A NOTE ON EPIGRAPHIC METHODOLOGY

One of the significant advances in the technique of handling a non-stoichedon inscription has been a rule advocated by Sterling Dow that, in counting the number of letters to be restored in any line of such a text, only half a letter space should be allocated to iota. All other letters are entitled to be counted as the equivalent of one full space. This rule is, in fact, a kind of rule of thumb. It has been found to serve very well in practical application, but it does leave some rather curious-looking critical signs in the published texts. A lacuna may be defined, for example, as "about $5\frac{1}{2}$ letter spaces," though it is obvious that the stonecutters of antiquity did not deal in half letters. Texts so reconstructed come to have an appearance of scientific precision which is dangerous if too much emphasis is laid upon it, and any over-development of the method in the hope of building up an advanced technique of great scientific accuracy may well defeat its own purpose by creating a sort of pseudo-science and not a valid technique at all.

There is an instructive example of this pseudo-scientific approach to epigraphy in a recent article published by Robert Schlaifer in the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*,[1] which deserves examination because of the light it throws on the question of methodology. Schlaifer is dealing with a text which was published by Pritchett in *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, pp. 115-118, no. 23, for which the use of his new technique gives him restorations in some cases different from the original ones.

His method is to take the preserved fragment of the inscription and to select some letter in the first line of it as a point of reference. The letters appearing directly below this letter in the other lines of the inscription are arranged correspondingly in a diagrammatic chart and through them all is drawn a vertical line called the "line of reference." Then the letters of the rest of the preserved text and of proposed restorations are written out forwards and backwards from this vertical line by allowing one-half a space for each iota and a full space for each of the other letters. A drawing showing how this is done for the text here in question is presented on page 244 of the publication cited. After all certain restorations are made, vertical lines are drawn at each margin to indicate a maximum and minimum length of line. These are used as a control for all other restorations; any text which extends beyond or falls short of these vertical lines is to be rejected.

In the first line of the text which Schlaifer considers are the words: ὑπὲρ τ[ῆ]ς β[ουλῆς]. There is some inconsistency that is puzzling to the reader in that Schlaifer states in his text (p. 245) that the rho of ὑπέρ is taken as the point of reference, whereas in his drawing (p. 244) he has placed the vertical line through the upsilon of ὑπέρ, three letter spaces to the left of it. Nor does the drawing, even so, start with

[1] Vol. LI, 1940, pp. 244 ff.

that degree of accuracy which one would like to find if scientific conclusions are to be drawn from it. A control is provided by the photograph published in *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, p. 115. Numbering the lines as Schlaifer has numbered them, the nu of line 50 is not directly below the upsilon but just off center to the left of it. In line 52, the omicron is more or less in line with this nu, but in Schlaifer's chart it appears a full letter space to the left, and on down through subsequent lines other deviations from the actual appearance of the stone may be observed.

If Schlaifer intended the rho of ὑπέρ to be his point of reference, then the alpha in line 50 should be in the interspace to the left of it as it is on the stone, and similar corrections ought to be made for other letters. Without going further in our investigation than this preliminary line of reference, it is obvious that, even if the rest of the method is sound, it labors in this instance under the heavy disadvantage of initial inaccuracy.

As the technique develops, more serious faults appear. By creating a chart built up solely by rule of thumb, the distortion becomes greater the further one proceeds toward the right or left from the line of reference. For example, the lambda at the beginning of line 57 appears on the stone slightly to the right of iota below it and represents an error of disposition that amounts to more than one letter space. The first alpha of line 60 should be to the right, not to the left, of the eta above. The delta in line 56 is not above the epsilon of [Φιλοκ]λέους; it was engraved over the lambda. Similar misrepresentations appear along the right edge. It is true that Schlaifer says of his method (*loc. cit.*, p. 245, note 2) that " this method is obviously not used to reconstruct the appearance of the stone: the letters on the left margin were of course alined vertically. The purpose of the chart is rather to show at a glance the amount of deviation of each line from perfect adherence to the formula, i. e. the number of letters above or below the average." This is an extraordinary admission, for apparently, as a valid basis on which to work, Schlaifer would have us accept his diagram, which is visibly distorted, in preference to the stone itself where the correct disposition, so far as it is preserved, can be seen at a glance on a photograph or squeeze. Students of inscriptions in recent years have been laying more and more emphasis on the necessity for utilizing all the evidence which the stone affords; in point of method it would be a retrogression to build restorations which ignore the available evidence of disposition. No hypothetical arrangement can be substituted for the actual disposition of the letters, and any technique which is not premised on an accurate presentation of the stone ignores a fundamental principle of epigraphy. It would be better method to apply the so-called rule of thumb only to restorations where the stone is not preserved.[2] Surely this will not seem to anyone an undue restriction on the new technique.

[2] Even this rule cannot be applied rigidly, for the development of the Greek alphabet resulted in considerable inequalities in the size of the various letters. Cf. R. P. Austin, *Stoichedon Style*, p. 112.

Moreover, one must not overlook the essential consideration of vertical alignment along the left margin, even in hypothetical reconstructions, and the principle of syllabification along the right margin. If one were to begin from the middle of the stele, restorations at the right might show a greater variation in number of letters than those at the left. Working from his chart, Schlaifer, *loc. cit.*, pp. 247-248, seeks to show that a restoration suggested for line 59 is not correct: [*τὸν ὑπογραμματέα* Τιμοκρά]*τ̣ην* Τιμοκράτου Κυ[*δαθηναιέα καὶ*]. The difficulty is supposed to be that the initial word *τὸν* ought to be restored at the end of the previous line. Since the amount of space available at the end of line 58 is the basis on which Schlaifer builds his argument, let us look for a moment at the possible restoration for the end of this line. The original restoration was: Φι]*λίσκον Ἱππίου ἐκ* Κ[*εραμέων καί*]. This would be satisfactory even according to Schlaifer's computation of the space available, but, since Schlaifer notes that the letters of the demotic *ἐκ* Κ may equally well be completed as *ἐκ* Κ[*ηδῶν*] or *ἐκ* Κ[*ολωνοῦ*] and that these restorations are probably not long enough to fill the available space, he concludes that the numerical chances are against Pritchett's restoration. If either of these two latter demotics should be adopted, Schlaifer would bring the initial *τὸν* of line 59 back into position as the final word of line 58. He might do this (the chances seem to him fifty-fifty) even with the restoration of *ἐκ* Κ[*εραμέων*] for the demotic. So Schlaifer gets what he calls a three to one chance that the original restoration is not correct. Had Schlaifer noted that the letters *ἐκ* Κ might also be completed as *ἐκ* Κ[*οίλης*], perhaps he would have argued that the mathematical chances against Pritchett's restoration were as high as four to one.

Such rule of thumb weighing of the probabilities can hardly decide the issue. Schlaifer has been intent on what his disposition demands for the end of line 58, but he has not thought through what it involves by way of compensation at the beginning of line 59. Based on his average length of lines he allows here a lacuna of $22\frac{1}{2}$ spaces. Having already placed the article *τὸν* at the end of the preceding line, he can utilize only twelve of these by restoring the word *ὑπογραμματέα*. The remaining ten and a half spaces represent the beginning of the name of the assistant secretary; his name, ending in *-της*, contained therefore a total of fifteen and a half letters. This is an extraordinarily long name and one would like some suggestion as to how it should be restored.

Apart from epigraphical considerations, Schlaifer objects to the restoration of the name as [Τιμοκρά]*τ̣ην* because, as he says, the cases in which a son bore the same name as his father are only about one in ten. Unfortunately, there is no control over his count; possibly it included names before the Hellenistic period, for it was not until this time that the custom of naming a son after his father became more prevalent,[3]

[3] See E. Fraenkel in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.E.*, *s.v.* Namenwesen, col. 1624; cf. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, I, p. 635.

but the present document dates from the end of the third century. Examples of the same name and patronymic listed in Greek type in the first eight pages of the index of Dow's *Prytaneis*, which contains inscriptions dated with four exceptions in the first three centuries before Christ, are in the ratio of 1 (26) to 3 (78). Admittedly this is only a sampling, just as Schlaifer's figures depended on a sample, but it is obviously not a just statement of the case to claim that the chances against the restoration of [– – –]τ̣ην as Timokrates are ten to one because the father was named Timokrates. Argument of this type is futile and because of a pseudo-statistical basis it brings with it the deceptive faults of an unsound scientific method.

When the amount of space available for restoration at the beginning of line 59 is given more weight in the argument than Schlaifer has attached to it, it becomes apparent that the definite article τὸν should in fact be restored at the beginning of the line. This leaves just about enough room for the form [Τιμοκρά]τ̣ην, and there is no epigraphical reason whatsoever against the restoration of his name. At the same time, the greater space at the end of line 58 probably calls for as long a demotic as possible and it seems reasonable under these circumstances to retain the form ἐκ Κ[εραμέων].

This brings us to certain questions of interpretation for the secretary of the Council and People. Philiskos from the Kerameikos, who appears as secretary of the Council and People in *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, no. 23, may have his name restored also in another decree published by Dow as *Prytaneis*, no. 28. The amount of restoration in Dow's inscription is extensive and cannot by itself alone be urged as proof, but there is no evidence against it, and, if the inscriptions belong to the same year, then the restoration may be considered just as nearly certain as in the companion document. Furthermore, it is a fact that Timokrates of Kydathenaion was named as assistant secretary in *Prytaneis*, no. 28. The coincidence that his name may be restored with great epigraphical probability in the new inscription, also as assistant secretary, makes it seem more likely that the two inscriptions do belong to one year, for they now show the same names in two of the elective annual offices.

Schlaifer claims that this is no sufficient reason for changing Dow's date for *Prytaneis*, no. 28, from 229/7 to 223/2, which is known to be the year of the new inscription. We have already discovered that his epigraphical arguments against the original restorations do not have the cogency which he claims for them; we must now consider his thesis that the decrees need not belong to the same year even if the elective annual officers named in them are identical. It is true that Schlaifer identifies the Timokrates of *Prytaneis*, no. 28, with the father of the secretary in 223/2, but he makes the point that in the third century the old rule in the Athenian constitution that an official could not hold the same office twice no longer applies. He says of the secretary of the Council and People (*loc. cit.*, p. 246) that "this official was elective (Arist. *Resp. A.* 54. 5) and could have been chosen for a second time." He believes

(*loc. cit.*, p. 247) that "the general conditions in Athens in the late third century make it none the less highly probable that various offices previously restricted to a single tenure could then be held repeatedly." The evidence of Aristotle, Ἀθ. Πολ., 62, 3, shows clearly that in the fourth century magistracies, whether allotted or elective, could be held only once. Exceptions were multiple tenures in military offices and a double tenure in the Council. But these exceptions do not apply to the secretary of the Council and People, whom Ferguson has shown to be a magistrate in the Aristotelian sense of that word,[4] nor do the exceptions apply to the undersecretary. For the century after Aristotle there is no evidence to justify Schlaifer's conclusion that any change had been made in these two offices of secretary and assistant secretary. One can only say that there is not a single demonstrable instance of the same person holding one of these offices a second time.[5] We hold it to be a better practice to apply to the third century the rules of the fourth century unless there is some reason or evidence to be adduced to the contrary. Ferguson, for example, has summarized his investigation concerning the administrative offices in the Hellenistic period as follows: "The term of office, however, was lengthened in one instance only, that of the general superintendent of the administration. Repetition in the tenure of the new offices was generally prohibited; and the safeguards were left so far as possible undisturbed – – – the *demos* made a very sparing use of re-election and exercised the same sharp control over its officials as of old."[6] Elsewhere, he has ruled out the possibility that secretaries existed as civil servants with a more or less permanent tenure of office.[7] Once again the weight of the evidence is against Schlaifer's position.

There is still something to be said about the date of *Prytaneis*, no. 28. The *terminus ante quem* was placed by Dow as 228/7 because the priest of the eponymos in this inscription was identified with the king of 227/6. But Ferguson, following Kahrstedt, has pointed out that a priest might also perform the duties of an archon, without bearing that title and without relinquishing his priesthood.[8] There is no reason to suppose that being an ex-archon and hence a member of the Areopagos disqualified a man from holding a minor priesthood like that of the eponymos hero of one of the tribes. We believe that Proxenos of Aphidna might have been priest of the eponymos even after 227. The letter forms of the inscription, according to Dow, are of the period 229-210, and the date of the document may not be used as evidence in favor of Schlaifer's proposed relationship of father and son for the two undersecretaries.

[4] *Athenian Secretaries*, pp. 66-70; *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 161, note.

[5] See Bonner and Smith, *Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, II, pp. 31-32.

[6] *American Historical Review*, XVI, 1910-11, pp. 6-7.

[7] *Athenian Secretaries*, p. 36; cf. *Klio*, IV, 1904, p. 7; and Bonner and Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-33. For the term of office of the undersecretaries, see also *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, p. 117, and the authorities there cited.

[8] *A.J.P.*, LIX, 1938, p. 233.

Dow's proposal to date *Prytaneis*, no. 28 before the creation of Ptolemais has in part already been corrected.[9] But there is other evidence which favors a date for *Prytaneis*, no. 28 after the creation of the new tribe (223). The first column of names of the register is not preserved, but as dated by Dow and Schlaifer it must contain all of the representatives of the two large demes of Rhamnous and Aphidna, making a total of only twelve prytaneis. We know that in the first half of the following century Rhamnous alone had 16+ councillors in *Prytaneis*, no. 48 and 21+ in *Prytaneis*, no. 73. Later, there were thirteen (*Prytaneis*, nos. 98? and 102). If the inscription is dated after Aphidna's transfer to Ptolemais, this leaves the twelve prytaneis for Rhamnous alone, and is more in keeping with that deme's representation. The first column would then be one line shorter than the others, and this arrangement is exactly paralleled in *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, no. 25.[10]

It is not unfair, we believe, to say that Schlaifer's treatment of the date of *Prytaneis*, no. 28, adds nothing to the problem, that it leaves out of account some of the evidence, and that his attack on the original determinations can be criticized seriously on the score of method. It should be noted that he has made some improvements in the text of *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, no. 23, but these are not conditioned by his methodology.[11]

Schlaifer's re-examination of the text of *Hesperia*, IX, no. 23, was occasioned by a desire to eliminate from line 56 the restoration of the name of the priest of the eponymos as [Πρόξενος Ἀρμοδίου (?) Ἀφι]δναῖος. This Proxenos was known to have been priest of the eponymos for the tribe Aiantis in *Prytaneis*, no. 28; so the restoration in *Hesperia*, IX, no. 23, was offered in the belief that Proxenos might have served in this same year as priest for the tribe Akamantis. Schlaifer wished to get rid of this restoration in order to support his theory that priests of the eponymoi were, in the case of many tribes, restricted to the gene which in pre-Kleisthenean times had charge of the cults of these various heroes.[12] There is reason indeed to question not only the restoration of the name Proxenos, but also the identification of this official from Aphidna as a priest (Schlaifer, *loc. cit.*, p. 251). It is more probable that the man from Aphidna was the treasurer of the Council and that the priest in this inscription is named in line 55, being ---]δος Σφήττιος, especially since the latter is from the honored tribe, which in the majority of cases furnished the priest.[13] The tendency was strong to group together the officers of the prytanizing tribe, namely, the treasurer, the secretary, and the priest;[14] and in the few cases when three officials were cited between the two prytany decrees they were these officers of the prytanizing tribe with the priest third in order.[15] Previously, it was assumed that the priest was

[9] *A.J.P.*, LX, 1939, p. 260.

[10] See also *Prytaneis*, nos. 9, 10, and 47(?).

[11] *Loc. cit.*, pp. 244, 250-251.

[12] *Loc. cit.*, pp. 251-257.

[13] See Schlaifer's table, *loc. cit.*, p. 251.

[14] See Ferguson, *Athenian Secretaries*, pp. 67-68, and Dow, *Prytaneis*, p. 13.

[15] See, e. g., *Prytaneis*, no. 84, and *Hesperia*, IX, no. 26. Cf. *Prytaneis*, no. 46+ Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 112.

in fourth position between the time of his first known appearance in prytany inscriptions (223/2) and 203 and in third position thereafter.[16] Evidence for the years before 203, however, was confined to two examples,[17] which can hardly be considered as outweighting the reasons in favor of the third position.

There is other relevant evidence which Schlaifer might have offered to uphold his theory of the eponymos-priests,—at least so far as it applies to the tribe Kekropis. In a catalogue of the genos of the Amynandridai (*I.G.*, II², 2338), Ariston son of Sosistratos, who was a member of the deme Athmonon and of the tribe Attalis, is listed as the priest of Kekrops. In a decree of the Amynandridai, which must date from a different year, Graindor has shown that this man was again listed as holding the same priesthood.[18] In other words, the genos which claimed Kekrops as its founder provided for the tribe Kekropis a priest, presumably for life, who was a member of another tribe.[19]

Among the occurrences of the priest of the eponymos in prytany decrees, there should be added to Schlaifer's table (*loc. cit.*, p. 251) the examples in *Prytaneis*, nos. 39 (Antigonis)[20] and 61 (? Kekropis), and *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, no. 26 (Hippothontis).[21] Additional examples from other than prytany decrees include *S.E.G.*, III, 117 and *I.G.*, II², 4676, the well-known dedication made by Eurykleides, or his son Mikion, of Kephisia (Erechtheis) as priest of the newly-created cult of Ptolemy Euergetes.[22] There is also additional material from the Roman period.[23]

W. Kendrick Pritchett

Institute for Advanced Study

[16] Dow, *Prytaneis*, p. 15. For at least one exception, see *Hesperia*, X, 1941, no. 77, and compare Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 116. For omissions of the priest, see Dow, *loc. cit.*

[17] *Prytaneis*, nos. 28 and 36. There is no reason for certainty concerning the order in *Prytaneis*, no. 31.

[18] *B.C.H.*, LI, 1927, pp. 245-247. Cf. *I.G.*, II², 5357.

[19] For the transmission of the offices of a genos, see Ferguson, *Class. Phil.*, V, 1910, pp. 263, note 2, and 276; and Threpsiades, Ἐλευσινιακά, I, p. 232, note 2.

[20] Cf. Dow, *Prytaneis*, p. 89, note 1.

[21] For the priest of Erechtheus, compare also A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, III, pp. 12-13 (with examples there cited).

[22] See Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 242, and Treves, *Les Études Classiques*, IX, 1940, p. 147. Treves believes on the evidence of this inscription that the priesthood of Ptolemais became an hereditary appendage of the family of Eurykleides. For the disappearance of this family from public office, see Ferguson, *Klio*, IV, 1904, p. 10.

[23] For ἱερεὺς ἐπωνύμου in prytany inscriptions, see, e.g., *I.G.*, II², 1806, line 14. For ἐπώνυμος τῆς φυλῆς, see *I.G.*, II², 3705; Kirchner *ad I.G.*, II², 1764; and T. L. Shear, *A.J.A.*, XXXIX, 1935, pp. 443-444 (*Hesperia*, V, 1936, pp. 16-17; *J.H.S.*, LV, 1935, p. 151). This eponymos will be discussed by J. H. Oliver in a forthcoming article in *Hesperia*. For ἐπώνυμος in private cults, see Kirchner and Dow, *Ath. Mitt.*, LXII, 1937, p. 10. Schlaifer's attribution (*loc. cit.*, p. 251) to Pritchett of a theory that the priesthood of the eponymos was not created until the latter half of the third century is incorrect; no opinion on this subject has ever been offered by him.

EDITOR'S NOTE

As a supplement to the list of inscriptions from the Athenian Agora printed above on p. 90, it is now possible to give the following references to newly discovered texts which have been published elsewhere than in *Hesperia*. This list includes the grave monuments edited by Kirchner in the last volume of the Berlin *Corpus*, not only those transcribed by him in 1936 but others copied for him between that time and his final work on the volume. In Kirchner's record many of the inscriptions from the Stoa of Attalos carried only a provisional section number, preceded by the letters ΣΑ, when his copies were made. In the following table the final inventory numbers have been added for the benefit of those who may wish to make notes in their copies of the *Corpus*.

Agora Inventory Number	*Harv. St. Cl. Phil.*, Vol. LI, 1940
I 3320	pp. 111-124
I 3321	pp. 111-124
I 3323	pp. 111-124
I 3456	pp. 111-124
I 5734	pp. 111-124
	Harv. St. Cl. Phil., Suppl. Vol. I, 1940
I 2486	pp. 171-172
I 2982	pp. 171-172
I 5680	pp. 521-530
I 5799	pp. 171-172
	Inscriptiones Graecae, II²
I 30 + 34 + 1181	7601
I 34, see 30	
I 88	6423
I 190 + 1319	5920
I 546	8563
I 588 (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 584)	9821
I 636	6495
I 640	11969
I 691 + 977	6147
I 714	5366
I 742	5930
I 799	5692

Agora Inventory Number	*Inscriptiones Graecae*, II²
I 843	9197
I 844	5301
I 883	7753
I 947	11271
I 971	9279
I 977, see 691	
I 1006	12595
I 1079	11276
I 1098	7384
I 1114	11466
I 1115	7922
I 1122	7775
I 1123	10083
I 1134	12101
I 1139	5281
I 1142	10525
I 1152	8148
I 1157	11413
I 1164	12370
I 1170	10528a
I 1174	7137
I 1181, see 30	
I 1184	12302
I 1193	6952
I 1202	12414/6
I 1210	9730
I 1213	10721
I 1231	5794
I 1239	8872
I 1255	10804

Agora Inventory Number	*Inscriptiones Graecae*, II²
I 1272	7340
I 1279	11577
I 1283	8848
I 1319, see 190	
I 1342	10064
I 1376	5291
I 1381	6244
I 1390	11555
I 1391	9537
I 1479	12971/2
I 1522	9608
I 1523	6133a
I 1531	9863
I 1532	8683
I 1616	12205
I 1653	12133
I 1661	10716
I 1736	10031
I 1795	7986
I 1828 (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 537)	5500
I 1846	10312
I 1887	9309
I 1996	9866
I 2022	8861
I 2031	10258
I 2037	7941
I 2053	5295
I 2064	10290
I 2069	9627
I 2074	10836
I 2079	8476
I 2095	8290
I 2133	9142
I 2135	12340
I 2136	5704
I 2186	8275
I 2198	12320
I 2222	12139
I 2238	10887
I 2240	11006
I 2268	12023
I 2273	7426
I 2288	5308
I 2344	8519
I 2396	12360
I 2397	11785
I 2476	8490
I 2481 (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 392)	7125
I 2493	6303
I 2518	13180
I 2569	11296
I 2595	11378
I 2612	13045
I 2632 (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 2631)	9461
I 2667	11073
I 2687	11418
I 2819	12278
I 2825	13126
I 2902	6374
I 2954	8545a
I 2973	12039
I 3013	6648
I 3106	7625
I 3111	7154
I 3129	12786
I 3174 (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 317)	9099
I 3176	5717
I 3213	8795
I 3215	9411
I 3260	8892
I 3275	11543
I 3284	9929
I 3302 (two inscriptions)	6233 and 9769
I 3316	13186
I 3326	9290
I 3350	8281
I 3362	6435
I 3386	8087
I 3444	9333
I 3552 (ΣA 107)	12087
I 3554 (ΣA 109)	7076
I 3555 (ΣA 110)	6817
I 3559 (ΣA 114)	10163
I 3560	7812
I 3562 (ΣA 117)	6275

Agora Inventory Number	*Inscriptiones Graecae*, II²
I 3564 (ΣA 119)	6238
I 3565 (ΣA 120)	7919
I 3566 (ΣA 121)	5743
I 3567 (ΣA 122)	11264
I 3568 (ΣA 123)	10364
I 3573 (ΣA 128)	8047
I 3575 (ΣA 130)	11310
I 3579 (ΣA 134)	9584
I 3580 (ΣA 135)	9345
I 3583 (ΣA 138)	8449a
I 3584 (ΣA 139)	8001
I 3587 (ΣA 142)	7989
I 3588 (ΣA 143)	5344
I 3593 (ΣA 148)	6014
I 3596 (ΣA 151)	10474
I 3600 (ΣA 156)	10902
I 3657 (ΣA 192)	12288
I 3729	7281
I 3789	9232
I 3845	10593
I 3927	7870
I 3981	11890
I 4000	10358
I 4011	5684 and Addenda
I 4022	10541
I 4080	8782
I 4085	5657
I 4089	9666
I 4096	6511
I 4119	7568
I 4136	11578
I 4141	8715
I 4148	9550
I 4154	9014
I 4161	10122
I 4174	11136
I 4175	8132
I 4182	12082
I 4232	7201
I 4239	9164
I 4285	8166
I 4286	5307
I 4324	6529a
I 4333	9240
I 4366	6375
I 4383	11097
I 4403	8566
I 4409	9871
I 4451	12313
I 4464	10167
I 4471	10529
I 4488	9300
I 4494	7836a and 10525c
I 4506	9131
I 4517	8496
I 4521	9657a
I 4552	9771a
I 4561	7839c
I 4563	12596
I 4619 (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 4616)	12304
I 4632	9743
I 4645	5707
I 4654	10238
I 4691	10061a
I 4694	5538a
I 4765	7903a
I 4778 (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 4748)	8976a
I 4810	10530a
I 4821	11490 and Addenda
I 4860	8112a
I 4862	8908a
I 4894	9717 and Addenda
I 4957	12410a
I 4993	9862a
I 5002	6839b
I 5009	10733a
I 5015	8199a
I 5057	8450a
I 5059	7759a
I 5064	9963a
I 5082	10897a
I 5083	6809a
I 5088	7699a
I 5096	9069a
I 5097 (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 5094)	5718a

Agora Inventory Number	*Inscriptiones Graecae*, II²
I 5106	8104 and Addenda
I 5107	12114a
I 5111	10067a
I 5119	9468a
I 5129	6988a
I 5133	5961a
I 5134	9465a
I 5140	8180a
I 5160	9427a
I 5163	8548a
I 5192	7840a
I 5204	10052a
I 5217	9581 and Addenda
I 5240	5375a
I 5241	12204a
I 5252	7433a
I 5265	11845a
I 5266	8028a
I 5270	9990a
I 5277	7431a
I 5287	8275a
I 5313	10064a
I 5316	11471a
I 5332	11034a
I 5343	7291a
I 5350	8140a
I 5380	6675a
I 5396	5585a
I 5418	8816 and Addenda
I 5428	13056a
I 5552	10093a
I 5554	7839b
I 5570	12712a
I 5575	10065a
I 5580	8704a
I 5600	10238a
I 5604	12175a (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 12175)
I 5612	8481a
I 5649	10753a
I 5704	6409a
I 5712	7833a
I 5745	6190a
I 5755	7834a (incorrectly given in the *Corpus* as 5735)
I 5780	8452a
I 5814	12547a
I 5842	11773a
I 5857	10249 and Addenda
I 5867	6210a

In addition to these numbers, I 5220 and I 5468 have been cited by A. E. Raubitschek in *A.J.A.*, XLV, 1941, p. 70.

B. D. MERITT