

SEAN BYRNE

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1095* AND THE DELIA OF 98/97 BC.  
A Document about the Athenian Politician Medeios

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 109 (1995) 55–61

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1095 AND THE DELIA OF 98/97 BC*  
A Document about the Athenian Politician Medeios

The nature of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1095*, a fragment of a letter followed by commendations for an agonomethes and an architheoros who managed and participated in a certain festival, probably the Delia, has long been misunderstood and, hence, neglected.<sup>1</sup> Its original editor Koehler (*IG II 641*) correctly surmised the epistolary nature of the first ten lines<sup>2</sup>, but, due to a single but crucial misreading, was unsure how to interpret the remainder of the inscription<sup>3</sup>, guessing that it may be a decree to honour the agonomethes of the Theseia or some other games<sup>4</sup>, and dated it a generation too late<sup>5</sup>. Kirchner in his turn (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1095*) accepted Koehler's readings along with his suggested restorations and interpretation of the unpromising looking piece without attempt at improvement. To my knowledge it has remained disregarded ever since.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I examined the stone (EM 7789) at the Epigraphical Museum in 1987 as part of a study of the public documents of post-Sullan Athens, for which opportunity I thank Dr Peppas-Delmouzou and Dr Karapa-Molisanis.

The following abbreviations are used for works cited more than once in the notes:

Ph. Bruneau, *Les Cultes de Délos*: Ph. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique* (Paris, 1970)

*LGPN II*: M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne (eds.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names Vol. II Attica* (Oxford, 1994)

*PA*: J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (Berlin, 1901–1903)

Tracy, *ALC*: S. V. Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.* (Berkeley, 1990)

Tracy, *Contributors*: S. V. Tracy, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2336. Contributors of First Fruits for the Pythais* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, Heft 139) (Meisenheim am Glan, 1982).

<sup>2</sup> “Epistula aliqua perscripta fuit cuius ultima verba erant [γ]έγραφα ὑμῖν.”

<sup>3</sup> “Reliqua haud scio an ad plebiscitum pertinuerint . . .”

<sup>4</sup> Koehler's “Theseorum . . . vel aliorum ludorum” became in the heading of Kirchner's edition a bald “in honorem agonomethetae Theseorum”. But Koehler's suggestion was an admitted grope in the dark, made with reference to a series of documents which concern the penteteric festival of the Theseia of their respective years. For this series cf. G. Bugh, *ZPE* 83 (1990) pp. 20–35; it consists of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 956* (161/0 BC), *IG II<sup>2</sup> 957* (157/6 BC), *IG II<sup>2</sup> 958* (153/2 BC), *IG II<sup>2</sup> 960, 961 and 962* (c. 148–134 BC), *IG II<sup>2</sup> 963* (c. 140 BC), *IG II<sup>2</sup> 964 and 965* (c. 130 BC), and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1014 + 959 = Tracy, ALC p. 184* (109/8 BC). The documents vary in their states of repair, but they can be said to contain typically a probouleutic decree in honour of the agonomethes followed by a list of victors, and in form are quite unlike *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1095*.

<sup>5</sup> He preferred to see Medeios, the supposed archon of l. 12, as different from and later than the homonymous archon who dates *IG II 467 = IG II<sup>2</sup> 1028 = Tracy, Hesp. Suppl. 15* (1975) pp. 33ff. no. 6 (now dated to 101/0 BC); the consequent identification with Medeios “III” (*PA 10099 + 10100; LGPN II (9)*) has not been challenged since, although Dinsmoor (n. 6) remained cautious.

<sup>6</sup> Other than as (spurious) evidence for a mid-first century archonship of Medeios: Kirchner included it in his testimonia in *IG II<sup>2</sup> Pars Quarta* (1918) p. 24 Archontum Tabula VII; W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931) p. 292 said that he is “possibly the same archon Medeios” as the one believed to be named on *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1340*; see below n. 11.



breaks off just 1–1½ letter spaces after YMIN, and that the standard epistolary salutation, ἔρωσθε, commonly is inscribed after a gap of some letter spaces.<sup>7</sup>

Line 11: For the tentative restoration of Δηλίων see the discussion below.

Line 12: Between ΜΗΔΕΙΟΥ and ΑΡΧ there is a curling ligature which has not been noted previously; I have been unable to locate anything like it in Threatte's *Grammar*. Its purpose remains uncertain, but it would seem to be punctuation serving to separate the name of the agonothetes from that of the architheoros. Both editions read the last four letters as ΑΡΧΟ and restore the word as ἄρχο[ντος]; in fact they are five letters, plainly ΑΡΧΙΘ, and refer to the office of the architheoros.

Line 13: only the bottom horizontal of the initial *sigma* is visible (as indicated by Koehler); for restoration of the name, see below. Previously unnoted is the *vacat* of a single letter space between Ἄθηνοβίου and the final two remaining letters of the line; on this basis, and by analogy with the presentation of the name without demotic in the previous line, ΦΙ should not be treated as the start of a demotic but as the start of the first word in a new sentence: *exempli gratia* I suggest φι[λοτίμως].

Line 16: The verb is restored as [ἐπ]ετέλεσαν by edd. pr., but [συν]ετέλεσαν is at least as likely.

Line 18: The participle which ends -αναμενα and precedes a reference to something Roman cannot be construed.

Now that it is known that what was thought to be a reference to an archon eponymous for dating purposes is in fact a reference to an architheoros for honorific purposes, the purport of the document, along with the identity of those it honours, the festival in question and its date, may be reappraised.

IG II<sup>2</sup> 1095 is the remnant of an honorary decree of the Athenian boule and demos. It consists of three distinct sections. The first part, which will have included dating formula and preamble, is all but lost: preserved now is the merest trace of a line at the top of the fragment (l. 1a); marking off this section from the next is a blank line.<sup>8</sup> The second consists of the transcript of a letter which was composed in the name of a single entity ([ὑπεγ]έγραφα)<sup>9</sup>: its sparse remains offer no encouragement for meaningful reconstruction, but its general intent will have been to vouch that the honorands of the decree properly observed their duties in the conducting of a festival, and its inclusion will have served to corroborate the decree's following motivational clauses.<sup>10</sup> This is clear from consideration of the contents of the third section, namely commendations for Athenian officials who attended a festival outside Attica and were judged to have participated in the games and conducted the appropriate rituals with due zeal (they performed the “θυσίαν συντελ[ομένην]”, they “ἀγῶνα διώκησα[ν]”, all was done “μεγαλοπ[ρεπῶς]”). These commendations are part of

<sup>7</sup> E.g. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1136, 2; FD III (2) 48 = *Hesp. Suppl.* 15 (1975) pp. 60ff. no. 7 h, 2.

<sup>8</sup> It is likely that the missing start of the line was inscribed; however, the space available at this point of the fragment would allow approximately 4 letters, and this *vacat*, by analogy with that of l. 10, surely indicates a marking off of what follows from what had come before.

<sup>9</sup> It is significant that the author of the letter uses the first person singular, and therefore must be a monarch of some sort, as opposed to a governing body in the name of a polis, in which case the plural would have been used, e.g. ὑπογεγράφαμεν (FD III (2) 48 = *Hesp. Suppl.* 15 (1975) pp. 60ff. no. 7 h, 2), ὑπογεγράφαμεν (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1132, 50).

<sup>10</sup> The inclusion of such letters in Athenian decrees is common in this period; cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1132, 50ff. = FD III (2) 68 (130/29 BC); IG II<sup>2</sup> 1134, 77 ff. (117/16 BC); IG II<sup>2</sup> 1136 (106/5 BC); FD III (2) 48 = *Hesp. Suppl.* 15 (1975) pp. 60 ff. no. 7 h ll. 1–2 (98/7 BC).

clauses, probably introduced by ἐπειδή, outlining the service which motivated the decree; citation of the honours decreed in recognition of this service will have followed.

The honorands included an agonothetes (l. 11) and an architheoros (l. 12) at the least, both Athenians as shall be seen; more officials (perhaps two) may have been named on the lost portions of ll. 11–13, but our lack of knowledge as to the original length of lines of the document renders certainty impossible. This combination of agonothetes and architheoros is surprising. An Athenian agonothetes was responsible for the holding of Athenian games; an Athenian architheoros was by definition leader of a delegation which either attended a festival held in a foreign state, as in the present case, or visited foreign states to announce a festival in their home state. How an architheoros could work together with an agonothetes in the management of the same festival is not immediately evident. Furthermore, the name of the particular ἀγῶν for which the agonothetes was responsible has not survived – the definite article τῶν dangles tantalisingly before the stone breaks off but its noun is gone. However, consideration of the two officials whose names survive and whose identities can be ascertained suggests how the two offices may have come to function together in a certain festival, and what that festival was.

The first name, Μηδείου, is a patronym, and the preceding word now lost will have been the name of this Medeios' son<sup>11</sup>; the missing name is surely to be restored as [Μήδειος], and is a further reference to one of the most frequently attested Athenians of the late second and early first centuries BC, Μήδειος Μηδείου Πειραιεύς.<sup>12</sup> Perhaps the name of the agonothetes is lost from the end of l. 11 along with the title of the office filled by Medeios from the start of l. 12; more probably Medeios is in fact the agonothetes. What is unlikely is that Medeios is the architheoros: the point of punctuation which intervenes between the patronym Μηδείου and office title ἀρχιθ[έωρος], as well as the usual practice of giving the office title before the personal name, would seem to rule this out.<sup>13</sup> In any event, he is attested here as a high ranking member of an embassy, which sits well with the host of offices he is otherwise known to have performed. These include the most prestigious and powerful *archai*, such as the hoplite generalship (99/8 BC) and the eponymous archonship no less

<sup>11</sup> Its genitive case had been believed to be due to the dating formula, and accordingly [ἐπὶ] was restored. It is worth noting that there is now no real evidence for an archonship held by Medeios "III". In *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1340* (*vidi*), the reference to an archonship is totally restored: his name [Μηδεί]ου Μηδείου is all that remains of the first line which stands at the original head of the inscription in lettering taller and more lightly cut than what follows; its genitive case will be due to a dating formula, but not necessarily by archonship. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2874*, a dedication by a priestess to Artemis, is dated "[ἐπὶ] Μηδείου ἄρχοντος"; however, the lettering is large (0.022 m) and cannot be used as a basis for close dating (cf. Tracy, *ALC* p. 5 for this principle), and it is more economical to identify this Medeios with "II" and to date the inscription to 101/0 BC. Accordingly, his name should be removed from the archon list of the first century BC (still current is that of Meritt, "Athenian Archons 247/6–48/7 BC" in *Historia* 26 (1977) pp. 161–191, who for Medeios follows Notopoulos, "Studies in the Chronology of Athens under the Empire" in *Hesperia* 18 (1949) p. 25 and p. 51).

<sup>12</sup> *PA* 10098; *LGPV* II (8); Tracy, *First Fruits* p. 210.

<sup>13</sup> For office titles preceding the names of the holders, among contemporary documents cf. *FD III* (2) 48 = *Hesp. Suppl.* 15 (1975) pp. 60ff. no. 7 h ll. 14–15 for the position of the titles epimeletes/architheoros and theoroi; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1054*, 24–5.

than four times (101/0 BC, and illegally from 91/0 to 89/8 BC).<sup>14</sup> Pertinent to his role in the embassy of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1095 is his service as agonomethes of the Panathenaia in 99/8 BC, as well as more generally his willingness to expend much energy and money on assuring the success of the Pythaïs to Delphi of 98/7 BC; but to be noted especially are the official posts he filled in 98/7: his epimeleia of Delos and his agonothesia of the Delia festival.<sup>15</sup>

Another inscription may serve to point to further involvement of Medeios in a mission of this sort. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1054 is a decree of the boule and demos to praise the architheoros and theoroi for their successful visit to the Erotideia and Romaia games at Thespiiai, and includes provision for the inscription of a letter from the polis of Thespiiai which the theoroi have brought back (ll. 28–31).<sup>16</sup> The names of three of the theoroi survive, at least partially (ll. 25–26), but the name of the architheoros has deliberately been erased (l. 24).<sup>17</sup> The name of Medeios is known to have suffered *damnatio memoriae*, presumably as a result of unpopularity he incurred for his illegal three year tenure of the archonship and his pro-Roman stance in the face of the ascendancy of Mithridates.<sup>18</sup> A plausible hypothesis is that the name of the architheoros erased from IG II<sup>2</sup> 1054 is likewise that of Medeios, and that he was the leader of the theoroi to the festival at Thespiiai.

The name ending in [--]σιος is to be restored as [Διονύ]σιος and can be identified with Διονύσιος Ἀθηνοβίου Εὐπυρίδης who also is well attested in this period.<sup>19</sup> He is known to us as a child pythaist to Delphi in 128/7 BC<sup>20</sup>. Along with his brother Νικήτης and sister Φίλυλλα he honoured with a dedication his cousin Χρυσίς of the deme Pergase sometime in the last part of the second century<sup>21</sup>, and he may have been honoured himself by the demos in the same period<sup>22</sup>. He served as mint magistrate with his brother Νικήτης perhaps in 97/6 BC<sup>23</sup>. And, most importantly for the understanding of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1095, he is attested as

<sup>14</sup> For the role, connections and importance of Medeios, see Tracy, *First Fruits* pp. 159–164.

<sup>15</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 2336 = Tracy, *First Fruits* ll. 183, 187 (agonothesiae); *ib.* l. 189; *ID* 1711; 1757 (epimeleia).

<sup>16</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1054 (EM 7622) is judged to be an inscription “in the style of” the cutter of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1008, whose known work dates from the period 118–96 BC (Tracy, *ALC* p. 196). I viewed this stone at the Epigraphical Museum in April, 1988; to the minor improved readings reported in *SEG* XXXII 138, I add that in l. 28 the true reading for “περὶ τὸν δῆμον” is “πρὸς τὸν δῆμον”.

<sup>17</sup> “nomen architheori consulto erasum est”; my own autopsy confirms that this was the case.

<sup>18</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 2336 = Tracy, *First Fruits* ll. 183–9; the *damnatio* will have been effected “during the period from late 88 to early 86” (Tracy).

<sup>19</sup> Such a restoration and identification is obvious, but has been bedevilled by the failure of the previous editors to note the *vacat* of a single letter space between patronymic and ΦΙ and the consequent assumption that those two letters were the start of the demotic Φι[λαΐδης]; hence *PA* 248 = *LGPN* II Ἀθηνόβιος (2) is a ghost. The absence of demotics for Medeios and Demetrios is in keeping with the fact that the basis for the decree is a letter composed outside Athens by a non-Athenian.

<sup>20</sup> *FD* (III) 2 12 II, 5; Medeios too was a child pythaist in this procession, named in the previous line.

<sup>21</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 3484.

<sup>22</sup> *Hesp.* Suppl. 15 (1975) p. 73 no. 14; the lack of patronymic and the frequency of the name Διονύσιος in the deme Eupyridai in this and other periods (cf. *LGPN* II) render the identification uncertain.

<sup>23</sup> M. Thompson, *The New Style Coinage of Athens* (New York, 1961) p. 561; the date is according to Habicht, *Chiron* 21 (1991) p. 11 n. 15, where he points out that 98/7 BC, allotted to this mint magistracy in his general scheme of chronology for this office, is incompatible with Dionysios’ tenure of the epimeleia of the Delian emporion in the same year.

epimeletes of the Delian emporion in 98/7 BC<sup>24</sup>. Thus he is known to have been well-connected and to have filled official positions which required special expertise.<sup>25</sup> It would be no surprise to find that he served as architheoros; even if another name and another title of office intervened on the lost portion between ἀρχιθ[έωρος] and [Διονύ]σιος, his position on this mission will have been one of prestige. It is a position which also has a precedent for a member of his family: his cousin Χρυσίς was decreed high honours from the Delphians for the performance of her duties as priestess of Athena in the Pythais of 106/5 BC; a letter containing a copy of the decree was sent to Athens and inscribed there (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1136*).

Hence the two men both were on Delos in the year 98/7 BC in senior administrative posts: *ID 1711* testifies directly to this association. But not only was Medeios epimeletes of the island in this year; he is also attested as taking on the agonothesia of the Delia festival (note 13 above). This was not the first time that Medeios was involved with this festival. *ID 1868* is a dedication set up by his parents to honour him on his becoming a “δηλιαστής”, along with his two sisters for their involvement both in the Delia and the related Apollonia.<sup>26</sup> And *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2459*, a poorly preserved inscription now supplemented by new readings and interpretation by Tracy<sup>27</sup>, commemorates his gymnasiarchy and perhaps also agonothesia of the Delian Apollonia as well as at least the Eumeneia.<sup>28</sup> For Dionysios personally, there is no such direct link with the Delia or Apollonia, but participation in the procession of the Apollonia is listed as one of the duties of the epimeletai of the emporion in a document dated to about 145 BC.<sup>29</sup>

Based on this, I suggest that *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1095* concerns the Delia festival of 98/7 BC, and as such records the honours decreed for Medeios and Dionysios respectively for sponsoring and taking a leading participatory role in it. Medeios was governor of the island for the year and as such had to forego a place in the grand Pythais to Delphi. At least he was able to sponsor the festival for Delian Apollo, a festival with which his family had a long association. Dionysios acknowledged the involvement traditional to his post as epimeletes of the emporion by leading the theoroi from Athens. Such a construction would explain the unexpected teaming of an Athenian agonothesites with an Athenian architheoros at the same festival. Delos had been under the governorship of the Athenians since 166 BC, and Athenians occupied all positions of administration. As such, they were responsible for state festivals and liturgists such as agonothesitai and gymnasiarchai naturally came from their number. On the other hand, Delos was a foreign possession, and festivals of longstanding local importance, such as those in honour of Delian Apollo, were not subsumed in the Athenians’

<sup>24</sup> *ID 1711*, which also names Medeios in his role as epimeletes of the island.

<sup>25</sup> Tracy, *First Fruits* p. 119.

<sup>26</sup> For the Apollonia and Delia see Ph. Bruneau, *Les Cultes de Délos* pp. 65–89; for the separate identity of the two festivals, *ibidem*. pp. 85–6.

<sup>27</sup> Tracy, *ALC* p. 199.

<sup>28</sup> For this reference to the Eumeneia a full two generations after the death of Eumenes II, see Habicht, *Hesperia* 59 (1990) p. 573.

<sup>29</sup> *ID 1507* ll. 5–7; cf. P. Roussel, *Délos colonie athénienne* (Paris, 1916) pp. 180, 209; Ph. Bruneau, *Les Cultes de Délos* p. 76; for the date of the archon Metrophanes who dates this inscription see Habicht, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) p. 246.

calendar as one of their own.<sup>30</sup> Hence, the appropriateness of an official participatory party being designated as *theoroi*, led by an *architheoros*, even if some or all of them in fact resided on the island at the time. Remaining a mystery is the identity of the author of the letter commending *Medeios* and *Dionysios*, and what role he had in the celebration of the *Delia*.

La Trobe University, Melbourne

Sean Byrne

---

<sup>30</sup> Ph. Bruneau, *Les Cultes de Délos* p. 82.