## GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

3．Boundary marker of poros stone，found on April 23，1937，in a modern or late Turkish wall in Section P．Parts of the top，both sides，and the back are preserved； the bottom is broken away．

Height， 0.261 m．； width， 0.365 m ； thickness， 0.221 m ．

Height of letters， ca． 0.054 m ．

Inv．No．I 4773.

First half of the Fifth Century
［ N$] v \nu \phi a$
［í］o hıє $\hat{o}$
hópos


No． 3
The location of this sanctuary of the Nymphs is not known，but it may be con－ jectured plausibly that it was on the northwest slope of the akropolis，beneath the grottos of Pan，where Judeich（Topographie von Athen ${ }^{2}$ ，1931，p．302）shows reason to believe that a cult of the Nymphs existed．The inscription was found some little distance away，near the northern edge of the market place．

4．Inscribed boundary stone of marble，found on February 26，1934，in a well in Section $\Gamma$ ．The stone is chipped on all sides，and the back and bottom are broken off，but the complete inscription is preserved．

Height， 0.258 m. ；width， 0.15 m ．；thickness， 0.071 m ．
Height of letters， $0.014 \mathrm{~m} .-0.024 \mathrm{~m}$ ．
Inv．No．I 1454.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { hópo } \\
& \mathrm{s} h ⿺ 𠃊 \\
& \rho o ̂{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \pi \\
& \text { ó } \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \\
& 5 \text { os 录av } \\
& \theta \hat{o}
\end{aligned}
$$

The date is probably in the late fifth or early fourth cen－ tury в．с．


No． 4
5. Horos-stone of Pentelic marble, broken away at the bottom but otherwise complete except for some chipping of the surface, found on April 16, 1935, in Section $\Pi$.


No. 5

Height, 0.19 m. ; width, 0.20 m . ; thickness, 0.072 m .

Height of letters, ca. 0.03 m .
Inv. No. I 2800.

$$
\text { ca. } 400 \text { в.с. }
$$

hóp $[$ os $h]$
$\iota \in \rho \hat{o}$

Cf. I.G., I ${ }^{2}$, 856-858; $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 2596-2599$.
6. Inscribed fragment of Pentelic marble, found on February 21, 1935, in a modern fill in Section O. The sides are all rough, but possibly original. Cf. Hesperia, V, 1936, p. 41.


Height, 0.18 m. ; width, 0.16 m ; thickness, 0.078 m .

Height of letters, $c a .0 .018 \mathrm{~m}$.
Inv. No. I 2472.
ca. 400-350 в.с.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{o}[\rho o] \stackrel{\varphi}{\rho} \\
& {[\mathrm{M}] \eta \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \iota o}
\end{aligned}
$$

For the Metroön, see Thompson, Hesperia, VI, 1937, pp. 115-224.

No. 6
7. Circular base of black Eleusinian limestone, with rough anathyrosis at the bottom, but so far as preserved smooth on top. The stone was found on September 20, 1934, in the northern part of Section $\mathrm{H}^{\prime}$.

Height, 0.101 m .; estimated original diameter, 0.425 m .
Height of letters, 0.011 m .
Inv. No. I 2003.


No. 7

The character of the lettering and the genitive forms (with $\mathbf{O}$ in line 1 and with Or in line 4) indicate a date near the middle of the fourth century b.c., whereas the name of the archon Pythodotos satisfies the requirements of space and of the preserved letters in line 1. For the formula of the restoration cf. I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 1742-$ 1753. The extent of the restoration at the end of line 2 is uncertain, as is also the mention of the $\beta o v \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ at the end of line 3. But the crowns were usually voted by both Boule and Demos.
8. Boundary stone of Pentelic marble, with the top, back, and left side preserved, found on February 8, 1936, in a Turkish wall in Section $\Sigma$.

Height, 0.473 m. ; width, 0.242 m . ; thickness, 0.17 m .
Height of letters, $c a .0 .022 \mathrm{~m} .-0.029 \mathrm{~m}$.
Inv. No. I 3361.


```
ö\rhoos ¢[行]
ó\deltaô : \tau\hat{\eta}[s]
\pia\tau\rhoía[s]
```

No. 8
9. Fragment of Hymettian marble, broken on all sides, found on March 27, 1935, in Section O.


No. 9

Height, 0.12 m. ; width, 0.14 m. ; thickness, 0.085 m .

Height of letters, 0.01 m . Inv. No. I 2688.
ca. 330 в.с.
ミTOIX. 32
[----- $\epsilon \mathfrak{i s} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu] \dot{a} \nu \alpha[\gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta} \nu$ каì $\tau \eta ̀ \nu]$
 $\left[o \hat{v} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu o v{ }^{v} \Delta \Delta \Delta \Delta^{v} \delta \rho \alpha \chi \mu\right] a ̀ s ~ \epsilon \in[\kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa a \tau a ̀ ~ \psi \eta \phi]$

vacat

The writing is much like that of I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 335$ ( $334 / 3$ в.c.). For the omission of the words $\tau \hat{\omega} \iota \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \iota$ from the end of the final clause, see, for example, I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 221,368$.
10. Fragment of Pentelic marble, with smooth-picked right side and roughpicked back preserved, found in the débris of a modern house in Section $\Theta \Theta$ on January 29, 1937.

Height, 0.281 m. ; width, 0.177 m .; thickness, 0.088 m .
Height of letters, $0.009 \mathrm{~m} .(\mathrm{O}=0.006 \mathrm{~m} . ; \phi=0.011 \mathrm{~m}$.$) .$
Inv. No. I 4439.
The inscription is stoichedon. Ten lines occupy a vertical space of 0.18 m . and five letters (measured on centres) occupy a horizontal space of 0.09 m .

ca. 330 в.с.
ztoix. 18






[ $\rho \tau \epsilon \tau o \hat{v} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu$ ] ov $\tau o \hat{v}$ ' $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta \varphi$


[aı av̉兀òv ка]ì $\sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a \nu \omega \hat{\sigma}$
[aı $\chi \rho v \sigma \hat{\omega} \iota ~ \sigma \tau] \epsilon \phi a ́ \nu \omega \iota ~ \grave{a} \pi$
[ò $\chi \iota \lambda i ́ \omega \nu \delta] \rho a \chi \mu \omega \bar{\nu} \kappa a i ̀ \epsilon$
[î̀al $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma o] \delta o \nu ~ a v ̉ \tau \omega ิ \iota ~ \pi$

[ $\nu------]^{\wedge}[\ldots .$.
No. 10
The inscription is a decree of the K $\boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, and must be dated by its letter forms about 330 в.c. Cf. also the genitive form $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\nu}[\mathbf{o s}]$ in lines 9-10.
11. Fragment of Hymettian marble found on June 7, 1938, in the wall of a building of Byzantine date in Section $\mathbf{H}^{\prime}$. Parts of two adjacent faces are preserved, but the stone is otherwise broken.

Height, $0.245 \mathrm{~m} . ;$ width, 0.19 m. ; thickness, 0.10 m .
Height of letters, ca. 0.006 m . (A, E, N, etc.).
Inv. No. I 5512.
The inscription is not stoichedon.


No. 11. Adjacent Inscribed Surfaces

| A | B |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in wreath | ---------- |  |  |
| ----ı |  |  |  |
| ----v | $10[\alpha \rho \chi] \omega \nu: \vdash)$ vacat |  |  |
| ------a rov̀s |  |  |  |
| 5 ------a | vacat |  |  |
| ---- |  |  | $\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho v \tau[\alpha \nu \in i ́ a \nu]$ |
| -al |  |  | Ev̉фávךs $\Phi$ [ $\rho$ v́v $\omega \nu$ os] |
| ------ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| wreath | [Пa८a]pıєv́s |  | Eip ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ оок $\lambda \hat{\eta}[s----]$ |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {'A }}$ O $\mu$ ovev́ [ s ] |
|  |  | wreath |  |

The monument must be reconstructed as a dedicatory base, erected by the prytaneis of one of the tribes or by the councillors of the year $324 / 3$. The date is determinable from the name of the archon in line 11 and from the name of the secretary калà $\pi \rho v \tau a \nu \epsilon i a \nu$ in lines 19-20. The secretary's name, which appears here
 is no possibility of restoring it in I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 363$, for there is a conflict with the preserved letters of that inscription, which must now be assigned to some other year.

It appears in line 10 that the stonecutter made a beginning of inscribing the name of the archon ${ }^{\circ} H \gamma \eta \sigma$ ías after the mark of punctuation which follows the title $\left[{ }^{\circ} \rho \chi\right] \omega \nu$; but the unfinished letter was left without erasure and the archon's name was fully inscribed in line 11. After an uninscribed space of one line were listed the annual officers of the council. Four of these, with their titles, are named in two columns on the preserved portion of the stone.

The records that offer the closest parallels are to be found in I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 223$, I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 1700$, and in Dow, Hesperia, Suppl. I, no. 1. These inscriptions give the officers for the years $343 / 2,335 / 4$, and $327 / 6$ respectively, as follows:

In one of the decrees of $I . G$., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 223$ mention is also made of $\tau \grave{o} \gamma \gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon ́ a$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \iota \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \iota$, line 10 (A).

$$
\text { I.G., } \mathrm{II}^{2}, 1700 \text { (335/4 в.с.), lines 213-220 }
$$









${ }^{1}$ The name should be restored also in I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 454$ and 547 , which are to be dated in $324 / 3$; cf. Pritchett-Meritt, The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, pp. 2-3.

Hesperia, Suppl. I, no. 1 ( $327 / 6$ в.c.), lines 32-37 and 75-84

$[-------] \omega \nu o s \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \mathrm{M} v \rho \rho \iota \nu$
$[\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho \nu \xi \beta o v] \lambda[\hat{\eta} s \kappa] \alpha \grave{\imath} \delta \eta^{\prime}[\mu] o v$

[ $\tau \alpha \mu \hat{\prime} \alpha] s$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \beta[o v \lambda \hat{\eta} s]$
$[----]^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \pi o \lambda \lambda o[------]$
75 кат $\alpha \pi \rho[\nu \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon i ́ \alpha \nu]$

$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau[$ ò $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \mu \alpha]$
$\Delta \eta \mu[--------]$
$\dot{\alpha} \nu[a \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \epsilon v s]$

$\dot{\epsilon} \pi\left[\grave{\imath} \tau \grave{\alpha} \psi \eta \phi^{\prime} \sigma \mu\right] \alpha \tau \alpha$
$\Lambda$ 信 $[-------]$ yos $\Delta \epsilon \iota \rho$
$\dot{\alpha}[\nu \tau \iota \gamma \rho \alpha] \phi \in v ́ s$
$[-----] \Pi \rho \alpha \xi \iota \iota \epsilon ́ \lambda o v \mathrm{~K} v \delta \alpha \nu$
Dow observed that the offices represented in $327 / 6$ could be made the same as
 to correspond to $\tau \alpha \mu i ́ a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ єis $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \dot{\theta} \eta \eta \mu a$ of $I . G$., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 1700$. There were thus three lists in which the secretary $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{a} \psi \eta \phi \dot{\prime} \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ was named, but no epigraphical record of the secretary $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath}$ rov̀s $\nu o ́ \mu o v s$ before $324 / 3$, the date of our present document.

Accepting Brillant's identification of the secretary $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{\alpha} \psi \eta \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu a \tau \alpha$ with the secretary $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi i \grave{\imath}$ тoùs עó $\mu o v s,{ }^{2}$ I suggested in a note in the American Journal of Philology (LXI, 1940, p. 78) that $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{\alpha} \psi \eta \phi \dot{\sigma} \mu \mu \tau \alpha$ may have been the earlier designation (down through $327 / 6$ ) and é $\pi \grave{\imath}$ тov̀s vó $\mu o v s$ the later ( $324 / 3$ and after). Aristotle
 $\tau \grave{\alpha} \psi \eta \phi i \sigma \mu a \tau \alpha$, so I suggested further that Aristotle may have written his chapter on the secretaries after $327 / 6$, and that he described the office by the official title which it bore at the time.

There is another possibility to be considered, namely, that the restoration in Hesperia, Suppl. I, no. 1, should be $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau$ [ov̀s $\nu o ́ \mu o v s]$ rather than $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau$ [ò $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha]$ and that the secretary named by Aristotle existed as early as $327 / 6$. Much may be said in favor of the restoration $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau$ [ov̀s $\nu o ́ \mu o v s]$ in Hesperia, Suppl. I, no. 1. In the first place the phrase $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau[\grave{o} \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu a]$ is not a very good substitute for $\tau \alpha \mu i a s$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon i s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ o \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha$. Furthermore, as Dow observed, the officials in $327 / 6$ were recorded

[^0]in two groups, the reader, the herald, and the treasurer being listed at the end of column I, while the clerical officials were listed together at the end of column III. If $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau\left[\begin{array}{l}\dot{\alpha} \\ \alpha \\ \nu\end{array} \dot{\theta} \eta \mu \mu\right]$ is to be restored, the title of a minor financial officer is intruded into the panel of clerks. The clerical character of this second group can be maintained by reading $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau[$ ov̀s $\nu o ́ \mu o v s]$, and this official is now named together with the $\dot{a} \nu a \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon v_{s}$ and the $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \grave{s}$ калà $\pi \rho v \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon i ́ a \nu$, just as he is in the new document.
 not that of a temporary appointee possibly not required in other years. His duties were confined to handling the money for the dedication. We need not expect that a special treasurer was elected in every year for this one specific task.

With the appearance in Hesperia, Suppl. I, no. 1, of two different officials, one of whom was named $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau$ [ov̀s $\nu$ ó $\mu o v s]$ and the other of whom was called $\dot{\epsilon} \pi\left[\begin{array}{l}i \\ i \\ \alpha \\ \psi \eta \phi \dot{i} \sigma \mu\end{array}\right] a \tau a$, Brillant's argument for the identity of the two offices must be considerably modified. There were, if these restorations are correct, two different offices, at least as early as $327 / 6$. This conclusion is strengthened by the discovery that both names appear in another inscription from the Agora which must be dated as late as $303 / 2$ (Inv. No. I 4720: $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{\alpha} \psi[\eta-$
 unpublished).

The available evidence indicates that there were indeed two separate offices, though the secretaryship émì rov̀s $\nu \mathbf{o} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{o v s}$ is not as yet epigraphically attested earlier than $327 / 6 .^{3}$

Face B of the present inscription is broken away at the right. One may observe that a wreath was cut beneath the two preserved columns in which four of the officers of the Council were named. The last portion of the stone probably contained a second wreath, and by inference from its width, room for two more columns to list the remaining officials. These were the $\dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon u ́ s$, the $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho v \xi \beta \quad \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} s \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta \dot{\eta} \mu o v$, the

[^1]$\tau \alpha \mu i a s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} s$, and probably the $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \grave{v} \mathrm{\epsilon} \pi{ }^{\prime} \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{\alpha} \psi \eta \phi \dot{\prime} \sigma \mu a \tau \alpha$. The unpublished Agora inscription just noted proves that the office of $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \grave{v} s \dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{\alpha} \psi \eta \phi i \sigma \mu a \tau a$ existed at least as late as $303 / 2$, and, since apparently it did not duplicate that of
 title in a text of $327 / 6$.

In line 6 , Charippos, the $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \grave{v} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega} \iota \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \iota$, may be identified as the son of that Philon of Rhamnous who was diaitetes in $325 / 4$ (P.A., 14874). Cf. I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}$, 1926, line 146. In line 12 the secretary Euphanes was the son of the well-known Phrynon of Rhamnous who was politically active two decades earlier (P.A., 15032).

We have already called attention to the fact that the name of the secretary supplied by this document must be restored in I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 362$. The text of this inscription is given in the Corpus as ETOIX. 27-29. As a matter of fact, the lines so far as preserved are uniformly $\Sigma$ TOIX. 28, the only irregularity being that the initial letters EI of $\epsilon\left[\right.$ iкоб $\left.\tau \hat{\eta}_{\iota}\right]$ in line 5 were cut in one letter space (see figure on p. 46). The photograph shows that Akamantis must be restored as the tribe in prytany instead of Erechtheis, and I have followed Dinsmoor (Archons of Athens, p. 373) in restoring the calendar equation to suit an ordinary year. ${ }^{4}$

```
I.G., II 2, 362 (324/3 в.c.)
```



```
    [\nu]\tauídos є̇\nuá\tau\etas [\pi\rhov\tau\alpha\nu\epsilonías \hat{\eta}\iota Ev̉\phiá]
    [\nu\eta]s Ф\rhov́\nu\omega\nuos `P[a\mu\nuov́\sigma\iotaos \epsilon'\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\muá]
    [\tau]\epsilonv\epsilon\cdot \Thetaa\rho\gamma\eta\lambda[\iota\omegaि\nuos ỏ\gamma\deltaó\eta\iota ѐ\pii \delta'́ка]
[ [\hat{\epsilon}]\nu\alphá\tau\eta\iota каì \epsilon[ [iко\sigma\tau\hat{\eta}\iota \tau\hat{\etas \pi\rhov\tau\alpha\nu\epsilonía]}]
```



```
    [\psi] \etá\phi\iota\zeta\epsilon\varphi - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
```

The problem of dating $I . G ., \mathrm{II}^{2}, 363$ presents serious difficulties, for the letters preserved on the stone do not permit the restoration of the name of the secretary of $324 / 3$. Nor in fact do the letters fall into place in the name of any known secretary of this period. An approximate date for the inscription is given by the name of the orator [Подv́єvк] $\boldsymbol{\tau o s} \Sigma \omega \sigma[\tau \rho \alpha ́ \tau o v \Sigma \phi] \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \iota o s$, who moved a decree in the archonship of Niketes (332/1; cf. I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 344$ and 368) and another in the archonship of Archippos (318/7; cf. I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 350$ ). ${ }^{5}$ I suggest tentatively that I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 363$ be assigned to the year $326 / 5$ with the following restorations:

[^2]
I.G., II², 363 ( $326 / 5$ в.c.)
sTOIX. 29



$\left[\ldots{ }^{8} . . . \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a ́ \tau \epsilon v \epsilon \nu{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A}\right] \nu \theta \epsilon[\sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota]$


$[\epsilon \psi \dot{\eta} \phi \iota \zeta \epsilon \nu$. . . . . . . . . . . . ] $]$ v́s vacat

$[a ́ \tau o v \Sigma \phi] \eta{ }_{\eta} \tau \tau \iota o s \epsilon[\hat{i} \pi \epsilon \nu \cdot \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota] \delta \grave{\eta} \Delta \iota \nu \nu[\hat{v} \sigma]$


```
    [\mu\omega\iota \epsiloṅ\pi\iota]\delta\hat{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu \tau[\rho\iota\sigma\chi\iota\lambdaíov]s }\mu\epsilon\delta\dot{\iota}\mu
```



```
    [\tau\hat{\eta}\iota}\pi\rhoo]\tau\epsiloń\rho[a\iota \sigma\pia\nuo\sigma\iota\tauía\iota ...]\^\SigmaT।
    [.......]OPI[.......... . . . . . . .] ] DE[.]
1 5
    [........]^
```

The reading H in line 2 is certain; in line 3 the photograph and the squeeze both support the reading $\mathrm{A} \Gamma \mathrm{O}$ which was reported by Lolling and printed in the majuscule text of I.G., II, 5, 492 f . In line 12 the reading $\epsilon i \not \tau] \iota \delta^{\prime} o \iota \tau[o$ is clearly preferable to $\left.{ }_{\epsilon} \tau\right]$ 〕 $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ oi $\pi[--$, not only because it is spaced correctly in the line, but also because the last visible letter is clearly tau. For the use of the phrase, see, for example, I.G.,

 $[\delta \epsilon ́ \delta] \omega[\kappa \epsilon \nu]$----

The spacing out of the date by archon in line 1 so that it occupies a whole line can be paralleled in $I . G ., \mathrm{II}^{2}, 349$ in the archonship of Aristophanes. ${ }^{6}$ The reading $\nu \theta \in$ in line 4 is certainly part of the month-name 'A $\nu \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \rho \omega \hat{\omega} \nu o s$, and the eta of line 2 can only be part of the numeral of the prytany; so the length of the secretary's name can be determined. He is otherwise unknown, but must fall within the span of political activity of Polyeuktos, ca. 342-318. The probable year is that of Chremes in $326 / 5$. The mention of a contribution of grain corroborates a date during the famine of 330-326. We suggest that Dionysios (lines 9-10) may be the tyrant of Herakleia mentioned again in I.G., $I^{2}, 360$, line 38 , in connection with the famine at Athens, and that he had become sympathetic to Athens between 330/29 and the date of this inscription.
12. Upper right corner of a pedimental stele of Hymettian marble, found on April 27, 1936, in the south wall of the Church of Christ in Section HH.

Height, 0.21 m. ; width, 0.147 m ; thickness, 0.104 m .
Height of letters, 0.007 m .
Inv. No. I 4071.

The inscription is stoichedon with a square chequer-pattern which measures 0.0146 m .

[^3]

324/3 в.с.
ETOIX. 25
 [. . . . . . ${ }^{15}$. . . . . . . $\left.\pi \rho v \tau \alpha\right] \nu$ eías
 [os є́ $\left.\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon v \epsilon . . .{ }^{\circ} ..\right] \hat{\omega} \nu o{ }^{v}$
5 [- - - - - - - - - к] aì $\tau \rho$
 [ $\eta \sigma^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \alpha-----------$ ]

No. 12
The decree cannot belong to the prytany of Akamantis or to the month of Thargelion. ${ }^{7}$ Calendar equations are possible in the third and eighth prytanies with the restoration 'A [ $\nu \tau \iota \circ \chi^{\prime}$ íos ] in lines 1-2 or in the fifth prytany with the restoration A [iavtíסos].
13. Three pieces of Pentelic marble, one of which (frag. $b$ ) was found on June 1, 1936, in a well in Section KK. The large fragment (a) and a second small fragment (c) were found in Grave XXXI in the Hephaisteion on March 6, 1939. Both small pieces are broken on all sides, but the large fragment is from the upper left corner of the stele and preserves its original thickness. Above the inscription was a sculptured relief, now much battered, showing Athena with helmet and spear, facing right, leaning on her shield. The relief must have contained three figures, of which that at the extreme right is lost; the central figure, which represented a man, is half preserved.
$a$ : Height, 0.65 m. ; width, 0.26 m .; thickness, 0.16 m .
$b$ : Height, 0.17 m .; width, 0.13 m .; thickness, 0.12 m .

[^4]$c$ : Height, 0.076 m. ; width, 0.162 m . ; thickness, 0.15 m .
Inv. No. I 4224.
The inscription is stoichedon, with a square chequer-unit which measures 0.0158 m .


No. 13

324／3 в．c．
ETOIX． 31


［ $\nu \omega \nu 0$ ］s ${ }^{\text {＇P } P a \mu \nu o v ́ \sigma \iota o[s ~ \epsilon ́ \gamma \rho a \mu \mu a ́ \tau \epsilon v \epsilon \nu ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ .] ~}$
lacuna

lacuna
$[------] \chi[\rho v \sigma \hat{\omega} \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a ́ \nu \omega \iota]$


The restoration of［＇Акаца⿱亠乂 $\boldsymbol{\prime} \delta$ ］os in lines 1－2 is shown to be impossible by the new text of I．G．， $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 362$（p．47，above）．Akamantis held the ninth prytany．

14．Horos－stone of Pentelic marble，broken on all sides，found on June 20， 1935，in Section $N^{\prime}$ ．

Height， 0.16 m ．；width， 0.151 m ．；thickness， 0.05 m ．
Height of letters，$c a .0 .012 \mathrm{~m}$ ．
Inv．No．I 3031.


| ［ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \rho$ ］os $\chi \omega \rho$［ ${ }^{\prime}$ ］ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5 | ［o］¢ каї оіки́ |
|  | ［a］s ${ }_{\text {ajorotu }}$ |
|  | ［ $\dagger$ ］${ }^{\text {datos } \pi}$ |
|  | ［a］¢ $\delta i$ Фıлокл |
|  | ［＇́ovs］ |

No． 14
15. Boundary stone of Hymettian marble, found on February 7, 1935, in the wall of a modern house in Section N. Parts of the top and left side are preserved, but otherwise the stone is broken.

Height, 0.195 m .; width, 0.28 m .; thickness, 0.075 m . at the bottom, 0.04 m . at the top.

Height of letters, 0.02 m .
Inv. No. I 2372.

ópos $\mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \mu a$ [тоs]
 $\mu o s \cdot \epsilon i s \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \varphi[\pi o \nu]$ є̇ $\nu \nu \epsilon ́ a \pi o ́ \delta \epsilon \varsigma,[\epsilon i s ~ \tau o ̀]$ 5 єौซш бє́ка

No. 15
16. Fragment of Hymettian marble, broken on all sides, found on February 27,1934 , in Section $\Gamma$. The inscribed surface was only roughly dressed, and the stone itself was left quite rough below the last line of the inscription.

Height, 0.176 m. ; width, 0.132 m .; thickness, 0.055 m .
Height of letters, $c a .0 .02 \mathrm{~m}$.
Inv. No. I 1455.


Fourth Century b.c.
$\left[\begin{array}{l}\circ \\ o\end{array}\right] \rho[o s \chi \omega \rho i ́]$
[o] $\pi \epsilon[\pi \rho \alpha \mu]$

$[\sigma] \epsilon \iota \vdots \times H--$

For similar documents, see $I . G ., \mathrm{II}^{2}, 2684 \mathrm{ff}$.
No. 16
17. Irregular fragment of Hymettian marble, found on May 8, 1934, in the wall of a modern cellar in Section $\Lambda$. The back and right side are rough-picked, but the stone is elsewhere broken away.

Height, 0.205 m. ; width, 0.215 m .; thickness, 0.063 m .
Height of letters, 0.014 m . and 0.026 m .
Inv. No. I 1973.


> ö $\rho$ os
> [oi]кías $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta[s]$
> $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\pi} \pi \grave{\imath} \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota$
> ХП

For similar documents, see $I . G ., I^{2}, 2684 \mathrm{ff}$.
No. 17
18. Part of a small stele of Pentelic marble, found on May 9, 1934, in a cistern in Section AR.

Height, 0.128 m. ; width, 0.195 m. ; thickness, 0.041 m .
Height of letters, $0.006 \mathrm{~m} .-0.01 \mathrm{~m}$.
Inv. No. I 1978.


A ['E $\pi \grave{\imath} \Delta \eta] \mu \eta \tau \rho i ́ o v ~ a ̀ \rho \chi o \nu \quad 309 / 8$ [тos ö $\rho$ ]os oікі́as $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \mu$



[ö $\rho$ оs o]iкías $\pi \rho о к к о ̀ s ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi$
[отí $\eta \eta] \mu a \cdot \Sigma \iota \mu a ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$

No. 18
The top and right side of the stone are smooth, and the back, though rough, apparently preserves its original surface. The first inscription (lines 1-4) was imperfectly erased to make way for the second, and the letters are still legible in the erasure. The bottom of the second inscription is lost, but the name of the woman
for whose dowry the house was mortgaged is preserved. The name $\Sigma \iota \mu a ́ \lambda \eta$ appears also in a later inscription, I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}$, 1328, line 29 (P.A., 12659). For similar documents, see $I . G ., \mathrm{II}^{2}, 2659 \mathrm{ff}$.
19. Fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, found on March 8, 1934, in a modern wall in Section $\Lambda$

Height, 0.19 m .; width, 0.12 m .; thickness, 0.10 m .
Height of letters, 0.007 m .
Inv. No. I 1541.


307/6-302/1 в.с.
ZTOIX. 29
[------------------- $\tau]$
 [८ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu]$ ठокı $\left[a \sigma^{\prime} \alpha \nu\right.$ ö $\tau \alpha \nu \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau о \nu$ סıкаб] $[\tau \eta \rho \iota] o \nu \pi \lambda \eta \rho[\hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \circ \circ \pi \omega s$ 只 $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \phi \alpha ́ \mu \iota \lambda \lambda o \nu \hat{\eta}]$ 5 [七ка]ì $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$ ả $[\omega \nu i \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \iota \iota \dot{v} \pi \epsilon ̀ \rho ~ \tau o \hat{v} \delta \hat{\eta}]$
 $[\lambda \lambda \eta ́] \nu \omega \nu \sigma \omega \tau[\eta \rho i ́ a s \cdot a ̉ \nu a \gamma \rho a ́ \psi a \iota ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau o ́ \delta \epsilon]$ [ $\tau \grave{o} \psi] \eta \eta^{\prime} \phi \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$ [ $\left.\tau o ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ a ~ \tau o \hat{v} \delta_{\eta}^{\prime} \mu о v\right]$ [ $\epsilon i \sigma] \tau \bar{\eta} \lambda \eta \nu \lambda_{\iota}\left[\theta_{i}^{\prime} \nu \eta \nu\right.$ каì $\left.\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota \quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho\right]$
10 [oтó] $\lambda \epsilon \iota \cdot \epsilon i s \delta[\grave{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma \tau \hat{\eta}]$

 $[\sigma \mu a \tau] \underset{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu a \lambda \iota\left[\sigma \kappa о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \iota \delta_{\eta}^{\eta} \mu \omega \iota.\right]$ vacat

No. 19
The character of the lettering is similar to that of I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 464$ (307/6), but the present fragment seems to belong with none of the pieces of similar date now published in the Corpus. For the restoration of line 4, see I.G., $I^{2}$, 466, line 35 ; for lines $4-5$, see $I . G$., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 558$, line 11 ; for lines $6-7$, see $I . G ., I^{2}, 466$, line 10 and $I . G$., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 457$, line 15 ; and for lines $7-10$, see $I . G ., \mathrm{IJ}^{2}$, 542 , lines $12-14$. Granted the general period, praise for service to " Athens and the other Hellenes" is an indication of date after 307. The payment for the stele by the $\tau \alpha \mu i a s ~ \tau o \hat{v} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu o v$ shows that the
decree is probably earlier than 301, for this officer makes his last appearance in that year (I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 505$ ). See Dinsmoor, Archons of Athens, p. 28; Kahrstedt's repudiation of the text of I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 505$ is arbitrary and unjustifiable (Untersuchungen zur Magistratur, p. 14). ${ }^{\mathrm{s}}$
20. Fragment of a stele of Hymettian marble, with a wide moulding surmounted by a pediment, found on December 13, 1934, in the wall of a modern house in Section O. The stone is broken at the right and at the bottom.


Height, 0.218 m. ; width, 0.156 m .; thickness, 0.054 m .

Height of letters, $c a .0 .007 \mathrm{~m}$.
Inv. No. I 2161.

No. 20
ca. 300 в.с.
NON-ETOIX. $c a .31$


 $\kappa \nu v \tau \alpha \iota \epsilon \nu ̈ \nu o[v s ~ \grave{\omega} \nu ~ к а і ̀ ~ a ̉ \epsilon i ̀ ~ \phi \iota \lambda o \tau \iota \mu о v ́] ~$

$\rho \gamma \epsilon \omega \nu\langle\omega \nu\rangle \cdot \delta \epsilon\left[\delta o ́ \chi \theta a \iota\right.$ тồs ỏ $\left.\rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \iota \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \alpha \iota\right]$
[М] $\nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \rho[\chi \circ \nu-------------]$
The inscription has been restored with reference to similar decrees of $\boldsymbol{o} \rho \gamma \epsilon \bar{\omega} \nu \epsilon \boldsymbol{s}$ published as $I . G ., \mathrm{II}^{2}, 1249 \mathrm{ff}$. The formulae imply that Mnesarchos probably was

[^5]not an Athenian, for his good-will toward the Athenian demos holds a prominent place in the motivating clauses of the decree. The date is probably ca. 300 b.c. The writing is very careless, but not more so than that of $I . G$., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 378(294 / 3)$. See the photograph in Hesperia, VII, 1938, p. 98.

In line 6 I have assumed that the stonecutter omitted the final $\omega \nu$ of $\boldsymbol{o} \rho \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$ by mistake, but attention should be called to the fact that Harpokration quotes a genitive form ó $\rho \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \omega \nu$ from one of the lost orations of Lysias (Frag. 112, ed. Sauppe), which is noted in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, s. v. ó $\rho \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$, as probably a false reading.
21. A thin fragment of bluish Hymettian marble, with the left edge preserved, but broken at the right, the top, and the bottom, found on February 3, 1934, in a loose fill beneath the floor of a Byzantine building in Section $\mathrm{H}^{\prime}$.

Height, 0.12 m. ; width, 0.093 m .; thickness, 0.03 m .
Height of letters, 0.006 m .
Inv. No. I 1273.


Early Third Century.
ETOIX. 34
 $\nu$ N七ко [. . . . . . . . . ${ }_{22}^{2} .$.


$5 \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu[\gamma \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda o v \sigma \iota \nu$ oi $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho o i ̀ ~ o i ~ \dot{a} \pi \sigma o \sigma \tau a \lambda \epsilon ́ \nu]$


 $\tau \alpha \tau\left[\tau о \nu \kappa \alpha i ̀ \tau \grave{a} \psi \eta \phi i \sigma \mu a \tau \alpha \tau o \hat{v} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu o v \cdot \dot{a} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\eta}_{\iota}\right]$ 10 [ $\tau \cup ́ \chi \eta \iota \delta \epsilon \delta o ́ \chi \theta a \iota \tau \hat{\eta} \iota \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} \iota------]$

No. 21
The lettering is stoichedon, of a character very much like that of I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 657$, which must be dated in $285 / 4$. In the present fragment there seems to be a slight irregularity at the beginning of line 7, but the compensations permissible in the early third century were sufficiently elastic so that this need not have caused a disturbance of the order. Six lines measure 0.083 m ., and five letters (measured on centres) occupy a span of 0.075 m .

The orator Mnesiergos is to be identified with the Mnesiergos, son of Mnesias, of Athmonon, who proposed the decree preserved as I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 704 .{ }^{9}$ The date of this decree is now given as $262 / 1 ;{ }^{10}$ the prosopographical evidence of the new fragment here published weighs against its being assigned to a later year. It is assumed in the restoration given above that religious envoys ( $\theta \in \omega \rho o i$ ) had been sent to some festival, where they had offered sacrifices as directed by the laws and the decrees of the Demos. The name of the festival is not preserved, but epigraphical require-
 $\lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}--]$ in line 7. The festival of Herakles most probable for the restoration was that at Thebes (cf. Hesperia, IV, no. 38, citations 11, 21, 22, 30, and 32). Praise of an Athenian delegation to the Basileia at Lebadeia in Boiotia in 283/2, the approximate date of the present document, is recorded in Hesperia, IV, 1935, no. 40.
22. Fragment of Hymettian marble, broken away on all sides, found on May 7, 1934, in Section K.

Height, 0.095 m. ; width, 0.18 m . ; thickness, 0.095 m .
Height of letters, $c a .0 .005 \mathrm{~m}$.
Inv. No. I 1966.


No. 22
ca. 225 в.c. (?)
NON-ETOIX. ca. 46




5

${ }^{9}$ Sundwall, Nachträge zur Prosopographia Attica, s.v.
${ }^{10}$ Cf. Pritchett-Meritt, The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, p. xx.


```
[\deltaढ̀ av̀\tau]⿳⺈⿴囗丨[\iota----------------------------
```

The character of the lettering is quite like that of I．G．， $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 837$ ，of the archon－ ship of Theophilos，though similar lettering occurs also in the early second century． The absence of any mention of the Ptolemaia after the Eleusinia in line 4 suggests a date before the creation of the tribe Ptolemais（cf．commentary on I．G．，$I^{2}$ ，851）． On the other hand，the first exact parallel for the restoration offered in lines 4－6 is found in a document which must be dated in 196／5 в．c．（Hesperia，V，1936，no．15， lines 50－52）．

23．Fragment of Hymettian marble，with the smooth－picked left edge pre－ served，but otherwise broken，found on February 27，1935，in a modern wall in Section 0 ．

Height， 0.14 m．；width， 0.16 m ； thickness， 0.065 m ．

Height of letters， $0.006 \mathrm{~m} .-0.007 \mathrm{~m}$ ．
Inv．No．I 2527.

The inscription is not stoichedon． Eight lines occupy a vertical space of 0.092 m. ，and thirteen letters （measured on centres in line 4）occupy a horizontal space of 0.136 m ．


No． 23 ca． 200 в．c．

NON－ETOIX．$c a .54$






 ả $\nu a \gamma \rho a ́ \psi a \iota ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau[o ́ \delta \epsilon ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \psi \eta ́ \phi \iota \sigma \mu a ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon ́ a ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ к а \tau a ̀ ~ \pi \rho v \tau a \nu \epsilon i ́ a \nu] ~] ~$

 ［ $\tau \iota] \omega \tau \iota \kappa[\hat{\omega} \nu$ гò $\gamma \epsilon \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$ ả $\nu \alpha ́ \lambda \omega \mu \alpha]$ vacat

The lettering suggests a date $c a .200$ в.с., and the marble is of the same curiously mottled appearance as that of the decree of $196 / 5$ b.c. in honor of Kephisodoros (Hesperia, V, 1936, no. 15).
24. Small dedicatory plaque of Pentelic marble, broken away below but otherwise preserving the edges and original back, found on February 27, 1935, in a modern fill in Section 0.

Height, 0.07 m. ; width, 0.079 m. ; thickness, 0.018 m . Height of letters, $c a .0 .008 \mathrm{~m}$. Inv. No. I 2526.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ['A] } \theta \eta \nu a \gamma o ́ \rho a
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { тò } \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi\langle 0\rangle \nu
\end{aligned}
$$

It is possible that a sigma, closely spaced, may have been inscribed where the surface of the stone is now chipped at the end of line 1 ; if so, the name was

25. Fragment from a pedimental stele of Hymettian marble, found on November 23, 1934, in the wall of a house in Section N. The stone is broken, except at the top, and the surface is much weathered.


Height, 0.29 m. ; width, 0.31 m .; thickness, 0.10 m .

Height of letters, 0.005 m .
Inv. No. I 2211.

No. 25




This stone cannot be associated with Hesperia, Suppl. I, no. 84, for the spacing of lines and letters is wider. Three lines occupy a vertical space of 0.032 m ., and seven letters (measured on centres) occupy a horizontal space of 0.062 m . The approximate width of the stone is indicated by the apex of the pediment and may be computed-along the first line of the inscription-as $c a .0 .45 \mathrm{~m}$.

The extensive lacuna to be filled in lines 3-4 shows that the date of the month was given both $\kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho \chi o \nu \tau \alpha$ and $\kappa a \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon o ́ \nu . ~$
26. Fragment of an inscribed stele of Hymettian marble, with part of the pediment preserved, found on March 9, 1934, in the wall of a modern cistern in Section $\Gamma$. The stone is broken at the right, and behind, and rough-picked on top. Close to the apex is part of an akroterion. The inscribed surface below the pediment is broken on all sides.

Height, 0.225 m. ; width, 0.215 m ; thickness, 0.115 m .

Height of letters, 0.007 m .
Inv. No. I 1594.


No. 26
122/1 в.с.


The approximate width of the stele is determined by the apex of the pediment. The restorations reflect the wide spacing of the letters in line 1 and the closer spacing of lines 2-3; even so it has been necessary to assume a dual system of reckoning in the civil calendar. Cf. I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 1006$, line 3.
27. Fragment from the top of a pedimental stele of Pentelic marble, with the back and right side preserved, found on May 1, 1934, in a modern wall in Section K.

Height, 0.13 m .; width, 0.26 m .; thickness, 0.054 m .
Height of letters, $0.005 \mathrm{~m} .-0.008 \mathrm{~m}$.
Inv. No. I 1921.


No. 27


[- - - - - - - - - -]ọ Фגvєv́s

The letter forms indicate a date in the late second or first century b.c. For similar documents, see Hesperia, III, 1934, no. 64 (I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 2991$ a) and I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}$, 2991.
28. A small rectangular shaft of Pentelic marble, found in a late fill in Section B on February 23, 1934. The shaft is surmounted by a flat projecting fascia and a rounded top; it is left rough below for insertion into a base.

Height, 0.29 m .; width of face, 0.084 m . ; thickness, 0.077 m .
Height of letters, 0.007 m .
Inv. No. I 1349.

> ’A $\rho \iota \sigma \tau$ о $\nu$ íк $\eta$
> ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \rho \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \iota \delta \iota$
> $\Sigma \omega \tau \in i ́ \rho a \iota$

For Artemis Soteira at Athens, see (for example) I.G., $\mathrm{II}^{2}, 1343,4631,4695$, and compare Judeich, Topographie von Athen ${ }^{2}$ (1931), p. 411.

No. 28
29. Fragment from the lower part of a statuette of Pentelic marble, found on April 12, 1934, in Section K. The preserved part represents the feet and drapery of a figure standing on a plinth; to the right, on a small base, are the feet of another smaller figure.

Height of the plinth, 0.02 m . ; width across the face of the plinth, 0.11 m . Height of letters, $0.003 \mathrm{~m} .-0.005 \mathrm{~m}$.
Inv. No. I 1787.


No. 29

The text of $a$ was inscribed on the small base, and $b$ was cut between guide-lines on the plinth. The inscription names the artist, and identifies the figures; part $b$ resolves itself into a rather unsatisfactory hexameter couplet. In line 4 it is possible that the letters IH[ were inscribed in a ligature, but the horizontal stroke connecting $I$ and $[$, if one existed, is very faint.
30. Miniature altar of Pentelic marble, found on May 4, 1935, in Section $\Pi$.


Height, $0.131 \mathrm{~m} . ;$ width, 0.08 m .; thickness, 0.069 m .

Height of letters, 0.006 m .
Inv. No. I 2843.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ca. } 100 \text { A.D. } \\
& \text { 'A } \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{o} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{a} \\
& \epsilon \dot{v} \chi \dot{\eta} \nu \\
& \text { 'A } \rho \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \iota \delta \iota
\end{aligned}
$$

No. 30
The corner akroteria are broken; between them the top is a shallow concave bowl.


[^0]:    ${ }^{2}$ Les Secrétaires Athéniens, pp. 97-108.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The evidence thus offers nothing new about the date of composition of 'A $\theta$. .

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. Pritchett-Meritt, The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, p. 3.
    ${ }^{5}$ For the restorations in these documents see Schweigert, Hesperia, VIII, 1939, pp. 33-34.

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ For the demotic Koddurés, tentatively ascribed to the secretary of $331 / 0$, see Schweigert, Hesperia, VIII, 1939, p. 33.

[^4]:    ${ }^{7}$ See the text of $I . G ., \mathrm{II}^{2}, 362$ as published above on p. 47.

[^5]:    ${ }^{8}$ See the comments by Ferguson in A.J.P., LIX, 1938, pp. 230-231.

