

EPIGRAPHIC NOTES

1. A Duplicate of the Treaty between Athens and Chalcis, *I.G.*, II², 44 (378/7 B.C.).

The fragment which preserves the record of the treaty of alliance between Athens and Chalcis is a fairly large rectangular block, the top of which is decorated in an unusual fashion. It consists of a shallow narrow panel in which a row of stylized leaves, approaching the centre of the stele from each side, was cut. The block possesses still another unusual feature in the decorative form of punctuation used (line 1) in the name [Ἀρ]ιστοτέλης :: Εὐφιλήτο, for which the best parallel exists in *I.G.*, II², 156 (photograph, *Hesperia*, VII, 2, p. 270) of the fifth century B.C. Time, weather, and mistreatment have served to obscure identically similar workmanship on another, much smaller fragment of Pentelic marble (published as *I.G.*, II², 155). Not only these features, but also the text itself has passed unrecognized. The stone was difficult to read because of its weathered surface, and several letters were incorrectly transcribed. In line 1 there is no *vacat*, but the peculiar five-point mark of punctuation; and the letters are not ΕΤΕ, but ΕΥΦ. With the aid of *I.G.*, II², 44, of which it is clearly a duplicate, the following text of *I.G.*, II², 155 has been constructed:

1	[Ἀριστοτέλης] :: Εὐφιλήτο	CTOIX. 20
	[Ἀχαρνῆς ἐγ]ραμμά[τενεν]	
	[ἐπὶ Νανσινία]ο ἀρχ[οντος]	
	[ἔδοξεν τῆι βολῆι καὶ τῆι δῆμωι· Ἀ[εωντὶς ἐπρυντ]	CTOIX. 37
5	[ἀνευεν· Ἀριστοτέλης ἐγ]ραμμά[τενεν· τῶν προέδ]	
	[ρων ἐπεψήφισεν - - -]	

As in *I.G.*, II², 44, the letters of lines 1–3 are wide-spaced and larger, and those of lines 4–6 smaller and crowded. Consequently the *stoichedon* order of twenty letters per line in lines 4–6 gives way to a line of thirty-seven. In all probability *I.G.*, II², 44 had also been erected on the Acropolis, and later found its way to the South Slope, as so many other inscriptions have. Duplicates of such important records were not uncommon. Fair-sized fragments of the treaty of the Athenians and Chians and part of a duplicate exist (*I.G.*, II², 34, 35), and both were found on the Acropolis. Likewise, there are examples from the fifth and fourth century of duplicates of administrative decrees (cf *I.G.*, II², 216, 217). The identification of this fragment removes it from the large number of unsolved fragments.

2. A New Fragment of the Treaty between Athens and Dionysius, the Elder.

The new fragment of *I.G.*, II², 105, which records the treaty between Dionysius and the Athenians (368/7), was found on the Acropolis and published first in the *SB. Berliner Akademie*, 1887, 1196 by Koehler from a copy of Lolling. Then it was republished with no change in the *Editio Minor* as *I.G.*, II², 523. Badly battered and preserving no original side save the inscribed face, which is hardly damaged, the new fragment exhibits features unmistakably similar to those of *I.G.*, II², 44. The alignment and letter-forms are identical. Only the portion of the document to which this piece belongs is presented below:

δμνῦ[ναι δὲ τὸν νόμιμον δ]
 [ροκον ἐκ]ατέρους· τοῦ[σδε ὄρκος ἀπο]λ[αβεῖν]
 [᾿Αθηναί]ων τὸς πρέσβ[εις τοὺς πλ]έοντ[ας εἰ]
 40 [ς Σικελί]αν· ἀναγράψ[αι δὲ τὸ ψήφ]ισμα [τόδε]
 [τὸν γραμ]ματέα τῆς [βολῆς ἐν στε]ήλη[ι λιθίν]
 [ημι καὶ στῆσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει, εἰς] δὲ [τὴν ἀνα]
 [γραφήν δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δ]ήμ[ου ΔΔΔ δ]
 [ραχμάς] vacat

Koehler had restored *γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου* in line 3 of *I.G.*, II², 523 and had dated it "end of fourth century." The new juxtaposition replaces this restoration with *γραμ]ματέα τῆς [βολῆς* and abolishes the need of explaining the embarrassing use of *τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου* in a document earlier than the last decade of the fourth century (*τ. γ. τ. δ.* at *I.G.*, II², 510; *Hesperia*, VII, 2, p. 300). The use of *τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς* is well in accord with the epigraphical custom at this period.¹

¹ The earliest dated use of *γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανεῖαν* in the formula of payment occurs in the important decree concerning the reorganization of the objects of the Chalkotheke, now dated in 353/2 B.C. (*Hesperia*, VII, 2, p. 286).