THE INSCRIPTIONS

During the excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies in the Athenian Agora in 1931 there were discovered eighty-one Greek inscriptions. This number includes all the fragments, however small, and must be somewhat reduced to represent correctly the inscriptions which may be expected to yield evidence of historical importance. Nevertheless, the extent of the epigraphical discoveries in the first year seems particularly gratifying. It has always been known that inscriptions would be among the principal discoveries made in the Agora, though the greater number of documents and the more important individual records are probably to be expected in the neighborhood of the ancient Council House, to which the excavation has not yet been extended. The fact that the less promising section of the area to be excavated yielded eighty-one fragments in the first campaign is a good omen for the future success of the excavations in epigraphical discovery.

The inscriptions range in date principally from the sixth century B.C. (one small piece of a dedication) to the second century A.D. (cf. No. 10 below). There are also later dedications and sepulchral monuments. Of more immediate importance to the historian is the fact that inscriptions are being discovered from precisely those categories which will contribute most to the determination of Hellenistic chronology. The inscriptions honoring the epheboi, the taxiarchs, and certain other official boards, were usually placed in the Agora. From such documents we often learn the relative sequence in time of the archons whose names they record. The present interest in problems of Hellenistic chronology and history, which has been revived and increased by Dinsmoor's great work on the Archons of Athens, will certainly be maintained by the discoveries in the Agora. It is not too much to hope that a definitive solution will be given to many problems which now prevent an accurate record of the history of Hellenistic Athens.

The director of the excavations, Dr. T. Leslie Shear, placed at my disposal during the summer of 1931 squeezes and photographs of some of the more important documents found in the first campaign. Some of these require further study in Athens, but in so far as preliminary publication can be made it seems advisable to make known the new texts as soon as possible. The documents which can be thus published are given in the following pages.

1. A statue base of Pentelic marble, found in Section E in a late wall 5/B–I. June 6, 1931.
   Height, 0.285 m.; bottom diam., 0.62 m.
   Height of letters, 0.012 m.
   Inv. No. 153 I 14.
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Euboulides was eponymous archon in 394/3. It is already known that he belonged to the Eleusinian deme (P. A. 5325), but this inscription gives the father's name as Epikleides. The paredros was also a son of Epikleides, and also from Eleusis, evidently a brother of Euboulides. Since Aristotle (Ἀθ. Πολ., 56, 1) informs us that in his day each of the three principal archons had two paredroi (cf. also Ι.Γ. ΙΙ², 1696), it is interesting to find the name of only one inscribed on this base from the early fourth century. The paredros and secretary are otherwise unknown.
2. A statue base of Hymettian marble, found in Section E, house 20.
Length, 0.50 m.; width, 0.48 m.; height, 0.20 m.
Height of letters, 0.012 to 0.015 m.
Inv. No. 147 I 8.

This particular Hieron is already known from a sepulchral monument (I.G. II, 3804b; P.A. 7524a), but the present inscription gives the additional name of his deme. The grave stele exhibits the form ἵεων ἵεωνιος for the patronymic and should be dated in the second half of the fourth century. The inscription here, with patronymic ἵεωνιος, should be dated before the middle of the fourth century.

3. Three fragments of Pentelic marble, which were found near together in Section E in a late wall 5/I–B.

Fragment a: Height, 0.83 m.; width, 0.40 m.; thickness, 0.305 m. Inv. No. 157 I 18. Left edge preserved.
Fragment b: Height, 0.42 m.; width, 0.17 m.; thickness, 0.15 m. Inv. No. 156 I 17. Broken on all sides.
Fragment c: Height, 0.22 m.; width, 0.313 m.; thickness, 0.207 m. Inv. No. 155 I 16. Top and right edge preserved.
Height of letters in line 1, 0.022 m.; in lines 3–50, 0.012 m.; in lines 52–56, 0.009 m.
Fig. 3
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[ vacat

[ Ερεχθηδος ]

[ Οινηδος ]

[ Αχαρνες ]

[ Αχαρνες ]

[ Ιλαψιγο Λακαδής ]

[ Ιερίο φυλασιος ]

[ Αγνικατος φυλασιος ]

[ Ειδήμοφυλασιος ]

[ δήμοφυλασιος ]

[ γοσ φυλασιος ]

lacuna

[Aηγηδος]

lacuna

[Kεφοπιδος]

[...οξ[- --------- - - -]

[Σμικ[- --------- - - -]

[Ευφο[- --------- - - -]

[Σωφίο [ς - - - - - - -]

[ Ἰπποθω [ντιδος ]

[Αρεντ[ος - - - - - - -]

[Πανδιονιδος]

[Παιαντει[ς[- --------- - - -]

[Παιαντει[ς[- --------- - - -]

[ Πο[οβα]λίσιος ]

[μενος Μ[μα]νίσιος ]

[ Αγγε[λθ]ον ]

[ ο Κυθηρ[ος ]

[ Άηονιδος ]

[ Άηονιδος ]

[ [κο Παιο[νδης ]

[φιονος Φ[φιάρη]ος ]

[Θεοχίος Λευκούρει[ς ]

[Φανόμαχος Λιονα[ο Σονιες ]

[Αχαμαντιδος ]

[...ο Αιοδωρ[ο - - - - -]

[...έ[θης Τιμο[...ος

[...ος Αιοδωρ[ο - - - - -]

[...έ[θης Τιμο[...ος

[...ος Αιοδωρ[ο - - - - -]

[...έ[θης Τιμο[...ος

[...ος Αιοδωρ[ο - - - - -]

[...έ[θης Τιμο[...ος

[...ος Αιοδωρ[ο - - - - -]
The inscription records a list of names arranged in two columns and separated according to the ten official tribes. The character of the lettering and the use of O for OY indicate a date in the first half of the fourth century. So little is preserved of the prescript in lines 1 and 2 that the occasion for the document remains obscure, but it resembles in its general form the earlier lists of those killed in battle who were buried at public expense in the Kerameikos. It is true that in the inscriptions of the fifth century the names were not written in full with patronymic and demotic, as is the case in the record now under discussion, but this divergence is readily explained by the different dates to which the inscriptions belong. Moreover, the prescript of lines 1 and 2 may be restored on the analogy of I.G. I², 943, for example, somewhat as follows:

\[
[\epsilon\nu \ldots \cdot \cdot \cdot \ 'A\theta] \eta\nu[\alpha\iota\omicron \omicron \ \omicron \ \delta\eta\omicron \ \delta\epsilon\omicron \ \delta\pi\alpha\theta\sigma\omicron\omicron] \text{ vacat.}
\]

There are other specific similarities with these earlier burial monuments. After the names have been listed (lines 3–41) there appear the beginnings of four lines (47–50), well indented from the left margin of the stone, and separated from the text above and below. These lines seem to be the beginning of two elegiac couplets, such as might be appropriately added to the inscription to recount the valor of the dead and to praise in song their courage in the war in which they lost their lives. I have been unable to identify the lines in question with any known elegy, but the custom of adding such elegies after the names of the dead is well illustrated by I.G. I², 943.

After the list of men from Antiochis there is one line on the stone uninscribed, followed by a single preserved epsilon indented slightly toward the right. In I.G. I², 949 (line 76), a category of \( \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\alpha\sigma\alpha\omicron\omicron\) followed the names from Antiochis. The same restoration seems reasonable here and offers an additional indication that the present document also is a public grave stele for men who fell in battle.

I have not as yet identified with certainty any of the names listed in the inscription, though the sons of two of the men from Sounion are known. In line 37 appears a patronymic ending in \(-\ -\ -\ -\ K1O\). It so happens that the only name known from
Sounion which can be restored in this line is Λεύκιος. A certain Λεύκιος Θεοκλέους Σουνείς is mentioned in I.G. II², 417 (P.A. 9057) which must be dated approximately in 330 b.c. The present inscription gives the name of the father Theokles, son of Leukios. The necessary restoration exactly fills the space available on the stone in line 37.

We know also a Dionysios, son of Phanomachos, from Sounion, whose name appears on a grave monument from the latter part of the fourth century (I.G. II, 2550; P.A. 4245). In line 38 of the present document the name of the father should be restored: [Φανόμαχος] Διονυσίος [Σουνείς], filling exactly the amount of space available on the stone.

If we recede one generation from the possible floruit of Leukios in 330 b.c. it is possible to date the inscription here under discussion in the second quarter of the fourth century.

4. An inscribed statue base of Hymettian marble, found in Section E in a late wall 5/B–I.

Height, 0.38 m.; width, 0.18 m.; thickness, 0.22 m.
Height of letters, 0.007 m.
Inv. No. 152 I 13.

Fig. 4
The inscription may be dated by the form of the letters in the early fourth century. Aristokrates should probably be identified as the Aristokrates who was choregos at the Dionysiac festival in 388/7, when he provided the chorus for one of the tragedies of the younger Sophokles (I.G. II2, 2318).

5. Two contiguous fragments of a stele of Pentelic marble, found built into a late wall just in front of the Stoa of Zeus. The upper fragment (Inv. No. 930 I 96) is preserved to the full width of the stele but the surface along the right edge has been lost. The left edge of the lower fragment (Inv. No. 154 I 15) is also preserved.

Height, 0.475 m.; width, 0.43 m.; thickness, 0.13 m.

Height of letters, 0.006 m.
In Dinsmoor's discussion of the archons between 292/1 and 262/1 B.C. he found that the two years 277/6 and 276/5 belonged in all probability to Sosistratos and Olbios, though there was no evidence to show which archon should be assigned to the earlier year and which to the later. The present inscription gives in full the name of the secretary as Kydias the son of Timonides of the deme Euonymon. Since this deme belongs to the third tribe, Erechtheis, Olbios must be assigned to 277/6, thus leaving 276/5 available for Sosistratos.

The orator of the decree was Leon, son of Kichesias, of Aixone. An ephebos under the archonship of Kimon bearing this name is listed in I.G. II², 787. But there is no available year after Kimon's archonship to which Olbios, with a secretary from Erechtheis, can be assigned. I assume rather that the orator of the present decree was the grandfather of the ephebos of Kimon's year. Under these circumstances it appears that the elder Leon was probably about thirty-five years old in 277/6, and of appropriate age to be taking part in the deliberations of the Athenian Council.

The restoration of the document is based largely on well-known formulae. I am indebted to W. S. Ferguson for the suggestions offered in lines 11 and 12. The reading supplied in line 14 is based in part on line 12 of I.G. II², 500, another decree of earlier date honoring a board of taxiarchs. This earlier decree was set up in front of the strategion (I.G. II², 500, line 39), and since its place of discovery so nearly coincides with the place where the present inscription was found, I feel confident that the words καὶ στῆσαι ἕμπροσθεν τοῦ στρατηγίου suggested in lines 28–29 afford a sound restoration.

Professor Ferguson informs me by letter that there is some ground for believing that Olbios should be assigned to a date after the Chremonidean war. But a full statement of the case for this later date would involve a completely new analysis of the archon lists of the latter half of the century, and must await the publication of Ferguson's forthcoming monograph on the secretary cycles.

6. Fragment of a stele of Hymettian marble, broken at top and bottom, but with both sides preserved. Found in Section E 9/Al' at a depth of 1.50 m.

Height, 0.485 m.; width, 0.606 m.; thickness, 0.172 m.
Height of letters, 0.006 m.
Inv. No. 200 I 61.

1 Dinsmoor, The Archons of Athens, p. 76.
2 Since this was written Ferguson's book, Athenian Tribal Cycles, has appeared. His date for Olbios is 247/6 (pp. 24, 26, and 35–36).
This document makes a welcome addition to the few inscriptions now preserved honoring the epheboi of the third century. The part of the stone containing the honorary decree and the list of epheboi has been lost, but the names of the ephebic instructors have been preserved. It happens that three of these are known from other inscriptions of the latter half of the century.

Heortios of Acharnai was an ephebe in the archonship of Philoneos when his father Hermodoros was paidotribes (*I.G. II*², 766). He appears as paidotribes in the present...
document, and was still acting as paidotribes in one of the years after the creation of the tribe Ptolemais (I.G. II², 944 b). The long career as paidotribes which his father enjoyed before him extended from the archonship of Menekles through the archonships of Thymocharis, Philoneos, and Polyuuktos (I.G. II², 665, 700, 766, and 681). According to Dinsmoor’s arrangement of the archons, this is a span of at least twenty-one years, from 269/8 to 249/8.¹ Dinsmoor’s dates for the archons down to the end of the Chremonidean war I now accept as substantially correct, but in view of the varied suggestions still made for Thymocharis, Philoneos, and Polyuuktos,² I refrain from assigning definite dates to these archons and limit myself to indicating the bearing which the present inscription has upon the problem.

Since Heortios II (P.A. 4741), the son of Hermodoros II (P.A. 5138) is now paidotribes, it follows that the inscription must be dated after Thymocharis, Philoneos, and Polyuuktos. Unfortunately the names of the akontistes and hoplomachos are not preserved for the year of Polyuuktos. But in the year of Thymocharis, or rather in the year immediately preceding Thymocharis, the akontistes was Lysikles of Sypalettos and the hoplomachos was . . . . . . of Ankyle (I.G. II², 700, lines 29–30). The same akontistes is mentioned in the present document, though the hoplomachos is different. In the year of Philoneos (I.G. II², 766) the akontistes was still Lysikles of Sypalettos, and the hoplomachos was Charisandros. These are the names which appear in the new inscription here published. The inference to be drawn is that Thymocharis, Philoneos, and the unknown archon of this new document form an open sequence in the order given. There is no new evidence for the relative date of Polyuuktos, though one is tempted to place Thymocharis and Philoneos as late as possible in order to avoid long careers for Lysikles and Charisandros. Perhaps this is not necessary.

Lysikles of Sypalettos appears not only as akontistes in I.G. II², 700 and 766, but as priest of Asklepios in I.G. II², 1534, lines 204 and 208. The new inscription shows that Charisandros belonged to the deme Halimous (line 4). The demotic [Ἀλιμοῦνα] may now be restored in I.G. II², 766, line 42. A similar restoration should be made in I.G. II², 766, line 10. Dinsmoor’s tentative suggestion (op. cit., p. 167) that Charisandros of I.G. II², 766, should be identified with [- - - - - - Νι]ώδους Ἄρηκής of I.G. II², 700, line 30, is to be rejected.

A possible date for the inscription is about 240 B.C. Cf. Ferguson, Athenian Tribal Cycles, pp. 102–107.

7. Stele of Pentelic marble, broken at the bottom and at the right. The inscribed surface is surmounted by mouldings and part of a pediment. Found in Section E 20/KE at 0.60 m.

The inscription is not written stoichedon, and the lines contain from 31 to 36 letters each. In line 1 the name of the prytanizing tribe should be restored with as few letters as possible, either as Οίνηδος or as Αἰγήδος. It has been generally assumed that the archon Chairephon preceded by four years the archon Diokles III, both of whom are mentioned in an Eleusinian garrison decree (I.G. II², 1304).¹ This inscription, however, brings the first definite proof of this time relationship, for it names the secretary of the year of Chairephon as Φ[- - - - - - - - Κv]δαντίδης. In the period of the thirteen tribes, during which both Chairephon and Diokles must be dated, the deme Kydantidai belonged to the seventh tribe, Ptolemais. The secretary of the year of Diokles is known as Μισισοφάνης Σιμάτσοκλέους Κατιάδης (I.G. II², 847), belonging to the eleventh tribe, Hippothontis; and the four-year interval between them is thus established. Diokles is dated in 215/4 by those who assign the secretary of Thrasyphon's year (221/0) to Pandionis (V), or in 211/0 by those who assign him to Antigonis (I). The date of Chairephon is thus determined as 219/8 (Ferguson-Kirchner in I.G. II², iv, p. 16) or as 215/4 (Dinsmoor, op. cit., p. 209). The present inscription gives the initial letter of the secretary's name and his demotic. It also affords evidence for the calendar character of the year, for the equation Βοεδρομίον 10 = Πρυτανή Μ, 15 belongs to an ordinary year of twelve months in the period of the thirteen tribes. The first two prytanies of the year each contained twenty-seven days.

8. Fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, found in Section E 30/ΚΓ at 0.50 m. Height, 0.183 m.; width, 0.15 m.; thickness, 0.055 m. Height of letters, 0.005–0.007 m. Inv. No. 496 I 77.

Fig. 8

[- - - - - - - - - - - επειδὴ οἱ πρωτάνεις τῆς - - -]
[καὶ οἱ δείδουσαν εὐαγγελίζοντες καὶ στεφανώσαντες ἀποφαίνο] [μὴν τῇ βουλῇ τῶν ταμίων δὲ ἐπλοντὸ οἱ πρωτάνεις ἐξ ἐαυτῶν] [nomen demoticum τὰς ουσίας τεθυγάται πάσας τὰς καθηκούσ] [ας ἐν τῇ προ[ντο]ο[ν]εία ὑπὲρ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἐπικεφαλῆ]
The inscription is to be dated in the early second century, where numerous similar documents are found (I.G. II², 864, 899, 912, 913, 914, 915, 917, 918, 952, 972). It may be noted also that most of these documents were found in the region of the ancient Agora. The lines of this inscription each contain about fifty-two letters, but are not written stoaicly. The restorations follow well-established formulae and require little comment. The phrase ἐν τῶι πνευματικῷ in line 16 has been supplied on the analogy of I.G. II², 918, line 13.

9. A stele of Pentelic marble, preserved in several small fragments which can be united to form two major groups. Found in Section E 30/ΚΓ at 0.50 m.

Fragment a: Height, 0.468 m.; width, 0.24 m.; thickness at edge 0.045 m., at centre 0.105 m.
Fragment b: Height, 0.38 m.; width, 0.24 m.; thickness, 0.096 m.
Height of letters, 0.007 m.
Inv. No. 497 I 78.
The inscription is dated in the archonship of Jason II, 125/4 B.C. The name of the secretary in the year of Jason is given in I.G. II², 1003, as [- - - -] Ἀναξικράτους Ἐλεφύνος. The present document (line 2) makes it possible now to restore the complete name as Ἀθρόβωρος Ἀναξικράτους Ἐλεφύνος. By comparison also with I.G. II², 1003, it appears that the name of the orator (line 6) was Καραίχος Καραίχον Ἀλαιες. The father (P. A. 8252) is known from Athenian coins of the first half of the second century. His demotic Αλαιες is given in I.G. II², 1003, and the name of his son Καραίχος is added by this new inscription.

The date of the decree as given on the stone in line 3 does not show whether the year of Jason was an ordinary year of twelve months or an intercalary year of thirteen months. The restorations of the date within the month τετράτης ἐπὶ δέκα and ἐπεζῆμη ἐπὶ
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déka are equally possible epigraphically; the former is appropriate for an ordinary year, while the latter would necessitate the assumption that the year was intercalary. The question can be decided only by reference to the already published inscription of Jason's year (I.G. II², 1003).

The name of the secretary Ἀθηρόδωρος may now be restored at the end of line 1 in I.G. II², 1003. The number of the prytany is unknown, but may have occupied a minimum of five letter spaces (ἕξας) or a maximum of nine letter spaces (ἑνδεκάτης or δωδεκάτης). The number of letters in line 1 was consequently 61 or more, up to a maximum of 65. Although the inscription is not stoichedon, the lines so far as preserved contain approximately the same number of letters in an equal distance upon the stone. Under these circumstances, line 3 should also be restored with 61–65 letters; the actual restoration available, with the phrase ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, occupies 61 letter spaces.

A similar argument applies to lines 6 and 7. The inscription is evidently concerned with honors voted to a retiring board of prytaneis during the succeeding prytany of the year. The customary formula of these decrees must be supplied in the lines in question: ἔτερ ὣν ἀπαγγέλλωσιν οἱ πρυτανεῖς τῆς | - - - - ιδος ἐπὶ τὸν θυσίων ὣν ἐθυνον, etc. The number of letters in line 6 is thus likewise restored as 61. At the beginning of line 7 must be supplied the longest tribal name, ἵπποθωντίδος. If a shorter name is here restored, then the number of letters in line 6 falls below 61. It is apparent that the actual length of line was therefore more nearly 61 than 65 letters. The restoration suggested above for line 3 is confirmed, and the restoration of any one of the longer numerals after the name of the tribe in line 1 is shown to be highly improbable.

These observations are of importance because no equation of dates can now be found which will fill the lacuna in line 2 on the assumption that the year was intercalary. Various combinations are possible with an ordinary year. Accordingly, I restore the date in line 3 of the new inscription as Μεταγειτηνίων [τετράδι ἐπὶ δέκα - -]. I give here also the restored text of I.G. II², 1003:

NON CTOIX, c. 61

Ἐπὶ Ἴδους ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντ[ιοχίδος - - - πρυτανείας ἢ Ἀθηρόδωρος]
Ἀναξιχράτους Ἐλευσίνος ἔγραμ[μέτειν - - - ὄνος - - - - - , - - ]
τι καὶ δεκατε τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις· τῶν προαίρων ἐπεισὴ]
φιλεῖν Θεόδοτος Θεοδότου Κρίσου[ταῖς καὶ συμπράξοντι]
ἔδοξ[ἐν τοῖς θήμων]
[Καράγχος Κα]ραχόν Ἀλεξίδος ε[ἰπὲν· ἐπὶ ὄν ἀπαγγέλησιν οἱ πρυτανεῖς τῆς]
[Ἱπποθωντίδος ἐπὶ τὸν θυσίων ὄν ἐθυνον - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

10. Two fragments of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, found in Section E 6/Δ at 1.70 m. and Section E 7/Ζ at 1.10 m.

Fragment a: Height, 0.217 m.; width, 0.263 m.; thickness, 0.069 m. Inv. No. 203 I 64.
Fragment b: Height, 0.26 m.; width, 0.19 m.; thickness, 0.066 m. Inv. No. 199 I 60.
Height of letters, 0.007 m.
Fig. 10
ΤΟΙΟΧΡΑΤΩΡ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΘΕΟΥ ἈΝΤΩΝΙΝΟΥ δ ὁς, θεὸς Οὐήρου Παρθικοῦ ἀδελφός, θεὸς Αἰρῆς Σαρμαστικὸς Γερμανικὸς [δ ἔρηκε[ ἡς μεγατος, ἁμαρκηκῆς ἐξουσίας τῷ τῷ] 5
[ἀντοκράτωρ τῷ ὑπατοντῷ γ', πατηρ πατρίδος] ὁς, ἀνθρώπος καὶ
Ἀντοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Αὐρήλιος Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικὸς [δ ἔρηκε[ ἡς μεγατος, ἁμαρκηκῆς ἐξουσίας τῷ τῷ] 10
[ἀντοκράτωρ τῷ τῷ γ', πατηρ πατρίδος] ὁς, ἀνθρώπος καὶ
Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Σαρμαστικὸς Γερμανικὸς [δ ἔρηκε[ ἡς μεγατος, ἁμαρκηκῆς ἐξουσίας τῷ τῷ] 15
[ἀντοκράτωρ τῷ τῷ γ', πατηρ πατρίδος] ὁς, ἀνθρώπος καὶ

[Αὐτοκράτωρ Καὶσαρ θεοῦ Ἀντωνίνου δός, θεοῦ Οὐήρου Παρθικοῦ ἀδέλφῳ ὁς, θεοῦ Ταραγοῦ Παρθικοῦ ἐκγόνου, θεοῦ Αἰρῆς Σαρμαστικὸς Γερμανικὸς, ὁ δὲ ἐρήκε[ ἡς μεγατος, ἁμαρκηκῆς ἐξουσίας τῷ τῷ] 5
[ἐγνοῦ ὁ υἱὸς, Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικὸς, ὁ δὲ ἐρήκε[ ἡς μεγατος, ἁμαρκηκῆς ἐξουσίας τῷ τῷ] 10
[ἐγνοῦ ὁ υἱὸς, Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικὸς, ὁ δὲ ἐρήκε[ ἡς μεγατος, ἁμαρκηκῆς ἐξουσίας τῷ τῷ] 15
[ἐγνοῦ ὁ υἱὸς, Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικὸς, ὁ δὲ ἐρήκε[ ἡς μεγατος, ἁμαρκηκῆς ἐξουσίας τῷ τῷ] 20
[ἐγνοῦ ὁ υἱὸς, Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικὸς, ὁ δὲ ἐρήκε[ ἡς μεγατος, ἁμαρκηκῆς ἐξουσίας τῷ τῷ]
The two fragments of this inscription have no point of contact, but the relative positions can be determined by the restorations in lines 17ff. The document is a letter to the Athenian people (?) from the joint emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. The name of Commodus was deleted in antiquity and then again inscribed after the erasure.

The joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus extended from 176 to 180 A.D., but the date of this letter is more accurately determined by the fact that Commodus held the consulship for the second time (line 5). This necessitates a date during the year 179 A.D., or at least before the death of Marcus Aurelius in March of 180 A.D.

Mention is made in the inscription of a certain Quadratus (lines 8, 10). He is known to have been procurator (δ ἐπίτροπος ἡμῶν) from another inscription (I.G. II², 1108) which is also a letter to the Athenians from the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. It seems impossible to restore much of the text of the letter. In line 13, the reference to an ἀδή (iota subscript was not used in this inscription) indicates that perhaps the letter was concerned, in part at least, with an ode composed in honor of the emperors. But lines 14 and 15 seem to deal with matters of more specific local administrative importance.

Even the restoration of the imperial titles presents unexpected difficulties, although it is clear that the lines contained approximately ninety letters each (not stoichedon). The name of Marcus Aurelius was probably written in the same way both in lines 1–3 and in lines 17–19, though his relationship to Hadrian ought normally to have been given before his relationship to Trajan. It is impossible to restore the same formula for Commodus in lines 3–5 and in lines 19–21.

There have been found also two smaller pieces belonging to this inscription which I give here as fragments c and d.

Fragment c: Found in Section E 4/A at 2.40 m.
Height, 0.17 m.; width, 0.115 m.; thickness, 0.067 m.; Height of letters, 0.007 m.
Inv. No. 149 I 10.

Fig. 10 c
Fragment $d$: Found in Section A 35/I at 1.60 m. Height, 0.06 m.; width, 0.06 m.; thickness, 0.07 m.; Height of letters, 0.007 m. Inv. No. 166 I 27.

Fig. 10 $d$

The relation of these fragments to the larger pieces $a$ and $b$ is obscure. Both fragments are broken on all sides, but preserve their original thickness. In May of 1933 two additional fragments of this inscription were discovered, but publication of them must be delayed until a later report. It has also been found that $L.G.$ II$^2$, 1108 actually joins directly beneath fragment $a$.

University of Michigan

Benjamin D. Meritt

Note: For the sake of complete final publication, students of the documents here printed are earnestly requested to send reprints of articles they may write concerning these inscriptions, or comments by letter, to Professor Benjamin D. Meritt, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.