

Wheeler, Everett. 2022. "Roman Colchis, Iberia and Alani: Some Notes as *Apologia*." In *Connecting East and West. Studies Presented to Prof. Gocha R. Tsetskhladze*, ed. John Boardman, James Hargrave, Alexandru Avram, and Alexander Podossinov, 791-836. Leuven: Peeters.

Xydopoulos, Ioannis K. 2021. "The Other Greeks: The Achaei of the Western Caucasus." In *Peoples in the Black Sea Region from the Archaic to the Roman Period. Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on the Black Sea in Antiquity Held in Thessaloniki, 21-23 September 2018*, ed. Manolis Manoledakis, 141-146. Summer-town, Oxford: Archaeopress.

EIRENIAS OF MILETUS' CAREER BETWEEN THE ATTALIDS AND THE SELEUCIDS*

SIMONE RENDINA

Abstract. The role played by Eirenias of Miletus in the mid-2nd century B.C. between his city and the Attalids and Seleucids demonstrates the vitality of his *polis*, which had de facto the status of a free city after the Treaty of Apamea of 188. A small corpus of Milesian inscriptions shows that Eirenias, known only from epigraphy, dedicated most of his political activity to relations with external powers, playing numerous times the role of ambassador in favour of his city, for which he was able to obtain many privileges from the Attalids and, to a lesser extent, from the Seleucids. Notables such as Eirenias, who used their external relations for the benefit of their own cities, constituted the connecting element between the euergetism of kings and powerful outsiders and that of private citizens.

The political, military, and economic role of the city of Miletus in the Hellenistic age, especially between the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C., has been widely re-evaluated by scholars.¹ In the history of Asia Minor, and in particular of Ionia, the Treaty of Apamea of 188 was a fundamental event. On this occasion, much of northern Asia Minor, up to the Mae-

* This article has greatly benefited from suggestions from its anonymous reviewers. All translations from Greek and Latin sources are mine.

¹ See Bresson and Descat 2001 for the cities of western Asia Minor and Miletus in particular.

ander, was destined for the king of Pergamon, Eumenes II. The new Attalid territories also included part of Ionia and the city of Ephesus within it.² However, the city of Miletus was not annexed to the new Attalid territories; the city thus had to manage complex relations with that dynasty.³ This autonomy, however, was not an abstract concept but derived from the concrete activity of some individuals belonging to the elites.⁴ One of them was a certain Eirenias of Miletus.

Polybius mentions the *status* of Miletus after the Treaty of Apamea in a list of cities that were not assigned to Eumenes II after the Roman victory and indeed were, to some extent, rewarded. Miletus had, in fact, managed to negotiate with the Seleucids a *status* of virtual independence since before the Syrian War, during which the city helped Rome.⁵ Polybius also states that the Romans returned to the Milesians their sacred lands.⁶ Polybius, by referring to the restitution of sacred lands, probably alludes to the concession to Miletus of a territory of the much-disputed city of Myus.⁷ Rostovtzeff already argued that Miletus did not decline before or after the Treaty of Apamea. At the turn of the 3rd and 2nd centuries, in particular, it appears that the city was in excellent eco-

² Polyb. 21.46.10: τῆς δ' Ἀσίας Φρυγίαν τὴν ἐφ' Ἑλλησπόντου, Φρυγίαν τὴν μεγάλην, Μυσοῦς, οὓς (Προουσίας) πρότερον αὐτοῦ παρεσπάσατο, Λυκαονίαν, Μιλυάδα, Λυδίαν, Τράλλεις, Ἐφεσον, Τελμεσσόν. Walbank (1979, 173) recalls that Ephesus had been taken by Antiochus III in 197 (Polyb. 18.41a.2) and surrendered to Rome after the Battle of Magnesia of 190 B.C. (Livy 37.45.1).

³ Allen (1983, 110-121) argues that Miletus was then a free city, as demonstrated by the existence of civic coinage datable to this period and by epigraphic evidence. For the Attalid state between 188 and 133 B.C., see Thonemann 2013. For the Attalids in general, see Hansen 1971, Hopp 1977, and Virgilio 1993.

⁴ For the bargaining power of the cities of western Asia Minor, see also Ma 1999.

⁵ Polyb. 21.46.5. Cf. Walbank 1979, 169: "Miletus was independent before the war and had helped Rome." Payen 2019 and 2020 demonstrate that even after the Treaty of Apamea, the Seleucids had influence over their former territories.

⁶ Polyb. 21.46.5: Μιλησίοις δὲ τὴν ἱερὰν χώραν ἀποκατέστησαν, ἧς διὰ τοὺς πολέμους πρότερον ἐξεχώρησαν.

⁷ Walbank 1979, 169-170; Gauthier 2001; Thornton 2004, 367.

conomic conditions and had an aggressive policy.⁸ The ancient evidence reporting the submission of Myus and the *συμπολιτεία* with the city of Pidasa (*I. Delphinion* 149) confirms this view.⁹

A key to understanding the social history of the Hellenistic *poleis* is the study of the careers of the members of the elites, who, by acting as ambassadors, were intermediaries between the assemblies of Greek cities and royal courts, or between Greek assemblies and the Roman Senate. A *corpus* of five Milesian inscriptions allows us to examine the foreign relations of Eirenias of Miletus and their effects on the society of Miletus.¹⁰ This individual, known only from inscriptions, dedicated most of his political activity to relations with external powers, playing numerous times the role of ambassador in favour of his city, for which he was able to obtain many privileges: according to the epigraphic documentation, he went about four times to the court of the Attalids and at least once to that of the Seleucids.¹¹ As the epigraphic evidence shows, Eumenes II of Pergamon was the main recipient of the embassies in which Eirenias participated. The time span in which the embassies are placed is therefore the reign of Eumenes II; however, it is not excluded that Eirenias was the main interlocutor of the rulers of Pergamon even

⁸ Rostovtzeff 1941, 665-670. In those same pages, Rostovtzeff shows that euergetism had a significant development in Miletus during those decades: between 200 and 199, Eudemus of Miletus donated a large sum of money for the education of children; after the battle of Magnesia, Timarchos and Herakleides, who were two influential friends and collaborators of Antiochus IV, donated a *βουλευτήριον* to the city. In general, for euergetism in the Hellenistic age, see Veyne 1976, with comments on the case of Eirenias on p. 237; Gauthier 1985, where the actions of Eirenias are discussed on pp. 31 and 57; Beck 2015; Domingo Gygas 2016; Domingo Gygas and Zuiderhoek 2021.

⁹ See Gauthier 2001 for the submission of Myus to Miletus.

¹⁰ Bringmann and von Steuben 1995, 284 [E1], 284 [E2], 285 [E], 286 [E], 287 [E]. For Eirenias and his foreign relations, see also Allen 1983, 115-121; Herrmann 1987, 174-182; and Queyrel 2003, 287-297.

¹¹ Herrmann 2016, 297-298; see also Herrmann 2001, 106.

after the death of this king, since the dating of inscriptions is uncertain and two of them seem to refer to Attalus II of Pergamon.¹²

The first inscription (284 [E1]) is in honour of Eirenias, who is named after his father, Eirenias.¹³ This epigraphic document was found walled in a well in a village located southeast of ancient Miletus in 1960 and was published for the first time by Peter Herrmann.¹⁴ The text is distributed in three blocks of marble and is incomplete.¹⁵

In this honorary inscription for Eirenias, the *πρυτάνεις* and the individuals in charge of the defence of Miletus establish that Eirenias be publicly praised and a gilded statue be erected for his deeds in favour of his fellow citizens; the honours shall be approved by the tribunal (*δικαστήριον*) and shall be proclaimed by the *ἀγωνοθέται* (directors of the games) and *βασιλείς* of the local Dionysia; the *ἀνατάκται* (officials of finance) shall take care of the expenses necessary for these honours; and three *ἐπιστάται* (superintendents) shall see that the statue is completed.¹⁶ These honours are a reward for Eirenias' successful diplomatic mission at the court of Eumenes II. Eirenias spoke with King Eumenes II in accordance with a concession (*συγχώρησις*) made by the people of the city. The king donated, as suggested by Eirenias, 160,000 medimni of grain and a

¹² Bringmann and von Steuben 1995, 286 [E] and 287 [E]. Attalus II succeeded his brother Eumenes II on his death in 158-157 B.C. (Marek 2016, 565), actually as the regent of Eumenes II's son, Attalus III.

¹³ Main editions: Herrmann 2016, 255-273; *SEG* 36, 1046; Queyrel 2003, 287-289.

¹⁴ On the finding of the inscription and on the material aspects of the stone, see Herrmann 2016, 255-256.

¹⁵ We will not focus on two other epigraphic documents that concern Eirenias: *I. Didyma* 142 and *Milet I*, 3, 147 (where he is briefly mentioned at ll. 87-88). The two inscriptions are referred to in Herrmann 2016, 260-261. The first one is especially relevant for the study of the economic history of Miletus as it is an honorary inscription for Eirenias, who is commended for his financial help for his city and its citizens in difficult situations. However, the two inscriptions do not concern the relations between Eirenias, as a representative of the city of Miletus, and the Hellenistic kings.

¹⁶ For the gilded statue that was dedicated to Eirenias in Miletus, see Kaye 2022, 263. In general, for honorific monuments in the Hellenistic age, see Ma 2013 (with references to Eirenias on pp. 73 and 244).

certain amount of wood to Miletus in order to build a gymnasium in the city.¹⁷ The community then honoured the king and sent Eirenias again to ask the king to increase the donations and take charge of the expenses needed for the honours. In the incomplete text of the second block, it is shown that, through a sister of "Antiochus," who should be identified with Antiochus IV Epiphanes (while the mentioned sister was most likely his sister-wife Laodice), Eirenias had managed to obtain from Antiochus an exemption from customs duties (ἀτέλεια) for the products (γενήματα) of Miletus that were exported to the Seleucid kingdom.

The dating of this inscription is disputed and is complicated by the need to distinguish the dating of the deeds for which Eirenias is honoured from the dating of the making of the inscription. There is a double *terminus ante quem* for the acts for which Eirenias receives acknowledgment: for Eirenias' two embassies to Eumenes II, the *terminus ante quem* is obviously 158-157 B.C., the date of the death of Eumenes.¹⁸ For the embassy to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the *terminus ante quem* is 164, the date of the death of the Seleucid king. The authors of the *Nouveau choix d'inscriptions grecques* propose to place the inscription in a time span between about 167 and 160 B.C.; K. Bringmann and H. von Steuben propose a date prior to 167. The most thorough and systematic discussion of the text was carried out by P. Herrmann, who proposed that the inscription attests to the very first diplomatic relations between Eumenes II and Eirenias since it does not mention any previous contact between this ambassador and the Attalid king.¹⁹

The inscription 284 [E2] is also difficult to date.²⁰ The text is incomplete, as there are only the *considérants*, that is, the reasons for the honours attributed to an individual. It is clear that the honoured individual is Eumenes II of Pergamon, and that he made himself meritorious to-

¹⁷ For the so-called gymnasium of Eumenes II, see Emme 2013, 151-154, dating it to 160-159 B.C. and locating it in the "Westmarkt" area of Miletus; cf. Trümper 2015, 196-203; Kaye 2022, 263.

¹⁸ Marek 2016, 565.

¹⁹ Institut Fernand-Courby 1971, 55-60, no. 7; Bringmann and von Steuben 1995, 346, no. 284 [E1]; Herrmann 2016, 294-299.

²⁰ Main editions: Th. Wiegand, *SB Berlin* 1911, 26-27; *Milet I*, 9, 307.

wards the people of Miletus by sending a letter (γράματα [*sic*]), in accordance with a suggestion of Eirenias (ll. 16-18). The Attalid ruler and the Milesian citizen must therefore have already been on cordial terms. Herrmann's proposal, identifying the diplomatic relations mentioned in this inscription with the facts referred to in the previous one, is convincing.²¹

A further inscription (285 [E]) reports that Eirenias, together with other ambassadors of the κοινόν of the Ionians, visited Eumenes II on the island of Delos, probably when relations with him were already established and he was the main interlocutor of the Attalid king in Miletus.²² It has been rightly observed that Eumenes was on Delos as this was a stage of his return from the voyage that he had made to Rome in 167. This had been a failed voyage as the Romans, who had been suspicious of the ambiguous attitude of their allies during the Third Macedonian War, which had just ended, had favoured Eumenes II's competitor, Prusias II of Bithynia; later (166-165 B.C.), the Romans would also have furthered the cause of the Galatians against the Attalid king.²³ Eumenes II received congratulations from the ambassadors of the κοινόν of the Ionians on his recent victories over the Galatians (campaigns of 168-166 B.C.) on ll. 7-13. The visit of the ambassadors to Delos thus probably took place in the winter of 167-166.²⁴ Eumenes did not lose the solidarity of the cities of Asia, which felt threatened by the Galatians, although he was having issues with the Roman senate.²⁵

The inscription was placed in Miletus and consists of the complete text of an epistle of Eumenes II to the κοινόν of the Ionians. Eumenes recalls that Eirenias and a certain Archelaos gave him the text of a decree (ψήφισμα) of the Ionian confederation, which thanked the king for

²¹ Herrmann 2016, 295.

²² Main editions: Th. Wiegand, *SB Berlin* 1904, 86; *OGIS* 763; *Milet I*, 9, 306; cf. *SEG* 4, 443.

²³ Polyb. 30.18-19; 30.28; 30.30; Herrmann 2016, 287.

²⁴ Herrmann 2016, 287.

²⁵ For the meeting of the ambassadors of the Ionian κοινόν, including Eirenias, with Eumenes II on the island of Delos in 167-166 and their bestowal of honours on the king, see Kaye 2022, 67, 262-263.

his generosity towards the Greek cities, shown in his fight against the barbarians (i.e., the Galatians); he was rewarded with a golden crown, a gilded statue, and the proclamation of honours in the agones of the confederation and of the cities. Eumenes accepted the honours and promised that he would help the Ionian confederation and give it the financial means for the celebration of his eponymous day. He also offered to erect the statue of himself at his own expense and chose as its location the sacred land (τέμενος) that the inhabitants of Miletus had already decreed to him. The reason for this was the particularly eminent role of Miletus, but an additional reason was the kinship that bound Miletus to Eumenes, since Cyzicus had been founded by the Milesians and was also the homeland of the king's mother, Apollonis.²⁶

The inscription 286 [E] is a decree of the βουλή of Miletus on the celebration of the anniversary of the birth of Eumenes II, concerning in particular the regulation and financing of the distribution of cereals for that occasion.²⁷ The council decides that two officials will be charged with supervising the distribution of grain to the citizens on the 6th of Lenaion, the anniversary of the king's birth, and will also have to deal with sacrifices, the banquet, the parade in arms of the ephebes, other aspects of the Crown Law (στεφανηφορικὸς νόμος), and the regulations on priesthood. Subsequently, officials will also have to be chosen who will purchase cereals or deal with their supply. The regulation concerning the fund for the distribution of cereals is presented: 30 talents taken from commercial loans (ἐμπορικὰ δάνεια) will be transferred to the heads of the public bank (δημόσια τράπεζα) by those responsible for the construction of a gymnasium in Miletus, Eirenias and Zopyros, son of Asklepiodoros. The interest will be handed over to the committee charged with the purchase of the cereals. This is followed by clauses against the illicit transfer to other transactions of the sums referred to and in favour of maintaining the memory of King Eumenes II (μνήμη). Eumenes' brothers, King Attalus and Athenaios, and his son, Attalus

²⁶ For the general problem of kinship (συγγένεια) between communities in the Greek world, see Musti 1963, Curty 1995, and Lücke 2000.

²⁷ Main editions: Th. Wiegand, *SB Berlin* 1911, 27-28; *I. Didyma* 488.

(the future Attalus III), will be informed of this procedure. Finally, indications are given regarding the engraving of the decree.²⁸

Different dates have been proposed for this decree: for P. Herrmann, the text was decreed shortly before or shortly after the death of Eumenes II; for R. E. Allen, it is slightly earlier than 160-159 or slightly later; according to K. Bringmann and H. von Steuben, it should be placed in the period immediately following the death of Eumenes II; for F. Queyrel, the mention of Attalus II as a king allows to date the inscription to the period of joint rule of Eumenes II and Attalus II, between 159 and 158.²⁹ However, the mention of Attalus II as the king at the same time as the issuance of honours for Eumenes II is perplexing. Literary sources indicate that he became βασιλεύς with difficulty, as Attalus III was supposed to be Eumenes II's successor; after his death, Attalus II would become his regent and king in an unofficial way (Strabo 13.4.2 = 624C). Herrmann and Allen also show the existence of inscriptions that seem to attest to the coregency of Eumenes II and Attalus II.³⁰ In addition, although the μνήμη of Eumenes II is mentioned (l. 38), this does not necessarily indicate that he was dead, since in 285 [E] (l. 56), this word is used by Eumenes himself, the author of the epistle, in reference to himself. The decree should also be placed at an advanced stage of the construction of the gymnasium in Miletus, which is referred to in the text; Eirenias is mentioned as responsible for the building, along with Zopyros.

Finally, 287 [E] was inscribed on one side of a square block of marble found walled in the parodos of the theatre of Miletus and was discovered in 1903. However, only in 1965 was the text published by Herrmann.³¹

²⁸ The complex financial procedure described here has been thoroughly analysed by Migeotte 2012.

²⁹ Herrmann 2016, 292-293; Allen 1983, 116-118; Bringmann and von Steuben 1995, 353, 356, no. 286 [E]; Queyrel 2003, 295. Eumenes II died on 158-157; see Marek 2016, 565.

³⁰ Herrmann 2016, 292-293; Allen 1983, 116-118.

³¹ Main editions: Herrmann 2016, 274-286; McCabe and Plunkett 1984, 5, no. 11. Another side of the block, adjacent to the one we are examining, also contains an

The initial part of the decree is missing; the text begins with indications concerning the use of a sum of money. This is followed by the tasks entrusted to a secretary (γραμματεὺς), who is charged with selling the priesthood for Eumenes II, here referred to as θεός, choosing a commission that will regulate the priesthood, and turning the decree into a law of Myus. In addition, the secretary will take care of the inscription of the decree on the base where the statue of the king will be erected and by the door of the temple of Apollo Τερμινθεύς in Myus. A treasurer (ταμίης) will take care of financing the expenses needed for this inscription, and two ambassadors will be sent to the king to report the decree and ask him for help in the future. The decree ends with the names of two chosen ambassadors; only one name is readable, that of Eirenias.

Was Eumenes II still alive when the decree was voted? Was he, or Attalus II, the recipient of the diplomatic mission of Eirenias and his colleague? In the inscription, Eumenes is defined as a θεός (l. 5), and according to the general opinion, the deification of the Attalid kings only took place after their deaths. In fact, Bringmann and von Steuben suggested that the inscription should be dated after Eumenes' death.³² However, the admittedly incomplete text does not contain a distinction between the king honoured with divine worship and the king currently in office, with a possible reference to Eumenes' successor, Attalus II: as Allen has stressed, only one βασιλεύς is mentioned in the inscription.³³ Thus, Eumenes was probably alive and was also honoured with a priesthood and the title of θεός. This implies, however, that we renounce the idea of a rejection of forms of deification in life by the Attalids.

This can be confirmed by the fact that in the epistle of Eumenes II to the κοινόν of the Ionians, Eumenes himself accepted the honours be-

inscription. It is an incomplete decree dedicated to a certain Apollodoros of Miletus, son of Metrophanes. Herrmann 2016, 274-279 proposed to date this inscription either in the 3rd century or soon after 196 B.C., as the decree was voted by the citizens of Myus (which was again part of the territories of Miletus since that year).

³² Bringmann and von Steuben 1995, 357, no. 287 [E].

³³ Allen 1983, 119.

stowed on him by the Ionians and by Miletus in particular, and among these honours there was also a piece of sacred land, i.e., a *τέμενος* (285 [E], ll. 60-64). According to the same text, Eumenes did his utmost to preserve the memory (*μνήμη*) of himself (ll. 54-56). In conclusion, while Eumenes was still alive, he received honours such as the title of *θεός*, a *τέμενος*, and priestly offices.³⁴

Miletus was responsible for autonomously awarding to Eumenes II divine attributes: it was the only city in Ionia, as Eumenes himself observed in the epistle, to honour him with a *τέμενος*, and in the decree of Myus (which was then part of Miletus), it decreed the sale of the priestly offices for the king. Miletus was a virtually independent and non-tributary city; this was not necessarily an advantageous position but rather an uncertain situation. Those who found themselves in such a situation of insecurity, such as the inhabitants of Miletus, did not see the privileges assigned to their city as something taken for granted but, on the contrary, as something earned by bargaining with the powerful, e.g., by conferring honours on them and expecting benefits in return. Miletus had to make even greater manifestations of veneration than Ephesus, which was part of the Attalid kingdom and therefore automatically enjoyed the protection of the kings of Pergamon.³⁵

As illustrated by the five inscriptions, Miletus awarded honours to Hellenistic kings, thus showing its autonomy and bargaining power. In the first inscription examined, the initial impetus to request the grain necessary to finance the gymnasium, in addition to wood, came from an individual, precisely Eirenias, and the word used to indicate the approval of the people (*πλήθος*) was *συγχώρησις*, concession (284 [E1], l. 5): it was an independent action by a private citizen.³⁶

It is very likely that such an action was not alien to the interests of King Eumenes II. A passage of Polybius (31.31.1-3) indicates that Eumenes II donated 280,000 medimni of grain to the Rhodians in 161-160

³⁴ For the cult of the Attalid dynasty, see Virgilio ²2003, 102-109 and Hamon 2004.

³⁵ Allen 1983, 120-121.

³⁶ As also stressed by Kaye 2022, 264.

B.C., so that what was earned from its sale could be lent at interest, and the proceeds could be allocated to the salaries of the *παιδευταί* and the *διδάσκαλοι* of the sons of the Rhodians; Polybius also observes that it was undignified that the Rhodians could accept this sort of charity, and it was all the more shameful because they were then in good economic conditions. Eumenes II was therefore inclined to make donations destined for gymnasia and education, even if the donation was not indispensable, since the recipients could afford these services. Moreover, the epigraphic documentation attests to the dedication by Eumenes II of gymnasia to Cos, Andros, and Ephesus; as shown by P. F. Mittag, who listed these inscriptions, this was a typical way of expressing generosity by this king.³⁷

The method of financing through a donation of grain was quite common. In the inscription 284 [E1], the financing of the gymnasium was made in this way. Moreover, as the decree of the *βουλή* of Miletus (286 [E]) on the celebration of the anniversary of the birth of Eumenes II shows, the proceeds of interest from commercial loans could be used for distributing cereals to the population. Whether or not the donation of cereals was a financing method aimed at avoiding forms of inflation, it must have been widespread, not only among the Attalids but also among the Seleucids, as shown by an inscription analysed by J. Ma, which attests to the donation of grain to Iasos by Laodice III, wife of Antiochus III; the proceeds from the sale of cereals were to be used to finance the dowries of the daughters of poor citizens.³⁸

The recipient of the embassies in which Eirenias participated, as already pointed out, was not exclusively the Attalid kingdom. The first inscription in honour of the Milesian ambassador (284 [E1]), in fact, reports the embassy to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the Seleucid king. The mention of both Eumenes II and Antiochus IV in this inscription could be explained by Michail Rostovtzeff's idea that in that period there was

³⁷ Mittag 2006, 108.

³⁸ Ma 1999, 223-224; text on pp. 329-335. However, the Seleucids did not have the same inclination as the Attalids had to donate means for education or buildings, such as gymnasia; see Mittag 2006, 108. Cf. Bringmann 2005 for Seleucid donations.

a sort of *entente cordiale* between Attalids and Seleucids – an idea that, according to Rostovtzeff, was also confirmed by the presence in Syria of tetradrachms minted in Asia Minor.³⁹ In fact, Eirenias' presence both at the court of Eumenes and of Antiochus would have been out of place if the two kings had been in hostile relations.

Antiochus IV granted Miletus the privilege of ἀτέλεια, i.e., an exemption from indirect taxes, for the products of Miletus that were exported to the Seleucid kingdom, as shown by ll. 1-6 of the second section of the honorary decree. The extensive documentation of the cases of ἀτέλεια shows that it was one of the main methods chosen by the Seleucid rulers to reward the communities or individuals by whom they had been honoured or benefited.⁴⁰

The exemption from indirect taxes was certainly advantageous for the recipients of this ἀτέλεια, as highlighted by the satisfaction expressed by the inhabitants of Miletus who honoured Eirenias in this inscription and who had seen themselves greatly benefited by this privilege, but it was also advantageous for the authority that issued the honour. There is another striking case of ἀτέλεια in the 2nd century B.C., contemporary to the dedication of honours to Eirenias. Rome had granted ἀτέλεια to Delos, thus disadvantaging the economically competing island of Rhodes, as reported by Polybius (30.31.10-12). The main purpose of the Romans, according to Astymedes of Rhodes (the speaker in Polybius' passage), was to damage the economy of Rhodes, which had demonstrated an ambiguous attitude towards Rome during the Third Macedonian War. However, the Romans also knew that giving Delos the ἀτέλεια would increase traffic to it. In the following years, Delos would become a thriving centre for Italic and Roman merchants. The ἀτέλεια was therefore an efficient way to favour the rewarded people and also

³⁹ Rostovtzeff 1941, 655-659; Herrmann 2016, 269. For the relations between Eumenes II and Antiochus IV, see Mørkholm 1966, 51-57. For the relations between Attalids and Seleucids between 281 and 175 B.C., see Chrubasik 2013. For Seleucid power, see Musti 1965 and 1966; Capdetrey 2007.

⁴⁰ Ma 1999, 129, 132, 150, 288, 345.

favour the rewarders themselves.⁴¹ An exemption that a Hellenistic king made in favour of the merchants who travelled to his kingdom, like the one the Milesians received from Antiochus IV thanks to Eirenias, could thus be considered a great advantage by the beneficiaries.

Miletus was one of the most beloved cities of the Seleucid rulers; for example, in an inscription that reports a letter of Seleucus II to the city (RC 22), according to the interpretation of J. Ma, the king made Miletus free.⁴² Miletus, which had been under the control of the Ptolemies since c. 280 B.C., after the tyranny of an Aetolian adventurer, had been previously freed by Antiochus II, who therefore received divine honours from the city.⁴³

Antiochus IV is known to have offered other gifts to the Milesians. Herakleides and Timarchos, respectively the διοικητής (secretary of finance) and the satrap of Media under this king, appear from the epigraphic evidence to have borne the cost of a new βουλευτήριον and to have dedicated it on behalf of the king.⁴⁴ It should be recalled that at that time Miletus was leading the κοινόν of the Ionians, with which Eumenes II also had close relations. Antiochus IV's expressions of generosity in Asia Minor were not limited to this city. An inscription of Ilium from the 2nd century B.C. recalls his merits towards the δήμος of this city. The city of Cyzicus, which had been founded by Miletus, also maintained good relations with both the Seleucids and the Attalids. The city was the birthplace of Apollonis, mother of Eumenes II and Attalus

⁴¹ For tax exemption in Greek trade, and ἀτέλεια in particular, see Bresson 2000, 131-149; Rubinstein 2009. For harbour duties and the ἐλλυμένιον in particular, see Chankowski 2007 and Carrara 2014. For Greek economy in general, see Migeotte 2002; Bresson 2007 and 2008.

⁴² Ma 1999, 44.

⁴³ Ma 1999, 41.

⁴⁴ Th. Wiegand, *Miletus II*, 95-99. For the donation of Herakleides and Timarchos, see Mørkholm 1966, 56, where some testimonies of the generosity of Antiochus IV towards some cities of Asia Minor are collected; for these two officials, see also 103-107. For the ambassadors of Miletus in the Seleucid kingdom, see Herrmann 1987.

II.⁴⁵ According to Livy (41.20.7), the city received golden vessels (*uasa aurea mensae*) as a gift from Antiochus IV to be used in the prytaneion. Cyzicus is referred to in the inscription of Eudemos of Seleucia (Cilicia), an official of Antiochus IV. According to Mørkholm, he probably became *proxenos* in Cyzicus in exchange for the help he lent in the king's bestowal of favours on the city.⁴⁶ From the fact that Cyzicus, a city "related" to the Attalids as it was the homeland of Apollonis, mother of Eumenes II and Attalus II, was a colony of Miletus, it followed that Miletus was also related to the Attalids.⁴⁷ However, a *συγγένεια*, a kinship, although mythical, also existed with the Seleucids: they proclaimed themselves the descendants of Apollo, and near Miletus stood one of the most important places of worship of this god, the sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma; the kinship is shown by a letter of Seleucus II to Miletus (282 [E], ll. 5-6).

The privileges offered by Seleucus II and Antiochus IV, an enduring kinship between Miletus and the Seleucids, and some connections between the city elites and the rulers of Syria may have allowed, at least in Miletus, a certain memory of the Seleucids. The same cannot be said of the other cities of Asia Minor. The reception of the Seleucids among the populations once subject to them was complex. On the one hand, in a passage of Livy, after the Treaty of Apamea, the peoples of Lycia affirmed that the Rhodians were much worse masters than Antiochus III had been (Livy 41.6.9); moreover, three wars took place between Rhodes, Lycia, and Caria (Polyb. 30.31.4), a sign of discontent unprecedented in the Seleucid age. On the other hand, the Attalids were more inclined to euergetic activity than the Seleucids were.⁴⁸ Thus, even after the end of the Attalid rule, while the Se-

⁴⁵ See p. 42 of this article.

⁴⁶ *Syll.*³ 644-645. For the examples cited, see Mørkholm 1966, 56-57.

⁴⁷ See the epistle of Eumenes, 285 [E], l. 65.

⁴⁸ Polybius reports that his father Lycortas stated, in a speech dated to 169-168, that Antiochus IV was undeniably a great benefactor, but he was also the first of his dynasty to conduct a policy of charity towards the Hellenic communities (Polyb. 29.24.12-16). However, it should be stressed that Polybius may have been underestimating the euergetic activity of the Seleucids due to his own political preference for the Ptolemies over them.

leucids were scarcely remembered, there was a long permanence of the Attalids, especially of Eumenes II, in the collective memory. It probably persisted in Miletus, which, through Eirenias, had received many privileges from Eumenes II, and was a widespread phenomenon throughout Asia Minor. The inscriptions in honour of Diodoros Paspáros in Pergamon attest, after the first Mithridatic war, some decades after the end of the Attalid rule, to a renewal of the *Nikephoria*, festivals instituted in the Attalid age by Attalus I and Eumenes II.⁴⁹ Aristonicus claimed to be the son of Eumenes II and called himself Eumenes III, probably to gain support from the population of Asia Minor.

The corpus of inscriptions regarding Eirenias finally allows us to raise the problem of the political value of the honours for citizen benefactors in the Hellenistic age and of the discussed continuity of this phenomenon with the euergetism of the classical age, which had generally been due to external benefactors. Does the first inscription that has been examined (284 [E1]) show euergetism by Eumenes II or Eirenias? It was Eirenias who, as an ambassador, obtained generous concessions from Eumenes and conceived the project of a gymnasium, which he proposed to the city population. However, the funding of the gymnasium was due exclusively to Eumenes. In this inscription (I, l. 13), Eirenias is called εὐεργέτης, and the same definition is attributed to Eumenes in the decree in his honour by the people of Miletus (284 [E2], l. 3), which probably refers to the funding for the construction of the gymnasium.⁵⁰ In a certain sense, notables such as Eirenias were the connecting element between the euergetism of kings and powerful outsiders and that of private citizens, which had such a long life throughout the Hellenistic and Roman ages.

University of Cassino and Southern Lazio, Italy
simone.rendina@alumni.sns.it

⁴⁹ Jones 1974 and 2000.

⁵⁰ Herrmann 2001, 106: Eirenias' engagement for his city was matched by an euergetic activity deployed by King Eumenes II. This could be seen as a ritual of reciprocity between donations granted by the king and honours bestowed by the city.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Robert E. 1983. *The Attalid Kingdom. A Constitutional History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Beck, Mark. 2015. *Der politische Euergetismus und dessen vor allem nichtbürgerliche Rezipienten im hellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien sowie dem ägäischen Raum*. Pharos: Studien zur griechisch-römischen Antike 35. Rahden: VML.

Bresson, Alain. 2000. *La cité marchande*. Pessac: Ausonius Éditions.

— 2007. *L'économie de la Grèce des cités (fin VI^e-I^{er} siècle a. C.)*. I vol.: *Les structures et la production*. Paris: A. Colin.

— 2008. *L'économie de la Grèce des cités (fin VI^e-I^{er} siècle a. C.)*. II vol.: *Les espaces de l'échange*. Paris: A. Colin.

Bresson, Alain, and Raymond Descat, eds. 2001. *Les cités d'Asie mineure occidentale au II^e siècle a.C.* Pessac: Ausonius Éditions.

Bringmann, Klaus. 2005. "Königliche Ökonomie im Spiegel des Euergetismus der Seleukiden." *Klio* 87: 102-115.

Bringmann, Klaus, and Hans von Steuben. 1995. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer. Teil I: Zeugnisse und Kommentare*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Capdetrey, Laurent. 2007. *Le pouvoir séleucide. Territoire, administration, finances d'un royaume hellénistique (312-129 av. J.-C.)*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Carrara, Aurélie. 2014. "Tax and Trade in Ancient Greece. About the *Ellimention* and the Harbour Duties." *RÉA* 116.2: 441-464.

Chankowski, Véronique. 2007. "Les catégories du vocabulaire de la fiscalité dans les cités grecques." In *Vocabulaire et expressions de l'économie dans le monde antique*. Études 19, ed. Jean Andreau and Véronique Chankowski, 299-331. Pessac: Ausonius Éditions.

Chrubasik, Boris. 2013. "The Attalids and the Seleukid Kings, 281-175 B.C." In *Attalid Asia Minor. Money, International Relations, and the State*, ed. Peter Thonemann, 83-119. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Curty, Olivier. 1995. *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques. Catalogue raisonné des inscriptions contenant le terme συγγένεια et analyse critique.* Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-romain 20. Genève: Librairie Droz.

Domingo Gygas, Marc. 2016. *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City. The Origins of Euergetism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Domingo Gygas, Marc, and Arjan Zuiderhoek, eds. 2021. *Benefactors and the Polis. The Public Gift in the Greek Cities from the Homeric World to Late Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Emme, Burkhard. 2013. *Peristyl und Polis. Entwicklung und Funktionen öffentlicher griechischer Hofanlagen.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Gauthier, Philippe. 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV^e-I^{er} s. av. J.-C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions.* Athènes: École française d'Athènes.

https://cefael.efa.gr/window.php?site_id=1&serie_id=BCHSuppl&volume_number=12&issue_number=0&actionID=summary

— 2001. "Les Pidaséens entrent en sympolitie avec les Milésiens. La procédure et les modalités institutionnelles." In *Les cités d'Asie mineure occidentale au II^e siècle a.C.* Études 8, ed. Alain Bresson and Raymond Descat, 117-127. Pessac: Ausonius Éditions.

Hamon, Patrice. 2004. "Les prêtres du culte royal dans la capitale des Attalides. Note sur le décret de Pergame en l'honneur du roi Attale III (OGIS 332)." *Chiron* 34: 169-185.

Hansen, Esther V. 1971. *The Attalids of Pergamon.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Herrmann, Peter. 1987. "Milesier am Seleukidenhof. Prosopographische Beiträge zur Geschichte Milets im 2. Jhdt. v. Chr." *Chiron* 17: 171-192.

— 2001. "Milet au II^e siècle a.C." In *Les cités d'Asie mineure occidentale au II^e siècle a.C.* Études 8, ed. Alain Bresson and Raymond Descat, 109-116. Pessac: Ausonius Éditions.

— 2016. "Neue Urkunden zur Geschichte von Milet im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr." In *Kleinasien im Spiegel epigraphischer Zeugnisse. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, ed. Peter Herrmann and Wolfgang Blümel, 255-302. Berlin: De Gruyter. = *IstMitt* 15, 1965: 71-117, tab. 33-34.

Hopp, Joachim. 1977. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden*. Vestigia. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte 25. München: C. H. Beck.

Institut Fernand-Courby, ed. 1971. *Nouveau choix d'inscriptions grecques. Textes, traductions, commentaires*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Jones, Christopher P. 1974. "Diodoros Paspáros and the Nikephoria of Pergamon." *Chiron* 4: 183-205.

— 2003. "Diodoros Paspáros Revisited." *Chiron* 30: 1-14.

Kaye, Noah. 2022. *The Attalids of Pergamon and Anatolia. Money, Culture, and State Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lücke, Stephan. 2000. *Syngeneia: epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie*. Frankfurter althistorische Beiträge 5. Frankfurt am Main: M. Clauss.

Ma, John. 1999. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 2013. *Statues and Cities. Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*. Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture and Representation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marek, Christian. 2016. *In the Land of a Thousand Gods. A History of Asia Minor in the Ancient World*. In collaboration with Peter Frei, trans. Steven Rendall. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

McCabe, Donald F., and Mark A. Plunkett. 1984. *Miletos Inscriptions: Texts and List*. Princeton, NJ: Institute for Advanced Study.

Migeotte, Léopold. 2002. *L'économie des cités grecques. De l'archaïsme au Haut-Empire romain*. Paris: Ellipses.

— 2012. "Les dons du roi Eumène II à Milet et les *emporika daneia* de la cité." In *Stephanèphoros. De l'économie antique à l'Asie Mineure. Hommages à Raymond Descat*, ed. Koray Konuk, 117-123. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions.

Mittag, Peter Franz. 2006. *Antiochos IV. Epiphanes. Eine politische Biographie*. Klio. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte. Beihefte Neue Folge 11. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Mørkholm, Otto. 1966. *Antiochus IV of Syria*. *Classica et Mediaevalia*. Dissertationes VIII. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Musti, Domenico. 1963. "Sull'idea di συγγένεια in iscrizioni greche." *AnnPisa* 32.3/4: 225-239.

— 1965. "Aspetti dell'organizzazione seleucidica in Asia Minore nel III sec. a.C." *PP* 20: 153-160.

— 1966. "Lo stato dei Seleucidi. Dinastia popoli città da Seleuco I ad Antioco III." *Studi Classici e Orientali* 15: 61-197.

Payen, Germain. 2019. "L'influence séleucide sur les dynasties anatoliennes après le traité d'Apamée." In *Rome and the Seleukid East. Selected Papers from Seleukid Study Day V, Brussels, 21-23 August 2015*. Collection Latomus 360, ed. Altay Coşkun and David Engels, 279-307. Leuven: Peeters.

— 2020. *Dans l'ombre des empires. Les suites géopolitiques du traité d'Apamée en Anatolie*. Suppléments francophones de la Revue Phoenix 1. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Queyrel, François. 2003. *Les portraits des Attalides. Fonction et représentation*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 308. Paris: De Boccard.

Rostovtzeff, Michael. 1941. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. Vol. II. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rubinstein, Lene. 2009. "Ateleia Grants and Their Enforcement in the Classical and Early Hellenistic Periods." In *Greek History and Epigraphy. Essays in Honour of P.J. Rhodes*, ed. Lynette Mitchell and Lene Rubinstein, 115-143. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.

Thonemann, Peter. 2013. "The Attalid State, 188-133 B.C." In *Attalid Asia Minor. Money, International Relations, and the State*, ed. Peter Thonemann, 1-47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thornton, John. 2004. "Note." In *Polibio, Storie. Vol. VI (Libri XIX-XXVII)*, ed. Domenico Musti, trans. Filippo Canali De Rossi. Milano: BUR.

Trümper, Monika. 2015. "Modernization and Change of Function of Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Imperial Period. Case-Studies Pergamon, Miletus, and

Priene." In *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasion*, ed. Peter Scholz and Dirk Wiegandt, 167-221. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Veyne, Paul. 1976. *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*. Paris: Seuil.

Virgilio, Biagio. 1993. *Gli Attalidi di Pergamo. Fama, Eredità, Memoria*. Studi ellenistici 5. Pisa: Giardini.

— 2003. *Lancia, diadema e porpora. Il re e la regalità ellenistica*. Studi ellenistici 14. Pisa: Giardini.

Walbank, Frank William. 1979. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius. Vol. III. Commentary on Books XIX-XL*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.