NOTES ON ATTIC DECREES

I.G., I\(^2\), 1

Recent articles about “the earliest Attic decree” have brought new restorations and new interpretations to the text of the famous inscription which deals with affairs on the island of Salamis. A short discussion by Wilhelm \(^1\) has given a new text of the first two and one-half lines and has shown, in my opinion, that the versions of this document which appear in the Corpus and in Tod’s Greek Historical Inscriptions (no. 11) cannot be correct in either form or meaning. Kahrstedt \(^2\) also has raised compelling objections against the Corpus text, but in the matter of interpretation he has come to conclusions quite the opposite of those set forth by Wilhelm, and which Wilhelm makes no attempt to refute. The question at issue was whether the decree refers to the original inhabitants of the island of Salamis (restoring oikōntas at the end of line 1) or to Athenian klerouchs resident on Salamis (restoring klerōχos at the end of line 1). Wilhelm’s suggested wording for the opening clause is as follows:

`Εδοχεν τοι δήμοι· τὸς Ἐλαιαμίν ὑμῖν ὀικόντας
οἰκέν ἐὰν Σαλαμίνι καὶ τε\[

The part of this restoration which is new grew out of an observation made by Bannier \(^3\) that decrees not infrequently have a breaking down of a specification into several sentences in which the following repeats the verb of the preceding and adds a more exact specification, or that they show a development of the sentence through repetition of the verb and the addition of another verb with a co-ordinating conjunction. Hence Wilhelm restores τε\[ in line 2 to be repeated by the verb τε\[ in line 3, to which is added the more exact specification χυνύν Ἀθεναῖοι and the additional specification of the verb καὶ στρατ[ενεθ]αι. The most persuasive example which he cites in support of his restoration is to be found in the addendum (op. cit., pp. 96-97) where the following quotation is given from a decree of Cyrene: \(^4\) ἀπο-πέμπεν ἐς τὰν [Διβ]ὐαν Βάπτομ μὲν ἄρχαγέα νῳ τε καὶ βασιλῆα· ἔταίρους δὲ τῶν Θηραίων πλένε· ἐπὶ ταῖς ἱσα[ι κ] αἰ ταῖ οἱ ὀμοία πλέν κατὰ τὸν οἶκον.

\(^1\) Attische Urkunden IV, pp. 5-11 (Sitzb. Ak. Wien, 1939).
\(^2\) Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehöriige in Athen (1934), pp. 358-361.
\(^3\) Rh. Mus., LXVII, 1912, p. 522; ibid., LXIX, 1914, p. 494.
\(^4\) S.E.G., IX, no. 3, lines 26-28.
In spite of this the new suggestion must be rejected. If the clause states that those who dwell on Salamis are to be allowed to live and pay taxes there, according to Wilhelm’s interpretation, it is not an elaboration of this simple statement to say in the exephegetical clause that they are to pay taxes and serve in the army with the Athenians. The two clauses as they stand side by side are contradictory in that the first grants a privilege while the second imposes a restriction. If the verb τελέν means that the inhabitants of Salamis are to pay taxes with the Athenians, it ought not to be construed in both categories, and if one insists, as evidently Wilhelm must, that there is no paradox, then in the short terse phraseology of this early Attic decree the restoration which Wilhelm offers is a verbose and roundabout way of saying a very simple thing. One wonders why the verb τελέν was repeated when the scribe had already written enough to convey the supposed meaning: [τε]λέν [χρόνον 'Αθεναίοι]σι.

This objection to the asyndeton and to the repetition of the verb is equally valid if one were to restore κλερόχος instead of οἰκώντας in line 1, so we are forced to the conclusion that the new type of restoration suggested by Wilhelm has led to no positive result. Kahrstedt’s statement of the case against οἰκώντας in line 1 is of more importance. The arguments he advances have been unanswered and seem to me unanswerable, though it does not necessarily follow that the word to be restored must have been κλερόχος. I believe it much more satisfactory to assume that this decree defines the status of all Athenians living on Salamis, whether they had been sent as klerouchs or not, and that the restoration in line 1 should be Ἀθεναῖος.

The evidence for the sending of klerouchs to Salamis is ambiguous. Pindar’s second Nemean ode honors the victor Timodemos of Acharnai, and some of the scholiasts have tried to explain Pindar’s reference to his having been brought up on Salamis by saying that he was one of the Athenian klerouchs there. But there were other explanations, like that of Aristarchos, who attributed the references to Salamis to the supposed fact that Timodemos belonged to the tribe Aiantis. This was nothing more than an unhappy guess, for Acharnai belongs not to Aiantis but to Oineis. The scholion on line 19 should be read in full: Ἑπιτείται διὰ τὶ δῆποτε τὰ περὶ Σαλαμίνα εἰς τοὺς περὶ Τιμόθεμον λόγους προσήκεται. οὐ γὰρ δήπον Σαλαμίνας ἦν· ἀντικριν γὰρ αὐτὸν Ἀχαρνέα φησὶ τὸν δήμων. Ἀρισταρχος μὲν οὖν τῆς Αιαντίδος φυλῆς εἶναι, οὔκ ὀρθῶς· οἱ γὰρ Ἀχαρνεῖς τῆς Οικείδως φυλῆς εἰσιν. οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀσκληπιάδην φαιν ὅτι εἰκός ἔστων αὐτῷ εἶναι τῶν τῆς Σαλαμίνα κατακληροχησάντων Ἀθηναίων· εἰκός οὖν αὐτὸν γεννηθέντα Ἀθήνησι τεθράφθαι ἐν Σαλαμίνη.

The school of Asklepiades, like Aristarchos, seems to have been guessing, but the scholiast confirms that their view was a guess by reporting it after εἰκός ἔστων and εἰκός. Moreover, when he supposedly went to Salamis, Timodemos would seem himself to have been too young to be a klerouch in his own name: γεννηθέντα Ἀθήνησιν.

---

τεθράφθαι ἐν Σαλαμίνι; and the very fact that he was wealthy enough and prominent enough to win a victory that was celebrated by Pindar removes him from the class of citizen that was usually chosen for purposes of colonization.

It is our belief that Timodemos was not a klerouch, but an Athenian citizen whose family may have lived on Salamis, and where indeed he may himself have spent his youth, as the scholiast conjectures. So far as the scholion gives proof, our guess today may be just as valid as the guess of Asklepiades; and this leaves the direct evidence for the klerouchy very tenuous indeed.6

On the other hand it is reasonable to suppose that Athenian settlers did go to Salamis when the island was conquered and again when the island was finally adjudicated to Athens after the expulsion of the tyrants.7 Even so, there is no reason to suppose that the decree must deal with klerouchs alone. It must have been passed after the restoration of democracy at the end of the sixth century, and it is best interpreted as giving evidence of the way in which all Athenians on the island, old settlers as well as new, were to be incorporated in the structure of the Athenian state. They were to be guaranteed possession of their residences and property on the island; but inasmuch as the phrase οἰκέν ἕαν implies not only the guarantee of their residences but also the management of their own affairs, this grant of privilege was qualified with the provision that the Athenians on Salamis would have to pay taxes and serve in the army at Athens.

The logic of the context calls for an adversative particle between the first and second halves of the sentence. The letters -λεν in line 2, therefore, should be restored not as [τε]λέν but as [π]λέν. With the interpretation here given I propose the following restoration for these first two and one-half lines of the decree ending with the full stop of punctuation in the middle of the third line:8

This restoration is achieved with a stoichedon length of line of 35 letters, an arrangement which must be followed in the first six lines of the inscription. Wilhelm (op. cit., p. 8) has done well to call attention to the unhappy circumstance that many restorations proposed for this text have not yielded the same number of letters in

6 Beloch, Gr. Gesch., 12, 2, p. 314, seems to feel more confidence in the evidence of the scholiast, and Kahrstedt, who supplied κλερόχος in line 1 of I.G., 12, 1, calls Timodemos “wohl Sohn eines Kolonisten von c. 510.” Cf. Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen, p. 358.
8 A tip of the lambda is on the stone in τελέν in line 3. It is clearly visible in all the published photographs.
each of the first six lines. This introduces us to considerations of a purely physical nature with respect to which considerable advance has been made within recent years. Austin, in his book on Stoichedon Style (pp. 20-21 and 45), has made a careful study of this text, particularly of the first six lines of it, and has urged very strongly that restorations which do not yield the same length of line are very unlikely to be correct. One must therefore undertake to see that any restoration proposed conforms to the necessary requirements of the stoichedon pattern.

As is well known, the letters of the last six lines of this document are not stoichedon. Yet in spite of their apparently haphazard arrangement it is possible to observe a certain plan and order in their general disposition. This is a fact perhaps not quite so compelling as the rigorous pattern of stoichedon order but nevertheless a fact which must be taken into account when restorations are proposed. One can show, for example, that the verb ho[rXAle]v which appears in I.G., I², 1, in lines 10-11, is too short by three letter spaces to fill the amount of space available on the stone. The question of disposition which affects these latter lines can best be seen with reference to a reconstructed drawing. If one studies the dispositions shown in Fig. 1 he will note in a general way the following phenomenon: the first letters of all lines at the edge of the stone run through in a continuous column from top to bottom. The second letters of all lines form another column which runs continuously from top to bottom, though it swings slightly toward the right in the later lines and to a perfectionist seems somewhat straggly. It appears as if the stonecutter was reluctant to break away from the stoichedon order in the beginning of line 7 but that he was anxious to shift the letters toward the right so that the second letters of lines 7-12 might come below both the second and third letters of lines 1-6. It is a significant fact that the third letters of lines 7-12, if we may call the mark of punctuation in line 12 a letter, form a fairly vertical column beneath the fourth letters of lines 1-6. This progression is now continued across the face of the stone in such a fashion that one may trace continuous columns of letters from top to bottom if one will begin his column with those letters in any one of the following sequences of letter spaces: 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 13, etc. One will note with particular interest the perfection of the pattern as it appears in the column marked by the thirteenth letter space. This was noted by Austin (op. cit., p. 21), though without reference to the general disposition. If this scheme is carried across the face of the stone, the sequence of traceable columns will come to its conclusion with the following column numbers: 28, 31, 34, and 35. The normal length of line in the lower part of the inscription is thus determined as the equivalent

---

8 See also Cl. Phil., XXXIV, 1939, p. 384.
9 Right to left in the drawing. The monument was a tapering pillar with the lines of the inscription reading from top to bottom. For the sake of following the text we here refer to the top as the left side, the bottom as the right side, the right side as the top, and the left side as the bottom. See Wilhelm, Ath. Mitt., XXIII, 1898, pp. 466-467.
of twenty-four letter spaces. There is a possibility of variation with an excess of one letter in line 10, where I have ventured to restore δρ[αχμῶν]. The restoration I believe certain, and the excess of one letter is made necessary by comparison with restorations in lines immediately above. However, one will note that the initial letters of δρ[αχμῶν] are unusually close together and that the two letters which follow the word are also crowded. The excess of one letter space in this line which seems called for by the proposed restoration is confirmed by the actual disposition of the stone itself. One will note in the last line that there is a similar crowding in [ἐν]ὲ τές. Here the preceding mark of punctuation usurps one letter space, and the slight crowding compensates for this to make possible again a line of twenty-four letters.

Wilhelm has already observed that the mark of punctuation in line 3 must be taken as separating two distinct clauses of the inscription and he uses this observation as one of the arguments against a proposed restoration of Luria, which was adopted by Tod, where the mark of punctuation has no organic function. A similar observation may be made about the mark of punctuation in line 12. These triple dots do not belong midway within a single clause. On the contrary, they separate a clause which follows from one which precedes. The phrase, therefore, which begins in line 12 with [ἐν]ὲ τές β[ο]λῆ[ς] mu must stand alone and cannot be part of a sentence which has been traditionally read as ταυτ' ἐδοξώσχυσ[εν] : [ἐν]ὲ τές β[ο]λῆ[ς] με. I suggest for this last line the reading: [ἐν]ὲ τές β[ο]λῆ[ς] με ταυτ' ἐγνώσθεπ. It is not part of the decree, as is proved by the fact that it stands in asyndeton, not connected with what precedes by the particle δέ. It is merely a statement of record, and I believe it shows that the decree was brought up for discussion in the Demos as a probouleuma or γνώμη of the Council. Scholars have commented (e.g., Tod, op. cit., p. 14) on the absence of any mention of the Council in the opening formula of this decree. The interpretation here given of the last line supplies this deficiency, and we see already the familiar pattern of Athenian legislative machinery. The democracy was still young and one notes
merely that the phrase ἔδοξεν τεί βολέι καὶ τοῦ δῆμου, which we find in the fifth century, had not yet become the stereotyped method of expression in the opening lines of a decree.1

As already observed, a new provision of this decree begins after the mark of punctuation in line 3. The Athenians resident on Salamis are not to rent out certain property (?) except under certain conditions. It is very difficult to discover from the preserved letters how to make a restoration that will define with reasonable certainty what this property was and what these conditions were. I offer a text below by way of example. It is based upon the assumption that no Athenian of Salamis was to rent property on Salamis unless the lessees also lived there. It would be rash indeed to claim that this is the only interpretation that may be made for these lines. But whatever the provision, a penalty was attached (lines 4-7) for anyone who did rent his property in violation of the terms of this decree. These lines, down through line 6, are now restored with a uniform length of 35 letters.

Except for the irregularities already noted of an extra letter in line 10 and of assigning one space to the mark of punctuation in line 12, lines 7-12 should be restored with 24 letters each in order to give to them the same amount of space on the stone as that occupied by the first six lines. The provision in lines 9-10 is that the Athenians on Salamis shall provide their own arms to the value of thirty drachmai. Naturally this applied only to those who had the necessary property qualification to make them eligible. With the old restoration of lines 10-11, ho[πλιξε]ν δὲ [τὸ]ν ἄρχωντ[α], it was assumed that the archon supplied the arms because, supposedly, the recipients could not afford them themselves. Kahrstedt writes (op. cit., p. 360): Man konnte nicht warten, bis der neu angesetzte Bauer den Kaufpreis für die ἀπλα bar zurückgelegt hatte, und ihn so lange von der Wehrpflicht entbinden; der Mann hätte dann bloss sein Geld zu vertrinken brauchen, um von der Heerespflicht verschont zu bleiben: ein Preis auf schlechte Wirtschaft.

For purely physical reasons we have just seen that the restoration ho[πλιξε]ν is not permissible, so there is no evidence in any case for the archon furnishing the arms. But to suggest that a landowner would drink away his substance merely to avoid liability to furnish arms is a specious bit of special pleading which needs for its refutation only the reminder that the same might be said of the Athenians in Attica. Nor do I see any reason to suppose that all the Athenians on Salamis were “neu angesetzt,” and that they cannot, some of them at least, have had available capital with which to buy arms. The difficulty disappears when one assumes that many of them were probably of long residence on the island.

11 The use of τοῦτο ἔδοξεν τοῦ δῆμου in I.G., I², 3 and 4 of 485/4 B.C. is found in the postscripts and is by implication of its position a proof that the decrees came to the Demos as probouleumata. But even at this date it is apparent that the later phraseology had not become established.
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Instead of ho[πλύσε]ν I have restored in lines 10-11 the participle ho[πλυσμένο]ν, which fills the requirements of space in line 10, and I interpret the clause to mean that after the eligible Athenians had armed themselves the archon was to pass judgment on the arms which they provided.

This brings to a conclusion the body of the decree proper. The statement in the last line that the decree was formulated as a probouleuma in the Council has already been noted above. The entire text is as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{ἐδοξεν τὸι δέμοι. τὶς ἐΣ ἀλαμ[ἱν Ἀθηναῖος]} \\
oiκὲν ἐὰ Σαλαμῶν [αἰεὶ π]λὲν [ἥτι δεὶ Ἀθένε] \\
&σι τελέν καὶ στρατ[εύσθ]αι: τὶς ὁ δὲ Σαλαμῶν μ. \\
&ν δὲ μισθοὶ ἀποτί[νεν τὸ μοθόμενον καὶ τὸ μ.] \\
&ισθοῦτα λεκάτη[ρον τὸ τριπλάσιον τὸ μισθό] \\
&ἐς δεμῶσιο[ν: ἐσπράτεν δὲ τὸν ἃ] \\
&ριὰ[κ]οντα: δρ[αχμὼν:] ho[πλυσμένο] \\
&ν δὲ [τ]ὸ[ν ἄρχοντα τὰ ἡ[πλα κρύν] \\
\end{align*}\]

I.G., I\(^{2}\), 24

In Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,\(^{12}\) Robert Schlaifer has undertaken a new study of the first decree which refers to the priestess of Athena Nike. The text which he proposes reads as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{IG I\(^{2}\) 24} \\
&\text{in lapide supra coniuncto} \\
&[-,-,-, ἐγραμμάτευε] \\
&[-,-,-, ἐπηρτάνευε] \\
&\text{in lapide conservato} \\
&[ἐδοξεν τὲι βολὲι καὶ τὸ ]ι [δὲ]μο[ι, ... ] \\
&[.... ἐπεστάτε, Ηππόν]ικος ἐλπὲ· [τὲι] \\
&5 [῾Αθηναία ἑὶ Ὕ]περεαν ἥ ἄ[στ] \\
&[ἐχ ς ἀστόν ἐστι]ι (?) ἐχ ῧ Ἀθηναῖον ἑἐπ[σ]δ] \\
&[ν καθίστα]σθαι· κτλ.
\end{align*}\]

Appended to this text is an *apparatus criticus* which gives in compendious form something of the history of the document and the various readings and restorations proposed.

There has been some insistence lately on the desirability of publishing such an *apparatus* with the text of every inscription. In particular, L. Robert advocates even the inclusion of erroneous restorations, because one profits from the mistakes of his predecessors. For many inscriptions it would be obviously a waste of space to print all readings and restorations now known to be incorrect. This holds true, for example, of the many decrees from the archonship of Anaxikrates (307/6 B.C.) and for many of the fragments of the Athenian tribute-quota lists, though Schlaifer has himself insisted upon the desirability of an *apparatus criticus* even for the tribute-quota lists.

Some justification might be offered for a compendious apparatus of very simple texts, especially where earlier transcriptions have been published in inaccessible sources, or where the originals have been lost and cannot themselves now be studied. But it should be remembered that a student can derive profit from the mistakes of his predecessors only when he has some explanation of how the mistakes came to be made. This requires commentary which may serve to clarify the problems that have to be discussed. But more often it is necessary to refer to the original publications themselves and to follow with some care the line of argument set forth by each editor. The text of an inscription differs from the text of a classical author in that its prototype is usually available at least in photograph or squeeze, so that a demonstrably true text can frequently be established by applying sound principles of epigraphical study. Some of the difficulties and some of the shortcomings of the compendious *apparatus criticus* are so well illustrated in that offered by Schlaifer on *I.G.*, I², 24 that it seems worthwhile to make some further comment upon it.

As a note on line 4, Schlaifer gives \[\text{[\textit{hup}πον]}\] Körte; \[\Gamma\lambda\alpha\text{[\textit{υκoς]} West; and it will be observed that in the text proper he adopts Körte's restoration of the name \[\text{[\textit{Hup}πον]}\]κoς for the orator of the decree. There is no reference in the publication at our disposal to clarify the reasons for the divergent restorations made by Körte and West. One must perforce go to other publications to find the reasons that lay behind these two suggestions. The reference to Körte can be found by consulting the commentary in the *Corpus* on *I.G.*, I², 24; but the reference to West hangs completely in the air, and one would be at a loss to discover anything about it if he did not have information quite extraneous to that offered by Schlaifer's article. In point of fact,
W. B. Dinsmoor in 1924 noted the sloping stroke of an alpha before the preserved upright which Körte had read as the second iota in the name of Hipponikos. Only the lower part of this upright vertical stroke is preserved; so Dinsmoor restored it as an incomplete upsilon and read the resulting name as \( \Gamma\alpha\dot{\iota}\kappa\sigma\). In the summer of 1925 Allen West was in Athens with Dinsmoor. At this time Dinsmoor showed to West the traces of the name as he had read them, and West confirmed his interpretation. A note from West was communicated to Tod when he was preparing his edition of *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, and in his publication (p. 79) he reports: “Professor A. B. West informs me that the traces on the stone point to \( \Gamma\alpha\dot{\iota}\kappa\sigma\) as the proposer of the decree and rule out \( \iota\pi\pi\o\nu\)\( \kappa\sigma\).” It must be supposed that this is the source from which Schlaifer derived his knowledge of the reading \( \Gamma\alpha\dot{\iota}\kappa\sigma\), though in fact, in following the principle of *suum cuique*, it would now be correct to attribute the reading in line 4 to Dinsmoor rather than to West and to write the form not as Schlaifer has written it but with the alpha outside the brackets and indicated as doubtful or incomplete by a dot beneath it: \([\Gamma\alpha]\dot{\iota}\kappa\sigma\). In the meantime, the certainty that \( \iota\pi\pi\o\nu\)\( \kappa\sigma\) is a false restoration was also affirmed by Wade-Gery.\(^{16}\)

The difficulty of setting forth these facts in the compendious terminology of an *apparatus criticus* will be obvious to anyone and is further demonstrated by the fact that the note which Schlaifer does give does not represent the history of the reading at any time. So far as the restoration of the text itself is concerned, we note that Dinsmoor, West, and Wade-Gery, who have all seen the stone, declare the reading of the name Hipponikos to be impossible. Had Tod in his publication had full notes from West, undoubtedly he would have read \([\Gamma\alpha]\dot{\iota}\kappa\sigma\) instead of \([\Gamma\alpha\dot{\iota}\kappa\sigma]\), as the form now appears in his publication. The improved form is that which should be given in line 4, and the name of Hipponikos should be relegated to a footnote. In both cases the *apparatus criticus* in the traditional literary form is useless, and the history of the reading cannot be understood without an adequate commentary.\(^{17}\) Schlaifer may have made use of Tod’s commentary, though he makes no reference to Tod and has not profited by the implications of his discussion.

So much for line 4. In lines 5-6, there appears the phrase \( \text{he} \ \dot{a}\ [\sigma\tau\epsilon \ \epsilon\chi\varsigma \ \alpha\sigma\tau\omicron \ \dot{\epsilon}\omicron]\ (.?). This is now offered as a substitute for the reading of Kavvadhias: \( \text{he} \ \alpha\ [\nu \ \alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon \ \epsilon\chi\varsigma \ \alpha\sigma\tau\omicron \ \epsilon]\) or for that of Ziehen: \( \text{he} \ \alpha\ [\nu \ \delta\iota\alpha \ \beta\iota\omicron \ \h\i\epsilon\iota\varphi\alpha\tau\alpha]\). Against the restorations of his predecessors Schlaifer has advanced epigraphical arguments\(^{18}\) to show that the letter following the last alpha preserved in line 5 may have been iota, or possibly alpha, gamma, or delta. So much of the surface, however, is preserved that


\(^{17}\) Welter, in his discussion of the chronology of the Nike bastion (*Arch. Anz.*, 1939, p. 14), has also ignored the fact that the name Hipponikos must be abandoned. So also Arvanitopoulos, *Εγγραφική*, p. 62, and A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, III, p. 813, note 5.

one may not restore the letter nu.19 The same objection which Schlaifer offers against the traditional nu may also be offered with some probability against the sigma which he himself suggests, but the principal objection to his new restoration is linguistic rather than epigraphical and amounts simply to the fact that it is not good Greek. If this clause is final or serves to describe a definite person (usually with δοσις), a future indicative might be used; if it is generic, or if the modal force so common after an imperative in the leading clause is present, then ἄν with the subjunctive is necessary.20 It is impossible to make sense of it with a verb supplied in the present indicative.

But let us return to the epigraphical considerations. Granted that the stone is so well preserved after the final alpha of line 5 that the next letter cannot have been nu and probably was not sigma, one may restore it as gamma, the form being conditioned by the initial letter of the following word. Under these circumstances it is possible to read:

Γλαύκος εἶπε [τε]ι
[Ἄθεναις τε Νί]κει ἥλερεν ἥ [γ κο]
[νεὶ ἡμερεθεί]ν ἔξεις ἄθεναίον ἡπα[σό]ν
[ν καθίστα]σθαι.

Attention may be called to the fact that final nu before an initial kappa frequently changes to gamma,21 and if one objects that there are already instances in this inscription where the same combination occurs without change, it may further be observed that such change is by no means always uniform.22

This clause in the decree provides for an open election of a priestess for Athena Nike from the entire body of Athenian women. It is difficult to see how the Greek can be made to refer only to a change in method of election for an already existing priesthood, as Schlaifer (loc. cit., p. 259) would have us believe. It is true that few details are given, that even necessary details are omitted, but these may have been given elsewhere, possibly in the amendment which followed or in another decree. This fact should not prevent our translation of the proposal of Glaukos, and its interpretation, in the light of the Greek text that can be recovered on the stone. Schlaifer admits that “scholars have always thought that this text is the record of the creation of the priesthood of Athena Nike.” Rightly so. Of particular significance is the absence of the definite article with ἥλερεν. The Athenians were to elect a priestess, not make some change in the status of the priestess, i.e., in the status of a priestess whose

19 In view of this fact it is difficult to understand his affirmation (loc. cit., p. 259, note 3) that Ziehen’s restoration is “satisfactory epigraphically.”
22 See, for example, I.G., Ι2, 372, lines 41 and 44, and 67 and 68.
existence already could be postulated. This does not mean that the sanctuary of Athena Nike on the acropolis was without the services of a priestess before this decree was passed. The necessary functions were probably performed by the priestess of Athena par excellence, the priestess of Athena Polias. But by the provisions of this decree the reconditioned shrine of Athena Nike was to have a separate priestess of its own.

The preserved portion of I.G., I², 24 was surmounted by a separate stone. The two pieces were joined by the strongest form of splice or scarf-joint, sloping down toward the back. Dinsmoor has argued on architectural grounds that this joint is quite unsuited to receive the bottom moulding of an acroterion or relief. The upper stone, now lost, must have been an additional piece added on to increase the height of the stele and consequently there was room above the splice for lines of the inscription to be restored before the first line which appears in the lower fragment. In this first line of the lower fragment there are preserved parts of three letters which fall into proper position for the reading: [ἐδοκοσεν τεί βολεί και τὸ;] [δὲ] μο[...]. If this is correct, then the normal prescript could not have been recorded in its entirety on the lower portion of the stone; for two of the three clauses naming the prytany, the secretary, and the epistates would have to be omitted for lack of space. Schlaifer recognizes this irregularity and suggests that all elements necessary to the preamble of a decree can be accounted for if the prytany and the secretary were named on the upper stone. Since they could themselves hardly have occupied enough space to justify an upper stone, he assumes that there was also a relief there carved which presumably occupied most of the space. He attributes this “almost certainly correct answer” to Dow, though it should be noted that a similar suggestion had been previously and independently made by Tod. It is further clear that one of the items on the superimposed stone must have been the name of the prytany, for reference to Leontis in the body of the decree shows that this was the prytany in office when the decree was passed. Only in the ninth prytany of any year could the name of the following prytany be known in advance. So unless the prytany of this decree happened to be ninth in order within the year, Leontis must have been its name. Inasmuch as the formula [Δεορίς ἐπίτανε] cannot be restored in the lacuna at the top of the lower stone, it must have been one of the two items relegated to the upper fragment.

23 The significance of the article in implying previous existence has been noted in another connection by Meritt, Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps, p. 248.
24 The moneys of Athena Nike, even after this decree, continued to be stewarded by the same board of treasurers as the moneys of Athena Polias. See, for example, Meritt, Athenian Financial Documents, p. 93 (lines 18-19 and 21), p. 140 (line 51), and p. 143 (lines 116-117). Cf. Ferguson, Treasurers of Athena, p. 21, note 1.
26 Greek Historical Inscriptions, p. 79.
Schlaifer supports his argument for this disposition by noting that examples of the name of the secretary in this preliminary position are common and that the name of the prytany in a similar position is possible, though rare.28 He cites quite correctly *I.G.*, I², 78 as an example of the latter disposition. The two citations which he gives for the secretary are without probative value. Schlaifer has failed to observe that the text of *I.G.*, I¹, 22 (to which he refers) no longer names the secretary Eukles in the first line. The correct reading of this line has been given by Oliver as [Με]λεσϕι[οις χαρυγ]γρ[αφαί] in an article published by him in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LXVI, 1935, pp. 177-198, and more recently referred to in detail in *Epigraphica Attica*, pp. 49-53, and note 3. If one will glance at the text of *I.G.*, I², 31, which Schlaifer cites as another example for the preliminary position of the name of the secretary, he will realize how hazardous and unjustifiable it is to base any argument on the one single preserved letter of the first line of that inscription.²⁹

Nevertheless, many examples may be cited where the name of the secretary does appear in a conspicuous position before the opening formula of decree.³⁰ But the normal arrangement was for the name of the secretary to be repeated in the body of the inscription proper. So these examples do not afford exact parallels to the proposed arrangement of the present text. It would be so far a unique document if the name of the tribe in prytany and the name of the secretary were both to appear on a super-imposed piece of stone with neither one recurring in the preamble of the decree below.

The alternative can best be visualized if we remember Dinsmoor’s note on the architectural characteristics of the splice and the desirability of assuming that the face of the superimposed stone was available for inscription. There is also another physical characteristic here to be noted for the first time. The distance to be computed from the top of the first line of the lower fragment to the thin edge of the splice is only 0.003 m. This measurement has been provided by the kindness of McGregor from the marginalia of West’s copy of the *Corpus* and it is confirmed by Dinsmoor from his own notes.³¹ This amounts to exactly one-half of the normal interspace between lines, and the disposition suggests that the text ran continuously from the upper to the lower stone and that the lines were so calculated that the joint might evenly divide the interspace. Furthermore, the proximity to the joint of the first line

---

²⁹ This is especially true since the one letter (kappa) falls to the right of the preserved omicron in the line below.
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on this lower fragment makes it extremely improbable that the inscription was cut before the two stones were spliced together. The danger of breakage along the thin edge would have been considerable, when the letters were cut, if the upper piece was not already in position to sustain the impact of the chisel. From this consideration alone it appears that Schlaifer's thesis runs into serious difficulty when he suggests (loc. cit., p. 259) that one stonemcutter set to work on a sculptured relief and the names of the prytany and the secretary on one stone, while another cut the text of the inscription on the other stone. In such an event it must surely have been a more normal procedure to let one man do all the sculpture and the other do all the lettering; and in any case, if the two stones were worked separately, the beginning of text on the lower stone should have been at a greater distance from its top margin. Normally, in Attic inscriptions of the fifth century, the distance from the top margin to the first line of the text was greater than the interspace between lines, not less than the interspace as in this inscription, and this is true even though the normal stele has a rectangular top or protecting moulding and not the thin edge made by the acute angle of a scarf-joint.

Our conclusion must be that the two pieces of this stele were dowelled together before the inscription was cut, and the evidence of disposition indicates that the text ran continuously from the upper fragment to the lower. This implies that the main inscription was cut principally upon the upper fragment, now lost, and that the motion of Glaukos was an amendment to it. Under these circumstances the partially preserved letters which have been restored with the reading [τό] [δέ] [μοι] cannot belong to the sanction-formula; they must come, rather, from the concluding lines of the principal text before the amendment begins. Such a restoration is entirely possible and by way of example one may suggest for it the following wording:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[................. τόσ δέ πρυτάνες χρεμ]} \\
\text{[ἀπάσα περὶ τούτου ἐν τό] [δέ] [μοι ἐν τ]} \\
\text{[ἐι πρότει ἡδραι Ἕλ] ἀγκος ἐπε [· τε]}
\end{align*}
\]

etc.

This solution of the problem takes full account of the physical peculiarities of the stele itself and avoids an extraordinary preamble from which two essential elements have been relegated to a separate stone affixed above it. It must be remembered that the stele, consisting of upper and lower fragments firmly joined together, should be conceived as a unit even before the inscribing of the text. It was dealt with by the stonemcutter who cut the letters just as he would have dealt with any stele, with the exception that he so arranged his letters as not to have any of them fall upon the line of juncture between the two pieces. First he inscribed the main decree for which we now have only parts of three letters preserved. Then he inscribed the amendment proposed by Glaukos and finally he inscribed the amendment proposed
by Hestiaios. There must be some misunderstanding in Schlaifer's assertion (loc. cit., p. 258) that if I.G., I^2, 24 as we know it was an amendment it would have been cut on the back of the stone carrying the decree it was calculated to amend. Apparently Schlaifer in this part of his argument is attempting a new definition of the term “amendment.” It would be extraordinary to claim that amendments, as epigraphists commonly understand them, were cut on the back of their stelai.

The rider proposed by Glaukos is punctuated, according to the restoration proposed above, by one uninscribed letter space between the end of the first decree and the beginning of his name. The rider proposed by Hestiaios was punctuated as a new paragraph. For both devices there are parallels in the fifth-century inscriptions of Athens. There is apparently no other fifth-century inscription where both systems of punctuation were used in the same decree, but this is merely a matter of disposition and we have no assurance that a stonemason acquainted with both styles could not have used them both if it pleased him to do so. With the motions of Glaukos and Hestiaios both considered as amendments, it is now possible to assume that the formula of publication appeared in the lost decree of the upper stone. Its omission would have to be considered an irregularity if the motion of Glaukos is to be interpreted as the original decree. The following text of I.G., I^2, 24 is proposed in order to illustrate the arguments advanced in the preceding discussion:

I.G., I^2, 24

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 29

[ἐσαχθεν τεῖ βολεί καὶ τοὶ δέμοι· Λεό]
[ντίς ἐπρυτάνευ ... ......]
lacuna to the end of the upper stone
[ ...... ....... τὸς δὲ πρυτάνες χρημ]

[ἀπὸσω περὶ τούτον ἐν τῷ] 4 [δέμο] μο[ι ἐν τῷ]
5 [ἐν πρότει ἥδραι τῷ Γλ.] ἂν ὑσκος εἶπε [τῶρ]
[Ἀθηναίαι τεῖ Νί]κει ἡρέμαιν ἥ ἄ[γ γο]
[ν ἡρεθεί] 5 ἂν ἂθεναίον ἱπτα[σά]
[ν καθίστα] θαύμαι καὶ τὸ ἡνρόν θυρόσα
[ι καθότι ἄν Καλλικράτες χονγγράφο]

10 ἐν ἀπομαθθάσαι δὲ τὸς πολεμᾶς ἐπὶ τ

---

32 From inscriptions of about the same date, cf. I.G., I^2, 19, 58, 59, 70b, 70a + c (Wilhelm, Attische Urkunden IV, pp. 52-58, 71-72; see below, pp. 320-326), 94, 95, 118, and 148 for the letter space, and I.G., I^2, 39, 65, 76, 84, 139, 144, and 152 for the paragraph. It may be well to note here two corrections that should be made in the published texts: in I.G., I^2, 94, line 11, and in I.G., I^2, 118, line 26, there should be indicated in each case a blank space on the stone before the name of the orator. I.G., I^2, 70, fragment b, line 10 has been corrected by Wilhelm, Attische Urkunden IV, p. 54; see below, p. 322.

Wilhelm has now published a new text of *I.G., I², 27* and called attention once more to the chance that *I.G., I², 143* is related to it.\(^{34}\) The relationship depends partly on the names of men honored by the Athenians and their disposition on the stone and partly on the fact that the preambles of both decrees can be restored with the same tribe in prytany, the same secretary, and the same epistates. The orator also may have been the same, though no trace of his name is preserved in *I.G., I², 143*.\(^{35}\) Presumably, therefore, *I.G., I², 143*, which is later in date than *I.G., I², 27*, is a copy or a reaffirmation of the earlier decree.

For the sake of the record it may be well here to note that the brackets indicating restoration have not always been properly placed in the new text of *I.G., I², 143*. These can be controlled by the excellent photograph published by Wilhelm (op. cit.) and from the earlier published majuscules of the first editions.

---


\(^{35}\) Wilhelm’s latest text of *I.G., I², 27* is incorrect in showing four letters instead of three to be restored in the name of the epistates at the end of line 2. In his text, and in the *Corpus*, the letter after *ἐπε* in line 5 should be alpha, not nu. This appears clearly on my squeeze.
In lines 10-13 the text of the Corpus has been corrected by Wilhelm to read:

```
[elv ...] .av ... .

v tois [.................]

opas [................... eav de tis auton]
```

The use of dots which Wilhelm advocates to show the number of missing letters even in a long lacuna (op. cit., pp. 41-42) is not in the present instance correct, for they show here 26 letters in line 10, 25 letters in each of lines 11 and 12, and only in line 13 the correct number of 27 letters. One further correction in the Corpus text may be made, for part of a sigma is on the stone in line 12 to give the reading tois. The combination of letters in line 11 suggests very strongly a grant of freedom from military service, ateleiav σ [trepaeias, which would be quite appropriate as part of the inscription immediately preceding the better-preserved formulae which deal with the punishment of anyone who might cause the death of these proxenoi of the Athenians, and such an interpretation is made to seem even more reasonable by the appearance of the letters OPAX at the beginning of line 13. These should probably be expanded as ϕρ]opas. In the new text of I.G., I', 154 which Wilhelm publishes (op. cit., p. 33) we find for example the clause atel]leav elv [ai autov 'Atheveou; kai ϕ]opas kai [σtreueias. There is difficulty in the present instance of restoring the same wording of the formula, but that the clause deals in some way with a provision for exemption from military service seems nevertheless apparent. Taking into account the new reading in line 12 I suggest the following restoration:

```
10 [. . . . . . elvai de kai atelei]

[i]an σ [trepaeias autois kai ekqono]

v tois [prebpvatois aiei plen ϕρ]

opas [tēs heauton' ean de tis auton]
```
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If this reading is correct, the decree grants to the several men honored and to their oldest sons in perpetuity freedom from military service except for garrison duty in their own city.

The clause which begins here in line 13 with the words ἐὰν δὲ τίς αὐτῶν has been restored by Wilhelm to read: ἐὰν δὲ τίς αὐτῶν ἀποθάνει βιαῖος θανάτων ἐν τῶν πίθον. In the main this is surely correct, but Wilhelm allows it to be followed by an amendment for which he proposes the following text: [. . . .] ἵβολος εἰπέ· ἐναι δὲ αὐτοῦσι καὶ πρὸς οὗτοι πολίται. It is impossible to make the restoration in this way. If in fact the letters ΙΒΩΛ are to be taken as part of the name of an orator, then the first clause of his proposed amendment ought not to contain the particle δὲ. Even with δὲ the line is so short that αὐτοῖς has to be given the unusual spelling αὐτοὺς to make up the necessary 27 letters. Nor is it possible to compensate for the loss of δὲ by assuming a longer name for the orator. Part of an omicron is still preserved at the edge of the stone so that the letters in line 17 on which a reconstruction must be based are ΙΒΩΛΟ instead of ΙΒΩΛ. These preclude the possibility of writing any form such as [. . . .] ἵβολος δὲς for the orator’s name.

There can, I think, be no doubt that if this clause is interpreted as an amendment then δὲ must be omitted. It is appropriate only if the orator has prefaced his remarks with the conventional τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τέι βολεῖ, or some similar introductory phrase. The amendment of Hestiaios in I.G., I², 24 begins, for example: οἱ οἰκονομοὶ ἑπέ· τρῆς ἀνδρας ἑλέσθαι ἐγ βολές, and the amendment of Alkibiades in I.G., I², 116, again without the particle δὲ, begins as follows: καθὰ χιλιόμετρο Σκ[ατερία]οι πρὸς Ἀθηναίοις, κατὰ ταύτα ποιεῖ καὶ καταθέναι κτλ. There is in the published text of I.G., II², 55 a suggested restoration [. . . .] ἐπέν· ἐλέσθαι δὲ καὶ προσβείαν but this has no probative value and in principle it merely shows the same inaccuracy which we have already observed in Wilhelm’s proposal for the present inscription.

Here it is best not to try to restore an amendment and not to try to read the letters at the beginning of line 17 as part of the name of an orator. With a different division into words they can, and I believe should, be made part of the reading καὶ ἐὰν τῇ βόλον νταί. This can be expanded with a stoichedon line of 27 letters as part of the formula granting the men honored access to the Council and Demos in case they wish to seek any favor: καὶ ἐὰν τῇ βόλον νταί λαγχάνει παρὰ τὸ δέμο πρὸς οὗτοι εἰναι αὐτοῖς κτλ. This restoration necessitates the reading Ἀθηναῖοι instead of τοῖς πολίταις, as by Wilhelm, in line 16.

I.G., I², 45

Some improvements have been made by Wilhelm in the text of the decree concerning the colony at Brea. In lines 1-2 one is now able to read: [. . . .] he

---

56 Attische Urkunden IV, pp. 11-17 (Sitzb. Ak. Wien, 1939).
dé ἄρχει πρὸς ἡν ἕν ἄν ἅν ἅν Ῥ[νε][[νε] ἐγράφεσαι ἐοῖ]ἀγέτο, and Wilhelm has suggested for the sentence immediately following the restoration: εἰν δὲ ἐσάγει, ἐνέχ[να ἄχσια ? θέτο] ἰο ἐκάς ε ἰο ἐγραφάμενοι. This avoids the embarrassing assumption that had to be made under the old restoration, which need not be here repeated, to the effect that a magistrate who introduced a case into court was compelled to post surety by the man who laid the information or brought the charge.

Following immediately upon these provisions which involve some kind of court action, the next provision in the decree as restored in the Corpus reads as follows:

\[\pi\]([ήμινα]

\[\delta\] ἀἀγον αὐτοῖς παρασχόντον ἦν ἀπ[οικιστ]

5 [αὶ καλλ] ἰερέσατι ἱπτέρ τέλ ἀποκιάς [ἱπόσα] [ἀν αὐτο] ἦς δοκεί.

To this Wilhelm raises objection. One would not, he claims, offer for sacrifice herds of goats in some yet to be specified number, and he notes further the implication that the use of ποιμνον in this restoration presupposes that a herd had a more or less determinable number of goats, which in itself does not seem reasonable. His objections are directed against the restoration π[ήμινα] and in place of the Corpus readings of these lines he proposes the following text:

\[\pi<ρ>\]([βατα ἐ]

[ς θυσία]ν αὐτοῖς παρασχόντον ἦν ἀπ[οικιστ]

5 [αὶ καλλ] ἰερέσατι ἱπτέρ τέλ ἀποκιάς, [ἱπόσα] [ἀν αὐτο] ἦς δοκεί.

Citing examples in which the letter rho in words like πρόβατα has been omitted by the stonemender, he attempts to justify the omission here under influence from the rho in the preceding and following words γραφάμενοι and παρασχόντον. None the less, the omission remains an irregularity and it must cast doubt upon the validity of the restoration. A more serious difficulty is encountered in the asyndeton which Wilhelm must assume at the beginning of the sentence. In his restoration, the particle δὲ has been omitted. This omission, too, he attempts to justify by citing numerous examples of asyndeton in other Athenian decrees (op. cit., pp. 14-15). These supposed parallels do not have for the present case much probative value. One should justify asyndeton in a case of this kind not by citing occasional examples from other decrees, but by showing that the practice of the scribe who cut this particular inscription was to use asyndeton when the subject matter changed from one provision to another. In this decree concerning the colony at Brea the student will observe that the scribe invariably introduced each new provision with the particle δὲ, no matter how far removed from what preceded its subject matter may have been. The examples are all clear and may be read in lines 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 19, 20, 26, 29, 30, and 39.
It would be extraordinary to find the particle δὲ omitted in line 3, so extraordinary in fact that lack of room for it in Wilhelm’s restoration may be considered evidence that the restoration is not correct. The doubt first cast by the misspelling πό[βατα] for πρό[βατα] is confirmed by the absence of the connective. For the sake of example I suggest the following reading for these doubtful lines:  

πό[ρον δ΄ ἐ]

[ς θυσία]ν αὐτοῖς παρασχόντων ήοι ἀπο[ικότα]

5 [αἰ καλλ[ιερέσω]ίνια ἤπερ τέσ [ἀποικίας] [καθότι]

[ἀν αὔτο]ῖς δοκεῖ.

In this restoration the word πό[ρον] has been taken from Boeckh (loc. cit.) and the restoration [ἐς θυσία]ν from Wilhelm. One may inquire why the provision calls for furnishing “means for a sacrifice” and does not specify the particular victims and the number of them. As I have restored the final words of the sentence the assumption is that these details were to be determined by the ἀποικίσται to whom reference is made by [ἀὔτο]ῖς in line 6.

I.G., Ι, 49

In the Corpus three fragments are united as parts of one inscription under this number with comment in the introduction “composuit Wilhelm nec tamen edidit.” It has been known for some time that fragment c of this inscription belongs elsewhere as part of the constitution of restored democracy, I.G., Ι, 114, which must be dated in 410 B.C., and Wilhelm now dissociates the other two pieces, fragments a and b. He expresses surprise that they were brought together in the text of the Corpus supposedly according to his determinations but actually in contradiction to a reconstruction which he discovered and proclaimed as long ago as 1898. It is difficult for the student now to recover the substance of Wilhelm’s argument in 1898, for the reference which he gives to it merely states that on January 19 of that year he read a paper entitled “Zwei attische Inschriften (C.I.A. II 20. IV, I S. 23, 116 b.)” These two inscriptions are I.G., Ι, 55 and I.G., Ι, 49a. There is no reference to the substance of his discussion nor does Wilhelm give any further indication of it in his new publication except to say that the editors of the Corpus made restorations in contradiction to those earlier made by him.

37 The last visible letter on the stone in line 4 is omicron. This was read by Boeckh, Kleine Schriften, Vol. VI, p. 173, and plate IX. Part of it is still visible on my squeeze.
38 Attische Urkunden IV, pp. 48-52 (Sitzb. Ak. Wien, 1939).
The text of fragment a as Wilhelm restores it now lies before us, but it is still uncertain what disposition should be made of fragment b. In 1937 Schweigert published a new reading of this smaller piece,\(^{40}\) noting that its left margin is preserved and attempting a restoration showing fragments a and b in the relative positions which they have in the Corpus and which he believed to depend on unpublished notes of Wilhelm. Fragment b cannot be assigned to this position, yet Schweigert has made it clear from a new reading in its first line that it deals with Eretrians as does also fragment a. It seems probable, therefore, that both fragments a and b belong to the same inscription, though their relative disposition in the reconstructed text must remain uncertain. The net gain is Wilhelm’s new text of fragment a and Schweigert’s new readings and discovery of the margin on fragment b.

\(^{40}\) Hesperia, VI, 1937, pp. 322-323.

At last Wilhelm (op. cit., pp. 52-72) has published the new fragment of I.G., I\(^2\), 70 which he discovered in June of the year 1903. He points out that even as late as 1924 the previously known fragments of this inscription were published incorrectly by Hiller von Gärtringen in the position to which they had originally been assigned by Koehler in 1896, and that Bannier in 1927 made suggestions which are now definitely proved wrong by the evidence of the new fragment.

It must be regretted that so important a stone has had to wait so long since its discovery for even preliminary publication. The student must lament particularly the fact that Hiller, who was editing a volume of the Corpus destined to serve as a standard publication for a long time, could not feel free to use the discovery already twenty-one years old when his volume was published and so avoid the perpetuation of many errors. The notes in the Corpus refer to the discovery of the new piece by Wilhelm with the appended remark “qui novum fragmentum addet.” This promise is now belatedly fulfilled in the text at our disposal, which is published with the accompaniment of three excellent photographs on plates VI-VIII.

The letters of the inscription are beautifully cut, but the surface of the stone is not always well preserved and there is considerable difficulty in reading some of them, particularly near the edges of the original stele and at the top and bottom of fragment b. This fragment b can no longer be associated with fragment a as was assumed in the Corpus, but must be assigned to a position in the upper part of the stele. Wilhelm’s text of it appears in his new publication on page 54. I have several changes to make in the readings from this stone, for I made a careful study of the three fragments in Athens in 1927, and have my own transcript and good squeezes of them.

In line 4 Wilhelm reads: \(\text{\`e}pe\dot{a}[\alpha]\nu\ \text{h}e\text{ko\`}\iota\). The verb cannot be read in full, and I suspect that, in printing, an angular bracket to denote restoration has dropped out.
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after the second letter of it. From my own transcript and squeeze I read ἐπειδᾶν ἥ[---- , and I note that the final letters which Wilhelm gives without sign of restoration would in this line extend beyond the preserved edge of the stone. Of more importance in the establishment of the text is the reading in line 14, where an iota precedes the delta which Wilhelm restores as the initial letter of δ[ἐόνται]. This is represented in the text of the Corpus, line 27, as the bottom half of a vertical stroke, but enough of it is preserved so that it must be interpreted either as iota or tau. Inasmuch as tau is out of the question before delta, the letter must be read as iota. It is not possible to construe it as a normally shaped upsilon; so unless one wishes to attribute an error to the stonemason, he must here reject Wilhelm’s suggested restoration: ἡόταν [τοῦ] δ[ἐόνται]. There must in fact be a considerable change in the complexion of this whole sentence, lines 13-16, for which Wilhelm has made these restorations:

[..... προσαγαγό[ντον δὲ Ποταμόδορον καὶ τὸν ἥνι]
[ὁν Εὐρυτίωνα] ἡόταν [τοῦ] δ[ἐόνται παρὰ Ἀθεναίον ἦν οὐ]
[πρατεγοὶ καὶ] ἦν πρ[ντ]α[ν ἦν ἦν αἰεὶ ὀντες πρὸς τὲν β’]
[οἷν καὶ τὸν δὲ]μο[ν πρότος μετὰ τὰ ἱερά.]

In the last line two strokes of the nu are preserved in the word δὲ[μον] after which my transcript shows a complete epsilon. These readings are partially given in the text of I.G., Ι’, 70, line 29, and I feel so confident of the epsilon that I believe the restoration πρότως μετὰ τὰ ἱερὰ cannot be correct. Beneath the epsilon there is the upper part of a triangular letter like alpha, gamma, or delta in a line for which Wilhelm and his predecessors had no reading.

The objection which we have raised against reading ἡόταν [τοῦ] δ[ἐόνται] in line 14 by showing that the letter before the delta was iota and not upsilon is strengthened by the fact that in this inscription the genitive ending in οὐ is regularly written with simple ο. Even if the indefinite τοῦ were to be restored in this line it should be restored and written το. This does not fill the space of the stoichedon order and some substitute for it must be found. I suggest that the word is [ἐπ][δ[ἐμόσιν] and that it was followed probably by the adverb Ἀθένεσιν. The generals and the prytaneis were to bring Potamodoros and his son Eurytion before the Council and the Demos when they came and were living in Athens. The provision is one of general nature, so I suspect also the use of a present tense προσαγαγό[ντον instead of the aorist προσαγαγ[ντον in the opening line of the sentence. The general character of the provision is further emphasized by the fact that one may now restore ἦν αἰεὶ στρατευοἰ instead of ἦν στρατευοί. Inasmuch as the generals were annual officers, access to the Council and Demos was envisaged not only for the current year but for years to come, whenever they happened to be in Athens. The sentence may now conclude with the familiar formula ἐ[ἀν το δέονται παρ’ Ἀθεναίον, which
makes use of the preserved epsilon in the last line but one, and which should replace
the previously suggested πρῶτος μετὰ τὰ ἑιρά. Or the conditional phrase may intro-
duce a new sentence, for which the restoration can be carried over into the succeeding
line: ἐ[ἀν δὲ τὸ δέονται ἐναι αὐτοῖς εὑρέσθαι ἀγαθὸν ἥ,τι] ἀ[ν τῶν δύνονται κτλ.

The first provision of the amendment made by Archestratos has been restored
to show that Potamodoros should have right of possession and freedom from taxes
in Athens: ἐναι δὲ [Ποταμόδοροι καὶ ἐγκτεσὶν Ἀθηναῖς καὶ] ἀτέλε[ιαν] ἕ[ος εὐφρέτεαι
γενομένοι Ἀθηναίοις. In such provisions when right of possession was granted it was
custonary to specify what it was that the beneficiary should have the right to possess,41
and it was also frequently specified to what taxes the exemption was specifically
applicable. There is no provision for either of these restrictive definitions in the
restoration above suggested. Rather, we find once again the statement of motive
(Willhelm, op. cit., p. 56) which must have been amply treated in the decree proper
to which the motion of Archestratos was a mere amendment. I suggest, therefore,
that the lines in question should be read: ἐναι δὲ [Ποταμόδοροι γές ἐγκτεσὶν Ἀθηναῖς
καὶ] ἀτέλε[ιαν] ἕ[ος ὀσονπερ καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοῖς εὐφρέτεαις;] and that the following text should
be proposed for fragment 5: 42

[... ] 41 See, for example, the index in Dittenberger, S.I.G.3, IV, p. 302.
42 To avoid confusion I retain Wilhelm’s numbering of the lines though I believe it extremely
unlikely that any sure stroke of a letter can be read in line 1.
To avoid too great separation of the texts I give here a transcript of fragments a and c with continuous numbering of the lines. The changes in restoration from those proposed by Wilhelm (op. cit., pp. 57-58) are discussed later.

In line 21 begins the formula of a new decree which was passed in the prytany of Akamantis of the year 424/3. This decree gives a vote of praise to Potamodoro...
and his son Eurytion and directs that the kolakretai of the prytany of Akamantis shall give to Potamodoros 500 drachmai. The restoration according to Wilhelm reads as follows:

\[ \text{Katovat} \text{ho} \text{Trautos} \text{o} \text{Potamodoros} \text{500 drachmai.} \]

The prytaneis are then instructed to see that the kolakretai give the money to him. This part of the decree is followed by the clause \( \tau\alpha\nu\tau \mu\varepsilon \nu \tau\varepsilon \mu \beta\omicron [\lambda\varepsilon \nu \phi\sigma\epsilon\phi\iota\sigma] \\alpha\omicron\theta\omicron\alpha \), which Wilhelm notes (op. cit., pp. 66 and 71) as dividing the decree of the Council proper (lines 24-30) from the subsequent provision of lines 30-40, which was moved by the orator Hermodoros.

It must be admitted that the decree as it exists has a form which is quite exceptional. The phrase \( \tau\alpha\nu\tau \mu\varepsilon \nu \tau\varepsilon \mu \beta\omicron [\lambda\varepsilon \nu \phi\sigma\epsilon\phi\iota\sigma] \\alpha\omicron\theta\omicron\alpha \) is not a historical record which indicates that the preceding provisions were a decree of the Council and that those which follow were not. The use of the infinitive here implies that a motion was being made that the Council should pass the provisions just outlined. Inasmuch as Hermodoros (lines 23-24) is given credit for the probouleuma of the Council, we may assume that the exceptional clause was part of the motion as he offered it on the floor of that body. He then proceeded with his own addition to the probouleuma, modifying it so that it had, when finally passed in the Council, the form which appears in our inscription. We are seldom able to follow in the preserved texts the course of the debates in the Council chamber, but in this instance one should understand that the provisions of lines 24-30 were originally put forward by someone whose name is no longer preserved to us. They were taken over by Hermodoros and, in his opening remarks as he addressed the Council, approved by him with the recommendation that the Council ratify them. He then proceeded with his own additions to the probouleuma (lines 30-40).

It was a complete probouleuma (lines 24-40) as thus amended which was brought to the Assembly for ratification by the people. The unity of the probouleuma is further attested by the formula employed in the first amendment offered in the Assembly (lines 40-41) \( \'\alpha\rho\chi\varepsilon\sigma\tau\rho[a] \tau\omicron\varepsilon \pi [e \cdot \tau\alpha \mu\varepsilon \nu \\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{a}p\epsilon\tau \tau\acute{e} \beta\omicron\lambda\acute{e}\iota] \). Presumably subsequent amendments, if there were any, should have been introduced with the usual formula \( \tau\alpha \mu\varepsilon \nu \\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{a}p\epsilon\tau—\text{nomen}—\), giving the name of the man who had proposed the preceding amendment. This is one justifiable reason for not restoring a formula of amendment before the words \( \tau\acute{e} \beta\omicron\lambda\acute{e}\iota \) in line 45.

Wilhelm’s restoration \( \epsilon\nu \tau [\epsilon\iota\delta\varepsilon \tau\acute{e}i] \ \epsilon\acute{e}\rho\acute{e}r\alphai \) in line 28 implies that the probouleuma was to be acted upon in the Assembly on the same day that it was passed by the Council, for otherwise its provisions could not have been carried out with the sanction of the Demos “on this very day.” If we may suppose for a moment that the probouleuma

\[ \text{Katovat} \text{ho} \text{Trautos} \text{o} \text{Potamodoros} \text{500 drachmai.} \]

Akamantis in the passage cited, but formal proof that Akamantis was the eighth prytany was given by Meritt, The Athenian Calendar, pp. 87-88. See the text of I.G., I², 324 as published in his Athenian Financial Documents, p. 139, line 33.
was passed in the morning and ratified by the Assembly in the afternoon and that before evening the kolakretai were to give five hundred drachmai to Potamodoros, it would seem unnecessary to specify that these kolakretai were to be the kolakretai of the prytany of Akamantis. With the assumption of payment \( \text{ἐν τῷ εἰδέ τῇ} \) \( \text{ἐμέραι} \) there could be no possible ambiguity as to the identity of the board of kolakretai and consequently no reason for defining them as \( \text{τὸς κολακρέτῳ τῷ ἔπὶ τῆς Ἀκαμάντειδος} \). The fact that they are so defined indicates the intention of the probouleuma to guarantee that its provisions should be carried out before the end of the prytany. But it indicates also that there was envisaged the delay of a day or perhaps more before the probouleuma could be ratified by the Assembly. This is not surprising in view of the fact that the Council met every day, save for certain exceptions, while the Assembly had regularly only four meetings during a prytany (Aristotle, 'Αθ. Πολ., 43, 3).

I suggest in place of the restoration \( \text{ἐν τῷ εἰδέ τῇ} \) \( \text{ἐμέραι} \) that one should read \( \text{ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ} \) \( \text{ἐμέραι} \). The first clause of the decree provides that a vote of praise shall be given to Potamodoros and to his son Eurytion. At the time when the Council was deliberating this provision as a part of its probouleuma the actual date upon which the provision was to be ratified by the Demos lay somewhere in the future; and the phrase \( \text{ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ} \) \( \text{ἐμέραι} \) as used in connection with the grant of money means that the grant was to be made on the same day that the vote of praise was ratified by the Demos.

Lines 30-32 were restored by Wilhelm as follows:

\[
\text{ἐὰν δὲ τὸ δὲ}
\]
\[
[ε]ταῦ Ποταμοδόρος ἥ Ε[ὑρντίον (ἐ Ἑὑρυτίον)] ὡς ἱνὸς αὐ[τ]όν.
\]
\[
\]

Here it is assumed that the name of the son Eurytion was accidentally inscribed twice by the stonecutter. This is a very unlikely assumption, particularly so since Wilhelm must assume the Ionic use of \( \text{ἡ} \) instead of Attic \( \text{ἐ} \) on that part of the stone which is preserved in line 31. This is an inscription without any other example of Ionicism, and it would be better here where the interpretation is doubtful to restrict one's suggestions to the evidence offered by the stone. The letters near the middle of line 31 cannot be restored to read \( \text{ἡ Ε[ὑρντίον] ---} \); they must be restored as part of some word beginning with a rough breathing, like \( \text{ἥ[---]} \). The precise phrase may be doubtful, but I suggest \( \text{ἥ[ος ἄν ζεῖ]} \) as fulfilling the necessary epigraphical requirements. The implication must be that Potamodoros at the time of this decree was already well advanced in years, an implication which is borne out by the fact that his son Eurytion was named before him in the amendment of Archestratos (line 41), perhaps because Eurytion was already factually the head of the house (see Wilhelm, op. cit., pp. 69-70).
The changes which I have introduced into the text of lines 34-40 are of minor importance and do not change the general sense of Wilhelm's restorations. The supplements in these lines are admittedly difficult to make. I regard the genitive τὸ [χρέος? τὸ ἐν τοῖς πρώσθε] ν χρόνοι ἐγ[γενε]μένο of lines 35-36 as a partitive genitive depending upon ἀποδώναι, and I believe that some form of this verb should be repeated in line 38.

In line 43 Wilhelm has restored ἱεκάσστοι with doubling of sigma in order to comply with the necessary stoichedon arrangement of the letters, and at the beginning of line 44 he reads the letters [ . ]στ without restoration. I have recorded these letters in line 44 in my own transcript as [ . ]στ———, and I believe that they should be restored as part of the word [ἐκά]στ[οι]. This word will, therefore, not be restored also in line 43, so I suggest there in place of the anomalous reading ἱεκάσστοι the phrase ἐκ δεμοσίο. The last preserved letter of the inscription (line 48) is clearly either upsilon or chi, not alpha.

I.G., I², 83

The restoration of this inscription which has now been given by Wilhelm (op. cit., p. 79) is undoubtedly correct in principle and even in much of its phraseology. His text for lines 15-25 reads as follows:

[..............................20..............................] 
[.............................19..................... ἀναγράφσαι] δὲ καὶ
[πρόξενον καὶ εὑρήγετεν Ἀθέναιον] ἐν στέλ-
[εὶ λήθεί καὶ θέναι ἐμ πόλει τῶν] γραμματ-
[ἐὰν τῶν τέως βολῆς. ............] εἴπετε. τὰ μ-

[ἐν ἀλλὰ καθάπερ τεί βολῆι. ἐναὶ δὲ Π]ολυστρ-
[ἀτοὶ ὡς ὄντι προχάσενοι (οder: εὑρήγετε?) τὸ
δέμο τὸ] Ἀθεναῖο-

[ν ἐὰν βόλεται καὶ γέες καὶ οἰκίας ἐγ]κεσε Ἂ-
[θένεσιν, εὑρέσθαι δὲ καὶ ἀλλο ἥτο] ὁ ἄν δέτα-
[i ἄγαθον. συνεπιμέλεσθαι δ' αὐτόν? τ]οῖς σ]τρ-
[ατεγοῖς? κτλ.]

The necessity for assuming an Ionic spelling πρόξενον instead of προχάσενον in line 17 makes one wonder whether the readings should not in fact be given throughout with a length of line longer by one letter than that which Wilhelm employs. His line which seems to call more than all others for only 34 letters is line 22, where, however, he admits that the restored phrase ἐὰν βόλεται has no parallel. It implies as Wilhelm suggests that Polystratos might have the privilege of possessing land and a house in Athens if he wished it, or if he asked for it, and Wilhelm cites an example of later date, I.G., Π², 907, line 7, to show the phraseology sometimes used with reference
NOTES ON ATTIC DECREES

I.G., Ιν, 116

This inscription contains an amendment by Alkibiades, one of the provisions of which is that the Selymbrians shall pay the expense of erecting the stele on which their treaty with the Athenians was to be made public (lines 27-32): ['Αλ]κβ[ιάδ]’ές είπε, καθ’ θυσινέθεντο Σε[λυμ]’β[ριαν]’οι πρ[ός 'Αθ]’εναίος, κατά ταύτα ποιέω, καὶ καταθεναι ἐ[μ]παθικαί [ὅ]λον τὸ [θέ]νασιν, θεράσας δὲ καὶ ἅλλο ὅτο ἀν ἀνέτα[ν ἅγαθον παρὰ τὸ δέμο ἀποφαίνοντα τ] ’αι σ[τρατεύοι κτλ. Ε]πιμελέσθην δὲ αὐτὸ ἦν οἱ οἵτ[ιν]’εσ τρατεύοι κτλ., but there is too little preserved to say how or where this provision appeared on the stone.

No restorations have been made for the fragmentary upper lines of the document. Following Wilhelm’s example I begin the text here with line 15:

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 35

15 .......................... 30
[.............] οντο
[.............] αναγραφαὶ [δὲ καὶ]
[πρόχειραν καὶ ευθυγέτου ’Αθεναίον] ἐν στέλ[
[εἰ λαθίνει καὶ θείναι ἐμ πόλει τὸν] γραμματ[
[ἐὰν τὸν τέσσερις bolēs ............] εἰπε· τὰ μ

20 [ἐν ἅλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολαί]· εἰναι δὲ Π]ολυστρό[
[ἄτοι λος ὅτι προχέιροι τὸ δέμο τὸ] ’Αθεναῖο[ν]
[ν αἰτεσαμενο] καὶ γές καὶ οἰκιάς έγκτειν ’Α[θένασιν, θεράσας δὲ καὶ ἅλλο ὅτο ἀν δέτα[
[i ἅγαθον παρὰ τὸ δέμο ἀποφαίνοντα τ] ’αι σ[τρατεύο]

25 [στρατεύοις] ε[.....]...........ε[τεδε']

Wilhelm has suggested (op. cit., p. 89) that the lacuna of 18 letters in the foregoing restoration be filled by the supplement καὶ τὸν Σελυμβριανόν thus giving a closer antecedent for αὐτὸ[ν] in τέλεσι τοῖς αὐτὸ[ν] to refer to than would be the case if it had to refer back to Σε[λυμ]’β[ριαν]’οι at the beginning of the sentence.
There are several notes to be made on this text, the first being that the lacuna is by no means determined as exactly 18 letters. This part of the inscription is not stoichedon, and actually the lacuna here in question is the equivalent of 18 letters in the line above it while it corresponds to only 17 letters in the line below it.

The second observation is that the letters still preserved on the stone are not correctly shown in the Corpus text because of incorrect use of brackets. One should read τόστ[ρ]ατεγός τὰς συνθέ[κ]ας instead of τόστ[ρατεγός τ]ὰς συνθέ[κ]ας and τ[ὲς] βολές instead of τ[ὲς βολές]. The letters indicated are all clearly legible today and appear on the squeeze in Princeton.44

The third observation is that the supposed lacuna of 17 or 18 letters after τ[ὲς] βολές is an erasure.45

Hence the text of this part of the inscription upon which an interpretation can be based should be read as follows:

--- [’Αλ]κιβ[ιάδε]ς ἐπεὶ καθὰ χυσώθεντο Σε
[λυμ]βριανοῦ οἱ πρ[ὸς Σθ]εναι, κατὰ ταῦτα ποιεῖν,
καὶ καταθέναι ἐ[μ]πολ[εὶ ἀναγράφοντας τόστ
30 [ρ]ατεγός τὰς συνθέ[κ]ας μετὰ τὸ γραμματέος τ
[ὲς] βολές [--- 17 or 18 ---] ἐν στέλει λιθὰ

There being here no question of erasure because of damnatio memoriae, the normal explanation is that the stonecutter inscribed something by mistake which he later decided to expunge. But if this is true the supplement can hardly be καὶ τὸν Σελυμβριανὸν as Wilhelm has suggested. Rather, there should be no supplement at all, and the text as now read, corrected in antiquity by the engraver, gives the complete version of this provision of the amendment.

I suggest that the erasure may have contained the words καὶ τὸ φιλέψμα τόδε (17 letters), which were repeated in line 32. If this was so then the engraver corrected the duplication by erasing one of the phrases. The awkward position which the preserved phrase [κ]αὶ τὸ φιλέψμα τόδε now has at the end of the sentence indicates that even in making the correction the wrong set of words was erased, and that the original text may have been intended as: καὶ καταθέναι ἐμπολεὶ ἀναγράφοντας τὸ στρατεγός τὰς συνθέκας μετὰ τὸ γραμματέος τὲς βολὲς καὶ τὸ φιλέψμα τόδε ἐν στέλει λιθηί τοῖς αὐτὸν.

I.G., Ἰ, 144

In commenting upon the text of I.G., Ἰ, 28 as it now appears in the Corpus, Wilhelm has again reminded us that fragments α and β do not belong to the same

44 Michel, Recueil, 1437, has an almost correct reading.
45 Noted also by Michel, Recueil, Suppl., p. 11, and Tod, Greek Historical Inscriptions, p. 219. Tod also notes that the erasure is one of 17 or 18 letters.
NOTES ON ATTIC DECREES

He offers many improved restorations of both fragments, that of *a* having a length of line of 28 letters, and that of *b* having a length of line of 33 letters.

Some of the phraseology of *I.G.* 1, 28a is much the same as that of *I.G.* 1, 144, fragment *c*, which I have recently united with *I.G.* 1, 155 and with a new fragment from the Athenian Agora in the publication of the text in *Hesperia*, VIII, 1939, no. 22. Wilhelm makes two additions to this text, reading τὸν δὲ[έ] at the beginning of line 13 (*op. cit.*, p. 35) instead of τῶν δ[, and reading ἄνυτον λ[αγχάνεω] at the beginning of line 22 instead of ἄνυτον λ[άγχανέτο]. These readings do not appear on the photograph published in *Hesperia*, loc. cit., p. 68, and I should hesitate to claim them as certain from my examination of a squeeze. However, Wilhelm has made these notes after examination of the stone, and I believe that his readings should be accepted and used in any attempted reconstruction. My published restoration of lines 21-24 read as follows:

\[
\text{[ἐὰν δὲ τις ἀδίκε]} \\
\text{[ι ἄ]}\text{τότον λ[αγχάνεω ᾿Ἀθένεων πρός]} \\
\text{[τρ]όμ πολέ[μαρχον τάς δίκας ἀνευ πρ]} \\
\text{ντανείο[ν].}
\]

For this Wilhelm substitutes the following proposal (*op. cit.*, p. 20):

\[
\text{[κατά]} \\
\text{[τρ]ότον λ[αγχάνεων τάς δίκας πρός]} \\
\text{[τρ]όμ πολέ[μαρχον ἀνευ πρ]} \\
\text{ντανείο[ν καὶ ἐπιδεκάτων ?]}
\]

Surely the precise form of this restoration cannot be correct, for the required length of line of 27 letters is obtained in line 22 only by inserting an iota into the infinitive ending of λ[αγχάνεω], and something has dropped out of the text in line 23 where Wilhelm's restoration shows only 19 letters. Possibly he intended to insert here the locative ᾿Ἀθένεων which he has removed from the previous line, as I had published it, to make room for τάς δίκας. It seems to me to make very little difference in which of the two lines respectively these two phrases go, but I believe that the stoichedon order requires the use of both of them and that it would be better satisfied by the retention of an imperative form λ[αγχάνεω] in line 22.

These lines from 13 down to 24 may, I think, be still further improved. The letters that can be read on the stone have been fairly well deciphered with the exception of those in line 21 where the fracture between the two fragments occurs. Here, in 1939, I read ὑοτ[α], but repeated examination of my squeeze and photograph convinces me that the letters may equally well be ετο[. . .]ν. One may exercise

a control in some measure over this reading by referring to the photograph in *Hesperia*, VIII, 1939, p. 68.

I adopt Wilhelm’s readings for lines 13-14 but make some changes and additions in the following lines to give a new text of lines 13-24:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau\nu\ \delta[\varepsilon \ \alphaποκτείναντα \ \ενξέψθαι \ \tau]\quad &\quad \iota\varsigma \ \piολί[\varepsilonν \ τον \ πόλεον \ προείρ]\nonumber \\
\omicron\sigma \ \alpha\varsigma[\tauοῖς \ \hαπέρ \ \hυπέρ \ \'\Lambdaθεναίον] &\quad 20 \ \etaται \ \cdot \ \eta\lambda[\nu \ \deltaε \ \αδυκεί \ \tauις \ \varepsilon \ '\Lambdaθεναίον] \\
\epsilonφσεφ[\ισταί \ \varepsilon\ν \ τις \ \αποθάνει \ \betaια] &\quad \varepsilon \ \tauο[\upsilon \ \sigma\varsigma][\mu\muάχων \ \tauον \ '\Lambdaθεναίον \ \kατά] \\
\iota\omicron \ \thetaαν[\ατοί· \ τέν \ \deltaε \ \τιμορίαι \ \kατά] &\quad [\tau] \ ούτον \ \lambda[\alphaγχανέτο \ '\ Αθένεσιν \ \pρός] \\
\tauο \ \αυτό [\έναι \ \varepsilon\ν \ τις \ \δέσει \ \varepsilon \ \απάγε] &\quad [\tau] \ \upsilon \ \piολέ[\mu\arχον \ τάς \ \δίκας \ \ανευ \ \pi\rho] \\
\iota \ \Pi\upsilon\chi\sigma[\epsilonνίδεν \ \hέπερ \ '\Lambdaθεναίον \ \tauο] &\quad \upsilon\tauανείο[\upsilon]. \ \text{etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

The remainder of the text, including that of an upper separate group of fragments, may be found in *Hesperia, loc. cit.*, pp. 65-67. I do not accept Wilhelm’s suggestion \[\kαι \ \επιδεκάτων?\] for line 24.

\[I.G., \ I^{2}, \ 154\]

Wilhelm has now placed at our disposal a much improved text of this inscription (op. cit., p. 33), but some change for the better may still be made in its concluding lines.

As published in the *Corpus* the last three lines read:

\[
[. . . . . .] \ \hόθεμ βό[\lambdaοιται \ \upsilon \ \tauον \ \deltaε \ \gamma] \\
[\rhoαμματ]\epsilonα \ \tauές \ \ [\betaολές \ \αναγράφατε \ \epsilon] \\
[στέλει \ \lambda] \ \iota\upsilon[\epsilonι \ \-- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \ -- \--
in the majuscule text of the earlier publication in I.G., I, Suppl., p. 23, no. 116 a. It is incorrect either to enclose it in brackets or to write it in the transcript as a certain epsilon. It may equally well have been tau, an identification which I believe is now confirmed by the photograph published by Wilhelm (op. cit., plate III).47 This line contains the phrase οἱ δὲ πρυτάνες μὲν τὰ τέσ [βολὲς] and makes no reference to the secretary. Examples which show the prytaneis acting as a part of the Council and yet with the Council are known from I.G., I², 91, lines 9-11: ἀποδότων [δὲ τὰ] χρήματα ἦνι πρυτάνες μετὰ τέσ βολὲς καὶ ἑξασελεφύτων ἐπεὶ [δᾶν] ἀποδότων, and from I.G., I², 65, where the text as read by Meritt, Documents on Athenian Tribute, p. 28, lines 52-54, is as follows: τὸς δὲ κέ[ρυκας ἡσοῦ ἄν τιν]ὲς [ὁ] σε ἄν ἴν πρυτάνες με[τὰ τέσ βολὲς ἠλοντα]τι πέμψατε ἐς τὰς πόλεις. The new restoration, moreover, has the added advantage of eliminating the uninscribed space of two letters which had to be assumed in this line of I.G., I², 154 in earlier versions. I read and restore:

\[ [αἰ. οἱ δὲ πρυτάνες μὲν τὰ τέσ [βολὲς h] [ἐλέσθον τρές ἄνδρας] ἤνι ᾧ [ν — — —]. \]

I suggest here a provision for the selection of a special committee of three who were to carry out an assignment the precise nature of which we do not know. For the number three, see I.G., I², 24, lines 16-17: τρές ἄνδρας ἠλεόσθαι ἐν βολὲς, and I.G., I², 39, lines 64-67: τὰ δὲ ἀνειρὰ τὰ ἐκ τὸν χρεσμὸν ἢπερ Ἑὐβοῖας θὔσαι ὁς τάχυστα μετὰ ἀνερκλεός τρές ἄνδρας ἠδὸν ἄν ἐλεται ἢ καὶ βολὲς σφὸν αὐτῶν.

I.G., I², 156

Since Schweigert published in Hesperia (VII, 1938, pp. 269-270) a new fragment of this inscription it has been clear that the text can best be restored with a stoichedon line of 42 letters. Wilhelm (op. cit., pp. 83-87) has made some improvements in the restorations as offered by Schweigert and by Hiller von Gärtringen. I believe it possible to make one further improvement which depends on a different reading of one of the letters preserved near the right edge of the Corpus fragment. A vertical stroke in line 2 of I.G., I², 156 has been interpreted as iota so that Hiller’s reading gives εἰ[ναί δὲ αὐτοῖς ἒνερέσθαι ἢν ἄν δὲ]ονται παρὰ Ἀθη[ναίον. This implied a length of line of 39 letters. The only change made by Schweigert was to insert καὶ before the word αὐτοῖς, thus bringing the length of line to the desired number of 42 letters, but Wilhelm writes (op. cit., p. 84) “In Z. 2 des anderen Bruchstückes IG I² 156 wird statt mit Schweigert: εἰ[ναί δὲ καὶ αὐτοῖς ἒνερέσθαι ἢν ἄν δὲ]ονται.

47 In Wilhelm’s text πε[ν]ποκατων in line 7 should be π]ποκατων, κ[αί in line 13 should be κα]τ, and one lambda should be omitted from [βλαββα] in line 13. A similar incorrect use of brackets occurs in Wilhelm’s text of I.G., I², 53 (op. cit., p. 34) where he notes the iota of εἰάρ in line 6, criticizes Schweigert for not recording it, and then restores ε[ιάρ]. The reading should be ε[ιάρ.}
parà Ἀθεναίον ergänzt werden können: εἰ[ναὶ δ᾽ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀλλο ἀγαθὸν ὅτο ἂν δὲ]ονται κτλ.” This supposed iota which has appeared as the second letter in εἰ[ναὶ may be seen from the excellent photograph which Schweigert publishes (op. cit., p. 270) to be not iota but rather part of the letter nu or pi. The stroke is not centered above the epsilon below it but is placed well to the left in proper position to belong to one of these broader letters. Consequently I restore ἐπι and call attention to the fact that the verb εὑρέσθαι which is customary in this particular phrase and which Hiller and Schweigert both restored may still be retained. With this exception the text as determined by Wilhelm reads as follows:

I.G., Ι², 166

A new text of this inscription now lies before us supported by an excellent photograph and so completely different from all preceding texts that they are rendered obsolete. The better preserved portion of the text has been given by Wilhelm, though he has omitted some of the fragmentary lines; my copy of the complete inscription reads as follows:

NOTES ON ATTIC DECREES

In lines 3-5 Wilhelm restored

\[ \ddot{a}v \]
\[ [\delta \, \varepsilon \, \mu \varepsilon \, \delta \delta \sigma, \, \varepsilon \varsigma \alpha] \varepsilon \alpha \kappa \alpha \sigma \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \tau - \]
\[ [\theta \nu \{\delta \varepsilon ?\} \, \tau \pi \nu \tau \, \tau \alpha \nu \varepsilon \] 
assuming that the particle \( \delta \varepsilon \) had been inscribed a second time by mistake in the apodosis of the conditional sentence. If an error is to be assumed here I should prefer the reading: \( \omicron \, \nu \varepsilon \omega \, \pi \nu \tau \, \tau \alpha \nu \varepsilon \) which is one letter in excess of the amount of space available but which is in keeping with the meaning of the document that the new prytaneis shall take forceful action to secure payment by the kolakretai within five days of the time when they enter office.

In lines 10-11 I have restored \( \tau[\varepsilon \iota \, \theta \varepsilon \omicron \iota \cdot \, \delta \delta \] \alpha \nu \tau [\, \theta \nu \varepsilon \] in place of Wilhelm’s \( \tau[\varepsilon \iota \, \'A\theta \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota \iota \cdot \, \delta \] \alpha \nu \tau [\, \theta \nu \varepsilon \) where he thinks \( \'A\theta \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota \iota \) may have been a mistake for \( \'A\theta \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota \iota \). I.G., I\textsuperscript{2}, 171

In the first publication of this fragment by Koumanoudes (‘Εφ. ’Αρχ., 1887, p. 218) two letters were represented at the very bottom of the preserved part of the stone separated from the main body of the text above by an uninscribed surface. These same letters are shown also in the majuscule publication of I.G., I, Suppl., p. 196, no. 116\textsuperscript{6}. Beneath them Koumanoudes had placed a row of dots indicating that in his opinion other letters may have existed even below these last two which he recorded. There is no indication in I.G., I, Suppl., as to whether the editor had any opinion on this possibility. Hiller in I.G., I\textsuperscript{2}, 171 interprets these last two letters as the end of a one-line postscript, and now recently Wilhelm (op. cit., p. 89) wishes to return to the idea of a continuous text. His restoration of the monument shows that one decree came to an end in line 8 just above the uninscribed surface and he assigns these two letters below the uninscribed surface to the opening line of a second decree. With this assumption he asks “Ist es Zufall, dass sich ergänzen lässt: ["Εδοχσεν τεί βολεί καὶ τοί δέμοι, Πανδη] ον [ις επηρτάνειε] ? “

There is some mistake about this suggestion, for to restore the text of a new decree as Wilhelm has indicated it would require a stoichedon line of 33 letters. He has observed that the earlier published majuscules give to these two letters ON the same stoichedon arrangement that is exhibited by those of the upper lines, but he has himself demonstrated that these upper lines should be restored with a stoichedon line of 23 letters. One wonders even if Wilhelm can have confused 23 with 33 at some time in the course of his study and then finally failed to notice the discrepancy. However the error arose, it is evident that this last line does not represent the opening line of a new decree naming Pandionis as the tribe in prytany. In fact, the letters preserved cannot be reconciled with the opening line of any decree, for the normal formula Εδοχσεν τεί βολεί καὶ τοί δέμοι would occupy the entire first line and three
letter spaces of the second line in a stoichedon text of 23 letters. This phrase does not contain the combination ON.

Under these circumstances we believe that the suggestion made by Hiller that these letters be taken to represent part of a postscript may still be accepted until some better explanation is put forward for them. This seems imperative if the length of line is to be restored with 23 letters. In lines 2-4 Wilhelm reads [..... καλέσαι δὲ αὑτὸ] σι [ς τὸ πρωτανείον ἐπὶ δειπν] νον [εἰς αὖριον] ——. The letter here read as iota in line 2 lies so far to the left in its stoichos that it should be completed rather as pi or nu. Any restoration must be quite tentative, but the following satisfies the known epigraphic requirements:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[......9..... ἐναι δὲ παρὰ] τ[ό δέ]} & \quad \text{[αθέναι ἐμ πόλει τὸν γράφματ}-
\\
\text{[μο (?] καὶ εὐφρέσθαι αὑτοῖ]ς ἐπ[αὶ]} & \quad \text{[ἐὰ τέσσερες τέλεσθι τοῖ]ς Νεό-}
\\
\text{[τεσαμένους ἡταν ἄν δύ] νον[τα]} & \quad \text{[---]} \quad \text{Uninscribed space of several lines}
\\
\text{[i ἀγαθον· ἀναγράφον δὲ τὸ φο]σ} & \quad \text{———}
\\
\text{5 [ἐφισμα τόδε ἐστέλει κ]αὶ κατ-} & \quad \text{———}
\end{align*}
\]

I.G., I², 179 + 169 + 61

By dividing the words differently in the second line of I.G., I², 61 Wilhelm has shown that the text of this composite inscription does not refer to an otherwise unknown Sikan but rather to a group of people, named with ethnics in I.G., I², 179, who were honored together by the Athenian Council and Demos.\(^4\) Instead of reading τοῦ Σικαῦ[ὅν, one should read α[ὑ]τοὶ κα[ί], and all reference to the Sikan disappears. I give the following text, taken with some modifications from Wilhelm’s publication:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[ἐδοξήσεν τέι βολέω καὶ τοῖ δέμι]} & \quad \text{[θῖνει· ἥνι δὲ πολεμαὶ ἀπομ]υθ}
\\
\text{[ον· Κεκρ[πο[πὶ ἐπρυτάνευε . . . . .]}} & \quad \text{[οσσάντον· ἥνι δὲ κολακρέσαι] δό}
\\
\text{[. . . . os ἑγι[αμμάτευε . . . . .]}} & \quad \text{[ντον τὸ ἄργυρον· ἡπόσ δ' ἀν] μὲ}
\\
\text{[ἐπ]στάτε Λ [. . . . ἐπε . . . .]}} & \quad \text{[αδικόνται, ἐπιμελόσθον α]ὐτό}
\\
\text{5 [.....]ν τόν Λ[ἰνεάτεν ? καὶ . . . .]} & \quad \text{[ν χοι στρατευοὶ ἥνι αἰέ] στρα}
\\
\text{[. . . . ]αν τόν Α[νεάτεν ? καὶ . . . .]}} & \quad \text{[τ]έγωντε[ς καὶ ἐ βολέ· ἐναι δ]'ε [α[ὑ]}
\\
\text{[. . . . τ]όν Ψ[γονίον? ἐπειδ]ευ] & \quad \text{[τοις κα[ι πρόσοδον πρὸς τέν β]}
\\
\\
\text{[ἐν καὶ ἀναγράφον προρχένοι] & \quad \text{[rupt]ανες [προσαγεν αὐτὸς εἰς τ]}
\\
\text{10 [καὶ εὐργέτας --- κτλ. ---]} & \quad \text{[ἐν βολέων [κα]ὶ τὸν δέμον ἐπάναγα]}
\\
\text{lacuna} & \quad \text{25 kes πρότ[οις μετὰ τὰ} λεπρά ἐπεί}
\\
\text{[. . . . ἐναι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ φρο]ρα} & \quad \text{[δὰν he [βολε] περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐς τὸν δ]}\text{ }
\\
\text{[ς καὶ στρατείας ἀτέλεα]ν' ἠν δ} & \quad \text{[ἐμον ἐ[χοσενέγκει]}
\\
\text{[ἐ γραμματείς [ν τὲς βολὲ]ς ἀνα} & \quad \text{vacat}
\\
\text{[γραφοσατο ἐμ πόλει ἐστέλει] ει λι} & \quad \text{———}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{40}\) Attische Urkunden IV, pp. 41-48 (Sitzb. Ak. Wien, 1939).
In line 8 the preserved letters are not merely $\text{ΑΘ}$, as given by Wade-Gery,\(^{50}\) and repeated by Wilhelm (op. cit., p. 42) as part of a phrase which he suggests by way of example: $\text{ώς οὐνας ἁνδρας ἁγαθὸς περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν } \text{'Αθεναίων}$. The letters are $\text{ΙΑΘ}$\(^2\), as reported in $\text{I.G.}$, I, Suppl., p. 167, no. 116\(\text{u}\), and repeated in $\text{I.G.}$, I\(\text{a}\), 179; they must be interpreted as $\text{ΙΑΘΕ}$.

Evidently the names of the benefactors of Athens were concluded before line 8 was reached, for the letters $\text{ΑΘΕ}$ ought properly to be expanded as some form of $\text{'Αθεναῖος}$ and not as a foreign name or ethnic. Considerations of space show that there were three names of foreigners. I have suggested that two of them may have had the ethnic $\text{Ἄμεατης}$ and one the ethnic $\text{Φεγώντιος}$, representing neighboring towns of the Athenian empire in the Chalcidic peninsula,\(^{51}\) and that after the names there appeared the motivating clause $\text{ἐπείδη εὖ ποιῶσ} | \text{'}Αθε[ναίος}$, which satisfies the traces of letters on the stone and the stoichedon arrangement. It is necessary also to restore the verb $\text{ἐπαινέσαμαι}$ and probably some phrase indicating that they were to be made proxenoi and benefactors of the Athenians.

If this is true, then lines 11-12 may not be made to read καὶ ἐναὶ | α[ὑτὸς προξενένος | 'Αθεναῖον ν (cf. Wilhelm, op. cit., p. 44). On the analogy of Wilhelm’s new text of $\text{I.G.}$, I\(\text{a}\), 154, lines 15-17 (καὶ μετοικία | ἀτέρ[ε]ται εὖ[ν αὖν 'Αθένεσιν] καὶ φ[ι]ρο[ᾶ]ς καὶ | στρατεύσις — —) I suggest here ἐναὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ | καὶ φρο[ᾶ]ς καὶ στρατεύσις ἀτέλεια] ν. The preserved letters in line 11 which Wilhelm reads from his transcript and squeeze as $\text{ΙΑ}$ appear similarly on my squeeze except that only the lower tip of the iota is preserved. Even this is so spaced that it may perhaps be completed as rho better than as iota.\(^{52}\)

$I.G.$, II\(\text{a}\), 38

This inscription was published by Eleanor Weston in $\text{A.I.J.}$, LXI, 1940, pp. 347-352, as part of the same original monument with $\text{I.G.}$, II\(\text{a}\), 71, a document once known and lost and now recovered in the American excavations of the Athenian Agora. The association of the two pieces depended on an observation made by Schweigert and communicated to Miss Weston.

Wilhelm’s restoration with a length of line of 32 letters\(^{53}\) is so persuasive that this connection with $\text{I.G.}$, II\(\text{a}\), 71, which required a line of 28 letters, must be abandoned. It should be noted that the stones do not join, and that they were associated only on the basis of the general appearance of letter forms and the supposed lengths of line of 28 letters in both fragments.

---

\(^{50}\) B.S.A., XXXIII, 1932-1933, p. 133.


\(^{52}\) For the reading of line 14 cf. also Meritt, Epigraphica Attica, p. 147, note 26.

In the last line Miss Weston read \(\text{φόνος}\). Here Wilhelm says (op. cit., p. 24) that the letters clearly visible are \text{ONO}, though they are not published in the \text{Corpus} or in Wilhelm's \text{editio princeps} (\text{Eranos Vindob.}, p. 246, note)\(^{54}\) on which the text of the \text{Corpus} was based. However, a photograph just received from Athens confirms Wilhelm's reading, except for the fact that only parts of the omicrons, not the whole letters, are preserved. Following his suggestion that these letters form some part of the word \text{φόνος}, one might restore in lines 3-6, for example:

\[
\tau[\text{εν} \; \text{δὲ} \; \text{τιμωρίαν} \; \text{ἐναί} \; \pi\epsilon] \\
[\rho\iota \; \alpha\nu\tau\circ \; \kappa\alpha] \theta\alpha\pi\epsilon\rho \; \epsilon[\alphaν \; \tau\iota\circ \; \text{τινα} \; \text{Ἀθηναίων} \; \epsilon] \\
[\nu \; \tau\iota\circ \; \text{ὑπερο} \; \rho\iota\alphaι \; \beta[\text{αιω} \; \thetaα\nu\alpha\tau\circ \; \text{ἀπόκτε}] \\
[\iota\nu\iota \; \kai \; \tau\o \; \phi]\; \text{όνο} \; [\text{kαταδικασθή} \; \text{vel sim.}] \\
\]

\textit{Hesperia, VII, 1938, p. 275, no. 10}

The inscription here published consists of three fragments which join together and which were all found on the north slope of the Acropolis. They were edited by Schweigert, who restored the text with a stoichedon length of line of 31 letters. Wilhelm now wishes\(^ {55}\) to attribute these fragments to the same stele with \text{I.G., I}\(^ {2}\), 55. He claims that they undoubtedly belong together as one may see from the photographs which show the same Ionic writing and the same weathering of the white marble.

This attribution shows the danger of studying inscriptions from photographs alone.\(^ {56}\) I have squeezes of fragment \text{b} of \text{I.G., I}\(^ {2}\), 55 and of one of the small fragments of \textit{Hesperia, VII, 1938, p. 275, no. 10}. These show indeed the same Ionic lettering which is visible also in the photographs, but the squeezes show also the relative size of the letters and their relative spacing. In \text{I.G., I}\(^ {2}\), 55 three lines occupy a vertical space of 0.04 m., while in Schweigert’s fragments three lines occupy a vertical space of 0.052 m. The horizontal measurements give about 0.009 m. for each letter space of \text{I.G., I}\(^ {2}\), 55 and about 0.012 m. for the new text published by Schweigert. It is obvious that the association suggested by Wilhelm is impossible and that the new inscription has nothing to do with \text{I.G., I}\(^ {2}\), 55.

Under these circumstances it seems best to retain the stoichedon line of 31 letters suggested for the new text by Schweigert and thus to avoid some anomalies in spelling which appear in Wilhelm’s restorations. There is no longer any need to develop a line

\(^{54}\) Wilhelm’s first text posited a line of 28 letters: \text{Ἀθηναίων κρατ[όςν ... δ]φείλεν Ἄθο[η ... ἐν ... ἀπ]οθάνη τ[ην] τιμωρίαν ἐν[ ... κ]άθαπερ ἐ[ἀν τις Ἀθηναίων ἐν τῇ ἕπερο[ρ]ια[β][μιω] ἰδεάτων ἀποθάνη κτλ. \\

\(^{55}\) 

\(^{56}\) See, for example, Meritt, \textit{Epigraphica Attica}, pp. 66-68.
of 32 letters to agree with the length of line in I.G., I 55. I change the wording of Schweigert’s restorations in two places and suggest for lines 9-14 the following text:

\[
\begin{align*}
[\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots] & \quad \text{\textit{\textbf{s}:}} \quad \text{\textit{\textbf{\'h}n \text{\textbullet{D}e} \text{\textbf{\'b}ia[\text{\textbullet{I}n \text{\textbf{\theta}an\'a\tw}i]}]}}, \\
10 & \quad \text{\textit{\textbf{\pi}o \text{\textbullet{A}p\text{\textbullet{O}the\'a}n\'i} \text{\textbullet{Ei}}} \text{\textbf{\nu}ai \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\'h}n \text{\textbullet{T}i}}[\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\mu}o\text{\textbullet{O}ri\'a}n \text{\textbullet{A}v\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\tau}o}\tw}i}]}]}, \\
& \quad \text{\textit{\textbf{Ka}the\'a\'p\text{\textbullet{E}r \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\'h}n \text{\textbullet{T}i}}}[\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\'A}the\text{\textbullet{\nu}a}i\'o}n \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\tau}i\nu\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\alpha}p\text{\textbullet{O}k\text{\textbullet{\tau}e}n}]}]}, \\
& \quad \text{\textit{\textbf{\eta}i \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\kappa}a\text{\textbullet{L}e\text{\textbullet{O}s\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\a}i} d\text{\textbullet{D}e} \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\a}}}\nu\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\tau}o}\tw}n \text{\textbullet{Kai}} [\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\'E}p\text{\textbullet{I} \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\xi}e\text{\textbullet{N}i}a} \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\e}\tau}o}]}, \\
& \quad \text{\textit{\textbf{\p\nu\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\tau}a\text{\textbullet{\nu}i\'o}n} \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\e}}}]} \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\a}v\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\tau}i\'o}n} \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\tau}a\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\mu}}]}}, \\
& \quad \text{\textit{\textbullet{E}n \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\a}l\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\l}a} k\text{\textbullet{a\text{\textbullet{\tau}a}p\text{\textbullet{E}}}} \text{\textbullet{\tau}h \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\b}i} \text{\textbullet{\textbf{\o\l\text{\textbullet{\textbf{\h}i}}} \ldots \ldots \ldots}]. \\
\end{align*}
\]
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