1. The Treaty with Philip, I.G., I², 53.

In 1918 Bauer published a fifth-century fragment found in the Asklepieion (Klio, XV, 1918, p. 193; see Fig. 1), and identified it as part of a treaty between Athens and Philip (433/2 B.C.), which is mentioned in Thucydides (I, 57, 3). The identification and date of the document depend on the name Φίλιππος, part of which occurs in line 4. For a short time Philip played an important rôle in Macedonian history, largely because he was used by Athens as a counter-weight to the prestige of Perdikkas. Since by the year 429/8 he had fallen out of power, a date ante quem is established for the text. Using this historical background and depending justly on the opinion that the letter forms of the fragment belonged to the well-developed style of the 430's, Bauer made a text of the piece, which remained unchanged in the second publication in the Editio Minor (I.G., I², 53). Further examination of this document has convinced me that more can be done in establishing the text. A close parallel to the substance and phraseology of this fragment can be found in another inscription from the year 424/3. For example, in lines 7 and 8 of Bauer’s piece are the words [λ]ευστάς μὲ υ-

and τὸς λείζε[σθαί]; and again in line 9 -θαί μετ-. These words are part of a formula which is used in the treaty between Athens and Halieis (I.G., I², 87; new text by Meritt and Davidson, A.J.P., LVI, 1935, pp. 65-71). Compare the following passage from lines 7-9 of I.G., I², 87 (quoting the text of Meritt and Davidson):

--- Λ[ευστάς μὲ ἡποδέχεσθαι μεθ’ α]ὐτ[ὸς λ]είζε[ς]
θαί μεδὲ χρ̣ [ὑπεντεύσθαι μετὰ τὸν πολ]εμίον ἐπ’ Ἰ’Ἀθέ]
ναίος --- --- --- --- ---

“They are not to harbor pirates nor themselves engage in plundering nor yet campaign on the side of the enemies against the Athenians.” The letters [λ]ευστάς
μὲ ἡ- are clearly to be restored [λ]eusτὰς μὲ ἡ[υποδέχεσθαί]. I would restore lines 7-10 of our fragment thus:

[kαὶ λ]eusτὰς μὲ ἡ[υποδέχε]
[σθαι μεδὲ αὐ]τὸς λείζε[σθαι μεδ']
[ἐπιστρατεύσε]θαι μετ[α ὅτων πολ]
[ἐμίον ὅτων Φιλίππο] μεδ' [ἐπὶ Φιλί]
[ππον μεδ' ἐπὶ ὅτς χοιμμάχος].

This new text has a length of twenty-five letters a line, on the basis of which lines 2-3 may be restored as follows:

[χοιμμαχία Ἀθ]εναῖον [καὶ Φιλίπ]
[πο ὁ τάδε ὁμίνυ' ναι Ἀθε[ναῖος ---].

The letters -εγγεν are clearly part of the phrase ἐπὶ τῇγ γέν, and belong to the formula pertaining to the defense measures of the alliance. For this passage I suggest:

[--- ἕαν]
[tis ἐει ἐπὶ τ]έγ γέν Φι[λίππο, ἔστ]
[o καὶ πολέμιος Αθένα[ἰος καὶ τ]
[oῖς χοιμμα]χοις ---

Above the N of line 2 is an omicron, obviously part of the heading [Θε]ο[ί], which can be disposed symmetrically with its letters over the first, ninth, seventeenth, and twenty-fifth letters in the stoichedon text of the lines below, as follows:
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[Θ     е] o [ί]
[χοιμμαχία Ἀθ]εναῖον [καὶ Φιλίπ]
[πο ὁ τάδε ὁμίνυ' ναι Ἀθε[ναῖος ἕαν]
[tis ἐει ἐπὶ τ]έγ γέν Φι[λίππο, ἔστ]
5 [o καὶ πολέμιος Αθένα[ἰος καὶ τ]
[oῖς χοιμμα]χοις καὶ е[...[...
[...  καὶ λ]ευστὰς μὲ ἡ[υποδέχε]
[σθαι μεδὲ αὐ]τὸς λείζε[σθαι μεδ']
[ἐπιστρατεύσε]θαι μετ[α ὅτων πολ]
10 [ἐμίον τὸν Φιλίππο] μεδ' [ἐπὶ Φιλί]
[ππον μεδ' ἐπὶ ὅτς χοιμμάχος ---]

2. A Duplication of Texts.

In 1853 Pittakys published the following small fragment ('Εφ. Ἀρχ., no. 2014), stating that he had found it north of the Parthenon on June 2, 1845.

1 Cf. I.G., I², 19; I.G., II², 14, 16, and 36.
This piece was subsequently published again by Rangabé in 1855 (Antiquités Helléniques, II, no. 594) with one minor variation in the text, and it was also copied by Velsen in his notebooks, again with some changes in marginal letters. It is now published twice in the Editio Minor as I.G., II², 883 (from Velsen’s notes) and as I.G., II², 43, lines 93-96 (378/7 B.C.). In actuality it joins I.G., II², 43, and yields the following text:

\[\text{έκόντες π[ρο]σχωράσι [- - - - - ἔπη]}
\[\phiιομένα τῶν δῆμων καὶ τ[ - - - - ]
\[νήσων εἰς τὴν συμμα[χίαν - - - - -]
\[τοῖς τῶν ἕπηφι[σμένων - - - - -]

3. A Decree of the Year of Euboulos, 345/4 B.C.

In his commentary on I.G., II², 219 Kirchner remarks that the phrase ἔδοξεν τῶν δῆμων, which he has restored in lines 5-6, occupies an unusual position; and so it does, appearing between the designations of the secretary and of the chairman of the proedroi; but the parallel he adduces in I.G., II², 215 is not close, since in that example the whole phrase τῶν προεδρῶν κτλ. is omitted. The ultimate reason for the present queer position of ἔδοξεν τῶν δῆμων in I.G., II², 219 is the faulty restoration of line 6 as τ[δέ] πρ[οεδρῶν - - -]. I append the following restoration to show the proper position and character of the text (see Fig. 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>345/4 B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Θ [ε o i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε λ / [- - - - ca. 6 - - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ἐ] π’ Εὐβόλα[ον ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς . . . . ἔδοξεν ὅ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[γδ] ὑπὸ πρ[υπανείασ ἤ . . . . . ἔξενοι . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [ . . . ] ἐξ Οἰο[ν εὐγραμμάτευε· ἐκτην καὶ δεκάτ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[η] τ[ῆς] πρ[υπανείασ· τῶν προεδρῶν ἐπεφήφῃ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ιξ] εὐ[Διο[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ἔδοξεν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[τῆ] β[ούλη ἢ καὶ τῶν δήμων]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ . . . . . . ] ε[τεν - - - - - - - - - - - - ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 [ . . . . ] δοτ[ - - - - - - - - - - - - ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the phrase ἔδοξεν τῆ βουλῆ καὶ τῶν δήμων falls into a proper place between τῶν προεδρῶν ἐπεφήφηζεν and ὁ δεῖνα εἶπεν. The decree was passed on the sixteenth
day of the eighth prytany. Perhaps the name in line 2 is 'Ελα[ντορκτον], for there is space enough to inscribe the name symmetrically above the text proper.¹

4. An Honorary Decree, 322/1 B.C.

Koehler published in I.G., II, 146, a small fragment, which he called Pentelic,² that has been republished several times, including the edition in I.G., II², 289. The stone must be attributed to I.G., II¹, 372 of the year 322/1 B.C., which is described as "marmoris Hymettii." Weather and environment, as every archaeologist knows, work wonders with the surfaces of marble, and fragments which join often possess totally different colors. In this case I.G., II², 289 has a brighter aspect than I.G.,

¹ In 346/5 B.C. (cf. I.G., II², 1443, lines 93-95) the Elaiousians honored Athens with a crown. Their good-will was further rewarded by Athens in 341/0, when the Demos granted Elaious terms comparable to those given to the Chersonesitai (I.G., II², 228). For their loyalty cf. Hesperia, VIII, 1939, no. 4; Demosthenes, XXIII, 158.

² Published also by Rangabé, Antiquités Helléniques, no. 544, and Pittakys, 'Εφ. 'Αρχ., 1853, no. 1984.
II², 372, as the photographs reveal (Figs. 3 and 4), but in every other respect the workmanship and style are identical. I have consequently reconstructed the following text:

\[\text{Fig. 3. No. 4, Fragment } a\]

\[\text{Fig. 4. No. 4, Fragment } b\]

\[a \ (I.G., \ II², \ 372)\]

\[322/1 \text{ B.C.} \quad \text{ΣΤΟΙΧ. 27}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[Επὶ \ Φιλοκλέους \ ἀρχοντος \ ἐπὶ τῆς]} & \\
[\.\.\. ντίδος ὣγ]δό[ης πρυτανείας ἤ] & \\
[Εὐθυγένης \ Ἡφ] αὐ[τὸς τοῦ Κηφεί] & \\
[εὖς ἐγραμμάτ]ε[νυς \ Ελαφηβοι] & \\
5 & \\
[σ ἑνάτη] ἐπὶ] δέκα, [ἐκτε τῆς πρωτα] & \\
[νείας \ έκκλησία \ [ἐν Διονύσου \ τῶν π] & \\
[προέδρων \ ε]] πεφήφ[ὐξε \ ... \ 10 \ \ldots] & \\
[\.\.\. .] \ \sigma \ εδοξ[εν \ τῶι δήμωι] \ \text{vacat} & \\
[Δημάδης] σ Δημέ [ον Παμφνεις έπεν] & \\
10 & \\
[ἐπειδή] \ \Lambda] νικο[\ldots \ldots .] & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[b \ (I.G., \ II², \ 289)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[\ldots \ldots 23 \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots] \ \text{ως} & \ \Sigma \\
[\ldots 9 \ldots \ \text{πρόξενον καὶ} \ \text{εὐ} \ \text{εργέτ} & \\
[\text{ην} \ \text{αὐτὸν καὶ} \ \text{τῶς} \ \text{ἐκγόνου}] \ \text{ς} \ \text{τοῦ} \ \text{δή} & \\
[\text{μου} \ \text{τοῦ} \ \text{Ἀθηναίων,} \" \ \text{εῖναι} & \\
\] & \\
\end{align*}
\]
EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

15 [ἐγκτησιν γῆς καὶ οἰκίας] s. vacat
[..........................] o. 'Α ζηνε
[νὺς εἶπε: τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθά] πε[ρ] τέα βο
[νλει, τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τ]ὴς βουλῆς
[ἀναγράψαι ἐν ἄκροπόλει] τοδε τὸ ψ
[ρῶν καὶ στήσαι τέλεσι τ]οῖς Νικα.[.]

For the restorations in lines 5-6 and the calendar character of the year, see Dinsmoor, Archons of Athens, pp. 373-374.

The restoration in line 15 is one letter short of the space available on the stone.

In line 16 the name Αμιστοφῶν Αμιστοφάνος Αζηνεύς can no longer be restored, for by the year 330 B.C. he had already died at an advanced age (Demosthenes, XVIII, 162; Aeschines, I, 158; schol. ad Aesch., I, 64). The restoration [ἐπειδὴ Α]υκο[––] in line 10 was made by Leonardos, 'Αρχ. Δελτ., 1916, p. 216 (= Ad-denda to I.G., II, 372, p. 660).

5. The Gorgoneion of Athena Parthenos.

Through the preservation of numerous fragments of the records of the Treasurers of Athena we are informed at various periods of the fourth century about the condition of the Athena Parthenos. The anxiety and strict watch over the statue is attributable to the forty-four talents of gold, which naturally attracted the eyes of thieves, whom even Athena does not seem to have deterred from filching part of her costly accoutrements. In fact, it is known that a certain Phileas dared steal the Gorgoneion.1 It was the duty of the Tamiai to examine the statue carefully, comparing the state of its various parts with the specifications inscribed on a bronze stele, and to present their report in this form:

[ἐν τ]ω Ἑκατονπέδῳ τὸ ἀγαλμα παρελάβομεν ἐντελές κα
[ἰ τ]ὴν ἀσπίδα κατὰ τὴν στήλην τὴν χαλκῆν.2

In the years 321/0 and 317/6 it was still intact,3 and remained so until it was stripped of its gold plates by Lachares in the early years of the third century.4

Aside from the references to it in the treasure-records and the literary allusions, there is further evidence about the statue in a fragmentary decree of 304/3 B.C. (I.G.,

---

1 See Dinsmoor, A.J.A., XXXVIII, 1934, p. 96.
3 I.G., II, 1468, lines 6-7; 1477, lines 9-13.
II\textsuperscript{a}, 482, lines 10-11), for the collocation of the words \textit{ἀγαλμα}[- and \textit{ἐ]κατομπε}[\delta–
can hardly fail to elicit comparison with the passages in the treasure records\textsuperscript{1}. Since
this allusion to the Athena Parthenos exists in a public decree, what is the sense of
the passage? I would associate with this passage the following official designation of
a committee chosen to supervise repairs on the Athena Nike (\textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{a}, 403, lines 6-8):
gά[λμα[το]ς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Νίκης \textit{ἐπισκευὴν} τοῦ ἀγά[λμα[το]ς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Νίκης \textit{ἐπισκευὴν} τοῦ ἀγά[λμα[το]ς Ἀθη
nᾶς τῆς Νίκης \textit{ἐπισκευὴν} τοῦ ἀγά[λμα[το]ς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Νίκης \textit{ἐπισκευὴν} τοῦ ἀγά[λμα[το]ς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Νίκης \textit{ἐπισκευὴν} τοῦ ἀ

The restorations are certain. Since the form of the designation \textit{οἱ ἐπισκευὴν} \textit{τοῦ ἀγάλμα[το]ς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Νίκης} is typical, and can be shown to be a parallel for the passage mentioning
the Athena Parthenos, I would restore on analogy with that official title the passage in
lines 9-12, as follows:

--- \textit{ἐν} \textit{ἐπισκευὴν} \textit{ἐπισκευὴν} \textit{τοῦ ἀγάλμα[το]ς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Νίκης} <

\textit{πειθή} \textit{οἱ ἐπὶ \textit{τῆς} ἐπισκευὴν} \textit{τοῦ \textit{ἀγάλμα[το]ς Ἀθη

\textit{τος} \textit{τοῦ ἀγάλμα[το]ς Ἀθηνᾶς \textit{τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἐπισκευὴν} \textit{κατομπε}

\textit{δῶ} \textit{Ḥημημένοι} \textit{ὑπὸ τοῦ δῆμου κτλ.}.]

According to this restoration the repairs concerned with the Athena Parthenos
occurred in 304/3, and were of sufficient importance to warrant the passing of a
decree. Unfortunately the rest of the decree is lost, and it may not, after all, have
described the nature of the repairs. The theft of the Gorgoneion again comes to
mind, for it was separated from its place on the shield (cf. \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{a}, 1388, B, lines
52-53: [\textit{γοργόνεον χρυσόν} \textit{ὑπάγων} \textit{ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἐπισκευὴν} \textit{ἀπὸ} \textit{τοῦ Ἐπισκευὴν} \textit{ἀπὸ} \textit{τοῦ} \textit{νεῶ\textit{}}]).\textsuperscript{2} If the
repairs are concerned only with the statue itself, it is a possibility that the Gorgoneion
and the sliver of gold mentioned in the treasure-records were replaced in their proper
positions. Their separation from Athena may perhaps have received attention from
Demetrios, now resident for the winter of 304/3 (the time of the decree) in the
Parthenon, and annoyed not to be able to see “his sister” in full regalia.\textsuperscript{3} The
restoration of these pieces to their former positions would have been a pleasing little
attention on the part of Demetrios to his colleague in the Temple.

\textbf{Eugene Schweigert}

\textsuperscript{1} Dinsmoor suspected without offering further proof that this passage referred to repairs on
the Athena Parthenos. See \textit{Archons of Athens}, p. 37, note 2; \textit{A.J.A.}, XXXVIII, 1934, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{2} The references are \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{a}, 1388; 1393, 35; 1400, 53; 1401, 38; 1415, 22-23; 1421, 22;
1425, 251; 1428, 145; another piece from the shield in \textit{I.G.}, II\textsuperscript{a}, 1423; 1425; 1428; 1429.
\textsuperscript{3} Plutarch, \textit{Demetrios}, 23-24.