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INTRODUCTION

Apologia

Experience has shown that organizational formulations easily result in unsatisfactory compromises, obscurities, and omissions. Doubtless one person, acting alone, is no less liable to error, but he can at least try to satisfy that one person's notions, such as they may be, of thoroughness and clarity. In much of what follows, the expression is unavoidably dogmatic, but like the Leiden proposals, everything is recommendation, not law; whatever authority inheres in the recommendations must derive from inherent reasonableness, if there is any, and from reasonableness alone. Or rather, since we are after all in the realm of convention, where ultimately it is usage which alone matters, and alone establishes law, I have understood "reasonable" to mean "reasonable in the light of present practice."

For better or worse, I have sought no official backing. L. Robert and Z. Stewart have read the whole with discernment, but I wish not to involve them or any other person, E. L. Bennett Jr, H. Bloch, J. Chadwick, W. V. Clausen, K. M. Clinton, DeG. Faes Jr, E. W. Handley, J. H. Kroll, P. L. MacKendrick, G. Nagy, G. M. Quinn, R. S. Stroud, L. L. Thiriette Jr, S. V. Tracy, L. B. Urdahl and J. C. Waalden also have given valuable assistance. If what is contained herein leads to useful discussion and agreement, in practice (one would hope) as well as in theory, and also, if it is needed, in organizational action, I for one shall be pleased to conform to the eventual decisions. All that matters is to serve clarity, simplicity, and adequacy—not to gratify any one person's feelings about any particular sign.

Certain limitations of the present effort should be noted. Textual apparatus is not dealt with. There is nothing here on "style": my efforts in that direction, along with those of others in America, are set forth in the American Journal of Archaeology 69 (1965) 199-206 (with abbreviations). Nor have I attempted to deal with usages outside the classical sphere, e.g. cuneiform tablets and the like. The Leiden and other treatments of conventions have usually cited examples which were fabricated, and which consequently had (it seemed to me) an air of unreality. I have therefore been at pains, except in a few brief instances, to cite instances from actual inscriptions in their context. Some of these are from my own publications: in searching for instances which are perfectly certain, one is driven to selecting instances which are familiar.

For better or worse, I have sought no official backing. L. Robert and Z. Stewart have read the whole with discernment, but I wish not to involve them or any other person, E. L. Bennett Jr, H. Bloch, J. Chadwick, W. V. Clausen, K. M. Clinton, DeG. Faes Jr, E. W. Handley, J. H. Kroll, P. L. MacKendrick, G. Nagy, G. M. Quinn, R. S. Stroud, L. L. Thiriette Jr, S. V. Tracy, L. B. Urdahl and J. C. Waalden also have given valuable assistance. If what is contained herein leads to useful discussion and agreement, in practice (one would hope) as well as in theory, and also, if it is needed, in organizational action, I for one shall be pleased to conform to the eventual decisions. All that matters is to serve clarity, simplicity, and adequacy—not to gratify any one person's feelings about any particular sign.

Certain limitations of the present effort should be noted. Textual apparatus is not dealt with. There is nothing here on "style": my efforts in that direction, along with those of others in America, are set forth in the American Journal of Archaeology 69 (1965) 199-206 (with abbreviations). Nor have I attempted to deal with usages outside the classical sphere, e.g. cuneiform tablets and the like. The Leiden and other treatments of conventions have usually cited examples which were fabricated, and which consequently had (it seemed to me) an air of unreality. I have therefore been at pains, except in a few brief instances, to cite instances from actual inscriptions in their context. Some of these are from my own publications: in searching for instances which are perfectly certain, one is driven to selecting instances which are familiar.
Evidently therefore the time has come when some reconsideration and reformulation might be useful. The task, it seems to me, is one of carrying out orders—orders interpreted as intelligently as possible—not of issuing commands. The legislators of Leiden, for instance, chose to alter the meaning of \( \langle \) in Greek epigraphy so that, although in nearly all the past century of publications \( \langle \) regularly meant dele, in works after ca. 1932 \( \langle \) usually mean addde. In itself the change is bad, but alas addde is not, in the Leiden code itself, always the meaning (infra, pp. 11, 12). Clarity was not obtained by the change. In general, no sensible person, if it were possible at present to start ab initio, would advocate what we have (I assume) now to accept. Fortunately occasions for using \( \langle \) and \( \rangle \) are rare, and in any case, whenever these unusual brackets are used, the editor’s commentary must give an explanation which will obviate misunderstanding. In the second and third chapters I have sought in the main to clarify only brought into sharper relief the mistakes (as some of them seem to me) made in the legislation that governs us.

When it comes to the one really common set of brackets, \([\ ]\), the question of what to put between them is not a matter of interpreting legislation, which in this instance is widely permissive, but rather of investigating what certain extreme doctrines of usage involve, and of trying to suggest more reasonable practice. In Greek epigraphy of the Classical period, there is an increasing pressure of conviction that restorations should no longer be freely inserted in texts to express the editor’s subjective, or largely subjective, conjectures; but rather that restorations should be rigidly controlled by specifiable evidence. In this at present somewhat chaotic sphere, the time may not be ripe for codification, but at least positions can be clarified: in the hope that it may prove helpful, I devote the fourth chapter to an effort in this direction.

Also with diffidence, and because correct practice ought to begin at home, I have attempted in the fifth chapter a would-be model edition of a small non-controversial inscription which may illustrate some frequently recurring features: physical indications of size, and spacing on the stele; an erasure with an erased letter visible; restorations both positive and conjectural.

**General Definition of Objectives**

Textual studies may or may not move toward it, but the aim of good editing is surely not difficult to conceive. The aim of good editing is to set forth in print, by use of regular, understood, agreed-upon conventions, which shall be as simple and clear as possible (so that non-specialist readers can comprehend with a minimum of difficulty), a clear and correct representation of the original text. It will usually be necessary for any critical reader to have recourse both to photographs or diagrams of the original, and, for anything which may seem unclear, to the editor’s subjoined commentary. But the text should be presented in such a manner as to reduce to a minimum all such efforts.

In the following pages, the frequently used diacritical signs and other conventions are treated first; after them, the rare ones.

**II**

**CONVENTIONS**

**Above and Below the Preserved Text**

The need often exists to inform the reader, as part of the edition itself of the text, how much is missing. This has never been discussed, but clearly the content of the missing parts can and often should be indicated.

**Examples:** In the Athenian prytany inscriptions, *Hesperia* Suppl. I, the developed scheme being regular (p. 4): indication of parts missing can sometimes usefully be given, as in nos. 20, 39, 47, etc.

Fragments of alphabetized lists, with information about parts missing at the sides as well as above and below: *AJA* 67 (1963) 963.

For certain exigencies in Bronze Age texts, Latin abbreviations are suggested (infra, p. 18).

**Numbering of Lines**

Usage varies, with resulting trouble, in respect to lines of letters which certainly once existed but are no longer preserved, or about which there is no positive knowledge, but which need to be referred to in dealing with the text. The longest Athenian list of contributors, *IG II* 2932, is damaged between the lines now numbered “310” and “315.” In this area, Kirchner read parts of five lines, but apparently the first of these, the one following line 310, where all he could read was the sum \( \Delta \) at the end, escaped notice and was not numbered. This was merely a careless error. The four other lines, viz. the lines inscribed in the area immediately preceding line 315, were counted as lines 311–314. By itself this was of course correct. But between line 310a (as we may call it) and line 311, he allowed room for yet an additional four lines, certainly once inscribed (as he thought), but of which nothing is now legible. In accord with practice which has always been more or less usual, but is surely wrong, these four lines also received no numbers. We may compare Kirchner’s numbering with a proper sequence of numbers (edition in preparation):
This is so obvious that we must ask how the erroneous practice ever came into existence. Evidently it arose from thinking that a "line" must be letters, and that reading or restoration. The line-number is used solely for convenience, to have a line-number must designate
in which letters may or may not have been inscribed. All areas which something to refer to; and what it refers to is not necessarily letters, but an
lines in the original text. If it is, so much the better; if it cannot be, no matter.
What matters is convenience and accuracy of reference.

If the old system, viz. a number only for lines where letters are legible, had to be followed, then any reading made subsequently in the area after line
is made, still the line now numbered 382 may need to be referred to: it
If the old system,

* Measurement shows that this "line" never existed, i.e. there was space only for lines 380, 381, 382.

This is so obvious that we must ask how the erroneous practice ever came into existence. Evidently it arose from thinking that a "line" must be letters, and that a line-number must designate only letters. This is an unnecessary and often an unfortunate limitation. A line-number is only a symbol, not an indication of a reading or restoration. The line-number is used solely for convenience, to have something to refer to; and what it refers to is not necessarily letters, but an area in which letters may or may not have been inscribed. All areas which may have been inscribed, or which need to be referred to for any reason, may be numbered. The final number may or may not be an accurate figure for the total of lines in the original text. If it is, so much the better; if it cannot be, no matter. What matters is convenience and accuracy of reference.

Convenience is not well served by the printing of line-numbers one for every five lines (5, 10, 15, 20...). Intervals of four (4, 8, 12, 16, 20...) are easier and the system is gaining adherents; REG 71 (1958) 1b1. Intervals of three (3, 6, 9, 12, 15...) have been tried, and in short texts the numbering of all lines.

Restorations: Square Brackets [ ]
Square brackets enclose areas once inscribed, whether the stone is: (a) preserved but with the surface too worn or eroded to retain actual strokes of letters, so that letters are seen vaguely but no stroke can be positively read, as in much of the water-worn Prytaneis (Hesperia Suppl. I) no. 76, and in much of the foot-worn Hesperia 3 (1934) 22; or (b) preserved behind the original front surface, itself now missing, as in some of Prytaneis no. 1; or (c) entirely broken away, as in Prytaneis no. 1, most of lines 4–9.

In any formal text, as distinct from short excerpts quoted in the midst of other matter, every square bracket should be answered by another square bracket.1

Print οτέσσας προσθέτει τοῦλον ἄγαν[- - - - - - - -]
not ἄγαν[- - - - - - - -]
but print e.g.: Greek names in Epχ- are rare.

To indicate many lines missing, if there is no danger of misunderstanding, dashes alone may be used, as in much of IG II* 2325.

No detectable stroke of a letter should be enclosed within square brackets.

Print: AΠΕΙV[ ]/ not AΠΕΙ[I!!!]
For a proposal to designate restorations that are probable but not certain by a small interrogation point, see Chapter IV (codified on pp. 30–31).

Lacunae: Dashes, Dots [–], [...]
A dash or dashes should be used solely to indicate a lacuna of uncertain length. The lacuna should be marked also by square brackets.

Do not print – or [ – – ]
Print [ – – – ] or, if an estimate, though inexact, would be useful, print [ – [ – – – ]
The number of dashes is wholly a matter of convenience.
[– ] can mean a few; or many; or an indefinite number of letters missing. [ – – – – – ] can mean 40 letters, more or less, missing.

1 Failure to reproduce any square bracket at all in quoting an epigraphical text, however venal in some instances, is certainly to be stigmatized. One clear example will suffice. Writing on 'Ἐρμής ἔγραψεν τὸν ἐπίχορον ἢμαρκόντος Πρυτανείαν', Oehler quoted IG III 1917 and 1918 without brackets as reading ἢμαρκόντος ἢμαρκόντας Πρυτανείαν. In this Oehler followed earlier restorations. Actually, the first word, except for the final signa, was all a restoration made by R. Neubauer, and in IG III 1917, W. Dittenberger, though cited by Oehler as supporting the restoration, explicitly rejected it. The space in question probably contained the Arkhon’s dedicatory inscription (Dittenberger; J. Kirchner in IG II* 1733; S. Dow in edition forthcoming). The ἢμαρκόντας ἢμαρκόντος—that is their proper title—probably were elected (there is no specific evidence) but Oehler’s unbracketed omission is indefensible.
Spaces Left Blank by the Letterer: Small superscript * or vat or vado

A small superscript italic * indicates one space intentionally left blank by the mason. If a small number of spaces are left blank, print one * for each blank space:

- * four spaces left blank.
- *+ 1½ spaces left blank.

If the blank space is lengthy:

- vado or vat where the space can be approximately measured.
- vat where the space cannot be measured; or is indefinitely large; or for any reason an estimate would not be useful.

Blank spaces can sometimes be restored:

- [*] one space is considered by the editor to have been left blank, but the surface is not preserved sufficiently so that the matter can be determined by the stone itself.
- * part of the surface is preserved, but not enough to determine, positively, that a space was left blank.
- vat or vat or e.g. vat where spaces are considered by the editor to have been left blank, the stone itself being non-committal.

Usually the commentary should discuss fully all doubtful or unusual blank spaces; for restored blank spaces, authority should usually be specified.


Doubtful Readings: Subscript Dots

A subscript dot should be placed under any letter which as a whole is so dim that, in isolation, neither the letter as a whole, nor any stroke of it, could be positively read.

A subscript dot should be placed under any letter of which a stroke or strokes are clear, but do not suffice to determine what the letter would be in isolation.

Examples: If middles of letters are gone, so that A can = Θ or Θ, then for ΕΩΕΙΕΝ print βιον. If A can = Α, Δ, Λ; and Ε can = Γ, Ε, Π, then for ΑΕΞΑΠΟΕΕΕ print ΑΔΧΕΞΑΠΟΕΕΕ

The context in which a letter occurs should not be considered in determining whether or not the letter should be dotted.

This principle is often violated, but should not be. The editor should not take it upon himself to decide for the reader what contexts are decisive, but should give a true impression of the reading of each letter in isolation.

See W. K. Pritchett, article cited infra.

No letter between brackets, except doubtful letters in erasures and printed between [], should be dotted.

A subscript dot should be printed under any letter which as a whole is so dim that, in isolation, neither the letter as a whole, nor any stroke of it, could be positively read. This is the only clear principle. The dot must not be permitted to mean, ambiguously, either "identity of letter doubtful" or "letter positively identifiable although imperfectly preserved." This would destroy the value of the dot. If all imperfect letters had to be dotted, some inscriptions would have many dots. The cases which at first thought seem difficult are those in which only a little remains: e.g. to print A as 5 with no dot. Let it be remembered that the transcribed text as printed is a conventional representation, not a facsimile, of the inscribed letters.

No letter between brackets, except doubtful letters in erasures and printed between [], should be dotted.

In the present, as in the past, some scholars would dot letters within square brackets. A particular proposal is to enclose in brackets, and to dot, letters of which some small part remains. The seeming advantage of this proposal is that it would create a category intermediate between letters of which some fair amount remains, and letters of which nothing at all remains. They propose:

- Nothing remaining of the alpha: x(x)
- One bit remaining of the alpha: Κ. J. x(x)
- More remaining of the alpha: Κ/Ι x
- Half remaining of the alpha: Κ/Ι x

There are two objections, both fatal. (1) The editor should not take it upon himself to draw the line between what is more and what is less certain. No definition, no clarity, is possible in the almost infinite possibilities. (2) A dotted letter within square brackets would naturally be taken to mean not "reading doubtful" but "restoration doubtful." (The problem of expressing doubt about restorations is dealt with infra.)

Attribution: Shading [ ]

Where the surface is in a condition such that it appears to have been inscribed, but attribution has made the existence of inscribed letters doubtful, shading will convey a correct notion. Thus IG I 843 line 5 (Hesoria 4 [1935] 32) should read:

[-------'Ἀτριάδολοι] [ ]

See the photograph, op.cit. p. 31. The designation of a sacrificial victim might well be inscribed after the deity.

The paragraphs sign, a short horizontal line extending into the margin, is frequent in another Code inscription, Hesoria 10 (1941) 32, Frag. 5 (see the photograph), and to show that the surface is gone, so that the presence or absence of the sign cannot be determined by reading, shadings do best:

Line 7 [ΚΩ ΚΡΙΤΕΥ]
Line 8 [ΟΙ: ΚΡΙΤΕΥ]

Rasurae: Double Square Brackets [ ] indicate a rasura:

[ (- ), (- ), (- ), (- ), (- ), (- ), (- )]

Indicating erased areas of lengths as shown, where no letter can be read and where the editor restores nothing.
Thus IG II² 3402 (quoted here entire) line 1:

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

The commentary will state that in line 1, an area subsequently erased, either \([\text{\textoeoG}]}\) (IG II² 3398, by the same mason), or \([\text{\textoeoG}]}\) (IG II² 3401, also by the same mason) was inscribed; but as yet no determination has been made between them.

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

Indicating an area containing the letters shown within the brackets, which were the only letters ever inscribed in the area, and which were evidently intended to be erased, but can still be positively read, as in IG II² 3402, line 4 supra. The commentary will have a full statement. If some letters are doubtfully read, print dots under them.

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

Indicating that the first inscription was entirely obliterated, and a second inscription, legible in whole or in part (scil. the letters shown) was incised in the area.

Many erasures made for correction are in this category. Pythiana (Hesp. Suppl. I) p. 188 line 36, clearly photographed on p. 187, should be printed:

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

No trace of the previous inscription has been read. The commentary will have a full statement.

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

Indicating that the first inscription is still legible, in whole or in part, and that a second inscription is also legible in whole or in part. It will not be possible always to print the other text in the margin; it must be left for the commentary.

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

IG II² 1043 line 105 if, was first written

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

Evidently wishing to replace the sign Κ for a father of identical name with the word itself, someone (Praxagoras himself?) “erased” the sign and presumably the whole demotic. The sign is still faintly visible, however, and a trace shows of the kappa. The whole word was then crudely inscribed, giving

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

Accordingly print:

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

and, in the margin or elsewhere,

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

Indicating an erased area in which nothing can be read but in which the editor restores the letters shown.

None of the last four letters of line 1 is said to be visible in the (deep) erasure.

If some letters can be read and some are restored, print as supra for IG II² 3402 line 4.

IG II² 1989 line 1 (infra p. 34) should be read:

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

since parts of the inscription can be made out. Actually the end of the rasura is not preserved, but only the part which contained the first five letters. An explicit version would be:

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

A photograph, and/or a sentence in the commentary, would make this monstrous solution unnecessary, but in addition, to make the text instantly intelligible, I suggest a broken line at the break:

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]

Indicating that the editor restores an erasure and the letters conjectured to have been erased.

This should be kept as a possibility, however infrequent and cumbersome (see the next previous illustration).

Erasures of Large Areas. In IG II² 3416, Kirchner tried large brackets, to enclose most of four lines. It would have been better to enclose each line in double brackets separately.

But larger erased areas have to be considered. In some instances—more than have been recognized—especially statue bases of Late Roman date, whole surfaces have been erased, some surfaces more than once. Thus Corinth VIII, 1, no. 108, as will be shown elsewhere, was twice inscribed and twice erased. Almost the entire surface of one side of the opisthographic wall used for the Athenian Law Code of 411/0-40/399 B.C. was inscribed, erased, and inscribed a second time (Hesperia 30 [1961] 63-64). In such instances, the entire second text need not be printed within double brackets; but a statement about the erasure(s) should be made prominent.

The bronze Athenian dikasts’ tickets were frequently reused, all the inscriptions being legible at least in part. For publishing such texts, a form “Use 1,” “Use 2,” etc., is suggested in BCH 87 (1963) 65ff.

Reading Clear, Interpretation Unknown: Capital Letters

Whole capital letters are used, and certainly should continue to be used, at least in epigraphy, to designate letters which individually are legible (or partially legible and if so dotted) but which collectively do not appear to the editor to make sense.

\[
\text{[\hspace{1cm}]}
\]
L. Robert, *Les Gladiateurs dans l’Orient grec* (Paris 1940) 155, no. 124, lines 5-6:

Τὸ γὰρ οἰνόον ὅστις ἔλειψεν
πρὶν ἑτεροὶς παλάμοις ΠΕΟΝ ψυχῆς ἐπικοινωνοῦν

Printing such letters in capitals has the advantage of calling attention to the problem: an error in reading, or in inscribing, or the presence of a quite unusual name.

Strokes Clear, Letters Unknown: Broken Capitals

Partial, or broken, capital letters are used, and should continue to be used, where (as often at an edge of the stone) the context does not decide the identity of the (imperfectly preserved) letter. Despite difficulties of printing, it is usually easier and clearer to indicate typographically just what is legible than to express the situation in words, although usually verbal explanation ought to supplement the typographical.

IG II² 3242, quoted entire, as copied by U. Koehler:

\[ \text{---} \]
\[ [\text{---}] \]

No indication is given, and possibly the stone gave none, about how many letters are represented by the five upright strokes before the tau.

A more accurate image can be conveyed by the use of shadings for lost parts of letters. Thus IG II² 157a line 2 should read:

\[ \text{[---]} \]
\[ \text{[---]} \]

The fifth letter is thus shown to have had an upright stroke at the left, and no horizontal at the bottom.

Parts Read Earlier, now Missing: Underlining

Not discussed anywhere, but regularly used e.g. in IG II², is the use of underlining to indicate letters read with certainty in earlier editions but now missing (usually because of the breaking-away of parts of the stone at the edges). This happens not infrequently, and the underlining is a valuable convention. The commentary should of course explain. Underlining is solely for this.

For example, more of the right end of the dedicatory inscription IG II² 2860 has been lost since U. Koehler’s time. The text is now given (entire):

\[ \text{[---]} \]
\[ \text{[---]} \]
\[ \text{[---]} \]

The subscript dot should be used solely for doubtful readings, never for editorial corrections.

Numerous omitted strokes, clearly read, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 2-5, &c. Here there are so many instances that no effort is made to indicate them except in the commentary. This is allowable: the intent is usually indubitable.

Additions by the Editor: Pointed Brackets \( \langle \)\)

Letters (or numerals, etc.) inserted by the editor to supply letters (etc.) considered by him to have been intended to be inscribed, but which were omitted by error.

IG II² 3242 lines 5 (part) and 6:

\[ \text{[---]} \]
\[ \text{[---]} \]

The commentary states that the stone has ANIATPOY. The man Αἰολίων Ἀντιπάτρου Φυλεύς and his father are known from other inscriptions.

Substitutions by the Editor: Pointed Brackets \( \langle \)\)

Enclosing letters (or numerals, etc.) substituted by the editor for letters (etc.) actually inscribed, but considered by him to have been inserted by error, instead of the (correct) letters given within the pointed brackets.

IG II² 386 + EM 12564; new text, *HSCP* 67 (1963) (47-) 49, lines 3 and 4 (parts):

\[ \text{[---]} \]

The stone reads ΕΙΑΩΣ, i.e. it has a clear A where \( \lambda \) was intended.

Letters Left Incomplete by the Letterer: Pointed Brackets \( \langle \)\)

Especially in inscriptions where the mason had to change from one chisel to another, parts of letters were sometimes never cut. Most often, e.g. \( \lambda \) was left as \( \lambda \). Editors disagree, but strictly \( \lambda \) should be printed; certainly not, if the reading and intent are clear, \( \lambda \). The subscript dot should be used solely for doubtful readings, never for editorial corrections.

Suppressions by the Editor: Braces \{\}

Enclosing letters (etc.) considered by the editor not to have been intended to be inscribed, but inscribed by error.

IG II² 1990.4, part:

\[ \text{[---]} \]

In rare instances incomplete letters, which in the final intention of the scribe were not meant to be inscribed (or written) at all, were left unerased: the incompleteness was meant to signal the cancellation of the strokes inscribed. The predicament is illustrated in a papyrus, where the facts were detected and clarified by J. Schwartz and H. C. Youtie, *TAPA* 91 (1960) 256; an epsilon was left incomplete where an impulse to write ἔρρα was rejected. Print \( \epsilon \) and explain in the commentary that an epsilon was left incomplete.
Resolutions of Abbreviations and Ligatures: Parentheses ( )
Indicating letters added by the editor to fill out an abbreviation to the full form of the word.

*Agωθει* [Τιχτη]
[έπι] άριστον Τιβ ΚΛ [� = --- = --]
*Μελ(πτως) στρειντ[ν] γυν[ν] τε φα, κτ[λ.]

The abbreviations for Tiberios and Klaudios are so familiar as not to need expansion; but the demotic might not be known to all readers. (Although the cognomen cannot be restored, the man's family is known and the demotic is indubitable.) Parentheses are used also to give the full form of an abbreviation inscribed as a ligature.

The ligature should be specifically mentioned if it cannot be reproduced.

Where the stone has ΙΠ preceded by a name, print πρ(σβύτερος); or ΙΠ in a date, print πρ(δ) or, if the printer can do so, print ΙΠ (πρδ).


ΕΥΤΥΧΕΙΤΕ—Ι. Ε. Κ. ΟΚΤΟΒΡΙΩΝ
for which print

εύτυχειτε—πρ(δ) ει' Κ(αιλανάδων) Οκτοβριων

Note on Pointed Brackets
The signs ( ) are ambiguous, and the Leiden convention (reference *infra*, p. 14) p. 20 proposes [ ] for corrections, but these look too much like [ ], and broken type or poor printing might easily change [ to ]. Hence in epigraphy this recommendation has not been accepted. Others (e.g. F. W. Schehl, *infra*) have proposed other signs. In all of the above instances except restorations and abbreviations, the critical apparatus ought to state the facts clearly. There is no other way to insure clarity of understanding. To multiply signs is to burden the editor and the reader without guaranteeing success. Instances are uncommon enough so that the critical apparatus will not be unduly lengthened.

Editing of Earlier Modern Copies
A certain number of inscriptions survive only in the transcriptions made of them usually some decades ago. To a greater or less extent these copies are defective, and the modern editor, no matter how conservative (epigraphical editors are, or surely ought to be, the most conservative of all), must emend, often extensively. He must put into his text other letters, different from those he finds in the copy.

For diacritical signs there are two choices, and practice is divided. One choice is to put a dot under the letter substituted by the new editor for the reading in the copy. In practice the dot used has sometimes come to mean nothing whatever, except "a letter, not having necessarily any resemblance to the letter now proposed, was read in this space." Editorial extremes of this sort in editing copies by Faivel, Baumsteiner, and Vernon are cited by Pritchett, *AJA* 59 (1955) 57.

The alternative is to treat the copy as if it were an original text and to enclose in pointed brackets letters substituted by the editor. Pritchett has proposed that this be done whenever there is little or no coincidence of strokes. On the other hand, if the substituted letter is similar, the proposal is that it should be dotted. Thus *iota for sigma would be printed (I)*, whereas *theta for omicron would be dotted, Θ*.

This would be an improvement, and yet it is far from being a perfect solution. (1) It makes the editor the judge of whether the resemblance is close; he will tend to decide in favor of his own interpretation, and thus he will favor dots. (2) Pointed brackets occupy more horizontal space and do really mar the page (as Meritt urged) more than any other sign.

There is only one solution, and that is to print the copy itself as near on the page as possible to the new edition of it. This can always be done: the copy is not like a photograph. Then the editor, if he wishes, can state that all letters altered by him are dotted. More important is to introduce a general statement, based on positive instances, if there is sufficient material, about the accuracy of the copyist; about which letters of the alphabet misled him, and how often. Depending on the style of lettering, this may vary from inscription to inscription (if there are several), and from inscriptions which evidently were well preserved to those which were not.

The Problems of Editing
The main problem, surely, is not to change the Leiden system, but to improve its working. More accurate realization, however, of what is involved, and sharper formulations, are only a part of the task, and the lesser part. The more important sphere of effort is not legislation but practice. We are all more or less at the mercy of editors. Photographs must always be printed, but they cannot always suffice. The very areas where difficulties arise are the areas where photographs are likely, especially when dimmed by reproduction on the printed page and reduced in size, to be inadequate.

Avoidable editorial malpractice certainly ought to be stigmatized: no one who reads the astonishing instances collected by W. K. Pritchett in *AJA* 59 (1955) 55–61 can doubt that. Discussion of editorial conventions may tend to make editorial practice more accurate. But lack of skill is also a factor, curable only in part by diligence and long practice, by better squeezes and greater patience.
III

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE FOLLOWING BIBLIOGRAPHY is intended to be complete, at least for epigraphy, and to be critical. Items no longer worth reading are included for their historical value. I hope they are sufficiently criticized; to be explicit, however, I give here the opinion that under discussions the only items of enduring value are the second half of the J./L. Robert passage, on publication, and the article by W. K. Pritchett, on dotting letters.

Earlier Systems

The Leiden System was not universally adopted at once. For summaries of earlier systems in epigraphy see e.g. Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum 6 (1932) p. viii, and earlier volumes; J. Kirchner, Inscriptiones Graecae II iii 13, page v. Other discordant systems, G. Klaffenbach, Griechische Epigraphik (Gottingen 1966) 103. For a more extensive treatment, with older bibliography (p. 9), see the official publication of the Union Académique Internationale (infra, ed. 2., next section; hereinafter referred to as UAI1). For a brief and convenient summary, see Chronique d'Egypte 7 (1932) 268. History of the use of dots to indicate uncertain readings, W. K. Pritchett, American Journal of Archaeology 59 (1955) 55-57.

The Leiden System

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

Union Académique Internationale, "Emploi des signes critiques; disposition de l'apparat dans les éditions savantes de textes grecs et latins: Conseils et recommandations."


Although the effort had been begun some years before, the main feature was an attempt to take into account the conventions adopted by the Papyrological Section of the 18th International Congress of Orientalists, which met in Leiden, 7-12 September 1932; the measure in question was passed unanimously on 10 September. The object was to recommend usage that might become uniform for the editing of all Greek and Latin writings: i.e., for papyrology, epigraphy, and texts of authors. A formidable list of scholars eventually contributed opinions. The present brochure, which was the result, records previous usages and pleads for uniformity on a basis of a few simple signs used with a minimum of change. The second half of the brochure is on textual apparatus. There are lists of signs, abbreviations, etc., and a full index.

SUMMARIES OF THE LEIDEN SYSTEM FOR THE USER

J. Kirchner, Inscriptiones Graecae, II iii 13 (Berlin 1935: Atica, Dedication) page v.

The examples are clear, but the whole is compressed, and the "erased" letters under [ ] should be printed in brackets, [ ] [ ] δμνω.

The final entry, Α in notandis litteris dubiis, should be altered to state that the letter is partially damaged, and that what remains is compatible with the proposed reading, but that the actual remains, independently of the context, do not make the reading mandatory. If e.g. the left stroke only of a π is legible, the letter should be printed with a dot, Π; but if the two strokes forming the upper right corner of a π are definitely preserved, even though only partially, print Π without a dot.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, ed. J. J. E. Hondius, 7 (Leiden 1994) p. viii (in line 13 for δεφι, read δεφι), and subsequent volumes, e.g. ed. A. G. Woodhead, 18 (1962) p. xii.

Same examples as in IG II1; the erasures are however properly treated, but correct the part on subscript dots as supra under J. Kirchner, IG II1.

M. N. Tod, Greek Historical Inscriptions I (Oxford 1946) p. xx has the old system; II (1948) p. viii; Leiden system.

Alter [ ] to read: enclose letters deliberately erased in ancient times but still legible; [ ] [ ] enclose letters believed by the editor to have stood in the erased area.

Correct the part on subscript dots as infra under J. Kirchner, IG II1.


The Leiden system, but with reversion to the rectangular enclosure for the second (most recent) inscription in a rassura. Apart from lack of sanction, this has the disadvantage of not being immediately intelligible: the reader might assume it surrounded letters read from the first inscribing. Dots under letters "epigraphically doubtful" is also a statement liable to misinterpretation.

G. Klaffenbach, Griechische Epigraphik (Gottingen 1966) 102-103.

Alter as supra on dots. On erasures note that an erasure need not have been made by the original mason, or by any mason.
CONVENTIONS IN EDITING

American Journal of Archaeology 69 (1965) 200.

Expand to conform to IG II* and SEG supra. The double brackets [ ] enclosing erasures should not appear to be of two different kinds, but should all be the same.

Page 9: the letters restored in the erasure should be printed not ["Oroloioi"] but ["Oroloioi"]. Page 9: dots: alter to read as supra. Otherwise these pages are the best and fullest recent guide.

DISCUSSIONS OF THE LEIDEN SYSTEM


The first announcement: a brief account of the procedure at Leiden, a brief and faulty summary of the signs, and some good recommendations for papyrological publications. (Program of the session of 11 September, p. 129; President, M. D. Cohen; his speech, pp. 131–133; seven additional papers on other subjects, after the first of which came the "Essai d’unification." The brochure had come before the session of the previous day, after four papers had been read, and along with three others bearing on publication. These three are the ones that are summarized next hereunder.)


Papyrology has a central position, since it deals with documents, as does epigraphy, and texts of authors, as does palaeography. Discussion of signs: some of the views set forth have not been adopted.


Recommendations for ease of use, concerned with larger aspects than signs: see the official brochure, and L. Robert (infra).


Concerned with dots and underlinings to indicate doubtful readings. A sound discussion, but no absolutely precise formulation is offered. See Pritchett (infra), who, however, did not know Hunt’s article.

U. Wilcken, Archiv für Papyruforschung 10 (1932) 211–212.

Notes thirty years of uniformity within papyrology; contrasts epigraphy and texts of authors. Declares that the Greek Corpus will follow the Leiden system, despite difficulties and anxieties.

B. A. van Groningen, Mnemosyne, n.s. 59 (1932) 362–365.

Similar to the article noted above, but briefer.

F. W. Scheffel, American Journal of Archaeology 58 (1954) 23 n.32.

Urges < > for corrections by the editor to replace errors in the text; < > for additions by the editor to make up for omissions in the text. This has not been adopted, it is too elaborate.


Criticism of the Leiden system, in favor of keeping some of the old epigraphic conventions; and recommendations, all excellent, for larger aspects of publication. See also REG 68 (1955) 186.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


This is a brief discussion at the end of a review of J./L. Robert, La Carie: departure from the Leiden system would be deplorable; the system adds no printing cost or difficulty; Teubner has adopted it.


This should be read entire. Summary: see the following item, p. 371 n.13.


The section on restorations, pp. 373–382, is a strong statement, with examples drawn from one of the most difficult fields. This essay alone should suffice to alter practice. (But about one related aspect, stoikhedon, pp. 382–384, more consideration is needed of how masons work.)

The Wingspread Convention

Institute for Research in the Humanities (University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, U.S.A.; 1962; two pages; obtainable on request).

"Notae Diacriticae in Edendis Textibus Mycenaeci Minoicae," a Tertio Colloquio Internazionali Studiorum Mycenaecorum in 'Wingspread' convocato, editoribus commentatoribus commendata.

After discussion in a session of the colloquium (7 September 1961), the Convention was drafted, in consultation with various scholars, by a committee consisting of J. Chadwick and S. Dow. The effort was directed (a) toward bringing editorial usage into conformity with the Leiden system, and (b) toward suggesting special usages, which might be uniformly adopted in this field, that would make for greater clarity in editions of Minoan and Mycenaean texts (Linear A, Linear B, and earlier scripts).

(a) The Leiden system was adopted without change. The note on restorations between square brackets may be quoted: "The Leiden system makes no provision, and scholars have experimented but have never agreed on one, for indicating what restorations are positive and what are conjectural. Restorations of letters or individual signs which make normal spellings in words which are themselves indubitable, or of formules which are amply attested in the given context, are positive; but where certainty is unattainable, the editor must be free to print other letters, signs, or words, which he feels should be restored to indicate the possible sense. In this situation the simplest course is to insert a small interrogation point, and to comment in the apparatus; or to leave space blank and to give the suggested restoration wholly in the apparatus."

(b) Certain exigencies recurring frequently in the tablets led to the adoption of the following, which is supplementary to the various Leiden usages:
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[−− ? −−] Dashes and interrogation point to indicate doubt whether a sign or more than one sign was inscribed in the area.
N.B. A space between a bracket and a sign, or a sign and a bracket, indicates that the sign is believed to be the beginning, or in the other case the end, of a word or sign group; if the bracket immediately precedes or follows the sign, this indicates that the word or sign group may or may not be complete, e.g.:

50[ means that no digits can have followed the numeral;
50[ means that it is impossible to tell whether or not any digits followed.

Similarly,

−[−] te-ra means that there is enough space, or a divider, between the broken edge and the sign te to show that this is the beginning of the word.

−[−]te-ra means that there is insufficient evidence to show whether or not the word is complete.

−[−]te-ra means that there is a trace of an unidentified sign preceding te, and there is reason to think that it is part of the same word. (In Classical epigraphy positive strokes of the unidentified sign would be shown with shading. This is not feasible for the syllabaries, with their more elaborate signs.)

Areas broken away:
sup. mut. (scil. supra mutila) above the first line, or
inf. mut. (scil. infra mutila) below the last line, indicate that the beginning, or end, of the tablet is missing.

If the missing part can be delimited, the text should state, e.g.:
sup. mut. desunt 3 versus
inf. mut. desunt ca. 3 versus

In the eight years that have elapsed since the Wingspread Colloquium, usage has still varied with regard to hyphens and commas. For illustrations of the most recent (and I think, most sensible) practice, see J. Chadwick, *BSA* 58 (1963) 68ff. There are still proposals that need study:
for the divider; so that it shall not be overlooked, leave space on either side, as in pe-da, wo-ru. This is convenient for the editor and, if in fact it leads to no misunderstandings, harmless. But when one thinks of scholars in other fields trying to use texts in which all the words are separated apparently by commas, one hesitates. It is deplorable that the normal divider (at least) cannot be conveniently represented.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Accent marks as in ra' in place of subscript figures as in ra, are favored by some. This usage, derived from a convention used in transcribing Hittite cuneiform, is another instance of willingness to risk misleading non-specialists. The subscript figure can hardly mislead.

'Broad' transcriptions, as contrasted with transcriptions that use the highly accurate diacritical marks, e.g. hyphens, dividers. Broad transcriptions are to be used for a word or two quoted in the course of a sentence in a modern language. Good authorities sanction broad transcriptions, which in many contexts may be safe. In Classical epigraphy scholars have learned, however, that it is wise to make all quotations accurate: in the best usage, broad transcriptions are not found.
IV

RESTORATION IN EPIGRAPHICAL TEXTS

The Nature and Magnitude of the Problem

In the course of the centuries, most Greek inscriptions on most sites have been damaged. The principal causes of damage, never systematically studied, but informative in many instances, are: breakage, for various reasons; damage by traffic, as in the case of paving blocks and door-sills; erosion by water, and other damage by weathering, in the case of inscriptions long exposed; soil damage of various kinds when inscriptions are long buried; hard cement and other damage incurred when inscriptions are used for building; damage by direct human action, as in Attika by Philip V, Sulla, the Heruli, et al.; and accidental damage in modern museums. Small wonder that an inscription of more than a few lines preserving all its letters is a rarity; and that on an average, individual inscriptions (except columnar grave monuments, the largest class in Attika) survive to the extent of less than half. More letters are lost than survive.

Next to providing an accurate version of what is preserved, the chief and hardest task of the epigraphical editor is usually to restore the letters that are not preserved. In its totality the task is enormous, never-ending, almost omnipresent. No one of the problems that arose at Leiden is remotely comparable in magnitude to that of clarifying usage in regard to restoration.

In practically all instances, the sign for restorations long has been, and is, the pair of square brackets [ ]. About what sign to use, there could and can be no dispute. Leiden made no change, and no one proposes any different sign. But about what to put inside the square brackets—whether to put only what is virtually certain, or whether it is allowable to put also matter that may be entirely unsupported and conjectural—there has been much dispute, and practice varies extremely. In one aspect or another, restoration has been discussed, by L. Robert and others, time and again. Nevertheless I venture to think that there is room, and need, for a treatment which will attempt to be systematic.

Extremists are few, perhaps, but they are entitled to a full and fair hearing. I have tried to quote opinions so fully that there will be no danger of misrepresentation by suppression of the context; and I have not made use of invidious italics mine. On the other hand, let lay readers keep firmly in mind the fact that once a restoration is launched, especially if it is made to appear "authoritative," it may be copied and utilized for years, pernicious in itself and setting an example for others.

Certain fundamentals are not open to dispute. Everyone would agree that for any restoration, either under conception (1) or (2), infra, or under any conception in-between, the spatial and other physical requirements of the inscription must be observed; though some scholars have admitted far more manipulation of the apparent conditioning factors than other scholars would admit. It should also be unnecessary to insist that any restoration must conform in style, orthography, etc., to the period, region, etc., of the inscription.

The Two Extreme Conceptions

Without pausing to explore any middle ground, it will be convenient first to state clearly the two extreme conceptions, viz. (1) that in the text proper only positive, i.e. completely attested and assured, restorations should be made; in contrast to (2) which declares that in the text proper conjectures also should be admitted, the editor being free to place there anything he chooses, even including matter which certainly did not originally stand there.

(1) The Kirchner Principle. There are a host of small restorations which are universally accepted without comment. If in the clause of validation a decree has ἘΑΩΕΕΝ on the stone, the restoration ἘΑΩΕΕΝ needs no defense. Many of the letters, or the whole word, could similarly be claimed as certain, ὙΒΟΤΥΠΟΥ; but when the whole word is claimed, we are in the realm of phraseology. Whole words and phrases can be restored when there are ample numbers of supporting instances, and no relevant instances of difference or omission. Occasionally, but rarely, such restorations can be made on the strength of external literary or archaeological evidence; most such restorations belong in the conjectural or in-between class. Names and other proper nouns and terms offer special problems: if adequate evidence can be brought to bear, certainty can sometimes be attained. But according to conception (1), no element of uncertainty can be present. Detailed examples need not be given here: obviously conception (1) admits restorations on the largest scale in groups of inscriptions all on one subject, where there is multiple repetition of terms and phrases.

With respect to persons, conception (1) places responsibility wholly on the editor. The motto is caveat restitutor. The reader understands that the editor puts his full authority behind the restoration, as being what undeniably stood in the original text; but the editor should specify what his evidence is, if it is not apparent. The day of unsupported ipse dixit "authority" has passed. His practice was not perfect, but J. Kirchner is one editor who endeavored, on the whole, to follow the precepts of conception (1), and for convenience the conception may be named as his, not because he was a theorist, but merely because he used conception (1) in as many instances as any editor. The mechanism must obviously be a store of cards or the equivalent giving the relevant data.

It may be that the very strictness of (1) tends to defeat it. If there is a universal understanding that everything between square brackets is printed as being absolutely certain, then the less scrupulous editors will occasionally be tempted
to try to impose their own restorations by putting them into square brackets. This malpractice cannot be obviated by any system—just as at present the less scrupulous editors do not dot enough letters. Still, a cast-iron system invites abuse more than does a flexible system.

In the second place, Kirchner’s principle (1), if carried out rigidly, necessitates printing all suggestions for restorations that fail short of certainty in the commentary. Thus in some cases what is virtually a second text has to be printed in the commentary. The student finds himself pencilling the restorations into the text above, where they can be read and studied with ease.

(2) THE PRINCIPLE OF EXTREME FREEDOM. Whether or not these objections are fatal, a radically different conception of restorations has been adopted by some scholars, and we owe to B. D. Meritt’s Epigraphica Attica (Cambridge [Mass.] 1940) ch. 4 (pp. 109–138, and notes pp. 148–151), a statement, with illustrations, of such a view. It was ably re-stated, with some expansion, by his collaborator (on ATL), M. F. McGregor, in a review of Epigraphica Attica, published in AJP 64 (1943) 245–246. This conception (2), which may be called the Meritt-McGregor one, is that the editor should consider himself bound by the space, etc., as supra, but by no other external, impersonal consideration.

Along the sliding scale of certainty and uncertainty there comes also a time when the exact wording of a restoration may not be correct but when the general sense and tenor of the argument can be carried through approximately as in the original by means of restoration [Meritt, p. 109].

Such restorations [of decrees relating to the Sicilian expedition] do not need to claim verbal accuracy. Their purpose is to yield a consecutive text in a fragmentary document so that a probable, or even possible, meaning may be derived from it. It is much easier for a student to follow and control an interpretation given by the epigraphist if the interpretation is expanded into epigraphic language that might once have appeared upon the stone. Such restoration for the sake of interpretation is sometimes carried in the footnotes and not inserted in the text of the document proper. . . . But a good suggestion is most easily followed if inserted into the text, where the angular [i.e. square] brackets leave no doubt as to what is part of the original still preserved on the stone [Meritt, pp. 129–130].

. . . it would be rash indeed to claim verbal accuracy for many of the longer restored passages of the fragmentary texts (of the tribute assessment decree of 425, IG I3 69, as edited by B. D. Meritt and A. B. West [Ann Arbor [Mich.] 1934]). Nonetheless, the restorations do prove that the interpretation is epigraphically possible, and in some instances they have in my opinion sufficient weight even to condition the interpretation [Meritt, p. 131].

The question of restoration is left until last and in a chapter that should be read by all the skeptics the author states his own guiding principles. He believes that restorations fall into two classes: (1) those which purport to be verbally accurate and so to reproduce the original text, and (2) those in which verbal accuracy is not claimed but which attempt to reproduce the sense, at least, of the original. Meritt thinks that the second type of restoration should be encouraged, since it presents to the reader the epigraphist’s “notes” and so documents his general determinations concerning the sense of the text and the length of lacunae. Thus he may prove that such a meaning as he has conjectured is at least not impossible on epigraphical grounds; in any case, argues Meritt, the intelligent reader is always protected by the brackets of the text and the red of the drawing. Such restorations, though not verbally accurate (and sometimes quite wrong), are based on the principle of trial and error and stimulate others, with the happy result that the supplements of fragmentary documents gradually approach more and more closely to the truth, and often reach it (see the excellent and convincing example, pp. 119–129).

The skeptic (who thinks of the epigraphist as a sort of detective fitting together puzzles), faced with a heavily restored text, may be amused. But the truth is, his amusement is based on a twofold ignorance: in the case of the tentative restoration, of modern epigraphic method (Meritt, pp. 129–130); in the case of certain restoration, in the criteria employed in reconstructing a text. My own advice to the skeptic is that he read the book.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that the epigraphist himself is at fault when he uses his purely tentative restorations as a proved basis for detailed historical conjecture. What we really need, I suppose, is a method of distinguishing between established and tentative restoration; yet one would hesitate to suggest that another type of bracket or another color ink be added to the already complicated epigraphic paraphernalia. As it is, the epigraphist must be reasonably conservative and the doubter must develop an intelligent tolerance [McGregor, pp. 245–246].

Difficulties with the Principle of Extreme Freedom

These, apart from illustrative matter, are the relevant passages: what it amounts to is, all restorations are to stand on an equal footing in print. The notion that restorations have value as illustrating the editor’s determination of the mere length of space available has little weight, because the accepted conventions of dots or dashes with superscript figures and indications of blank spaces fulfill the same function with perfect adequacy. On the other hand, no one could reasonably dispute the proposition that restorations which provide continuous sense in a fragmentary passage have potential value. But potentially they have another quality: they tend often to exert a tyranny over the mind—even when printed in the commentary. Of course, that cannot be avoided. What is troublesome is that, if printed in the text proper, with no warning signal save the brackets, they are exactly on a par with restorations which are
indubitable. Upon the reader is placed the burden of determining where, in the "sliding scale" of certainty-uncertainty, any given restoration belongs. To Meritt and McGregor, this burden is evidently one which every reader of epigraphical texts must bear. Shall he, filled with "intelligent tolerance," tolerate the tyranny of mere conjectures, or can he determine that it is mere conjecture? Presumably not; for his task includes "controlling" the interpretation before him.

Full rather of intelligent intolerance, the reader must stop, haled by the square brackets, at every substantial restoration, and try to "control" the ensuing restoration. The motto is *fretat risuitur, fretat lector.* Instead of accepting all restorations as presumably sound, the reader finds himself accepting none. This has happened. One contemporary historian-epigraphist declares of the texts in *ATL* that he accepts "only what is on the stone." Thus conception (2), though admitting (at least McGregor does, eschewing the "sliding scale") a distinction between certainties and uncertainties, runs the risk of destroying confidence even in the certainties.

**Examples of Free Restoration**

Meritt’s examples (for which he gives references) help to clarify what is involved.

(i) He comments upon a review by M. Feyel in which Feyel was troubled by *Pytaneis* 79, with its restoration of 14 whole lines. The restoration was made by me solely to determine the height of the stele, and the consequent number of slots in the Kleroterion on the other side. Feyel missed this aspect, and I judge that here my exposition was at fault in not making inescapable the fact that certainty was not claimed. The conjectural restoration should have been labeled "conjectural" more plainly. I had thought it was approximately correct; but fragments published subsequently by Meritt and W. K. Pritchett seemed to show that it was two lines too long. This was decisively confirmed in the summer of 1962, when I was able to find joins which linked all the fragments throughout.

(ii) Next we are asked to consider the history of *ATL* Aq, col. i, lines 111–119. Throughout many of the earlier attempts, ignorance of spatial requirements and of names of small cities played the dominant part, and conjecture was often far afield. I have not tested the final result, but most of the restorations are merely parts of short lines, and there is a high probability that most if not all can be put down as certain. The history of this fragment is a history not of pure restoration but of increasingly correct knowledge of what is involved. It is a splendid example of progress, but it is successful precisely because unfounded conjectures were replaced by solid knowledge.

(iii) The next example concerns *ATL* II, pp. 40–43 (Aq = IG I* 63), fragment 4. Meritt indicates the kind of argument for placing the fragment where it now is. I have not attempted to test the argument, but in any case the difficult point is that the restoration results in an extraordinary constitutional assumption. The placing and restoration give for line 16 the words *kai *86 [vou]6ekrē:[ δυσκοπητὴν] νο[υ]τ[ε]τάνον. This is presumably one of the chief instances which has "sufficient weight even to condition the interpretation," or rather to inform us that in 425/4 B.C. there was a board of nomothetai, otherwise unknown, in existence, and that it could summon dikasteria. The second assumption is perhaps even more difficult than the first. Dikasteria are never known to have been summoned by any officers except the thesmothetai. The dikasteria had authority superior to that of the nomothetai not many years later, when Nikomakhos and his board, called *anagrapheis,* were functioning; after they had finished the work, in 399/4, Nikomakhos, so far from being able to summon a dikasterion to validate their code, was instead summoned to stand trial on grave charges in a dikasterion (Lysias 30), we do not know with what result. Possibly every reader should be expected to know this; all I urge here is that a major new hypothesis in fifth-century constitutional history is printed without any warning in the text except square brackets. It is small wonder that critics have been uneasy and outspoken.

(iv) The fourth example (actually given first in *Epigraphia Attica*, pp. 109–111) is *ATL* II, p. 18 (List 12) lines 3–20, where in the quota list for 443/2 B.C., the authors restore 18 lines of the Ionic panel, both the amounts and the cities, complete: not a single numeral or letter is preserved on the stone.

The exact order of the names within the panel may not be precisely accurate, though we believe unlikely any considerable variation from the text of the original monument. But this does not destroy or impair in any way the value of the restorations for the student who wishes to know which cities of the Ionic province paid tribute in the spring of 442 (pp. 109–110).

**The Factors Involved in Restoration**

The problem of the status and form of restorations can perhaps be clarified by analysis into the factors involved, in the hope that one factor at least can somehow be altered. The factors involved in restoration appear to be five in number:

(a) The stones as they have come down to us, with gaps where restorations will range through all degrees of certainty, probability, possibility, and uncertainty—from parts of letters, which can be restored with absolute certainty, to missing fragments which cannot be "restored" at all.

(b) The external evidence, "literary" and epigraphical, monumental, etc., which has come down to us and which, constituting the "tradition," throws whatever light can be had, apart from pure reason, on the problem of what to restore in a given lacuna.

(c) The editor, a human being, also a scholar, i.e. well-intentioned, variable, unreliable in some instances, and refractory to regimentation; likely to have
studied the document long enough to have authoritative views—or mere idée fixes.

(d) The reader, also a human being, etc.; less likely to have special knowledge such as is involved in the interpretation of every inscription.

(e) Print, usually letterpress; once set, rigid. Controlled in respect to form by the Leiden system; in respect to content, not at present controlled.

If all readers (d) could be expected to have adequate knowledge, so that whoever reads an epigraphical text knew instantly just what degree of reliance to place on every restoration, no problem would arise. Restorations of any kind could be printed freely, and no one would be misled. Conception (q) virtually presupposes just this state of affairs; or rather, it presupposes that every reader can be expected to inform himself adequately about whatever restorations concern him.

There are of course, for some classes of inscriptions, a few readers more or less of this sort. They will wish, and they will often be able, to lay hands on the evidence without undue trouble, and they will be able to form a judgment satisfactory at least to themselves. But in a field where knowledge is so large and so special that usually only a small number of scholars is thus equipped, and where, even for such specialists, access to the relevant squeezes may be vital, the assumption of adequate potential knowledge is so unreal as to be nothing short of preposterous. Free restorations (a) shift a heavy, often an unbearable, burden to the reader. Free restorations are an act of ultra-specialist editors editing for ultra-specialist readers. If for these readers the burden is hard, for non-specialists it is impossible.

A Further Example

This could perhaps be illustrated by the last example given. The editors of ATL are willing to assume that all their readers can form a satisfactory judgment on the 10 cities-plus-payments. It may or may not seen a reasonable assumption: the judgment must rest in part on study of the proposition that payments, at least in the period in question, were in fact so regular that restoration of a long series of entries results in certainty. To establish this is a task which the reader may or may not reasonably be expected to perform. See further infra.

Conventions in Editing

A simpler illustration makes the situation clearer. In the dikast’s pinakion IG II1 1875, J. Kirchner left the second line unrestored:

\[ \text{T} \, \text{EPX}- \]

Earlier Kirchner himself had followed his predecessors in restoring ‘EPX’[269], but some pinakia had a patronymic in this place. Had Kirchner discovered that there was an eligible Greek personal name in EPX—Greek names in EPX—before the Roman Empire are rare; but in the Index to Hesperia 1–10 (1946) p. 56, A. E. Raubitschek completed Meritt’s [.\text{\textit{\textmu}}}\text{\textnu\textomega\nu\nuγ}] which was read in an inscription of fin. s. V a., to give [‘\text{\texti{\textg}rr\nu\nuγν}] Raubitschek kept the brackets (and dot): he was within the scope of conception (q). But observe how costly in time his procedure is for the critical reader. Is there a known Greek name Erkhimenes? To find out, a whole series of books must be carefully consulted; and the usual ones, certainly, will reveal none. The only Greek name in EPX—found by me in a reasonably long search was ‘EPX[\text{\texti{\textg}rr\nu\nuγ]} and this name dates from the Roman Empire. In short, [‘\text{\texti{\textg}rr\nu\nuγ}] appears to have been a wild guess, unfounded. It took some time to find out the facts, and so to determine that the pinakion should be restored, after all, with the deinitic ‘EPX[\text{\texti{\textg}rr\nu\nuγ}]. Why Kirchner hesitated, we cannot be sure; but he was not sufficiently careful in dealing with the pinakia. The matter does not end there. Pushing the inquiry back to the original reading, I have found from a squeeze that Meritt’s [.\text{\textit{\textmu}}}\text{\textnu\textomega\nu\nuγ} is incorrect; no basis whatever exists for Erkhimenes, even as a guess. The correct reading is clearly [.\text{\textit{\textmu}}}\text{\textnu\textomega\nu\nuγ, and the correct restoration is [‘\text{\textit{\textg}rr\nu\nuγ] the only such name which is well attested. Subsequently on two occasions J. H. Kroll has examined the pinakion in Basel. Inscribed at least twice, the second text is {\textit{\texti{\textg}rr\nu\nuγs [\text{\texti{\textg}rr\nu\nuγs (\text{\texti{\textg}rr\nu\nuγs]. The section letter (I) is missing.

In this instance, therefore, and usually in all instances where the restoration is not at once and obviously certain, the reader must do what the editor ought to have done. Quite apart from the (minor) question about how the result ought to be presented, the editor ought normally to provide adequate data for judging his restorations.

If then the reader (d) is not the solution to the problem, and if the editor (c) can only be influenced, if at all, by a consensus of sensible opinion, then the real basis of opinion, viz. the inscription itself (a), is the right point of attack.

Various Essential Considerations

The situation as a whole is really simple. Some restorations in inscriptions, ranging from such easy matters as the restoration of EΑ[.\text{\textg}EE\nu\nuγ and other restorations of the same kind, usually brief, on to other, usually longer, restorations of words and phrases, are all merely clerical. To restore them is merely to restore a regular form. No historical act is assumed beyond the clerical act—a copy assumed to have been in the regular form, given to the mason, who is assumed to have inscribed it correctly. Call this type of restoration Type A. Exceptions can have occurred, from various causes; but if an exception did occur
The restoration of facts is often recognized to be somehow a different matter, but epigraphists have been none too sharp in their realization of just what is involved. It is only recently, for instance, that the perils involved in restoring the preambles of Athenian decrees have become vividly clear to some few scholars. But take the former illustration. To restore 18 lines of a tribute quota list may seem like an innocent procedure: the gap is there, 18 lines long; from 449/1 and other years, 18 cities, more or less regular in order, can be found to fill the gap. Cleverly it is easy and natural to put them in. There is a very real probability, moreover, that these cities did pay in 449/2. But when the amounts also are restored, a large number of acts, e.g., payments by thousands of persons, are "restored." This is anything but clerical. A season of drought or disease, of storms, of local disaffection, or whatever, can have reduced any or all of the payments. Whether any such thing happened, we simply do not know. Such restorations—call them Type B, the restoration of facts—are in a different sphere altogether from that of mere clerical copies and masons' regularity.

Yet another special set of problems in restoration is present in dealing with documents which involve a complex series of interdependent items, such as the developed preambles of Athenian decrees. Here historical facts, in the aspect of dating by Arkhon and Grammateus, are mingled inextricably with more or less regular formulas. In HSCP 67 (1963) 56-75 I have tried to show that epigraphical facts should not be treated promiscuously in order to meet the demands of general theories—especially of theories which themselves are open to grave question.

The restoration of personal names involves a great many slightly divergent situations, about which many pages could be written. On the one hand, licence to print mere guesses should be denied altogether. On the other hand, readings themselves can be justified often only by demonstration that a name exists, and is not unlikely in the given region and period. Such names usually belong in the commentary; but occasionally, when the choice is between one highly likely form and one highly unlikely, the likely form might well appear in the text, but marked (infra) as a suggestion. For an illustration of a prosopographical suggestion in a text, see, in the chapter which follows, IG II1 1989.3. For recent discussions of actual free restorations, see W. K. Pritchett, AJA 56 (1952) 161-168, and S. Dow, Festschrift David Moore Robinson, II (St. Louis 1953) 358-360.

Inscriptions in verse are in a class by themselves with respect to restorations. Restoration of verse is the restoration not of a mere clerical or formulaic expression, and not of historical facts involving many persons, but of words written by one verifier. To restore what is missing from his verses is bound always to be especially tempting, in that it is an act of re-creation; as in other restorations, but more so, it puts, or seems to put, a premium on special skill.

Verses which are of low order, as in many epitaphs, will be likely to involve conventional phrases, so that the chance of being right is comparatively favorable. But even in the restoration of such verses, there are obvious hazards, one of which is the danger of actually improving on the original. When it comes to
CONVENTIONS IN EDITING

If the reader please, let it be imagined, for the sake of exploring consequences, that the new principle is adopted, so that at last in Greek epigraphy we have a simple distinction—[certain]; [not certain?]; in the contents of square brackets. The extremities represented by conceptions (1) and (2) are both avoided.

For the reader, perpetual recourse to the commentary is reduced. The specialist (1) does not have to seek out in the commentary a text which may fit, nor (2) combat what he may regard as an extravagant claim of certainty trying to impose itself. The non-specialist can see at a glance what is definitely known and is acceptable for his purposes. For the reader, the use of the interrogation point in epigraphical texts makes everything easier.

For the editor, or rather for some editors, life will be harder. No longer putting the burden on the reader, they must do enough work to decide whether or not their restorations are certain or highly probable (or mere conjectures, to be put in the commentary). No longer can the editor edit for specialists alone; no longer can he hide behind the square brackets, which hitherto have meant all things to all men. Obligated now to distinguish in his text between what is certain and what is not, the editor may decide wrongly: many editors inevitably will decide wrongly. The important thing is that whereas hitherto no editor could be condemned for anything in square brackets, provided it fitted the space, etc., now the editor's every decision is recorded for all to see. This in turn will have the wholesome effect of inducing the editor to explain fully in his commentary what the basis for his decision was. When no decision had to be made and everything could go into the square brackets, then no explanation was really demanded.

Proposed Rules

The scheme proposed herein provides four principal possibilities for the printing of restorations. Rules may be codified somewhat as follows:

I. Square brackets, no interrogation point.
   **Significance:** certainty or probability so great as to admit no reasonable doubt.
   **Applicable to:** formulae occurring often in the same place in the same class of documents; facts independently attested; also, with caution, to some other verbal and factual restorations.

II. Square brackets, single interrogation point(s).
   **Significance:** definite probability.
   **Applicable to:** formulae with insufficient support in other documents, or containing variable elements, or supported only by strong abstract reasons; facts lacking sufficient independent support but reasonably likely.
   **Form:** a small superscript interrogation point at the end of the restoration; or after any doubtful word of a multi-word restoration; or at the beginning as well as at the end of a multi-word restoration which as a whole is less than certain.

III. To avoid a multiplicity of interrogation points: a heading which states in some form that restorations are conjectures.
   **N.B.** In classes I–III the space must usually be closely determinable and must meet the requirements.

IV. Suggestions offered in the commentary.
   **Significance:** crude approximation, suggesting the general nature of the restoration.
   **Applicable to:** lacunae which cannot be measured, restorations which do not fit, but which may suggest the sense or the nature of the original.
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

EPHEBOI IN NERONIAN ATHENS

Previous Study, Provenience, Description

EPIGRAPHIKON MOUSEION, Athens, inventory number 5288. First published by P. Graindor, BCH 51 (1927) 301-302, no. 75. In Athens de Tiberi à Trajan (Cairo 1931), Graindor refers to it five times (see index) but without adding. Kirchner had the BCH publication and also a transcription by J. von Prott. The resulting text, IG II² 1989, has Graindor’s error of spacing in line 3 and Graindor’s wrong placing of col. ii; but omits line 8, which Graindor had indicated. The present edition is intended to supplant these (the only) earlier two.

Graindor has nothing on the provenience, but Kirchner reports, from the EM inventory, that it was found at the church of Hag. Demetrios Kataphores. Many of the Ephebic inscriptions from the time of the Roman Empire, viz. IG II² 1963-1989, were found in the dismantling of this church. The church was built into the “Valerian” Wall, now called the Late Roman Fortification: it dates from A.D. 276-282 (Agora Guide [Athens 1962] 29, 86-87, and bibliography on 213, no. 39). The inscriptions came from the Diogenion, which was the gymnasion of the Epheboi (on which HSCP 63 [1958] 424 and TAPA 91 [1960] 408). The church of Demetrios Kataphores was dismantled, and the inscriptions were extracted, in 1860. Like this one, many Ephebic inscriptions were omitted from IG III, and still more from S. A. Koumanoudes, Philistor (Athens 1861-62), earlier.

The monument is the upper left corner of a stele of Pentelic marble, preserving part of the original left side, and surmounted by a small ovolo-and-fascia moulding (height, 0.025-0.027 m.; profile, Fig. 1) and a pediment with the (small) left akroterion projected forward from a solid background.

Traces of paint are extensively preserved. Thus there is a clear floral design on the akroterion, giving in black painted form a leaf and tendril; also clear are two vertical bars at the right end of the akroterion. Certainly the leaf and tendril are Graindor’s “anthemion in black,” and they are probably von Prott’s “kneeling man.” In the center of the pediment a simple incision outlines a shield: half or less remains. To the left of the (central) shield are remains of a figure in red. It has a crude horse-shape; I am unable to say what it represents. In the (left) corner of the aetos is a much smaller object in black. On the ovolo there was doubtless a red and black egg-and-dart; it has vanished. Kirchner very observantly reported that the lines of the text were painted alternately red and black. Doubtless squeezes have removed much of the color, but clear traces are visible on both stone and photograph: in line 1 only a little red, but much black in 2 and 4. Alternating colors in the lines of Neronian inscriptions will be studied by me elsewhere; here I note that lines 1, 3, 5 (heading), 6-7 were red; 2, 4, 8, 9-10 were black. The letters of many fine inscriptions were filled with color, and enough survives, especially in Egypt, to show that an alternating scheme was not infrequent.

The original thickness is preserved: 0.053 m. through the moulding, 0.046 m. through the inscribed area. This is extraordinarily thin, and the stele should be grouped with the few very thin Athenian stelai mentioned in AJA 67 (1963) 261.
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The back is level, finished however with closely spaced marks of the point all over: a curious treatment, not a quarry surface. The side too was not well smoothed; some plaster adheres. The height is 0.248 m., the width 0.246 m. The center being preserved, the original width can be reckoned as ca. 0.40 m.; for so small a thickness, the stele was very wide, and the height can hardly have been much if any over ca. 0.80 m. There was probably room for no more than 20 names (40 lines) in each column. It is natural to suspect, though I cannot prove, that the stele was re-cut after a former use.

Letters of preamble and line 5: average height of line plus interline, 0.0164 m.; letters alone, full height, 0.013 m. Letters of list: height, 0.010 m. (as often, they were smaller, but it was these alone that Kirchner measured, whereas Graindor had both); interline 0.003 m. The photograph is adequate for the shapes of the letters. Most notable is the tail of the rho, small in line 4 (end), tiny in line 2 (near end). Presumably this is an archaism.

**IG II² 1989, New Text**

A.D. 53/4-66/7

Pediment partly preserved with shield in center, the center being directly over the me of ἀρχόμενος. Normally spaced line 2, has 31 full letters.

1 ἄγοδος τοῦ Ναυλοῦ Ἡλίσβας Ἐλευσίνης
2 ητί Δικαίος ἀρχίστατο καὶ ιρίος Φανὸς
3 σοῦ ὑπόστου, κομνηνοί γνώμονας Θεότοκος
4 κλάνοι τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου Μαρίας ὑποταγὸν
5 πηχομένοις
6 [*A]πάνησις 9 Ἐν [-----] [-----]
7 [*-α]μου 10 [-----] [patronymic]
8 [*-α]μου 11 [-----] [-----]

Uncertain number of lines missing in each column; not more, probably fewer, than 50.

**Commentary**

Line 1. Suppression of both final iota, dear here in ἄγοδος τοῦ Ναυλοῦ, appears to be uncommon at this date, but evidently there was some looseness of usage. The earliest positive instances are IG II² 1996 and 1998 of fin. i p.—Epigraphical conventions call for iota adscript when inscribed, subscript when suppressed.

As in another Nero inscription, Hesperia 12 (1943) 66-71, the erasure was made with unusual care: the chisel was a narrow one, driven over the area several times; the sides of the depression were made to slope in gently, and the surface curves evenly. In the area of the erasure, however, the (hitherto unread) two uprights and the slanting middle stroke of the first me can be dimly made

**Figure 2**

**Epheboi in Neronian Athens (IG II² 1989)**
out on the squeeze, and the photograph has revealed the left foot of the second nu. This confirmation of the emperor's name, restored by Graindor, is welcome, because it is not preserved beyond the fifth letter, where I have printed a dotted line (supra p. 9) to indicate the broken edge of the stone. (Graindor assumed that the alternative was ΓΑΙΟΣ, which with $\frac{41}{2}$ letters would barely fill the space, but the designation in IG II 2 292 is Γάιος Καταρα οὐσωρόστιυρ—unedited).

Nero was named in eight Athenian inscriptions, including the present, and his name was later erased in all. Only one of the eight, viz. Hesperia 28 (1959) 82 no. 12, preserves a three-word designation, i.e. what must evidently be restored in the present inscription. Another, viz. Hesperia 12 (1943) 66–71, should probably be restored in the same way. The rest are: IG II 2 1990 line 1 (note in line 3 Nero is not erased), 3182, 3273, 3278, 3279 (restoration uncertain).

In IG II 2 1990 line 1, 3182, and 3278, Nero's own name alone is erased, whereas in Hesperia 12 (1943) 66–71 and in Hesperia 28 (1959) 82 no. 12, all three names are erased. About the present inscription there is no other evidence, and there can be no certainty, as to whether more was erased than Nero's own name.

Line 1 was inscribed with wider horizontal spacing, in the preserved part, than line 2; hence the final two words of line 1 were evidently crowded, to judge by the preserved center, by the length of line, and by the (restored) length of line 3. Nevertheless the crowding is not natural; it may suggest that different, shorter names were used, but since none is known, more likely the last two letters were smaller and were crowded.

Line 2. No other document dated by this Archon Diokles survives, and no precise year for his term can be given. For the list of Archontes, see J. H. Oliver, Hesperia 11 (1942) 83–84; for the controlling cycles, J. A. Notopoulos, Hesperia 18 (1949) 49. For the identity of the man Diokles, a common name to be sure, but less so than earlier, Graindor suggested, and Kirchner mentioned (i.e. approved), Διοκλῆς θεωτητολοχος άγνωστος, known to us med. s. I p. as having been Dadouchos, Exegetes, and Hoplite General (IG II 2 4175 and 4176 [of A.D. ca. 41?], 4042 [his daughter], 3283 [Epimeletes?—restored—of the Asklepieion]).—The Priesthood of Drusus in Athens is treated by P. Graindor, Ath. v. Aug. 157; Ath. de Tüb. 116.

Line 3. Following Graindor all too closely, Kirchner put [--- Κλ.---] κλεος for the nomen only of the Kosmetes. No name has been suggested for the lacuna; there is no name [--- Κλ.---] Κλ. Actually line 3 is spaced very slightly more widely than line 2, and had ca. 30 letters if filled, so that the name would be [--- Κλ.---] Κλ. The longest name in -κλεος, viz. άπρωτοκλεος, is known in Athens, and would fit. But since κλεος begins with a 3-letter syllable, as much as two spaces at the end of the previous line (3) can have been left blank. We need fill only [--- Κλ.---] Κλ. The termination -κλ. is just about the commonest for names in Greek, but among such names, total lengths of 10 letters or more
are actually not numerous, and among the long names, one that is fairly frequent in Roman Athens, and has 101 letters, can be restored:

3 ενωτον τεωτον Θεωστον
4 κλεος του Ι Μαρα[εων]

In the list of Epheboi IG II1 1970 lines 42–45, special honors are signalized for one person, named in a single central (painted) wreath, Θεωστοκλες [Θεωστό]. The date is A.D. 45/6. The honors were voted, doubtless, by his fellow-Epheboi, one of whom set up the stele. Presumably Themistokles had some athletic victory: for such victors in Ephebic inscriptions, see e.g. IG II1 1992, and presumably the [four] names within crowns in IG II1 1973—both inscriptions are of this same period. It is notable that Themistokles was not named at all in two other lists of Epheboi of his year (elsewhere I shall publish studies of the three lists of A.D. 45/6). In any case it seems altogether likely that the future Kosmetes, or, less likely, his father, was already prominent in A.D. 45/6. Moreover the name Themistokles is known in Marathon, though not until med. s. III p.: IG II 3704 (for its importance, see J. H. Oliver, Hesperia 5 [1936] 92, who quotes it entire), line 8; which records a daughter, who is a Marathonian, of Κακοστοκλες, "Ἄνδρας." Possibly he was a descendant.

LINE 5. A fairly short two-word heading is required for symmetry, and the forthcoming study mentioned supra will show that there is no likely alternative. W. Dittenberger had dated the expression φιλόν γορπών to the reign of Claudius (comm. on IG II1 1970); but it appears also, at least once, under Nero. Various other terms, φιλόν alone, etc., are used of groups of friends. IG II1 1989 is now proved, with three columns clear, to have been one of the longer φιλόν inscriptions of this latter class, but not the longest. There are a few of intermediate size (e.g. IG II1 1984). Not much had been made of the φιλόν γορπών and the other φιλόν—a sample is P. Graindor, Ath. de Tib. 86—until L. Robert collected its analogues in usage among the Epheboi, also ascertained its Roman equivalent, and improved the understanding of various texts: Hellenica I (1940) 127–131. The Latin equivalents show that the translation of γορπώς should be 'agile, vigorous' (128), i.e. 'athletic.' I suppose that this is right, and that the adjective does not qualify the friendship specially: they are not 'agile as friends,' but rather 'friends who are agile fellows.' Even so, one suspects that the words as used by the Epheboi of themselves had a slang flavor, and that the connotation was wider and vaguer, so that γορπώς meant 'lively'—Robert himself translates one occurrence as brave (128 n. 10).

LINES 6ff: the list of Epheboi. Hitherto a voc. has been printed after line 6, as if line 9 might be the patronymic of Apolexis. It has not been noticed that line 9 is half a space higher: it represents a new, central, column of names, deliberately spaced out of alignment with col. i, so as to avoid the very confusion which former texts have introduced. Inscribing columns out of alignment with each other was a common arrangement, see e.g. in the Bowdoin alphabetized list, AJA 67 (1963) 262n. There were three columns in all, the third being doubtless lower, and in alignment with col. i. Col. i was indented, as in IG II1 1998.

Since the first Ephebos is given a patronymic, the question arises whether all the Epheboi were listed with patronymics. Most of the other first-century lists are made up without patronymics regularly given; but IG II1 1967, and the first group, lines 10–14, of IG II1 1970, suffice to show that many of the names in the present list, and perhaps all, had patronymics. The resulting arrangement—three single-word columns, with nomen and patronymic in alternate lines—is unique. Any fragment should be easily recognizable; I have found none.

LINE 6. Listed first, Apolexis has the position of greatest dignity. The name is comparatively rare: most occur in Agora inscriptions, see the Hesperia Index 1–10 i.e. Graindor conjectures that this Apolexis was a descendant of one or both of the Arkhons of 25/4–10/7 and 8/7–2/1 B.C., but the patronymic does not encourage it.

LINE 7. Part of a (new) slanting stroke shows clearly at the break, and the letter was Α, Α, (Α), or Μ.

LINE 8. Graindor read here ΚΙ but the first visible stroke, which slants, slants a bit more steeply than in Κ and thus belongs more likely to a Υ (not to a Υ). What follows, a tiny trace, is not certainly a stroke but is correctly placed for the upper left (serif'd?) corner of any one of many letters.

LINE 9. After ΕΥ a trace shows as of a serif and the end of an oblique stroke, also apparently of an upright stroke. The only letter which fits the traces is Μ, but too little remains for certainty.

The Inscription as a Whole

From the proportions of the stele, and the care used in laying out the list in three columns, the total number of Epheboi listed can be estimated as at least 90, at most 60, with ca. 36 as probable. On numbers of Epheboi in this period there is little information and no up-to-date table: in general, John Day, An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination (New York 1942) 275; Graindor, Athénes de Tibère à Trajan (Cairo 1931) 87. But the study of A.D. 45/6 will show that almost certainly the present inscription did not list all the Epheboi of its year.

With all its color and ornamentation, the original was a handsome monument, superior to most stelai. Patronymics doubtless were part of its style. The lettering is handsome too, but mannered, not really fine. And when the time came to obliterate Nero's nomen, the Athenians saw to it, in this instance as probably in all the other Neronian inscriptions, that the erasing was sufficiently thorough, and so near as not to mar the whole.
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