

MICHAEL B. WALBANK

PROXENIA FOR EUENOR SON OF EUEPIOS OF ARGOS IN AKARNANIA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 86 (1991) 199–202

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

PROXENIA FOR EUENOR SON OF EUEPIOS OF ARGOS IN AKARNANIA

The fourth-century physician Euenor of Akarnania, who later became an Athenian citizen, is known to us from several epigraphical documents and from one, ambiguous literary source.

IG ii² 373 (EM 7186) has long been known as the lower part of a stele containing the end of one decree and the beginning of another:¹ by the earlier decree, hitherto undated, Euenor of Akarnania is praised for his services to Athens, is named proxenos and euergetes, along with his descendants, and is granted other privileges of the sort usually awarded to euergetai. By the second decree, dated by its prescript to 322/1 B.C., he is identified as the son of Euepios; the grant of proxenia is recalled, he is praised for his attention to the needs of Athenian citizens, and is awarded an olive crown and the right (*enktesis*) to own a house anywhere in Attica except on common land or the borders. It was always assumed that the two decrees on this stele were very close in date since the second decree begins, after a regular prescript, with τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῆι βουλευῆι, a clause which usually marks an amendment to an earlier probouleumatic decree, although opinions vary as to why this unusual formulation was adopted.²

It is now clear that the first decree for Euenor is, in fact, much earlier than the second: IG ii² 373 proves to be the lower part of the same stele as that of IG ii² 242 (EM 7064), which it joins without a break in the text.³ IG ii² 242 preserves the prescript and opening lines of a decree securely dated by archon-formula to 337/6 B.C.⁴

The text of the first decree of the composite document (IG ii² 242, together with lines 1-15 of IG ii² 373) follows here:

¹ It was found on the Akropolis in 1836, west of the Parthenon, and first published by K.S. Pittakys, *Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.*, 18 (1840) 312-313, #371. The right and left sides and back are preserved.

² For recent discussions and summaries of earlier views about the reason for the amendment-formula and the date of IG ii² 373, see M.J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens 2* (1982) 129-131, and C.J. Schwenk, *Athens in the Age of Alexander* (1983) 68-71, no. 14.

³ The stones were first associated with one another by me in 1989 and the join confirmed in 1990. I am grateful to Mrs. C. Peppas-Delmousou, the Director of the Epigraphical Museum in Athens, for permission to study and to republish these stones, and also to her Assistant, Mrs. Chara Karappa-Molisani. Dimensions as joined: H. max., 0.708 m.; W. max., 0.356-0.364 m.; Th., 0.127-0.137 m. Letter-height, lines 1-30, 0.005 m.; lines 31ff., 0.004-0.005 m.; stoichedon, lines 1-30, 0.0107 m. x 0.0107 m.; lines 31-34, 0.0090 m. x 0.0090 m.; lines 35ff., 0.0090 m. x 0.0092 m.

⁴ The stone was found in excavations on the Akropolis on April 20, 1840, between the Parthenon and the Propylaia, and first published by K.S. Pittakys, *Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.*, 33 (1853) 781-782, #1305. The lower part of a relief is preserved, above a vertical fascia and crowning moulding, together with the upper part of the stele; the left side and back are preserved. The relief depicted a standing draped figure, whose legs survive.

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|---------------|
| | | Stoichedon 33 |
| 337/6 B.C. | | |
| a (IG ii ² 242) | [Θ]ε[οί] | |
| | [ἐ]πὶ Φρυγίχ[ο]υ ἄ[ρχοντος, ἐπὶ τῆς Πανδιονί]- | |
| | [δ]ος δεκάτη[ς] π[ρυτανείας· Χαιρέστρατος Ἄ]- | |
| | χαρνεὺς ἐγ[ρ]α[μμάτευεν· Σκιροφοριῶνος ἐ]- | |
| 5 | νει καὶ νέ[αι, πέμπτη καὶ τριακοστῆι τῆς] | |
| | πρυτανεία[ς· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν Εὐ]- | |
| | θυκράτης [Ἄφιδναῖος· Διόφαντος Φρασικλ]- | |
| | εἶδου Μυρ[ρινοῦσιος εἶπεν· 11] | |
| | [.]ΑΡΓ[.]Ι[. 27] | |
| 10 | [.]ΝΟ[. 30] | |
| | [.] ἄγγε[λ]λ[. 26] | |
| | ΑΝΤΟ[.]ΛΕ[. 26] | |
| | [.]ΕΣΝΟ[. 28] | |
| | ΥΣΙΣ[.]ΕΛΙ[. 25] | |
| 15 | ἐδέοντο [. 21 ἐψηφί]- | |
| b (IG ii ² 373) | σθαι τῆ[ι βουλῆι προσαγα]γεῖν Εὐήνορα π[ρ]- | |
| | [ὸ]ς τὸν [δῆμον· γνώμην] δὲ ξυμβάλλεσθαι τῆ[ς] | |
| | [βουλῆς εἰς τὸν δ]ῆμον ὅτι δοκεῖ τῆι βουλ[ῆ]- | |
| | [ι· ἐπειδ]ῆ Εὐή[νωρ] Ἄκαρνάν(ιος) πρόθυμός ἐστι[ν] | |
| 20 | περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ ποεῖ ὅτ[ι] | |
| | δύναται ἀγαθόν, εἶναι {δὲ} αὐτὸν πρόξενο[ν] | |
| | καὶ εὐεργέτην τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων κα- | |
| | ὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγγόνους καὶ εἶναι αὐτῶι καθ- | |
| | άπερ τοῖς ἄλλοις εὐεργέταις καὶ ἀναγρά- | |
| 25 | ψαι τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήλῃι λιθίνῃι τὸ- | |
| | ν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκρ- | |
| | οπόλει· εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δ- | |
| | οῦναι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου: ΔΔ: δραχμὰς ἐκ | |
| | τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῶν δ- | |
| 30 | [ή]μωι | |

Although the prescript is quite well-preserved, not very much can be made of the opening lines of this decree (lines 8-17), except that the text printed in IG ii² is inaccurate. Line 9: previous editors read [.]ΑΡΧΟΝΟ. Of these letters, only the alpha and the rho exist. Before alpha there is a mark that might be the tip of the lower diagonal of a kappa, but it is very doubtful; in the stoichos after rho, the marks interpreted as a chi are too far to the left and are probably random scratches; there are also marks, at the bottom left and at the top right corners of the stoichos, that are best interpreted as parts of a gamma. The first omicron

claimed by earlier editors definitely does not exist: the abrasion is too deep for any letter to have survived here. Nor do the next two letters survive, except that there is a clear vertical, slightly right of centre, below the mu of line 8, which seems to have been claimed as a dotted nu. Very hesitantly, one might restore Ἄργ[ε]ῖ[ος] here, or, less likely, [Ἄ]καρ-υ[ά]υ[ιος]. Perhaps [εἶπε· περὶ ὧν Εὐήνωρ] Ἄργ[ε]ῖ[ος] λέγει (for the rationale behind this restoration, see below). Lines 10-12: the tops of the dotted letters survive. Lines 13: previous editors read: [θ]εσμ[ο]θ[ε]τ-. Epsilon and sigma survive, but the letter interpreted by my predecessors as a mu is actually a nu, and nothing else is preserved for certain, although there seems to be a trace of a circular letter after this nu. Line 14: the right arm and vertical of upsilon survive, followed by sigma, iota and sigma. The tops of the dotted letters survive. Line 16 (= fragment b, line 1): the bottoms of these letters survive. Line 20: the bottom of the left vertical of nu and the bottom of the vertical of tau are preserved. Line 28: the foot of the vertical of upsilon survives. Line 30: the right foot of mu is visible.

The orator who proposed the first decree for Euenor (lines 7-8), Diophantos son of Phrasikleides Myrrhinousios (PA 4435), whose name is restored here with some confidence from another decree of the same day and year (IG ii² 243), is the same man who proposed the second decree of IG ii² 373 fifteen years later, in 322/1 B.C.; he was a member of a wealthy family and was fairly prominent from the 340s through the 320s.⁵ It may be that this family had ancestral connections with Akarnania; at any rate, that the same person should have moved two different decrees for Euenor, fifteen years apart, suggests a close relationship between the proxenos and the orator.

Euenor is likely to have been one of the several Akarnanian exiles who came to Athens in or just before 337/6 B.C.,⁶ and his services as a doctor should likely be related to the treatment of Athenian casualties from the battle of Chaironeia, as C.J. Schwenk has suggested for the two honorands, probably doctors, of another decree of the year 337/6 B.C. (IG ii² 304+604).⁷ M.J. Osborne has identified him as the medical theorist cited by Athenaios (2.46d) for his opinion regarding the advantages of cistern-water over spring-water: Athenaios (2.46d) compares his views with those of Hippokrates and other writers on the uses of water in medicine.⁸

There survives yet another decree for Euenor, IG ii² 374, by which he is identified as a physician and a citizen of Argos in Akarnania (hence my suggested restoration of line 9 of IG ii² 242+373, above), and is awarded Athenian citizenship and a laurel crown for the way

⁵ See PA 4435 with J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C.* (1971) 166-167. Apart from the three decrees mentioned above, Diophantos also proposed another decree in 320/19 B.C. (IG ii² 382).

⁶ See, for instance, IG ii² 237 (338/7 B.C.), for Phormion and Karphinas and their associates, and IG ii² 267, an award of proxenia to two or more persons, possibly Akarnanians, of about the same date.

⁷ C.J. Schwenk (footnote 2 above) 68-71. The stele was to be set up in the Asklepieion at Athens, which suggests that these men were physicians.

⁸ M.J. Osborne, 1982 (footnote 2 above), 131.

in which he has used his skills to attend to the needs of the Athenian citizenry. The formulae of the prescript of this decree suggest a date after 319/8 B.C.; its most recent editor, M.J. Osborne, preferred to place it between 307/6 and 303/2 B.C.,⁹ but the new date for the original decree in honour of Euenor makes it now more likely that his citizenship was awarded in the brief interval of democracy between the oligarchy of 321/0-319/8 and the rule of Demetrios of Phaleron that began late 318/7B.C., in fact, where earlier editors wished to place IG ii² 374.

Calgary

Michael B. Walbank

⁹ M.J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* 1 (1981) 19; 123-124, #D 50; 2 (1982) 129-131; 3-4 (1983) 177.