρατιθέντες τοὺς θυρεοὺς καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους ἐπιφάνειαν σκεπάζοντες ἀσφάλειαν αὐτῷ παρεσκεύαζον [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]). One might alternatively translate the initial clause to bring out the Greek phraseology more clearly, "Publius (Scipio) thrust/gave himself into the danger." Cf. 1 Macc 2:50; 6:44; 11:23; 14:29.

examples exhibit the concern of an elite, mid-second century BC Greek statesman for the congruence between one's (noble) life and one's manner of death.

Diodoros of Sicily and Polybios also recount instances of Roman self-endangerment and noble death. For example, Quintus Aulius, elected master of horse for the dictator Quintus Fabius, demonstrated his bravery at a time of crisis during the prolonged struggle against the Samnites (314 BC).[34] Instead of participating in the shameful flight, he "stood alone (μόνον ὑπέστη) against the mass of the enemy" in an effort, not to win, but to maintain "his fatherland undefeated."[35] Diodoros concludes that "thus he, by not sharing with his fellow citizens in the disgrace of flight, gained a glorious death for himself alone" (ἰδίᾳ περιεποιήσατο θάνατον ἔνδοξον).[36] Thus, in contrast to the shame of the other soldiers, Aulius's solitary stand against the Samnites for the reputation of his πατρίς accrued good repute, or honor, for himself.

Polybios offers a number of comments about his perception of certain Roman military ranks and practices.[37] For example, he states that the Romans did not want centurions to be "venturesome and daredevil" (θρασεῖς καὶ φιλοκινδύνους) or to "initiate attacks and open the battle;" rather, they should be "natural leaders" and "men who will hold their ground when worsted and hard-pressed and be ready to die at their posts" (ὑπομένειν καὶ ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας).[38] Polybios also comments on how, admirably (καλῶς) in his view, the Roman army encourages "young soldiers to face danger" (πρὸς τὸ κινδυνεύειν).[39] For a variety of acts of voluntary self-endangerment

---

[34] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.72.6–8.

[35] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.72.7–8 [Geer, LCL]. The flight (φυγή) is characterized in Diodoros with the terms of shame καταισχύνειν and αἰσχύνη.

[36] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 19.72.8.

[37] Polybios had been a hostage in Rome for seventeen years.

[38] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.24.9 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

[39] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.39.1 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

above and beyond the call of duty, as it were, Rome offers a series of ranked rewards and distinguished honors commensurate with the deeds.[40] One of the more prestigious rewards, for example, consists of a gold crown (the *corona muralis*) for being the first to mount the wall during a siege assault.[41] Likewise, "those who have shielded and saved any of the citizens or allies receive honorary gifts (δώροις) from the consul, and the men they saved crown their preservers" (τοὺς σωθέντας...τὸν σώσαντα στεφανοῦν) and even "reverences his preserver as a father all through his life, and must treat him in every way like a parent."[42] These inducements for valor "excite to emulation and rivalry" for soldiers on the field and at home, since the prestige of self-endangering individuals is on display in both domains.[43] As a result, the Roman military structure stimulated self-endangerment in at least three realms: (1) standing one's ground and enduring severe peril (esp. centurions), (2) initiatory military operations during a siege, (3) for the sake of a fellow citizen-soldier (and possibly for allied troops).

Polybios further praises Roman military institutions for the way in which they stimulate bravery to protect the homeland. For Polybios, it is disadvantageous for Carthage to rely largely upon a mercenary army. Rome on the contrary and to Polybios's

---

[40] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.39.1–11. Polybios specifically mentions that the higher reward-gifts "are not made to men who have wounded or stripped an enemy in regular battle or at the storming of a city, but to those who during skirmishes or in similar circumstances, where there is no necessity for engaging in single combat, have voluntarily and deliberately thrown themselves into the danger" (ἐν οἷς μηδεμιᾶς ἀνάγκης οὔσης κατ᾽ ἄνδρα κινδυνεύειν αὐτοί τινες ἑκουσίως καὶ κατὰ προαίρεσιν αὑτοὺς εἰς τοῦτο διδόασι).

[41] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.39.5. Cf. e.g., Gellius, *Attic Nights*, 5.6.16–17. See Frank W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume I, Commentary on Books I–VI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 721. For an example in battle of using the prospect of rewards to motivate self-endangering valor, Polybios relates the events of the Roman siege of Epipolae in Sicily (212 BC). Roman commander Marcellus takes Epipolae (Sicily) puts "fittest" in position to take on "the brunt of the danger, with promises of great rewards" (Polyb., *Hist*., 8.37.1–13). He "reminded the scaling party of the rewards that awaited them if they behaved with gallantry…" (καὶ προσαναμνήσας τῶν ἐσομένων δωρεῶν τοῖς ἀνδραγαθήσασι; Polyb., *Hist*., 8.37.5).

[42] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.39.6–7 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL] (σέβεται δὲ τοῦτον καὶ παρ᾽ ὅλον τὸν βίον ὁ σωθεὶς ὡς πατέρα καὶ πάντα δεῖ τούτῳ ποιεῖν αὐτὸν ὡς τῷ γονεῖ). On the "civic crown," see also, e.g., Gellius, *Attic Nights*, 5.6.12–15. See Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume I*, 721–722. Walbank notes that Polybios is the only author to include allies in addition to citizens as those whom a soldier could rescue and qualify for "the *corona ciuica* [civic crown] of oak-leaves." Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume I*, 721.

[43] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.39.8–10 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

approval uses primarily Italian soldiers. As a result, the Romans fight with an indominable wholeheartedness concerned for the survival of "fatherland" (πατρίς) and children (τέκνα) that is lacking in the Carthaginian mercenary forces.[44]

Polybios points to the institutions of Rome that generate and foster the spirit of endurance in times of peril.[45] He details the process by which individuals accrue prestige and receive praise through their ritual enshrinement in the public memory.[46] The lexicon of benefaction provides Polybios with the terminology to describe this discretely Roman mechanism of benefit (heroic deed for the general good) and reward (public memorialization). He writes that, "by this constant renewal of the good report of brave men, the celebrity of those who performed noble deeds is rendered immortal, while at the same time the fame of those who did good service to their country becomes known to the people and a heritage for future generations."[47] The practices that publicly valorize the heroic person, most importantly for Polybios, inspire the young men "to endure every suffering for the public welfare in the hope of winning the glory that attends on brave men."[48] A long chain of historical examples of Romans braving single combat and facing death and loss for the general benefit of Romans buttress Polybios's argument that Rome's institutional practices successfully promote such beneficial self-hazarding behavior.[49] One example in particular impresses Polybios the most.

---

[44] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.52.1–7.

[45] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.52.10–11.

[46] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.53.1–54.1 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

[47] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.54.2 (ἐξ ὧν καινοποιουμένης ἀεὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς ἐπ᾽ ἀρετῇ φήμης ἀθανατίζεται μὲν ἡ τῶν καλόν τι διαπραξαμένων εὔκλεια, γνώριμος δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ παραδόσιμος τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις ἡ τῶν εὐεργετησάντων τὴν παρίδα γίνεται δόξα).

[48] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.54.3 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL] (τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, οἱ νέοι παρορμῶνται πρὸς τὸ πᾶν ὑπομένειν ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν πραγμάτων χάριν τοῦ τυχεῖν τῆς συνακολουθούσης τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν εὐκλείας). See also Scipio's speech before Zama (Polyb., *Hist*., 15.10).

[49] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.54.4–5. At least some of the instances to which Polybios alludes are legendary examples, e.g., Livy, *History of Rome*, 2.5 (L. Iunius Brutus), 4.29 (A. Postumius), and 8.7 (T. Manlius Torquatus). Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume I*, 740.

Polybios marshals "a single instance" that encapsulates the Roman effort to produce "men who will be ready to endure everything in order to gain a reputation in their country for valor:" the noble death of Horatius Cocles ("One-Eyed").[50] In full, it reads:

> It is narrated that when Horatius Cocles was engaged in combat with two of the enemy at the far end of the bridge over the Tiber that lies in the front of the town, he saw large reinforcements coming up to help the enemy, and fearing lest they should force the passage and get into the town, he turned round and called to those behind him to retire and cut the bridge with all speed. His order was obeyed, and while they were cutting the bridge, he stood to his ground receiving many wounds, and arrested the attack of the enemy who were less astonished at his physical strength than at his endurance and courage (ὡς τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τόλμαν). The bridge once cut, the enemy were prevented from attacking; and Cocles, plunging into the river in full amour as he was, deliberately sacrificed his life, regarding the safety of his country and the glory which in future would attach to his name as of more importance than his present existence and the years of life which remained to him (ὁ δὲ Κόκλης ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις κατὰ προαίρεσιν μετήλλαξε τὸν βίον, περὶ πλείονος ποιησάμενος τὴν τῆς πατρίδος ἀσφάλειαν καὶ τὴν ἐσομένην μετὰ ταῦτα περὶ αὐτὸν εὔκλειαν τῆς παρούσης ζωῆς καὶ τοὺ καταλειπομένου βίου). Such, if I am not wrong, is the eager emulation of achieving noble deeds (ὁρμὴ καὶ φιλοτιμία πρὸς τὰ καλὰ τῶν ἔργων) engendered in the Roman youth by their institutions.[51]

Horatius's heroic deed exemplifies the success of the Roman deed-reward mechanism Polybios touts so fervently. Horatius engages in combat against a voracious and formidable enemy military force, exhibits the utmost endurance at severe personal risk out of concern for the communal safety of his πόλις/πατρίς (Rome), and is motivated by the prospects of post-mortem prestige rather than his own remaining life. Ultimately, he gives his life so that by his death his city might live. His final act of casting himself (ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν) into the river demonstrates his full-fledged enthusiasm and commitment

---

[50] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.52.11 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL] (ἓν δὲ ῥηθὲν ἱκανὸν ἔσται σημεῖον τῆς τοῦ πολιτεύματος σπουδῆς, ἣν ποιεῖ<ται> περὶ τὸ τοιούτους ᾽ἀποτελεῖν ἄνδρας ὥστε πᾶν ὑπομένειν χάριν τοῦ τυχεῖν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τῆς ἐπ᾽ ἀρετῇ φήμης). Polybios's versions of the story of Horatius Cocles occurs in Polyb, *History of Rome*, 6.55.1–4; cf. Livy, *History of Rome*, 2:10. In Livy's version, Horatius swims to safety and receives ample gratitude from the state and from private citizens for his valorous deed. Livy, *History of Rome*, 10.11–13. For details on the legendary story of Horatius Cocles, see Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume I*, 740–741.

[51] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.55.1–4 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

for the deed.[52]

Scipio (Africanus), when a young man, also exhibited virtue when he risked his own life to rescue his father from assured death in the battle of Ticinus against Hannibal (218 BC).[53] Polybios devotes a lengthy section to the exemplary character and skill of Scipio in part as a counterpoint to the widespread notion that divine intervention or Fortune rather than Scipio's own ingenuity and skill had caused his success (especially at New Carthage).[54] The first example Polybios provides as initial attestation of Scipio's upright character is the story of Scipio saving his father, Publius Scipio.[55] The account goes that during battle Scipio was with a contingent of troops his father had ordered for his protection, "but when he caught sight of his father in the battle (ἐν τῷ κινδύνῳ), surrounded by the enemy and escorted only by two or three horsemen and dangerously wounded," he urged his protective contingent to go help.[56] They hesitated because of the size of the opposing force, so Scipio decided to enter the fray himself.[57] Polybios reports, "he is said with reckless daring to have charged the encircling force alone. Upon the rest being now forced to attack, the enemy were terror-struck and broke up."[58] As a result, his father, "thus unexpectedly delivered, was the first to salute his son in the hearing of all as his preserver."[59] Scipio's deed was so enshrined in the public memory that Seneca, some

[52] Polyb., *Hist.*, 6.55.3.

[53] Polyb., *Hist.*, 10.3.3–7; cf. 3.65.1–11.

[54] Polyb., *Hist.*, 10.2.1–13; more broadly 10.2–20. On Polybios's purpose, sources, and accuracy about Scipio's assault on New Carthage, see Frank W. Walbank, *Volume II, Commentary on Books VII–XVIII* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 191–220.

[55] Polyb., *Hist.*, 10.3.3–7; cf. 3.65.1–11. Polybios's source is Scipio's close friend, Gaius Laelius (Polyb., *Hist.*, 10.3.2). For an argument that Scipio's rescue of his father is a genuine historical event rather than a legend or fabrication on the part of Polybios's source, see Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume II*, 198–199.

[56] Polyb., *Hist.*, 10.3.4 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

[57] Polyb., *Hist.*, 10.3.5–6.

[58] Polyb., *Hist.*, 10.3.6 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

[59] Polyb., *Hist.*, 10.3.5–6 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]. Recall 6.39.6–7 (on the "civic crown"). Walbank notes that "Pliny [the Elder] records that Africanus refused the *corona ciuica* from his

two hundred and fifty years or so later, uses it (in combination with other of Scipio's deeds) as the example *par excellence* to argue that a son can indeed benefit a father in a way that outweighs the father's benefit to his son.[60] Thus, the mechanism of stimulation and memorialization to encourage and reward acts of self-endangerment for the good of Rome seems to have been reasonably functional. Having now proffered examples from Carthaginians and Romans, the final example of military self-endangerment comes from a Greek.

Finally, the Rhodian commander Theophiliskos suffered a noteworthy death at the naval battle of Chios (201 BC).[61] The enemy combatants consisted of Philip V on the one side and Attalos I Soter and Rhodes on the other. Theophiliskos was wounded but fought with bravery worthy of memory. A contingent of Philip's ships had overtaken a Rhodian ship and killed the pilot Autolykos after a valiant fight.[62] Suddenly Theophiliskos came to aid the sinking Rhodian vessel and gained control of the battle, but enemy ships quickly surrounded him.[63] In the ensuing struggle Theophiliskos "receiving himself three wounds and displaying extraordinary courage, just managed to save his own ship (αὐτὸς δὲ τρία τραύματα λαβὼν καὶ παραβόλως τῇ τόλμῃ κινυνεύσας μόλις ἐξέσωσε τὴν ἰδίαν ναῦν), Philostratos coming up to his succor and taking a gallant part in the struggle" (τὸν ἐνεστῶτα κίνδυνον εὐψύχως).[64] Having thus been rescued, he

---

father *apud Trebiam*" (Pliny, *Nat. hist*. 16.14). Pliny reads, "Scipio Africanus refused to accept a wreath for rescuing his father at the Trebbia." Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume II*, 199.

[60] Seneca, *Ben.*, 3.33. Seneca states, "Is there any doubt that the commonplace benefit of his birth was surpassed by his rare filial devotion and his valor, which brought to the city itself, I might almost say, greater glory than protection?" (*Ben.*, 3.33.3 [Basore, LCL]). Reference to Seneca, *Ben.*, 3.33 thanks to Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume II*, 198. For other references to Scipio's saving act in Roman literature, see Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume II*, 198.

[61] Polyb., *Hist.*, 16.5.4–7; 16.9.1–5. For comment on the battle of Chios, see Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Volume II*, 503–511.

[62] Polyb., *Hist.*, 16.5.1–2.

[63] Polyb., *Hist.*, 16.5.3–5.

[64] Polyb., *Hist.*, 16.5.6 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

rejoined his main body of ships. Polybios, with an eye toward the commander's virtue of endurance despite his wounds, writes, "Theophiliskos now joined his other ships and again fell upon the enemy, weak in body from his wounds, but more magnificent and desperate than ever in bravery of spirit" (τῇ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς γενναιότητι λαμπρότερος ὢν καὶ παραστατικώτερος ἢ πρόσθεν).[65] After he completes his narrative of the battle, Polybios summarizes the character and significance of Theophiliskos's performance: "He had proved himself a man of great bravery in the fight and a man worthy of remembrance for his resolution."[66] Polybios approves the posthumous honors that the Rhodians gave to Theophiliskos because, as much the same with his praise of the Romans, Rhodes promotes the behavior of (prudent) self-endangerment for the benefit of the πατρίς. He comments, "Therefore very justly the Rhodians paid such honors (τιμαῖς) to him after his death as served to arouse not only in those then alive but in their posterity a spirit of devotion to their country's interests" (πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος καιρούς).[67] Like Rome, Rhodes (and Greek cities generally) praised, committed to public memory, and encouraged emulation of those who endanger themselves for the community. Nevertheless, Rhodes's honors for the heroic behavior of Theophiliskos is but one instance of the wider phenomenon of Greek cities repaying praise, prestige, and privileges to elite citizens or foreigners who risked their own lives to benefit their community.[68]

Benefactors Facing Dangers and Serving in Crises

Benefactors took on several different roles to address the varied critical

---

[65] Polyb., *Hist.*, *Hist*. 16.5.7 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL].

[66] ἀνὴρ καὶ κατὰ τὸν κίνδυνον ἀγαθὸς γενόμενος καὶ κατὰ τὴν προαύρεσιν μνήμης ἄξιος (Polyb., *Hist.*, *Hist*. 16.9.2 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[67] Polyb., *Hist.*, 16.9.5 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]; see all of Polyb., *Hist.*, 16.9.1–5.

[68] Other relevant examples that deal with issues of danger, risk, and memory in Polybios's *Histories* include Epaminondas (Polyb., *Hist*., 9.9.9–10), Hannibal (9.9.9–10), and in the speech Polybios creates for Lykiskos (9.38.4).

situations that cities faced. An inscription could express a crisis or "détresse publique" with several terms.[69] The lexicon of crisis in the Hellenistic period included the following words and phrases: (1) περίστασις (crisis), ἡ τῶν καιρῶν περίστασις (the crisis of the times), (2) καιροὶ ἀναγκαῖοι (needful times), (3) καιροὶ ἀναγκαιότατοι (most needful times), (4) δυσχερεῖς καιροί (hard times), ἀπεγνωσμένοι καιροί (desperate times), ἐπιγινομένοι καιροί (critical times that have arisen), (5) καιροί (critical situations), (6) κίνδυνοι (dangers), (7) θλίβεσθαι (being afflicted, under pressure, overwhelmed), (8) ἀπόγνωσις (despair).[70] Each contingent, local circumstance called for an adaptive response to meet the crisis to ensure the safety and well-being of the populace.

Diplomacy

Envoys who embarked on diplomatic missions faced dangers from various sources and received praise for their laudable service in times of crisis.[71] For instance, sometime in the third century BC the city of Istros honored Dioskourides son of Strouthion, "a good man concerning the city and the citizens," because "he showed himself eager for the *demos* and during the dangers of the city he conducted many Hellenic and barbarian embassies for peace, taking account of no danger."[72] In return for

[69] On "public distress" in Hellenistic Asia Minor, see Thibaut Boulay, *Arès dans la Cité: Les Poleis et la Guerre dans L'Asie Mineure Hellénistique* (Pisa, Italy: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2014), 335–384.

[70] Boulay, *Arès dans la Cité*, 337–350.

[71] *I.ScM* I 8 (3rd or 2nd c. BC, Istros); *I.ScM* I 12 (3rd c. BC, Istros); *IG* II^2 654 (285/284 BC); *AIO* 823 (ca. 267 BC, Rhamnous); *IG* 12.7.386 (ca. 250–200 BC, Amorgos); *AIO* 837 = *SEG* 51.110 = *I.Rhamnous* 17 (235/234 BC, Rhamnous); *IG* II^3 1 1147 (225/224 BC, Athens); *IG* II^3 1 1137 = *IG* II^2 844 (228/227, 221/210, 193/192 BC, Athens); *SEG* 43.41 (after 216/215 BC); *IOSPE* I^2 32 = *Syll.*^{3} 495 (3rd c. BC; ca. 200 BC, Olbia); *I.ScM* I 15 = *SEG* 24.1095 (ca. 200 BC, Istros); *SEG* 52.724 (ca. 200 BC, Istros); *IG* II^3 1 1292 (200/199 or 184/183 BC, Athens); *CID* 4.106 (184/183 BC, Delphi); 1 Macc 11:22–24; *SEG* 18.750 (180–120 BC, Araxa); *IG* II^3 1 1323 (shortly after 175 BC, Pergamon); *OGIS* 339 (133–120 BC, Sestos); PH289481 (shortly after 131 BC, Kyzikos); *SEG* 39.1243 (ca. 130–110 BC, Kolophon); *FD* III 4.43 (119 BC, Delphi); *I.Aph2007* 2.503 (1st c. BC, Aphrodisias); *I.Aph2007* 12.103 (1st c. BC, Aphrodisias); *I.Priene* 121 (ca. 90 BC, Priene); PH256676 (probably ca. 85–80 BC, Alabanda); PH316597, PH316953, PH301900 (= IvP II 256), PH316574 (= OGIS 764), and PH316601 (ca. 69 BC, Pergamon); *I.ScM* I 54 (ca. 50 BC, Istros); *IGBulg* I^2 13 = *Syll.*^{3} 762 (49/48 BC, Dionysopolis); *OGIS* 767 = *I.RCyr2020* C.416 (ca. 2 AD, Cyrene).

[72] ἐπειδὴ Διοσκου|ρίδης Στρουθίωνος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς|| ὢν περὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς πολί|τας πρόθυμον ἑαυτὸν παρείσχη|ται τῶι δήμωι ἔν τε τοῖς κινδύνοις| τῆς πόλεως πρεσβείας Ἑλληνικὰς| καὶ βαρβαρικὰς πολλὰς ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰ-||ρήνης πεπρέσβευκεν οὐδένα κίνδυ|νον ὑπολογισάμενος (*I.ScM* I 12.3–

his self-imperiling embassies to benefit the city in times of trouble, Istros awarded him praise, a gold crown to be presented regularly at the games, and a bronze statue.[73]

In 225/224 BC, Prytanis, a notable Peripatetic philosopher, undertook a dangerous and costly mission as an envoy on behalf of the city of Athens and used his rhetorical skills for its benefit.[74] The *demos* of Athens commended him for "giving himself without hesitation to the common need of the city" and for performing his embassy while "taking into account no pain or danger of what might happen, taking thought of no expense."[75] In the motivation clause the decree reiterates that the *boule* and *demos* of the Athenians appreciate benefactors who display full commitment to their services, "so, therefore, that the People may be seen at every opportunity to have been mindful of those who exert themselves to meet its needs."[76]

Among the numerous benefactions of Polemaios of Kolophon was his stint as envoy.[77] Not only did he provide funds from his personal finances, but he was able to procure friendship with Rome and patronage for the city from Roman notables.[78] The decree brings out the protective nature of his conduct by highlighting the relative safety

---

11).

[73] *I.ScM* I 12.14–22.

[74] *IG* II^3 1 1147 (225/224 BC, Athens). On the mission of Prytanis, see Polyb., *Hist*., 5.93.8–10; Christian Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, trans. Deborah Lucas Schneider (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 177–178; Matthias Haake, *Der Philosoph in der Stadt: Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in den hellenistichen Poleis* (Munich, Germany: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2007), 89–99.

[75] δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπροφ[α-]||σίστως εἰς τὴν κοινὴν χρείαν τῆς πόλεως ἀπ[ε-]|δήμησεν…οὔτε πό|νον οὔτε κίνδυνον ὑπολογισάμενος οὐθένα *ν* | τῶν ἐσομένων οὔτε δαπάνης οὐδεμιᾶς φροντί|σας (*IG* II^3 1 1147.14–19).

[76] ὅπως ἂν οὖν ὁ δῆμος ἐμ παγ|τὶ καιρῶι μεμνημένοις φαίνηται τῶν ἐκτενῶς| τὰς χρείας αὐτωι παρεσχημένων (*IG* II^3 1 1147.25–27). Translation from Stephen Lambert, "Honours for Prytanis of Karystos," Attic Inscriptions Online, last updated February 8, 2017, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/MorettiISE/i-28. Prytanis was awarded praise, a gold crown announced at City Dionysia (tragedies) and Panathenaia (games), other benefits as seen fit, a free dinner, and stone stele in the agora (*IG* II^3 1 1147.27–50).

[77] *SEG* 39.1243 (ca. 130–110 BC, Kolophon).

[78] *SEG* 39.1243.

of the population of Kolophon who remained at home because of Polemaios's self-endangering ambassadorial services across land and sea: "he permitted the other citizens to remain untroubled in their own (homes), while he himself undertook the danger on behalf of all (the others), and by land and by sea hazarding (the danger) in his body and his soul and in his entire life concerning the *demos*."[79] Polemaios was able to successfully curb the armed brigandage and raiding in territory owned by Kolophon by securing an edict from Rome.[80] Likewise, he was able to get the charges dropped against a citizen who had been convicted in the Roman court system.[81] The decree also draws attention to Polemaios's self-endangerment in his priestly services, saying that, "considering it noble to endure dangers on behalf of the land that reared him, in the duties that were assigned to him by his fatherland he nobly continued saying and doing what is most excellent."[82] Furthermore, he was generous to certain people who had experienced pressing times and forgave numerous debtors of their debt.[83] For these and other benefactions Polemaios received various rewards, including a gold crown and a gold statue on a pillar in the temple of Apollo of Klarios near the altar of the Graces.[84]

Another benefactor from western Asia Minor during the late second century

---

[79] τοὺς μὲν λοιποὺς| τῶν πολιτῶν ἀπαρενοχλήτους| ἐῶν μένειν ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων,| αὐτὸς δὲ τὸν ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων|| κίνδυνον ἀναδεχόμενος| καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασ|σαν σώματι κ<καὶ τ>ῆι ψυχῆι καὶ| τῶι παντὶ βίωι περὶ τοῦ δήμου| παραβαλλόμενος (*SEG* 39.1243.ii.16–24). Translation modified from "Kolophon Honours Polemaios," http://www.attalus.org/docs/seg/s39_1243.html, accessed August 21, 2021.

[80] *SEG* 39.1243.ii.33–51.

[81] *SEG* 39.1243.ii.51–62.

[82] καλὸν δὲ κρίνων καὶ αὐ|θαιρέτως ὑπομένειν| τοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ θρέψαντος| ἐδάφους κινδύνους, ἐν|| ταῖς ἐπιτρεπομέναις| ἑαυτῶι χρείαις τῆς πα|ρίδος γνησίως καὶ λέ|γων καὶ πράσσων τὰ κρά|τιστα διατετέλεκεν (*SEG* 39.1243.iii.16–24). Translation modified from "Kolophon Honours Polemaios," http://www.attalus.org/docs/seg/s39_1243.html, accessed August 22, 2021.

[83] *SEG* 39.1243.iii.25–58. Note the mention of "crises" to describe the circumstances of those whom Polemaios helped (τὰς τυχικὰς περιστάσεις; *SEG* 39.1243.iii.27–28; οὐδένα κατὰ| περίστασιν ἐπ<τ>αικότα πε|ριορῶν; iii.50–52).

[84] *SEG* 39.1243.v.25–57. On the gold statue, the text specifies the location: στῆσαι δὲ εἰκόνα| χρυσῆν ἐπὶ στυλίδος ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος|| τοῦ Κλαρίου παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν τῶν Χαρίτων (*SEG* 39.1243.v.43–45).

BC, Menippos, adopted son of Apollonides, received commendation from the city of Klaros for his considerable services as envoy to Rome some five times, to the Attalids, and to various other cities.[85] Menippos, among other things, persuaded Rome to maintain the city's ancestral laws and judicial autonomy and secure Romans as patrons of Klaros.[86] Two different honorific inscriptions contain the same exact wording explaining in brief the reason Klaros honored Menippos: because he was "a benefactor and concerning the city, earnest and loving the good and leading the fatherland in times of necessity."[87] The larger of the inscriptions, a formal honorific decree, adds that Menippos offered to finance the cost of erecting the statue that the city awarded him because the Klaros was hard-pressed (θλίβεσθαι) at the time.[88]

One of the most lauded benefactor-envoys in Hellenistic history was Diodoros Pasparos of Pergamon, who operated in post-Mithridatic War circumstances.[89] Of the many services of Diodoros Pasparos to Pergamon, his successful embassy to the Romans stands out in terms of endangered benefaction. After the First Mithridatic War, Pergamon

---

[85] *SEG* 39.1244 (ca. 120–110 BC, Klaros); *SEG* 37.957 (ca. 133–100 BC, Klaros).

[86] *SEG* 39.1244.i.10–ii.7, iii.5–13.

[87] εὐεργέτην ὄντα καὶ περὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἐκτενῆ καὶ φιλάγαθον καὶ προστάντα τῆς πατρίδος ἐν καιροῖς ἀναγκαίοις (*SEG* 39.1244.32–34; *SEG* 37.957.5–11 [see *NewDocs* 9 §4]).

[88] ἐπαινέσαι δὲ αὐτὸν διότι θλιβομένης τῆς|| πόλεως τὴν τιμὴν αὐτὴν ἀποδεχόμενον| παρὰ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τοῖς προγεγραμένοις ἀκόλου|θον γινόμενον ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι τελέσειν παρ᾽ ἑ[αυ-]|τοῦ τὴν ἐσομένην δαπάνην εἰς τὴν εἰκόν[ος]| ἀνάθεσιν καίτοι γε τοῦ δήμου καὶ τὴν δαπάνην ἡ-||δέως ἀναδεχομένου διὰ τὴν πρὸς Μένιππον ἐ|κτένειαν (*SEG* 39.1244.iii.34–41).

[89] The documents related to Diodoros Pasparos include PH316597, PH316953, PH301900 (= IvP II 256), PH316574 (= OGIS 764), and PH316601 (ca. 69 BC, Pergamon). On various aspects of his date, historical situation, and his exploits and rewards, see Christopher P. Jones, "Diodoros Pasparos and the Nikephoria of Pergamon," *Chiron* 4 (1974): 183–205; Regan L. Barr, "Honors for Late Hellenistic Civic Benefactors in Western Asia Minor," (MA thesis, University of Cincinnati, 1995), 7–31; T. Corey Brennan, "Embassies Gone Wrong: Roman Diplomacy in the Constatinian Excerpta de Legationibus," in *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, ed. Claude Eilers (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 171–174; Andrzej S. Chankowski, "La procedure legislative à Pergame au ler siècle au J.-C : à propos de la chronologie relative des décrets en l'honneur de Diodoros Pasparos," *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 122, no. 1 (1998): 159–199; Christopher P. Jones, "Diodoros Pasparos Revisited," *Chiron* 30 (2000): 1–14; Cristina Genovese, ""Per Eterna Memoria e Immortalità di un Benefattore". L' 'Heroon' di Diodoro Pasparo a Pergamo," *Mediterraneo Antico* 14, nos. 1–2 (2011): 57–74; Biagio Virgilio, "La Città Ellenistica e I suoi 'Benefattori': Pergamo e Diodoro Pasparos," in *Studi sull'Asia Minore* (Pisa, Italy: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2014), 117–130.

was in dire economic straits.[90] The war itself had taken its toll on the city. Mithradates had executed eighty conspirators from Pergamon.[91] Likewise, no doubt otherwise productive human and monetary capital was diverted to finance and prosecute war. Because Pergamon had supported Mithradates against Rome, they were on the losing side of the conflict and subject to a massive indemnity as well as the Roman moneylenders and *publicani*.[92] Thus, the diversion of productive economic resources to destructive ends (war), the heavy burden of tribute from Mithradates and then Rome, and the presence of Roman tax farmers all contributed to the dismal economic situation. Pergamenes incurred heavy debts at high interest rates in their attempt to recover. Diodoros Pasparos's embassy to Rome was able to obtain relief from several of these burdensome impositions and as a result facilitate economic recovery.

In the mid-first century BC the benefactor Akornion served as priest and envoy. As envoy, Akornion got into the good graces of King Burebista and subsequently served successfully as an envoy on behalf of both Burebista and Dionysopolis to the Romans.[93] In the honorific decree for Akornion, the city recognized his exemplary conduct despite the dangers and highlights his wholehearted devotion to his services in times of crisis during which he poured out expenses from his own private funds to complete them:

> And the goodwill of the king with respect to the safety of his city he urged, and in all other ways of himself unsparingly did he give (ἔν τε τοῖς λοιποῖς ἅπασιν ἀφειδῶς ἑαυτὸν|| [ἐν]διδοὺς); the city's embassies with their dangers he undertook without hesitation to win in all respects the advantage for his native city.[94]

---

[90] This paragraph draws on Barr, "Honors for Late Hellenistic Civic Benefactors in Western Asia Minor," 12–13. See also Biagio Virgilio, "La Città Ellenistica e I suoi 'Benefattori': Pergamo e Diodoro Pasparos," 120–123.

[91] Appian, *Mithridatic War*, 192.

[92] On the Roman moneylenders and *publicani*, see Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 7.6.

[93] *IGBulg* I^2 13.22–42.

[94] [κα]ὶ συνβουλεύων τὰ κράτιστα καὶ τὴν εὔνοιαν τοῦ β̣[α|σιλέ]ως πρὸς τῆς πόλεως σωτηρ [ί]αν προσπαραμ̣[υ|θού]μενος ἔν τε τοῖς λοιποῖς ἅπασιν ἀφειδῶς ἑαυτὸν|| [ἐν]διδοὺς καὶ τὰς τῆς πόλεως

> And in general throughout every situation of crisis he applied himself body and soul, expenses being paid from his own means of livelihood; and, some of the material things of the city subsidizing by himself, he has exhibited the greatest zeal for the safety of his native city.[95]

The honorific decree highlights that Akornion endured dangers and aided his city during critical times for the advantage (τὸ σύμφερον) and safety (σωτηρία) of his home city. His enthusiasm to act on their behalf in difficult times was so ardent that he risked his own life. For his self-hazarding behavior Dionysopolis returned gratitude by awarding him praise, a gold crown presented at the Dionysiac games (annually), and a bronze statue at the most conspicuous place in the agora.[96]

As priest and envoy Phaos son of Klearchos served the people of Cyrene to combat the raids (ca. 5/4 BC–AD 3) of the Marmaridae, a Libyan tribe.[97] The honorific decree (*OGIS* 767 = *I.RCyr2020* C.416; AD 2) for Phaos recounts his wartime services, saying that he had "acted as envoy during the Marmaric War, in winter, putting himself in danger (ἑαυτὸν ἐς τὸς κινδύνος ἐπιδὸς) and bringing military aid which was most timely and sufficient for the safety of the city."[98] With Cyrenaica in trouble from the Libyan incursions, Phaos hazarded harsh winter conditions in a crucial diplomatic

---

πρεσβήας καὶ κινδύνους ἐπ[ι-]||ḍοχόμενος [ἀ]ṓκνως πρὸς τὸ πάντας τι κατεργάζεσθᾳ[ι]| τῇ παρτίδι συμφέρον (*IGBulg* I^2 13.27–32; ca. 48 BC; translation from Sherk [1984] §78).

[95] καθόλου δὲ κατὰ πᾶσ<α>ν περίστασιν κ[αι|ρ]ῶν ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι παραβαλλόμενος καὶ δαπάναις χρώμ[ε-]||νος ταὶς ἐκ τοὺ βίου, τινὰ δὲ καὶ τὼν πολιτικῶν χορηγίων σωματ[ο-]||ποιῶν παρ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ τὴν μεγίστην ἐνδείκνυτα[ι] σπουδὴν εἰς τὴν ὑ|πὲρ τῆς πατρίδος σωτηρίαν (*IGBulg* I^2 13.38–42; translation from Sherk [1984] §78). One can also note the occurrence of ἐπιδοῦναι ἑαυτόν for his priestly services: "[he was called upon] by the citizens and he devoted himself (to the priesthood)" ([παρακληθεὶς ὑ]πὸ τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν; *IGBulg* I^2 13.15; translation from Sherk [1984] §78).

[96] *IGBulg* I^2 13.43–49.

[97] On the Marmaric War, see Joyce Reynolds and J. A. Lloyd, "Cyrene," in *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume X: The Augustan Empire, 43 B.C.–A.D. 69*, ed. Alan K. Bowman, Edward Champlin, and Andrew Lintott, 2nd ed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 635–636; Eireann Marshall, "Cyrenaican Civilisation and Health: Constructing an Identity in a Frontier," *Pegasus* 39 (1996) 10–11. The ancient sources that attest to the Marmaric War are sparse (mainly *SEG* 9.63; *OGIS* 676; Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, 55.10a.1). Also concerning the Marmaric War is *I.RCyr2020* C.737, an honorific decree for a certain Alexis, who also faced dangers and risked his life. But the decree for Alexis a little more fragmentary than the Phaos decree.

[98] [καὶ] πρεσβεύσας ἐν τῷ̃ Μαρμα|ρικῷ̃ πολέμῳ ἐν χειμῶσι ἑαυ|τὸν ἐς τὸς κινδύνος ἐπιδὸς|| καὶ τὰν ἐπικαιροτάταν συμμα-|[χ]ίαν καὶ πρὸς σωτηρίαν τ[ᾶ]ς πό-|[λ]εος ἀνηκοίσαν ἀγαγὼν (*I.RCyr2020* C.416.a.7–12). Translation from Braund §51.

mission to Rome to bring military aid to ensure the safety of Cyrene.

One of the critical services an envoy could provide was to negotiate the return of hostages and captives and to rescue the imprisoned. The city of Istros honored the envoys Diodoros, Prokritos, and Klearchos for bringing back over sixty hostages and persuading the perpetrator Zalmodegikos, king of the Getae, to return the money he had extracted.[99] Their mission entailed considerable risk, since they "travelled through hostile territory, endured every danger, and displayed every enthusiasm" in their efforts.[100] After pirates captured over thirty people at Amorgos, the brothers Hegesippos and Antippapos, themselves captives, offered themselves as hostages and persuaded the pirate captain to release all the captive citizens and some of the freedmen and enslaved and to spare the citizens from being sold, tortured, and from enduring hardship.[101] In 235/234, the city of Rhamnous praised Dikaiarchos of Thria because (among other things) "when the general Philokedes was present at Eretria he supported this man in advocating and securing the release and saving from prison (ἐξ<ε>ί(λ)ετο ἐκ τοῦ [δε]σμωτηρί[ου]) of one of the citizens who had been condemned to death."[102] In 228/227 BC, a certain Eumaridas was voted honors for his role in securing the release of Athenian captives from the pirate Boukris, who had raided the countryside of Attica.[103] He generously contributed to the

[99] *I.ScM* I 8 (3rd–2nd c. BC).

[100] ἀπεδήμησάν τε διὰ τῆς πολε|μίας πάντα κίνδυνον ὑπομείναν|τες καὶ πᾶσαν προθυμίαν παρασχό[με-]‖νοι (*I.ScM* I 8.8–10).

[101] *IG* 12.7.386 (ca. 250–200 BC). See Angelos Chaniotis, "Mobility of Persons During the Hellenistic Wars: State Control and Personal Relations," in *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'Antiquité à l'époque modern: procedures de contrôle et documents d'indentifications*, ed. Claudia Moatti (Rome: École française de Rome, 2004), 296; Austin[2] §105.

[102] καὶ παραγενομένου τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Φιλοκή-|[δ]ου εἰς Ἐρέτριαν συνηγόρησέν τε τούτωι καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν| [ἕ]να ἀπηγμένον ἐπὶ θανάτωι ἐξ<ε>ί(λ)ετο ἐκ τοῦ [δε]σμωτηρί[ου]‖ καὶ ἀνέσωισεν ἀποδεικνύμενος τὴν εὔνοιαν ἣν ἔχει πρὸς‖ τοὺς πολίτας (*AIO* 837.14–25; quote from ll. 21–25; translation from Sean Byrne and Chris de Lisle, "Rhamnous honours Dikaiarchos of Thria," Attic Inscriptions Online, last updated June 4, 2021, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IRhamn/17).

[103] *IG* II[3] 1 1137 = *IG* II[2] 844. See also the second decree (211/210 BC) on the inscription (*IG* II[3] 1 1137) for Eumaridas that specifies that the bronze statue for him be placed "in the precinct of the People and the Graces," which refers to the cult to the Graces that began in 229 when Athens was liberated from Antigonid control. Cf. *IG* II[3] 4 8. Stephen Lambert, "Decrees honouring Eumaridas of Kydonia and His Son Charmion," Attic Inscriptions Online, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII2/844, last

ransom fund and also loaned the captives travelling expenses. Later, he negotiated on behalf of the Athenians with certain Cretan cities to ensure Athenian negative rights from pillaging.[104] Around 85–80 BC, the Karian city of Alabanda praised Pyrrha[kos] because not only did he rescue enslaved citizens abroad ("some of the citizens who were enslaved in foreign lands he delivered"), but during his diplomatic trip as envoy to renew kinship and friendship with Rome he "took into consideration no danger to his own self" and completed the mission successfully.[105] Finally, sometime in the mid-1st century BC when citizens of Istros had been taken captive by barbarians and held as ransom, the benefactor Aristagoras paid their ransom and rescued them with his diplomacy with the barbarians.[106] Whether their city faced tribulations by pirates from the seas, barbarians from the hinterland, or another polity during war, benefactor envoys performed rescue operations by risking their own bodies and resources by braving dangerous weather, crossing through hostile territory, offering themselves as hostages, paying from their own funds, and otherwise persuading the captors to release the imprisoned and enslaved.

Envoys had to be prepared to risk their lives and their financial resources without knowing what setbacks might arise. As a result, cities honored them as

---

updated May 26, 2018.

[104] Philip de Souza comments that "these negotiations seem to have been aimed at reducing attacks on the Attic coast by pirates emanating from Crete. It would appear that certain cities had been allowing their citizens to take booty from Attica, and the people of Athens were making a concerted effort to prevent further occurrences." Philip de Souza, *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 67.

[105] τινὰς δὲ καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν ἐ[πὶ ξέ-]|νης δουλεύοντας ἀπέσωισεν (PH256676.10–11); παρακληθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δή[μου]|| προθύμως ὑπ[ή]κουσεν οὐθένα κίνδυνον ὑφιδόμεν[ος]| καθ᾽ αὐτόν, ἀποδημήσας τε κατώρθωσεν τὰ κατὰ τὴ[ν πρεσ-]|βείαν συμφερόντως τῆι πατρίδι (PH256676.19–22). On Pyrrha[kos], see Federico Santangelo, *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire: A Study of Roman Policies in Italy and the Greek East* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 54–55.

[106] τῆς τε πατρίδος ὀχυρωθείσης καὶ κατὰ μέρος τῶν πολειτῶν ἀ|πὸ τῆς βαρβάρου καταπορευομένων εἰς τὴν πόλιν τισὶν μὲν δεξιῶς ἀπ[αν-]|τῶν τῶν κρατούντων τῆς χώρας βαρβάρων, τισὶν δὲ τῶν πολειτῶν ἐ[ις]|| λύτρα προτιθεὶς ἔδειξεν ἑαυτὸν πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀπάντησιν τῶν σωζο[μέ-]νων εὐομείλητον, πλεῖστά τε συναλλάγματα πολείταις ἅμα κ[αὶ]| ξένοις ποιησάμενος πρὸς πάντας ἀφιλαργύρ|ὑπεστήσατο (*IScM* 1.54.12–17). On Aristagoras, see Alexandru Avram, "Wohltäter des Volkes (εὐεργέται τοῦ δήμου) in den pontischen Städten der späthellenistischen Zeit," in *Bürgesinn und Staatliche Macht in Antike und Gegenwart*, ed. Martin Dreher (Konstanz, Germany: University of Konstanz Press GmbH, 2000), 154–156. For the mid-1st century date of *I.ScM* I 54, see Petre Alexandrescu, "La fin de la Zone Sacrée d'époque grecque d'Istros," *Dacia* 51 (2007): 211–219.

benefactors and highlighted the peril the city faced and the dangers these benefactor-envoys voluntarily hazarded. All these envoys were recognized for their willingness to avoid no danger—whether dangers from travel, climate, or hostile foreign actors—and to serve their cities in perilous circumstances like oppressive indemnity, war, debt, economic hardship, or when pirates or barbarians had kidnapped some of the population. Failure was a real option for these envoys, but they were able to successfully overcome the obstacles and secure tangible benefits for their cities in times of trouble.

Ousting Garrisons

If a foreign garrison held a city under the rule of a king, a benefactor might aid the local effort to oust the occupying forces.[107] After Kallias of Sphettos had helped Athens drive out an Antigonid garrison from Athens, the countryside was still in a state of war and the Macedonian king Demetrios I still had control of a garrison at the Peiraios and was making his way to Athens from the Peloponnesos.[108] But "when Kallias learned of the danger facing the city" (τὸν κίνδυνον τὸν περὶ τὴν πόλιν) he paid and supplied a thousand soldiers that he was commanding in Andros and took them to the countryside to protect the grain harvest.[109] Kallias's commitment to helping Athens in its struggle for freedom from Antigonid control result in him being wounded. The decree for him recounts his heroic self-hazarding despite the dangers, saying, "when Demetrios arrived, and surrounded the town with his army and laid siege to it, Kallias, fighting on behalf of the People and going on the attack with the soldiers with him, despite being wounded shirked no danger whatsoever at any time for the sake of the preservation of the

[107] Aside from Kallias of Sphettos, see also Zenodotos Baukideos (PH258005; probably 303/302 BC).

[108] *IG* II^3 1 911.11–18 (270/269 BC, Athens) = *SEG* 28.60. On Kallias, see T. Leslie Sheer Jr., "Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 BC," *Hesperia Supplement* 17 (Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1978); Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, 96–97, 127–129.

[109] *IG* II^3 1 911.18–27. Translation from Sean Byrne, "Honours for Kallias of Sphettos," Attic Inscriptions Online, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII31/911, last updated July 25, 2019.

People."[110] Along with his other services to Athens, Kallias's self-hazarding conduct in the struggle against Demetrios Poliorketes garnered praise and honors from the *demos* of Athens, including a gold crown, a bronze statue in the agora, choice seating at the games, and an inscription inscribed in stone and placed next to his statue.[111]

Defending City and Country

War, invasion, attack, and the threat of force or tyranny were crises that provided the conditions for a benefactor to address with service and self-endangerment.[112] At various points in the Hellenistic period the Gauls/Galatians posed a threat to populations of certain Greek cities. Those who rose to the occasion and performed laudably in the crisis received due recognition. In the initial incursions of the Gauls/Galatians into Greece and Asia Minor in 279/278 BC, a certain Sotas resisted the Galatians who were "lawlessly wishing to attack" (παρανόμως προσπεσέσ[θ]αι βουλόμενοι).[113] As a part of the Prienian resistance effort, Sotas recruited quality citizens and people who lived in the countryside and they together risked their lives (κινδυνεύειν) "for the common safety of the *demos*" ([ὑπὲρ τ]ῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας τοῦ [δήμου]).[114] He and his soldiers were able to successfully defend the countryside and ensure the survival of many people and their property by bringing them into the city.[115] In Erythrai the *demos* honored Simos son of Apollonios and eight other *strategoi* for protecting the city,

---

[110] καὶ ἐπειδὴ παραγενόμενος Δημήτιος καὶ πε|ριστρατοπεδεύσας ἐπολιόρκει τὸ ἄστυ, ἀγωνιζόμενο|ς ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου Καλλίας καὶ ἐπεξιὼν μετὰ τῶν στρατι-||ωτῶν τῶν μεθ᾽ αὑτοῦ καὶ τραυματίας γενόμενος κίνδυ|νου οὐθένα ὑποστελλόμενος οὐδὲ ἐν ἐνὶ καιρῶι ἕνεκα| τῆς τοῦ δήμου σωτηρίας (*IG* II^3 1 911.27–32). Translation from Sean Byrne, "Honours for Kallias of Sphettos," Attic Inscriptions Online, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII31/911, last updated July 25, 2019.

[111] *IG* II^3 1 911.86–109.

[112] On various aspects of the role of benefactors in Hellenistic warfare, see Angelos Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 18–43.

[113] *OGIS* 765 = *I.Priene* 17. Quote from *OGIS* 765.7.

[114] *OGIS* 765.30–31.

[115] *OGIS* 765.19–38.

providing weapons, and giving financial aid out of their own pockets during "many fears and dangerous crises" (πο[λλῶν φό-]|βων καὶ κινδύνων περιστάντων) prompted by the Galatian invasions.[116]

Sporadic Galatian invasions still occurred in the second century BC. From 168–166 BC the Attalid king Eumenes II fought against a Galatian invasion. He commended the city of Tabai for the courageous conduct and self-endangerment of its citizen Koteies.[117] Koteies, a local Karian magnate, distinguished himself in the eyes of Eumenes II by successfully and in a timely fashion rendering military aid to the important Attalid city of Apameia-Kelainai against fast-approaching Galatian invaders. Column II of the inscription mentions how, in contrast to others who were terrified (πτοηθέντες) and fled the city, Koteies risked personal hazard, saying, "he gave himself more readily to the danger."[118] In 119 BC, the city of Lete in Macedonia honored Roman quaester Marcus Annius for replacing the command of the slain Sextus Pompeius and leading the Macedonian soldiers to victory against the Gauls/Galatians.[119] The inscription in Annius's honor stresses the formidability of the Gallic armies, noting the "huge army" in the first battle and the "even more Gallic horsemen" and "a horde even larger" in the subsequent battle.[120] Such a grave threat sets the conditions for Annius's own bravery: "he went on the attack with the soldiers he had in the encampment, and avoiding no danger or suffering (οὐθένα κίνδυνον οὐδὲ κακ[ο-]|παθίαν ὑποστειλάμενος; ll. 27–28),

---

[116] *I.Erythr.* 24.10–11.

[117] *SEG* 57.1109.

[118] ἕτεροι πτοηθέντες [ἐξ]-εχώρουν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως…ἑτοιμότερον ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ<ν> κίνδυνον ἔδωκεν (*SEG* 57.1109.Col. II.15–20). Note other terminology of danger and crisis: κίνδυνος (*SEG* 57.1109.Col. III.21) and περίστασις (*SEG* 57.1109.Col. II.22). Eumenes II also describes Koteies as displaying upright conduct with respect to the people of Apameia by showing goodwill (εὔνοια; *SEG* 57.1109.Col. I.5; Col. II.14), readiness (προθυμία; *SEG* 57.1109.Col. I.5), enthusiasm (σπουδή; *SEG* 57.1109.Col. I.9–10), word-deed congruency (*SEG* 57.1109.Col. II.10–13), and being diligent/lacking hesitation (ἄοκνος; *SEG* 57.1109.Col. I.6), dedicated (ἐκτενής; *SEG* 57.1109.Col. I.7), and constant (ἀεί; *SEG* 57.1109.Col. I.8).

[119] *Syll.*[3] 700.

[120] *Syll.*[3] 700.12, 20–23. Translation from Sherk (1984) §48.

deployed his troops and defeated the enemy in combat."[121] When others might flee out of terror or shrink back from a substantial foe, Koteies and Annius risked their lives to protect cities in crisis.

Other barbarian groups posed a threat to Greek cities near the Black Sea. When the barbarian king Saitaphernes came to the city of Olbia to demand gifts, the city lacked the funds but Protogenes, at the bequest of the *demos*, gave him 400 gold pieces to satiate him.[122] Saitaphernes came again and once again demanded favors from Olbia when the city was, like before, depleted in funds and forced to rely on Protogenes to offer a substantial gift (900 gold pieces).[123] On this occasion the king "took the presents but flew into a rage (εἰς ὀργὴν δὲ καταστάντος) . . . [and so] the people met together and [were] terrified (περίφ[οβος])."[124] Olbia's woes did not stop there. The city was largely unwalled and several barbarian tribes (Galatians, Skiroi, Thisarnatai, Scythians, and Saudaratai) "were eager to seize the fort," which caused many people fighting for the Olbian cause to desert or prepare to desert the city out of fear.[125] At this point "the people met in an assembly in deep despair" because they saw "before them the danger that lay ahead and

---

[121] *Syll.*[3] 700.26–29. Translation from Sherk (1984) §48. For his conduct, Annius received praise, leaf crown, annual equestrian games in his honor (month of Daisios), congratulations via envoys, stele in most conspicuous place in the agora (*Syll.*[3] 700.36–50).

[122] *IOSPE* I[2] 32.5–13 (*Syll.*[3] 495; late 3rd c. BC, Olbia). On the Protogenes inscription, see Cristel Müller, "Autopsy of a Crisis: Wealth, Protogenes, and the City of Olbia in c. 200 BC," in *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC*, ed. Zosia H. Archibald, John K. Davies, and Vincent Gabrielsen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 324–344; Peter Thonemann, *The Hellenistic World: Using Coins as Sources* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 33–34; Angelos Chaniotis, "*Paradoxon*, *Enargeia*, Empathy: Hellenistic Decrees and Hellenistic Oratory," in *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change*, ed. Christos Kremmydas and Kathryn Tempest (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 209–212; Angelos Chaniotis, "Emotional Language in Hellenistic Decrees and Hellenistic Histories," in *Parole in Movimento Linguaggio Politico e Lessico Storiografico nel Mondo Ellenistico: Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma, 21–23 Frebbraio 2011*, ed. Manuela Mari and John Thornton (Pisa, Italy: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2013), 340–342.

[123] *IOSPE* I[2] 32.87–90.

[124] *IOSPE* I[2] 32.A.95. Translation from Chaniotis, "*Paradoxon*, *Enargeia*, Empathy," 209–210. Note how the narrative is replete with emotions—anger, fear, hope, back to fear—and the emotional narration moves back and forth between negative and positive emotions. Chaniotis, "*Paradoxon*, *Enargeia*, Empathy," 210.

[125] *IOSPE* I[2] 32.B.1–21. Translation from Chaniotis, "*Paradoxon*, *Enargeia*, Empathy," 210.

the terrors in store."[126] Into this bleak picture of a city desperate for deliverance, the situation was reversed once again by the noble conduct of Protogenes: "when no one would volunteer (οὐδενὸς δ᾽ ἐπιδιδόντος ἑαυτὸν) for all or part of the demands of the people, he [Protogenes] promised he would himself build both the walls and would advance the whole cost of the construction."[127] In addition to his diplomatic and military services, at other moments in his career as benefactor, Protogenes alleviated debts (outright or remitted interest), bought grain and corn multiple times for the community stock during shortages and offered favorable lending terms, helped finance tribute to Saitaphernes (again), fixed numerous public buildings and structures (e.g., towers, granary, walls), financed transportation costs for stones, and managed city finances with honesty.[128] One gets the impression that the only thing Protogenes did not do was heal the sick with his touch.

During times of war benefactors sometimes rendered help to individuals in precarious conditions. In the 140s BC, Sotas son of Patrokles, who was at the time of his services simply a land magnate with no official governing position and a neighbor to the small town of Olbasa, offered hospitality by way of refuge and provisions for Olbasan citizens displaced by war.[129] The people of Olbasa honored him because he "was of great help to the citizens in the difficult circumstances (ἐν τοῖς περιστᾶσι καιροῖς) during the Pisidian war, always taking in refugees from those citizens who had been saved from the enemy and providing distributions for those who had been driven from their homes."[130]

---

[126] *IOSPE* I^2 32.B.22–27. Translation from Chaniotis, "*Paradoxon*, *Enargeia*, Empathy," 211.

[127] οὐδενὸς δ᾽ ἐπιδιδόντος ἑαυτὸν οὔτ᾽ εἰς ἅπαντα οὔτ᾽ εἴς μέρη ὧν ἠξίου ὁ δῆμος, ἐπαγγείλατο αὐτὸς κατασκευᾶν ἀμφότερα τὰ τείχη καὶ προθήσειμ πᾶσαν τὴν εἰς αὐτὰ δαπάνην (*IOSPE* I^2 32.B.27–31). Text and translation from Chaniotis, "*Paradoxon*, *Enargeia*, Empathy," 212.

[128] *IOSPE* I^2 32.

[129] *SEG* 44.1108 (138/137 BC, Olbasa, Pisidia). For translation and commentary see Peter Thonemann, "The Attalid State, 188–133 BC," in *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, ed. Peter Thonemann (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 13–14.

[130] Translation from Thonemann, "The Attalid State, 188–133 BC," 113.

The struggle for the freedom of a city or the fight against tyranny gave benefactors their repute in some cases. The city of Erythrai praised nine *strategoi* for their conduct that preserved their democratic governance (δημοκρατία) and freedom (ἐλευθερία) when it was threatened by war.[131] The inscription in their honor recounts how "shrinking from no fear or danger, they gave themselves eagerly to saying and doing what is beneficial to the city."[132] In the second century BC, the city of Araxa honored Orthagoras son of Demetrios first for his role as ἡγεμών in the war against Moagetes because he "endured every danger and every distress" (πάντα κίνδυνον καὶ πᾶσαν κακοπαθίαν ὑπομίνας).[133] During his embassy to the city of Kibyra, "looking the tyrants in the face, he lost no opportunity to oppose them and in consequence often found himself in many dangers and exposed to plots on account of his struggles on behalf of his fatherland."[134] Later he helped quell tyrannies in the Lycian cities of Xanthos and Tlos and sought Orloanda's freedom and to admit it into the Lycian League.[135]

Not uncommonly benefactors guarded fortresses and/or the countryside of a city.[136] For example, Diokles son of Leodamas, conforming to his ancestral virtues,

---

[131] *I.Erythr.* 29 (270–260 or 261–248 BC, Erythrai). Cf. *Syll*.[3] 410.

[132] [οὐδένα οὔ-]||τε φόβον οὔτε κίνδυνον ὑποστελλόμενοι, προθύμως δὲ ἑα[υ-]|τοὺς ἐπιδιδόντ<ε>ς εἰς τὸ καὶ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν τὰ τῆι πόλ[ει]| συμφέροντα (*I.Erythr.* 29.9–12).

[133] *SEG* 18.570.8–11 (180–120 BC, Araxa). Note also the almost identical phraseology to describe his role as envoy to Kibyra to report the crimes of Moagetes and the city of Boubon: "he endured every danger and distress and acted as envoy worthily of our demos and the nation who dispatched (him)" (πάντα κίνδυνον καὶ κακοπαθίαν ὑπομένων ἐπρέσβευσεν ἀξίως τοῦ τε ἡμετέρου δήμου καὶ τοῦ ἀποστείλαντος ἔθνους; *SEG* 18.570.23–25).

[134] καθόλου| τε τοῖς τυράννοις ἀντιβέπων οὐδένα καιρὸν| παραλέλοιπον, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐμ πολλοῖς κινδύνο[ις]| καὶ ἐπιβουλαῖς γέγονεν διὰ τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς πα[τρί-]|δος ἀγῶνας (*SEG* 18.570.25–29). Translation from Kweku A. Garbrah, "On the Enumerative Use of τε," *ZPE* (1993): 195.

[135] *SEG* 18.570.36–46, 55–56. On Orthagoras's activity, see Christina Kokkinia, ed., *Boubon: The Inscriptions and Archaeological Remains, A Survey 2004–2006* (Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008) 20–23.

[136] E.g., Dikaiarchos (*AIO* 837 = *SEG* 51.110 = *I.Rhamnous* 17; 235/234 BC, Rhamnous); Demainetos (*I.Eleusis* 211; 209 BC, Eleusis [Attica]); Agathokles son of Antiphilos (*I.ScM* I 15 = *SEG* 24.1095; ca. 200 BC, Istros); an unknown benefactor of Aphrodisias (*I.Aph*2007 12.701). On the guarding of the countryside, reasons the countryside needed protection, and solutions to the threats, see Angelos Chaniotis, "Policing the Hellenistic Countryside: Realities and Ideologies," in *Sécurité Collective et Ordre Public dans les Sociétés Anciennes*, ed. Cédric Brélaz and Pierre Ducrey (Geneva: Foundation Hardt,

displayed "every zeal and care for the district of the Halasarnitai" because "during the wars, he aimed at safeguarding the fort and those who inhabit the territory, showing the greatest consideration and engaging himself in every danger for its sake."[137] Moreover, a benefactor also could endure dangers to protect unwalled cities from brigands, pirates, and/or barbarians like in the cases of Apollodoros son of Pankrates and Aristagoras of Istros.[138] Finally, to address a city's lack of defensive capacities in times of imminent threat and the perils of war, a benefactor could fund the construction or maintenance of defensive structures (e.g., walls) and provide critical and urgent military leadership.[139]

Several benefactors were lauded for their conspicuously commendable personal self-hazarding conduct during times of crisis. Apollonia (Pontos) honored the admiral and *autokrator* Hegesagoras of Istros for his military services on their behalf when Mesembrians invaded the countryside of Apollonia and desecrated the temple of Apollo.[140] The language of the inscription elucidates the grave situation, saying that the Mesembrians "opened against us undeclared hostilities" and "perpetrated serious acts of sacrilege on Apollo's shrine and exposed our city to extreme risk" (εἰς τοὺς ἐσχάτους κινδύνους ἀγαγόντων τὴν πόλιν).[141] Hegesagoras stepped into this critical moment and risked his life to serve Apollonia:

> During landing operations, he put his life at risk with more boldness than ever, and in all other actions he threw himself (ἑαυτὸν διδοὺς) into the fight with no thought

---

2008), 103–145.

[137] *SEG* 48.1104. (ca. 201/200, Halasarna). Translation from Chaniotis, "Policing the Hellenistic Countryside," 128.

[138] Apollodoros son of Pankrates (*I.RCyr2020* B.1 = *SEG* 38.1869; either erected in 62/61 BC or 3/4 AD; events occurred around 90–60 BC [?]); Aristagoras (*I.ScM* I 54; ca. 50 BC, Istros); Claudius (*SEG* 51.1832 + 57.1670).

[139] E.g., Theukles of Halasarna (*Syll.*^{3} 569 ca. 201/200 BC, Halasarna; Cf. *IG* XII.4.1.75; *SEG* 54.746); Aleximachos of Taucheira (*I.GCyr* 66900 = TM 738351 = *SEG* 26.1817; 2nd–1st c. BC, Libya, Cyrenaica); Apollous son of Nikeratos and Poseidonios son of Geron (*I.ScM* II 2; ca. 100–50 BC, Tomis).

[140] *I.ScM* I 64.3–6 (200–150 BC, Istros).

[141] Translation from François Chamoux, *Hellenistic Civilization*, trans. Michel Roussel and Margaret Roussel (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002), 169.

> given to personal risk. He always met with success, and in these operations never failed to instill in his soldiers a high-spirited conduct that secured the desired result.[142]

For Hegesagoras's successful and virtuous self-hazarding services that "saved the city, its territories and harbors, with our assistance and that of our allies" and regained the territory of Anchialos for the Apollonians, the city awarded Hegesagoras praise, a gold crown awarded at Dionysia, a bronze statue of him "fully armed on a ship's ram" in the temple of Apollo the Healer, a decree inscribed on stele, and a proclamation of the honors for him (and the Istrians) at the city's games.[143]

In the Black Sea region, the Istrians honored Agathokles for his series of exploits to protect it from pillage and invasion from neighboring Thracian people groups.[144] To solve the crises he used various means. He led military forces to protect the crops in the countryside from attackers (twice) and he undertook dangerous diplomatic missions through enemy territory. Where others fled due to fear (διὰ τὸμ φόβον), Agathokles faced the danger and risked his life to protect the city.[145]

An honorific decree from Keramos is rich in crisis and danger terminology and perhaps for that reason equally rich in honorific accolades.[146] This honorific decree

---

[142] ἐν ταῖς ἀποβάσεσιν παραβολώ|τερον ἑαυτὸν διδοὺς εἰς τοὺς ἀγῶνας καὶ ἐν τοῖς|| λοιποῖς ἅπασιν φιλοκινδύνως ἀγωνιζόμενος ἐπὶ| προτερημάτων διὰ παντὸς ἐγείνετο καὶ τοὺς στρα|τιώτας ἑαυτοῦ προθύμους καὶ χρησίμους ἐν τῶ[ι]|| πολέμωι διὰ παντὸς παρείχετο (*I.ScM* I 64.23–28). Translation from Chamoux, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 169.

[143] *I.ScM* I 64. Translation from Chamoux, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 169.

[144] *I.ScM* I 15 = *SEG* 24.1095 (ca. 200 BC, Istros). For English translations, see Burstein §68 and Austin[2] §116. On Agathokles and the crisis at Istros, see Smaranda Andrews, "Greek Cities on the Western Coast of the Black Sea: Orgame, Histria, Tomis, and Kallatis (7th to 1st century BCE)," (PhD diss., Iowa State University, 2010), 80–81.

[145] For another instance of a benefactor providing military services against barbarians in the Black Sea region, see Diophantos of Sinope (*IOSPE* I[2] 352; ca. 110 BC). For a benefactor-general during the Chremonidean War, see Epichares of Ikarion (*AIO* 823; ca. 267 BC, Rhamnous).

[146] *I.Keramos* 6 = *SEG* 36.992 (probably 167–133 BC, Keramos). On this inscription see Boulay, *Arès dans la Cité*, 337–338; Gary Reger, "Sympoliteiai in Hellenistic Asia Minor," in *The Greco-Roman East: Politics, Culture, Society*, ed. Stephen Colvin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 169–170; Gary Reger, "The Relations between Rhodes and Caria from 246 to 167 BC," in, *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, ed. Vincent Gabrielsen, Per Bilde, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Lise Hannestad, and Jan Zahle (Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1999), 84–85; D. M. Lewis, "Inscriptions from Asia Minor," *The Classical Review* (1988): 124–125; Jonas Crampa, Review of *Die Inschriften von Keramos*, by Ender Varinlioğlu, *Gnomon* 60, no. 7 (1988): 603–609; E. L. Hicks,

recounts the long career of an unknown (to us) benefactor for his services to the people of Keramos in Karia. He provided useful services during several crises for the city despite personal risk and even threats on his life:

> In much earnest and ready for the guarding he showed himself in the needful times, looking askance at neither danger nor distress, beyond measure considering the good repute for the most noble things.[147]
>
> In the time of the *sympoliteia* he continued to say and do everything on behalf of what was advantageous, making the most powerful displays of his own good disposition to the whole people, and he behaved lovingly (φιλοστόργως) to the citizens who met him individually about matters about which they cared; and after these things, when the state fell into a difficult situation (ἐν δυσχερεῖ καταστάσει), he, undeterred by the quite-certain threatening of some, tried to increase his good disposition toward the people by saying and doing everything nobly and truthfully (γνησίως καὶ ἀληθινῶς).[148]
>
> A critical situation ([π]εριστάσεως) happened to befall the *demos*, and he was called by the citizens to withstand nobly what occurred, he put all his own matters second to the common advantage (τὰ ἀπαντηθέντα, πάντα δεύτερα τὰ καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν θέμενος τοῦ κοινῇ συνφέροντος), he avoided nothing related to honor and good repute (τῶν πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν διατεινόντων) to the citizens, and when the *demos* judged the alliance with the Rhodians to be critical (ἀναγκαιοτάτην εἶναι), having been chosen as envoy he gave himself eagerly (ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν προθύμως), and having applied himself with care for a long time he, with his fellow envoys, disposed the Rhodians to make the alliance, through which occurred not only to exist inviolability (*asphaleia*) for the citizens forever, but also to those who inhabit the city and the countryside.[149]

In three different crises that faced Keramos (ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καιροῖς, ἐν δυσχερεῖ καταστάσει, περίστασις), this individual rose to the occasion and preferred to endure "danger" and "distress" and credible threats to his life (κίνδυνος, κακοπαθία, ἀνάτασις) so that he could render the Keramians critical services. Fittingly in such frequent dire circumstances, the honorific decree draws attention to his honorable conduct in sundry ways, characterizing the benefactor as acting "beyond measure considering the good

---

"Ceramus (Κέραμος) and Its Inscriptions," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 11 (1890): 113–119.

[147] τ̣ῷι πλ̣<ή>θει ἐκτενῆ καὶ πρόθυμον [εἰς φυλακ]ὴν ἑαυτὸν παρεῖχε[ν ἐν τοῖς ἀν|αγκαιο]τάτοις καιροῖς οὔτε κίνδυνον οὔτε κακοπαθίαν ὑφορώμενος, περὶ πλείστου δὲ ποιούμ[εν|ος τ]ὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις δόξαν (*I.Keramos* 6.2–4).

[148] *I.Keramos* 6.4–9. Translation from Reger, "Sympoliteiai in Hellenistic Asia Minor," 169.

[149] *I.Keramos* 6.9–18.

repute for the most noble things," "lovingly," "nobly and truthfully," putting "all his own matters second to the common advantage," "avoiding nothing related to honor and good repute to the citizens," "giving himself eagerly," and "caringly." In short, this benefactor's dedication to his urgently needed services were second to none.

Sometime after 42 BC Seleukos of Rhosos and his relatives received Roman citizenship (πολιτεία) with its attendant privileges and tax exemption (ἀνεισφορία) on his property because of his self-endangering conduct as naval captain on the side of the Triumvirate during the wars following Julius Caesar's assassination.[150] The epigraphic account draws attention to the hardship, risk, and danger Seleukos underwent as well as to his endurance and commitment to risk his life for the Roman republic and its people:

> [Since Sele]ukos of Rhosos, son of Theodotos, has fought alongside us in [Italy (or ?Sicily] under our supreme command, has suf[fered] a great deal of hardship and [run] many great risks on our behalf, without shrinking from any danger in his steadfastness, [and] has displayed [complete] devotion and loyalty (πίστιν) to the Republic, has linked [his own fortu]nes to our sa[fety], and has endured every suffering on behalf of [the Re]public of the Roman people, and in our presence as well as in our absence has been of ser[vice to us].[151]

In a letter from 31 BC, Octavian promised to ensure the city of Rhosos its status of "sacred, inviolable, and autonomous," acknowledging his own willingness to guard their privileges because of Seleukos's striving in war alongside him and proven goodwill (εὔνοια) and fidelity (πίστις).[152] In 30 BC, Octavian commended Seleukos once again to

---

[150] *IGLSyria* 3.1.718 (36–30 BC).

[151] [ἐπεὶ Σέλ]ῠκος Θεοδότου Ῥωσεὺς συνεστρατεύσατο ἡμεῖν ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν| [Ἰταλίαν (*vel* Σικελίαν?) τό]ποις, ὄντων αὐτοκρατόων ἡμῶν, πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα περὶ ἡμῶν ἐκακοπά-|[θησεν ἐκιν]δύνευσέν τε, οὐδενὸς φεισάμενος τῶν πρὸς ὑπομονὴν δεινῶν,|| [καὶ πᾶσαν] προαίρεσιν πίστιν τε παρέσχετο τοῖς δημοσίοις πράγμασιν, τούς τε| [ἰδίους καιρ]οὺς τῆι ἡμετέραι σωτη[ρίαι] συνέζευξεν πᾶσάν τε βάβην περὶ τῶν| [δημοσίων π]ραγμάτων τοῦ δήμο[υ] το[ῦ] Ῥωμαίων ὑπέμεινε, παροῦσιν καὶ ἀποῦσίν| [τε ἡμεῖν χρη]στὸς ἐγένετο (*IGLSyria* 3.1.718.12–18). Text and translation from Andrea Raggi, "The Epigraphic Dossier of Seleucus of Rhosus: A Revised Edition," *ZPE* 147 (2004): 123–138, slightly modified. For the enumeration of the benefits of citizenship, see Doc. II. §3–12 in Raggi, "The Epigraphic Dossier of Seleucus of Rhosus," 123–138.

[152] καὶ ταῦτα ἤδειον διὰ Σέλευκον τὸν ναύαρχόν μου ποιήσω{ι} συνεστρ`ατ΄ευμέ-|[νον μοι π]άντα τὸν τοῦ πολέμου χρόνον καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἠριστευκότα καὶ πᾶσαν ἀπόδειξιν εὐνοίας| [τε καὶ πίσ]τεως παρεσχημένον, ὃς οὐδένα καιρὸν παραλέλοιπεν ἐντυγχάνων ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πᾶ-|[σαν εἰσφ]ερόμενος σπουδὴν καὶ προθυμίαν ὑπὲρ τῶν ὑμεῖν συμφερόντων (*IGLSyria* 3.1.718.81–84). Text and translation from Raggi, "The Epigraphic Dossier of Seleucus of Rhosus," 123–138. For evidence of Rhosos as "sacred, inviolable, and autonomous" into the second century AD, see *RPC* IV.3.6300.

Rhosos for his services in which he displayed "goodwill, loyalty (πίστις), and bravery" during times of war.[153] This inscription illustrates how times of crisis provide the opportunities for a person to demonstrate one's fidelity by means of self-endangering conduct on behalf of others. Risking one's life for others was a sure sign of credible reliability and loyalty.

Disease

When a natural disaster struck, war came, or a pandemic swept through the city, doctors became even more crucial for the health of the population. Cities frequently chose to publicly praise physicians who rendered exceptional services to their people. For instance, the doctor Diodoros son of Dioskourides, public doctor of Samos, received praise because he cared for and cured many sick, provided care equally to all when an unexpected earthquake shocked the city and harmed many people, and when the city was under siege and "many were wounded," "he considered no hardship or expense to be of greater importance than the safety of all."[154] In the early second century BC plague swept through the city of Olous (Crete) and was severely affecting the population.[155] Because of the crisis, the people of Olous persuaded a doctor from Kasos to remain in the city even though he had been called back to Kasos. The doctor "gave himself (ἐπιδόντος αὑτὸν) even more to his craft and saved those who were sick as many as he was able with his care."[156] On display in the honorific inscriptions for these doctors is commitment to

[153] [καὶ] αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγίαινον. Σέλευκος ὁ καὶ ὑμέτερος πολεί-[της καὶ ἐμ]ὸς ναύαρχος ἐμ πᾶσι τοῖς πολέμοις συνεστρατευμένος μοι καὶ π[ολλ]ὰς ἀπο-[δείξεις κ]αὶ τῆς εὐνοίας καὶ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἀνδρείας δεδωκώς, ὡς καθῆκο[ν ἦ]ν τοὺς|| [συστρατευ]σαμένους ἡμεῖν καὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἀρεστεύσαντας, κεκόσμηται φιλανθρώποις| [καὶ ἀνεισφ]ορίαι καὶ πολειτ<εί>αι. Τοῦτον οὖν ὑμεῖν συνίστημι· οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ἄνδρες καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὰς| [πατρίδας] εὔνοιαν προθυμοτέραν ποιοῦσιν· ὡς οὖν ἐμοῦ πάντα δυνατὰ ποιήσοντος ὑμεῖν ἥδει-[ον διὰ Σέ]λευκον, θαρροῦντες περὶ ὧν ἂν βούλησθε προς με ἀποστέλλετε (*IGLSyria* 3.1.718.87–93). Text and translation from Raggi, "The Epigraphic Dossier of Seleucus of Rhosus," 123–138, slightly modified.

[154] Austin[2] §145 (201–197 BC, Samos). Translation from Austin[2] §145.

[155] *IC* I 22 4C.

[156] ἐμπε|πτωκότος ἁμῖν| καιροῦ σκληροῦ καὶ| χρειᾶν πολλᾶν καὶ|| ἀναγκαιᾶν διὰ| τὰς φθορὰς τὰς| τῶν ἀνθρώπων| καὶ τὸν ἐμπεπτω|κότα λοιμὸν, ἐ-||πείσαμες αὐτὸν| ἀξιώσαντες πα|ραμεῖναι καὶ μὴ

benefit a population with their medical practice when their services were urgently needed.

Famine and Food Supply

Famine and lack of food caused stress for the populations of cities. When a crisis in the food supply struck a city, benefactor often addressed the issue by one of several means. On some occasions a benefactor provided for the population out of their own resources. So, Polykritos during his stint as *agoranomos* provided financial aid to Erythrai for the purchase of corn.[157] The longest honorific decree from the Hellenistic period to date (383 lines) catalogs the extensive decades-long career of the benefactor Moschion of Priene.[158] In one instance, Moschion and his brother's financial contributions ensured a sufficient supply of grain for the city, and thus saved it from complete disaster.[159] In Cyrenaica, Aleximachos of Tacheira helped fund the defense of the city during war and bought grain in bulk to sell at a lower price to the populace during a shortage occasioned by the wartime conditions.[160] During his time as *agoranomos* for Epidauria, Euanthes relieved the city of famine by buying grain in bulk and selling it at a lower price at a cost to himself.[161]

In perhaps the most effusive description of a benefactor who helped a city by

---

κα|ταλιπὲν ἀμὲ ἐν| τῶι ἀναγκαιοτάτω[ι]|| καιρῶι, πεισθέντο[ς]| δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ πολ[ὺ ἔ-]|τι μᾶλλον ἐπιδόν|τος αὐτὸν κατὰ| τὰν τέχναν καὶ σώ-||ζοντος τὸς ἐνο|χλουμένους ὅς ἦς| δυνατὸν κατὰ τὰν αὐτοῦ ἐπιμέλειαν (*IC* I 22 4C.6–28).

[157] *I.Erythr.* 28.19–29 (ca. 270 BC, Erythrai).

[158] *I.Priene* 108 (after 129 BC, Priene).

[159] *I.Priene* 108.68–75. Cf. Sopatros son of Eubolos (*IG* IX 2 1104; Demetrias, Magnesia, 1st c. BC or later?).

[160] *I.GCyr* 66900 = *SEG* 26.1817; cf. *Syll.*[3] 354 (ca. 300 BC, Ephesos).

[161] *IG* IV[2] 1 66.20–37 (74 BC, Epidauria). Cf. Diodoros son of Herkleidas (*IG* IV 2; 84/83 BC, Aigina, but originally from Megara). See Kent J. Rigsby, "Aegina and Megara (*IG* IV.2[2] 750)," *Classical Philology* 105, no. 3 (2010): 308–313, who explains that "the grain-purchase fund was exhausted by war requisitions, pirates had entered and overrun the territory, there was famine, but he saw to it that grain was sufficient" (308).

maintaining a sufficient food supply, the city of Thebes (Egypt) praised Kallimachos the *strategos* for his services in times of crisis. The most relevant portion is long but useful to see how the city characterizes his services in terms of danger and deliverance:

> And further, now . . . [the] severe famine caused by a crop-failure like none hitherto recorded, and when the city had been almost crushed by [need], he, having devoted himself wholeheartedly, voluntarily contributed to the salvation of each of the local inhabitants ([ἐπι]δοὺς μεγαλοψύχως ἑαυ[τ]ὸν αὐτόκλητο[ς] ἐπὶ τῆι ἑκάστου τῶν ἐντοπίων σωτηρίαι ἐσέφερε; l. 11). Having labored [as a father on behalf] of his own fatherland and his legitimate children, with the good will of the gods, in continuous abundance of [food] he maintained nearly everyone; and [he kept them] unaware of the circumstance (περιστάσεως) from which he furnished the abundance. The famine, however, continued in the present year and became even worse and . . . a failure of the flood and misery far worse than ever before reigning throughout the whole [land] and the condition of the city being wholly critical and…and all having become weak from want and virtually everyone seeking everything, but [no one] obtaining it, he, having called upon the greatest god, who then stood at his side, [Amonrasonth]er, and having nobly shouldered by himself the burden again (καὶ εὐγενῶς μόνος ὑποστὰς τὸ βάρος πάλιν; l. 19), just as a bright star and a good daimon, he shone upon [everyone]. For he dedicated his life wholly…for the inhabitants of the district of Thebes, and, having nourished and saved everyone together with the wives and children, just as from [a gale and] contending winds, he brought them into a safe harbor.[162]

This inscription to honor Kallimachos employs a stark contrast. The palpable destitution and existential danger imposed by the famine is met by a matching abundance of generosity from Kallimachos. The use of metaphors—unnecessary in the strict sense of an account of deeds and comparatively unusual in honorific decrees—likening the benefactor Kallimachos to a father providing for his children or likening his deliverance from famine to saving people from a storm on the sea enhances the prestige of the honorand.

At other times a benefactor went on a diplomatic mission to acquire shipments of food. Phaidros of Sphettos secured grain and money for Athens from Ptolemy I.[163] Furthermore, a benefactor sometimes secured the produce of the countryside by leading military forces to protect the land. Phaidros of Sphettos protected the Athenian

---

[162] *OGIS* 194.9–22 (ca. 39 BC; Thebes, Egypt). English translation from Burstein §111 (slightly modified).

[163] *IG* II^2 654.28–30.

countryside during crisis and saw to it that the crops made it to the city.[164] Likewise, when the city of Sestos was experiencing a crisis (περίστασις) because of the repeated attacks of Thracians and surrounding wars that resulted in the crops of the countryside being depleted, Menas son of Menes served his second term as gymnasiarch in exemplary manner above and beyond what was required of him in his provisions for the ephebes.[165]

Financial Trouble or Debt

Debt could be an especially crushing burden on the finances of a city. Earlier it was shown how Orthagoras helped unburden the debt of the people of Olbasa.[166] Elsewhere, the people of Istros praised Hephaistion of Kallatis because he recognized "the difficulties facing the city and remitted [the] interest" (of 400 gold pieces) that the city owed him and agreed to accept return payment for the original loan (300 gold pieces) "without interest [over] a period of two [years]."[167] Benefactors who offered favorable conditions of repayment, alleviated collective debt with their own resources, or restructured the terms of debt in a way favorable to the debtors or outright forgave the debt were found worthy of praise and honors from their cities.

Summary

When trials and tribulations came to Greek-speaking populations in the Hellenistic and early Roman eras, they provided the opportunity for local benefactors to show their quality. To respond to times of distress and crisis these benefactors offered their services and committed themselves to alleviating the troubles. As envoys they braved hazardous travel and hostile foreign powers, negotiated to bring back hostages

---

[164] *IG* II^2 654.35–36.

[165] *OGIS* 339.53–86 (133–120 BC, Sestos).

[166] *SEG* 18.570.

[167] Translation from Austin^2 §120.

(even offering themselves as hostages instead), freed prisoners, secured grain shipments from abroad during famine, acquired the friendship of Rome and patronage from its elites, obtained relief from war indemnity, and more. As military leaders they campaigned by land or by sea, protected the countryside, fought off the incursions of brigands, pirates, and barbarians, built walls, funded other defensive structures, paid for armaments, quelled tyrannies, ousted garrisons, and defeated formidable foes. As doctors they healed the sick during plagues, war, and natural disasters. As financiers they bought grain during shortages and offered it at lower prices, provided debt relief, and forgave debts. In all these times of distress, the benefactors endured threats and plots against their lives, wounds, pain, and dangers from humans and nature alike. Yet when others fled out of fear and terror, they "gave themselves" to face the danger and to serve their people in their time of need.

CHAPTER 6

ENDANGERED BENEFACTION IN 1 MACCABEES AND JOSEPHUS'S *LIFE*

1 Maccabees and the Family of Endangered Benefactors

The sons of Mattathias in 1 Maccabees exhibit characteristics of endangered benefactors. In fact, the endangered benefactor emerges as a distinct motif or thematic thread throughout the narrative of 1 Maccabees. First Maccabees portrays the sons of Mattathias as endangered benefactors who resolutely expose themselves to hazard to set Israel free from foreign dominion. The crisis that grips Israel in 1 Maccabees provides the circumstances for the services of the sons of Mattathias.

The author portrays Israel's crisis in terms of a covenant breach (ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ διαθήκης; 1 Macc 1:15). A twofold threat confronts Israel. Trouble from without emerges from the "sinful root" (ῥίζα ἁμαρτωλός) Antiochos IV Epiphanes (1 Macc 1:10). Trouble from within proceeds from "lawless sons" (υἱοὶ παράνομοι), Israelites who exhort Israel to "make a covenant with the nations surrounding us" (διαθώμεθα διαθήκην μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν κύκλῳ ἡμῶν; 1 Macc 1:11). Antiochos's temple plundering results in "shame" (αἰσχύνην; 1 Macc 1:28) and his military agent's attack on Jerusalem leads to "disgrace" (ὀνειδισμόν; 1 Macc 1:39), "contempt" (ἐξουδένωσιν; 1 Macc 1:39), and "dishonor" (ἀτιμία; 1 Macc 1:40) for Israel. By the end of the first major movement of the narrative (1 Macc 1:1–64), the forces of lawlessness have overtaken Israel. The enemy from the margin has ruptured Israel's borders and disrupted the very center of Israel, the temple. Aggressive, compelled covenantal abandonment (according to the author) provides the calamitous situation within which Judean benefactors can emerge to show their quality.

Mattathias and his sons recognize the utter shame that the situation has brought to Israel according to covenantal standards (1 Macc 2:6–14). Antiochos's officials offer Mattathias and his sons royal friendship and honor according to common Hellenistic standards (1 Macc 2:18). Such a compact would create a hierarchical reciprocal relationship in which the higher status party (Antiochos) bestows gifts and which the lower status party (Mattathias and his sons) would in turn return honor, allegiance, and obedience.[1] Mattathias understands subordination to Antiochos to entail covenant dereliction, so he situates himself and his family in opposition to the king in the name of fidelity to God's covenant, "the covenant of our ancestors" (διαθήκη πατέρων ἡμῶν; 1 Macc 2:19–22). When another Judean offers to sacrifice and subordinate himself to Antiochos, Mattathias manifests the spirit of the warrior-priest Levitical order and becomes "Phinehas redivivus" (Num 25:1–15).[2] He slays the apostate and the royal official because of his zeal for the Torah.[3] In the subsequent narrative, the Maccabean brothers emulate the pattern of their father and their ancestors by recapitulating their "ancestors' faith and zeal for the covenant."[4] Soon after the outbreak of hostilities, Mattathias makes his death-bed speech (1 Macc 2:49–51):

> Now, disdain and rebuke have become firm, and it is a time of destruction and fierce anger. (50) Now, children zealously strive after the law and give your lives for the covenant of our ancestors (δότε τὰς ψύχὰς ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ διαθήκης πατέρων ἡμῶν).

---

[1] The officials propose that the king will bestow "silver and gold and many parting gifts" (ἀργυρίᾳ καὶ χρυσίῳ καὶ ἀποστολαῖς πολλαῖς) and that Mattathias and his sons shall be "friends of the King" (ἔσῃ σὺ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ σου τῶν φίλων τοῦ βασιλέως; 1 Macc 2:18).

[2] David A. deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 279.

[3] Note the use of the term ζηλῶσαι in 1 Macc 2:24 (ἐζήλωσεν) and 26 (ἐζήλωσεν τῷ νόμῳ). The ζηλ- word-group finds expression fairly frequently in Hellenistic honorific inscriptions, with benefactors being praised for exhibiting the conduct of "an emulator"/"zealot" (ζηλωτής) or for "emulating"/"showing zeal" (ζηλῶσαι). E.g., *OGIS* 339.90 ("they became zealots/emulators of the best things"; ζηλωταὶ τῶν καλλίστων γίνωνται; 133–120 BC; cf. *I.Perge* 14.A.20–21), *ID* 1508.9–11 ("through this way many became zealots/emulators, seeing the thanksgiving of the *demos*"; διὰ τοῦ τρόπου τούτου πολλοὶ γένωνται ζηλωταὶ θεωροῦντες τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ δήμου; ca. 150 BC), *IG* XII.9 236.5–6 ("having been zealous for/emulous of the life of virtue and good repute from his prime"; τὸν ἐπ᾽ ἀρετῇ καὶ δόξῃ βίον ἐζηλωκὼς ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας; ca. 100 BC).

[4] deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 279.

> (51) And remember the deeds (τὰ ἔργα) of the ancestors, what they did in their generations, and you will receive great repute and an eternal name (δέξασθε δόξαν μεγάλην καὶ ὄνομα αἰώνιον).

His opening statement first describes the perilous situation, the second offers the programmatic moral exhortation for his sons that drives the rest the of narrative, and the third offers exemplars and motivation in the forms of rewards (for benefits rendered) to enable Mattathias's sons to fulfill his exhortation. Because the current circumstances have descended into such dire straits, the required pattern of conduct entails imitation of virtuous ancestors who faced analogous situations (especially Phinehas), and voluntarily exposing oneself to peril, even to the point of death. Mattathias's exhortation to "give your lives for the covenant of our ancestors" resembles the language of honorific inscription for endangered benefactors. Conceptually, the parallel is straightforward: a crisis arises and constitutes the current situation, and despite the hazards, the individual benefactor willingly risks his life to mitigate or relieve the crisis for the sake of others. Lexically, the portrayal of such a pattern of behavior in 1 Maccabees 2:50 matches how honorific decrees often portray endangered benefactors and their voluntary commitment with the phraseology of (ἐπι)δοῦναι plus self-reference (ἑαυτός, ψυχή, σῶμα), plus an additional explanatory clause to clarify the purpose or beneficiaries of the self-endangerment.[5]

Another relevant aspect of Mattathias's death-bed speech is his contrast between present shame and future honor (1 Macc 2:62–64). If his sons follow his instructions the future will vindicate them, and they will receive honor (δοξασθήσαθε; 1 Macc 2:64). It appears then, the author of 1 Maccabees found the model of the

---

[5] E.g., *IG* II^3 1 1147.14–16 (giving himself unhesitatingly to the common need of the city, he departed"; δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπροφ[α]σίστως εἰς τὴν κοινὴν χρείαν τῆς πόλεως ἀπ[ε]δήμησεν; 225/224 BC); *SEG* 43.41.4–6 ("giving himself unhesitatingly to the embassies and the rest of the liturgies to whatever the *demos* assigned him"; διδοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπροφασίστως εἰς τὰς πρεσβεί[α]ς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς λειτουργίας εἰς ὅσας αὐτὸν ὁ δῆμος προχειρί[ζε]ται; after 216/215 BC); *SEG* 57.1109.Col. II.18–20 ("most daringly he gave himself to the danger"; ἑτοιμότερον ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ<ν> κίνδυνον ἔδωκεν; ca. 166 BC); *OGIS* 339.19–20 ("giving himself unhesitatingly to all things advantageous to the city"; διδοὺς ἀπροφασίστως ἑαυτὸν εἰς πάντα τὰ συνφέροντα τῆι πόλει). See chapter 7 for further discussion of (ἐπι)δοῦναι + self-reference.

endangered benefactor a useful paradigm and compatible with Jewish patriarchal heroes. In this reading, the author portrays Mattathias exhorting his sons to act as Israel's endangered benefactors. If the author uses similar endangered benefactor terminology for Mattathias's sons, then the plausibility of this reading increases and opens the possibility that he develops the concept as a distinct theme in the narrative.

Judas

After the death of Mattathias, Judas is the first of his sons to take initiative in leading the military operations of the Judeans to gain freedom from the Seleukids (1 Macc 3:1). The goal of freedom is underscored in the diplomatic mission Judas sends to the Romans to secure an alliance with them "to lift the yoke from them, because they saw the kingdom of the Greeks enslaving Israel with enslavement" (1 Macc 8:18). His conduct is much like other Hellenistic benefactors who devoted themselves to aiding their cities with military means.[6] He conducts his campaign against both sources of threat to the covenant, covenant members who violate the law and foreign kings (1 Macc 3:5–7). In a series of battles, Judas defeats several Seleukid generals all the way up the ranks to Lysias (1 Macc 3:10–12 [Apollonios], 13–24 [Seron]; 4:1–25 [Gorgias], 28–35 [Lysias]). After besting Lysias, Judas and his brothers restore the temple and sacrifices, initiate the festival of lights, build walls for Jerusalem, station a garrison, and fortify Beth-zur (1 Macc 4:36–61). Then, once Judas attacks some surrounding peoples (1 Macc 5:3 [sons of Esau/Idumeans], 4–5 [sons of Baean], 6–8 [Ammonites]), a new threat from τὰ ἔθνη in Gilead and Galilee causes the Jewish populations to be in distress (ἐν θλίψει; 1 Macc 5:16) from war (1 Macc 5:9–16). Judas and Simon lead the Judean armies to victory in battle after battle and return to Jerusalem in triumph (1 Macc 5:17–54). Further, having already restored the temple, Judas and his brothers destroy altars and idols of other deities

[6] The book of 2 Maccabees also portrays Judas as an endangered benefactor. See especially 2 Macc 11:7.

(1 Macc 5:68). In a stark reversal of fortune, Antiochos IV Epiphanes is now suffering affliction (θλῖψις; 6:11) at the hands of Judas (1 Macc 6:8–16). Judas then drives out the Seleukid garrison in the Jerusalem citadel (1 Macc 6:18–27), defeats Alkimos the leader of "all the lawless and impious men from Israel" (πάντες ἄνδρες ἄνομοι καὶ ἀσεβεῖς ἐξ Ισραηλ; 1 Macc 7:5) and "all those who trouble their people" (πάντες οἱ ταράσσοντες τὸν λαὸν αὐτῶν; 1 Macc 7:22, 23–24), avoids the kidnapping plot of Nikanor (1 Macc 7:26–30), and routs and decapitates Nikanor (1 Macc 6:31–32, 39–50). In his military operations for Israel's freedom, Judas must contend with enemy within and without the covenant.

Like an honorable military general, Judas's death conforms to and exemplifies his pattern of distinguished self-endangerment to aid his distressed people conducted during his life.[7] When Demetrios I Soter sends Bacchides and Alkimos to Judah with twenty thousand infantry and two thousand cavalry (1 Macc 9:1–4), at the sight of the much larger forces, most of Judas's three-thousand-man army deserts out of fear (ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα; 1 Macc 9:6). Nevertheless, Judas and the eight hundred remaining soldiers faced the danger and rather than preserving their own lives in the present (σῴζομεν τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχὰς τὸ νῦν) to live to fight another day, they heed Judas's call to die honorably: "if our time has come near, then let us die with bravery on behalf our brothers and let us not leave, for our good repute" (1 Macc 9:10).[8] Outnumbered and outmatched, Judas and his army lose the battle and Judas is killed (1 Macc 9:11–17). Israel's eulogy for Judas illustrates the narrator's perspective on his death, "how a mighty one fell, who delivers Israel" (1 Macc 9:21; cf. 2 Sam 1:19).[9]

---

[7] Compare (see above), e.g., Polybios's description of the deaths of Hamilcar Barca (Polyb., *Hist.*, 2.1.7–8) and Hasdrubal (Polyb., *Hist.*, 11.2.1–11) as being in conformity with their virtuous lives.

[8] εἰ ἤγγικεν ὁ καιρὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀποθάνωμεν ἐν ἀνδρείᾳ χάριν τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν καὶ μὴ καταλίπωμεν αἰτίαν τῇ δόξῃ ἡμῶν.

[9] πῶς ἔπεσεν δυνατὸς σῴζων τὸν Ισραηλ, evoking Saul and Jonathan, perhaps presaging Simon as a Davidic figure.

Eleazar

Eleazar, the fourth son of Mattathias, receives one main narrative block dedicated to his heroic conduct (1 Macc 6:43–46). After the author introduces Eleazar in 1 Macc 2:5, he does not re-introduce him by name until 6:43. Nevertheless, prior to 1 Macc 6:43–46 the author signals that all of Mattathias's sons have been fighting in the resistance efforts.[10] Eleazar's narrative reads:

> Now Eleazar, called Avaran, saw that one of the animals [elephants] was equipped with royal armor. It was taller than all the others, and he supposed that the king was on it. (44) So he gave his life to save his people and to win for himself and everlasting name (καὶ ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν τοῦ σῶσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ περιποιῆσαι ἑαυτῷ ὄναμα αἰώνιον). (45) He courageously ran into the midst of the phalanx to reach it; he killed men right and left, and they parted before him on both sides. (46) He got under the elephant, stabbed it from beneath, and killed it; but it fell to the ground upon him and he died. (1 Macc 6:43–46 NRSV)

Eleazar faces the most formidable enemy army yet (1 Macc 6:30; cf. 3:39; 4:28), which includes fear-inducing, battle-aroused war elephants (1 Macc 6:30, 34–37).[11] The author thus heightens the threat to Israel and gives special attention to the formidability of the elephants.[12] So, when Eleazar perceives that the enemy king is riding upon the most formidable elephant in the enemy army, he is hazarding his own life against a hitherto unrivaled threat. He exposes himself to death to defeat the king with the purpose that he delivers his people and secures himself perpetual good repute ("perpetual name").[13] Despite his efforts, his deed to benefit his people does not end the battle or set Israel free from foreign dominion. Instead, the Judeans flee and the two armies continue the fight at

---

[10] Judas receives individual mention, but in the early narrative the other four brothers typically appear as "his brothers" (e.g., 1 Macc 3:2, 42; 4:36; 5:10, 60, 63, 65). Simon and Jonathan received a brief individual mention (Simon in 1 Macc 5:17, 20, 21; Jonathan in 5:17).

[11] For the ability of war elephants to induce fear, see, e.g., Plutarch, *Pyrrhus*, 17; Polyb., *Hist*., 5.84 (in which Indian elephants of Antiochos also terrify the African elephants of Ptolemy). For general cavalry employment, including elephants, in the Hellenistic period, see Robert E. Gaebel, *Cavalry Operations in the Ancient Greek World* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002), 230–262.

[12] According to the author's count, the Seleukid army size increases from forty thousand infantry and seven thousand cavalry units (1 Macc 3:38), to sixty thousand infantry and five thousand cavalry units (1 Macc 4:28), to now the astonishing number of one hundred thousand infantry, twenty thousand cavalry units, and thirty-two war elephants.

[13] Had Eleazar succeeded in killing the king, the battle likely would have ended in Judean favor. When Nikanor dies his army falls into disarray and loses the battle (1 Macc 7:43–44).

Jerusalem (1 Macc 6:47–54). Although Eleazar's bravery and strenuous commitment for Israel's freedom was limited in its immediate efficaciousness, the author portrays his conduct in terms of an endangered benefactor as a part of the overall effort of the benefactor-sons of Mattathias.

The language in 1 Maccabees 6:44 directly draws from Mattathias's exhortation in 1 Maccabees 2:50–51. Mattathias instructs his sons to give their lives (δότε τὰς ψυχὰς; 1 Macc 2:50), which Eleazar embraces by wholeheartedly giving himself to face the threat (ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν; 1 Macc 6:44). If his sons obey, Mattathias promises that they will receive honor and an "eternal name" (ὄναμα αἰώνιον; 1 Macc 2:51). The author notes part of Eleazar's express purpose is "to secure for himself an eternal name" (περιποιῆσαι ἑαυτῷ ὄναμα αἰώνιον; 1 Macc 6:44). The conceptual and lexical connection between Eleazar's deed and Mattathias's exhortation indicate that the author is consciously developing the endangered benefactor motif at this point in the narrative.

Jonathan

After Judas—the main protagonist from 1 Maccabees 3:1–9:22—dies, the youngest son of Mattathias, Jonathan, replaces him as "ruler and leader" (ἄρχων καὶ ἡγούμενος; 1 Macc 9:30). Jonathan has been fighting alongside his brothers since the revolt began. He remains close to Judas during hostilities while Judas leads the revolt (1 Macc 5:17, 24, 55). According to the author, the situation when Jonathan succeeds his brother is at the lowest point in Israelite history since the end of the prophetic period (1 Macc 9:27). A litany of crises plague Israel just like those that beleaguered Hellenistic cities. The author portrays the "dire affliction" (θλῖψις μεγάλη) in Israel despairingly (1 Macc 9:23–27): the traitorous Israelites (οἱ ἄνομοι, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν) scour Israel and gain support, severe famine strikes (λιμὸς μέγας), the "ungodly" (οἱ ἀσεβεῖς) rule the country, and shame befalls "the friends of Judas" (τοὺς φίλους Ἰουδου). Yet, in the ensuing narrative, Jonathan faces the perilous situation and carries out a series of

military and diplomatic ventures to secure Israel from hostile incursions (1 Macc 9:28–12:53). His actions achieve some intermittent periods of peace (e.g., 1 Macc 9:57, 73).

As seen with several of the benefactor-envoys in the honorific decrees, diplomatic missions were often depicted as posing a potential threat to the individual envoy. Indeed, treacherous treatment by foreign actors occurs several times in Judean relations with the Seleukids before Jonathan's mission in 1 Maccabees 11:23–29 (1 Macc 1:29–50; 7:10, 27, 30; cf. 13:17, 31; 16:11–17). Thus, Jonathan knows the dangers associated with his diplomatic foray, but nonetheless risks his life to secure peace with Demetrios II by meeting with the king at Ptolemais (1 Macc 11:24). The text says that in so doing, "he gave himself to danger" (ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν τῷ κινδύνῳ; 1 Macc 11:23). Like the description of Eleazar in 1 Maccabees 6:44, the author draws explicitly on endangered benefaction language. Jonathan fulfills his father's dying exhortation (δότε τὰς ψυχὰς; 1 Macc 2:50) and acts like his brother Eleazar. The benefits of his self-endangerment are evident in his meeting with Demetrios II, who treats Jonathan with honor and agrees to terms (1 Macc 11:24–29). He will remove the tribute obligation for Judea and Samaria (1 Macc 11:28, 34–35). But Demetrios and Jonathan do not maintain their reciprocal relationship for long, because Demetrios proves ungrateful for Jonathan's military assistance and reneges on their treaty by resuming hostilities (1 Macc 11:53; 12:24). Thus, the results of Jonathan's self-endangering diplomatic mission at Ptolemais only ends in momentary peace.

Simon and All the Sons of Mattathias

The author presents Simon as the culminating benefactor of the Maccabean brothers, the one that completes their collective benefacting activity. The main text that summarizes Simon and his brothers' deeds in endangered benefactor terminology comes from the honorific decree in 1 Maccabees 14:27–29, which, as scholars have recognized,

characterizes Simon in general terms drawn from Greek euergetism.[14] Gardner summarizes how the honorific decree for Simon is a Jewish adaptation of the Hellenistic civic decree form in which Simon provided services (benefactions) and receives various positions of status and power as his rewards.[15] At the beginning of the decree, it refers to all of the sons of Mattathias in endangered benefactor terminology (1 Macc 14:29):

> ἐπεὶ πολλάκις ἐγενήθησαν πόλεμοι ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ, Σιμων δὲ υἱὸς Ματταθίου ἱερεὺς τῶν υἱῶν Ιωαριβ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἔδωκαν αὐτοὺς τῷ κινδύνῳ καὶ ἀντέστησαν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις τοῦ ἔθνους αὐτῶν, ὅπως σταθῇ τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νόμος, καὶ δόξῃ μεγάλῃ ἐδόξασαν τὸ ἔθνος αὐτῶν.
>
> Since wars often occurred in the countryside, Simon son of Mattathias, priest of the sons of Joarib, and his brothers gave themselves to danger and they opposed the enemies of their nation, so that their holies [i.e., the sanctuary] and the law would stand, and with great glory glorified their nation.

Simon is the prominent figure, but the decree credits "Simon…and his brothers" for their voluntary self-hazarding services. The instigation for the decree acknowledges that both Simon and his brothers (i.e., "the house of his [Simon's] father") fought Israel's enemies and "established freedom for [Israel]" (ἔστησαν αὐτῷ ἐλευθερίαν; 1 Macc 14:26). This conception of freedom should be considered a part of the wider array of expressions of freedom in Greek cities in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods in which freedom entails the population's ability to abide by its ancestral laws and customs and be free from foreign control and arbitrary power ("lawlessness"). In the narrative of 1 Maccabees, the sons of Mattathias fight the internal and external threats to the civic rule of ancestral laws and imposition of foreign dominion and customs to replace the native customs and rituals (as construed by the Hasmonean perspective).

In addition to freedom, the benefits conferred by the sons of Mattathias include

---

[14] Frederick W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982), 80–83; deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 283–284; Gregg Gardner, "Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Civic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E.," *JBL* 126, no. 2 (2007), 332–337; Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 22–23. Josephus even calls Simon "benefactor" (εὐεργέτης; Josephus, *AJ* 13.214). Josephus reference thanks to Gardner, "Jewish Leadership," 335.

[15] Gardner, "Jewish Leadership," 337.

the temple and law (τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νόμος) being maintained as well as honor to Israel (δόξῃ μεγάλῃ; cf. 1 Macc 2:51). The brothers faithfully obey their father's exhortation and reap the reward. Mattathias says, "have zeal for the law!" (ζηλώσατε τῷ νόμῷ; 1 Macc 2:50), and the author states that they conducted themselves "so that their sanctuary and the law would stand" (ὅπως σταθῇ τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νόμος; 1 Macc 14:29). Further, Mattathias instructs his sons, "give your lives" (δότε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν; 1 Macc 2:50) for the ancestral covenant, and the author writes that "they gave their lives to danger" (ἔδωκαν αὐτοὺς τῷ κινδύνῳ; 1 Macc 14:29). Additionally, he tells them, "you will receive great repute and a perpetual name" (δέξασθε δόξαν μεγάλην καὶ ὄνομα αἰώνιον; 1 Macc 2:51), and the author confirms that "they glorified their people with great repute" (δόξῃ μεγάλῃ ἐδόξασαν τὸ ἔθος αὐτῶν; 1 Macc 14:29). But because Simon is the final living brother, he receives special attention for his benefactions. He receives the honor because of the benefits he and his family bestowed upon Israel. Therefore, it will be illuminating to briefly recount his deeds and the benefits he conferred.

In 1 Maccabees 13:1–6, Simon takes the leadership mantle from Jonathan and vows to emulate his brothers, who risked their lives for the sake of Israel, against the growing threat of Trypho. Trypho holds Jonathan captive, and he demands from Simon one hundred thousand silver talents and two of his sons (to be hostages) in exchange for Jonathan (1 Macc 13:12–16). Despite knowing that Trypho's diplomatic outreach is deceitful, Simon forwards the money and his sons (1 Macc 13:17). Thus, he forgoes his own interests and incurs personal loss for the sake of the people (1 Macc 13:17–18). Trypho, as Simon expected, acts treacherously. He reneges on the exchange and instead of sending Jonathan, he keeps him and soon after kills him (1 Macc 13:19, 23). As a result of this encounter with Trypho, Simon loses his brother, a hundred thousand silver talents, and two of his sons are now enemy hostages so that "the people" (ὁ λαός) would not think that he puts his own interests before those of the people of Judea (1 Macc 13:17).

In response to Trypho's renewed threat against Israel (1 Macc 13:31), Simon completes several benefactions, including liberating Israel from foreign control. He fortifies Judea with numerous building projects (1 Macc 13:33) and initiates diplomatic relations to provide food to the pillaged country (1 Macc 13:34). As a result of his embassy to secure friendship with Demetrios, "the yoke of the nations was lifted from Israel" (ἤρθη ὁ ζυγὸς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰσραηλ; 1 Macc 13:41) many benefits accrued for the population: the land of Judea at rest (1 Macc 14:4), fertile agricultural endeavors (1 Macc 14:8), abundant food (1 Macc 14:10), military defense (1 Macc 14:10), peace (εἰρήνη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; 1 Macc 14:11; cf. 14:8), security from external and internal enemies (1 Macc 14:12–14), care for the lowly (τοὺς ταπεινοὺς) and respect for the law (1 Macc 14:14), and a properly restored temple (1 Macc 14:15). Simon, much like Protogenes of Olbia, was a comprehensive benefactor, providing services across the board in several significant ways.

Josephus and His *Life*

In his *Life*, Josephus is at pains to portray himself as a much falsely maligned and frequently endangered benefactor.[16] His self-portrait consists of numerous incidents of heroic conduct in dangerous situations. The fact that he depicts himself in such terms is instructive because it shows how a first century Judean seems perfectly at home in speaking about himself with the language and motifs of benefaction.[17] A few examples will suffice. At the beginning of his public life when several of his "close associates" had been sent bound to Rome on overblown charges, Josephus says that he hazarded a sea

[16] The Greek text follows, Josephus, *The Life. Against Apion*, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray (LCL 186; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926). The translation of Josephus's *Life*, unless otherwise noted, comes from Steve Mason, ed. and trans., *Life of Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

[17] For the argument that Josephus's audience consists of "non-Judeans living in Rome who are fascinated by Judean culture, and interested enough in Josephus" to read his autobiographical account, see Steve Mason, *Life of Josephus*, xix–xxi, quote from xxi.

journey to affect their preservation/deliverance (σωτηρία).[18] Only after he "faced many dangers at sea" (πολλὰ κινδυνεύσας κατὰ θάλλασαν) did he reach Rome.[19] After he faced the mortal peril of shipwreck, he was able to meet the requisite people to set his priestly associates free from their bondage.[20] Later, on the eve of war, Josephus depicts himself offering salient precautionary advice to those who wished to revolt and risk the lives of their families and homelands (πατρείς) against the much more formidable military might of Rome, showing that he knows the difference between recklessness and admirable self-endangerment.[21] Elsewhere Josephus shows his virtue in military contexts.

On one occasion, Josephus, rather than taking care of his own safety, decided to endure peril for the sake of the Galileans to whom he had been entrusted as general.[22] At the instigation of John of Gischala, certain Jerusalem authorities ventured to deprive Josephus of his command in Galilee.[23] Their orders were that the delegation should send Josephus to Jerusalem alive if he submitted to their orders, but to kill him if he resisted.[24] When Josephus got wind of the plot, he first decided to abandon his command and journey to Jerusalem.[25] Despite the Galilean pleas for him to stay for fear of their vulnerability to bandits if he left, he "was concerned for [his] own safety" (σωτηρία) and determined to depart for his home city Jerusalem.[26] It was then that direct divine

---

[18] Josephus, *Life*, 14.

[19] Josephus, *Life*, 14.

[20] Josephus, *Life*, 15–16.

[21] Josephus, *Life*, 17–19.

[22] Josephus, *Life*, 202–212.

[23] Josephus, *Life*, 189–203.

[24] Josephus, *Life*, 202.

[25] Josephus, *Life*, 204–205.

[26] Josephus, *Life*, 205–207.

prompting by means of a dream convinced him to remain in Galilee.[27] So, when the Galileans again fervently supplicated him to stay, he recounts, "Listening to these things from them and seeing the despondency of the mob, I was inclined towards pity, considering it to be worthwhile to endure even the obvious danger for the sake of such a mob as this."[28] By recounting the fervent pleas of the Galileans for his aid, Josephus shows his moral character as one who is willing to disregard his own safety (σωτηρία) in order to endure a situation that will put his life at risk for the sake of others.

In Josephus's retelling, the Galileans attitude toward him is one of beneficiaries to a benefactor. He records that during his fight to remain in command, a crowd of Galileans called him "benefactor and preserver (εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ) of their country."[29] Likewise, when his opponents attempted to persuade the Galileans to abandon Josephus and defect to them, the Galileans expressed their goodwill (εὔνοια) toward their guardian (προστάτης).[30] When Josephus arrived during this event, the crowd exhibited praise and gratitude to him as is appropriate for a well-regarded benefactor.[31] Having confined those who had tried to convince the Galileans to defection, the Galileans once again proclaimed him their "benefactor and preserver" (εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ) and bore witness in defense of the virtue (ἀρετή) of their unjustly maligned benefactor.[32] This brief foray into Josephus's *Life* shows that the motif of the endangered benefactor was known to Josephus and that he found it morally praiseworthy enough to portray himself in such

---

[27] Josephus, *Life*, 208–209.

[28] Ταῦτα δὴ καὶ ἐπακούων αὐτῶν καὶ βλέπων τοῦ πλήθους τὴν κατήφειαν ἐκλάσθην πρὸς ἔλεον, ἄξιον εἶναι νομίζων ὑπὲρ τοσούτου πλήθους καὶ προδήλους κινδύνους ὑπομένειν (Josephus, *Life*, 212).

[29] Josephus, *Life*, 244. Translation my own.

[30] Josephus, *Life*, 250.

[31] Josephus, *Life*, 251–252 (προελθόντος δε μου κρότος παρὰ παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους εὐθὺς ἦν καὶ μετ᾽ εὐφημιῶν ἐπιβοήσεις χάριν ἔχειν ὁμολογούντων τῇ ἐμῇ στρατηγίᾳ; Josephus, *Life*, 251).

[32] Josephus, *Life*, 259.

terms.

Conclusion

Individual self-endangerment during a crisis for the benefit of others constitutes a cross-cultural, cross-temporal, widely geographically distributed, phenomenon in the Mediterranean world. Greek historians laud Carthaginians, Romans, and Greeks alike for their noteworthy acts of self-hazard. Greek cities across the eastern Mediterranean praised their benefactors for similar deeds of self-imperiling for the benefit of the community. Populations, individual worshippers, and scribes portrayed their gods as the agents of acts of deliverance. The book of 1 Maccabees adapts the endangered benefactor motif and uses it to give a good reputation to the Hasmonean family by highlighting the sons of Mattathias as benefactors who risked their lives for imperiled Israel and afforded it freedom. A Judean like Josephus makes use of the motif of the endangered benefactor for his own self-portrayal in his *Life*. Each event of self-endangerment has its own motivations, contingent causes, and social and historical contexts. Nevertheless, the phenomenon is commonly connected to issues of virtuous conduct, repute and prestige, community survival and maintenance, emulation, and public memory in each of the cultures in which it occurs. Gaining greater clarity of the individual events and circumstances, as well as the various cultural practices and attitudes regarding self-endangerment in the Greco-Roman world provides a context for understanding how Paul uses similar terminology, cultural scripts, and themes in his letters.

CHAPTER 7

BENEFACTION IN GALATIANS

Some previous scholarship has sought to contextualize Galatians in the context of civic benefaction, but despite some fruitful studies there is room for further exploration. Frederick Danker's work remains the most groundbreaking for the vocabulary of benefaction in the New Testament and for the motif of endangered benefaction.[1] Still, his study leaves room for a more concentrated examination of Galatians and a further exploration of different motifs of benefaction in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. Not surprisingly, scholars like James Harrison and Ferdinand Okorie find that Paul requires his auditors to show gratitude to God for God's χάρις to them, whether they call it "reciprocity" or not.[2] Yet their work also leaves room for further exploration of benefaction themes in Galatians beyond debates about reciprocity. John Barclay concludes that "priority," "incongruity," and "circularity" characterize God's Christ-gift in Galatians.[3] In other words, God initiated the gift relationship (rather than the human counterparts), God gave the Christ-gift to recipients irrespective of culturally significant standards of worth, and Paul expects the recipients of the Christ-gift

---

[1] Frederick W. Danker, "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: SBL Press, 1981), 39–48; Frederick W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982); Frederick W. Danker, *2 Corinthians*, ACNT (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989); Frederick W. Danker, "Imaged Through Beneficence," in *Reimagining the Death of the Lukan Jesus*, ed. Dennis D. Sylva (Frankfurt, Germany: Anton Hain, 1990), 57–67, 184–186.

[2] James R. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Ferdinand Okorie, "Benefaction in Galatians: An Analysis of Paul's Language of God's Favor in Its Greco-Roman Context" (PhD diss., Loyola University Chicago, 2018). See now a revised and updated version of Okorie's dissertation in Ferdinand Okorie, *Favor and Gratitude: Reading Galatians in Its Greco-Roman Context* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2021).

[3] John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015).

to conduct themselves with an appropriate response to their benefactor God. As helpful as Barclay's categories are, especially in comparative perspective within the history of a certain strain of Western Christian theological tradition, they are pre-determined high-level abstractions that leave benefaction motifs of Galatians underexamined and without proper thick evidentiary contextualization in the ancient sources.[4] Additionally, in his commentary on Galatians David deSilva interprets the text with certain benefaction scripts in mind, such as returning gratitude to a benefactor (and avoiding ingratitude), self-endangerment, and imitation of a benefactor.[5] What is lacking in these benefaction studies is a coupling of both (1) a thorough examination of ancient benefaction categories relevant to Galatians tied strongly to the ancient literary and documentary sources and (2) a focused study of Galatians itself. The previous chapters of this dissertation have sought to take a more ancient source-driven approach to benefaction cultural practices, scripts, motifs, and language. This study seeks to go beyond the simple issue of reciprocity to incorporate the larger cultural encyclopedia that accompanies the institution of civic benefaction in Greek cities. Paul makes use of several of these aspects of the cultural encyclopedia of benefaction in Galatians.

The present chapter is divided into eight sections. The first section examines Galatians in light of the previous discussions of generosity, civic freedom, and endangered benefaction. Following that, the second section draws on the notions of promise and kinship diplomacy to look at how Galatians exhibits them. Next, a brief look at Paul's rhetoric about the Antioch incident is illuminated by the themes of endangered benefaction, word-deed congruency, and imitation. After that, the term ἐπιχορηγῆσαι and

---

[4] Though it should be added that Barclay includes a discussion of civic benefaction, Seneca, and a thorough examination of divine gift-giving in several Second Temple Jewish sources to help contextualize and compare with Romans and Galatians. See Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 1–61, 189–328. A thick evidentiary description of Hellenistic benefaction and its motifs needs to include an even wider array of sources, especially epigraphical sources. This is not to fault Barclay but merely to point out the different approach to this dissertation from his own contribution.

[5] David A. deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018).

the cultural script of starting and completing help shed light on the impact Paul's language in Galatians 3:1–5 would have had on his audience. After that, Galatians is examined for how Paul uses the scripts of gratitude, ingratitude, and how the Galatians might plausibly see themselves as victims of a "gift as bait" ploy. Then, there is a brief section on benefits to the worthy and unworthy. Penultimately, aspects related to time in relation to benefaction receive attention. Finally, the chapter closes with a discussion of fidelity and imitation in Galatians.

The Generosity of God's Messiah: Civic Freedom and Endangered Benefaction

In the opening and closing of the Galatians, Paul and his associates draw attention to the χάρις—generosity or benefaction—of "(our) Lord Jesus Christ."[6] As a result, the notion of the benefaction and generosity of God's Messiah frames the entire letter. In several places in the body of the letter Paul uses χάρις or χαρίζεσθαι to describe God or Christ's beneficence or beneficial deeds. Paul expresses shock that the Galatian assemblies are turning from "the one who called" them "by the generosity (or the benefaction) of Christ" (ἐν χάριτι χριστοῦ; Gal 1:6), he describes how God appointed him and called him "through his generosity (or benefaction)" (διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ; Gal 1:15), he speaks of "the benefaction that was given to me" (τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι; Gal 2:9), he connects the generosity (or benefaction) of God to Christ's self-surrendering conduct and the event of Christ's death saying that he does not negate or invalidate "the generosity (or benefaction) of God" (τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ; Gal 2:21), he describes God's promises to Abraham as an act of benefaction (τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ θεός; Gal 3:18), and he cautions the Galatian assemblies that if they accept compelled male circumcision then Christ would cease dispensing benefits to them (χριστός ὑμᾶς

[6] χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Gal 1:3); ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί· ἀμήν (Gal 6:18).

οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει; Gal 5:2) and they would fall out of favor with him (τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε; Gal 5:4). These various occurrences of direct benefaction terminology throughout Galatians and at key points in the letter invite one to examine Galatians in relation to other aspects within the varied network of motifs and practices of civic benefaction.

Freedom and Enslavement

In Galatians, Paul uses the language of liberation from enslavement to describe the conduct and services of the Messiah. Key statements come in Galatians 1:4, 2:4, and 5:1. Paul speaks of "the freedom which we have in Christ Jesus" (τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; Gal 2:4) and how the Lord Jesus Christ "gave himself for our sins so that he would deliver us from the present age of evil" (τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ) and that "for freedom Christ liberated us" (τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν). In Galatians, then, Christ's liberative conduct is a significant motif and the language merits detailed explanation.

Chapter 3 of this dissertation examined civic freedom in Greek cities during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. In general, civic freedom (ἐλευθερία) exhibited two correlated elements. First, the negative element of freedom entailed a population's lack of external subjection, whether in the form of compulsory payments, occupying garrisons, a foreign governor, or a native or foreign-propped tyrant. Second, the positive element of civic freedom entailed to ability of the population to abide by its own ancestral customs, laws, and (often democratic) governance. Thus, a population's lack of external constraint and the positive ability to operate in a state of self-governance constituted civic freedom.

Understanding freedom in Galatians makes the most sense as analogous to civic freedom for a population in a Greek-speaking city in the Hellenistic and early

Roman periods.[7] In this reading, freedom in Galatians refers to freedom at a population level in which the population is free from subjection to external powers of force, compulsion, control and is free to conduct its affairs by its own customs and laws. This understanding of freedom makes sense of several aspects of the letter. First, the presence of plural pronouns in Galatians that qualify freedom suggests that the freedom in question is a shared freedom with which Paul and his audience operate as a group. Paul speaks of "our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus" (Gal 2:4) and how "Christ liberated us" (Gal 5:1) and "gave himself…so that he would deliver us" (Gal 1:4). Paul can include himself as participating in the same freedom as Galatians (non-Jews) because he is speaking of a shared civic sort of freedom of non-interference (negative freedom) on the one hand as well as practices and protocols of group cooperation on the other (positive freedom). Second, Paul contrasts freedom with group-level enslavement to the "false brothers" (Gal 2:4), enslavement to τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (Gal 4:8–9), and to compelled circumcision (Gal 5:1–4). Third, Paul explicates the positive aspects of freedom in terms of group standards of conduct and shared ways of getting along together (Gal 5:13–6:10). It is within this aspect of freedom, understood as analogous to civic freedom, that helps make sense of the phrase "the law of Christ" (ὁ νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ; Gal 6:2). As other cities celebrated their freedom to conduct their lives according to their

[7] English language commentaries generally do not understand freedom in Galatians as analogous to civic freedom, but Michael Wolter has made such a suggestion. Wolter asks, "Why do they [the Galatians] forfeit their freedom by submission to the law (the Torah), whereas obedience with respect to the other law (the "law of Christ") does not have this consequence?" In answering, he argues that "Paul does not locate himself in a discourse about the freedom of the individual, as such a discourse was frequently conducted in Greek philosophy, but rather that he presupposes a *political* understanding of freedom." Wolter cites Demosthenes, *Oration* 10.4 [= 4 *Philippic* 4]; 2 Macc 2:22; Plutarch, *Timoleon*, 23.2; Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 8.7. Michael Wolter, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, trans. Robert L. Brawley (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015), 363–365. See also Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 429n19. The following commentaries were consulted to see if they understood freedom in Galatians as civic freedom: Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990); J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33A (New York: Doubleday, 1997); Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010); Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011); Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013); Peter Oakes, *Galatians*, PCNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015); deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*; Craig S. Keener, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019).

ancestral constitution, customs, and laws—and they brought attention to this fact in their public inscriptions—Paul instructs the Galatian assemblies to conduct themselves according the "the law of Christ" (Gal 6:2). As a result, the notion of freedom in Galatians is best explained as a freedom analogous to civic freedom: Christ liberates the population of Christ-followers (as a group) from enslavement to various forms of forceful subjection (negative freedom) and liberates them to be able to live as a group according to shared customs and law, "the law of Christ" (positive freedom).

If freedom in Galatians is understood as analogous to civic freedom, it is no surprise that a substantial portion of the letter is dedicated to instructing the Galatians in proper conduct (esp. Gal 5:13–6:10). Paul spends time talking about negative freedom (i.e., freedom from subjection/enslavement) and positive freedom (i.e., freedom to act according to shared standards of conduct and law). These two elements of civic-style freedom are complements to each other. It would be much more surprising if Paul mentioned how Christ has liberated the Galatians from various forms of enslavement and then failed to instruct them on what exactly were their standards of conduct under their new-found freedom. Indeed, if Paul failed to provide some sort of standard of conduct or shared ways of getting along together for his Galatian audience, he would have failed to adequately address possible arguments of his rivals who promoted the Torah as the standard of conduct.[8] Thus, the civic freedom understanding of freedom in Galatians brings additional coherence to the letter as a whole communication.

Like several other expressions of ἐλευθερία in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods (see chap. 3), Paul contrasts freedom with enslavement. A brief review of the freedom-enslavement discourses will be helpful. For example, Chremonides invoked the shared memory of the Athenian-Spartan alliance against enslavement (καταδουλοῦσθαι)

[8] To understand Torah as being the collection of Judean "laws" (νόμοι) and the Judean "constitution" (πολιτεία) for getting along together as a group that God established when he liberated Israel from Egypt, see e.g., Josephus, *A.J.*, 4.194, 195, 196, 198, 292.

from the Persian-led offensive to motivate and persuade the two cities in his present to unite against a contemporary threat of enslavement to Macedonian hegemony.[9] The Achaians fought against enslavement (δουλεία) to the Spartans, the Aitolians (as constructed by Polybios) worried that when Rome defeated Philip V it would merely be a "change of masters" (μεθάρμοσις δεσποτῶν) rather than freedom, and the Roman Senate charged king Perseus with attempting to enslave Greek cities that it had freed from Macedonian control.[10] Further, to draw attention to their own generosity Augustus and Nero both framed some of their own actions in terms of freeing a population from enslavement. Augustus proclaimed that "I set the state free from the slavery (ἐκ τῆς…δουλήας [ἠλευ]θέ[ρωσα) imposed by the conspirators."[11] Nero announced that in contrast to longstanding history of foreign or mutual enslavement of Greeks to Greeks and the comparably meager generosity of other Roman commanders who gave freedom to cities, he liberated the entire province of Greece.[12] It is within this discourse of civic freedom and enslavement to foreign powers that one can situate Paul's rhetoric of freedom and enslavement in Galatians.[13]

In the opening of Galatians, Paul remarks that the Lord Jesus Christ "gave himself for our sins so that he might deliver us from the present age of evil" (τοῦ δόντος

---

[9] *IG* II^3 1 912 (265/264 BC). For English translation see BD^2 §19, Austin^2 §61, or *Attic Inscriptions Online*.

[10] Polyb., *Hist*., 11.12.3; 18.45.6; Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 10.1–2; *RDGE* 40B.27–28.

[11] *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 1.1 (AD 14). Translation from Alison E. Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 59.

[12] *IG* VII 2713.12–26 (AD 67).

[13] See also how Josephus calls God's deliverance of Israel from Egypt "freedom" (ἐλευθερία) and contrasts it with enslavement and destruction (δουλεύειν, ἀπολέσθαι; Josephus, *A.J*., 2.327, 329–330). Elsewhere, Josephus remarks that Judean "enslavement" (δουλεία) to the Romans when Pompey conquered in 63 BC was deserved because of the στάσις in Israel, which prompted God to subject the Judeans, "not worthy of freedom," to the Romans (καὶ Ῥωμαίοις ὑπέταξεν ὁ θεὸς τοὺς οὐκ ἀξίους ἐλευθερίας; Josephus, *B.J*., 5.396). On the dominant significance of freedom and enslavement in Paul's undisputed letters with respect to "justification" rhetoric, see Chris Tilling, "Paul, Evil, and Justification Debates," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016): 190–223.

ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ; Gal 1:4). The ἐξελέσθαι ἐκ construction occurs in numerous places in Greek documentary and literary sources.[14] For example, in Polybios's narration of treaty talks between parties of the Aitolian War, Amynandros, the king of Athamania, arrived at the negotiations "to attempt to deliver the Ambraciots from their dangerous situation."[15] Further, the Roman consul Gaius Valerius Laevinus felt compelled "to act as protector of the Aetolians," so "he exerted himself in every way, laboring to rescue that nation from the dangers that beset them."[16] Additionally, the city of Rhamnous praised Dikaiarchos of Thria because (among other things) "when the general Philokedes was present at Eretria he supported this man in advocating and securing the release and saving from prison (ἐξ<ε>ί(λ)ετο ἐκ τοῦ [δε]σμωτηρί[ου]) of one of the citizens who had been condemned to death."[17] In another instance, a certain Poseidonios, apparently suffering from want in prison and the prospects of death, petitions the *epimeletes* Ptolemaios, saying, "thus, I ask you, remove me from [my] needful situation" (ἀξιῶ οὖν σε, ἐξελοῦ με ἐκ τῆς ἀνάγκης).[18]

Moreover, the Greek translations of Jewish scriptures are replete with examples of the ἐξελέσθαι ἐκ construction. For example, after the affliction brought upon Israel to the Midianites the people cried out to the Lord, who in turn sends them a prophet, saying, "the Lord the God of Israel says this, "I am the one who brought you out

---

[14] For some examples of the ἐξελέσθαι ἐκ construction, see *DGE*, "ἐξαιρέω," A.II.1.II.

[15] ὅ τε βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἀθαμάνων Ἀμύνανδρος παρεγένετο σπουδάζων ἐξελέσθαι τοὺς Ἀμβρακιώτας ἐκ τῶν περιεστώτων κακῶν (Polyb., Hist., 21.29.2 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[16] ὃς παρακληθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν Δαμοτέλη καὶ νομίσας ἴδιον εἶναι τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ καθήκαιν αὑτῷ τὸ προστατῆσαι τῶν Αἰτωλῶν, πᾶσαν εἰσεφέρετο σπουδὴν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν, ἐξελέσθαι σπουδάζων τὸ ἔθνος ἐκ τῶν περιεστώτων κακῶν (Polyb., *Hist*., 21.29.12 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[17] καὶ παραγενομένου τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Φιλοκή-|[δ]ου εἰς Ἐρέτριαν συνηγόρησέν τε τούτωι καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν| [ἕ]να ἀπηγμένον ἐπὶ θανάτωι ἐξ<ε>ί(λ)ετο ἐκ τοῦ [δε]σμωτηρί[ου]| καὶ ἀνέσωισεν ἀποδεικνύμενος τὴν εὔνοιαν ἣν ἔχει πρὸς|| τοὺς πολίτας (*AIO* 837.14–25; quote from ll. 21–25; translation from Sean Byrne and Chris de Lisle, "Rhamnous honours Dikaiarchos of Thria," Attic Inscriptions Online, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IRhamn/17, last updated June 4, 2021).

[18] ἀξιῶ οὖν σε, ἐξέλου με ἐκ τῆς ἀνάγκης. δυνατὸς γὰρ εἶ καὶ ἔσει με σεσωικώς (*P.Petr*. 3.36a R.20–23 = TM 7701; 218–217 BC).

from Egypt and led you out from the house of enslavement and delivered (ἐξειλάμην) you from the hand of Egypt and from the hand of all those who were afflicting you and cast them out from your face and I gave to you their land"" (LXX Judg 6:8–9).[19] Other instances from Jewish and non-Jewish sources speak of deliverance from various threats or dangerous situations: war, siege, violence, subjection, affliction, transgression, predatory animals, enemies, foreign armies, pursuers, disasters, torrents of water, dangers, sinners, wicked people, evildoers, needful times, evil times, internal disturbances of a city, poverty, fire, fear, brigands, enslavers and enslavement, and death.[20] As a result, the ἐξελέσθαι ἐκ construction overwhelmingly occurs with the sense

[19] Τάδε λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ὑμᾶς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐξήγαγον ὑμᾶς ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας καὶ ἐξειλάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν θλιβόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς ἐκ προσώπου ὑμῶν καὶ ἔδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν. The phrase ἐξελέσθαι ἐκ χειρός + an individual, group, or state is a common phrase in the Greek translation of Jewish texts to refer to deliverance from a threat of violence, subjection, or death (e.g., LXX Gen 32:12; 37:21, 32; LXX Exod 3:8; 18:4, 8, 9, 10; LXX Deut 32:39; LXX Judges 9:17; LXX 1 Kgdms 4:8; LXX 1 Kgdms 7:3; 10:18; 12:10–11; 14:48; 17:37; 4 Kgdms 18:29–30, 34–35; LXX 2 Chron 25:15; 32:17; LXX Jer 38:11; 1 Macc 5.12).

[20] E.g., war (Ep. Jer. 13, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐκ πολέμου καὶ ληστῶν οὐκ ἐξελεῖται), siege (Polyb., Hist., 21.35.5; τοὺς Ἰσινδεῖς ἐξελόμενος ἐκ τῆς πολιορκίας; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 14.116.2, ἐκ τῆς πολιορκίας ἐξελέσθαι), violence (LXX Gen 32:12), subjection (Baruch 4:21), affliction (1 Kgdms 26:24, ἐξελεῖταί με ἐκ πάσης θλίψεως; cf. LXX Nahum 2:2; Acts 7:10), transgression (Wisd. Sol. 10:1, ἐξείλατο αὐτὸν παραπτώματος ἰδίου), predatory animals (1 Kgdms 17:37), enemies (LXX Psalms 58:2, ἐξελοῦ με ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου, ὁ θεός; 4 Kgdms 17:39, αὐτὸς ἐξελεῖται ὑμᾶς ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν; cf. LXX 1 Chron 16:35; LXX Psalms 142:9), foreign armies or kings (LXX Jer 49:11; LXX Dan 3:17), pursuers (Judith 16:2, ἐξείλατό με ἐκ χειρὸς καταδιωκόντων με), disasters (2 Macc 2:18; ἐξείλατο γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐκ μεγάλων κακῶν; Sir 29:12, αὕτη ἐξελεῖταί σε ἐκ πάσης κακώσεως), torrents of water (LXX Psalms 143:7, ἐξελοῦ με καὶ ῥῦσαί με ἐξ ὑδάτων πολλῶν, ἐκ χειρὸς υἱῶν ἀλλοτρίων), dangers (Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, 90, ὁπλίταις ἐξείλετο ἀμὲ ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων κινδύνων; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.47.1, διὰ δὲ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπινοίας ἐκ τῶν κινδύνων ἐξελόμενοι τὴν πατρίδα), sinners (LXX Psalms 36:40, βοηθήσει αὐτοῖς κύριος καὶ ῥύσεται αὐτούς, καὶ ἐξελεῖται αὐτοὺς ἐξ ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ σώσει αὐτούς), wicked people (LXX Psalms 139:2; ἐξελοῦ με, κύριε, ἐξ ἀνθρώπου πονηροῦ, ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς ἀδίκου ῥῦσαί με), evildoers (LXX Jer 15:20–21; διότι μετὰ σοῦ εἰμι τοῦ σῴζειν σε καὶ ἐξαιρεῖσθαί σε ἐκ χειρὸς πονηρῶν; cf. LXX Jer 20:13; LXX Jer 22:3), needful times (LXX Job 5:18, ἑξάκις ἐξ ἀναγκῶν σε ἐξελεῖται), evil times (Sir 51:11; ἔσωσας γάρ με ἐξ ἀπωλείας καὶ ἐξείλου με ἐκ καιροῦ πονηροῦ), internal disturbances of a city (Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 5.69.3; 5.69.3; 6.35.2; 6.83.4; 8.12.3; 8.90.3), poverty (LXX Isa 48:10, ἐξειλάμην δέ σε ἐκ καμίνου πτωχείας), fire (LXX Isa 47:14; καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξέλωνται τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἐκ φλογός; LXX Dan 3:17), fear (Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 6.6.1, ἐξελέσθαι τὸ δέος αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς διανοίας βουλόμενος), brigands (Ep. Jer. 14, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐκ πολέμου καὶ ληστῶν οὐκ ἐξελεῖται), God/gods (LXX Job 10:7; Odes 2:39; LXX Hosea 2:12; LXX Isa 43:13), enslavers and enslavement (Diod. Sic., *Bib., hist*., 34/35.23, ἐκ τῆς δουλείας ἐξελέσθαι; LXX Jer 41:13, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐξειλάμην αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας; LXX Ezek 34:27, καὶ ἐξελοῦμαι αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν καταδουλωσαμένων αὐτούς), and death (LXX Joshua 2:13, ἐξελεῖσθε τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐκ θανάτου; LXX Psalms 114:8, ἐξείλατο τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐκ θανάτου; LXX Dan 3:88; ἐξείλετο ἡμᾶς ἐξ ᾅδου καὶ ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς θανάτου). More rarely, the phrase occurs in non-dangerous situations, e.g., removing supplies from cargo boats (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 11.20.4; τὴν μὲν ἀγορὰν ἅπασαν ἐκ τῶν φορτίδων νεῶν ἐξείλετο), removing a spear from one's chest (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 15.87. 5; ἐκ τοῦ θώρακος ἐξαιρεθῇ τὸ δόρυ), unloading suits of armor from merchants (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 16.9.5; ὁ δὲ Δίων ἐξελόμενος ἐκ τῶν φορτηγῶν πανοπλίας πεντακισχιλίας), expenditures removed from the public treasury (Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 7.24.2; τὰς ἐξαιρεθείσας ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου δαπάνας). Cf. unloading merchandise from an import (GEI035.3; [ἐ]ξέληται τὰ ἐμπόρια).

of deliverance from a situation of threat, jeopardy, or force. One implication from this survey of the ἐξελέσθαι ἐκ construction is that "the present age of evil" should be considered a threat and danger from which Paul, his associates, and the Galatians find deliverance and liberation through the agency of Christ (Gal 1:4).

For Paul, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου play a role in enslaving people past and present. Paul likens his own and the Galatians' existence as akin to being enslaved prior to the Christ-event, saying, "when we were children, we were enslaved under the elements of the cosmos" (ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι; Gal 4:3). Furthermore, Paul recalls the Galatians' former enslavement to τὰ στοιχεῖα, which entails relational ignorance between them and God, to persuade them not to "return to the weak and impoverished elements to which you want to be enslaved again" (Gal 4:8–9).[21] Most plausibly, the phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Galatians 4:3 refers generally to component parts of the created cosmos and then in Galatians 4:9 Paul specifies the στοιχεῖα as the heavenly bodies, which the Galatians are serving through calendrical observances (Gal 4:10).[22] Paul's enslavement rhetoric overlaps with his arguments about intermediaries as temporary confiners or controllers. So, the Torah, "because of transgressions," was added to God's promise-based relationship with Abraham through the mediation of angels (Gal 3:19), scripture/Torah "confined" people "under sin" until ἡ πίστις (Gal 3:22, 23), acting as a παιδαγωγός until Christ (Gal 3:24), and Paul and his audience ("we") alike were like an heir waiting to become lord of all but temporarily subject to the control of intermediary agents (ἐπιτρόποι καὶ οἰκονόμοι) of a father (Gal 4:1–2). For Paul, to be enslaved to τὰ στοιχεῖα is to return to the wrong sequence of the timeline of God's plan. That is, the temporary time of subjection is over

---

[21] ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς· νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε;

[22] Emma Wasserman, *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018), 152–154.

and returning to the previous states of confinement and enslavement result in an epistemological dead end under subordinate intermediaries to the God of Israel. The way of life for the Galatians does not lie under full Torah observance (Gal 3:21) or returning to service to heavenly bodies (Gal 4:8–10).

Paul regards imposing certain Jewish customs by force on non-Jews as an affront to the shared group freedom that Jews and non-Jews enjoy together. Thus, in Galatians 5:1 he urges the Galatians, "do not submit again to a yoke of enslavement" by accepting compelled circumcision. Dionysios of Halikarnassos, commenting on the swapping back and forth of a "yoke" (ζυγόν) of subjection between the Romans and the Samnites, remarks that the "yoke" "is a sign of those coming under hands" (of control).[23] Moreover, male circumcision itself had a strongly negative stigma attached to it among Greek and Roman cultures as seen not only in literature but in iconography.[24] Earlier in the letter he contrasts how Titus, a Greek, "was not compelled to be circumcised" (ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι) in Jerusalem (Gal 2:3) with the enslavement-intentioned actions of infiltration and espionage of the "false brothers" (Gal 2:4; διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν). Several phrases in Galatians reveal the aggressive strategies of compulsion by the group trying to forcibly impose circumcision on Galatians: "they are forcing you to be circumcised" (Gal 6:12; οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι), "they seek you not nobly but they want to exclude you so that you would seek them" (Gal 4:17; ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλ' ἐκκλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε), "just like back then the one born according to flesh

---

[23] τοῦτο δὲ σημεῖον τῶν ὑπὸ χεῖρας ἐλθόντων ἐστί (Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 16.1.4).

[24] Isaac T. Soon, "The Bestial Glans: Gentile Christ Followers and the Monstruous Nudity of Ancient Circumcision," *JJMJS* 8 (2021): 116–130. Soon summarizes, that "from a non-Jewish perspective, the visual correspondence with circumcised centaurs infused circumcision with hypersexual and bestial qualities." Further, "circumcision connoted the subhuman, the hybrid, the uncivilized, and the deformed. It is from this Graeco-Roman default that scholars should understand the relationship between Paul's non-Jewish audience and circumcision." Soon, "The Bestial Glans," 130.

persecuted the one (born) according to spirit so also now" (Gal 4:29; ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθεὶς ἐδίωκεν τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτως καὶ νῦν). Thus, Paul uses a series of terms to describe the deceptive and coercive conduct of the influencers and the duress they are causing for the Galatian assemblies: they spy (κατασκοπῆσαι; Gal 2:4), attempt to enslave (καταδουλῶσαι, ζυγόν δουλείας; contra ἐλευθερία, ἐλυεθερῶσαι; Gal 2:4; 5:1), coerce (ἀναγκάσαι; Gal 6:12; cf. 2:3), exclude (ἐκκλεῖσαι; Gal 4:17), and persecute/pursue (διώκειν; Gal 4:29).

Paul's language about the group compelling circumcision relates to other parts of his letter. The charge that the circumcision-enforcers "exclude" (Gal 4:17; ἐκκλεῖσαι) resonates with Paul's characterization of Kephas and others' sudden reversal of conduct to exclude non-Jews from table fellowship in the incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11–14). Likewise, the charge that they "persecute"/"pursue" (Gal 4:29; διώκειν) recalls Paul's description of his own violent conduct as a participant in *Ioudaïsmos* (Gal 1:13; διώκειν). The term ἰουδαϊσμός here does not refer to "Judaism" broadly speaking but a specific Hasmonean-like social vision and its implementation as exemplified in the pattern of conduct of Judas, son of Mattathias, and his brothers that uses coercion and force to fight for a particular vision of Judean/Jewish social order.[25] Thus, Paul is associating the

[25] On ἰουδαϊσμός as the legitimate social order as conceived and implemented by Judas and the Hasmonean dynasty as opposed to their Jewish rivals' vision for social order (ἑλληνισμός), see Sylvie Honigman, *Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochos IV* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2014), 119–146. Honigman highlights how ἰουδαϊσμός refers to a comprehensive social-political order with respect to law(s), the temple, the territory, political structure, and practices of piety (e.g., diet, idolatry and iconoclasm, war, and punishment of violators). See Honigman, *Tales of High Priests and Taxes*, 141–142. The term ἰουδαϊσμός originates with the pro-Hasmonean 2 Maccabees where it occurs in 2 Macc 2:21; 8:1; 14:38. In 2 Macc 2:19–23, the author summarizes the narrative as the story of Judas and his brothers re-dedicating the temple, waging war against Antiochos IV Epiphanes for ἰουδαϊσμός, pursuing/persecuting (διώκειν) "the barbarians," and liberating the city to abide by its own laws. The beginning of the main section about Judas and his campaigns (2 Macc 8:1–7) describes how Judas and those with him "summoned their kinsmen and those who were remaining in the ἰουδαϊσμός" (προσεκαλοῦντο τοὺς συγγενεῖς καὶ τοὺς μεμενηκότας ἐν τῷ Ιουδαϊσμῷ; 2 Macc 8:1) and then proceeded to wage war, with Israel's God, against the nations (τὰ ἔθνη; 2 Macc 8:5). In the final instance of ἰουδαϊσμός in 2 Maccabees, Razis is described as a supporter of ἰουδαϊσμός in the manner of an endangered benefactor, because he "hazarded his life and soul on behalf of ἰουδαϊσμός with all eagerness" (καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ιουδαϊσμοῦ παραβεβλημένος μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενίας; 2 Macc 4:38). Paul's rhetoric of violence and coercion in Galatians 1:13–14 (διώκειν, πορθεῖν, ζηλωτής) that characterizes his commitment to an ἀναστροφή in ἰουδαϊσμός supports the idea that ἰουδαϊσμός in Galatians 1:13–14 is not "Judaism" in general but a specific view (among many) of legitimate social order for Judeans/Jews, especially as it relates to the nations and Torah observance. Like

circumcision-enforcers with Kephas's lapse and with his own former violent pattern of conduct as an enforcer of a specific social vision for Judeans that Paul now regards as false.

When linked together these forces of confinement, compulsion, violence, and enslavement—the present age of evil (Gal 1:4), sin (Gal 3:21), τὰ στοιχεῖα (Gal 4:2, 8–10; cf. 3:21; 4:21), human attempts to exclude non-Jews from fellowship (Gal 2:11–14; 4:17) and to compel circumcision for non-Jews (Gal 2:3; 5:1–3)—form network of power that subjugates humanity and that disrupts social cooperation and flourishing. This network forms a complex of coercion from which the Galatian assemblies need deliverance and liberation. It is from this network of interrelated coercive and enslaving forces that situates the Galatians in a dire situation that a benefactor can address through services of liberation.

Endangered Benefaction

In chapter 5 and chapter 6 this study examined the motif of endangered benefaction by looking at epigraphical documents and a selection of literary sources. The domains of endangered benefaction, following Danker's interrelated twofold division, are divided into two basic categories: (1) a population (or person) under duress receiving relief from a benefactor and (2) a benefactor endangering himself or herself to accomplish a service for a group or individual. Both (1) and (2) can occur simultaneously in the same event, that is, a benefactor risks their life to provide a service that rescues the population or individual who is facing a hazard or mortal peril. As envoys, individual

---

Judas and the Hasmonean ἰουδαϊσμός, Paul's ἰουδαϊσμός entailed coercion and force against non-compliant people (whether against Jews/Judeans or Gentiles). Similarly, Novenson understands Ἰουδαϊσμός as "what Paul calls own exceptional activist program for the defense and promotion" of his "ancestral traditions" (Gal 1:14). See Matthew A. Novenson, "Did Paul Abandon either Judaism or Monotheism?," in *The New Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 242. For another view on how ἰουδαϊσμός does not refer to "Judaism" in general, see Carlos Gil Arbiol, "*Ioudaismos* and *ioudaizō* in Paul and the Galatian Controversy: An Examination of Supposed Positions," *JSNT* 44, no. 2 (2021): 218–239.

benefactors risked the dangers of travel (elements/weather, transportation, brigandage, hostile territory, cost, uncertainties), secured favorable political relationships, halted raids and thieves, rescued citizens imprisoned or enslaved abroad, and secured freedom or release from burdensome indemnities. In times of war, benefactors risked their lived and endured wounds in their effects to oust foreign garrisons, protect the countryside, arm the soldiery, help nearby cities fend off common foes, satiate local dynasts with gifts and tribute, save individuals from harm with hospitality, quell tyrannies, guard fortresses, fund defensive structures, protect unwalled cities from attacks, and conduct themselves with conspicuous bravery in the face of danger. As doctors, they hazarded the danger and served populations during natural disasters, war, or pandemics to care for the wounded and infirm. During famines and shortages, benefactors secured adequate grain for the city, often selling it at a lower than market rate. As financiers, benefactors relieved or forgave debt and took public costs upon themselves. For their services, benefactors received due public recognition and gratitude. Furthermore, chapter 6 found that Jews/Judeans had no problem incorporating the endangered benefactor motif into their literary sources. So, the author of 1 Maccabees portrays the sons of Mattathias as benefactors who, in various times and ways, risked their own lives to enact freedom for the Judean population from Seleukid control. Likewise, Josephus depicts himself as an endangered benefactor who risks his life to benefit his friends and the Judean population. The present section focuses on how Paul's portrayal of Christ fits within the broader corpus of instances of endangered benefaction.

Immediately, based on the previous section on freedom, one can classify Christ's conduct in terms of a polity's liberation from the oppressive, enslaving external forces upon a population. Thus, Christ frees his followers from the network of coercive, enslaving powers that subjugate humanity: "for freedom Christ liberated us" (τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν; Gal 5:1; cf. 1:4; 2:4). In addition, Paul remarks on the liberating conduct of Christ, saying he "gave himself for our sins, so that he might

deliver us from the present age of evil" (τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ; Gal 1:4).[26] Normal usage of the phrase δοῦναι ἑαυτόν has a sense that conveys voluntary commitment to something or someone.[27] Someone may commit themselves to a course of action or a task, for example, what is advantageous, reading, a matter, a peaceful life, the tenets of philosophy, cooperation, personal enmity, war, to deliver someone from distress, strong drink or drunkenness, demagoguery, the administration of justice, embassies, pleasures, or any number of other activities.[28] The phrase can be used to describe commitment to a person,

---

[26] A difficult textual decision between ὑπέρ and περί occurs in Galatians 1:4. The difficulty in choosing a preferred original (or earliest attainable) reading is reflected in the different choices of NA28, which favors ὑπέρ, and the *THGNT*, which favors περί. Manuscript support for both readings is strong, with περί supported by P46, א*, A, D, F, G, K, L, P, Ψ, 104, 1739, 1881, and the Byzantine text and ὑπέρ supported by P51, 01[r], B, H, 0278, 6, 33, 81, 326, 365, 630, 1175, 1241, 1505, 2464. The divergence of readings in all probability occurred due to the shared περ sequence in υπερ and περι as well as the overlapping semantic domains of both prepositions with respect to the phrase δοῦναι ἑαυτόν + preposition + τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. As such, either reading could explain the rise of the other due to a simple error in the copying process, whether visual, auditory, or memory related. Nevertheless, with both readings the sense of the preposition is similar, conveying that "our sins" are the reason for Christ "giving himself."

[27] The similar construction ἐπιδοῦναι ἑαυτόν may bring out the voluntary aspect of the action even more than the bare δοῦναι ἑαυτόν, but the phrases could possibly be considered interchangeable. E.g., Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 30.7.2–3; 34/35.38.1 (ἑτοίμως δ᾽ ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὰς τοιαύτας λειτουργίας ἐπιδιδοὺς); 34/35.38; Plutarch, *Cicero*, 5.2 (ἐπέδωκεν εἰς τὸ συνηγορεῖν ἑαυτὸν); Plutarch, *Compison of Demosthenes and Cicero*, 4.2 (ἑαυτὸν ἐπέδωκεν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην πολιτείαν); Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 6.263c (ἐπιδοῦναι ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὴν τῶν συνετωτέρων ὑπηρεσίαν); *IG* II^2 483.17–18 (ἐπιδέδω[κε]ν ἑαυτὸν δηνοσιεύειν [read: δημοσιεύειν]; 304–303 BC); *SEG* 36.992.15 ([αἱρε]θεὶς πρεσβευτὴς ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν προθύμως; probably 167–133 BC); *UPZ* I 62.8–9 (εἰς πᾶν τό σοι χρήσιμον ἐμαυτὸν ἐπιδιδόναι; ca. 160 BC); *SEG* 18.343.3–4 (εἰς μὲν τὰς νεωκορείας ἑκοῦσα ἑαυτὴν πάσας ἐπέδωκεν; 1 c. BC–1 c. AD); *I.ScM* 54.28–29 (ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν; ca. 50 BC).

[28] Voluntarily commit oneself to a course of action or a task: matters (τίς δ᾽ ὁ τῇ πόλει λέγων καὶ γράφων καὶ πράττων καὶ ἁπλῶς ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὰ πράγματ᾽ ἀφειδῶς δούς; Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, 89), what everyone regards to be advantageous (εἰς τὰ πᾶσι δοκοῦντα συμφέρειν ἑαυτὸν δοὺς), an arrangement/duty (τίς ἔστιν ὅστις εἰς ταύτην τὴν τάξιν ἑαυτὸν γνησίως ὑμῖν ἐθελήσει δοῦναι; Demosthenes, *Letters*, 3.32), to work together with certain people (ἐπολιτεύοντο γὰρ οὐχὶ τοῖς πονηροτάτοις καὶ συκοφάνταις συνεργεῖν διδόντες ἑαυτούς; Demosthenes, 1 *Against Aristogeiton*, 97), to deliver one's people (ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν τοῦ σῶσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; 1 Macc 6:44), merriment and celebration (δόντας ἑαυτοὺς τὸ παρὸν τῆς συμποσίας ἐπὶ πολὺ γεραιροένους εἰς εὐφροσύνην καταθέσθαι), reading (ὁ πάππος μου Ἰησοῦς ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἑαυτὸν δοὺς εἵς τε τὴν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων ἀνάγνωσι; Sir, Intro 7), a meeting with envoys (δοὺς αὐτὸν εἰς ἔντευξιν; Polyb., *Hist*., 3.15.4); (παραβόλως διδοὺς αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς κινδύνους), negotiations and treaty (ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Νικαγόρας εἰς τὰς διαποστολὰς καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν πίστεων συνθήκας; Polyb., *Hist*., 5.37.3), extraordinary danger in battle (κινδυνεύειν αὐτοί τινες ἑκουσίως καὶ κατὰ προαίρεσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τοῦτο διδόασι; Polyb., *Hist*., 6.39.4), a matter (οὕτως ἔφη δώσειν ὁ Βῶλις αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν χρείαν καὶ συμμίξειν τῷ Καμβύλῳ; Polyb., *Hist*., 8.16.11), dangers (λοιπὸν ἤδη σπανίως αὐτὸν ἐδίδου κατὰ τοὺς ὕστερον καιροὺς εἰς τοὺς κατ᾽ ἰδίαν κινδύνους; Polyb., *Hist*., 10.3.7), matters (ἐπὶ πράξεις αὐτὸν ἔδωκε; Polyb., *Hist*., 10.6.10), things open to view (δοὺς αὐτὸν τὰ μὲν κοινὰ καὶ προφαινόμενα πᾶσι; Polyb., *Hist*., 10.6.11), mistrust/disbelief and contempt (διόπερ οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐκὼν εἰς πρόδηλον ἀπιστίαν καὶ καταφρόνησιν ἔδωκεν αὐτόν; Polyb., *Hist*., 31.22.10), *paideia* (Ἰαμβοῦλος ἦν ἐκ παίδων παιδείαν ἐζηλωκώς, μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς τελευτὴν ὄντος ἐμπόρου καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 2.55.2), strong drink or drunkenness (φιλοτιμότερον τῇ μέθῃ δοὺς

group, or thing.[29] Additionally, one can use the phrase to show how someone commits to enter a specific place or location, for example, the midst of enemies, solitary areas, rugged places, a town, or a theater.[30] Sometimes the phrase is used with an accusative

---

ἑαυτόν; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 15.74.2), peaceful life (δοὺς ἑαυτὸν εἰς βίον εἰρηνικὸν; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 16.5.4), "comfortable living" (δοὺς δ᾽ ἑαυτὸν εἰς τρυγὴν; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 17.108.4; translation from [Welles, LCL]), brigandage and raiding (δόντες δ᾽ ἑαυτοὺς εἰς ληστείας καὶ καταδρομὰς πολλὴν τῆς πολεμίας χώραν κατέφθειραν; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.47.2), being sacrificed (ἄλλοι δ᾽ ἐν διαβολαῖς ὄντες ἑκουσίως ἑαυτοὺς ἔδοσαν, οὐκ ἐλάττους ὄντες τριακοσίων; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 20.14.5), demagoguery and obsequiousness to the masses (ἔτι δὲ αὐτὸν ὁρῶν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐξανόμενον καὶ δοὺς εἰς δημοκοπίαν καὶ πλήθους ἀρέσκειαν; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 25.8), philosophy (ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ λόγους; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 31.26.5), the administration of justice (ὁ Πομπήιος δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν δικαιοδοσίαν; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 38/39.20.1), sleep (ἔδωκεν αὑτὸν ὕπνῳ; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 1.39.2), joining a crowd (ὅτι καταλιποῦσα τὴν μετὰ μητρὸς οἰκουρίαν παρθένος ἐπίγαμος εἰς ὄχλον αὐτὴν ἔδωκεν ἀγνῶτα; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 3.21.2), knit picks and nonsense (εἰς τοσαύτην σκευωρίαν καὶ φλυαρίαν ὁ τηλικοῦτος ἀνὴρ ἑαυτὸν διδούς; Dion. Hal., *Comp.*, 25 [line 193]), everything to do with cooperation (ἑαυτοὺς εἰς ἅπαντα προθύμους ἐδώκατε; Josephus, *A.J*., 5.94), waging war (δίδωσιν ἑαυτὸν στρατεύειν ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς; Josephus, *A.J*., 6.271), an alliance (ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν εἰς συμμαχίαν; Plutarch, *Timoleon*, 13.3), the political candidacy (δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς στρατείας εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ δήμου πράξιν, ἐπὶ στρατηγίαν πολιτικὴν; Plutarch, *Sulla*, 5.1), rest (ἄρτι Λουκούλλου πρὸς ἀνάπαυσιν ἐκ μακρᾶς ἀγρυπνίας καὶ πόνων τοσούτων δεδωκότος ἑαυτόν; Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 16.4), personal enmity (δεδωκότος ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἔχθραν ἀφειδῶς; Plutarch, *Tiberius Gracchus*, 13.3); pleasure and exertion (ἐκεῖνος δὲ τὰ μὲν ἡδονῇ διδοὺς ἁπλῶς ἑαυτόν, τὰ δὲ σπουδῇ; Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 19.6), drinking and drunkenness (ταχὺ μὲν εἰς τὸ πίνειν καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι διδοὺς ἑαυτόν; Plutarch, *Antony*, 51.1), an experiment (καὶ τοῦ παιδαρίου διδόντος ἑαυτὸν πρὸς τὴν πεῖραν; Plutarch, *Alexander*, 35.4); affairs (ἑαυτὸν οἰόμενος διδόναι τοῖς πράγμασιν; Plutarch, *Galba*, 29.3), pleasures (τῷ γὰρ ὄντι πλησίστιος μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς ὁ ἀκόλαστος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν φέρεται καὶ δίδωσιν ἑαυτὸν καὶ συγκατευθύνει; Plutarch, *Moralia* [*On Moral Virtue*] 446B), the common need of the city (δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπροφ[α]σίστως εἰς τὴν κοινὴν χρείαν τῆς πόλεως; *IG* II^3 1 1147.14–15), embassies and other liturgies (διδοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπροφασίστως εἰς τὰς πρεσβεί[α]ς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς λειτουργίας εἰς ὅσας αὐτὸν ὁ δῆμος προχειρί[ζε]ται; *SEG* 43.41.4–6), everything that is advantageous to the city (διδοὺς ἀπροφασίστως ἑαυτὸν εἰς πάντα τὰ συνφέροντα τῆι πόλει; *OGIS* 339.19–20).

[29] Voluntarily commit oneself to another person or group of people or a thing: to Akarnanians (οἱ δ᾽ Ἀμφίλοχοι γενομένου τούτου διδόασιν ἑαυτοὺς Ἀκαρνᾶσι; Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 2.68.7), to a certain Tyrranos (ἐγκύμων οὖσα δίδωσιν ἑαυτὴν Τυρρηνῷ τινι; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 1.70.2); "to the Lord and to us" (ἀλλ᾽ ἑαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ; 2 Cor 8:5); to a husband (δίδωσιν ἑαυτὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἑαυτῆς τὴν οὐσίαν; recipient is implied; Achilles Tatius, *The Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*, 5.11.6); to a storm (δοὺς δὲ ἑαυτὸν ὅλως τῷ τοῦ δρόμου πνεύματι, τῆς τύχης ἦν; Achilles Tatius, *The Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*, 1.12.5), to Cicero and the others who hated Antony (ἐπεὶ μέντοι Κικέρωνι δοὺς ἑαυτόν ὁ νεανίας καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅσοι τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἐμίσουν; Plutarch, *Antony*, 16.3).

[30] Voluntarily commit oneself to a location: the midst of the enemies (εἰς μέσους δὲ τοὺς πολεμίους ἑαυτὸν δεδωκώς; Polyb., *Hist*., 1.56.9), an implied location (Αἰωλοὶ τολμῆσαι τὸν Φίλιππον οὕτω προχείρως αὐτὸν δοῦναι διὰ τὰς ὀχυρότητας τῶν τόπων; Polyb., *Hist*., 5.7.2), such a dangerous place (εἰς τόπους αὐτὸν δεδωκέναι παραβόλους καὶ τοιούτους; Polyb., *Hist*., 5.14.9), solitary places (διδοὺς δ᾽ ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὰς ἐρημίας ἠλᾶτο μόνος; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 5.59.4; καὶ τέλος εἰς τὰς ἐρημίας αὐτὸν διδοὺς; Josephus, *A.J*., 15.244), rugged places (τῶν δὲ Θηβαίων ὡς διακόσιοι προχειρότερον εἰς τόπους τραχεῖς ἑαυτοὺς δόντες ἀνῃρέθησαν; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 14.81.2), a theater (παρεκάλουν μὴ δοῦναι ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον; Acts 19:31), a certain town (εἰς κώμην τινὰ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων οὐκ ἄπωθεν αὐτοὺς ἔδωκαν; Josephus, *A.J*., 7.225), the middle of the Greek soldiers-at-arms (δοὺς ἑαυτὸν εἰς μέσα τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὅπλα; Plutarch, *Agesilaus*, 39.4). Note also Polybios's unique translational phrase δοῦναι ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων πίστιν or the like for the Latin phrase *deditio in fidem*, which denotes total submission to Rome: Polyb., *Hist*., 2.11.5 (αὐτοί τε σφᾶς ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἔδωκαν παρακληθέντες εἰς τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων πίστιν); Polyb., *Hist*., 2.12.3 (καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς δεδωκόσιν ἑαυτοῖς εἰς τὴν πίστιν); Polyb., *Hist*., 2.12.3 (καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς δεδωκόσιν ἑαυτοῖς εἰς τὴν πίστιν); Polyb., *Hist*., 10.34.6 (αὐτὸς δὲ παραγεγονέναι διδοὺς οὐ μόνον αὑτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς φίλους καὶ συγγενεῖς εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων πίστιν); Polyb., *Hist*., 20.9.11

complement to convey that someone is committing themselves to being something, for example, responsible, an example, ransom, or friends.[31] Occasionally, a reason is given for why someone "gives themselves," for example, for good repute and honor, for what is advantageous to the population, for another person or group.[32] Further, the phrase δοῦναι ἑαυτόν occurs often to describe how someone commits themselves to a dangerous situation or to personal risk.[33] Thus, Hannibal "gave himself recklessly to the dangers,"

(δόντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων πίστιν); Polyb., *Hist*., 20.10.7 (δεδωκότες ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὴν πίστιν); Polyb., *Hist*., 21.36.2 (διδόντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν πίστιν); Polyb., *Hist*., 27.2.6 (διδόντας αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν πίστιν κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἑκάστους). Cf. "into the guardianship of Rome" (καὶ δόντων ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὴν ἐπιτροὴν; Polyb., *Hist*., 2.11.5; 36.4.2).

[31] "Giving oneself" as something: as responsible (δίδωσιν ἑαυτὸν ὑπεύθυνον τοῖς πεισθεῖσι, τῇ τύχῃ, τῷ καιρῷ, τῷ βουλομένῳ; Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, 189; διδοὺς ἑαυτὸν ὑπεύθυνον τῷ πάντα βασανίζοντι φθόνῳ καὶ χρόνῳ; Dion. Hal., *Comp.*, 25 [line 200]), as an example (ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς τύπον δῶμεν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς; 2 Thess 3:9), as ransom (ἄνθρωπος χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων; Titus 2:14), as trustworthy friends (ἑαυτοὺς δίδομέν σοι φίλους πιστούς; Chariton, *Callirhoe*, 7.2.4), as "underhand"/subject (ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ὑποχείριον τῷ Γναίῳ; Plutarch, *Aemilius Paullus*, 26.7; ὑποχείριον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀσφαλῶς; Plutarch, *Sulla*, 10.1); as an appendage (προσθήκην ἑαυτὸν Ὀκταβίῳ δέδωκε; Plutarch, *Brutus*, 29.10).

[32] For good repute and honor (ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὲρ εὐδοξίας καὶ τιμῆς ἤθελον τοῖς δεινοῖς αὑτοὺς διδόναι, ὀρθῶς καὶ καλῶς βουλευόμενοι; Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, 97), good repute (εὐχερῶς ἑαυτοὺς ἐδίδοσαν ὡς μεγάλης τινὸς κοινωνήσοντες εὐκλείας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσομένης τῷ βασιλεῖ συναναστροφῆς; 3 Macc 2:31), for what is advantageous to the public (ἡλικίας πολεμικῶν ἀγώνων ἀπολυόμενος εἰς κίνδυνον ἑκούσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινῇ συμφέροντος; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 11.27.2), "for you" instead of "you for him" (ὅστις οὐχ ὑμᾶς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν δέδωκε; Cassius Dio, *Rom. Hist*., 64.13.3), for the city (θέλοντας αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως διδόναι; Achilles Tatius, *The Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*, 4.13.4).

[33] Voluntarily commit oneself to a dangerous or risky circumstance: to danger (ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν τῷ κινδύνῳ; 1 Macc 11:23), the midst of the enemies (εἰς μέσους δὲ τοὺς πολεμίους ἑαυτὸν δεδωκώς; Polyb., *Hist*., 1.56.9), dangers (παραβόλως διδοὺς αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς κινδύνους; Polyb., *Hist*., 3.17.9), into the hands of a foreign potentate (τολμηρῶς δοὺς αὐτὸν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας; Polyb., *Hist*., 4.29.2; δόντων ἑαυτοὺς εἰς χεῖρας; Polyb., *Hist*., 23.13.2), such a dangerous place (εἰς τόπους αὐτὸν δεδωκέναι παραβόλους καὶ τοιούτους; Polyb., *Hist*., 5.14.9), extraordinary danger in battle (κινδυνεύειν αὐτοί τινες ἑκουσίως καὶ κατὰ προαίρεσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τοῦτο διδόασι; Polyb., *Hist*., 6.39.4), dangers (λοιπὸν ἤδη σπανίως αὐτὸν ἐδίδου κατὰ τοὺς ὕστερον καιροὺς εἰς τοὺς κατ᾽ ἰδίαν κινδύνους; Polyb., *Hist*., 10.3.7), danger (ὁ δὲ Πόπλιος ἐδίδου μὲν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν κίνδυνον; Polyb., *Hist*., 10.13.1), "a long marching order" (μακρὰν αὐτὸν ἐν πορείᾳ διδόναι μέλλει; Polyb., *Hist*., 11.16.6; μακρὰν ἑαυτοὺς δόντες ἐν πορείᾳ Polyb., *Hist*., 11.16.8 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]), all the dangers (εἰς πάντας δὲ τοὺς κινδύνους δεδώκαμεν αὐτοὺς ἀπροφασίστως μετά γε τῶν ὑμετέρων ἡγεμόνων; Polyb., *Hist*., 21.20.9), peril (οὐ καλὸν δὲ τὴν τύχην εὐροοῦσαν ἔχοντας αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ παράβολον διδόναι; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 27.17.4), danger (ἡλικίας πολεμικῶν ἀγώνων ἀπολυόμενος εἰς κίνδυνον ἑκούσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινῇ συμφέροντος; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 11.27.2); death (ἐγὼ δ᾽ αὐτὸς ἐμαυτὸν ἐλευθερώσω, ὅπως καὶ τῷ ἔργῳ ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι μάθωσιν ὅτι τοιοῦτον αὐτοκράτορα εἵλεσθε ὅστις οὐχ ὑμᾶς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν δέδωκε; Cassius Dio, *Rom. Hist*., 64.13.3), toil, danger, expense (δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπροφ[α]σίστως εἰς τὴν κοινὴν χρείαν τῆς πόλεως ἀπ[ε]δήμησεν…οὔτε πόνον οὔτε κίνδυνον ὑπολογισάμενος οὐθένα *ν* τῶν ἐσομένων οὔτε δαπάνης οὐδεμιᾶς φροντίσας; *IG* II^3 1 1147.14–19), danger (ἑτοιμότερον ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ<ν> κίνδυνον ἔδωκεν; *SEG* 57.1109.Col. II.18–20), the struggles of battle (ἐν ταῖς ἀποβάσεσιν παραβολώτερον ἑαυτὸν διδοὺς εἰς τοὺς ἀγῶνας; *I.ScM* I.64.23–24), danger/crisis (τῆς πόλεω[ς| ἐ]ν ἐπικινδύνωι καιρῶι γενομένης διά τε τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν γειτνιώντων Θρᾳκῶν φόβοῃ| καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐκ τῆς αἰφνιδίου περιστάσεως ἐποστάντων χαλεπῶν, Μηνᾶ[ς]| καὶ λέγων καὶ πράσσων διετέλει τὰ ἄριστα καὶ κάλλιστα, διδοὺς ἀπροφασίστως ἑ-||αυτὸν εἰς πάντα τὰ συνφέροντα τῆι πόλει; *OGIS* 339.16–20).

Polybios's Eumenes II says "we gave ourselves to all the dangers without hesitation with your generals," Siccius "voluntarily gave himself to the danger for what is advantageous to the public," and Jonathan son of Mattathias "gave himself to the danger" of a risky embassy.[34] Benefactors received praise for their commitment to benefitting cities. So, Prytanis of Karystos "gave himself without hesitation to the common need of the city . . . not taking account for toil or danger of what will occur or considering any expense," Antisthenes "gave himself without hesitation to the embassies and the other liturgies for which the *demos* chose him," Koteies "daringly gave himself to the danger," Hegesagoras of Istros "during the landing operations he gave himself to the struggles," and Menas son of Menes "gave himself without hesitation to everything advantageous to the city" when Sestos faced critical danger from Thracian invaders.[35] To conclude, the phrase δοῦναι ἑαυτόν carries the sense of voluntary commitment to something or someone, whether it is a circumstance (especially a hazardous one), a course of action, a location, a person, or a thing.

Paul's formulation of δοῦναι ἑαυτόν in Galatians 1:4 should be understood with the normal sense of the phrase: commitment to something. Further, Paul activates a civic benefaction context with the opening χάρις in Galatians 1:3, which makes sense given that honorific decrees for benefactors sometimes lauded them by highlighting the benefactor's voluntary commitment of themselves to benefit the city with the phrase

---

[34] Polyb., *Hist*., 3.17.9 (παραβόλως διδοὺς αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς κινδύνους); Polyb., *Hist*., 21.20.9 (εἰς πάντας δὲ τοὺς κινδύνους δεδώκαμεν αὐτοὺς ἀπροφασίστως μετά γε τῶν ὑμετέρων ἡγεμόνων); Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 11.27.2 (εἰς κίνδυνον ἑκούσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινῇ συμφέροντος); 1 Macc 11:23 (ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν τῷ κινδύνῳ).

[35] Prytanis of Karystos (δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπροφ[α]σίστως εἰς τὴν κοινὴν χρείαν τῆς πόλεως ἀπ[ε]δήμησεν…οὔτε πόνον οὔτε κίνδυνον ὑπολογισάμενος οὐθένα ν῾ τῶν ἐσομένων οὔτε δαπάνης οὐδεμιᾶς φροντίσας; *IG* II^3 1 1147.14–19; 225/224 BC, Athens), Antisthenes (διδοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπροφασίστως εἰς τὰς πρεσβεί[α]ς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς λειτουργίας εἰς ὅσας αὐτὸν ὁ δῆμος προχειρί[ζε]ται; *SEG* 43.41.4–6; after 216/215 BC, Rhamnous); Koteies (ἑτοιμότερον ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ<ν> κίνδυνον ἔδωκεν; *SEG* 57.1109.Col. II.18–20; ca. 166 BC, Tabai, Karia), Hegesagoras of Istros (ἐν ταῖς ἀποβάσεσιν παραβολώτερον ἑαυτὸν διδοὺς εἰς τοὺς ἀγῶνας; *I.ScM* I.64.23–24; 200–150 BC, Istros; translation modified from Chamoux, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 169), Menas son of Menes (τῆς πόλεω[ς ἐ]ν ἐπικινδύνωι καιρῶι γενομένης διά τε τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν γειτνιώντων Θρᾳκῶν φόβον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐκ τῆς αἰφνιδίου περιστάσεως ἐποστάντων χαλεπῶν, Μηνᾶ[ς] καὶ λέγων καὶ πράσσων διετέλει τὰ ἄριστα καὶ κάλλιστα, διδοὺς ἀπροφασίστως ἑαυτὸν εἰς πάντα τὰ συνφέροντα τῆι πόλει; *OGIS* 339.16–20; 133–120 BC, Sestos).

δοῦναι ἑαυτόν (or the near synonym ἐπιδοῦναι ἑαυτόν). Yet Paul does not specify what exactly "the Lord Jesus Christ" committed himself to. He does not use a normal modifier after δοῦναι ἑαυτόν like εἰς, ἐπί, πρός, or a dative noun, but he uses a purpose clause (ὅπως) to specify that Christ committed himself to delivering his constituents from a dire situation—"the present age of evil" (ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ). Moreover, Paul, like other instances of δοῦναι ἑαυτόν, offers a reason for his self-commitment using ὑπέρ. While others "gave themselves" "for good repute and honor" (ὑπὲρ εὐδοξίας καὶ τιμῆς), "for what is advantageous to the public" (ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινῇ συμφέροντος), "for you" (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν), or "for the city" (ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως), Paul says Jesus committed himself "for our sins" (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁρμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν).[36] That is, in Galatians 1:4 the reason he was committed to his liberative activity was the sins of people (namely, Paul, his associates, and his audience).

Unlike δοῦναι ἑαυτόν, the phrase παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν is entirely absent from the benefaction epigraphical corpus. In fact, παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν has a different sense than δοῦναι ἑαυτόν so that the two cannot be interchanged for one another.[37] Specifically, παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν carries the sense of self-surrender, or handing oneself over into the control of another person or thing—whether it be an individual, a group, an institution, or an event or circumstance. The focus of the phrase is on the transfer of control. Most frequently the phrase crops up during battle, where people surrender ("hand themselves

---

[36] Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, 97; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 11.27.2; Cassius Dio, *Rom. Hist*., 64.13.3); Achilles Tatius, *The Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*, 4.13.4.

[37] Contra Harmon, who says that the difference between παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν and δοῦναι ἑαυτόν "is not inherently significant, since the two [terms παραδοῦναι and δοῦναι] can be used somewhat interchangeably," citing Deuteronomy 1:8; 1 Samuel 28:19 and possibly Luke 4:6. See Matthew S. Harmon, *She Must and She Shall Go Free: Paul's Isaianic Gospel in Galatians* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 59. The three examples he gives to support the interchangeability of παραδοῦναι and δοῦναι are in the context of the transfer of land (different than the current Gal 2:20 context) and none contain the specific phrases παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν or δοῦναι ἑαυτόν. One would need to argue the whole phrases are interchangeable rather than the individual isolated words παραδοῦναι and δοῦναι in a marginally related (land transfer) context. Further, the texts he does cite do not support the contention that παραδοῦναι and δοῦναι "can be used somewhat interchangeably," since the terms in the examples arguably convey different nuances, with δοῦναι conveying the simple act of giving and the παραδοῦναι more focused on the transfer of ownership and control of the territory.

over") to enemies.[38] It can also indicate self-surrender into the control of another in other domains of life, like surrendering oneself as a student to a teacher, soldiers putting themselves under the command of a general, submitting to religious rites, handing oneself over to a public office, submitting to a course of action or situation out of one's control (e.g., death, dangers, an uncertain future).[39] Moreover, sometimes the phrase is used in the context of vicariously handing oneself over to someone on behalf of another person or in an exchange. So, Alkestis "handed herself over" (ἑαυτὴν παρέδωκε) to die instead of her husband Admetos.[40] Cimon, son of Miltiades, "handed himself over to prison" and

---

[38] Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War,* 4.38; 7.68.1; 7.85.1; 7.86.4; Demosthenes, *False Embassy*, 56; Manetho, *The History of Egypt*, Fragment 11.1; Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 6.264b; Polyb., *Hist*., 1.21.7; 1.23.6; 1.87.10; 2.25.11; 2.54.7; 3.84.14; 4.75.6; 5.22.7; 5.50.9; 5.71.11; 7.1.3 [= Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 12.538a]; 8.21.9; 9.5.2; 9.9.10; 9.42.4; 16.22a.5; 18.26.10; 36.3.1; Fragment 153; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 5.79.1; 9.35.3; 11.22.4; 12.56.4; 13.19.3; 13.21.6; 13.23.5; 13.26.2; 14.105.2; 16.59.4; 17.76.1; 17.76.2; 17.78.4; 17.83.6; 17.86.6; 17.91.7; 17.103.8; 27.16.2; 36.10.2; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 3.50.2; 3.53.4; 3.59.3; 4.51.4; 4.52.2; 5.60.3; 11.17.4; 12.13.2; 16.1.4; Josephus, *A.J.*, 2.326; 6.72; 7.129; 8.261; 9.75; 9.285; 10.viii; 10.ix; 10.9; 12.376; 12.390; 13.142; 13.330; 17.284; 17.297; 18.52; Josephus, *Against Apion*, 2.231; Josephus, *B.J*., 4.553; 5.397; 6.366; 6.433; Plutarch, *Timoleon*, 13.3; 24.2; 34.5; Plutarch, *Pyrrhus*, 26.3; Plutarch, *Comparison of Nicias and Crassus*, 5.2; Plutarch, *Sertorius*, 3.5; 17.7; 27.1; Plutarch, *Pompey*, 28.1; 33.3; Plutarch, *Caesar*, 16.2; 27.5; 45.9; Plutarch, *Kleomenes*, 31.2; Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 39.2; Plutarch, *Dion*, 47.1; Plutarch, *Brutus* 26.5.

[39] Hand oneself over as a student (Isocrates, *Ep.* 4.10; παραδόνθ᾽ ὑμῖν αὐτὸν ὥσπερ μαθητὴν), hand selves over to command of the general Eumenes (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.58.1; ἵνα παραδῶσιν αὐτοὺς Εὐμενεῖ καὶ τἆλλα συμπράττωσι προθύμως), submit to religious rites (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 20.110.1; παραδοὺς οὖν αὐτὸν ἄνοπλον τοῖς ἱερεῦσαι), hand selves over to destruction (Philo, *Embassy to Gaius*, 233; παραδίδομεν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς ἀπώλειαν), hand self over to the office of *agoranomos* (Strabo, *Geography*, 14.2.24; τῷ ἀγορανομίῳ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν), surrender to a proposed course of action (Josephus, *A.J.*, 4.139; παραδόντες αὑτοὺς εἰς ἃ προεκαλοῦντο), hand selves over to fleeing (Josephus, *A.J.*, 6.191; ἀλλ᾽ αἰσχρᾷ καὶ ἀκόσμῳ φυγῇ παραδόντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐξαρπάζειν τῶν κινδύνων ἐπειρῶντο), surrender to dangers (Josephus, *A.J.*, 6.345; παραδοὺς αὐτὸν πανοικὶ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων τοῖς κινδύνοις; 1 Clem 55.5; παραδοῦσα οὖν ἑαυτὴν τῷ κινδύνῳ), surrender to an uncertain future (ἀδήλῳ τῷ μέλλοντι παραδόντας αὐτοὺς), surrender to the command of king David (καὶ παρέδοσαν αὐτοὺς; Josephus, *A.J.*, 7.53), surrender to leadership or control of another (Josephus, *A.J.*, 13.185; παραδώσειν μὲν αὐτοὺς; Plutarch, *Flaminius*, 5.4; ἐκείνῳ διεπίστευσαν ἑαυτοὺς καὶ παρέδωκαν; Plutarch, *Pyrrhus*, 4.1; Νεοπτολέμῳ παρέδωκαν ἑαυτούς; Plutarch, *Pompey*, 47.5; παντάπασιν ἑαυτὸν τῷ Καίσαρι χρήσασθαι παραδεδωκώς; Plutarch, *Pompey*, 55.3; οἱ δὲ κομψότεροι τὸ τῆς πόλεως ἡγοῦντο παρεωρακέναι τὸν Πομπήϊον ἐν τύχαις οὔσης, ὧν ἐκεῖνον ἰατρὸν ἥρηται καὶ μόνῳ παραδέδωκεν αὐτήν; Plutarch, *Alexander*, 71.4; μετὰ βοῆς καὶ κλαυθμοῦ παραδιδόντες ἑαυτούς καὶ χρήσασθαι κελεύοντες ὡς κακοῖς καὶ ἀχαρίστοις; Plutarch, *Caesar*, 64.6; παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν τῇ Καλπουρνίᾳ; Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, 25.2; καὶ μετὰ τῶν χρημάτων καὶ τῶν νεῶν αὐτὸν παραδιδόντος; Plutarch, *Moralia* [*Lives of the Ten Orators*] 845B; παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῷ Ἀνδρονίκῳ; Josephus, *A.J.*, 1.326; μετὰ τῶν τιμιωτάτων ἑαυτὸν ἐκείνῳ παραδιδούς), hand self over to household slaves (Plutarch, *Cicero*, 47.4; παρέδωκε τοῖς οἰκέταις ἑαυτὸν εἰς Καιήτην κατὰ πλοῦν κομίζειν), hand self over to hot springs (Josephus, *A.J.*, 17.171; ποταμόν τε περάσας Ἰορδάνην θερμοῖς τοῖς κατὰ Καλλιρρόην αὐτὸν παρεδίδου), hand selves over to war (Josephus, *B.J*., 7.145; αὐτοὺς τῷ πολέμῳ παρέδοσαν), hand self over to death (1 Clem 55.1; παρέδωκεν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς θάνατον), hand self over to the envy of citizens (Plutarch, *Timoleon*, 36.8; ἑαυτὸν οὐδὲ τῷ πολιτικῷ φθόνῳ παρέδωκεν), surrender self to trial (Plutarch, *Gaius Gracchus*, 16.2; ὡς ὑπευθύνους πολίτας ἐπὶ κρίσιν καὶ παραδόντας αὑτούς).

[40] "Then Alkestis, because Admetos was going to be killed on her account, came out and handed herself over" (οὖν Ἄλκηστις ὅτι μέλλει ἀναιρεῖσθαι Ἄδμητος δι᾽ αὐτήν, ἐξελθοῦσα ἑαυτὴν

assumed his late father's debts so that he could receive his father's body for burial.[41] Themistokles "surrendered himself and those on embassy with him as a guarantee of these things [that he said]" to the Spartans until the truth of what he said was verified.[42] People who Marcius Coriolanus had rescued offered to exchange themselves for him when he was on trial.[43] Josephus, on retelling the story of Joseph and his brothers, says that the brothers "were handing themselves over to punishment to preserve Benjamin" and "they were surrendering themselves to die for Benjamin's life" (ὑπὲρ τῆς Βενιαμὶν ψυχῆς).[44] Consequently, "handing oneself over" (παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν) in exchange for or on behalf of another was represented as laudable conduct in mythical, legendary, and historical writings.

In Galatians 2:20, then, Paul is probably referring to Jesus handing himself over to the Roman authorities and crucifixion, which is supported by the two references to Jesus's crucifixion that sandwich Galatians 2:20, saying "I was crucified with Christ" (συνεσταύρωμαι; Gal 2:19) and "Jesus Christ who was publicly portrayed as crucified" (ἐσταυρωμένος; Gal 3:1). That is, in Galatians 2:20 Paul is referring to how Jesus voluntarily "surrendered himself" to the Roman political apparatus that ended in his

---

παρέδωκε). Palaiphatos, *On Unbelievable Tales*, 40; cf. Hyginus, *Fabulae*, §51; Euripides, *Alcestis*.

[41] "Cimon, the son of Miltiades, when his father had died in the state prison because he was unable to pay in full the fine, in order that he might receive his father's body for burial, delivered himself up to prison and assumed the debt" (ἵνα λάβῃ τὸ σῶμα τοὺ πατρὸς εἰς ταφήν, ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν παρέδωκε καὶ διεδέξατο τὸ ὄφλημα; Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 10.30.1 [Oldfather, LCL]).

[42] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 11.40.2 (καὶ τούτων ἐγγυητὴν ἑαυτὸν παρεδίδου καὶ τοὺς μεθ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ συμπρεσβεύοντας).

[43] "These came forward with lamentations and entreated their fellow-citizens not to destroy as an enemy the man to whom they owed their preservation, begging one life in return for many and offering themselves in his stead to be treated by them as they thought fit" (μίαν τ᾽ ἀντὶ πολλῶν ψυχὴν αἰτούμενοι καὶ παραδόντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀντ᾽ ἐκείνου χρῆσθαι, ὅ τι βούλονται; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom*., 7.62.2 [Cary, LCL]).

[44] Josephus, *A.J.*, 2.137 (τῶν δὲ παραδιδόντων αὐτοὺς εἰς κόλασιν ἐπὶ σώζεσθαι Βενιαμὶν); 2.159 (οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες δακρύοντες καὶ παραδιδόντες ἑαυτοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς Βενιαμὶν ψυχῆς ἀπολουμένους). Some scholars have argued that Paul in Galatians 2:20 is alluding to either a specific phrase within Isaiah 53 (e.g., Isa 53:6, which can be read as κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν [instead of with αὐτὸν]) or to Isaiah 53 as a whole. See, e.g., Roy E. Ciampa, *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998): 51–65, 212, and Harmon, *She Must and She Shall Go Free,* 101–102, 115–117; cf. 55–66. It is possible that Paul is alluding to Isaiah 53:6 or to the whole passage of Isaiah 53 but the case in not decisive.

crucifixion. Furthermore, Paul portrays Jesus's self-surrender as something done "for" (ὑπέρ) Paul, which, based on the other instances of self-surrender for another, could indicate an exchange or at the very least something Christ did on Paul's behalf. Galatians 2:20 (παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν) should thus not be seen as an equivalent phrase to Galatians 1:4 (δοῦναι ἑαυτόν) but an elaboration on it. That is, Christ's wholehearted commitment to delivering his constituents (Gal 1:4) entailed him handing himself over to the Roman authorities (Gal 2:20), which resulted in his execution by crucifixion (Gal 2:19; 3:1).

Like παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν, the term ἀγαπῆσαι (Gal 2:20) is largely absent from the epigraphical benefaction corpus.[45] Generally, the term ἀγαπῆσαι conveys the sense "to have/treat with affection" or "to love." It can be used to describe a royal or high-status person's favorable disposition toward people of lower power and status and the affection/love a deity has for his or her devotees or favored individuals.[46] On the other hand, ἀγαπῆσαι can also be used for people's affection for high-status or powerful people in response to their generosity and benefaction.[47] Polybios contrasts ἀγαπῆσαι with "to consider enemies" (νομίζειν ἐχθρούς) and "to hate" (μισεῖν).[48] Jesus's own teaching had a

---

[45] For an exception, see *OGIS* 90.4, 8, 9, 37, 49.

[46] *DGE*, "ἀγαπάω." On royal or high-status affection/favor, see Demosthenes, *2 Olynthiac*, 2.19 (τούτους ἀγαπᾷ καὶ περὶ αὑτὸν ἔχει; "he loves these [various low-status types of people] and has [them] around himself") and Polyb., *Hist*., 5.56.1 (Ἀπολλοφάνης ὁ ἰατρός, ἀγαπώμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως διαφερόντως; "Apollophanes the doctor, especially beloved by the king [Antiochos III]"). On ἀγαπῆσαι to describe a deity acting with affection/love to humans, see, for example, *P.Münch.* 3.45.12 ([Πτολεμαῖ]ος αἰωνόβιος ἠγαπ̣[ημένος ὑπὸ τῆς Ἴσιδος]; 221–205 BC), *OGIS* 90.4 (ἠγαπημένου ὑπὸ τοῦ Φθᾶ), 8 (ἠγαπημένου ὑπὸ τοῦ Φθᾶ), 9 (ἠγαπημένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Φθᾶ), 37 (ἠγαπημένωι ὑπὸ τοῦ Φθᾶ), 49 (ἠγαπημένωι ὑπὸ τοῦ Φθᾶ; 196 BC), LXX Deuteronomy 23:6 (μετέστρεψεν κύριος ὁ θεός σου τὰς κατάρας εἰς εὐλογίαν, ὅτι ἠγάπησέν σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου). On ἀγαπῆσαι from humans to a deity, see LXX Deuteronomy 6:5 (καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου) and Mark 12:29–30.

[47] "It is indeed the part of a tyrant to do evil that he may make himself the master of men by fear against their will, hated himself and hating his subjects, but it is that of a king to do good to all and thus rule and preside over a willing people, earning their love by his beneficence and humanity" (τυράννου μὲν γὰρ ἔργον ἐστὶ τὸ κακῶς ποιοῦντα τῷ φόβῳ δεσπόζειν ἀκουσίων, μισούμενον καὶ μισοῦντα τοὺς ὑποταττομένους· βασιλέως δὲ τὸ πάντας εὖ ποιοῦντα, διὰ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν ἀγαπώμενον, ἑκόντων ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ προστατεῖν; Polyb., *Hist*., 5.11.6 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[48] "So instead of feeling affection for the Macedonians because they did not plunder your city when masters of it, you should consider them your enemies and hate them for preventing you more than once when you had the power of attaining supremacy in Greece" (διόπερ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἀγαπᾶν ὀφείλετε Μακεδόνας, <ὅτι> κυριεύσαντες τῆς πόλεως οὐ διήρπασαν, ἐφ' ὅσον ἐχθροὺς νομίζειν καὶ μισεῖν, ὅτι

focus on love, upending this love-enemy contrast by teaching a counter-script that his followers should "love your enemies and pray for those who persecute/pursue you" in imitation of their father God so that they would be "whole" (τέλειος; Matt 5:43–48).[49] Further, Jesus taught that the whole law could be summarized with the instructions to love God wholeheartedly (Deut 6:4–5) and to love one's neighbor (Lev 19:18), which summarizes the so-called First Table (εὐσέβεια; Exod 20:1–12; Deut 5:6–16) and Second Table (δικαιοσύνη; Exod 20:13–17; Deut 5:17–21) of the Ten Commandments, respectively (Mark 12:29–30).[50] Paul inherits the ethical counter-script of enemy-love and the double love-command as law-in-summary from Jesus and his earliest followers.

Paul, following the teachings of Jesus, considers love/affection (ἀγαπῆσαι, ἀγάπη) a vital part of the reciprocal relation between God and his people. God loves his pagans-turned-Christ-followers, who Paul calls "beloved by God" (1 Thess 1:4, ἀγαπημένοι ὑπὸ θεοῦ; cf. Rom 1:7, ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ), "my [i.e., God's] people" (λαόν μου) and "beloved" (ἀγαπημένην; Rom 9:25). And it is proper for God's people to love God in response to his own love for them (Rom 8:28; 1 Cor 2:9; 8:3). Moreover, Paul views love for one another as the superordinate principle for interpersonal ethics (Rom 13:8–9; Gal 5:13–14; 1 Thess 4:9; 1 Cor 13).[51] In Galatians 2:20, then, Paul—probably

---

δυναμένους ὑμᾶς ἡγεῖσθαι τῆς Ἑλλάδος πλεονάκις ἤδη κεκωλύκασι; Polyb., *Hist*., 9.29.12 [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]).

[49] On love in Jesus's teaching, see, e.g., David Flusser and R. Steven Notley, *The Sage from Galilee: Rediscovering Jesus' Genius* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007): 55–65. If Paul was familiar was the teaching of Jesus on love, which seems likely, it seems not too much a stretch here to make the connection in Galatians between Paul who "was persecuting/pursuing the assembly of God and destroying it" (Gal 1:13) and Christ who loved his enemy, the persecutor Paul (Gal 2:20) as indicating that Paul is seeing Christ as a paradigmatic example of someone who loves an enemy and persecutor (Matt 5:44). On τέλειος as wholeness and integrity in Jesus's teaching in Matthew 5–7, see Jonathan T. Pennington, *The Sermon on the Mount and Human Flourishing: A Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017), 69–85.

[50] On the Ten Commandments being understood by some Jewish people to be split into piety (εὐσέβεια, commandments 1–5) and justice/righteousness (δικαιοσύνη, commandments 6–10), see Paula Fredriksen, "Paul's Letter to the Romans, the Ten Commandments, and Pagan 'Justification by Faith,'" *JBL* 133, no. 4 (2014): 802–804.

[51] Note also how Paul calls several of his coworkers "so-and-so my beloved" (Rom 16:5, 8, 9, 12; δεῖνος ὁ ἀγαπητός μου;) or "my beloved son" (μου τέκνον ἀγαπητόν; 1 Cor 4:17; cf. 1 Cor 4:14), and calls his recipients "beloved" (Rom 12:19; 2 Cor 7:1; 12:19; 1 Thess 2:8; ἀγαπητοί; cf. Philem 1), "my

influenced by Jesus's own teachings on love and LXX Leviticus 19:18 (see esp. Rom 13:8–9 and Gal 5:13–14)—uses the term ἀγαπῆσαι to describe Jesus's paradigmatic loving act of self-surrender and self-endangerment on behalf of another—Paul himself. In this reading, Christ's "handing himself over for" (παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπέρ) Paul is the concrete expression of his affection and, combined with Galatians 1:4, functions as a pattern of behavior that serves as a model of proper virtuous conduct throughout the letter.

Galatians 3:13–14 is another significant text regarding Christ's actions to benefit his constituents: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us, because it is written, "cursed is everyone hanging upon wood," so that to the nations the blessing of Abraham would occur in/by Christ Jesus, so that we would receive through fidelity/trust/good faith the promise of the Spirit."[52]

The term ἐξαγοράσαι is not especially common in the ancient sources and the phrase ἐξαγοράσαι + ἐκ is entirely absent until its usage in Galatians 3:13.[53] Normally ἐξαγοράσαι carries the sense of buying something, for example, boats, a city, a house, or

---

beloved" (1 Cor 10:14; Phil 2:12; ἀγαπητοί μου), and "my beloved brothers/siblings" (Phil 4:1; ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί; cf. Philem 16).

[52] χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, ὅτι γέγραπται· ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου, ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.

[53] According to a *TLG* proximity lemma search for ἐξαγοράζω + ἐκ, the first occurrence of the phrase ἐξαγοράσαι + ἐκ in Greek literature occurs in Galatians 3:13. A search of ἐξαγορ and ἐξηγορ in the PHI epigraphical database and in the Papyrological Navigator (papyri.info) yields no instances of ἐξαγοράσαι + ἐκ either.

time.[54] The term is also used to describe redeeming ("buying out") a slave.[55] An honorific decree of Istros honoring the benefactor Agathokles son of Antiphilos notes how he was called upon to serve as an envoy while the countryside was under siege "to redeem the countryside and the harvest by whatever means" (κ̣[α]τὰ τρόπον ἐξαγοράζειν τὴν χώραν καὶ τὰ θέρη) and how he paid 600 pieces of gold to the attacking party (Zoltes and the Thracians) to convince them not to attack (resulting in a safe gathering of the harvest).[56] What holds these usages together is the notion of securing something for oneself, whether for one's own use (houses, boats, enslaved person) or for the protection of something (enslaved person, countryside/harvest) from some danger or threat. The usage of ἐξαγοράσαι in Galatians 3:13 conforms to the notion of securing something—in this case a population of people, i.e., Paul, his companions, and their Galatian audiences—from danger, in this case "from the curse of the law" (ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου).

Several facts must be considered when explaining the notion of "curse" in Galatians 3:13. First, in the context Paul quotes with modification two passages with

---

[54] E.g., Polyb., *Hist*., 3.42.2 (ἐξηγόρασε παρ᾽ αὐτῶν τά τε μονόξυλα πλοῖα πάντα καὶ τοὺς λέμβους; "he bought up all their canoes and boats" [Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL]); Polyb., *Hist*., 30.31.6 (ἀλλὰ Καῦνον δήπου διακοσίων ταλάντων ἐξηγοράσαμεν παρὰ τῶν Πτολεμαίου στρατηγῶν καὶ Στρατονίκειαν ἐλάβομεν ἐν μεγάλῃ χάριτι παρ᾽ Ἀντιόχου καὶ Σελεύκου; "But as for Kaunos, you will confess that we bought it from Ptolemy's generals for two hundred talents, and that Stratonikeia was given us as a great favor by Antiochos and Seleukos" [Olson, Paton, Walbank, and Habicht, LCL, slightly modified]); Plutarch, *Crassus*, 2.4 (ἐξηγόραζε τὰ καιόμενα καὶ γειτνιῶντα τοῖς καιομένοις; "he would buy houses that were afire, and houses which adjoined those that were afire" [Perrin, LCL]); *SB* 14.11645.17–19 (2nd c. AD; παρήκουσα περὶ [τῆς οἰκίας] ὅπου οἰκῶ ὅτει ἐξηγόρασε[ν αὐτὴν] ὁ Σαβῖνος; "I heard about the house where I live, that Sabinos has bought [it]"; translation modified from George M. Parassoglou, "Four Papyri from the Yale Collection," *The American Journal of Philology* 92, no. 4 [1971]: 657); OG Dan 2:8 (καιρὸν ὑμεῖς ἐξαγοράζετε; "you are buying time"); cf. Eph 5:16 (ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρόν); Col 4:5 (τὸν καιρόν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι).

[55] Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 15.7.1 (τοῦτον μὲν οἱ φιλόσοφοι συνελθόντες ἐξηγόρασαν; "Those who were philosophers, however, joined together, purchased his freedom" [Oldfather, LCL]); Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 36.2.2 (ἐξηγόρασεν αὐτήν [i.e., τὴν θεραπαινίδα]…ταλάντων Ἀττικῶν ἑπτά; "he purchased her freedom for seven Attic talents" [Walton, LCL]); Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 36.2a.1 (διὰ γὰρ τὴν φιλοστοργίαν ἐπιβαλόμενος ἐξαγοράσαι τὴν παιδίσκην τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔσχε τὸν δεσπότην αὐτῆς ἀντιπράττοντα, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τῷ μεγέθει τῆς τιμῆς προτρεψάμενος ἐξηγόρασεν αὐτὴν ταλάντων Ἀττικῶν ἑπτά καὶ τὴν ἀπόδοσιν τῆς τιμῆς εἰς τακτὸν χρόνον συνέθετο; "Wishing because of his affection for her to purchase the girl's freedom, he at first encountered her enslaver's opposition, but later, having won his consent by the magnitude of the offer, he purchased her for seven Attic talents, and agreed to pay the purchase price at a stipulated time" [Walton, LCL, slightly modified]).

[56] *I.ScM* I 15.29–30. For the full context, see *I.ScM* I 15.25–33. For English translations, see Burstein §68 and Austin[2] §116.

curse terminology: Deuteronomy 27:26 (Gal 3:10) and Deuteronomy 21:23 (Gal 3:13). The term ἐπικατάρατος in Deuteronomy 27:26 serves as a capstone to a barrage of occurrences of the term in Deuteronomy 27 (LXX Deut 27:15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 [x2], 24, 25; cf. LXX Deuteronomy 28:15–68, esp. 15–19) that designate an individual as "cursed" (ἐπικατάρατος) if that person violates various norms and negative rules enshrined in the covenant.[57] That is, the violator is liable to the sanctions of the covenant, the curses, which include death, suffering, defeat, and shame in the domains of personal health and bodily functioning, agricultural productivity, progeny, social relations, disease, and war and international relations (LXX Deut 28:15–68). Second, with respect to Deuteronomy 21:23 (Gal 3:13), Jewish sources generally do not regard crucified people as automatically cursed by God.[58] It was not crucifixion that incurred a divine curse in Deuteronomy 21:23 but the actual deed of blasphemy or apostasy.[59] So, it is not clear that

---

[57] In wider usage beyond Greek Jewish texts of the Second Temple Period the term ἐπικατάρατος occurs in a few epitaphs warding off those who would violate a tomb or in legal contexts to describe a consequence (i.e., being considered ἐπικατάρατος) for those who would violate legally binding stipulations. E.g., *SEG* 57.1107.1–9 (ἐνθάδε κεῖται ἱερεὺς Δήμητρος· ὅς ἂν ἀδικήσει, ἐπικατάρατος ἔστω ἀπὸ τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ θεῶν; ca. 425–400, Stratonikeia); PH262400.13–15 ([ἐὰν δ]ὲ τις ταῦτα παραβαίνῃ ἢ ἄκυρα π[οιῃ ἐπικα]τάρατος ἔστω αὐτός τε καὶ τὰ τού[του πάν]τα ἀπὸ θεοῦ τούτου; mid-4th c. BC, Sinuri); *I.Labraunda* 8.2–8 ([ἐὰν δὲ ἢ] τ̣ι̣ς̣ παραλάβηι τις τὴν εὔθυναν ἢ εἰσαγάγηι ἢ δικ̣ᾳ̣[στὴς δικάσηι ἢ δῶι παρὰ] τ̣ὰ̣ δεδογμένα παραευρέσι ἡιτιν<ι>οῦν, ἐξώλης [ἔστω αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ ἐξ αὐ]τοῦ καὶ ἐπικατάρατος καὶ ἄτιμος καὶ προσαπο[τεισάτω δραχμὰς…]ας καὶ ἔστω τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ ἱερὰ Διὸς Ὀσ[ογω καὶ ἐξέστω τῶι βου]λομένωι εὐθύνειν τὸν μὴ ἐμμείναντα ἄνευ π̣[ροθεσμίας παρευρέσει μη]δεμιᾶι ἐκκλειομένωι; after 240 BC [?]; "[But if] anybody undertakes the examination or brings a suit into court or [as a judge makes or proposes a judgement contrary to] what has been voted, under whatsoever pretext, he [himself and his descendants shall be] ruined, accursed and deprived of civic rights and he [shall pay] besides […drachmae] and his resources shall be consecrated to Zeus [Osogoa]"; translation from Jonas Crampa, *Swedish Excavations and Researches*, vol. III, part 1, *The Greek Inscriptions, Part I:1–12 (Period of Olympichus)* [Lund: CWK Gleerup 1969], 54). See also, *CIG* 2664.5–8; *IG* XII 9.1179.14–19; *IG* XII 9.955.

[58] deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 293–294; Paula Fredriksen, "Judaism, the Circumcision of the Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2," *JTS* 42 (1991): 552; Kelli S. O'Brien, "The Curse of the Law (Galatians 3:13): Crucifixion, Persecution, and Deuteronomy 21.22–23," *JSNT* 29, no. 1 (2006): 55–76; Daniel R. Streett, "Cursed by God? Galatians 3:13, Social Status, and Atonement Theory in the Context of Early Jewish Readings of Deuteronomy 21:23," *Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters* 5, no. 2 (2015): 195. After surveying the occurrences of crucifixion in Philo and Josephus and noting the lack of mention of a curse upon the crucified, O'Brien summarizes that "in Philo and Josephus, crucifixion is frequently portrayed as barbaric. Those who suffer it are not automatically condemned, but often innocent and almost always to be pitied." See O'Brien, "The Curse of the Law (Galatians 3:13)," 69. See also Streett's study that confirms the notion that crucified Jews in the Second Temple period were not considered cursed by God on account of their manner of death (citing Philo, *Flacc*. 72, 83–88; Josephus, *A.J.,* 12.256; 13.380; 17.295; cf. *B.J.,* 2.75. Streett, "Cursed by God?," 195. The only Second Temple Jewish text to connect crucifixion and curse is 11QTemple 64.6–13.

[59] Streett, "Cursed by God?," 195.

Paul is indeed talking about God cursing Christ in Galatians 3:13.[60] Third, the meaning of the phrase "to become a curse" (γενηθῆναι κατάρα) is not necessarily an equivalent to "being cursed" (by God or the law).[61] In fact, this rare phrase (γενηθῆναι κατάρα) more likely means "to become the object of society's ridicule (γέλως) or reproach" and "to have one's reputation so destroyed that one's name becomes a stock element in jokes or curse formulas."[62] When Galatians 3:13 is read in this light, Paul can be understood to be saying that Christ secured for protection those who are liable to covenantal sanctions by committing himself so fully to benefit them that he became an object of ridicule and dishonor (cf. Mark 15:15–32) in his death by crucifixion so that the "curse of the law" would not fall on them. Christ's disreputable, tortuous death, worthy of mockery, is the ordeal by which the benefits, "the blessing of Abraham" and "the promise of the Spirit," come to his constituents (Gal 3:14).

Paul's language about the conduct and accomplishments of Christ can be compared to the prototypical generosity of civic benefactors. In chapter 3 this study explained how in civic benefaction prototypical generosity consisted of committing oneself and one's resources to benefit others despite any difficulty, risk, or cost that may accompany the service(s). In this respect, Paul's language about Christ's conduct to benefit his constituency conforms to the cultural norm. Christ's services demonstrate total commitment to liberate his constituents from their situations of subjection and enslavement: he exhibited full commitment to his liberatory mission (Gal 1:4), exhibited wholehearted love by handing himself over to the Roman authorities to be crucified (Gal

---

[60] Streett puts it thusly: "the logical linkage is tight, allowing for only two options: either (a) Jesus was rightly executed for blasphemy and is thus under the curse of the law or (b) Jesus was an innocent victim and is thus under no curse at all" (Streett, "Cursed by God?," 199–200).

[61] Contra, e.g., deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 295.

[62] Streett, "Cursed by God?," 202. Streett cites two highly suggestive sources: Protevangelium of James 3:1 ("I have become a curse [ἐγὼ κατάρα ἐγενήθην] before the sons of Israel and I have been shamed and mocked by being expelled from the temple") and Acts of Thomas 104:8 ("You know, O king, what pain and suffering I had regarding my daughter….For I became a joke and a curse (ἐγενόμην γὰρ γέλως καὶ κατάρα) to our whole country"). Streett, "Cursed by God?," 202.

2:20), and experienced suffering, a loss of reputation, and death by being crucified so that he could benefit others (Gal 3:13). Christ shows a full-fledged commitment of his own life to provide benefits that mirrors the dedication of civic benefactors and no doubt in the estimation of early Christ followers exceeded them. Such generosity, like that of Alketas for the Pisidians (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.46–47), produces a bond of affection between Christ and his constituents that lasts beyond the grave. Further, in Galatians and the wider Pauline corpus, Jesus's conduct garners good repute (δόξα) for God (e.g., Gal 1:5; Phil 2:11) even if non-adherents do not recognize it (e.g., 1 Cor 1:23; 2:8). Paul even calls Jesus himself "the Lord of good repute" (ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης; 1 Cor 2:8), reflecting Jesus's prestige among his followers even post-mortem. Finally, there is some indication in Galatians that Paul considers Jesus's benefactions to be godlike because Jesus's cruciform pattern of conduct and resultant "new creation" (καινὴ κτίσις) configure standards for boasting and obtaining good repute (Gal 6:13–16).[63] This godlike deliverance mirrors that of Augustus in Chios after an earthquake destroyed the city. Augustus is said to have given benefactions to all humanity that "surpassed even the Olympian gods" and to have ushered in "a new beginning" (παλιγγενεσία) for those affected by the crisis.[64] But for Paul, Jesus does not surpass the God of Israel; rather, he works together with him (e.g., Gal 1:1–5, 15–16; 2:19–21; 4:4–7).

Freedom and the Law of Christ

Two of the key concepts in Galatians—νόμος and ἐλευθερία—are not two randomly selected categories unrelated to one another until Paul brings them together; rather, νόμος and ἐλευθερία are intimately intertwined in discourses about civic freedom

[63] On Christ's divine mode of being as expressed in Phil 2:6–8, see Crispin Fletcher-Louis, "'The Being That Is in a Manner Equal with God' (Phil. 2:6C): A Self-Transforming, Incarnational, Divine Ontology," *Journal of Theological Studies* 71, no. 2 (2020): 581–627.

[64] *SEG* 65.300.a.2–4, 7–8. Translations from Christopher P. Jones, "The Earthquake of 26 BC in Decrees of Mytilene and Chios," *Chiron* 45 (2015): 111.

and governance in Greek cities (see chap. 3). The two concepts go hand in hand such that freedom can be clarified to mean a city's ability (1) to live according to its own laws and (2) to be free from external compulsion and/or subjection to another power. Paul's schema for imagining law and freedom in the Galatian assemblies resembles the standard civic relationship between law and freedom (see above), which is why he can explain their shared ἐλευθερία (Gal 5:13) with a reference to "the νόμος of Christ" (Gal 6:2). Paul transfers this civic freedom-law relationship into the theological plane and applies it to the particular situation of time and place of the Galatian assemblies.

According to Paul, in the polity of God Christ reigns as the now-enthroned Messianic (Davidic) king over Israel and the nations (e.g., Rom 1:2–5).[65] The Jewish and non-Jewish populations of God's polity, now related to each other differently than prior to Christ liberating them from their states of bondage, must figure out shared ways of getting along together, general negative rules of just conduct, procedures for resolving disputes, guidance on ritual practices and protocols, and models/exemplars for virtuous ethical conduct. In Galatians 5:13–6:10, Paul addresses some of these topics in his explanation of what rights and responsibilities are entailed in their new-found group freedom.

The νόμος of Christ serves as the general principle of just conduct among Christ followers.[66] In short, the "law of Christ" consists of the rights and responsibilities of the members of the assemblies of God as guided by Leviticus 19:18 and the embodiment of "love of neighbor" by Christ in his pattern of behavior (Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13). More specifically, fulfilling the "law of Christ" includes abiding by the negative

[65] On the kingship of Jesus in Paul, see, e.g., Joshua Jipp, *Christ Is King: Paul's Royal Ideology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015). On a philological argument for understanding the title κύριος as royal, see D. Clint Burnett, *Studying the New Testament through Inscriptions: An Introduction* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Academic, 2020), 58–76.

[66] This is not to say the law of Christ is unrelated to the Torah. Barclay seems right to take the approach of understanding the "law of Christ" as Torah as "the law as redefined and fulfilled by Christ in love." See John Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 134; cf. 141.

rules of just conduct (the "you shall not" commands) of the so-called Second Table of the Law and positive responsibilities of one to another, that is, the principle of mutual service even to the point of self-endangerment as reflected in the Christ-pattern (Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13). Paul uses foils to exemplify what violates his vision of mutual service and self-endangerment, which include his past violent conduct (Gal 1:13), Peter's exclusionary conduct at Antioch (Gal 2:12), and the coercive conduct of those compelling circumcision on the Galatians (Gal 6:12).

In Galatians 6:2, Paul instructs the Galatian assemblies: "bear one another's burdens and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ" (ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ). One can see how freedom and law are two sides of the same coin when one puts the law of Christ maxim of mutual burden-bearing of Galatians 6:2 next to the opening ethical exhortation of the whole section of Galatians 5:13–6:10. Paul exhorts his audience in Galatians 5:13–14:

> For you were called to freedom (ἐπ᾽ ἐλευθερίᾳ), brothers, only not freedom for an opportunity in the flesh; rather, through love, act as slaves to one another" (διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις; 5:13). For the entire law is fulfilled in one maxim, in the "love your neighbor as yourself" (ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν; 5:14).[67]

In Galatians 5:13–14, freedom entails demonstrating love to fellow followers of Christ through mutual self-enslavement/service. Already Paul has described love (ἀγαπῆσαι) in terms of Jesus's self-surrender to the Roman authorities to be crucified on his behalf (Gal 2:20; 3:1; cf. Rom 5:8). In Galatians 5:13–14, then, Paul invokes the love-command of Leviticus 19:18 to support his exhortation of mutual service through love, which recalls Christ's own commitment to self-hazarding conduct to benefit others (Gal 1:4; 2:20;

---

[67] The linguistic construction of fronting an article before a well-known ethical maxim is common. Citing the Delphic maxim "know yourself" (Γνῶθι σαυτόν), which Plutarch calls a "divine command" (πρόσταγμα θεῖον; Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, 3.2), is frequently cited in this manner. See, e.g., Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 4.2.24 (Κατέμαθες οὖν πρὸς τῷ ναῷ που γεγραμμένον τὸ Γνῶθι σαυτόν;); Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*, 1.40 (Τούτου ἐστὶν τὸ Γνῶθι σαυτόν); 6:83 (τῷ Γνῶθι σαυτόν); Diod. Sic., *Bib., hist*., 9.10.2 (τὸ γὰρ Γνῶθι σαυτὸν παραγγέλλει παιδευθῆναι καὶ φρόνιμον γενέσθαι); Philo, *Embassy to Gaius*, 69 (τὸ Γνῶθι σαυτὸν); Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, 3.2 (τὸ Γνῶθι σαυτὸν).

3:13). Further, the resemblance between the ethical instructions in Galatians 6:2 and Galatians 5:13–14 suggests that "the law of Christ" is the pattern of Christ's behavior and that Christ followers should imitate his model to fulfill the law. Moreover, because Paul has already insisted that the Galatians not undergo circumcision and be indebted to do the whole law (Gal 5:2–3), the law of Christ enables them to fulfill the Torah without being subjected to it in its full detail. In effect, Paul's contention of mutual service through love results in the "fulfillment" of Torah, which enables Paul to navigate for the Galatians a path of obedience to God without compromising their negative freedom (i.e., not being enslaved/subjected to Torah; Gal 5:1–3).[68] Furthermore, the freedom that the Galatians' benefactor-king Jesus affords them is the positive freedom to live under the law of Christ, which serves as a general principle of conduct that sets behavioral expectations, facilitates cooperation, and aids decision-making during critical situations.[69]

Benefaction and Belonging: God's Promise and Paul's Kinship Diplomacy

The common practice of inter-city kinship diplomacy can help contextualize Paul's own practice of kinship diplomacy in Galatians.[70] The appeal to the patriarch Abraham, a figure from the legendary past, to persuade a population of Galatians of shared kinship between Jews and Galatians is an exercise in kinship diplomacy (Gal 3:6–

---

[68] See Barclay's argument that using πληροῦν (instead of e.g., ποιῆσαι or πράσσειν) affords Paul some strategic ambiguity in his instructions with respect to Torah observance. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 140–142.

[69] This view of "the law of Christ" coheres with Jipp's view of Christ as "living law" who embodies the law of loving neighbor in his life and serves as a model for his subjects to imitate so that they too could live by the law. See Jipp, *Christ is King*, 43–76, esp. 64–67, 70, 74–76.

[70] Paula Fredriksen has found kinship diplomacy to be useful in contextualizing Paul. See, e.g., Paula Fredriksen, "Why Should a 'Law-Free' Mission Mean a 'Law-Free' Apostle?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 134, no. 3 (2015): 639–640; Paula Fredriksen, "How Do the Nations Relate to Israel? Family, Ethnicity, and Eschatological Inclusion in the Apostle Paul," in *In the Crucible of Empire: The Impact of Roman Citizenship upon Greeks, Jews and Christians*, ed. Katell Berthelot and Jonathan Price (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2019), 134–135; Paula Fredriksen, "God is Jewish, but Gentiles Don't Have to Be: Ethnicity and Eschatology in Paul's Gospel," in *The Message of the Apostle within Second Temple Judaism*, ed. František Abel (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2020), 5–6. The present section is limited in scope, focusing on kinship diplomacy and the language of benefaction. A more detailed study on kinship diplomacy would be needed to fully contextualize Paul's kinship arguments.

4:31). Paul draws on his archive of ancestral genealogical information in Genesis to, like other kinship diplomats, creatively use his sources to persuade his audience to take a certain specific course of action. Recall how the kinship diplomacy between Kytenion and Xanthos and between Abdera and Teos could result in solidarity and service in the present, whether it was based on envoy-constructed ancestral ties or a longstanding interaction between the populations (see chap. 3).[71] Paul's appeals to kinship bonds of a legendary ancestor (Abraham) to motivate his audience to act a certain way shares similarities and differences with attempts at kinship diplomacy between Greek cities.

Paul speaks of God's promise to Abraham as a divine benefaction (κεχάρισται; Gal 3:18; cf. Rom 4:4, 16; χάρις).[72] Paul argues that Jews and non-Jews (thus, Galatians) share a kin relationship to one another by both being recipients of sonship adoption (υἱοθεσία; Gal 4:5) from God by being related to Abraham through Christ (Abraham's "seed"; Gal 3:16, 19), by being recipients of the Spirit of God's son Jesus (Gal 4:6–7), and exhibiting fidelity/trust in God like Abraham (Gal 3:6–9; Rom 4:11–12, 16–25).[73]

---

[71] *SEG* 38.1476 (Kytenion and Xanthos). On Teos and Abdera, see Mustafa Adak and Peter Thonemann, *Teos and Abdera: Two Greek Cities in Peace and War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022).

[72] Cf. Nero's use of χαρίζεθαι (*IG* VII 2713.11) to describe how he gave the Greeks an "unexpected gift" (ἀπρεσδόκητον δωρεάν), the benefactions of freedom and tax-exemption (*IG* VII 2713.11; ἀπροσδόκητον ὑμεῖν, ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, δωρεάν, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν παρὰ τῆς ἐμῆς μεγαλοφροσύνης, ἀνέλπιστον, χαρίζομαι, τοσαύτην, ὅσην οὐκ ἐχωρήσατε αἰτεῖσθαι. πάντες οἱ τὴν Ἀχαΐαν καὶ τὴν ἕως νῦν Πελοπόννησον κατοικοῦντες Ἕλληνες λάβετ᾽ ἐλευθερίαν ἀνισφορίαν, ἣν οὐδ᾽ ἐν τοῖς εὐτυχεστάτοις ὑμῶν πάντες χρόνοις ἔσχετε; *IG* VII 2713.9–15).

[73] On the Spirit's role in adoption, see Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship in the Letters of Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 68–77. For the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians, see Erin M. Heim, *Adoption in Galatians and Romans: Contemporary Metaphor Theories and the Huiothesia Metaphors* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 148–199. On the significance of the term προπάτωρ to describe Abraham in Rom 4:1 as the founding ancestor of a kin network not based on physical descent *per se* but through πίστις, see Lukas Bormann, "Abraham as 'Forefather' and His Family in Paul," in *Abraham's Family: A Network of Meaning in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. Lukas Bormann (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2018), 207–233. Abraham was also a useful figure to Paul because in Genesis he was associated with liberation and in the Psalms and Prophets he is mentioned in connection with the hope of deliverance from foreign oppression. See Roy E. Ciampa, "Abraham and Empire in Galatians," in *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham: Essays in Honor of Marvin R. Wilson*, ed. Steven Hunt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 153–168. Philo of Alexandria considers Abraham an exemplar to posterity of trust in God's promises (Philo, *On Abraham*, 275), "the first man and founder of the nation" (ὁ πρώτος καὶ ἀρχηγέτης τοῦ ἔθνους), and "a law, an unwritten rule" (νόμος αὐτὸν ὢν καὶ θεσμὸς ἄγραφος; Philo, *On Abraham*, 276).

Moreover, Paul uses allegory to explain how the Galatians have proper maternal lineage through the free woman Sarah (per God's promise) as opposed to enslaved Hagar (Gal 4:21–31).[74] Importantly, these women correspond to cities: the free polity of God—the "Jerusalem above" (ἡ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλὴμ)—which Paul imbues with the inviting quality of freedom, and "the present Jerusalem" (ἡ νῦν Ἰερουσαλὴμ), which Paul dismisses as enslaved (δουλεύειν) with its children (Gen 4:25–26). Further, Paul also fosters a sense of belonging for his Galatian recipients by reiterating how Judeans/Jews and Galatians share God as their common divine father (πάτηρ ἡμῶν; Gal 1:1, 3, 4; ἀββα ὁ πατήρ; Gal 4:6; cf. Gal 4:2). Paul strengthens this kinship by repeatedly calling his Galatian recipients "brothers" and casting others as "false brothers" (ἀδελφοί; Gal 1:11; 3:15; 4:12, 28, 31; 5:11, 13; 6:1, 18; cf. 1:2; ψευδαδέλφοι, 2:4). In short, Paul draws on his inherited genealogical resources not to creatively construct a shared ancestral past to motivate a discrete benefaction in the present (like Kytenion) but to construct a schema of group-level kin-relatedness that motivates shared belonging (through sonship adoption to God) in the present. If the assemblies of Christ-followers already felt a sense of disaffection from their civic community and now were being alienated from their new Christ-networks at the instigation of those compelling circumcision, Paul's kinship arguments and rhetoric could serve as a balm to their relational wounds.

In turn, this shared belonging directs the Galatians to certain courses of action, such as refusing forced circumcision (Gal 5:1–6) and builds the foundation for abiding by shared groups norms as summarized in several ethical maxims throughout the letter (esp. in Gal 5:13–6:10). Paul's group-level ethical instruction finds its grounding in the shared kinship and bond of being kin recipients of the Spirit of God's promise to their ancestor Abraham (Gal 4:6–7). So, Paul states, "if we live by the Spirit, let us act in alignment

[74] On the paternal and maternal imagery in Galatians, see Jane Heath, "God the Father and Other Parents in the New Testament," in *The Divine Father: Religious and Philosophical Concepts of Divine Parenthood in Antiquity*, ed. Felix Albrecht and Reinhard Feldmeier, TBN 18 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 331–333.

with the Spirit. Let us not become people of empty pomp, challenging one another, displaying ill-will toward each other" (εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν. μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι, ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες; Gal 5:25–26). Further, Paul says, "the one who sows into the Spirit from the Spirit will reap aionial life" (ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον; Gal 6:8).[75] Elsewhere, speaking in terms of a household, he urges the Galatians to do "what is noble" (τὸ καλὸν ποιοῦντες) and "let us work good to all, especially to the household of the trust" (ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως; Gal 6:9–10). As a result, like the Kytenians, the conduct of one's ancestors, even from the distant past, imposes moral obligations in the present. For Paul, God's now-realized promise-benefaction of the Spirit of the Son of God to the common ancestor of Judeans and Galatians obliges the Galatians to conduct themselves as a group according to certain ethical or ritual standards that are in accord with that Spirit.

Appeal to promise can conjure one or several cultural scripts (see chap. 3). For Paul, the use of promise could accomplish several things. First, because God has fulfilled his promise-benefaction to Abraham, God's good reputation is maintained, and as a result God is owed a proper response of praise and gratitude. If the Galatians had any fears or doubts about the trustworthiness of the God of Israel induced by the people compelling circumcision on them, Paul's invocation of God's promise may alleviate those fears and doubt by assuring them that Israel's God does not require non-Jewish/Judean males to undergo circumcision. Moreover, God's display of faithfulness to his promise could provoke the trust of the Galatians and hedge off what Paul perceives as a possible move toward defection (e.g., Gal 5:1–4). In sum, by appealing to the notion of promise, Paul's kinship argument in Galatians 3:6–4:31 could provide additional persuasive power in

[75] The phrase "aionial life" comes from Jamie Davies, "Why Paul Doesn't Mention 'The Age to Come,'" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 74 (2021): 205. The phrase casts ζωή αἰώνιος as qualitatively different from human time instead of simply an infinite extension of human time, referring to "God's kind of time in fellowship with ours." Davies, "Why Paul Doesn't Mention 'The Age to Come,'" 205.

convincing the Galatians to refuse forced circumcision and to do so as an expression of fidelity or good faith to the God who has kept his promise.

Kephas and the Fearful

In his biography of the Hellenistic dynast Demetrios Poliorketes, Plutarch remarks that viewing negative exemplars assists in moral instruction when paired with seeing positive exemplars. He explains that seeing harmful, shameful, and unjust (βλαβερός, ἀισχρός, ἀδικός) conduct allows one to better perceive and appreciate the virtues of the good and praiseworthy lives so that one can better understand virtue and become imitators (μιμηταί) of the positive moral exemplars.[76] Paul too in Galatians sets up foils and counter examples that draws more focused attention to the noble and good exemplars. In Galatians 2:11–14, Paul exhibits Kephas and certain other Judean Christ-followers as a foil to the conduct displayed by Christ.

When dangers and threats faced Greek-speaking cities, fear and terror gripped many would-be benefactors. Instead of confronting the danger, they hesitated out of fear. But the mark of a praiseworthy benefactor was to offer oneself for service when others drew back on account of fear. Thus, Koteies "gave himself more readily to the danger" when others fled the city terrified (πτοηθέντες); with nobody willing to volunteer (οὐδενὸς δ᾽ ἐπιδιδόντος ἑαυτὸν) in a desperate situation, Protogenes stepped up to shoulder the burdens of the Olbians time and again; Agathokles of Istros hazarded danger when others ran away out of fear (διὰ τὸμ φόβον); and when a crisis gripped the city of Sestos "because of fear of the neighboring Thracians" (διά τε τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν γειτνιώντων Θρᾳκῶν φόβον), Menas "gave himself unhesitatingly to all things advantageous to the city" (see chap. 5).[77] When others hesitated or fled, these civic benefactors "gave

---

[76] Plutarch, *Demetrios*, 1.1–6.

[77] Koteies: ἕτεροι πτοηθέντες [ἐξ]-εχώρουν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως…ἑτοιμότερον ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ<ν> κίνδυνον ἔδωκεν (*SEG* 57.1109.Col. II.15–20); Protogenes (*IOSPE* I^2 32); Agathokles (*I.ScM* I 15 = *SEG* 24.1095); Menas: καὶ τῆς πόλεω[ς] [ἐ]ν ἐπικινδύνωι καιρῶι γενομένης διά τε τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν γειτνιώντων

themselves" and displayed their true quality in service to their grateful cities.

Paul portrays the conduct of Kephas in terms that suggest cowardice and that show him acting as the opposite of benefactors who in the face of fear laudably devote themselves to benefit their communities to the point of risking their own lives.[78] The pressure from a group from James in Jerusalem was too much for Kephas, who "shrank back and separated himself" out of fear (ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν φοβούμενος; Gal 2:12). Further, Paul's language strongly contrasts the full commitment (Gal 1:4) and self-surrender (Gal 2:20) of Jesus for others with the lack of commitment and the withdrawal of Kephas for the Christ-followers from among the nations at Antioch (Gal 2:12). Linguistically the divergence is striking: Kephas separated himself (ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν; Gal 2:12) to the detriment of others but Christ "gave himself" (δοῦναι ἑαυτόν: Gal 1:4) and "handed himself over" (παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν: Gal 2:20) for the benefit of others. Paul's words make use of the endangered benefactor motif, seen through the lens of Christ's own self-endangerment for the sake of others, to cast Kephas in a role of would-be benefactor who shirked the opportunity to imitate Christ and stand firm in the face of fear.

The problem with Kephas's conduct is amplified by his apparent word-deed incongruency and performative contradictions. Paul's charge against Kephas that he is engaging in "playing a part" (ὑποκρίνεσθαι; ὑπόκρισις; Gal 2:13–14) when he withdrew from eating together with Gentiles in Antioch is no less than a charge that Peter lacks integrity. His deed of withdrawal is out of step with his previous affirmations and conduct. If Peter had already approved that Titus should not be compelled to be

---

Θρᾳκῶν φόβον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐκ τῆς αἰφνιδίου περιστάσεως ἐπιστάντων χαλεπῶν, Μηνᾶ[ς] καὶ λέγων καὶ πράσσων διετέλει τὰ ἄριστα καὶ κάλλιστα, διδοὺς ἀπροφασίστως ἑαυτὸν εἰς πάντα τὰ συνφέροντα τῆι πόλει (*OGIS* 339.15–20).

[78] deSilva characterizes Peter in contrast to Eleazar from 2 Macc 6:18–31, calling him "a sort of anti-Eleazar here [in Gal 2:13], acting out a role to avoid painful but necessary confrontation." deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 204. This dissertation sets Peter in contrast with the broader canvas of civic benefactors, as an "anti-benefactor" rather than simply an "anti-Eleazar."

circumcised in Jerusalem (Gal 2:3), if he had already consented to the arrangement of eating together with non-Jews in Antioch (Gal 2:11–12), and if he had affirmed Paul's manner of working among Gentiles (Gal 2:7–10), his inconsistency is evident to all when he ceased to eat with Gentiles. Moreover, if his audience is tracking with his moral reasoning, Paul's charge of word-deed incongruence would bring shame on Peter for his conduct and discourage imitation of his behavior in the present moment.

Galatians 3:1–5: God's Provisions

This section will explore the terminology Paul uses to describe God's furnishing of the Spirit in its benefaction context. In Galatians 3:5, Paul describes God as ὁ ἐπιχορηῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν ("the one who is supplying to you the Spirit and working powerful deeds among you").[79] The verb ἐπιχορηγῆσαι (to supply) occurs in a few Greek inscriptions that honor benefactors.[80] First, a late third century BC inscription from Morrylos in Macedonia honors a certain Alketas.[81] This individual, Alketas, benefitted the people of Morrylos in several ways:

> In times of heavy expenditure contributing (ἐπιχορηγῶν) to the maintenance of the visitors, on the occasion of the visits of the authorities and the other obligations of providing shelter, entertaining and spending from his own (ἐκ [τοῦ ἰ]δ̣ίου); in the seventeenth year, having accepted to build the city wall, alone, in order to provide for the safety of all (χάριν τοῦ πρ[ον]οηθῆναι τῆς π̣ά̣ντων σωτηρίας), he had corn brought to the market, and over and above that, spending freely ([δ]α[π]α̣νῶν μεγάλως), gave pasturing cows to the citizens and to the god.[82]

---

[79] deSilva brings out the imperfective aspect with his translation of "the one, then, who keeps on supplying to you and working miraculous signs among you." deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 264, 276, 276n32.

[80] The closely related term χορηγῆσαι occurs with more frequency in honorific inscriptions. Originally the term referred to funding "choral productions at public festivals," but eventually it gained the broader sense of "to furnish, supply." Danker, *Benefactor*, 331. For a choral example, see *I.Iasos* 160.6, 9, 15, 18. General "furnish" examples include *I.Priene* 108.151–152 (after 129 BC, Priene); *OGIS* 339.77 (133–120 BC, Sestos); *OGIS* 90.25, 33 (196 BC). References to *OGIS* 339 and *OGIS* 90 thanks to Danker, *Benefactor*, 331.

[81] *SEG* 39.605 (shortly after 206/205 or 205/204).

[82] *SEG* 39.605.1–12. Translation from M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, vol. 1, *A Historical and Epigraphic Study*. ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ 22 (Athens, 1996), 149; text from M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, vol. 2, *Epigraphic Appendix* (Athens, 1996), 70–71 (see Plate LII).

The result of Alketas's beneficence was a city that properly engaged in hospitality to outsiders, became more adequately fortified and safe from potential attacks, was provisioned with food, and in right relation to its deity. The community of Morrylos praised (ἐπαινέσαι) him "for his care and devotion to the citizens" ([ἐπί τε τῇ προ]νοίᾳ καὶ τῇ πρὸς τοὺς π[ο]λ̣ε̣ίτας [εὐ]νοίᾳ) by reciprocating his provisions with awards.[83] In this light, God's supply of the Spirit and δυνάμεις can be seen as a benefaction intended for provisioning a well-ordered and sufficiently supplied community (Gal 3:5). Nevertheless, Paul worries that the Galatians may be ceasing to receive God's provision properly (Gal 3:2–4).

A second example of ἐπιχορηγῆσαι comes from an inscription from western Asia Minor in Miletos from around AD 50.[84] The people posthumously honored Caius Iulius Epikrates, who was a high priest for life, *agonothetes* for life, and gymnasiarch.[85] Epikrates "completed (ἐπιτελέσαντα) all the liturgies and through word and deed and dedications and gifts (δωρεῶν) he arranged (for) the fatherland and supplied (ἐπιχορηγήσαντα)."[86] The two terms ἐπιχορηγῆσαι (to supply) and ἐπιτελῆσαι (to complete) that occur in this brief inscription with regard to Epikrates's beneficial deeds also appear in Galatians 3:3–5, where God is the one who supplies the Spirit (ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν τὸ πνεῦμα; Gal 3:5) and the Galatians are the ones (currently) attempting to complete (ἐπιτελῆσαι) God's provision of the Spirit and working of powerful deeds "by the flesh" (σαρκὶ; 3:3).[87] Whereas in the Milesian inscription the same individual

---

[83] *SEG* 39.605.12–22.

[84] *SEG* 44.938. For another (earlier) honorary decree for Gaius Iulius Epikrates (6/5 BC), see *SEG* 44.940.

[85] ἀρχιερεύς διὰ βίου, ἀγωνοθέτης διὰ βίου, and γυμνασίαρχος (*SEG* 44.938.8–10). He is also called "benefactor of the city" (εὐεργέτης τῆς πόλεως; *SEG* 44.938.14–15).

[86] *SEG* 44.938.11–14 (πάσας τὰς λειτουργίας ἐπιτελέσαντα καὶ διά δωρεῶν κοσμήσαντα τὴν πατρίδα καὶ ἐπιχ[ορηγή]σαντα).

[87] On starting and completing, see chapter 3.

completes his liturgies and supplies gifts, in Galatians God supplies the gift (the Spirit and powerful deeds) and the Galatians are obligated to complete in the proper manner (πνεύματι; Gal 3:3).[88] The analogous conceptual "liturgy" that the Galatians must complete is a life in conformity to the Spirit (Gal 5:25). Of significance is that the Spirit is the Spirit of God's Son that has entered the Galatians' hearts (Gal 4:6). That is, conformity to the pattern of Christ the endangered-son-benefactor constitutes a sort of "liturgy" that the Galatians must complete, lest they become like disreputable benefactors who fail to complete the service that they have begun.[89]

Gratitude, Ingratitude, and Decisions

Paul's letters are replete with him and his co-writers giving gratitude to God for various reasons or instructing others to do so.[90] Further, the practice of animal sacrifice to deities—gratitude in the form of gifts to gods—provides Paul with a model which he uses metaphorically to instruct Christ-followers to orient their entire lives as quality sacrifices to God (Rom 12:1–2). Moreover, Paul is concerned with the good repute (δόξα) of his benefactor God.[91] For instance, he states that the purpose of Christ's

---

[88] Although, one must note that Epikrates may have mediated the gifts (δωρεαί) from an imperial superior. See the commentary for *SEG* 44.938.

[89] The Galatians are recipients of benefaction who are obligated to imitate their benefactor Christ. So, calling them "disreputable benefactors" is referring to their failed conformity to the proper behavioral pattern. That is, rather than acting as Christ-like benefactors they are not fulfilling their obligation to do so.

[90] Rom 1:8 (εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου); Rom 6:17 (χάρις τῷ θεῷ); Rom 7:25 (χάρις τῷ θεῷ); Rom 14:6 (εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ θεῷ [x2]); 1 Cor 1:4 (εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου πάντοτε); 1 Cor 1:14 (εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ); 1 Cor 14:18 (εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ); 1 Cor 15:57 (τῷ θεῷ χάρις); 2 Cor 2:14 (τῷ θεῷ χάρις); 2 Cor 4:15 (ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα διὰ τῶν πλειόνων τὴν εὐχαριστίαν περισσεύσῃ εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ); 2 Cor 8:16 (χάρις τῷ θεῷ); 2 Cor 9:11–12 (ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι εἰς πᾶσαν ἁπλότητα, ἥτις κατεργάζεται δι' ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ θεῷ· ὅτι ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης οὐ μόνον ἐστὶν προσαναπληροῦσα τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν ἁγίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν τῷ θεῷ); 2 Cor 9:15 (χάρις τῷ θεῷ); Phil 1:3 (εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ); Phil 4:6 (ἐν παντὶ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωριζέσθω πρὸς τὸν θεόν); 1 Thess 1:2 (εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ); 1 Thess 2:13 (ἡμεῖς εὐχαρίστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ ἀδιαλείπτως); 1 Thess 3:9 (τίνα γὰρ εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι περὶ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ ᾗ χαίρομεν δι' ὑμᾶς ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν); 1 Thess 5:18 (ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριτεῖτε); Philem 4 (εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου).

[91] E.g., in typical language used for praising a benefactor for his or her deeds (δόξα, ἔπαινος), Paul prays for the Philippian assembly to be "filled with the fruit of uprightness that is through Jesus Christ to the good reputation and praise of God" (πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης τὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς

becoming "a servant of circumcision" was so that the nations would come to praise God and increase his good reputation (Rom 15:7–13).[92] On the contrary, refusing to acknowledge God's good repute and to thank him properly (οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ἠυχαρίστησαν) is the mark of a disordered, idolatrous mind (Rom 1:21). Therefore, any notion that Paul portrays the God-human relationship as non-reciprocal—in the sense that humans are not expected to (voluntarily) express praise or thanks to God for his deeds and care—is, to put it mildly, highly implausible. Such contentions for a non-reciprocal God would not only be a complete novelty in Greek, Roman, and Jewish/Judean cultural expressions of divine-human relationships but it also does not account for Paul's frequent expressions of praise, thanks, fidelity, and gratitude to God for his benefactions and deeds.[93]

In Galatians, the issue of ingratitude looms large. Paul famously lacks a note of gratitude to God for his audience in the beginning of the letter (cf. Rom 1:8; 1 Cor 1:4–7; Phil 1:3–6; 1 Thess 1:2–5; Phlm 4–6), presaging the tone of the letter and the attention he gives to the Galatians' own potential ingratitude.[94] Indeed, scholars that have engaged the issue of benefaction in Galatians tend to focus on the themes of ingratitude and defection at play in Galatians (see chap. 1). In Galatians, Paul most pointedly invokes the script of ingratitude in Galatians 5:1–5. After recounting Christ's benefaction of liberation and warning the Galatians not to live again with "a yoke of enslavement" (Gal 5:1), Paul

---

δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ; Phil 1:11).

[92] Paul uses several expressions to describe the Gentile praise of God in Rom 15:7–13 (δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν, εὐφράνθητε, αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον καὶ ἐπαινεσάτωσαν αὐτὸν; cf. Rom 15:6). On the argument that διάκονος περιτομῆς refers to Christ as a "servant of circumcision" in the sense of an "agent of circumcision" for Gentiles (as opposed to "a servant of the circumcised"), see Joshua D. Garroway, "The Circumcision of Christ: Romans 15:7–13," *JSNT* 34, no. 4 (2012): 303–322.

[93] On understanding Paul's God as a deity who engages with humans on reciprocal terms, see Eyl, *Signs, Wonders, and Gifts*, 170–212. Further, Eyl criticizes New Testament scholars who mischaracterize ancient Greek and Roman religiosity to showcase alleged uniqueness (i.e., superiority) of early Christianity as non-reciprocal. Eyl, *Signs, Wonders, and Gifts*, 198–206.

[94] Although Paul does not use εὐχαριστῆσαι in the opening of 2 Corinthians, he praises God with a different expression (εὐλογητός; 2 Cor 1:3–4).

bluntly tells them that "if you get circumcised, Christ will benefit you nothing" (ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει; Gal 5:2). He further explains "to the person who is circumcised" that they become "a debtor to do the whole Torah" (Gal 5:3). In consequence of this possible double trouble of no longer being on the receiving end of the benefactive activity of Christ and instead being indebted to Torah, the Galatians would sever their connection to their benefactor's generosity/favor. Paul warns the one who gets circumcised of how their decision will affect them: "you were cut off from Christ, anyone who is considered right by Torah, you fell out of his favor" (κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ, οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε; Gal 5:4).[95] As a result, Paul frames the situation so that the decisions the Galatian assemblies must make are set within a benefactor-recipient framework subject to the gratitude-ingratitude social script (see also Gal 1:6–9). If the Galatians accept compelled circumcision for their male members, they will exercise definitive ingratitude to God and Christ their liberator-benefactors and as a result cut off their ongoing relationship of favor and thanksgiving.

The "gift as bait" motif in Polybios offers a possible avenue for understanding one way the Galatians could have perceived the χάρις of God and Christ when faced with threats of forced circumcision. When some people began compelling circumcision for the Galatians, one can imagine the social script of "gift as bait" running for them.[96] A Galatian who turned to the God of Israel and his Messiah because of their benefactions would likely already be facing social dislocation to some extent. Forsaking one's ancestral deities and customs for exclusive devotion to Israel's God could cause a crisis of belonging. If the Galatians were no longer participating fully in public festivals or

---

[95] Note how Paul has flipped the script on who is showing ingratitude to God's benefaction. In Galatians 2:21 he was defending his own viewpoint, saying that "I am not annulling the benefaction/generosity of God" (οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ). Now in Galatians 5:2–4 he charges others with acting out of step with Christ's χάρις. On ἐκπίπτειν + genitive, see *DGE*, "ἐκπίπτω," B.I.3 (verse privado de, ser desposeído, perder; esp. caer, ser derribado de una posición de poder, perder).

[96] The idea that the Galatians may have considered that they had fallen victim to a "gift as bait" scheme is merely presented a possibility rather than a probability.

other social gatherings, or if some had decided to leave their local trade guild or other association due to its association with devotion to another god, then the social alienation would have been palpable. If the (male) Galatians originally received Paul's message with the understanding that they would not need to circumcise themselves, the humiliation of forced circumcision added to the cutting of ties to ancestral deities and customs and the loss of belonging in their native towns or cities could very easily have felt like the hook of a bait. In this scenario, being told Israel's God welcomes them into his family without circumcision because of his Messiah is the gift-bait to get them to submit to circumcision. If read in this light, Paul's letter to them would then be setting the record straight on the benefactions of the Judean God and his Messiah. In this scenario, the letter is (in part) reiterating that they must not submit to circumcision, the Galatians can find a sense of belonging and community among the children of Abraham and Sarah through Christ's Spirit, and that getting circumcised would actually constitute a violation of the protocols of benefaction and gratitude.

Benefits to the Worthy and Unworthy

In chapter 3 it was noted that typically one would normally give gifts or benefactions to "worthy" (ἄξιος) people or cities who had a good reputation. It was important for individuals or groups to be discerning in who they chose to benefit, lest they help an enemy or slight a valued friend. Further, people did not give benefactions without any explicable reason; instead, there was a strategy or rationale for giving to somebody rather than another. People who gave gifts indiscriminately came under criticism from others. Nevertheless, clemency, or showing favor to someone unworthy or someone who would normally receive punishment, was highly valued and a mark of virtue for kings and political figures.

In his reading of Galatians, John Barclay draws attention to how Paul presents God as one who gives the Christ-gift incongruously or unconditioned, that is, not

considering whether the recipients are worthy of the gift.[97] To determine whether God is described as giving incongruously, Barclay asks if "there is a hidden pre-constituted rationale for God's benevolence toward these trapped and sinful beneficiaries."[98] He identifies several incongruous dynamics in Galatians. Paul's use of the term "to call" (καλῆσαι) in Galatians 1:6 reflects how God's own initiative in reaching out with generosity/benefaction (χάρις) is done "without regard to conditions of capacity, status, or moral worth" to Gentile "sinners" who are ignorant of Israel's God and who are slaves to non-gods (Gal 2:15; 4:8–9).[99] Further, Paul's own autobiographical narrative expresses how God "called" Paul "through his generosity/benefaction" (διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ) despite Paul's prior striving against God's assembly and "without regard to his ethnicity, tradition, and excellence" (Gal 1:13–16).[100] Indeed, "ethnicity, status, and gender are no longer criteria of superior worth" (Gal 3:28).[101] Finally, at the end of the letter, Paul invokes the mercy (ἔλεος) of God upon Israel (Gal 6:16; εἰρήνη ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ).[102] Nevertheless, God is not arbitrarily dispensing benefits;

---

[97] Barclay defines incongruity as a gift "given without condition, that is, without regard to the worth of the recipient." Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 73.

[98] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 353.

[99] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 354.

[100] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 356–360.

[101] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 435.

[102] God is repeatedly lauded in the LXX as one who shows ἔλεος. Especially emphasized is the longevity and durability of his mercy. See, e.g., LXX Exod 20:6 (καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος εἰς χιλιάδας τοῖς ἀγαπῶσίν με καὶ τοῖς φυλάσσουσιν τὰ προστάγματά μου; cf. Deut 5:10; 7:9); LXX Exod 34:6–7 (κύριος ὁ θεὸς οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων, μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινὸς καὶ δικαιοσύνην διατηρῶν καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος εἰς χιλιάδας, ἀφαιρῶν ἀνομίας καὶ ἀδικίας καὶ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ οὐ καθαριεῖ τὸν ἔνοχον ἐπάγων ἀνομίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἐπὶ τέκνα τέκνων ἐπὶ τρίτην καὶ τετάρτην γενεάν); LXX Ps 17:51 (μεγαλύνων τὰς σωτηρίας τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος τῷ χριστῷ αὐτοῦ, τῷ Δαυιδ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος); LXX Ps 99:5 (ὅτι χρηστὸς κύριος, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἕως γενεᾶς καὶ γενεᾶς ἡ ἀλήθεια αὐτοῦ); LXX Ps 105:1 (ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι χρηστός, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ); LXX Ps 108:21, 26 (καὶ σύ, κύριε κύριε, ποίησον μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἔλεος ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, ὅτι χρηστὸν τὸ ἔλεός σου; βοήθησόν μοι, κύριε ὁ θεός μου, σῶσόν με κατὰ τὸ ἔλεός σου); LXX Ps 135:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26 (ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ); 1 Macc 4:24 (καὶ ἐπιστραφέντες ὕμνουν καὶ εὐλόγουν εἰς οὐρανὸν ὅτι καλόν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ). On ἔλεος καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ (Gal 6:16) as Paul offering a prayer for God to show mercy on his kinspeople Israel, see Susan Grove Eastman, "Israel and the Mercy of God: A Re-Reading of Galatians 6.16 and Romans 9–11," *New Testament Studies* 56 (2010): 367–395. See also, Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 420–421.

rather, his benefaction of Christ and the Spirit accords with his prior promise-based plans for the family of Abraham (Gal 3:6–28; 4:21–31). Thus, Paul's kinship discourse affords him the ability to give a rationale for God's otherwise unconditioned benefaction.

Time

Time could be referenced in relation to benefaction in several ways. A benefactor could be praised for a well-timed service, rewarded for constancy, and honorific decrees sometimes invoked past-present narrative to highlight the continuity of the benefactor's services from the past into the present (see chap. 3). Aspects of each of these benefaction themes occur in Galatians. In Galatians 4:4–7, Paul describes God's well-timed benefaction: "When the fullness of the time period came, God sent out his son" (ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ; Gal 4:4). God's sending of his son reflects the end of the Torah's tenure as intermediary. Now, history is divided with reference to the coming of the πίστις (Gal 1:23) and Abraham's promised "seed" (Gal 3:19).[103] God's proper timing of his benefaction is also seen in Christ's act of deliverance "according to the will of our God and Father" (κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν; Gal 1:4) and in scriptural foresight and the pre-proclaiming of the good news to Abraham (προϊδεῖν, προευαγγελίζεσθαι; Gal 3:8). Finally, God's benefaction in the Christ-event was not a one-time gift-event without ongoing effects. God supplies the Spirit as a continual resource and works powerful deeds for his assemblies (Gal 3:5).

The importance of time also relates to Paul's own autobiographical comments. In Galatians 1, Paul makes use of past-present narratives. He contrasts his mode of conduct (ἀναστροφή) when he was in *Ioudaïsmos* and "pursuing/persecuting the assembly of God and destroying it" with when God revealed his Son to him (Gal 1:13–

[103] Gupta is probably right to see ἡ πίστις in Galatians 3:23 as referring to "a social bond with God in and through Jesus Christ." Nijay Gupta, *Paul and the Language of Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020), 143–147.

16). He again uses a past-present narrative recounting how the Judean Christ-followers "only were hearing that the one pursuing/persecuting us back then is now proclaiming the good news of the trust that he was destroying" (Gal 1:23). His usage contrasts with the normal usage of past-present constructions in honorific inscriptions that mark the continuity of a benefactor's good conduct with a πρότερον-νῦν construction (see chap. 3). Paul describes his past conduct as characteristic of an anti-benefactor, describing his previous ἀναστροφή as detrimental to "God's assembly" (ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ; Gal 1:13). Paul's negative characterization of his past ἀναστροφή contrasts with how honorific inscriptions laud those who exhibit a useful or beneficial ἀναστροφή (residence/dwelling or mode of conduct) toward the towns and cities in the Greek-speaking world. So, in a proxeny decree an assembly (ἐκκλησία) of the city of Malis (Lamia) honored the horse-doctor Metrodoros because he "made his dwelling (τάν [τ]ε ἀναστ[ρ]οφὰν) and residence (here) for a long time, as it was appropriate for a noble and good man" (ἀνδρὶ καλῶι καὶ ἀγαθῶι).[104] Athens praised Protagoras the priest of Asklepios because he "has displayed seemly conduct (τὴν ἀναστροφὴν), fitting for the priesthood."[105] The Amphiktyonians praised a certain Pythian priest Demetrios because "he made his residence and conduct (ἀναστροφὴν) worthy of the honor of the Amphiktyonians and the good repute of the fatherland."[106] In Galatians 1, Paul uses past-present discourse to mark discontinuity, contrasting his past destructive pattern of conduct within Ἰουδαϊσμός with his present turn to God's Messiah and the pattern of behavior commensurate with fidelity to him.

---

[104] *IG* IX.2.69.6–7 (146–ca. 130 BC). The decree explains that Metrodoros gave his services "without a fee" (ἄνευ μισθοῦ; *IG* IX.2.69.8). Text and translations of *IG* IX.2 69 are from Matthew J. C. Scarborough, "A New Edition of *IG* IX,2 69," *ZPE* 193 (2015): 166–171.

[105] *SEG* 18.22.12–13 (πεποίηται δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀναστροφὴν εὐσχήμο[ν]α καὶ ὁρμόττουσαν τεῖ ἱερω[σ]ύνε[ι]; 165/164 BC or 140/149 BC; Athens). Translation from Stephen Lambert and Feyo Schuddeboom, "Honours for the Priest of Asklepios," Attic Inscriptions Online, last updated April 14, 2021, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII2/950.

[106] *FD* III 2.161.10–13 (καὶ τὴν ἐ<π>ιδημίαν καὶ ἀναστροφὴν [ἐ]ποιήσατο ἀξίαν τοῦ τε περὶ τοὺς Ἀμ[φ]ικτύονας ἀξιώματος καὶ τῆς π[ερ]ὶ τὴν πατρίδα δόξης; Delphi; 1st c. AD)

Fidelity and Imitation

The term πίστις has seen significant scholarly interest in the last ten years. The recent studies of Teresa Morgan, Jennifer Eyl, Nijay Gupta, Peter Oakes, Suzan Sierksma-Agteres, Matthew Bates, and John Goodrich have sought to situate the use of πίστις in the New Testament within a broader cultural context.[107] These studies have shown the complexity of the term and the variety of senses with which one could use πίστις (trust, fidelity, good faith, trusteeship/position of trust, confidence, proof). The present section does not attempt to comprehensively discuss πίστις in Galatians. Instead, it will draw attention to usage that reflects the letter's benefaction context. In this dissertation, the term πίστις was considered when used in the context of endangered benefaction.[108] What was found is that situations of distress and danger acted as occasions for someone to show their fidelity or good faith (πίστις). The term πίστις was employed when a crisis induced a dangerous situation within which a benefactor could show πίστις to another by reliably conducting commendable services despite the risk.[109] Interestingly, πίστις and *fides* language grew remarkably in the first century BC and even

---

[107] John K. Goodrich, "'Standard of Faith' of 'Measure of a Trusteeship'? A Study in Romans 12:3," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 74 (2012): 753–772; Suzan J.M. Sierksma-Agteres, "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ and *Fides* as Civic and Divine Virtues: A Pauline Concept through Greco-Roman Eyes," in *Paul's Graeco-Roman Context*, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2015), 525–543; Teresa Morgan, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Matthew W. Bates, *Salvation by Allegiance Alone: Rethinking Faith, Works, and the Gospel of Jesus the King* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017); Peter Oakes, "*Pistis* as Relational Way of Life in Galatians," *JSNT* 40, no. 3 (2018): 255–275; Gupta, *Paul and the Language of Faith*; Jennifer Eyl, "Philo and Josephus on the Fidelity of the Judeans," *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 12, no. 1 (2021): 94–121.

[108] See the section on Fidelity and Disloyalty in chapter 3, chapter 4, and the discussion of Seleukos of Rhosos in chapter 5.

[109] See also, Sir 22:23 (NRSV): "Gain the trust of your neighbor in his poverty, so that you may rejoice with him in his prosperity. Stand by him in time of distress, so that you may share with him in his inheritance" (πίστιν κτῆσαι ἐν πτωχείᾳ μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον, ἵνα ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτοῦ ὁμοῦ πλησθῇς· ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως διάμενε αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐν τῇ κληρονομίᾳ αὐτοῦ συγκληρονομήσῃς). A series of honorific inscriptions from Aphrodisias also draws attention to the remarkable services of a man during dangerous crises (Reynolds §28–31). This man, hailed as "deliverer and benefactor" (σωτήρ καὶ εὐεργέτης), is lauded for (among other things) "having saved his country from many and great dangers, having fought bravely in all the wars which beset his country, having guarded the forts entrusted to him by the city and preserved faith to the common interest (?) in the most difficult circumstances (ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων κινδύνων σεσωκότα τὴν πατρ[ί]δα πᾶσι τοῖς ἐνστᾶσι τῇ πατρίδι πολέμοις ἀγωνισάμενον ἀνδρείως καὶ διαφυλάξαντα τὰ ἐμπιστευθέντα ὀχυρώματα ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως καὶ πίστεις ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καιροῖς διατηρήσαντα τῶι κοινῶι; Reynolds §30.1–10). Text and translation from Reynolds §30 (5 sublinear dots omitted).

more so in the first century AD, with Judean texts showing a high concentration of πίστις language.[110] The high frequency of Paul's use of πίστις reflects this broader uptick of πίστις language.

In Paul's letter to the Galatians, it is evident that the Galatians are in a situation of distress and danger from individuals who are exercising force to compel Galatian males to undergo circumcision against their will (Gal 2:3–4; 4:29; 6:12; cf. 2:14). This hazardous situation can partially explain why Paul relies heavily on πίστις language in the letter. A dangerous situation can force decisions about fidelity and defection, keeping good faith or shirking the risk. Paul construes the decision in front of the Galatians in such terms: choose fidelity to their benefactors (God and Christ) by not submitting to forced circumcision; or choose defection from their benefactors by accepting circumcision, which would alleviate the threat but constitute a decisive act of ingratitude. Paul, of course, tries to persuade them toward what he sees as fidelity.

Paul connects his πίστις language with love and by extension Christ's self-endangerment on behalf of his constituents. In Galatians 3:11, Paul quotes (and modifies) the Old Greek of Habakkuk 2:4: ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται ("the righteous one will live by fidelity/trust/good faith" or "the one who is righteous by fidelity/trust/good faith will live").[111] For Paul, Gentile fidelity to God does not include "works of Torah" (ἔργα

---

[110] Jennifer Eyl, "Philo and Josephus on the Fidelity of the Judeans," 116–117. As word of caution, it should be noted that Eyl's numbers are based on *TLG* and thus omit epigraphical and papyrological sources.

[111] The Old Greek reads ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται. 8Hev XII reads [καὶ δί]καιος ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ ζήσετ[αι]. Although relatively rare, the phrase ἐκ πίστεως does occur in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods and refers to somebody acting "in accordance with/out of one's own good faith" (ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας πίστεως). The historian Polybios uses the phrase "out of his own good faith" (ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας πίστεως; Polyb., *Hist*., 28.1.9). In a related construction, the phrase ἐκ πίστεως occurs in the standardized phrase "out of the public interests and his/their own good faith" (ἐκ τῶν δημωσίων πραγμάτων καὶ τῆς ἰδίας πίστεως, with slight variations like ἐκ τῶν δημωσίων πραγμάτων πίστεώς τε ἰδίας). See *RDGE* §7.50–51 (190/140 BC, Magnesia); *IG* VII 2225.12–13, 39–40, 44–45 (170 BC, Thisbe [Boiotia]); *OGIS* 351b9–10 (ca. 156 BC, Priene); *IG* IX.2 89b.36–37 (ca. 140 BC, Narthakion [Thessaly]); *SEG* 58.1349.14 (135 BC, Priene); *I.Priene* 41.15 (135 BC, Priene); *SEG* 33.986.16, 19–20 (129/101 BC, Smyrna); *FD* III 2.70.63–64, 65–66 (112/111 BC, Delphi); *IC* III iv 10.73–74 (112/111 BC, Itanos [Crete]); *IG* XII.3 173.8–9 (105 BC, Astypalaia); *FD* III 4.37.15 (101 BC; cf. *FD* III 4.276.16); *SEG* 29.1076.121–122 (prob. 81 BC, Lagina); *SEG* 51.1427.31 (78 BC, Rome); *IG* XII.2 35.Col. B.25–26, Col. C.7–8, 19–20 (48/47–21 BC, Mytilene); Reynolds §8.93–94 (39/38 BC, Aphrodisias). Among the papyri associated with Babatha, the

νόμου; e.g., Gal 3:6–14), especially not circumcision (Gal 5:2–4). Instead, he connects fidelity to God to love, saying, "for in Christ Jesus neither circumcision not foreskin accomplishes anything; rather, fidelity exercised through love" (ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη; Gal 5:6).[112] The "in Christ" phrase in Galatians 5:6 recalls Christ's example of committed self-endangering love for others (Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13). Paul then further exhorts the Galatians that they should serve one another in mutual self-enslavement as a fulfilment of the Levitical love command (Lev 19:18) as an expression of love (Gal 5:13–14; cf. mutual burden-bearing in Gal 6:2). Negative examples pepper Galatians as foils to this fidelity-as-love ethic: Paul within *Ioudaïsmos* who was violently pursuing and destroying God's *ekklesia* (Gal 1:13–14), Kephas at Antioch who shrinks back out of fear rather than endangering himself for Christ-following Gentiles when pressure to disassociate with them comes from Jerusalem (Gal 2:11–14), and those who are forcing Gentile circumcision upon the Galatians (Gal 6:12). In contrast to these negative examples of compulsion and cowardice, Paul promotes a different principle. When members of the family of God are in danger, it is this principle of fidelity-as-love-of-neighbor that exhibits δικαιοσύνη, exemplified most fully in Jesus's act of love through self-surrender unto death on behalf of his constituents (Gal 2:20; cf. Gal 1:4; 3:13).[113] The family of

---

phrase ἐκ καλῆς πίστεως occurs in *P.Yadin* 28–30 (ca. AD 125): *P.Yadin* 28.10–11; *P.Yadin* 29.9; *P.Yadin* 30.15–16. Still, the phrase is rare enough that Paul's usages of ἐκ πίστεως should be probably considered a shorthand reference to Hab 2:4 each time. For Paul's ἐκ πίστεως usages in Romans as shorthand for Hab 2:4, see Roy E. Ciampa, "Habakkuk 2:4 in Romans: Echoes, Allusions, and Rewriting" in *Scripture, Texts, and Tracings in Romans*, ed. Andrew Das and Linda Belleville (Lanham, MD: Lexington/Fortress Academic, 2021), 11–29. Ciampa also contends that ἐκ πίστεως does not occur before the Greek translation of Hab 2:4 in Greek literature, papyri, or inscriptions. He says that the earliest papyrological occurrence is in *PSI* 10.1162 (3rd c. AD) and the earliest epigraphical occurrence is in *SEG* 6.442 (4th c. AD). Ciampa, "Habakkuk 2:4 in Romans," 12, 25n5. Ciampa is correct if he means the exact simple phrase ἐκ πίστεως and no other ἐκ πίστεως construction. But more broadly, the general construction ἐκ πίστεως does occur before Ciampa's examples (see above examples).

[112] On Paul's view that circumcision or foreskin is not able to bring about δικαιοσύνη, see Ryan D. Collman, "Just a Flesh Wound? Reassessing Paul's Supposed Indifference Toward Circumcision and Foreskin in 1 Cor 7:19, Gal 5:6, and 6:15," *JJMJS* 8 (2021): 30–52.

[113] Paul commends various people in his circle who he considers exhibiting laudable imitation of Christ's pattern of self-endangerment. For example, he instructs the Philippians regarding Epaphroditus,

Abraham and Sarah, both Jews and Gentiles, are supposed to imitate the example of their Messiah Jesus among themselves, each becoming endangered benefactors who risk their lives in affectionate service to one another.

Conclusion

Paying attention to the wide array of expressions of civic benefaction helps take New Testament benefaction research beyond the simple reciprocal versus non-reciprocal debates. The explanatory framework of benefaction connects a complex network of interrelated concepts, social scripts, practices, cultural institutions, motifs, and words/phrases in Galatians. In this chapter, Galatians bears both similarities and differences with the wider cultural context of Mediterranean populations during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods.

At a higher level of abstraction Paul by and large conforms to his cultural context and adheres to the cultural scripts, terminology, and motifs of civic benefaction. Christ exhibits prototypical civic generosity and the virtue of self-endangerment for the benefit of others in his full commitment to liberate his constituents from a network of enslaving and coercive powers. Paul uses the staple benefaction term χάρις (benefaction,

---

saying, "Receive him hospitably in the Lord with every joy and have esteem for such people, because on account of the work of Christ he neared death, hazarding his life so that he would fulfill the shortcoming of your service to me" (προσδέχεσθε οὖν αὐτὸν ἐν κυρίῳ μετὰ πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους ἐντίμους ἔχετε, ὅτι διὰ τὸ ἔργον Χριστοῦ μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισεν παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς πρός με λειτουργίας; Phil 2:29–30). Compare Paul's description of Epaphroditos with the strikingly similar language of the 2nd c. AD honorific decree for the civic benefactor Karzoazos of Olbia, who "was acknowledged as far as the ends of the world, exposing himself to dangers as far as the Emperors, for an alliance" (ἀλλὰ καὶ <μέχρι> περάτων γῆς ἐμαρτυρήθη τοὺς ὑπὲρ φιλίας κινδύνους μέχρι Σεβαστῶν συμμαχίᾳ παραβολευσάμενος; *IOSPE* I^2 39.26–28). Moreover, the decree draws attention to how others should imitate Karzoazos's example, "And the decree shall be dedicated in a conspicuous place, in order that those who read it take encouragement to imitate a life that receives praise" (ἀνατεθῆναι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν ἐπισήμῳ τόπῳ, ἵνα οἱ ἀναγεινώσκοντε[ς] προτροπὴν ἔχωσιν εἰς τὸ μειμεῖσθαι βίον ἐπαινούμενον; *IOSPE* I^2 39.36–39). Text and translation of *IOSPE* I^2 39 from Emyr Dakin, "Political Culture in the Cities of the Northern Black Sea Region in the 'Long Hellenistic Age,'" (PhD diss., City University of New York, 2020), 177–178. Further, Paul lauds and expresses gratitude to Priska and Aquila for their self-endangering benefaction on his behalf, saying, "Greet Priska and Aquila my coworkers in Christ Jesus, who risked their own neck for my life, to whom not I alone thank but all the assemblies of the nations, and the assembly at their home" (ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν, οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν, καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν).

generosity) to express the generosity of God and Christ (Gal 1:3, 6, 15; 2:9, 21; 3:18; 5:4; 6:18). Likewise, he uses the phrase δοῦναι ἑαυτόν, common in benefaction contexts, to describe the commitment of Christ to his liberatory service (Gal 1:4). Moreover, Paul's own language about freedom coheres well with the numerous examples of civic freedom in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. That is, in Galatians Paul talks about the double-sided group freedom that entails (1) freedom from external compulsion and enslavement (Gal 2:3, 4; 4:8–9, 17, 29; 5:1; 6:12) and (2) freedom of shared rules and protocols of social cooperation and getting along together (Gal 5:13–6:10). Further, the theme of promise and the practice of kinship diplomacy provides a relevant cultural context for Paul's own kinship reasoning based on the promise of the God of Israel to Abraham (Gal 3:6–4:31). In the Antioch incident, Kephas and those who withdraw from table fellowship with Gentiles out of fear show themselves to be cowardly and failed would-be benefactors who shirk their opportunity to display generosity like other civic benefactors who faced fear and hazard in service of their endangered communities (Gal 2:11–14). Peter's lack of word and deed congruence amplifies the shame and lack of integrity of his actions. In Galatians 3:1–5, Paul uses the starting-and-completing script to persuade the Galatians to continue how they started—with the Spirit that God provisions for them. Further, Paul frames the decision in front of the Galatians—to submit to circumcision or to resist it—in terms of ingratitude and defection. Accepting circumcision would constitute a decisive act of ingratitude that would sever the benefaction relationship with God and Christ, ceasing the bestowal of ongoing benefits (Gal 5:1–4). Additionally, the "gift as bait" motif found in Polybios can provide a possible avenue for understanding how the Galatians may have felt when pressured to submit to circumcision by others. Next, following John Barclay, it is probably best to understand Paul as describing God and Christ as benefitting people who are not "worthy" per se to be recipients of a divine benefaction, but to whom he has nevertheless shown favor (Gal 1:6, 13–16; 2:15; 4:8–9; 6:16). Still, in continuity with wider cultural norms,

God's unconditioned benefaction is given in a non-arbitrary manner based on a benefaction-promise to a shared ancestor of distantly related kin-groups (Judeans and Galatians) for whom Paul constructs a shared lineage through Abraham, Sarah, and Christ (Gal 3:6–4:31). Additionally, Paul, like other textualizations of critical benefactions, portrays God's benefaction as well-timed (Gal 4:4–7; cf. 1:4, 23; 3:8, 19) and ongoing (Gal 3:5). As in other instances of benefaction in which a benefactor demonstrates fidelity to another during a crisis by rendering services, Paul urges the Galatians who are under coercive pressure to get circumcised to recognize that uprightness is reckoned not by strict adherence to "works of Torah" but by fidelity to God and Christ, which one exercises through mutual affection and service after the self-endangering pattern of Christ (e.g., Gal 3:11; 5:6, 13–14; 6:2; compulsion: Gal 2:3–4; 4:29; 6:12; cf. 2:14; Christ-pattern: Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13). Finally, at several points it was argued that Paul presents Christ, like civic benefactors, as a model of imitation for the Galatians and as an exemplar of virtuous conduct.

At the level of Paul's own contingent circumstances of time and place the specifics of Paul's use of benefaction scripts and motifs display their differences with the wider population of expressions. For example, no civic decree honors a benefactor for "handing oneself over" (παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν) to receive a sentence of death by crucifixion (Gal 2:20; cf. 2:19; 3:1), but a few literary texts do use the phrase to describe someone surrendering themselves in exchange or on behalf of another person. Many benefactors risked their lives to benefit their cities or other individuals. Some were even wounded in their efforts (e.g., Kallias of Sphettos, Theophiliskos) or died as they performed their beneficial services (e.g., Quintus Aulius, Horatius Cocles). Envoys jeopardized their own lives and ransomed people from their captivity, imprisonment, and enslavement (e.g., Diodoros, Prokritos, and Klearchos, the brothers Hegesippos and Antippapos, Dikaiarchos of Thria, Eumaridas, Pyrrha[kos], and Aristagoras). Paul's portrayal of Christ in Galatians shares similarities with aspects of each of these benefactors, but (as

would be expected) no single instance maps onto Christ's conduct perfectly.

One relatively distinct feature of Galatians with respect to benefaction is Paul's language of affection/love (ἀγάπη, ἀγαπῆσαι). With a few exceptions, the ἀγαπ- terms are absent in the benefaction corpus. Yet Paul focuses on it with respect to Christ's self-surrendering conduct (Gal 2:20) and in his ethical instructions for the Galatian recipients (Gal 5:6, 13–14, 22). Paul also distances himself from the pattern of conduct exhibited by the sons of Mattathias in the Hasmonean propaganda of 1 and 2 Maccabees. Even though 1 Maccabees portrays the sons of Mattathias as endangered benefactor-generals and envoys who liberate Israel from foreign dominion and who restore their native ancestral laws, Paul rejects the Hasmonean type of aggressive, coercive social and political vision and considers it a part of his former way of conduct that opposed God (Gal 1:13–14). Instead, Christ's liberation comes through self-surrender to Roman crucifixion (Gal 2:19–20; 3:1, 13; 6:14; cf. 1:4; 5:1). Moreover, like other narratives of benefactors, Paul uses a past-present narrative (Gal 1:13–14, 23). But he differs from them in that they use past-present narratives to draw attention to the continuity of a benefactor's continuous service throughout his or her life, whereas Paul uses it to contrast his past conduct with his present. Overall, Paul's letter to the Galatians exhibits many points of similarity to his wider benefaction context, but also displays several points of variance because of his own specific situation.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

Understanding the social context of benefaction provides access to the ancient cultural encyclopedia with which Paul, his associates, and his audiences operated. Such an undertaking affords the researcher necessary information for understanding the benefaction language in Galatians. To restate the thesis: Paul's use of benefaction social scripts, words and phrases, concepts, and motifs in Galatians largely operates in continuity with the wider corpus of benefaction-events but varies with his specific configuration and combination of those various elements. The course of the dissertation details relevant aspects of the cultural encyclopedia of benefaction from roughly 350 BC to AD 150 (chaps. 1–6) and interprets Galatians within the context of that cultural encyclopedia (chap. 7).

This dissertation contributes to New Testament benefaction studies and Galatians scholarship by advancing several streams of scholarship. First, rather than focusing primarily on the issue of reciprocity, it provides a large catalog of culturally appropriate benefaction motifs, concepts, and social scripts for understanding Galatians in its historical and cultural context (chaps. 1–4). Second, whereas other studies are largely reliant on the work of Frederick Danker on endangered benefaction, this dissertation extends his work by expanding the suite of examples of endangered benefaction and by providing a more detailed look at the phenomenon (chaps. 5–6). Third, the dissertation addresses the lack of comprehensive treatment of benefaction in Galatians by contextualizing Paul's use of benefaction language, themes, concepts, and social scripts (chap. 7).

Summary of Chapters

Chapter 1 noted how Paul's use of χάρις in Galatians provides the entry point into the wider cultural encyclopedia of benefaction (Gal 1:3, 6, 15; 2:9, 21; 5:4; 6:18; cf. χαρίζεσθαι in 3:18). Further, the chapter examined the most significant post-1980 research on benefaction and Galatians. The chapter argued that despite the contributions of scholars like Frederick Danker, James Harrison, John Barclay, David deSilva, and Ferdinand Okorie, a more extensive exploration of benefaction and endangered benefaction in the ancient documentary and literary sources, coupled with a focus on Galatians, could extend the scholarship on Galatians and benefaction in a way that goes beyond the valuable contributions of past scholarship.

Chapter 2 highlighted the role and importance of proper gratitude to one's benefactor (human or divine) across all social domains. Indeed, the custom of gratitude for benefits occurs in numerous mammalian species and is probably a cross-cultural human universal with deep evolutionary roots that provides populations with a mechanism to scale-up an extended cooperative society. In the civic benefaction institution that developed in Greek cities, the repute mechanism and information feedback system form an adaptive selection mechanism for cities' populations and a repository of strategies for group survival and flourishing. In a benefaction relationship, a recipient's memory (or forgetfulness) correlates to the importance of a benefaction at the time of reception. Additionally, uprightness (δικαιοσύνη) could be a virtue of one who is reputed for generosity and assiduously repaying favors with gratitude. Furthermore, benefaction involves a series of complex decisions. On the one hand, the benefactor or giver had to decide who to benefit, what to give, and how much to give. On the other hand, a would-be recipient had to decide whether to receive a favor or gift or reject it, and how to return gratitude if one decided to accept a benefit. Reputation played a key role in how a would-be giver or recipient decides, but law, custom, and affection also factored into decisions. People who because of poverty were unable to thank a benefactor

appropriately could rely on the gods to repay on their behalf. Moreover, obsequiousness could please a would-be giver yet simultaneously disgust others. Being locked in one's own culturally specific gifting scripts and being ignorant of another's protocols could cause intercultural misunderstanding. Finally, the gift as bait tactic took advantage of the societal division of knowledge not to cooperate (the normal, win-win situation) but to manipulate others into a disadvantageous position or outcome. As a known tactic in gift-giving, would-be recipients of gifts or benefactions knew they should exercise caution when deciding whether to accept them or not.

Chapter 3 explored specific motifs and relational and systemic dynamics within the domain of benefaction that are relevant to Galatians. These included civic freedom, promise, starting and completing, word-deed congruency, benefits to the worthy and unworthy, generosity and abundance, time, ingratitude, fidelity and defection, kinship language, memory, imitation, and community survival. Subsequently, chapter 4 used the events of the First Mithridatic War (89–85 BC) to illustrate how many of these topics are brought together and cohere in the ancient sources.

Chapter 5 elaborated on the motif of endangered benefaction in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. People from different cultures appealed to and expressed thanks to the gods for preserving them or others from dangers and textualized the delivering power of their gods in inscriptions and literature. On the human level, individual self-endangerment for the sake of others was lauded in battle, rewarded with personal honors (e.g., crown, titles, gifts), and seen as an example worthy of memory for present and future generations. If leaders risked their lives, it could motivate their soldiers to imitate their valor and the shared struggle could produce a sense of unity between soldiers and commanders. Notable singular deeds of risk on behalf of others from Hasdrubal, Quintus Aulius, Horatius Cocles, Scipio Africanus, and Theophiliskos highlighted different aspects of self-endangerment. Next, the chapter examined in detail how a host of civic benefactors aided the populations of Greek-speaking cities during

times of acute distress. These benefactors recognized the dangers of enslavement, captivity, an oppressive foreign garrison, invasion, tyranny, pandemic, famine, and crushing debt and often undertook personally hazardous missions to provide relief and deliverance to people and populations who were in dire need of help.

Chapter 6 examined how 1 Maccabees and Josephus in his *Life* incorporate the theme of endangered benefaction in their work. The Greek 1 Maccabees portrays the sons of Mattathias as civic benefactors who risk their lives to ensure freedom for the people of Judea. In his *Life*, Josephus portrays himself as a benefactor who undergoes substantial risk to aid his friends and fellow Judeans.

Chapter 7 offers a contextualized and comparative reading of Galatians in its benefaction context. In general, Paul conforms to his cultural context by abiding by its social scripts, terminology, and motifs. Thus, Paul's understanding of freedom (ἐλευθερία) is analogous to civic freedom in Greek cities, which refers to a population's negative freedom from external powers of compulsion and control (whether to a foreign power or a native tyrant) and positive freedom to abide by its own laws, customs, and ways of getting along together as a group. For Paul, Christ has liberated his constituents from a complex of coercive and enslaving powers (negative freedom; Gal 1:4; 2:3, 4; 3:13, 21; 4:2, 8–10, 17, 21, 29; 5:1–3) and provided a freedom to get along together according to certain standards of conduct, decision-making, and virtue exemplified in the phrase "the law of Christ" (positive freedom; Gal 5:13–6:10).

Paul's portrayal of Christ's act of endangered benefaction broadly resembles the wider cultural pattern of self-endangerment to benefit others who are in jeopardy. Likewise, Christ exhibits prototypical generosity in line with other highly praised benefactors—total commitment to perform a benefit for others (in this case, liberation) even at great cost to oneself and despite hazardous circumstances. He "gave himself," that is, showed wholehearted commitment, to his liberatory activity and showed affection to his constituents by handing himself over to the Roman authorities to be crucified on

behalf of others in such a way that he secured them from danger, but the deed resulted in his own loss of reputation and honor (Gal 1:4; 2:21; 3:13). But, like the relationship of Alketas and the Pisidians (Diod. Sic., *Bib. hist*., 18.46–47), such generosity has the power to secure a bond of affection and a good reputation beyond the grave. Further, Paul's contention that Jesus's death results in a "new creation" (Gal 6:14–15) mirrors, for example, how Augustus provided benefits that caused a "new beginning" (παλιγγενεσία) in his effort to aid a city after an earthquake (*SEG* 65.300.a.7–8).

Like the common inter-city practice of kinship diplomacy, Paul himself engages in kinship diplomacy in Galatians by drawing on his archive of ancestral genealogical information in Genesis to persuade his audience to take a course of action based on shared kinship (i.e., to refuse circumcision) and to motivate a sense of shared belonging among kin members (Gal 3:6–4:31). Moreover, Paul taps into the common social scripts surrounding the notion of promise by characterizing God as faithful to his promise to Abraham, thereby adding persuasive power to his directive to refuse circumcision by giving the Galatians a framework for understanding circumcision-refusal as an expression of fidelity to the Judean God who keeps his promises (Gal 3:6–5:6).

Additionally, Paul makes use of the word-deed congruence script, the motif of endangered benefaction, and the practice of imitation of a benefactor to present Peter's conduct at Antioch as the inversion of all three (Gal 2:11–14). That is, Peter words and deeds in the Antioch incident showed lack of integrity, he shirked his opportunity to face danger on behalf of the Gentiles at Antioch, and in so doing he failed to imitate his benefactor Christ. In Galatians 3:1–5, Paul suggests that the Galatians are on the verge of becoming disreputable because they fail to continue their lives to completion in the manner that they started it, that is, "by Spirit" rather than "flesh". In so doing, they would spurn their benefactor God who provides the Spirit and powerful deeds to support well-ordered and sufficiently supplied assemblies. Paul's practice and insistence on gratitude to God and Christ and his consistent concern for his benefactors' good repute throughout

his letters, coupled with his invocation of the social script of ingratitude in Galatians (esp. Gal 1:6–9; 5:1–5), shows him in continuity with his benefaction context. Also, this dissertation suggested that the Polybian motif of "gift as bait" could provide a social script for understanding how the Galatian assemblies may have felt when faced with the prospects of forced circumcision.

The incongruous benefaction of God is out of step with the normal protocols of gift-giving to worthy or well-reputed recipients, but such unconditioned benefactions did occur, and people knew that a gift to the undeserving could produce a relationship where it was once lacking. As such, incongruity fits well within the ancient social scripts of virtuous clemency, humaneness, and favor to people who would otherwise not deserve them. Further, in Galatians God does not give his benefits arbitrarily; instead, Paul's kinship discourse allows him to provide a reason for God's benefaction to the Galatians (Gal 3:6–4:31).

Paul employs benefaction scripts related to time. God's benefaction is well-timed (Gal 4:4 –7; cf. Gal 1:4, 23; 3:19) and he is a continuous resource for his constituencies (Gal 3:5). With respect to himself, Paul depicts his past self as an anti-benefactor whose past "conduct" (ἀναστροφή) inverted the model of typical praiseworthy conduct that benefactors exhibited (Gal 1:13, 23). He uses a past-present discourse to mark discontinuity with his past rather than how honorific inscriptions use past-present discourses to show continuity and consistency of past behavior with the present.

Exercising fidelity or good faith toward a person or a city became a critical necessity when a violent crisis occurred. Defection to another person or power could have strategic and practical benefits for the defecting party. Paul's use of "fidelity" or "good faith" (πίστις) in Galatians can be at least partially explained with reference to the frequent usage of the term in context of crisis. For Paul, the crisis the Galatians face—coerced circumcision—provides the situation within which they can demonstrate their fidelity to God by refusing to submit to the violent act (e.g., Gal 5:1–5). Paul directs the

Galatians to pattern their conduct after their benefactor Messiah, who models the principle of fidelity-as-love-of-neighbor (e.g., Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13; 5:6, 13–14; 6:2).

The differences and distinctiveness of Paul's use of benefaction themes, scripts, and words comes not in a simple inversion of the categories in the available cultural encyclopedia but, like any other textualization of a benefaction, it comes in his specific combination of themes, scripts, and words that he activates within his own local situation. Paul uses words to describe Christ's benefaction that are not normally used to describe civic benefactors on honorific inscriptions, like "to surrender oneself" (παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν; Gal 2:20) and "to love/have affection" (ἀγαπῆσαι, ἀγάπη; esp. Gal 2:20; 5:6, 13–14).[1] Christ's conduct of liberation (Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13; 5:1) is in line with the pattern of other benefactors who risked their own lives, offered themselves as ransom, were injured in their service, were killed, or even tortured to death, but the specific known historical circumstances of Jesus's death by Roman crucifixion inform and constrain Paul's own description of Christ's benefaction.[2] Probably the strongest contrast between Paul's description of Christ reflects Paul's own personal discontinuity in his past and present (Gal 1:13–14, 23. That is, 1 Maccabees and Paul both portray the sons of Mattathias and Jesus respectively liberating their constituents from dominion to external powers and to live according to certain shared norms, but the aggressive and violent military mode of conduct of the sons of Mattathias differs from the self-surrender and crucifixion of Jesus.

---

[1] Although it should be noted that παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν does occur in literary sources and ἀγαπῆσαι is rare but not totally absent from the epigraphical corpus (see chap. 7).

[2] The legendary stories about the Roman general Regulus sacrificing his own life by being crucified by the Carthaginians for the benefit of Rome somewhat temper the "uniqueness" of a crucified benefactor. Although, it is important to note that Jesus was crucified during Paul's lifetime whereas the sources that laud Regulus for his legendary crucifixion occur several generations, some two to three hundred years, after Regulus's life. On Regulus and the legendary tradition surrounding him in relation to Colossians 2:15, see Joseph R. Dodson, "The Convict's Gibbet and the Victor's Car: The Triumphal Death of Marcus Atilius Regulus and the Background of Col 2:15," *Harvard Theological Review* 114, no. 2 (2021): 182–202.

Suggestions for Further Research

In part, this dissertation has sought to demonstrate the benefit of using epigraphical and (to a lesser extent) papyrological evidence to understand the historical, social, and linguistic contexts of Galatians. New inscriptions and papyri are published every year and are added to an ever-growing corpus of documents of a diverse nature. Scholars would greatly benefit from incorporating inscriptions and papyri in situating the New Testament documents in their original cultural contexts. Likewise, this dissertation has sought to underline how important it is to understand the institutions and practices of Greek cities in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods for situating and comparing early Christian documents. One potential study that would be welcome is a detailed comparison of kinship diplomacy with Paul's own project of imagining the relationship between Judeans and Gentiles as rooted in a shared kinship. Another potential study that would extend this dissertation would be a more comprehensive treatment of the benefaction themes in Josephus, including endangered benefaction, beyond his *Life*. Additionally, this dissertation has gathered cultural categories for others to use and expand upon to understand other New Testament and early Christian documents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achilles Tatius. *Leucippe and Clitophon.* Translated by S. Gaselee. Loeb Classical Library 45. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Adak, Mustafa. "Die rhodische Herrschaft in Lykien und die rechtliche Stellung der Städte Xanthos, Phaselis un Melanippion." *Historia* 56, no. 3 (2007): 251–279.

Adak, Mustafa, and Peter Thonemann. *Teos and Abdera: Two Greek Cities in Peace and War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.

Adrados, Francisco R., and Juan Rodríguez Somolinos, eds. *Diccionario Griego Español.* Last updated January 8, 2019. http://dge.cchs.csic.es/xdge/.

Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen (later *Staatlichen*) *Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden.* Berlin, 1895–2005.

Aelius Aristides. *Orations, Volume I.* Edited and translated by Michael Trapp. Loeb Classical Library 533. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.

Aland, Barbara, and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster/Westphalia, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

Alexandrescu, Petre. "La fin de la Zone Sacrée d'époque grecque d'Istros." *Dacia* 51 (2007): 211–219.

Andrews, Smaranda. "Greek Cities on the Western Coast of the Black Sea: Orgame, Histria, Tomis, and Kallatis (7th to 1st century BCE)." PhD diss., Iowa State University, 2010.

Appian. *Roman History, Volume III.* Edited and translated by Brian McGing. Loeb Classical Library 4. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019.

Arbiol, Carlos Gil. "*Ioudaismos* and *ioudaizō* in Paul and the Galatian Controversy: An Examination of Supposed Positions." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 44, no. 2 (2021): 218–239.

Arnaoutoglou, Ilias. *Ancient Greek Laws: A Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Ascough, Richard S., Philip A. Harland, and John S. Kloppenborg. *Associations in the Greco-Roman World: A Sourcebook*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012.

Athenaeus. *The Learned Banqueters, Volume II: Books 3.106e–5.* Edited and translated by S. Douglas Olson. Loeb Classical Library 208. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

_____. *The Learned Banqueters, Volume III: Books 6–7.* Edited and translated by S. Douglas Olson. Loeb Classical Library 224. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.

_____. *The Learned Banqueters, Volume VI: Books 12–13.594b.* Edited and translated by S. Douglas Olson. Loeb Classical Library 327. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Aubriet, Damien. "Olympichos et le Sanctuaire de Zeus à Labraunda (Caire): Autour de Quelques Documents Épigraphiques." In *Communautés Locales et Pouvoir Central dans l'Orient Hellénistique et Romain*, edited by Christophe Feyel, Julien Fournier, Laëtitia Graslin-Thomé, and François Kirbilher, 185–209. Paris: Nancy, 2012.

Austin, Michel. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Avram, Alexandru. "Wohltäter des Volkes (εὐεργέται τοῦ δήμου) in den pontischen Städten der späthellenistischen Zeit." In *Bürgesinn und Staatliche Macht in Antike und Gegenwart*, edited by Martin Dreher, 151–168. Konstanz, Germany: University of Konstanz Press GmbH, 2000.

Babrius, Phaedrus. *Fables*. Translated by Ben Edwin Perry. Loeb Classical Library 436. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Bagnall, Roger S., and Peter Derow, eds. *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.

Barclay, John M. G. *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.

_____. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

_____. *Paul and the Power of Grace*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020.

Barr, Regan L. "Honors for Late Hellenistic Civic Benefactors in Western Asia Minor." MA thesis, University of Cincinnati, 1995.

Bates, Matthew W. *Salvation by Allegiance Alone: Rethinking Faith, Works, and the Gospel of Jesus the King*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017.

Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome: Volume 1: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Beck, Mark. *Der politische Euergetismus und dessen vor allem nichtbürgerliche Rezipienten im hellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien sowie dem ägäischen Raum*. Rahden/Westfalia, Germany: Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH, 2015.

Berti, Monica. *Digital Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Leipzig: University of Leipzig. https://www.dfhg-project.org/.

Billows, Richard A. *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Blanton, Thomas R, IV. *A Spiritual Economy: Gift Exchange in the Letters of Paul of Tarsus*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2017.

Blanton, Thomas R, IV and Raymond Pickett, eds. *Paul and Economics*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017.

Blümel, Walter, ed. *Die Inschriften von Iasos*. Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1985.

Blümel, Wolfgang, ed. *Die Inschriften von Knidos*. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1992–2010.

_____. *Die Inschriften von Mylasa*. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1987.

Boeckh, August, Johannes Franz, Ernst Curtius, and Adolf Kirchoff, eds. *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Berlin, 1828–1877. Reprint, Hildesheim: 1977.

Bormann, Lukas. "Abraham as 'Forefather' and His Family in Paul." In *Abraham's Family: A Network of Meaning in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, edited by Lukas Bormann, 207–233. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2018.

Bouley, Thibaut. *Arès dan la Cité: Les Poleis et la Guere dans L'Asie Mineure Hellénistique*. Pisa, Italy: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2014.

Bourget, Émile, Gaston Colin, Georges Daux, Théophile Homolle, and André Plassart, eds. *Fouilles de Delphes*. Vol. 3, *Épigraphie*. Paris: École Française d'Athènes, 1909–1976.

Bousquet, Jean. "La Stèle des Kyténiens au Létôon de Xanthos." *Revue des Études Grecques* 101 (1988): 12–53.

Braund, David C. *Augustus to Nero: A Sourcebook to Roman History, 31 BC–AD 68*. New York: Routledge, 1985.

Bremer, Jan-Maarten. "The Reciprocity and Thanksgiving in Greek Worship." In *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, edited by Christopher Gill, Norman Postlethwaite, and Richard Seaford, 127–137. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Brennan, T. Corey. "Embassies Gone Wrong: Roman Diplomacy in the Constatinian Excerpta de Legationibus." In *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, edited by Claude Eilers, 171–191. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Breytenbach, Cilliers. "'Charis' and 'Eleos' in Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *Grace, Reconciliation, Concord: The Death of Christ in Greco-Roman Metaphors*, 207–238. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Bringmann, Klaus. "The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism." In *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, edited by Anthony W. Bulloch, Erich S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and Andrew Stewart, 7–24. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bringmann, Klaus, Walter Ameling, and Barbara Schmidt-Dounas. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*. 2 vols. Berlin:

Akademie Verlag, 1995.

Briones, David. “Mutual Brokers of Grace: A Study in 2 Corinthians 1.3–11.” *New Testament Studies* 56 (2010): 536–556.

_____. “Paul’s Intentional ‘Thankless Thanks’ in Philippians 4.10–20.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 34, no. 1 (2011): 47–69.

Burnett, Andrew, Michel Amandry, and Pere Pau Ripollès, eds. *Roman Provincial Coinage*. Vol. 1, *From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 BC–AD 69)*. London: The British Museum, 1992.

Burnett, D. Clint. *Christ’s Enthronement at God’s Right Hand and Its Greco-Roman Cultural Context*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021.

_____. *Studying the New Testament through Inscriptions: An Introduction*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Academic, 2020.

Burstein, Stanley M., ed. and trans. *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsos to the Death of Cleopatra VII*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Byrne, Sean. “Honours for Kallias of Sphettos.” Attic Inscriptions Online. Last updated July 25, 2019. https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII31/911.

_____. “Honours for Phaidros of Sphettos.” Attic Inscriptions Online. Last updated March 6, 2018. https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII31/985.

Byrne, Sean and Chris de Lisle. “Rhamnous honours Dikaiarchos of Thria.” Attic Inscriptions Online. Last updated June 4, 2021. https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IRhamn/17.

Cagnat, René, Jules Toutain, Pierre Jonguet, and George Lafaye, eds. *Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes*. 3 vols. Paris: Leroux, 1906–1927.

Calder, William, and James Maxwell Ross Cormack. *Monuments from Lycaonia, the Pisido-Phrygian Borderland, Aphrodisias*. Vol. 8 in *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua (MAMA)*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1962.

Callimachus, Lycophron, and Aratus. *Hymns and Epigrams. Lycophron: Alexandra. Aratus: Phaenomena.* Translated by A. W. Mair and G. R. Mair. Loeb Classical Library 129. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.

Caneva, Stefano, and Jan-Mathieu Carbon. “*CGRN* 137: Decree Concerning the Foundation of the Cult of Seleukos I and His Son Antiochos I at Aigai.” In *A Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (CGRN)*. 2017. http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be/file/137/.

Chamoux, François. *Hellenistic Civilization*. Translated by Michel Roussel and Margaret Roussel. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002.

Champion, Craige. “The Soteria at Delphi: Aetolian Propaganda in the Epigraphical Record.” *The American Journal of Philology* 116, no. 2 (1995): 213–220.

Chaniotis, Angelos. *Age of Conquests: The Greek World from Alexander to Hadrian*.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018.

_____. “Emotional Language in Hellenistic Decrees and Hellenistic Histories.” In *Parole in Movimento Linguaggio Politico e Lessico Storiografico nel Mondo Ellenistico: Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma, 21–23 Frebbraio 2011*, edited by Manuela Mari and John Thornton, 339–352. Pisa, Italy: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2013.

_____. “The Ithyphallic Hymn for Demetrios Poliorketes and Hellenistic Religious Mentality.” In *More than Men, Less than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship*, edited by Panagiotis P. Iossif, Andrzej S. Chankowski, and Catharine C. Lorber, 157–195. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011.

_____. “Mobility of Persons During the Hellenistic Wars: State Control and Personal Relations.” In *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l’Antiquité à l’époque modern: procedures de contrôle et documents d’indentifications*, edited by Claudia Moatti, 481–500. Rome: École française de Rome, 2004.

_____. “New Inscriptions from Aphrodisias (1995–2001).” *American Journal of Archaeology* 108, no. 3 (2004): 377–416.

_____. “*Paradoxon*, *Enargeia*, Empathy: Hellenistic Decrees and Hellenistic Oratory.” In *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change*, edited by Christos Kremmydas and Kathryn Tempest, 201–216. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

_____. “Policing the Hellenistic Countryside: Realities and Ideologies.” In *Sécurité Collective et Ordre Public dans les Sociétés Anciennes*, edited by Cédric Brélaz and Pierre Ducrey, 103–145. Geneva: Foundation Hardt, 2008.

_____. *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005.

Carbon, Jan-Mathieu, Saskia Peels, and Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge, eds. *A Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (CGRN)*. Liège, Belgium, 2016–. http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be.

Chankowski, Andrzej S. “La procedure legislative à Pergame au ler siècle au J.-C : à propos de la chronologie relative des décrets en l’honneur de Diodoros Pasparos.” *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 122, no. 1 (1998): 159–199.

Ciampa, Roy E. “Abraham and Empire in Galatians.” In *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham: Essays in Honor of Marvin R. Wilson*, edited by Steven Hunt, 153–168. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

_____. “Habakkuk 2:4 in Romans: Echoes, Allusions, and Rewriting.” In *Scripture, Texts, and Tracings in Romans*, edited by Andrew Das and Linda Belleville, 11–29. Lanham, MD: Lexington/Fortress Academic, 2021.

_____. *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Cicero. *In Catilinam 1–4. Pro Murena. Pro Sulla. Pro Flacco.* Translated by C. Macdonald. Loeb Classical Library 324. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.

_____. *On Duties*. Translated by Walter Miller. Loeb Classical Library 30. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913.

Clinton, Kevin, ed. *Eleusis*. *The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme*. Athens: Athens Archaeological Society, 2008.

Cohen, Getzel M. *The Hellenistic Settlements of Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Collman, Ryan D. "Just a Flesh Wound? Reassessing Paul's Supposed Indifference Toward Circumcision and Foreskin in 1 Cor 7:19, Gal 5:6, and 6:15." *Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting* 8 (2021): 30–52.

Cooley, Alison E. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Berlin, 1863–.

Crampa, Jonas. Review of *Die Inschriften von Keramos*, by Ender Varinlioğlu. *Gnomon* 60, no. 7 (1988): 603–609.

_____. *Swedish Excavations and Researches*, vol. III, part 1*, The Greek Inscriptions, Part I:1–12 (Period of Olympichus)*. Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup 1969.

Crook, Zeba A. "The Divine Benefactions of Paul the Client." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 2 (2001–2005): 9–26.

_____. "Grace as Benefaction in Galatians 2:9, 1 Corinthians 3:10, and Romans 12:3; 15:15. In *The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation*, edited by Dietmar Neufeld, 25–38. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

_____. *Reconceptualising Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty, and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.

Curty, Olivier. *Les Parentés Légendaires entre Cites Grecques: Catalogue Raisonné des Inscriptions Contenant le Terme συγγένεια et Analyse Critique*. Geneva: Droz, 1995.

Dakin, Emyr. "Political Culture in the Cities of the Northern Black Sea Region in the 'Long Hellenistic Age.'" PhD diss., City University of New York, 2020.

Danker, Frederick W. *2 Corinthians*. Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.

_____. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*. St. Louis: Clayton, 1982.

_____. "The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers*, edited by Kent Harold Richards, 39–48. Atlanta: SBL Press, 1981.

_____. "Imaged Through Beneficence." In *Reimagining the Death of the Lukan Jesus*, edited by Dennis D. Sylva, 57–67, 184–186. Frankfurt, Germany: Anton Hain, 1990.

Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Danker. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Daux, Georges. "Concours des Titeia dans un décret d'Argos." *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 88, no. 2 (1964): 569–576.

Davies, Jamie. "Why Paul Doesn't Mention 'The Age to Come.'" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 74 (2021): 199–208.

Davis, Basil S. *Christ as Devotio: The Argument of Galatians 3:1–14*. New York: University Press of America, 2002.

de Boer, Martinus C. *Galatians: A Commentary*. The New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.

Demosthenes. *Orations, Volume I: Orations 1–17 and 20: Olynthiacs 1–3. Philippic 1. On the Peace. Philippic 2. On Halonnesus. On the Chersonese. Philippics 3 and 4. Answer to Philip's Letter. Philip's Letter. On Organization. On the Navy-boards. For the Liberty of the Rhodians. For the People of Megalopolis. On the Treaty with Alexander. Against Leptines.* Translated by J. H. Vince. Loeb Classical Library 238. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930.

_____. *Orations*, *Volume II*: *Orations 18–19*: *De Corona, De Falsa Legatione*. Translated by C. A. Vince, J. H. Vince. Loeb Classical Library 155. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

_____. *Orations, Volume III: Orations 21–26: Against Meidias. Against Androtion. Against Aristocrates. Against Timocrates. Against Aristogeiton 1 and 2.* Translated by J. H. Vince. Loeb Classical Library 299. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

_____. *Orations, Volume VII: Orations 60–61: Funeral Speech. Erotic Essay. Exordia. Letters.* Translated by N. W. De Witt, N. J. De Witt. Loeb Classical Library 374. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.

deSilva, David A. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2000.

_____. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018.

_____. *The Letter to the Galatians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018.

_____. "Patronage and Reciprocity: The Context of Grace in the New Testament." *Ashland Theological Journal* 31 (1999): 32–84.

de Souza, Philip. *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Diggle, James. *Theophrastus: Characters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Dio Cassius. *Roman History, Volume V: Books 46–50.* Translated by Earnest Cary and Herbert B. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 82. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917.

_____. *Roman History, Volume VI: Books 51–55.* Translated by Earnest Cary and Herbert B. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 83. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917.

_____. *Roman History, Volume VIII: Books 61–70.* Translated by Earnest Cary and Herbert B. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 176. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History, Volume II: Books 2.35–4.58.* Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 303. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

_____. *Library of History, Volume III: Books 4.59–8.* Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 340. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

_____. *Library of History, Volume IV: Books 9–12.40.* Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 375. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1946.

_____. *Library of History, Volume V: Books 12.41–13.* Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 384. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950.

_____. *Library of History, Volume VI: Books 14–15.19.* Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 399. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954.

_____. *Library of History, Volume VII: Books 15.20–16.65.* Translated by Charles L. Sherman. Loeb Classical Library 389. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1952.

_____. *Library of History, Volume VIII: Books 16.66–17.* Translated by C. Bradford Welles. Loeb Classical Library 422. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963.

_____. *Library of History, Volume IX: Books 18–19.65*. Translated by Russel M. Geer. Loeb Classical Library 377. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947.

_____. *Library of History, Volume X: Books 19.66–20*. Translated by Russel M. Geer. Loeb Classical Library 390. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954.

_____. *Library of History, Volume XI: Books 21–32*. Translated by Francis R. Walton. Loeb Classical Library 409. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.

_____. *Library of History, Volume XII: Books 33–40*. Translated by Francis R. Walton. Loeb Classical Library 423. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume I: Books 1–5.* Translated by R.

D. Hicks. Loeb Classical Library 184. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

_____. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume II: Books 6–10.* Translated by R. D. Hicks. Loeb Classical Library 185. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Critical Essays, Volume II: On Literary Composition. Dinarchus. Letters to Ammaeus and Pompeius.* Translated by Stephen Usher. Loeb Classical Library 466. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

_____. *Roman Antiquities, Volume I: Books 1–2.* Translated by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library 319. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

_____. *Roman Antiquities, Volume II: Books 3–4.* Translated by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library 347. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

_____. *Roman Antiquities, Volume III: Books 5–6.48.* Translated by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library 357. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940.

_____. *Roman Antiquities, Volume IV: Books 6.49–7.* Translated by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library 364. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943.

_____. *Roman Antiquities, Volume VII: Books 11–20.* Translated by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library 388. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae: supplementum Sylloges inscriptionum graecarum*. 1903–1905. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag AG, 1960.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, Friedrich Hiller von Gärtingen, Johannes Kirchner, Hans Rudolf Pomtow, and Erich Ziebarth, eds. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. 4 vols. 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1915–1925.

Dobias-Lalou, Catherine. *Inscriptions of Greek Cyrenaica*. Bologna: CRR-MM, Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna, 2017. http://doi.org/10.6092/UNIBO/IGCYRGVCYR.

Dodson, Joseph R. "The Convict's Gibbet and the Victor's Car: The Triumphal Death of Marcus Atilius Regulus and the Background of Col 2:15." *Harvard Theological Review* 114, no. 2 (2021): 182–202.

Dormandy, Michael. "How to Understand What Passes All Understanding: Using the Documentary Papyri to Understand in Paul." *New Testament Studies* 67 (2021): 220–240.

Downs, David J. "Is God Paul's Patron? The Economy of Patronage in Pauline Theology." In *Engaging Economics*: *New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception*, edited by Bruce W. Longenecker and Kelly D. Liebengood, 129–156. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Durrbach, Félix. *Choix D'Inscriptions de Délos*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1976.

Durrbach, Félix, Pierre Roussel, and Marcel Launey, eds. *Inscriptions de Délos*. Paris:

Champion, 1926–1972.

Eco, Umberto. *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*. London: Phoenix, 2003.

Eastman, Susan Grove. "Israel and the Mercy of God: A Re-Reading of Galatians 6.16 and Romans 9–11." *New Testament Studies* 56 (2010): 367–395.

Eilers, Claude. *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Engelmann, Helmut, ed. *Die Inschriften von Kyme*. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1976.

Engelmann, Helmut, and Reinhold Merkelbach, eds. *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*. Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1972–1973.

Epictetus. *Discourses, Books 1–2.* Translated by W. A. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 131. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

_____. *Discourses, Books 3–4, Fragments, The Encheiridion*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 218. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Errington, R. Malcolm. *A History of the Hellenistic World, 323–30 BC*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008.

Eschner, Christina. *Gestorben und hingegeben „für" die Sünder: Die griechische Konzeption des Unheil abwendenden Sterbens und deren paulinische Aufnahme für die Deutung des Todes Jesu Christi*. 2 vols. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchen Verlag, 2010.

Eubank, Nathan. "Justice Endures Forever: Paul's Grammar of Generosity." *Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters* 5, no. 2 (2015): 169–187.

Euripides. *Cyclops. Alcestis. Medea.* Edited and translated by David Kovacs. Loeb Classical Library 12. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Evans, Vyvyan, and Melanie Green. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

Eyl, Jennifer. "Philo and Josephus on the Fidelity of the Judeans." *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 12, no. 1 (2021): 94–121.

_____. *Signs, Wonders, and Gifts: Divination in the Letters of Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Fanucchi, Stefano. *Greek Economic Inscriptions 035: Kyparissia. Regulations on Pentecoste Collection*. https://geionline.sns.it/search/document/GEI035.

Festa, Nicolaus, ed. *Mythographi Graeci: Palaephati ΠΕΡΙ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝ*. Vol. 3, Fasc. 2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1902.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. "'The Being That Is in a Manner Equal with God' (Phil. 2:6C): A Self-Transforming, Incarnational, Divine Ontology." *Journal of Theological Studies* 71, no. 2 (2020): 581–627.

Flusser, David, and R. Steven Notley. *The Sage from Galilee: Rediscovering Jesus' Genius*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Fränkel, Max. *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*. Vols. 1–2. Berlin: W. Spemann, 1890–1895.

Fredriksen, Paula. "God Is Jewish, but Gentiles Don't Have to Be: Ethnicity and Eschatology in Paul's Gospel." In *The Message of the Apostle within Second Temple Judaism*, edited by František Ábel, 3–19. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2020.

_____. "How Do the Nations Relate to Israel? Family, Ethnicity, and Eschatological Inclusion in the Apostle Paul." In *In the Crucible of Empire: The Impact of Roman Citizenship upon Greeks, Jews and Christians*, edited by Katell Berthelot and Jonathan Price, 131–140. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2019.

_____. "Judaism, the Circumcision of the Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2." *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 532–564.

_____. "Paul's Letter to the Romans, the Ten Commandments, and Pagan 'Justification by Faith.'" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133, no. 4 (2014): 801–808.

_____. "Why Should a 'Law-Free' Mission Mean a 'Law-Free' Apostle?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 134, no. 3 (2015): 637–650.

Gaebel, Robert E. *Cavalry Operations in the Ancient Greek World*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.

Garbrah, Kweku A. "On the Enumerative Use of τε." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* (1993): 191–210.

Gardner, Gregg. "Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Civic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126, no. 2 (2007): 327–343.

Garroway, Joshua D. "The Circumcision of Christ: Romans 15:7–13." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 34, no. 4 (2012): 303–322.

Gauthier, Philippe. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV^e^–I^er^ siècle avant J.-C.): contribution à l'histoire des institutions*. Paris: École Française d'Athènes, 1985.

Gellius. *Attic Nights, Volume I: Books 1–5.* Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 195. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

_____. *Attic Nights, Volume II: Books 6–13.* Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 200. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Genovese, Cristina. "'Per Eterna Memoria e Immortalità di un Benefattore.' L' 'Heroon' di Diodoro Pasparo a Pergamo." *Mediterraneo Antico* 14, nos. 1–2 (2011): 57–74.

Gill, Christopher, Norman Postlethwaite, and Richard Seaford, eds. *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. *The Tebtunis Papyri*. Vol. 2. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1907.

Goodrich, John K. "'Standard of Faith' of 'Measure of a Trusteeship'? A Study in Romans 12:3." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 74 (2012): 753–772.

Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page. *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1965.

Graham, A. J. "Abdera and Teos." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112 (1992): 44–73.

Grant, Mary, ed. and trans. *The Myths of Hyginus*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1960.

Gruen, Erich S. *Ethnicity in the Ancient World—Did It Matter?* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020.

_____. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

_____. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

_____. "The Origins of the Achaean War." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 96 (1976): 46–69.

Guarducci, Margarita, ed. *Inscriptiones Creticae*. Rome: National Institute of Archaeology and History of Art, 1935–1950.

Gupta, Nijay. *Paul and the Language of Faith*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020.

Gygax, Marc Domingo. *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City: The Origins of Euergetism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Gygax, Marc Domingo, and Arjan Zuiderhoek, eds. *Benefactors and the Polis: The Public Gift in the Greek Cities from the Homeric World to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Haake, Matthias. *Der Philosoph in der Stadt: Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in den hellenistichen Poleis*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2007.

Habicht, Christian. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Translated by Deborah Lucas Schneider. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

_____. *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities: The Early Cases*. Translated by John Noël Dillon. Ann Arbor: Michigan Classical Press, 2017.

Hagedorn, Ursula, Dieter Hagedorn, Robert Hübner, and John C. Shelton, eds. *Die Papyri der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*. Vol. 3, *Griechische Urkundenpapyri der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*. Pt. I. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1986.

Hands, A. R. *Charities and Social in Greece and Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1968.

Harding, Philip. *Athens Transformed, 404–262 BC: From Popular Sovereignty to Dominion of Wealth*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

_____, ed. and trans. *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Harmon, Matthew S. *She Must and She Shall Go Free: Paul's Isaianic Gospel in Galatians*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.

Harrison, James R. "Augustan Rome and the Body of Christ: A Comparison of the Social Vision of the *Res Gestae* and Paul's Letter to the Romans." *Harvard Theological Review* 106 (2013): 161–184.

_____. "Beneficence to the Poor in Luke's Gospel in its Mediterranean Context: A Visual and Documentary Perspective." *Australian Biblical Review* 65 (2017): 30–46.

_____. "The Brothers as the 'Glory of Christ' (2 Cor. 8:23): Paul's *Doxa* Terminology in Its Ancient Benefaction Context." *Novum Testamentum* 52 (2010): 156–188.

_____. "Ephesian Cultic Officials, Their Benefactors, and the Quest for Civic Virtue: Paul's Alternative Quest for Status in the Epistle to the Ephesians." In *The First Urban Churches*, vol. 3, *Ephesus*, edited by James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn, 253–298. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.

_____. "The First Urban Churches: Introduction." In *The First Urban Churches 1: Methodological Foundations*, edited by James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn, 1–40. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.

_____. "From Rome to the Colony of Philippi: Roman Boasting in Philippians 3:4–6 in Its Latin West and Philippian Epigraphic Context." In *The First Urban Churches*, vol. 4*, Roman Philippi*, edited by James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn, 307–370. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.

_____. "The Imitation of the 'Great Man' in Antiquity: Paul's Inversion of a Cultural Icon." In *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, 213–254. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 9. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

_____. "Negotiating the Seduction of Imperial 'Peace' and 'Security' in Galatians, Thessalonians, and Philippians." In *Introduction to Empire in the New Testament*, edited by Adam Winn, 165–184. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

_____. "Paul and the Agōnothetai at Corinth: Engaging the Civic Values of Antiquity." In *The First Urban Churches*, vol. 2, *Roman Corinth*, edited by James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn, 271–326. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

_____. *Paul and the Ancient Celebrity Circuit: The Cross and Moral Transformation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 430. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

_____. "Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics: Redefining the Canon of Honour in the Graeco-Roman World." In *Paul's Graeco-Roman Context*, edited by Cilliers Breytenbach, 75–118. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2015.

_____. "Paul and the Athletic Ideal in Antiquity: A Case Study in Wrestling with

Word and Image." In *Paul's World*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 81–109. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

_____. "Paul and the Gymnasiarchs: Two Approaches to Pastoral Formation in Antiquity." In *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 141–178. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

_____. *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2003. Reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2017.

_____. "Paul the 'Paradoxical' Parent: The Politics of Family Beneficence in First-Century Context (2 Cor 12:14–16)." In *Theologizing in the Corinthian Conflict: Studies in the Exegesis and Theology of 2 Corinthians*, edited by Reimund Bieringer, Ma Marilous S. Ibita, Dominika A. Kurek-Chomycz, and Thomas A. Vollmer, 399–425. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2013.

_____. "Paul, Theologian of Electing Grace." In *Paul and His Theology*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 77–108. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

_____. "The Social Context." In *The Content and Setting of the Gospel Tradition*, edited by Mark Harding and Alanna Nobbs, 105–126. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

_____. "Sponsors of Paideia: Ephesian Benefactors, Civic Virtue and the New Testament." *Early Christianity* 7 (2016): 346–367.

_____. "Times of Necessity." In *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 9, *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1986–87*, edited by S. R. Llewelyn, 7–8. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Hatzopoulos, M. B. *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, vol. 1, *A Historical and Epigraphic Study*. ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ 22. Athens: Center for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1996.

_____. *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, vol. 2, *Epigraphic Appendix*. ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ 22. Athens: Center for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1996.

Heath, Jane. "God the Father and Other Parents in the New Testament." In *The Divine Father: Religious and Philosophical Concepts of Divine Parenthood in Antiquity*, edited by Felix Albrecht and Reinhard Feldmeier, 325–342. Themes in Biblical Narratives 18. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Heim, Erin M. *Adoption in Galatians and Romans: Contemporary Metaphor Theories and the Huiothesia Metaphors*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Henrich, Joseph. *The Secret of Our Success: How Culture is Driving Human Evolution, Domesticating Our Species, and Making Us Smarter*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016.

Hermann, Peter, and Hasan Malay. *New Documents from Lydia*. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007.

Hicks, E. L. "Ceramus (Κέραμος) and Its Inscriptions." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 11

(1890): 113–119.

_____. “On an Inscription at Cambridge: Boechkh, *C. I. G*. 106.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 2 (1881): 98–101.

Hiller von Gärtringen, Friedrich, ed. *Inschriften von Priene*. Berlin: Reimer, 1906.

Hodge, Caroline Johnson. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Holmes, Michael W., ed and trans. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Honigman, Sylvie. *Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochos IV*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2014.

Die Inschriften von Ephesos. Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1979–1984.

Inscriptiones Graecae. Berlin, 1873–.

Isager, Signe, and Lars Karlsson, “A New Inscription from Labraunda. Honorary Decree for Olympichos: *I.Labraunda* No. 134 (and No. 49).” *Epigraphica Anatolica* 41 (2008): 39–52.

Isocrates. *Evagoras. Helen. Busiris. Plataicus. Concerning the Team of Horses. Trapeziticus. Against Callimachus. Aegineticus. Against Lochites. Against Euthynus. Letters.* Translated by La Rue Van Hook. Loeb Classical Library 373. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Jakoby, Felix, ed. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. 15 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923–1962.

Jalabert, Louis, and René Mouterde, eds. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*. Vol. 3.1, *Région de l’Amanus, Antioche, Nos. 699–988*. Paris: Geuthner, 1950.

Jennings, Mark A. “Patronage and Rebuke in Paul’s Persuasion in 2 Corinthians 8–9.” *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 6 (2009): 107–127.

Jipp, Joshua. *Christ Is King: Paul’s Royal Ideology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.

Jones, Christopher P. “Diodoros Pasparos and the Nikephoria of Pergamon.” *Chiron* 4 (1974): 183–205.

_____. “Diodoros Pasparos Revisited.” *Chiron* 30 (2000): 1–14.

_____. “The Earthquake of 26 BC in Decrees of Mytilene and Chios.” *Chiron* 45 (2015): 101–122.

_____. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Jongkind, Dirk, Peter J. Williams, Peter M. Head, and Patrick James, eds. *The Greek New Testament, Produced at Tyndale House Cambridge*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2017.

Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume I: Books 1–3.* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 242. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930.

_____. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume II: Books 4–6.* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus. Loeb Classical Library 490. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930.

_____. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume III: Books 7–8.* Translated by Ralph Marcus. Loeb Classical Library 281. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934.

_____. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume IV: Books 9–11.* Translated by Ralph Marcus. Loeb Classical Library 326. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

_____. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume V: Books 12–13.* Translated by Ralph Marcus. Loeb Classical Library 365. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943.

_____. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume VI*: *Books 14–15*. Translated by Ralph Marcus and Allen Wikgren. Loeb Classical Library 489. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943.

_____. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume VII: Books 16–17.* Translated by Ralph Marcus and Allen Wikgren. Loeb Classical Library 410. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963.

_____. *The Jewish War, Volume I: Books 1–2.* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 203. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

_____. *The Jewish War, Volume II: Books 3–4.* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 487. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

_____. *The Jewish War, Volume III: Books 5–7.* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 210. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.

_____. *The Life. Against Apion*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 186. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Joubert, Stephan J. "One Form of Social Exchange or Two? 'Euergetism,' Patronage, and Testament Studies." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 31, no. 1 (2001): 17–25.

_____. "Patrocinium and Euergetism: Similar or Different Reciprocal Relationships. Eavesdropping on the Current Debate amongst Biblical Scholars." In *The New Testament in the Graeco-Roman World: Articles in Honour of Abe Malherbe*, edited by Marius Nel, Jan G. van der Watt, and Fika J. van Rensburg, 171–196. Zürich, Switzerland: LIT Verlag, 2015.

_____. *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy, and Theological Reflection on Paul's Collection*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

_____. "ΧΑΡΙΣ in Paul: An Investigation into the Apostle's "Performative" Application of the Language of *Grace* within the Framework of his Theological

Reflection on the Event/Process of Salvation." In *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*, edited by Jan G. van der Watt, 187–211. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Justin. *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Translated by J. C. Yardley. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

Keener, Craig S. *Galatians: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.

Kokkinia, Christina, ed. *Boubon: The Inscriptions and Archaeological Remains, A Survey 2004–2006*. Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008.

_____. "The God-emperor. Fragments of a Discourse between Greek Cities and Provincial Governors." In *Communautés locales et pouvoir central dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain*, edited by Christophe Feyel, Julien Fournier, Laëtitia Graslin-Thomé, and François Kirbihler, 499–516. Nancy, France: Association pour la diffusion de la recherche sur l'Antiquité, 2012.

Komter, Aafke. "The Evolutionary Origins of Human Generosity." *International Sociology* 25, no. 3 (2010): 443–464.

Kowalski, Marcin. "God the Benefactor and His Human Clients in Rom. 5–8." *The Biblical Annals* 8, no. 1 (2018).

Lambert, Stephen. "Decrees Honouring Eumaridas of Kydonia and His Son Charmion." Attic Inscriptions Online. Last updated May 26, 2018. https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII2/844.

_____. "Honours for Prytanis of Karystos." Attic Inscriptions Online. Last updated February 8, 2017. https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/MorettiISE/i-28.

Lambert, Stephen, and Feyo Schuddeboom. "Honours for the Priest of Asklepios." Attic Inscriptions Online. Last updated April 14, 2021. https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII2/950.

Lampe, Peter. "Paul, Patrons, and Clients." In *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, edited by J. Paul Sampley, 2:204–238. Rev. ed. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Latyschen, Vasilii, ed. *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae*. Vol. 1, *Inscriptiones Tyriae, Olbiae, Chersonesi Tauricae*. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg: 1916.

Le Bohec, Sylvie. *Antigone Dôsôn roi de Macédoine*. Nancy, France: Nancy University Press, 1993.

Lefèvre, François, Didier Laroche, and Olivier Masson. *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes. Tome IV, Documents amphictioniques.* Paris: École française d'Athènes 2002.

Lewis, D. M. "Inscriptions from Asia Minor." *The Classical Review* (1988): 124–125.

Lewis, Naphtali, ed. *The Documents from the Bar Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989.

Llewelyn, S. R., ed. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 9, *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1986–87*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Llewelyn, S. R., and J. R. Harrison, eds. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 10, *A Review of the Greek and Other Published Inscriptions and Papyri Published between 1988 and 1992*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Livy. *History of Rome, Volume V: Books 21–22.* Edited and translated by J. C. Yardley. Loeb Classical Library 233. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019.

_____. *History of Rome, Volume VII: Books 26–27.* Edited and translated by J. C. Yardley. Loeb Classical Library 367. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020.

_____. *History of Rome, Volume XI: Books 38–40.* Edited and translated by J. C. Yardley. Loeb Classical Library 313. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018.

_____. *History of Rome, Volume XII: Books 40–42.* Translated by Evan T. Sage, Alfred C. Schlesinger. Loeb Classical Library 332. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938.

_____. *History of Rome, Volume XIII: Books 43–45.* Translated by Alfred C. Schlesinger. Loeb Classical Library 396. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary 41. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.

Ma, John. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

_____. "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age." *Past & Present* 180 (2003): 9–39.

MacGillivray, Erlend D. "Re-evaluating Patronage and Reciprocity in Antiquity and New Testament Studies." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 6 (2009): 37–81.

Makarov, Igor A. "Towards an Interpretation of the Civic Oath of the Chersonesites (*IOSPE* I^2 401)." *Ancient Civilization from Scythia to Siberia* 20 (2014): 1–38.

Malay, Hasan, and Marijana Ricl. "Two New Hellenistic Decrees from Aigai in Aiolis." *Epigraphica Anatolica* 42 (2009): 39–60.

Malina, Bruce J. "God, Benefactor and Patron: The Major Cultural Model for Interpreting the Deity in Greco-Roman Antiquity." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27, no. 4 (2005): 465–492.

Manetho. *History of Egypt and Other Works.* Translated by W. G. Waddell. Loeb Classical Library 350. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Marshall, Eireann. "Cyrenaican Civilisation and Health: Constructing an Identity in a Frontier." *Pegasus* 39 (1996): 9–17.

Marshall, Jonathan. *Jesus, Patrons, and Benefactors: Roman Palestine and the Gospel of Luke*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.259. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2009.

Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Mason, Steve, ed. and trans. *Life of Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary 9. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

McFarland, Orrey. *God and Grace in Philo and Paul*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

McLean, B. Hudson. *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Merrit, Benjamin D. "Inscriptions of Colophon." *The American Journal of Philology* 56, no. 4 (1935): 359–372.

Mihailov, Georgi, ed. *Inscriptiones graecae in Bulgaria repertae*. Vol. 1, *Inscriptiones orae Ponti Euxini*. 2nd ed. Sofia, Bulgaria: Institutum Archaeologicum, 1970.

Mikalson, Jon D. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Mitchell, Stephen. *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor. The Ankara District: The Inscriptions of North Galatia II*. Oxford: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1982.

Moo, Douglas J. *Galatians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.

Morgan, Teresa. *Roman Faith and Christian Faith*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Mott, Stephen C. "The Greek Benefactor and Deliverance from Moral Distress." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1971.

Müller, Cristel. "Autopsy of a Crisis: Wealth, Protogenes, and the City of Olbia in c. 200 BC." In *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC*, edited by Zosia H. Archibald, John K. Davies, and Vincent Gabrielsen, 324–344. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Neyrey, Jerome H. *Render to God: New Testament Understandings of the Divine*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.

Nicols, John. *Civic Patronage in the Roman Empire*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Novenson, Matthew A. "Did Paul Abandon either Judaism or Monotheism?" In *New*

Cambridge Companion to St. Paul, edited by Bruce W. Longenecker, 239–259. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Oakes, Peter. *Galatians*. Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

_____. "*Pistis* as Relational Way of Life in Galatians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 40, no. 3 (2018): 255–275.

O'Brien, Kelli S. "The Curse of the Law (Galatians 3:13): Crucifixion, Persecution, and Deuteronomy 21.22–23." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29, no. 1 (2006): 55–76.

Oegema, Gerbern S. "The Reception of 1 and 2 Maccabees in the Letters of Paul." In *Paul and Scripture*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Land, 59–74. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Okorie, Ferdinand. "Benefaction in Galatians: An Analysis of Paul's Language of God's Favor in Its Greco-Roman Context." PhD diss., Loyola University Chicago, 2018.

_____. *Favor and Gratitude: Reading Galatians in Its Greco-Roman Context*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2021.

Oropeza, B. J. "The Expectation of Grace: Paul on Benefaction and the Corinthians' Ingratitude (2 Corinthians 6:1)." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 24, no. 2 (2014): 207–227.

Osiek, Carolyn. "The Politics of Patronage and the Politics of Kinship: The Meeting of Ways." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 39, no. 3 (2009): 143–152.

Papiri greci e latini. Vol. 10. Florence: Italian Society for the Study of Greek and Latin Papyri in Egypt, 1932.

PHI Greek Documentary Texts. CD ROM #7. Software Database. Los Altos, CA: Packard Humanities Institute, 1991–1996. https://epigraphy.packhum.org. November 1, 2017.

Parassoglou, George M. "Four Papyri from the Yale Collection." *The American Journal of Philology* 92, no. 4 (1971): 652–666.

Park, Young-Ho. *Paul's Ekklesia as a Civic Assembly: Understanding the People of God*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 393. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Parker, Robert. "Pleasing Thighs: Reciprocity in Greek Religion." In *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, edited by Christopher Gill, Norman Postlethwaite, and Richard Seaford, 105–126. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Patterson, Lee E. *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010.

Pausanias. *Description of Greece, Volume III: Books 6–8.21 (Elis 2, Achaia, Arcadia).* Translated by W. H. S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 272. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.

Pennington, Jonathan T. *The Sermon on the Mount and Human Flourishing: A Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017.

Philo. *Every Good Man is Free. On the Contemplative Life. On the Eternity of the World. Against Flaccus. Apology for the Jews. On Providence.* Translated by F. H. Colson. Loeb Classical Library 363. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941.

_____. *On Abraham. On Joseph. On Moses.* Translated by F. H. Colson. Loeb Classical Library 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

_____. *On the Creation. Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis 2 and 3.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 226. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

_____. *On the Embassy to Gaius. General Indexes.* Translated by F. H. Colson. Index by J. W. Earp. Loeb Classical Library 379. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Pippidi, Dionisie, M, ed. *Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae*. Vol. 1, *Inscriptiones Histriae et vicinia*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1983.

Plutarch. *Lives, Volume II: Themistocles and Camillus. Aristides and Cato Major. Cimon and Lucullus.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 47. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

_____. *Lives, Volume III: Pericles and Fabius Maximus. Nicias and Crassus.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 65. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.

_____. *Lives, Volume IV: Alcibiades and Coriolanus. Lysander and Sulla.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 80. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.

_____. *Lives, Volume V: Agesilaus and Pompey. Pelopidas and Marcellus.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 87. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917.

_____. *Lives, Volume VI: Dion and Brutus. Timoleon and Aemilius Paulus*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 98. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.

_____. *Lives, Volume VII: Demosthenes and Cicero. Alexander and Caesar.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 99. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

_____. *Lives, Volume VIII: Sertorius and Eumenes. Phocion and Cato the Younger*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 128. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

_____. *Lives, Volume IX: Demetrius and Antony. Pyrrhus and Gaius Marius*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 101. Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press, 1920.

_____. *Lives, Volume X: Agis and Cleomenes. Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus. Philopoemen and Flamininus*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 102. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.

_____. *Lives, Volume XI: Aratus. Artaxerxes. Galba. Otho. General Index.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 103. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

_____. *Moralia, Volume III: Sayings of Kings and Commanders. Sayings of Romans. Sayings of Spartans. The Ancient Customs of the Spartans. Sayings of Spartan Women. Bravery of Women.* Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. Loeb Classical Library 245. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

_____. *Moralia, Volume VI: Can Virtue Be Taught? On Moral Virtue. On the Control of Anger. On Tranquility of Mind. On Brotherly Love. On Affection for Offspring. Whether Vice Be Sufficient to Cause Unhappiness. Whether the Affections of the Soul are Worse Than Those of the Body. Concerning Talkativeness. On Being a Busybody.* Translated by W. C. Helmbold. Loeb Classical Library 337. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

_____. *Moralia, Volume X: Love Stories. That a Philosopher Ought to Converse Especially With Men in Power. To an Uneducated Ruler. Whether an Old Man Should Engage in Public Affairs. Precepts of Statecraft. On Monarchy, Democracy, and Oligarchy. That We Ought Not to Borrow. Lives of the Ten Orators. Summary of a Comparison Between Aristophanes and Menander.* Translated by Harold North Fowler. Loeb Classical Library 321. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Polybius. *The Histories, Volume I: Books 1–2*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by Frank W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 128. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

_____. *The Histories, Volume II: Books 3–4*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by Frank W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 137. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

_____. *The Histories, Volume III: Books 5–8*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by Frank W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 138. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

_____. *The Histories, Volume IV: Books 9–15*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by Frank W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 159. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

_____. *The Histories, Volume V: Books 16–27*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by Frank W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 160. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

_____. *The Histories, Volume VI: Books 28–39. Fragments*. Edited and translated by S. Douglas Olson. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by Frank W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 161. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Pouilloux, Jean. *Choix d'inscriptions grecques*. Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 2003.

Priesigke, Friedrich, Friedrich Bilabel, Emil Kiessling, and Hans-Albert Rupprecht, eds. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten*. Vols. 1–21. Heidelberg: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1915–2001.

Price, Simon. *Religions of the Ancient Greeks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

_____. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Raggi, Andrea. "The Epigraphic Dossier of Seleucus of Rhosus: A Revised Edition." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 147 (2004): 123–138.

Rajak, Tessa. "Benefactors in the Greco-Jewish Diaspora." In *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome*, 373–391. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Reger, Gary. "The Relations between Rhodes and Caria from 246 to 167 BC." In *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, edited by Vincent Gabrielsen, Per Bilde, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Lise Hannestad, and Jan Zahle, 76–97. Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1999.

_____. "Sympoliteiai in Hellenistic Asia Minor." In *The Greco-Roman East: Politics, Culture, Society*, edited by Stephen Colvin, 145–180. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Rehm, Albert, ed. *Milet: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899*, Bd. 1, Hft. 3: *Das Delphinion in Milet*. Berlin: Reimer, 1914.

Reynolds, Joyce. *Aphrodisias and Rome*. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1982.

Reynolds, Joyce, and J. A. Lloyd. "Cyrene." In *The Cambridge Ancient History,* Vol. 10, *The Augustan Empire, 43 B.C.–A.D. 69*, edited by Alan K. Bowman, Edward Champlin, and Andrew Lintott, 619–640. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Reynolds, Joyce, Charlotte Roueché, and Gabriel Bodard, eds. *Inscriptions of Aphrodisias,* https://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/insaph/.

_____. *Inscriptions of Roman Cyrenaica 2020*. Society for Libyan Studies, 2020. https://ircyr2020.inslib.kcl.ac.uk/en/.

Rice, Joshua. *Paul and Patronage: The Dynamics of Power in 1 Corinthians*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2013.

Rigsby, Kent J. "Aegina and Megara (*IG* IV.2^2 750)." *Classical Philology* 105, no. 3 (2010): 308–313.

_____. *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Roman Provincial Coinage. Vol. IV.3, *The Antonine Period (AD 138–192): Lycia-Pamphilia to Arabia*. *RPC Online*. https://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/.

Sahin, Mehmet, ed. *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia*. Vols. 1–3. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1981–2010.

Sahlin, Sencer. *Die Inschriften von Perge*. Bonn, Germany: Verlag Dr. Rudolph Habelt GMBH, 1999–2004.

Salvo, Irene. "Romulus and Remus at Chios Revisited: A Re-examination of *SEG* XXX 1073." In *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*, edited by Paraskevi Martzavou and Nikolaos Papazarkadas, 125–137. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Santangelo, Federico. *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire: A Study of Roman Policies in Italy and the Greek East*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Satlow, Michael, ed. *The Gift in Antiquity*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Scarborough, Matthew J. C. "A New Edition of *IG* IX,2 69." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 193 (2015): 166–171.

Schellenberg, Ryan S. "Subsistence, Swapping, and Paul's Rhetoric of Generosity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 137, no. 1 (2018): 215–234.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *Galatians*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.

Schwartz, Seth. *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society? Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Seeley, David. *The Noble Death: Greco-Roman Martyrology and Paul's Concept of Salvation*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

Seneca. *Epistles, Volume II: Epistles 66–92.* Translated by Richard M. Gummere. Loeb Classical Library 76. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

_____. *Moral Essays, Volume III: De Beneficiis*. Translated by J. W. Basore. Loeb Classical Library 310. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Shear, T. Leslie, Jr. *Hesperia Supplements* 17*: Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.* Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1978.

Sherk, Robert K. *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

_____, ed. and trans. *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

_____, ed. and trans. *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus*. Translated

Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Sierksma-Agteres, Suzan J. M. "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ and *Fides* as Civic and Divine Virtues: A Pauline Concept through Greco-Roman Eyes." In *Paul's Graeco-Roman Context*, edited by Cilliers Breytenbach, 525–543. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2015.

Simonton, Matthew. "The Telos Reconciliation Dossier (*IG* XII.4.132): Democracy, Demagogues and Stasis in an Early Hellenistic Polis." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 139 (2019): 187–209.

Soon, Isaac T. "The Bestial Glans: Gentile Christ Followers and the Monstruous Nudity of Ancient Circumcision." *Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting* 8 (2021): 116–130.

Spawforth, A. J. S. *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Stoian, Iorgu, ed. *Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae*. Vol. 2, *Tomis et territorium*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1987.

Stolba, Vladimir F. "The Oath of Chersonesos and the Chersonesean Economy in the Early Hellenistic Period." In *Making, Moving, and Managing the New World of Ancient Economies, 323–31 BC*, edited by Zofia H. Archibald, John K. Davies, and Vincent Gabrielsen, 298–321. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2005.

Strabo. *Geography, Volume VI: Books 13–14.* Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Loeb Classical Library 223. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Streett, Daniel R. "Cursed by God? Galatians 3:13, Social Status, and Atonement Theory in the Context of Early Jewish Readings of Deuteronomy 21:23." *Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters* 5, no. 2 (2015): 189–209.

Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars, Volume II: Claudius. Nero. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. Vespasian. Titus, Domitian. Lives of Illustrious Men: Grammarians and Rhetoricians. Poets (Terence. Virgil. Horace. Tibullus. Persius. Lucan). Lives of Pliny the Elder and Passienus Crispus.* Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 38. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. 66 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1923–.

"Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum 1243: Kolophon Honours Polemaios." Attalus. Last updated June 23, 2018. http://www.attalus.org/docs/seg/s39_1243.html.

Tarn, W. W., and G. T. Griffith. *Hellenistic Civilisation*. 3rd ed. Cleveland, OH: World, 1952.

Taylor, John R. *Linguistic Categorization*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Theophrastus, Herodas, Sophron. *Characters*. *Herodas: Mimes. Sophron and Other Mime Fragments*. Edited and translated by Jeffrey Rusten and I. C. Cunningham. Loeb Classical Library 225. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae® Digital Library. Edited by Maria C. Pantelia. University of California, Irvine. Last updated September 29, 2021. http://www.tlg.uci.edu.

Thonemann, Peter. "The Attalid State, 188–133 BC." In *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, edited by Peter Thonemann, 1–47. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

_____. "'An Eternal Memorial of Goodwill towards Their Kinsmen': Abdera and Teos after the Third Macedonian War." Unpublished lecture handout.

_____. *The Hellenistic World: Using Coins as Sources*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume I: Books 1–2.* Translated by C. F. Smith. Loeb Classical Library 108. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

_____. *History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume II: Books 3–4.* Translated by C. F. Smith. Loeb Classical Library 109. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

_____. *History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume IV: Books 7–8. General Index.* Translated by C. F. Smith. Loeb Classical Library 169. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1923.

Tilling, Chris. "Paul, Evil, and Justification Debates." In *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 190–223. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Tucker, Brian J. "The Jerusalem Collection, Economic Inequality, and Human Flourishing: Is Paul's Concern the Redistribution of Wealth, or a Relationship of Mutuality (or Both)?" *Canadian Theological Review* 3, no. 2 (2014): 52–70.

Valerius Maximus. *Memorable Doings and Sayings, Volume I: Books 1–5.* Edited and translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library 492. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

_____. *Memorable Doings and Sayings, Volume II: Books 6–9.* Edited and translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library 493. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

van Bremen, Riet. "The Inscribed Documents on the Temple of Hekate at Lagina and the Date and Meaning of the Temple Frieze." In *Hellenistic Karia: Proceedings of the International Conference on Hellenistic Karia, Oxford, 29 June–2 July 2006*, edited by Riet van Bremen, Jan-Mathieu Carbon, 483–503. Pessac, France: Ausonius Éditions, 2010.

Varinlioglu, Ender, ed. *Die Inschriften von Keramos*. Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1986.

Varner, Eric R. "Portraits, Plots, and Politics: *Damnatio Memoriae* and the Images of Women." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 46 (2001): 41–93.

Vasileios, Petrakos, ed. *Ho demos tou Ramnountos. Synopsē tōn anaskophōn kai tōn*

ereunōn (1813–1998). Vol. 2, *Hoi epigraphes*. Athens: Archaeological Society of Athens, 1999.

Virgilio, Biagio. "La Città Ellenistica e I suoi 'Benefattori': Pergamo e Diodoro Pasparos." In *Studi sull'Asia Minore*, 117–130. Pisa, Italy: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2014.

Walbank, Frank W. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. I, *Commentary on Books I–VI*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

_____. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. II, *Commentary on Book VII–XVIII.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

_____. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. III, *Commentary on Books XIX–XL*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Wallace, Shane. "The Freedom of the Greek in the Early Hellenistic Period (337–262 BC). A Study in Ruler-City Relations." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2011.

Warmington, E. H, trans. *Remains of Old Latin, Volume IV: Archaic Inscriptions.* Loeb Classical Library 359. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Wasserman, Emma. *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018.

Watts, Joel L. *Jesus as Divine Suicide*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2019.

Weaver, Taylor. "Rethinking Pauline Gift and Social Functions: Class Struggle in Early Christianity?" In *Class Struggle in the New Testament*, edited by Robert J. Myles, 191–208. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2019.

Welles, C. Bradford. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1934.

White, L. Michael, and G. Anthony Keddie, eds. *Jewish Fictional Letters from Hellenistic Egypt: The Epistle of Aristeas and Related Literature*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.

Wilcken, Ulrich. *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde)*. 2 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1927–1957.

Williams, Jarvis J. *Christ Redeemed 'Us' from the Curse of the Law: A Jewish Martyrological Reading of Galatians 3:13*. London: T & T Clark, 2019.

_____. *Maccabean Martyr Traditions in Paul's Theology of Atonement: Did Martyr Theology Shape Paul's Conception of Jesus's Death?* Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.

Williamson, Christina G. "As God is My Witness. Civic Oaths in Ritual Space as a Means towards Rational Cooperation in the Hellenistic *Polis*." In *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, edited by Richard Alston, Onno M. van Nijf, and Christina G. Williamson, 119–174. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2013.

Witherington, Ben, III. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte. Edited by P. M. S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte. Rev. 4th ed. West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Wolter, Michael. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. Translated by Robert L. Brawley. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015.

Xenophon. *Hiero. Agesilaus. Constitution of the Lacedaemonians. Ways and Means. Cavalry Commander. Art of Horsemanship. On Hunting. Constitution of the Athenians.* Translated by E. C. Marchant and G. W. Bowersock. Loeb Classical Library 183. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

_____. *Memorabilia. Oeconomicus. Symposium. Apology*. Translated by E. C. Marchant and O. J. Todd. Revised by Jeffrey Henderson. Loeb Classical Library 168. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

_____. *Scripta Minora*. Translated by E. C. Marchant and G. W. Bowersock. Loeb Classical Library 183. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Zeller, Dieter. *Charis bei Philon und Paulus*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1990.

Zuiderhoek, Arjan. *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

ABSTRACT

PAUL'S ENDANGERED BENEFACTOR: GALATIANS IN ITS BENEFACTION CONTEXT

David Michael Wyman, PhD
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2022
Chair: Dr. Jarvis J. Williams

Paul's use of the word χάρις ("generosity," "benefaction," "gratitude") in Galatians (Gal 1:3, 6, 15; 2:9, 21; 5:4; 6:18; cf. χαρίζεσθαι in 3:18) opens the possibility for understanding his interaction with the wider cultural encyclopedia of benefaction. This dissertation argues that in Galatians Paul operates in continuity with the wider corpus of benefaction-events by using language, motifs, concepts, and social scripts from the cultural domain of benefaction, but he exhibits differences in his specific configuration and combination of those various elements. To contextualize and understand Paul's benefaction language this dissertation examines documentary (epigraphical and papyrological) and literary sources from ca. 350 BC to AD 150.

Chapter 1 introduces the word χάρις as well as civic benefaction, and surveys important scholarship on benefaction in relation to Galatians since 1980. Chapter 2 overviews the basic operations of benefaction and several social scripts associated with it. Chapter 3 examines a variety of topics related to benefaction: civic freedom, promises, starting and completing a benefaction, word-deed congruence on the part of a benefactor, how benefits were expected to be dispensed to worthy recipients but also how clemency and pardon were highly valued, how people represented prototypical and abundant generosity, certain temporal themes of benefaction, ingratitude, fidelity and disloyalty, benefaction within kinship diplomacy, memory, imitation, and community survival. Chapter 4 shows how many of the previously examined benefaction social scripts and

motifs cohere and belong together by briefly examining parts of the First Mithridatic War (89–85 BC). Chapters 5 and 6 describe and analyze in detail the phenomenon of endangered benefaction as attested in epigraphical and literary sources, including 1 Maccabees and the *Life* of Josephus. Chapter 7 then situates Paul's use of benefaction language in Galatians within the wider cultural encyclopedia of benefaction. Chapter 8 summarizes, draws conclusions, and offers suggestions for further research.

VITA

David Michael Wyman

EDUCATION

BA, Bridgewater State University, 2013
MA, MA, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, 2016

PUBLICATIONS

"A Byzantine Land Lease from Hermopolis." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 58 (2021): 177–86.
"Fragment of a Land Lease." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 57 (2020): 61–68.
Review of *God's Library: The Archaeology of the Earliest Christian Manuscripts*, by Brent Nongbri. *Religious Studies Review* 45 (2019): 377.
Review of *The Gospel of Matthew: A Hypertextual Commentary*, by Bartosz Adamczewski. *Religious Studies Review* 44 (2018): 470.

ORGANIZATIONS

Society of Biblical Literature
American Society of Papyrologists

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Teaching Assistant, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 2017–2020
Online Teaching Assistant, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 2018–2019