

RESIDUAL OR FUNCTIONAL? A TAXONOMY OF THE USES OF *PARAGRAPHOI* IN GREEK EPIGRAPHICAL TEXTS*

Davide Amendola

1. INTRODUCTION

In the ancient Greek world, the *παράγραφος* (or *παραγραφή*, according to fourth-century literary sources) – a straight dash written or cut horizontally beneath a line of writing at the left margin of a column of text – was a common lectional sign, generally employed to mark off divisions and transitions of some kind within a text (e.g., to denote a change of speaker or assist with reading aloud).¹ Scholars often emphasise that this sign is used far more sporadically in epigraphic sources than in papyrological ones (especially literary book-rolls).² However, closer inspection

* I am grateful to my fellow editors, Cristina Carusi, Francesca Maltomini and Emilio Rosamilia, for their help and encouragement as I worked on this project, as well as to the useful comments of the audience at the workshop *Documenti, supporti, layout. Giornata fiorentina fra papirologia ed epigrafia*, where I presented a preliminary version of this chapter. I would also like to extend thanks for the insights and suggestions by Alice Bencivenni, Michele Faraguna, Maria Serena Funghi, Charalambos Kritzas, Anna Magnetto, Marijana Ricl, Luca Ruggeri, and the two anonymous reviewers of the entire manuscript.

¹ Sometimes it served more than one concurrent function within the same context (especially in papyrological evidence): on the *paragraphos* in literary papyri and manuscripts, cf. Tanzi-Mira 1920; Grohmann 1929; Giangrande 1978; Cavallo 1983, 23-24; Turner 1987, 8, 12; Barbis Lupi 1994; Johnson 1994; Del Corso 2002, 151-153; Del Mastro 2017. Ancient Greek sources on the *paragraphos* include, e.g., Isoc. 15.59; Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.1409a19-21, where the reference could be to “a sign to mark sentence end”, according to Johnson 1994, 65 n. 1; Harp. Π 17, s.v. *Παραγραφή* Keaney (ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τῆς γραμμῆς ἦν [μέχρι] νῦν παράγραφον καλοῦμεν· καὶ ἔστι τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀφ’ οὗ παρέγραψα· τοῦτο δ’ ἂν εἴη, ἀφ’ οὗ παρεθέμην). Unless otherwise indicated, all dates in this chapter are BCE.

² Cf. e.g. Johnson 1994, 65 (“In documents, it is likewise employed, though rarely, to separate sections or the members of a list, but fairly regularly a paragraphus will divide the main text from the *subscriptio*”); Manganaro 2000, 410 n. 18 (“un segno raro in epigrafia, comune nei papiri”); Costabile 2001, 165; Del Corso 2002, esp. 180 (speaking of a “segno estraneo all’uso epigrafico ma comune nella scrittura su papiro sin dai suoi primi esempi”); and, most recently, Kalliontzis and Papazarkadas 2019, 305, arguing that “[s]uch *paragraphoi* are rare, albeit not unheard of, in epigraphical texts”. *Contra*, and rightly so, Faraguna 2020, 120 (“the sign is not as rare as it is sometimes stated”); see also Boffo and Faraguna 2021,

Davide Amendola, Scuola Normale di Pisa, Italy, davide.amendola@sns.it, 0000-0003-3316-8371

Referee List (DOI 10.36253/fup_referee_list)

FUP Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing (DOI 10.36253/fup_best_practice)

Davide Amendola, *Residual or Functional? A Taxonomy of the Uses of paragraphoi in Greek Epigraphical Texts*, © Author(s), CC BY 4.0, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0456-9.12, in Davide Amendola, Cristina Carusi, Francesca Maltomini, Emilio Rosamilia (edited by), *Text, Layout, and Medium. Documents from the Greco-Roman World between Epigraphy and Papyrology*, pp. 169-216, 2024, published by Firenze University Press, ISBN 979-12-215-0456-9, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0456-9

makes it clear that this claim requires substantial revision as an examination of a variety of examples in Greek inscriptions from different regions and periods actually allows for a precise categorisation – practically a taxonomy – of the sign’s use, as I argue below.³ Since the texts carved in stone or metal and painted on walls were usually copied from *antigrapha* on ephemeral materials (often, but not exclusively, papyrus), a detailed analysis of how *paragraphoi* were used in both inscriptions and papyri may seem, at first glance, particularly promising and productive. However, as is often the case with matters related to layout, so here caution must be exercised when adopting a comparative approach. Indeed, any attempt to distinguish the ways in which the sign is used in these two types of sources is hindered by the fact that, barring some categories in which overlap does occur (e.g., lists, accounts, and the like), documents inscribed on stone differ in their nature from those penned on papyrus. The same holds true for chronology as inscriptions and papyri of the same period can only be compared to each other between the early Hellenistic age and Late Antiquity.

To this one may add two further problems. On the one hand, modern editors of Greek inscriptions have always been fairly inconsistent about reproducing *paragraphoi* – a fact that makes any attempt to identify the use of these signs in epigraphic sources particularly challenging in cases where no high-quality images are available.⁴ On the other, scholars of Greek epigraphy generally regard the *paragraphos* as a residual element, namely, as a sign preserved only sporadically by stonecutters during the transition from *antigrapha* on papyrus and other soft materials to texts inscribed on durable materials. This general statement doubtless remains valid in many cases and in certain types of documents, as has been confirmed by the extensive research I have conducted for this study. However, the fragmentary condition of the evidence often impedes an accurate assessment of the actual occurrence and deployment of interpuncts and lectional signs in epigraphic documents, a problem that, in turn, prevents us from understanding whether their survival or absence has been affected by material conditions, such as *lacunae*, or is due, instead, to other, intentional factors.

I shall return to the problem of viewing *paragraphoi* and other signs as index fossils in ancient documents, but first I will analyse their use in Greek inscriptions. A thorough review of the evidence drawn from editions and available images (both

esp. 83–86. For marks related to the *paragraphos* in Attic inscriptions of the Roman period, see further Threatte 1980, 90–94. Guarducci 1967, 391–397 does not include *paragraphoi* among the signs employed in Greek epigraphic texts.

³ For the purpose of this paper, I will not take into account Greek verse inscriptions. On this point, see most recently Garulli 2019, esp. 136, who concludes that “[e]verything suggests that the *paragraphos* in verse inscriptions is employed as an all-purpose divider”.

⁴ For instance, Shear 2003, 103 chooses not to include *paragraphoi* in her re-edition of *IG II² 2311* “in order to increase its legibility”.

printed and virtual) has led to the divisions that appear in the following pages. The early history of the *paragraphos*, especially in the Athenian context, has recently been explored in a seminal paper by Michele Faraguna, who has conducted a careful examination of several epigraphic lists and accounts that were laid out in a columnar form. My purpose here is to further develop his research and gather a body of examples that offers a comprehensive account of the various uses of this sign in Greek documents on non-perishable materials from different areas and over a longer time span (namely, from the Archaic to the late Hellenistic period).⁵ In addition, I hope to show that, contrary to the general assumption, *paragraphoi* appear all over Greek inscriptions from a fairly early date. Due to the difficulties noted above, this study does not claim to be comprehensive, but does include many instances of the use of *paragraphoi* in Greek epigraphic sources that have never previously been taken into account or discussed. Within each section, the assembled cases will be presented in chronological rather than strictly typological order since another obstacle faced by a study of this type arises from the fact that more often than not, the said sign is not used consistently in the same document, let alone within a coherent group or set of inscriptions. This issue, in turn, is related to that of the sign's residual nature. I shall therefore return to both these issues at the end of this chapter.

2. EARLIEST EXAMPLES (OUTSIDE OF ATHENS)

From what I have been able to ascertain, the practice of adding a horizontal stroke between lines at the left margin dates back to as early as the late 6th century, since a trace of one apparently exists in the earliest-known documentary inscription from Samothrace, [1] *SEG LIII 917*.⁶ In this small archaic fragment in the Ionic dialect, tentatively assigned on palaeographical grounds to around 525–500, the right end of what seems to be a *paragraphos* is clearly visible between the two extant lines, both of which have a single mid-line dot (“apparently an interpunct”, according to the editors) at their beginning. Interestingly enough, the occurrence of a mark compatible with the *paragraphos* has elicited the conclusion that *SEG LIII 917* may be a fragment of “a financial document or a record of some sort”.⁷ Although this suggestion can-

⁵ Cf. Faraguna 2020, 120: “I have not been able to carry out a systematic survey, which is beyond the scope of this paper, but have collected a fair number of examples in mainly public inscriptions from the fifth and fourth centuries BC”.

⁶ Among the attestations of *paragraphoi* in inscriptions of the Archaic period, Costabile 2001, 165 only includes the agonistic dedication to Athena Alea from Tegea from the last quarter of the 6th century, *IG V.2 75* (*LSAG*², Arkadia, no. 5), but the signs separating the lines of text that he reads as *paragraphoi* are actually horizontal lines with curved ends that have been interpreted by Aupert 1980 as schematic representations of the stadium at Tegea; cf. Jeffery 1989, 209: “The technique strongly resembles that of contemporary Lakonian inscriptions, the neat lettering being written along a curious double-looped guide-line”. Photo available at Aupert 1980, 312, fig. 3.

⁷ Dimitrova and Clinton 2003, 237 (image available *ibidem*, at p. 236).

not be conclusively proven, the idea is all the more interesting as most later inscriptions or papyri in which *paragraphoi* are employed actually consist of accounts, lists and the like. This is true, for instance, of an account inscribed on a lead tablet from the sanctuary of Nemesis at Rhamnous, [2] *I.Rhamnous* 181 (*IG I³* 247bis: around 500) that refers to overseers in a sort of heading (ἐπιστατῶν) on side A and records two budgets with numerals on side B, that is, sums given to four recipients listed by name in the dative in ll. 6–9 and money received from three individuals (who paid it back to the treasury, according to Josine H. Blok) in ll. 11–13.⁸ In addition to being preceded by different headings (τὸ χρῆμα | ἀνέλονται | τὸς ἱεροποιῶς | τὸ ἐν τῷ μολυβδότῳ | ἡγαρμμένο at ll. 1–5 and [δε]μόσιον : ἡέχ[οσι] at l. 10, respectively), these two distinct sections are set apart by a long horizontal stroke between ll. 9 and 10, which extends nearly the entire width of side B and seems to cross at a right angle a vertical line running from top to bottom around 1 cm from the left margin.⁹ A similar case can be made for three other 5th-century documents inscribed on the same medium. The first, [3] *IG IX.1²* 874 (*SEG XLVIII* 604: ca. 475–450), is a palimpsest lead tablet from Corcyra inscribed in the Corinthian alphabet that records a delivery of wooden beams and clay tiles employed in the construction or repair of a dockyard roof: a horizontal line between ll. 5 and 6 clearly separates the series of items delivered by two different individuals (Alkimos at l. 1 and Philotas at l. 6) from each other.¹⁰ The second, [4] *Prignitz* 2014, no. 3 (ca. 450–425), is a receipt for a loan in the Phocian alphabet inscribed on a lead plaque that was found in the oracle sanctuary of Apollo at Kalapodi (arguably ancient Abai in eastern Phocis), one of the main religious centres of the Phocian League: here the *paragraphos* – a long line extending beneath the initial six letters of l. 3 (fully coinciding with those of the name [Γό]ργος) – appears to visually emphasise the distinction between creditor (at l. 3: [Γό]ργος ἀπέδοκε ἕκατι μν(ᾶ)ς) and debtor (at ll. 4–5: [τ]ούτας Μενόνδας | [ἔχ]ρέσατο).¹¹ Likewise noteworthy is that the sign is employed in combination

⁸ For a more recent assessment of the overall significance of this document, see Blok 2010, 77–79; cf. further Bubelis 2016, 178–187.

⁹ Petrakos 1999, 146: “Στὴν ἀριστερῇ ἄκρῃ τῆς κύριας ὄψης ὑπάρχει κατακόρυφη γραμμὴ ποῦ ἀπέχει 0.01 ἀπὸ τὸ ἄκρο τῆς πλάκας καὶ δευτέρη ὀριζόντια ποῦ χωρίζει τὸν ἔνατο ἀπὸ τὸν δέκατο στίχο”. Photo available at Mylonas 1985, 55, fig. 78; Petrakos 1999, 147 (drawing). Cf. Meyer 2017, 213 n. 17. On the clarity of the Rhamnous tablet’s layout, see also Faraguna 2020, 121; Osborne 2022, 61–62.

¹⁰ The line order on the tablet also deserves attention as the letters and numbers in the second half of ll. 4 and 7, which continue the text of ll. 3 and 6, respectively, are written retrograde and are separated from the rest by a pair of two lines meeting at a right angle. Moreover, short dashes at mid-height highlight the figures at ll. 2, 3, 4, 5, 8. For the drawing, see Koremis 1992–1998, 349. On the tablet, see also Marginesu 2021; Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 191.

¹¹ The *editores principes* (*SEG XXXVII* 422) see the sign as an underlining “wohl zur buchungs-technischen Hervorhebung” (Felsch and Siewert 1987, 683), while Prignitz 2014, no. 3, 138–139 (Abb. 4), who provides a re-edition of the text (*SEG LXIV* 471), neither prints it between lines 3 and 4 nor comments on its possible function in that context. Cf. Meyer 2017, 213 n. 17.

with other *interpuncta* since an *anō stigmē* occurs at the end of l. 3 after ἵκατι μν(ᾶ)ς (as happens immediately after the dating formula).¹² The third, [5] **Rosamilia 2023**, no. 24 (*IG Cyrenaica*² 081100: ca. 410), consists of accounts of uncertain character inscribed in a nearly *stoichedon* order on a fragmentary lead tablet from Cyrene (Fig. 52). In this case, the long horizontal stroke extending beneath the first five letters of l. 8 seems to separate two different sections of the document from each other, as further suggested by the temporal indication ἐφ' Ἑρμῆσάνδ[ρῶ at the beginning of l. 9, though traces of *paragraphoi* are probably also visible in fragments *f* and *k*.¹³

Equally relevant to this discussion of the earliest instances of the use of the mark to separate two distinct portions of text is one of the four still unpublished inscribed bronze tablets found near Thebes in a tomb-like cist of the 6th century, [6] **MΘ 35914** (*SEG LX 508*: opisthographic, around the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 5th century), which appears to contain regulations related to a sacred feast on its second side. As is clear from the image published by Angelos P. Matthaïou, a straight interlinear dash running one-half the length of the tablet divides the text above from a list of twenty-two people below, which is preceded by the heading θοίνατροι (perhaps “partakers in a feast”).¹⁴ Another example that bears mentioning in this context is [7] **IG IX.2 257** (van Effenterre – Ruzé, *Nomima*, I 33; Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 118), a bronze tablet dated to the third quarter of the 5th century that contains the honours bestowed on a Corinthian by the city of Thetonia in southern Thessaly. The layout strategy adopted by the engraver makes it clear that the horizontal line that begins at the left margin and runs beneath the first three letters of l. 1 was meant to separate the final portion of the document written at the top from its main body below as there was no more space left at the bottom of the tablet, and the cutter had to complete the text above.¹⁵

The aforementioned examples may lend support to the idea that despite the uncertainty of its origins, the *paragraphos* was initially conceived as a graphic aid for spatially separating items or slightly larger portions of text in financial documents and the like. Such an assumption is strengthened by the fact that in the vast majority of inscriptions (mainly from Athens) from the 5th century – the period when the mark became common – it is simply used to mark off different sections (as in the

¹² Moreover, the two parts of the dating formula (at ll. 1–2: [Γ]ενναίου γραμμ[ατέ]οντος : πρᾶτου μενός), as well as the names of the debtor and the guarantors of the interest (at ll. 4–6: [τ]ούτας Μενόνδας | [ἐχ]ρέσατο : Ηυανπόλιοι | [π]ροστάται τοκίο), are separated from each other by the *diplē stigmē*.

¹³ Photos and drawings available at: <<https://igcyr.unibo.it/igcyr081100>>.

¹⁴ On the tablet, see Matthaïou 2014, 221, with fig. 4. Faraguna 2020, 116 likewise refers briefly to the Theban tablets.

¹⁵ Photo available at Kern 1913, pl. 10; Jeffery 1989, pl. 11. A similar peculiarity in the arrangement of the text can apparently be found in the other opisthographic tablet of the four from Thebes, MΘ 35909 (*SEG LX 507*), since, according to Matthaïou 2014, 216, “the ending of the final word of the last line of side B is inscribed above the first line of the same side”.

Athenian tribute quota lists) and distinguish different entries in accounts or documents containing long lists (as in several sets of accounts related to construction works on the Acropolis and a series of documents from the mid-5th century onwards).¹⁶

3. SEPARATING THE ITEMS OF ACCOUNTS, INVENTORIES, LISTS, AND CATALOGUES

As noted above, the most straightforward employment of the *paragraphos* lies in public or private inscriptions that assume the form of lists or other such texts.¹⁷ This is clearly demonstrated by the following collection of relevant examples, which include, among others, the *stelae* of the Athenian tribute quota lists, accounts regarding the construction of prominent statues or public expenditure on architectural works, inventories of objects located in temples or shrines, lists of magistrates, religious regulations of various kinds, texts relating to financial matters, agonistic catalogues, and comparable documents:

- *Tabulae Hellenotamiarum* (IG I³ 259–290): as far as one may ascertain, the *paragraphos* occurs in only three lists.¹⁸ In two of these, it assumes the form of a rather long, “monumental” line meant to mark off geographical districts in which the members of the Delian League came to be regularly listed: [8] IG I³ 269 (year 12, 443/2), col. I, ll. 33–34 (juncture between the Ἴονικὸ φόρο and the ἑλλεσποντίο φόρο), col. II, ll. 26–27 (juncture between the ἑλλεσποντίο φόρο and the ἐπὶ Θράικες φόρο),¹⁹ and [9] IG I³ 270 (Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 119B: year 13, 442/1), col. I, ll. 34–35 (juncture between the Ἴονικὸς φόρος and the ἑλλεσπόντιος φόρος), col. II, ll. 30–31 (juncture between the ἑλλεσπόντιος φόρος and the ἐπὶ Θράικες φόρος). More interesting is the case of [10] IG I³ 283 (year 27, 428/7), col. II, 18–19, col. III, 1–2 and 3–4, as the *paragraphoi* here are not only considerably shorter than those found in most fifth-century Athenian inscriptions, but also seem to serve a purpose other than signalling geographic transitions (perhaps that of

¹⁶ Among the earliest Greek papyri displaying the same use of the mark, one may mention SB XIV 11963 (TM 4287; Turner, *GMAW* 88: late 4th c.), in which a line-space and a *paragraphos* at col. II, ll. 10–11 separate two different accounts of drachmas, apparently receipts and disbursements. Another point of special interest in this regard is the use of acrophonic numerals, which has no parallel in extant papyrological sources. One could also compare, for example, the list of articles required for a voyage, P.Cair.Zen. I 59054 (TM 2296: 257). On the layout of accounts and lists on papyrus, see Clarysse 2020.

¹⁷ On ancient Greek lists, see most recently Kirk 2021, who, however, focuses mainly, though not exclusively, on literary texts.

¹⁸ Cf. Del Corso 2002, 185, arguing that in IG I³ 269 and 270 “la *paragraphos* viene utilizzata per distinguere il computo di un *phoros* dall’altro, ma nelle altre iscrizioni della serie si ricorre più frequentemente a un aumento della spaziatura”; Meyer 2017, 212 n. 17; Faraguna 2020, 121.

¹⁹ In connection with this, it is a notable fact that the practice of organising tribute payers according to region was adopted in 443/2 since no clear geographical order is evident in the first eight lists. On this point, see especially Paarmann 2004; see further Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI*, commentary at p. 319.

highlighting some tributary names).²⁰ In connection with these lists, one may recall two further examples in the extensive series of documents within the Athenian Tribute Lists: the decrees proposed by Thudippus about the extraordinary reassessment of tribute, [11] *IG I³ 71* (Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 153: 425/4), col. I, ll. 119–120, in which the *paragraphos* is no doubt a residual element in the four columns of district lists, but also plays a major role at ll. 118–119, where it follows the heading τῶν τεσσ[σ]ά μιν [α]ς ἑο | φόρος ἐτάχθη, thereby separating this group from that of the other members of the Ionian district who paid individually; and the fragmentary reassessment decree that was attributed by *ATL* to the regular assessment of 422 (in the year of the Great Panathenaea), [12] *IG I³ 77*, in which *paragraphoi* are unevenly used to separate some of the Hellenistic (col. IV, ll. 2–3, 5–6, 9–10) and Thracian cities (col. V, ll. 26–27, 28–29, 30–31, 32–33, 34–35), but with no clear pattern emerging from the surviving portions of the text.²¹

- Sacrificial calendar of the deme of Thorikos on the front face of a rectangular stele of white marble, [13] *Lupu, Greek Sacred Law² 1* (Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 146; *CGRN* 32: ca. 440–430?): longish *paragraphoi* of varying length (3 to 6 letters) are consistently used to separate the entries, which generally end in a blank space (with the name of the next month starting a new line).²²
- Accounts for the Athena Promachos statue (?) from the Acropolis, [14] *IG I³ 435*, recently re-examined by Ronald Stroud and Elizabeth Foley, who assign them to the period 440–424: lightly incised horizontal lines extending the full width of the left sub-column are consistently employed, often in combination with vacats, to set apart the sums of money in acrophonic numerals recorded here (in the usual two-sub-column format, with figures on the left and expenditure items on the right).²³ One can compare this example with that of the building accounts of the Parthenon (*IG I³ 436–451*), which display the use of the sign uniquely in [15]

²⁰ The lists edited as *IG I³ 269* and *270* (both by inscriber 4, “the Cutter of *IG I³ 270*”, according to Tracy’s classification: see esp. Tracy 2016, 41–53, 83–91) are on the reverse face of the monumental *Lapis primus* (original dimensions: ca. 4 m. tall, 1.15 m. wide and 0.39 m. thick), which contains *IG I³ 259–272*, i.e. the fifteen annual lists from 454/3 to 440/39 (for a schematic drawing of the *Lapis primus*, see Tracy 2016, 42, fig. 1), while *IG I³ 283* belongs to the group of freestanding individual annual lists from the year 431/0 onwards that follow in time those inscribed on the *Lapis secundus* (*IG I³ 273–280*, years 16–23, 439/8–432/1, original dimensions: at least 2.2 m. tall, 1.47 m. wide and 0.34 m. thick).

²¹ On the problematic relationship between *IG I³ 77* and the Athenian tribute quota list *IG I³ 287*, see most recently Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI*, commentary at pp. 406–407.

²² Photos available at Lupu 2009, fig. 3–7. On the layout and punctuation marks of the inscription, see Lupu 2009, 119.

²³ Foley and Stroud 2019, 94 n. 27, speak of “prominent, horizontal dividing lines” and not of *paragraphoi*, rightly stressing that “[t]he shorter dividing lines in, e.g., *IG I³ 71, 77, 240, 386–389*, do not resemble those on the fragments of *IG I³ 435*”. However, this is not enough to exclude the possibility that those used in *IG I³ 435* are *paragraphoi* (cf. Threatte 1980, 76; Meyer 2017, 212 n. 17; Faraguna 2020, 121). Cf. Carusi 2020, 75–77. On the two-sub-column layout of most fifth-century Athenian accounts,

IG I³ 449 (Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 145: year 14, 434/3),²⁴ ll. 380–381, 384–385, 388–389, 391–392, 394–395, 396–397, 397–398, 400–401, 402–403, while listing the receipts (λέμματα τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ | τοῦτο τάδε at ll. 376–377) and the expenses for that year (ἀναλόμα[τ]α at l. 395, which serves as the heading for the items listed beneath it): short lines at the left margin of the sub-column that registers the items (on the right) regularly separate the entries (surplus from the previous year, money received from the treasurers of Athena, money derived from the sale of gold and ivory, expenses for purchases, for wages paid to workers at Pentele and the sculptors, for monthly wages, as well as surplus for that year). A similar case can be made for the accounts related to the construction of the bronze cult statues of Hephaestus and Athena in the Hephaisteion, **[16] IG I³ 472** (416/5),²⁵ in which short *paragraphoi* at the left margin of the right sub-column carefully articulate the various expenditures registered there (the exact opposite of what is found in *IG I³ 435*), as well as for a small fragment of *ratio incerta*, **[17] IG I³ 485** (450–445), ll. 3–4, 5–6. Another highly fragmentary account, **[18] IG I³ 486** (of uncertain date), seems to escape any attempt at characterisation.²⁶

- Final summary account for the construction of the colossal chryselephantine statue of Athena Parthenos, **[19] IG I³ 460** (Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 135B: 438/7), ll. 5–6, 9–10, 12–13, 14–15, 17–18, which stands out from the other documents of the series (*IG I³ 453*, 455–459) for its monumental appearance, the arrangement of its text into a single column, and the use of dividing lines that project rightwards from the left margin for around four *stoichoi*: these isolate the various entries of the *ratio* that deal with the total amount of silver money received by the *epistatai* (ll. 2–5: τάδε ἔλ[αβον at l. 2), what might have been a dedication of gold by Callaeschrus (ll. 6–9), the total expenses (ll. 10–12: ἀναλό[ματα at l. 10), two unclear categories of expenditure (namely, ἀπεργα[σία at ll. 13–14 and κατὰβλ[εμα at ll. 15–17), the costs of gold purchase (ll. 18–19), which were probably followed by the cost of ivory (now lost).²⁷

see also Marginesu 2022; Osborne 2022; cf. further C. Carusi's chapter in the present volume (Fig. 7). On numeracy in the account inscriptions, see esp. Cuomo 2013; Marginesu 2017.

²⁴ Cf. Threatte 1980, 76; Del Corso 2002, 185; Meyer 2017, 212 n. 17; Faraguna 2020, 121. The account is written on the right narrow face of the stele on which all the Parthenon accounts were laid out (*IG I³ 436–451*, years 1–15, 447/6–433/2). See also Carusi 2020, 77–78. Image available at Carusi 2020, 77, fig. 2; cf. further C. Carusi's chapter in the present volume (Fig. 1).

²⁵ Col. IV, 141–142, 145–146, 148–149, 150–151, 151–152, 152–153, 154–155, 160–161. On these accounts, see recently Lippolis and Vallarino 2010, esp. 253–257; Meyer 2017, 212 n. 17; Carusi 2020, 79–80. Cf. further C. Carusi's chapter in the present volume (Fig. 3).

²⁶ Both fragmentary accounts are referred to by Meyer 2017, 213 n. 17.

²⁷ Cf. Meyer 2017, 212 n. 17; Faraguna 2020, 121; see also recently Carusi 2020, 78–79. Cf. further C. Carusi's chapter in the present volume (Fig. 2).

- Building accounts of the Erechtheion (*IG I³ 474–479*), in which *paragraphoi* feature twice: in the review of the building's condition when the Athenians resumed work on it, [20] *IG I³ 474* (Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 181A: 409/8), and in the records of 408/7, [21] *IG I³ 476* (Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 181B: 408/7), the remnants of which list the amounts of money that the *epistatai* took from the treasurers of the goddess and spent on the project in the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth prytanies (for the wages of the work force, building materials, etc.).²⁸ In *IG I³ 474*, the sign separates some, but not all of the entries in the list containing the half finished parts (ἡμίεργα) of the temple (ll. 18–19, 21–22, 25–26, 46–47, 49–50), the unsmoothed and unchannelled parts (ll. 74–75, 76–77, 80–81, 82–83, 84–85, 89–90), the fully worked stones lying on the ground (ll. 97–98), as well as the half finished parts lying on the ground (ll. 117–118, 122–123, 124–125, 129–130, 135–136, 140–141, 142–143, 143–144, 150–151, 151–152, 159–160, 172–173, 179–180, 182–183, 186–187, 191–192, 199–200, 205–206), and occasionally separates sub-sections of the document from each other (e.g., ἡμίεργα from ἀκατάχσεστα καὶ ἀράβδοτα at ll. 53–54).²⁹ It is also employed twice on the reverse face in the section on the work needed to complete the building, where it appears to articulate certain actions (ll. 239–240, 241–242), though the text is rather fragmentary.³⁰ Several instances of the sign's misplacement are found as well (at ll. 140–141 rather than 139–140, 143–144 rather than 145–146, 151–152 rather than 153–154, 172–173 rather than 173–174, 182–183 rather than 183–184).³¹ In *IG I³ 476* (Fig. 49), as far as one can ascertain, the *paragraphos* only occurs at ll. 281–282 in combination with vacats and the mark ∴ to indicate the end of the accounts for the eighth prytany and the beginning of those for the ninth (ll. 281–282: vac. ∴: ἡπὲρ τέλς Αἰγιεΐδος vac.).³² What deserves mention here is that elsewhere in the records the transition from one prytany to the next is signalled in other ways: at ll. 65–67, the temporal indication ἐπὶ τῆς Λεοντίδος ἡβ[δόμης] opens l. 66, with a large blank space preceding it in the right-hand half of l. 65 and the sign ∴ following πρυτανευόσεις at the beginning of l. 67, while at l. 183,

²⁸ Cf. Meyer 2017, 212–213 n. 17; Faraguna 2020, 121.

²⁹ It is worth noting, however, that the headings of other sub-sections are in *ekthesis* (ll. 93–94: [λ]ίθινα παντελὸς ἐχσεργ[α]σμέ[να] | ἡὰ χαμαί, l. 103: [ἡμίεργ]α χαμαί), as in the case of the heading at the beginning of col. I (ll. 8–9: τὸ νεὸν τὰδε κατελάβομεν ἡμίεργα | ἐπὶ τῆι γονίαι τῆι πρὸς τὸ Κεκροπίο), with apparently no *paragraphoi* preceding or following them.

³⁰ See most recently Carusi 2020, 80, with all previous bibliography; cf. further C. Carusi's chapter in the present volume (Fig. 4). In column II of the fragmentary building specifications on the reverse face, however, it is *diploi stigmatai* that seem to perform the separative function that *paragraphoi* do earlier in the document (ll. 246, 249, 251, 252).

³¹ Some considerations on the significance of this fact will be developed later (see below, § 8).

³² Cf. Carusi 2020, 80–81; see further C. Carusi's chapter in the present volume (Fig. 5). On the mark ∴ in Greek inscriptions, see e.g. Guarducci 1967, 392; Threatte 1980, 75, no. 18.

the unparalleled sign Γ precedes the vacat before the phrase $\text{ἐπὶ τῆς Πανδι[ονί]-δος ὀγδοῆς πρυτανευούσι[εζ]}$ at ll. 183–185 (another vacat follows at l. 185). However, it cannot be ruled out that other marks, including *paragraphoi*, were used in the lost sections of the document.

- Accounts of the Eleusinian *epistatai*, showing the fairly systematic use of the sign in two records in the series: the case of the small fragment [22] *I.Eleusis* 50 (*IG* I³ 389: ca. 413?) is comparable to those of *IG* I³ 449 and *IG* I³ 472, since here, too, short horizontal strokes at the left margin of the right sub-column separate nearly all the expenditures (as usual, figures are registered in the left sub-column); in the opisthographic stele containing the *paralabe*-document on the obverse face and the *paradosis*-document on the reverse one, [23] *I.Eleusis* 52 (*IG* I³ 386–387, 408/7–407/6),³³ *paragraphoi* articulate the entries of the different lists, preceded by headings in *ekthesis*, albeit to a different extent. In particular, items are systematically separated by *paragraphoi* in the sections about wealth on the Athenian Acropolis at ll. 5–13 (ἐμ πόλει at l. 5), as well as in the City Eleusinion at the south-east corner of the Athenian Agora at ll. 14–19 ($\text{ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ τῷ ἐν ἄστει}$ at l. 14), income received by the overseers at ll. 144–148 (ἐπέτεια κεφάλαια at l. 144 and $\text{λέμματ[ο]ς σύμπ[αν κ]εφάλαιον}$ at l. 148), expenditures at ll. 149–172 ($\text{ἀν[α-λ]όματος κεφ[ά]λαιον}$ at l. 149 and $\text{κεφάλαιο[ν σύμπαν ἀναλόματος]}$ at l. 171), and perhaps in the section on wealth in the sanctuary of Eleusis at ll. 39–59 (heading at l. 39 and part of the column lost). The sign is sporadically employed in the sections on objects in the City Eleusinion at ll. 20–38 ($\text{σκεύε ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ}$ at l. 20: ll. 25–26, 27–28), on votive offerings at ll. 60 ff. (ἀναθήματα at l. 60: under l. 64, the last line of col. I), and on building materials at ll. 83–143 (heading lost: ll. 99–100, 101–102, 109–110, 142–143). *Paragraphoi* also serve to highlight the rubrics in *ekthesis*, which are often preceded and followed by the sign (*I.Eleusis* 52A).³⁴ Likewise noteworthy is that the usual association of *paragraphoi* and *diplai stigmatai* appears here as well, because whenever more than one item is written on the same line, it is the second of these signs that performs the separative function.
- *Poletai* records, attesting to the use of the mark in only two inscriptions within the set of records from the City Eleusinion known as Ἀττικαὶ στῆλαι (from Poll. 10.97), *IG* I³ 421–430, which list the sales of the personal and real property of

³³ Cf. Threatte 1980, 76; Del Corso 2002, 185; Meyer 2017, 213 n. 17. On *paragraphoi* in the accounts of the Eleusinian *epistatai*, see Cavanaugh 1996, 105–106; Tracy 2016, 127: “The *IG* text represents the shape of the numerals more accurately and has the paragraph marks clearly and accurately indicated. Clinton’s text omits a few of these marks and others resemble underlinings of letters”. Images of both *I.Eleusis* 50 and *I.Eleusis* 52 are available at Clinton 2005–2008, vol. IB, pl. 20 and 21–24.

³⁴ Very similar patterns in the use of the mark are evident in the *paralabe*-document on the reverse face.

the profaners of the Eleusinian Mysteries and the mutilators of the Herms,³⁵ as well as in *Agora XIX P2* (402/1), which records the sale of property confiscated from the Thirty Tyrants, the Ten, the Piraeus Ten and the Eleven. As for the layout of the so-called “Attic Stelae”, one must first note that in most cases, after indicating the name of the person convicted, the text is arranged into three sub-columns that record, in sequence, the sales tax (ἐπώνια), the sale price and the items sold, followed by the total (though “[a]ttempts to add up figures are sporadic and inefficient”, as noted in Lewis 1997, 171). As far as the evidence allows one to ascertain, [24] *IG I³ 430* (414/3) is the only text in the series that records the calendar dates of the sales in chronological order as headings of the different sub-sections (ll. 5-6, 8, 10, 13, 24, 31-32): *paragraphoi* signal the total of a given amount of time (κεφάλαιον σύμπαν), which is indented from the left edge, as at ll. 4-5, 12-13, 30-31,³⁶ but occasionally also some items, as at ll. 2-3, where the sign occurs in combination with the vacat of l. 2, probably to separate what is listed at ll. 1-2 and the slave mentioned at ll. 2-3; again, at ll. 7-8 and 9-10 *paragraphoi* separate two slaves of Axiochus sold on different occasions from the temporal indications pertaining to the following entries.³⁷ The short horizontal line at [25] *IG I³ 426* (Osborne - Rhodes, *GHI* 172C), fr. *b*, between l. 8 and the one-line vacat below, at the left margin of the column, is apparently an erratic *paragraphos*, which, together with the blank, indicates the end of a section of the list concerning the sale of the property of an unknown man of Eitea whose name is lost in the lacuna (this stele is arranged according to individuals). In [26] *Agora XIX P2*, whose extant fragments may represent three to six *stelae* originally set up in the Agora, *paragraphoi* occur under the rubric for instalment payments generally shortened to καταβολή, as well as under the tax rubric τὰ ἐπώνια ὁ π[ρι]άμενος ἐτέλ]ει, followed by a very wide blank.³⁸

³⁵ Cf. Threatte 1980, 76; Del Corso 2002, 184, who proposes comparing the arrangement of the writing here with that in some lists in the Zenon archive (cf. e.g. PSI VII 862 [TM 6687: 3rd c.], a list of goods); Meyer 2017, 212 n. 17; Faraguna 2020, 121. On the inscribers of the so-called “Attic stelae”, see Tracy 2016, 55-73. I have thus far been unable to check available images to see whether the long horizontal line above *IG I³ 422*, col. II, l. 178 is actually a *paragraphos* (cf. Meyer 2017, 212 n. 17, who accepts this view).

³⁶ No *paragraphoi* are found under ll. 19 (κεφάλαιον σύμπαν) and 20 (κεφ(άλ)αιον ἀμφοτέρω) arguably due to the large vacat below; cf. also the *paragraphos* at ll. 29-30 (under κεφάλαιον – –). See Lewis 1997, 160: “Entries are not continuous for more than a line or so, and the arrangement varies very considerably even inside a column. The cutters continually side-slip their entries to make room, both with columns of figures and with larger items of text”.

³⁷ The cases of ll. 35-36, 39-40 remain uncertain due to the fragmentary state of the stone.

³⁸ For the former, cf. fr. *d*, stele II, col. I, ll. 7-8, 15-16 (Walbank 1982, pl. 27b); for the latter, cf. fragments *f*, *g*, stele IV, col. I, ll. 12-13, but see also ll. 3-4 (Walbank 1982, pl. 28a). On the physical characteristics and formal features of these *stelae*, see Walbank 1982, esp. 91-92, who, however, does not discuss the function of the sign.

- Partly opisthographic fragments of the sacrificial calendar of Athens, [27] *SEG LII 48* (CGRN 45), an updated version of Solon's calendar of sacrifices (*kyrbeis*) belonging to the revision of Athenian law at the end of the 5th century: based on careful examination of the texts on faces A (Ionic alphabet, 403/2–400/399?) and B (Attic alphabet, 410–404?), both of which pertain primarily to accounts related to sacrifices, Stephen Lambert concluded that *paragraphoi* are desultorily employed to mark off sub-sections either within a single unit in a long stretch of text on a single festival (e.g., Pythais, Eleusinia, etc.) or on an item-by-item level.³⁹ Interesting to note here is that though the text's layout on the stone includes indented headings in the left margin, the lines separated by *paragraphoi* are not in *ekthesis*. The extra long horizontal line incised across face A (fragments 1, 3) does not relate to the *paragraphoi* at all since it separates the text above from that below, which is probably of a different character.
- Damonon's victory stele from Sparta, [28] *IG V.1 213* (probably early 4th century), which consists of six main parts: 1) a dedicatory hexameter distich to Athana Poliachos (ll. 1–5); 2) Damonon's victories in the τέθριππον (i.e. the four-horse chariot race) at various games (ll. 6–11); 3) Damonon's hippic victories at four different festivals (ll. 12–34); 4) gymnic victories of Damonon's son Enymakratidas as a boy or youth (ll. 35–49); 5) Damonon's gymnic victories as a boy (ll. 49–65); and 6) victories that Damonon and Enymakratidas won on the same day (ll. 66–96).⁴⁰ In this document, *paragraphoi* seem to serve two principal purposes: on the one hand, they indicate the section breaks (ll. 11–12, 34–35, 65–66), though in one case (at l. 49) it is a punctuation mark in the form of *diple stigmē* (which occurs in the same line) and not a *paragraphos* that highlights the transition; on the other, they articulate the victories, not listed in chronological order, of the two Lacedaemonians in various contests, both hippic and gymnic, held at several festivals or at a number of different events (part 2: ll. 9–10; part 3: ll. 17–18, 23–24, 30–31; part 4: ll. 43–44; part 5: ll. 52–53, 55–56, 58–59, 61–62; part 6: ll. 80–81, 89–90).⁴¹ I am inclined to rule out the possibility entertained by Christesen that the longer horizontal cuttings that run the entire width of the stone

³⁹ Face A, fr. 1, ll. 26–27, fr. 3, col. 3, ll. 74–75, fr. 6, ll. 3–4, 6–7; face B, fr. 9, col. 2, ll. 6–7, fr. 10, ll. 2–3, fr. 11, ll. 3–4, 4–5, 5–6, 6–7. Images available at Lambert 2002, pl. 31a, 33a–b, 35b, 36a–b. For an in-depth examination of punctuation and paragraph markers on the stone, see *ibidem*, 395–396.

⁴⁰ Photo available at Christesen 2019, 199–201, fig. 1–3.

⁴¹ At ll. 73–74 both the *diple stigmē* and the *paragraphos* are employed to mark the transition between one festival and the next. In connection to this, it should also be noted that the juncture between the initial dedication to Athana Poliachos and the following section is not marked by any sign. On *paragraphoi* in the Damonon stele, cf. Faraguna 2020, 120, who follows Nafissi's conclusion (2013, 119–120) that the stonemason cut the text on the stele very carefully by following its actual arrangement on an *antigraphon* written on soft material.

and the short lines at the left margin should be seen as one and the same sign.⁴² Instead, it seems more probable that these longer horizontal cuttings are actually guidelines, which sometimes overlap *paragraphoi*, as at ll. 10–11, without, however, bearing any relation to the contents (as is clear from ll. 22–23, 32–33).⁴³

- Cyrenean accounts on a rectangular lead tablet registering local deposits, [29] **Rosamilia 2023, no. 25** (*IG Cyrenaica*² 081200: ca. 400–380, according to the last editor) that was found along Rosamilia 2023, no. 24 (see above): longish horizontal dashes of nearly equal length (except for the one below l. 1 that extends slightly further rightwards) carefully separate entries from each other, with each occupying one line of text. Nonetheless, it is remarkable that two even longer *paragraphoi* at ll. 6–7 and 7–8 (approximately 14 letters) clearly isolate the indication of the total (τὸ πᾶν) at l. 7, which is written in larger letters than is the rest of the inscription.⁴⁴
- List of prizes awarded at the Great Panathenaia, [30] **SEG LIII 192** (*IG II*² 2311: ca. 380, according to Shear),⁴⁵ whose extant remains record some of the awards for musical events, gymnastic contests and hippic games (in two columns consisting, as usual, of two halves: one for the figures, the other for the text): short horizontal lines at the left margin are used more or less regularly as dividers to separate the prizes listed in order and, in the section devoted to the νικητήρια (ll. 83–89), all the entries along with the competitions and different categories of winners according to age divisions.⁴⁶
- Fragmentary stele recording a catalogue of some 750 names of Athenian councillors and their alternates (or, less probably, of cleruchs sent to Samos in the 360s), [31] **Agora XV 492** (*SEG XXXI* 132: ca. 380–360): the names are arranged by tribes and demes in five columns (two tribes per column), with *paragraphoi* occurring at the end (perhaps) of each listing to mark deme headings (ll. 9–10, 23–24, 28–29, 34–35, 38–39, 40–41, 47–48, 67–68, 153–154, 155–156). As is clear from l. 31, which contains the tribal heading Αἰγηΐδος preceded by an unscribed line above, blank spaces “were surely deliberately left in order to

⁴² See Christesen 2019, 10, who speaks of “*obeloi* (horizontal cuttings) of differing lengths that start in the left margin and run for some or all of the width of the stone”.

⁴³ On incised guidelines as “a common feature of Lakonian inscriptions”, see e.g. Christesen 2019, 10 n. 12.

⁴⁴ Cf. Rosamilia 2023, 282. Photos and drawings available at: <<https://igcyr.unibo.it/igcyr081200>>. See also E. Rosamilia’s chapter in the present volume.

⁴⁵ Cf. Threatte 1980, 76; Del Corso 2002, 185; Del Corso 2017, 44; Faraguna 2020, 121. Photo available at Kirchner 1948, Taf. 27, no. 58; Shear 2003, pl. V–VI.

⁴⁶ Shear 2003, 88: “When contestants were rewarded not only for winning but also for placing, the different prizes within the entry for each event were separated from each other by *paragraphoi* or horizontal lines inscribed under the right end of the numeral and the beginning of the first word; another such line marked the end of each entry”. See further Shear 2021, 171–172.

draw attention to the beginning of new rosters within the columns”.⁴⁷ Similar patterns in the use of the sign emerge in [32] *IG II².1 959* (*Agora XV 125*: ca. 265), a fragment of a prytany list arranged under five demotics, since each sub-list is separated by *paragraphoi* from the next one. The mark also appears in a list of *thiasotai* honoured with crowns from Salamis, [33] *IG II² 2347* (Kloppenborg and Ascough 2011, no. 12: ca. 300), in which, for some unclear reason, *paragraphoi* mark only a few names.

- Athenian *phialai*-inscriptions of the Lycurgan age, Meyer 2010, nos. 1–33,⁴⁸ which have recently become the focus of heated scholarly discussions: in the so-called “Great Stele”, [34] Meyer 2010, nos. 2–9 (*IG II² 1154–1559* + *Agora inv. I-3183* + *SEG XXV 178*), a large opisthographic stele of which eight fragments remain, several of the entries, which always start a new line, are marked off from the next ones by *paragraphoi*.⁴⁹ However, numerous *lacunae* make it impossible to assess whether each of them was actually set apart from the following in this way.⁵⁰
- Building accounts related to the construction of the temple of Asclepius at Epidauros, [35] Prignitz, *Bauurkunden 1* (ca. 400–390), which cover a period of nearly five years of the first decade of the 4th century (these accounts were drawn up annually): the *paragraphos* appears in isolation in one of the narrower side-columns that records minor running expenses (*δαπάναι*) on the stele’s obverse and reverse face (A II, B II), but its function here remains unclear since it seemingly refers to no temporal transition.⁵¹
- Cyrenean list of grain deliveries, [36] Rosamilia 2023, no. 6 (*SEG IX 72*; Rhodes – Osborne, *GHI 96*; *IG Cyrenaica² 010900*: ca. 330), in which short *paragraphoi*

⁴⁷ Traill 1981, 164 (elsewhere in his article, Traill curiously refers to the mark signalling the deme headings as a *parengraphos* rather than a *paragraphos*).

⁴⁸ Cf. Threatte 1980, 76; Del Corso 2002, 185; Faraguna 2020, 121. Although scholars discuss the identity of the dedicants of these silver cups and consequently the nature of Athenian *phialai*-records, it is impossible to revisit the arguments of the debate here. The bibliography on the issue is extensive: for a recent overview, see McArthur 2019.

⁴⁹ Face A, col. II, ll. 137–138, 143–144, 147–148, 151–152, 186–187, 193–194, 208–209, 212–213, 216–217, 220–221, 228–229; col. III, ll. 246–247, 250–251, 258–259, 331–332, 335–336; col. IV, ll. 371–372, 375–376; col. V, ll. 463–464, 467–468, 471–472, 475–476, 484–485, 488–489, 492–493, 496–497, 500–501, 504–505, 509–510, 513–514, 521–522, 554–555, 558–559, 562–563; face B, col. I, ll. 111–112, 113–114, 116–117; col. II, ll. 134–135, 231–232, 233–234, 236–237, 239–240, 242–243, below l. 244; col. III, ll. 259–260, 263–264, 266–267, 327–328, 331–332, 334–335, 342–343.

⁵⁰ The same conclusion is reached by Meyer 2010, 86: “The use of the *paragraphos* seems a little erratic”. Cf. Del Corso 2002, 185: “qui la *paragraphos* viene impiegata sistematicamente per distinguere il lemma relativo a ogni schiavo manomesso”. The sign also occurs in Meyer 2010, nos. 16 (*IG II² 1566*), 17–18 (*IG II² 1567* + 1568), 27 (*IG II² 1576b*), 31 (*SEG XLVI 180*) 33 (*SEG XLIV 68*), again fulfilling the function of marking the various entries. Images available at Meyer 2010, ph. 2–13, 22–23, 24–26, 35–37, 47.

⁵¹ Prignitz, *Bauurkunden 1*, A II, ll. 120–121. Unlike Hiller von Gaertringen, Prignitz neither reproduces the sign in his edition nor makes any comment on its function.

extend beneath the first letters of ll. 21, 23, 36, 38, 40 and 42 “to indicate where two successive lines form a single entry”.⁵² The only exceptions are ll. 55 and 57; one would expect the mark to isolate the relevant entry here, but its absence could again be due to a mistake by the stonecutter as he was copying the text from the *antigraphon* drafted on perishable material.

- Four “complementary” lists of magistrates from Thasos that will be published as *I.Thasos I*,⁵³ that is, two separate catalogues of eponymous ἄρχοντες (PLArch and the later GLArch) and two of θεωροί (PLTh and the later GLTh, IG XII.8 272–348), which were inscribed in several columns on the walls of some public buildings in the northeast corner of the agora – the older ones, [37] PLArch and [38] PLTh, in the 360s, the more recent ones, [39] GLArch and [40] GLTh, in around 325 (subsequent magistrates were added until the Imperial age, when GLArch and GLTh break down): as both ἄρχοντες and θεωροί were annual boards consisting of three magistrates (save in two periods, when the archonship was held by one man and by six men, respectively), *paragraphoi* systematically divide the lists into groups of three names.⁵⁴
- List of Milesian eponymous *stephanephoroi* from the sanctuary of Apollo Delphinios, [41] *I.Delphinion 122*,⁵⁵ first set up in 335/4, but continued year after year so as to cover the period from 525/4 to 314/3: the catalogue contains over 400 names, generally arranged in two columns in groups of ten, each of which is separated from the next by a short horizontal stroke.⁵⁶ A trace of the use of the sign, apparently with a similar function, can also be found in a fragment of an earlier copy of the same list, [42] *I.Nordkarien 171* (*IMilet 1360*), col. II, 5–6.⁵⁷
- Athenian *Didascaliae*, IG II² 2319–2323a, SEG XXVI 203, the famous catalogue of the participants and victors (though with no mention of χορηγοί or ἀγωνοθέται) at the dramatic festivals of the City Dionysia and Lenaea, spanning from the early 5th to the 2nd century, which has recently roused renewed scholarly interest:

⁵² As rightly noticed by Rhodes – Osborne 2003, *GHI*, at p. 486. Images available at <<https://igcyr.unibo.it/igcyr010900>>.

⁵³ For a general presentation, see Hamon 2016; Hamon 2019, 14–25; for the most recent overview, see Hamon 2022, with all previous bibliography.

⁵⁴ See also Faraguna 2020, 120; Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 78–80.

⁵⁵ As these lists were constantly updated over the centuries until the early Imperial era, they encompass the period between 525/4 BCE and 31/2 CE, with some gaps (*LDelphinion 123–128*).

⁵⁶ Cf. *LDelphinion*, commentary at p. 254 (G. Kawerau and A. Rehm): “Von 10 zu 10 Namen – oder Zeilen? – ist links unter dem ersten Buchstaben ein Querstrich, ein Obelos, angebracht, für die letzten 20 Zeilen allerdings unkorrekt”. See also Faraguna 2020, 120–121; Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 81–83.

⁵⁷ Cf. *INordkarien*, commentary at p. 119 (W. Blümel): “Zwischen Z. 5 und 6 ein kurzer Querstrich (Obelos) in der Breite von einem Buchstaben”. Image available *ibidem*, at p. 118. On the relationship between the two lists, see most recently Driscoll 2019; see also L.B. Borsano’s chapter in this volume.

insofar as it is possible to infer anything from such scanty evidence, *paragraphoi* do occur in a) the list of tragedies performed at the Dionysia, [43] *IG II² 2320* (Millis and Olson 2012, 61–69), ll. 14–15, 15–16, 17–18, 19–20; b) the list of comedies performed at the Dionysia, [44] *IG II² 2323a* (Millis and Olson 2012, 70–75), col. II, ll. 41–42 (very fragmentary), 51–52; and c) the list of tragedies performed at the City Lenaea, [45] *IG II² 2319* (Millis and Olson 2012, 115–117, now lost), ll. 68–69, 69–70, 75–76, 76–77, and [46] *SEG XXVI 203* (Millis and Olson 2012, 118–121), col. II, ll. 5–6, 6–7, 15–16, 16–17.⁵⁸ In all four instances, the horizontals clearly serve to set apart the winning actors, whose names are recorded at the end of each annual entry before the name, in *ekthesis*, of the following year's eponymous archon, though in at least one case, *IG II² 2320*, ll. 18–19, the sign seems to isolate the sub-section on the revival of an old tragedy (παλαιᾶι : Νεοπτόλεμ[ος] | Ὀρέστηι Εὐρυπίδο).⁵⁹ Based on the occurrence of this sign as well as other palaeographical and formal features (such as the use of double dots to mark abbreviations), Stephen Tracy has recently concluded that the writing on *IG II² 2320*, *IG II² 2321*, *IG II² 2323a*, *SEG XXVI 203* and, most likely, *IG II² 2319* is identical and that the *Didascaliae* therefore consisted of one large dossier inscribed all at once by a single cutter in or about the year 280.⁶⁰ The presence of *paragraphoi* has likewise elicited the claim that the *Didascaliae* derive from official archival records.⁶¹

- List of donations for the reconstruction of Thebes after 315, [47] **Kalliontzis and Papazarkadas 2019**, carved by several cutters on two joining fragments of a tall marble stele: as observed by the most recent editors of the inscription, the two *paragraphoi* at ll. 36–37 and 38–39 of col. II (on the right) most likely served “to highlight the ‘royal section’ of the contributions”.⁶² It should be noted, however, that the group of entries on kings apparently extends well beyond ll. 37 and ff., since it was probably meant to open with the reference to Philocles of Sidon at ll. 29–31, followed by that to Demetrius the Besieger at ll. 32–36 (if the reconstruction proposed in the recent re-edition is correct).⁶³ In connection with this, it is worth pointing out that unlike the other sections of the list in col. II

⁵⁸ Again, Millis and Olson failed to reproduce *paragraphoi* in their new edition of the *Didascaliae*, while Kirchner already carefully recorded them.

⁵⁹ As noted by Tracy 2015, 563. Photos available at Millis and Olson 2012, 63 (*IG II² 2320*, fragments a + b), 71 (*IG II² 2323a*), 119 (*SEG XXVI 203*); for Michel Fourmont's transcription of *IG II² 2319*, see Summa 2015, 116.

⁶⁰ Tracy 2015, 560–566.

⁶¹ Discussion in Sickinger 1999, 41–47; see also Summa 2015, 113.

⁶² Kalliontzis and Papazarkadas 2019, 305; see further Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 412. Photo of the re-assembled stele available at Kalliontzis and Papazarkadas 2019, 295.

⁶³ Knoepfler 2001, 24 n. 73 unconvincingly suggests that the *paragraphos* here may signal an addition to the text (at ll. 35 and ff.).

(individual subscribers at ll. 2–22; *poleis* at ll. 23–28), both of which are preceded by an uninscribed line, the name of Philocles is placed immediately below l. 28, with no blank space marking it.

- Records of various financial transactions inscribed on a fragmentary stele set up in the temple of Apollo Pythios at Karthaia on Keos and written on both faces (B–C) as well as on the left short side (A), [48] *IG XII.5 544, 1075–1076* (4th or early 3rd century), which includes at least three types of lists spanning several years and engraved by different masons (*IG XII.5 544, B1, l. 1–B2, l. 13* and *B2, l. 25–C2, l. 15; B2, ll. 14–24; C2, l. 16–A2, l. 63, 1075, A*): the first series of entries (*IG XII.5 544, B1, l. 1–B2, l. 13; 1075, B; 1076*), which begins at the top of the front of the stone and is preceded by a heading possibly related to land sales and the payment of a tithe (*B1, ll. 1–3: Θεοί. | Οἶδε ἀπέδοντο τὰ [χωρία, ἀποτείσαντες τῆι Θεο]ξενίαι τὸ ἐπιδέκατ[ον]*), consists of personal names followed by the locative expression τὰ ἐν (with something like χωρία implied), the toponym and a figure.⁶⁴ Interestingly, two consecutive *paragraphoi* occur at *B2, ll. 8–9, 9–10*, under the rubrics *Κεφάλαιον τῶν ταμια[κῶν]* and *Θεοξενιακῶν Ἀσκληπιακῶ[ν]*, arguably temple funds receiving a tenth of the proceeds of land sales, which are also mentioned at *B2, l. 25* at the beginning of a comparable list (*ll. 26–63*).⁶⁵
- List of the gymnasiarchs of Pherae starting from the late 330s, [49] *Helly, Te Riele, and van Rossum 1979* (*SEG XXV 664; Habicht 1976: late 3rd or early 2nd century*), engraved by several cutters and arranged in two columns preceded by a two-line prescript that extends the entire length of the stele: much as in the Thasian lists of θεωροί, most of the names in this catalogue are grouped into pairs through the placement of horizontal bars at the left margins of both columns, since in Hellenistic Thessaly the gymnasiarchy was generally exercised by two magistrates per year.⁶⁶ However, there are also entries containing just one name,⁶⁷ which points to some disturbance in the institutional routine. This is further confirmed by the repetition of the verb μετέλιπε at col. B, ll. 40–48 and 56 to denote a vacancy in the magistracy, as well as by the fact that the *polis* itself assumed the gymnasiarchy on one occasion (col. B, l. 7). Also worth drawing

⁶⁴ On this inscription, whose interpretation is in question, see Osborne 1988, 319–322; Osborne 1991 argues that the stele records land transactions involving properties leased out by private individuals rather than the leasing of temple land to the people listed, as presumed by Graindor 1906; cf. also Mendoni 1994, 151–152. Worth noting too is that a number of names seem to have been erased from the stone.

⁶⁵ Another κεφάλαιον-rubric occurs at *C2, l. 15*, apparently summarising the total number of transactions, [*Κεφάλαιον τῶν πάντων*], followed by the figure.

⁶⁶ On the inscription, cf. further Schuler 2007. Photo available at Habicht 1976, Tafel XLIII; Helly *et al.* 1979, 220, fig. 1.

⁶⁷ For one-name entries marked by *paragraphoi*, cf. A, ll. 67–68, 68–69; B, ll. 3–4, 4–5, 5–6, 6–7, 7–8, 15–16, 16–17, 20–21, 21–22, 48–49, 49–50, 55–56, 56–57.

attention to is another sign placed in the left margin of col. B (ζ), in correspondence to ll. 10, 28, 44 and 56, indicating that the list is further broken down into groups of ten items (each with one or more names).⁶⁸

- Fragment of a marble stele from Andros containing a list of foreign cities, [50] **Petrocheilos 2010, no. 4** (*IG XII.5 723*: ca. 175–150): the *paragraphos* above the first letter of l. 1 separates the catalogue from what precedes it on the stone, though it is impossible to determine whether this was a different document or another section of the catalogue itself (as in the Athenian tribute quota lists, for instance).⁶⁹
- Dedication by the *politeuma* of Boeotians to Zeus Basileus and the other ancestral gods on a limestone plaque from Xoïs (Sakha) near Alexandria in Egypt, [51] **I.Ptolemaic 115** (157–145?), where a horizontal divider is incised in the left margin of a blank space seemingly to separate the dedicants at ll. 6–14 from the dedicated object at l. 15, τὸ τέμενος καὶ τὰ συγκύρ[οντα] (“a sanctuary and its appurtenances”).⁷⁰ At first glance, this use of the *paragraphos* seems rather odd, but one could conjecture that as the plaque offers no space for the list of names of the fellow members of the association referred to at ll. 12–14 (οἱ [συμ]πολιτευόμενοι ὧν τὰ ὄνομα[τα] ἐν τῇ στήλῃ | ἀναγράφεται), the sign was originally meant to set apart the main text of the dedication from the appended list of συμπολιτευόμενοι. Nonetheless, this explanation is mere speculation.

4. PARAGRAFOI AS CLAUSE MARKERS

The use of *paragraphoi* as dividers between different clauses of the same document is attested by several inscriptions from the mid-fifth century onwards that include, *inter alia*, building regulations, *leges sacrae* and interstate documents.⁷¹ It is

⁶⁸ For a thorough examination of the marks employed in the inscription, see Helly *et al.* 1979, 232–234, who refer to parallels such as the Thasian lists of magistrates examined above; as for the occurrence of the symbol ζ in the left margin to count items ten by ten (“un *delta* de l’écriture cursive qui se laisserait interpréter naturellement comme l’abréviation de δέκα”), they propose comparing the list of the priests of Athana Lindia, Badoud, *Temps de Rhodes*, no. 12 (cf. further the remark made by Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 86 n. 74). One could also recall the stichometrical letters in literary papyri as an additional comparandum.

⁶⁹ Hiller von Gaertringen 1903, 462 favours the former option. Barely legible photo available at *Petrocheilos 2010*, 322.

⁷⁰ Photo available at Bowman *et al.* 2021, 235, fig. 62.

⁷¹ Among documentary papyri from the Ptolemaic period in which the same use of the mark can be observed, one may point to a brief *hypomnema* sent to Zenon by Amyntas, PSI V 533 recto (TM 2155: Philadelphia, 256), whose sections are marked off by *paragraphoi* at ll. 10–11 and 14–15, as well as the well-known collection of no fewer than forty-six different *prostagmata* issued by Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II and the two Cleopatras (II and III), P.Tebt. I 5 (TM 2938: 118), which are marked off from each other by *paragraphoi*. Paragraphing by means of blank line-ends and *paragraphoi* also occurs in the Revenue Laws Papyrus of Ptolemy Philadelphus of 259, col. LVI, ll. 10–11, 13–14 (Turner, *GMAW* 76).

useful to contrast this layout strategy to that adopted in earlier Greek inscriptions, such as the one carrying the law of the Eastern Locrians regarding their colony at Naupaktos, *IG IX*.¹² 718 (Meiggs - Lewis, *GHP* 20: ca. 500–475?), whose text, after an opening section, is broken down into nine paragraphs bearing the letters A to Θ in succession. Relevant examples of the employment of *paragraphoi* to mark different clauses are as follows:

- Opisthographic commercial document of uncertain purpose on a lead tablet from Lattara, [52] *Dana* 2021, no. 60 (*SEG LX* 1055: ca. 450): the *paragraphoi* below some of the traces at the top of face A (above l. 1) and at ll. 4–5 (in connection with a larger interlinear space) mark two different transactions, both of which are introduced by an invocation of Zeus (ὦ Ζῆν at ll. 1 and 5).⁷²
- Rules of a contract for public works from Tegea, possibly related to the building of the temple of Athena Alea, [53] *IPArk* 3 (*IG V.2* 6A; Rhodes - Osborne, *GHI* 60A: ca. 350), ll. 3–4, 6–7, 21–22, 31–32, 37–38, 42–43, 44–45: each new clause of this set of general building regulations (the document is termed κοινὴ σύγγραφος at l. 53) is marked off from the preceding one with a combination of a *paragraphos* (between the first and second lines) and a blank space (before the beginning of that clause).⁷³
- *Iamata* of Epidauros, [54] *IG IV².1* 121 (Rhodes - Osborne, *GHI* 102: ca. 320), a collection of individual acts of healing inscribed on a series of large *stelae* set up in the Asklepion, which were seen by Pausanias (2.27.3; 36.1): in this inscription, which is on the first of the extant four *stelae*, *paragraphoi* have a manifestly residual nature in that they do not consistently separate stories from each other, but rather occur only at ll. 70–71 and 78–79 to signal the junctures between sections VIII and IX and between sections IX and X.⁷⁴ This is all the more significant as not every account starts on a new line (as in the case of sections I at l. 3, IX at l.

⁷² According to Dana, a third section relating to olive oil starts in the final line of face A (l. 9) and continues on face B, but no marks seem to signal its beginning (on the function of *paragraphoi* in this inscription, cf. Dana 2021, 252). Photos and drawings of both sides can be found at Dana 2021, 253, fig. 166–170.

⁷³ Exceptions to this trend are the junctures between clause IV and clause V at ll. 31–32 and between clause VII and clause VIII at ll. 44–45: in the former case, only the *paragraphos* appears; in the latter, clause VIII begins a new line. On *paragraphoi* in *IPArk* 3, see also Thür and Taeuber 1994, 20–21; Rhodes - Osborne, *GHI*, at p. 286; Pitt 2014, 389. For an image of ll. 34–38 of the inscription, see *IG V.2* (F. Hiller von Gaertringen), Taf. III. The reverse face of the stone preserves a series of accounts of the treasurers of the generals in two columns, *IPArk* 4 (*IG V.2* 6B), in which, as far as one may ascertain, no *paragraphoi* are employed.

⁷⁴ Hiller von Gaertringen incorrectly printed the *paragraphos* between ll. 70–71, but the published photographs of the inscription (e.g. Kavvadias 1900, 256) make it clear that the sign is correctly placed below l. 71 on the stone. In the three other surviving *stelae* of the series (*IG IV².1* 122–124), the sign is not employed as it appears that “the organizational principles of the collections differ from *stela* to *stela*” (Rhodes - Osborne, *GHI*, commentary at p. 540).

- 72, XI at l. 90, XII at l. 95, XIII at l. 98, XIV at l. 104, XV at l. 107, XVI at l. 111, XVII at l. 113, XVIII at l. 120), which could make the addition of a mark other than a blank space in the preceding line somewhat redundant, but a number of them begin in the middle of lines (sections II at l. 9, III at l. 22, IV at l. 33, V at l. 41, VI at l. 48, VII at l. 54, VIII at l. 68, X at l. 79, XIX at l. 122, XX at l. 125).⁷⁵
- Dossier of purity regulations from Cyrene presented as stemming from an oracle of Apollo, [55] **Rosamilia 2023, no. 18** (*SEG IX 72*; Rhodes - Osborne, *GHI 97*; *CGRN 99*; *IG Cyrenaica*² 016700: ca. 325–300), inscribed on the obverse and left side of a marble pillar bearing the already quoted account about grain supplies *IG Cyrenaica*² 010900 on its right side (the reverse is blank): judging from the preserved margin, each of the nineteen extant clauses begins a new line and is separated from the previous one by a *paragraphos*.⁷⁶ Particularly noteworthy is the use of the sign to mark the final surviving section, which is preceded by the heading *ικεσίων* (“of suppliants”) that spans the entire width of face B (at l. 110), and the three different sub-sections of which it is comprised (ll. 109–110, 121–122, 131–132). What appears to be an instance of misplacement at ll. 31–32 deserves full consideration as some have suggested (and rightly so, in my view) that the insertion of the *paragraphos* between the two lines should be regarded as a mistake.⁷⁷ This fact is notable since it could lend support to the view that stonemasons carved the *paragraphoi* at some point after the main text had been completed.
 - *Diagramma* of Ptolemy I, [56] **Rosamilia 2023, no. 2** (*SEG IX 1*; *IG Cyrenaica*² 010800: 320), which consists of several separate clauses marked out with *paragraphoi* (most of them are no longer visible).⁷⁸ Each clause begins a new line, and

⁷⁵ Among these, some are separated from the preceding story by a blank space (sections III at l. 22, VIII at l. 68, XIX at l. 122, XX at l. 125), while some are not even signalled by a *vacat*, but begin immediately at the end of the previous story (sections IV at l. 33, V at l. 41, VII at l. 54). One may think of a case of misplacement at ll. 9–10 (juncture between sections I and II), where a blank space follows rather than precedes the summative title of the account (*τριέτης | [φο]ρά*). However, based on what is found at the beginning of sections I at l. 3 and X at l. 79, where a *vacat* follows a title that starts the line, one could propose that blank spaces were placed both before and after the summative titles in the *antigraphon* on soft material. As for the use of headings or titles of paragraphs within a line, one could compare, for instance, the sacred law of Andania, Gawlinski 2012 (*IG V.1 1390*; *CGRN 222: 92/1 BCE or 23 CE*), and the astynomic law from Pergamon, Saba 2012 (*OGIS 483*: second-century-CE copy of a late Hellenistic text), as well as the Cyrenean cathartic law and the treaty on the judicial assistance between Delphi and Pellana (see below, case no. [74]).

⁷⁶ *Rosamilia 2023*, no. 18, A, ll. 3–4 (?), 7–8 (?), 10–11 (?), 20–21, 25–26, 32–33, 39–40 (?), 42–43, 52–53 (?), 62–63 (?), 72–73 (?); B, ll. 90–91 (?), 96–97 (?), 105–106. The question marks after the line numbers indicate that based on the available images, the relevant *paragraphoi* appear to have been lost, but may plausibly be restored.

⁷⁷ On this point, compare the discussions of Oliverio 1933, 60–62; Dobias-Lalou 2000, 273–274, 307–308; Rhodes - Osborne, *GHI*, at p. 503; Robertson 2010, 269–270.

⁷⁸ *Rosamilia 2023*, no. 2, ll. 5–6 (?), 15–16, 19–20 (?), 25–26 (?), 31–32 (?), 33–34, 42–43 (?), 45–46, 50–51, 52–53, 55–56. Photo at *Rosamilia 2023*, tav. 3. Cf. Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 567 n. 28.

when the final line of the previous clause does not occupy the full width of the stele, a blank space is left at its end (ll. 19, 25, 31, 42, 45, 55). Interesting to note, the list of magistrates (ἀρχαί) that closes the document immediately follows the final clause of the *diagramma* in the same line (l. 72), with no mark indicating the beginning of the list.

- Catalogue of sales from Tenos, [57] *IG XII.5 872* (late 4th century), containing 47 contracts of sales and dowries registered by the ὑπαστνόμοι in two parallel series, all of which were probably recorded in the same archon year.⁷⁹ The sales are listed by month, but *paragraphoi* do not distinguish each entry: as far as the inscription's poor state of preservation allows one to ascertain, they merely signal a few of them and occasionally occur at the transitions between one month and the next.
- Lease of land by the phratry of the Antalkidai on a fragmentary stele from Poieessa, [58] *IG XII.5 572* (3rd century): two *paragraphoi* (at ll. 12–13 and 17–18) divide the surviving text into three different sections or clauses (there is a blank space at the end of the second at l. 17).⁸⁰
- Dossier of regulations related to the cult of a goddess of Near Eastern origin at Marmarini near ancient Larisa (Thessaly) on a tall, opisthographic marble stele (Fig. 50), [59] *SEGLXV 376* (CGRN 225: ca. 225–150): on the better-preserved side B-face I (considered the reverse face by the *editores principes* J.–C. Decourt and A. Tziaphalias, but the obverse in Decourt and R. Bouchon's revised edition),⁸¹ clauses are divided from each other either by *paragraphoi* or *diplai stigmai*: in the former case (B, ll. 6–7, 12–13, 16–17, 20–21, 22–23, 50–51, 52–53, 56–57, 64–65), new clauses begin a new line, with a blank space frequently left at the end of the previous one (B, ll. 7, 13, 17, 21, 23, 51, 53, 57, 65); in the latter, they start at the middle of the line (B, ll. 34, 44, 48, 60, 69, 73, 78), though in some instances, *paragraphoi* are also used to indicate the beginning of these clauses (at ll. 44–45, 48–49, 60–61, 69–70).⁸² More difficult to assess is the function of the mark on side A-face II due to damage to the stone slab (its left margin, in particular). What seems clear is that *diplai stigmai* were used in the section containing the calendar of the festival of Aloulaia/Eloulaia at ll. 3–18 to separate entries on

⁷⁹ Photo available at Kern 1913, pl. 35 (ll. 92–123); cf. *ibidem*, XV: “haec tertii a. Chr. saeculi literatura non sine fructu cum papyris eiusdem aetatis conferri potest”. See further Game 2008, 173–190; Faraguna 2019 (with all previous bibliography); Faguer 2020; Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 325–331.

⁸⁰ Drawing available at *IG XII.5* (F. Hiller von Gaertringen), at p. 151. On the inscription, cf. Osborne 1991, 320; Mendoni 1994, 150.

⁸¹ Cf. Decourt and Tziaphalias 2015; Bouchon and Decourt 2017.

⁸² On the possible functions of these lectional signs and their employment in the inscription, see also Carbon 2016, 187 n. 3; Bouchon and Decourt 2017, 170. However, in the digital edition for the online *Collection of Greek Ritual Norms* (CGRN), *paragraphoi* are unfortunately omitted (*diplai stigmai* and *vacats* are included, instead). Images available at Decourt and Tziaphalias 2015, 16, fig. 2–3; Bouchon and Decourt 2017, 181–186, fig. 1–6.

day-to-day regulations (ll. 4, 9, 15, 17), sometimes in combination with *paragraphoi* (ll. 8, 14), or to introduce upcoming sections (and their internal subdivisions) on the procedures of initiation at ll. 18–30 and the ritual of lifting trays with offerings at ll. 30–38 (as suggested by the heading τελετή τῆς θεοῦ at l. 18 and by a reference to a σκάφη at l. 30, both preceded by the mark).⁸³ Despite all this, it cannot be securely determined whether the apparent pre-eminence of *diplai stigmatai* should be understood as a deliberate choice or, as I tend to think of it, as a material accident.

- Lindian Chronicle, [60] *I.Lindos* 2 (99), a monumental marble stele heavily damaged at the bottom and consisting of two main sections, namely, an explanatory decree running horizontally across the top of the stone (A), republished as Badoud, *Temps de Rhodes*, no. 24, and two different lists written below it in three columns (B, C and D),⁸⁴ with two headings slightly indented from the left margin: the first, a catalogue of some forty objects dedicated to Athana Lindia by mythical and historical figures (col. B and C), the second, a collection of the goddess' epiphanies (col. D). *Paragraphoi* are systematically employed to separate each entry in both lists.⁸⁵
- A somewhat different case is the letter of Eumenes II to the guild of the Dionysiac *technitai* of Ionia and the Hellespont regarding their relations with the city of Teos, [61] *Welles, RC 53* (*I.Pergamon* 163; Le Guen, *Technites* 47; Aneziri, *Techniten* D12: ca. 170–160), where the *paragraphoi*, in combination with vacats, mark not only major, but also minor sense-pauses.⁸⁶ Although the text is divided topically into paragraphs, the diacritical mark, which is employed in addition to the blank space, does not always separate each clause, and thus its use is incon-

⁸³ Cf. further e.g. ll. 28 and 35, where additional clauses of the relevant sections are separated from the previous ones by *diplai stigmatai*. Nothing can be said of other passages on side A-face II at ll. 40–55 since the surface is too deteriorated to allow analysis. In particular, the last section (ll. 48–55), which relates to oaths and is introduced by the heading ὄρκων, could also have been marked out with a *paragraphos* since it starts a new line (as a result, the use of the *diple stigmatē* would have been pointless in this case). However, this suggestion cannot be definitively proven.

⁸⁴ This particular layout, which may also be found, e.g., in *IEleusis* 52 or in *IG I³* 474, deserves proper treatment (on this point, see also Del Corso 2002, 188 n. 87). In general, it can safely be concluded that since such an arrangement of the text cannot be found in papyrological sources, this layout was not influenced by that of draft copies on papyrus or other soft media, but was conceived primarily for public display.

⁸⁵ On this point, see also Blinkenberg 1941, col. 150; Higbie 2003, 155–156, with n. 3, further notes that “[i]f the last line of an entry contains only a single word or brief phrase, it may be indented”.

⁸⁶ For the former, cf. col. I C, ll. 3–4 (?), 9–10, 13–14; II B, ll. 7–8; II A, ll. 3–4, 5–6; II C, ll. 9–10, 15–16 (?); III B, ll. 4–5; III A, ll. 5–6; for the latter, cf. col. I A, ll. 1–2, 3–4; I C, ll. 6–7, 11–12; II B, ll. 4–5; II A, ll. 7–8; II C, ll. 13–14 (?); III A, ll. 7–8. At any rate, the greater or lesser width of vacats does not seem to relate to the nature of sense pauses. An excellent facsimile drawing is provided by Fränkel 1890, 92–100.

sistent with that found in the documents gathered in this section.⁸⁷ Moreover, owing to the poor preservation of the fragments, it is often difficult to assess how the sign relates to the lines beneath whose initial letters it is cut.

5. SEPARATING DOCUMENTS GROUPED TOGETHER IN EPIGRAPHICAL DOSSIERS

A further instance of *paragraphoi* separating sections lies in its use to divide different documents from each other within epigraphical dossiers. It should be noted that, despite the examples gathered in this section, the employment of *paragraphoi* in such contexts seems to have been fairly infrequent. Inscriptions in which this phenomenon is seen are listed below:

- Honorific dossier for the grain dealer Herakleides of Salamis on Cyprus (Fig. 51), [62] *IG II³.1 367* (Rhodes – Osborne, *GHI* 95; *Prossenie* 10: 325/4), which contains a set of five documents inscribed at public expenses and arranged on the stone in an order that differs from the chronological order in which they were passed.⁸⁸ This well-known inscription deserves careful attention since it offers insight into, *inter alia*, Athenian decision-making procedures and archival practices. It includes not only the definitive Assembly decree proposed by Demosthenes of Lamprai authorising the erection of the stele and awarding various honours to Herakleides (e.g., the status of *proxenos* and benefactor) for his gift to the people of three thousand *medimnoi* of wheat at five drachmas each in 330/29 and three thousand drachmas for grain purchase in 328/7 (I/5, 325/4), as well as the Council's *probouleuma* for it put forward by Phileus of Oinoe (V/4, 325/4), but also three earlier documents of 330/29–328/7 that shed light on the process behind the initiative to honour Herakleides. In sequential order, these are: Telemachos of Acharnai's original proposal to the Assembly (δημος) that the Council (βουλή) draw up an appropriate *probouleuma* that would allow the Assembly to honour Herakleides (III/1); the resulting proposal presented to the Council by his fellow demesman Kephisodotos of Acharnai that Herakleides be honoured and awarded a gold crown for his gift of 330/29 (IV/2); and Telemachos' motion in the Assembly that the honours proposed by the Council be bestowed on him and that an envoy be dispatched to Dionysius of Heraclea to request the return of

⁸⁷ On this point, see also Fränkel 1890, 92, who interestingly proposes comparing the combined use of the *paragraphos* and *vacat* here with that in P.Louvre inv. 9331r + 10438 (TM 61288 / LDAB 2430; MP³ 1235; Cavallo and Maehler 2008, no. 52: Hyp. *Ath.*; mid-2nd century); Welles 1934, liv, 221, 230.

⁸⁸ I/5 at ll. 2–28; II/3 at ll. 29–46; III/1 at ll. 47–51; IV/2 at ll. 52–66; V/4 at ll. 67–80. The other documents that accompany the final Assembly decree on the stele are referred to as “the other praises that there have been for him” rather than as proper motions in the publication clause of the final decree itself (at ll. 22–25: ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν | καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπαίνους τοὺς γεγενημένους ἀ|τῶι ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει). On this point, see esp. Osborne 1999, 353; cf. Liddel 2020, vol. 2, 130 n. 75.

Herakleides' sails (II/3).⁸⁹ Blank spaces are left at the end of the final lines of each of the documents inscribed (ll. 28, 46, 51, 66 and 80), but *paragraphoi* are placed only after I/5 (at ll. 28–29) and III/1 (at ll. 51–52), thereby physically dividing the final decree of the Assembly from the preliminary Assembly proposals II/3 and III/1 and the latter from the preliminary Council proposals (*probouleumata*) IV/2 and V/4. It therefore seems inevitable, as several scholars have already noted, that “these features of the organisation of the decrees on the stone, in particular the division between Council decrees and Assembly decrees, reflect the organisation of the state archive”.⁹⁰ This is all the more remarkable in that it seems to have no parallel elsewhere in Athenian epigraphy. An appropriate comparandum could be a base inscribed on three sides, *IG II³.1 306* (343/2), which, in addition to a dedication to Hephaestus by the Council (A, ll. 1–3), contains, in chronological order: (I) a motion in the Assembly that the outgoing Council should be honoured (B, ll. 24–26); (II) a proposal by the Atthidographer Phanodemos in the Council regarding the commemoration of I (B, ll. 17–23); (III) the text of a *probouleuma* of the Council for honouring the Atthidographer Phanodemus for submitting the best proposal in the ninth prytany, arguably II (A, ll. 4–16); and (IV–V) two Council decrees honouring the Council’s administrator Eudoxos of Sypalettos (B, ll. 27–33 and C, ll. 43–49). However, no *paragraphoi* are used to separate the texts gathered therein.⁹¹ The closest parallel to the use of the *paragraphos* to mark off documents of different types in Athenian inscriptions is therefore [63] *IG II³.1 429* (ca. 337), the law concerning the rebuilding of the walls in the Piraeus after the battle of Chaeronea, with appended contract specifications for the work to be done in Munychia at ll. 46 ff. ([σ]υγγραφαὶ τοῦ τέλους τοῦ Μονυχ[ί]ασι). These are arranged in four columns below the law itself, and

⁸⁹ Cf. e.g. Osborne 1999, 352, who speaks of “two sets of honours for Herakleides of Salamis which between them involve five separate motions to the Assembly”; Culasso Gastaldi 2004, 170–171, who refers to “due separate iniziative onorarie” and concludes: “non si tratta di cinque decreti, come comunemente si tende ad affermare, ma di due decreti, registrati e descritti dettagliatamente nel loro cammino deliberativo”. On the possible collaboration of the proposers Telemachos and Kephisodotos of Acharnai, see esp. Lambert 2018a, 178–179; Liddel 2020, vol. 2, 17–18.

⁹⁰ Lambert 2006, 138 further observes that “the ‘earlier praises’ had patently not previously been inscribed and were most likely obtained from copies in the Athenian state archive”. On this point, cf. also Sickinger 1999, 172; Culasso Gastaldi 2004, 171; Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 518–520.

⁹¹ On *IG II³.1 306*, see esp. Lambert 2018b, 233–234; Liddel 2020, vol. 2, 36 n. 3. For further instances of distinctly enacted decrees or different motions combined into a dossier in Athenian epigraphic sources, see, e.g., the decrees for Methone, *IG I³ 61* (Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 150: 430/29–424/3); the decrees for the Samians, *IG I³ 127* and *IG II² 1* (Osborne – Rhodes, *GHI* 191 and Rhodes – Osborne, *GHI* 2: 405/4 and 403/2); and the honours for the Pellianians of the Peloponnese (*IG II³.1 304*: 345/4 and 344/3?). For other examples beyond Athens in which *paragraphoi* are likewise not employed to separate different documents from each other, cf. e.g. *Illion* 1 (ca. 306); *IG XII.7 8–11* (late 4th or early 3rd century); *Illion* 33 (Welles, *RC* 10–13, ca. 275); and *IDelphinion* 146 (209/8). On epigraphical dossiers of decrees, see in general Rhodes and Lewis 1997, 24–27; Ghinatti 2004.

are separated from the main text above (ll. 1–45) by a horizontal line at the left margin between ll. 45 and 46.⁹²

- Records of the Epidaurian *hiaromnamones* for the westward extension of the ‘incubation’ hall (the so-called “Abaton”) on the north side of the *temenos*, [64] **Prignitz 2022, no. 22** (*IG IV*².1 108A, ll. 1–80: ca. 319), the Epidoteion, **Prignitz 2022, no. 25** (*IG IV*².1 108A, ll. 81–158: ca. 318–313) and the transport of timber for the stoa of the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas, **Prignitz 2022, no. 28** (*IG IV*².1 108A, ll. 159–170: ca. 313), which are all incised on the same stone, but separated from each other by *paragraphoi* (at ll. 80–81, 158–159 and at the end of the last account, below l. 170).⁹³
- Dossier from Kyme consisting of two decrees of the city (ll. 1–13, 20–55) and a letter from Philetairos (ll. 14–19) that pertain to the provision of ὄπλα for the purposes of φυλακή, [65] **SEG L 1195** (ca. 270), recently re-edited by Virgilio (*SEG LXVII* 916): the three documents, which were set in sequence, are separated from each other by *paragraphoi* at ll. 13–14 and 19–20.⁹⁴
- Three honorific decrees for the Seleucid officer Larichos, [66] ***I.Priene B - M* 29–31** (ca. 281–262), inscribed one after the other on the same marble stele in progressive chronological order.⁹⁵ A blank space is left at the end of each, while *paragraphoi* after the first and the second decree separate the three documents.⁹⁶
- Dossier concerning the cultic foundation of a certain Poseidonios at Halicarnassus, [67] ***CGRN* 104** (*Syll.*³ 1044; *LSAM* 72: ca. 285–245), which consists of three sections referred to as χρησμός, ὑποθήκη and δόγμα in the publication clause at ll. 49–51: each is set apart by a *paragraphos* (at ll. 11–12 and 22–23),⁹⁷ but since the second – the ὑποθήκη (“pledge” or “bequest” of various properties and other sources of revenue to Poseidonios’ descendants so that they can fund the cult that he initiated after securing divine approval) – ends at the very beginning of l. 22, and the third – the δόγμα (the “decree” passed by Poseidonios’ family regarding the functioning of the cult itself and its rites) – starts immediately after section II, a further, seemingly unusual lectional sign (⊔) is used along with the horizontal line between ll. 22 and 23 to mark the transition from section

⁹² See the remarks in Lambert 2006, 139–140.

⁹³ Prignitz 2022, 197: “Außerdem ist 25 durch eine Paragraphos am linken Rand (unter 22 80) und ein Präskript (25 1–2) als eigenständiger Text gekennzeichnet”. However, Prignitz reproduces no *paragraphoi* under Prignitz 2022, nos. 25 and 28, while Hiller does.

⁹⁴ Photo available at Manganaro 2000, 414; Virgilio 2017, 158. Cf. Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 383–384. See also A. Bencivenni’s chapter in this volume.

⁹⁵ Photo available at *I.Priene B - M*, vol. 2, at p. 29.

⁹⁶ Cf. Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 526 n. 71.

⁹⁷ Image available at Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013 (*SEG LXIII* 863), 119.

II to section III.⁹⁸ The three parts may well have been inscribed on the stele in chronological order (as in the case of *SEG L 1195* and *I.Priene B - M 29-31*), but this is by no means certain.⁹⁹

- A series of abbreviated decrees from the Asklepieion at Epidauros recording the appointment of *proxenoi* and *theorodokoi*, [68] *IG IV².1 96* (Perlman, *Theodorokia* Ep. Cat. E. 3: ca. 260-240), which were inscribed individually one after another on a single limestone stele: the employment of the *paragraphos* is clearly residual here since the sign occurs only at ll. 71-72 to distinguish decrees XIX and XX rather than carefully articulate each of them (this function is instead performed by the blank spaces).¹⁰⁰
- Decree of the Ioulietans (Ceos) honouring Charmippos of Rhodes as *proxenos* and benefactor, [69] *IG XII.5 599* (2nd or 1st century): a *paragraphos* is placed below the text of the decree (beneath l. 21), but since the stone is broken above and below, it is impossible to assess its actual function. Due to the set of summarised decrees from Epidauros, one may conjecture that the sign here is meant to separate this *ψήφισμα* from other similar decrees in a series.¹⁰¹
- List of private contributions for restoring certain parts of the sanctuary of an unknown goddess (κρήνη, βωμός and θάλαμος) by a group of at least 65 women from Paros, [70] *IG XII.5 186* (2nd century): the *paragraphos* between ll. 1 and 2 most probably separates this list, which is preceded by a reference to the eponymous archon, νεωκόρος and priestess at ll. 2-4, from the preceding inscription, incised in nearly its entirety on the block above.¹⁰²
- Four decrees honouring different benefactors inscribed on the front and left sides of a left marble anta block, [71] *I.Thrake Aeg. E7-E10* (Abdera, 2nd century): *paragraphoi* are placed at the left margin of the blank spaces following the proxeny decree for Philon of Acanthus (E7) and the decree for C. Apustius and his son P. Apustius (E9), thereby separating the two earlier documents on the left

⁹⁸ In connection with this, it is worth noting that though section I ends at the middle of l. 11, a blank space is left after the final word (ἔσεσθαι) and the phrase Ποσειδώνιος Ἰατροκλέους ὑπέθηκεν starts the following line. On the signs employed in the inscription, see also Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013, 103-104.

⁹⁹ On this point, see Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013, 71.

¹⁰⁰ On the comparable series of Aetolian abbreviated decrees granting citizenship and *proxenia*, see below, § 6.

¹⁰¹ Cf. however the publication clause at ll. 15-19 that contains provisions for inscribing the decree on a στήλη λιθίνη to be placed in the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios. As for the dating of this inscription, it was Fraser and Bean 1954, 161 n. 2 who noted that it “looks as if it might be of the first century B.C.”.

¹⁰² Image and drawing are available at *IG XII.5*, at pp. 55-56, where F. Hiller von Gaertringen points out that “[v]s. 1 prima linea _ non ad Σ pertinere, sed paragraphus esse videtur, supra quam hastae pars inferior est. Est igitur hic versus prioris inscriptionis ultimus, quae inscriptio alium lapidem superimpositum obtinuit”.

face (E7–E8), as well as those on the obverse face (E9–E10).¹⁰³ It is impossible to determine whether two other horizontal dashes were incised after E8 and E10 since the block is broken not only on the right, but also below, where the two decrees ended.

- Letters to the cities of Achaëa from L. Mummius and his successor Q. Fabius Maximus regarding privileges conferred on the Isthmian–Nemean guild of Dionysus’ *technitai* inscribed on a still unpublished inscription from Argos dated to 146–144, [72] *SEG XXXI 307*: *paragraphoi* apparently separate the various letters.¹⁰⁴

6. THE STRANGE CASE OF *PARAGRAPHOI* AT MID-HEIGHT

This section gathers pieces of evidence upholding the idea that the occasional horizontal dashes that occur at mid-height within lines of text in the Greek epigraphic record should be considered a graphic variant of the “traditional” interlinear *paragraphoi* at the left margin. Since cases are found in which the two co-exist and perform the same function in the same document, they can inevitably be viewed as different forms of one and the same lectional sign. When it comes to texts consisting of several clauses (such as those in § 4), it appears that the employment of either form of the *paragraphos* basically depends on whether a new clause begins in the middle of a line or initiates a new one. In the first case, the transition from one section to the next is marked by a horizontal dash placed at mid-height within the line; in the second, by a “traditional” *paragraphos*. Considering that horizontal strokes at mid-height with separative functions are thus far unattested in Greek papyri (at least as far as I can tell), one could go so far as to conjecture that this variant of the *paragraphos* was intended particularly for epigraphic use and that it already appeared in the final drafts of documents meant for public display. An alternative, albeit less plausible, scenario would be that it was the stonemasons who displaced the horizontal lines from their original location at the left margin while carving texts onto durable materials. Any systematic collection of instances of the employment of *paragraphoi* at mid-height must include the following inscriptions:

¹⁰³ Photo available at Loukopoulou *et al.* 2005, pl. 3–6. On the use of *paragraphoi* in this dossier, see also Picard and Avezou 1913, 122. On the archival practices hinted at by the documents in the dossier, see most recently Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 506–507.

¹⁰⁴ The discovery of this over 150-line-long inscription was announced long ago by Charalambos Kritzas (*AD* 28, 1973, 126). On the presence of *paragraphoi* in the text, see Costabile 2001, 165; on the inscription, see also Rhodes and Lewis 1997, 69–70. Ch. Kritzas (*per epistulas*) pointed out to me that “when the leaders of the guild of the Technitai copied from their archives on one stele the successive letters of the Roman magistrates, preceded by an introductory paragraph mentioning that the co-magistrates of Argos gave them the permission to do so, they have separated them with a *vacat* (a blank strip). In addition, they traced a short horizontal line (*παράγραφος γραμμή*) at the left margin between the paragraphs, closer to the last line of the preceding (upper) paragraph. This is clearly visible in three cases, and it is probable in one more case. It could also have existed elsewhere, but the stone is worn”.

- Treaty establishing the short-lived Hellenic League instigated by Antigonus Monophthalmos and Demetrius Poliorketes in 303 or 302 and dissolved in 301 after the battle of Ipsos, [73] *IG IV².1 68* (*Staatsverträge* III 446; *ISE* I 44), inscribed on an opisthographic stele erected in the Asklepieion of Epidauros: despite numerous *lacunae*, it appears that clauses are consistently separated from each other by short horizontal dashes at mid-height within the line.¹⁰⁵ In at least two cases, however, the small bar-shaped marking is placed at the left margin (below the first letters of ll. 90 and 94), making it clear that when the end of a clause coincided with the end of a line, the junction was indicated by “traditional” interlinear *paragraphoi*, as is also the case with the nearly contemporary Ephesian law on the credit crisis and the Aetolian list of *proxenoi* discussed below. A similar pattern is observed both in the opisthographic stele carrying the treaty on the judicial assistance between Delphi and Pellana, [74] *SEG XXVII 116* (*FDelphes* III.1 486: ca. 280), and in the inscription recording the sympolity between Myania and Hypnia in West Lokris, [75] *IG IX.1² 748* (*SEG XXIII* 305: ca. 190), since in both documents straight dashes at mid-height are carefully employed to separate clauses (though in the former case *paragraphoi* are paired with heading introducing them).
- Ephesian law regarding a credit crisis on five horizontally adjacent rectangular blocks of a wall that may have originally been part of a building within the Artemision, [76] *I.Ephesos 4* (ca. 299), republished by Walser in 2008 (*SEG LVIII* 1303): the various clauses are consistently separated by dashes at mid-height throughout the text of the law, but “traditional” *paragraphoi* are employed in three *loci* to mark the transition between one clause and the next.¹⁰⁶ Two further features are of note here: first, the heading at ll. 42–43 (ὕπερ τῶν ἐγγύων τῶν ἐγγυωμένων πρὸς | αὐτὰ) τὰ κτήματα) is marked before and after by two such dashes at mid-height that are further enhanced by the very large vacats preceding and following them; second, situated at the bottom of the right-hand column on block 2 (end of l. 64), which contains only 13 as opposed to 17 lines, is a very large vacat that probably indicates a stronger transition since the left-hand column on block 3 begins with a new clause (at l. 65).
- Decree of Gortyn on the use of bronze coins, [77] *I.Cret. IV 162* (ca. 250–200): at l. 2 a short horizontal dash at mid-height separates the enactment formula

¹⁰⁵ Cf. ll. 66, 73, 75, 78, 83, 87, 97, 144. The cases of ll. 15, 23, 40, 60, 125 are highly unclear as the stone is heavily damaged. Image available at Kavvadias 1918, 130.

¹⁰⁶ Photo available at *I.Ephesos* (H. Wankel), Tafel 4–6 (squeezes); Del Corso 2017, 56, tav. 3. This detail was already noted by both Wankel and Walser, but neither of them identified the signs as *paragraphoi*. See e.g. Walser 2008, 14: “Von kurzen Spatien umrahmte waagrechte Linien (–) gliedern den Text in Paragraphen. Unklar ist die Funktion dreier solcher Linien, die auf Block 3 am linken Rand zwischen die Zeilen 78 und 79, 86 und 87 und schliesslich 89 und 90 gesetzt sind”. On this inscription, see also F. Santini’s chapter in this volume.

followed by the quorum figure (τάδ' ἔφαδε τ]ᾱι [πόλι] ψαφίδδονσι τρια[κατίων π]αριόντων) from the substance of the decree (ll. 2–13).¹⁰⁷ The same mark performs a similar function in the Trallians' decree that is part of the epigraphic dossier from Magnesia on the Maeander on the recognition of the festival of Artemis Leukophryene, [78] *I.Magnesia* 85 (*I.Tralleis* 21: ca. 150), l. 14, where a serified horizontal dash at mid-height distinguishes the section consisting of, *inter alia*, the motivation clause and the purpose clause from one containing the enactment formula and the rest of the document.¹⁰⁸

- Two documents of the Magnesian dossier on the penteteric Leukophryena, namely, the so-called foundation decree, [79] *I.Magnesia* 16, ll. 11, 16, 24, 28, and the mythological history of Magnesia, [80] *I.Magnesia* 17, l. 4: in both instances, serified horizontal dashes at mid-height mark transitions between sections or highlight important sub-sections within the text.¹⁰⁹
- Rhodian arbitration of the territorial dispute between Samos and Priene, [81] *I.Priene B - M* 132 (Magnetto 2008: ca. 196–192), displaying what seems to be a residual deployment of the mark at ll. 112 and 185: in the first case, it indicates the transition from one section to the next as it separates the first Prienian argument (ll. 63–112) from the next statement by the Samians (ll. 112–118); in the second case, it is used in the section concerning the new boundary delineation between Samian and Prienian holdings (ll. 180–195), perhaps with the aim of indicating a sub-section.¹¹⁰ The second of these cases is arguably one of misplacement (by the stonemason?), since the dash occurs immediately before the conclusion of a sentence rather than after it.
- Grants of citizenship and *proxenia* within the Aetolian corpus of decrees honouring external citizens inscribed on a series of limestone stelae from Thermos (3rd to early 2nd century): the most notable instance of the use of *paragraphoi* at mid-height is probably the one that appears in a long list of *proxenoi* arranged

¹⁰⁷ Image available at *I.Cret.* IV, at p. 222. On the mark, see also *ibidem*, 223, *ad locum* (M. Guarducci): “Notandum est divisorium e linea transversa constans”.

¹⁰⁸ It should also be noted that the decree's various sub-sections are separated from each other by blank spaces (ll. 2, 12, 20, 21). On this document, cf. F. Santini's chapter in this volume.

¹⁰⁹ On these inscriptions, cf. F. Santini's chapter in this volume. However, assuming that the dash preceding τὸν [χ]ρησὸν at *I.Magnesia* 16, l. 11 is misplaced (it should probably have followed it), one could conjecture that the *paragraphoi* at ll. 11 and 16 isolate the temporal indication of ll. 11–16 rather than highlight keywords such as τὸν [χ]ρησὸν and πρῶτον (as Santini thinks). If that be the case, then the *paragraphoi* would be functioning as markers of both major and minor sense-pauses, as in the case of Welles, *RC* 53.

¹¹⁰ On the mark, cf. Magnetto 2008, 65–66, who makes the convincing case that its occurrence in the section on the boundary delimitation is probably meant to highlight “il punto del testo in cui si stabilisce un tratto del confine di particolare interesse per Priene”. Photos available at *I.Priene B - M*, vol. 2, at pp. 108, 111. See also F. Santini's chapter in this volume.

in two columns on the obverse face of a large stele, [82] *IG IX.1² 17*, ll. 1–96 (before 262), as here both versions of the mark – the “traditional” one at the left margin and the one at mid-height – are employed.¹¹¹ The second version also occurs in other lists of *proxenoi*, such as [83] *IG IX.1² 25*, *a* (ca. 246–236) and *d* (ca. 246–236), [84] *IG IX.1² 29* (210/9) and [85] *IG IX.1² 31*, *s* (214/3), as well as in collections of abbreviated decrees awarding proxeny and/or citizenship, such as [86] *IG IX.1² 12*, l. 25, and [87] *IG IX.1² 18*, l. 8: in the first group of inscriptions, the mark almost always highlights entries consisting of the names of the recipients followed by those of their guarantors (ἑγγυοί); in the second, isolated dashes separate the decrees that begin in the middle of lines from those preceding them.¹¹² In addition to these examples, one should also consider [88] *IG IX.1² 30* (ca. 196/5), a fragmentary list of abbreviated citizenship decrees in which, rather unusually, the mark distinguishes two awardees from each other at ll. 8 and 13.

- Opisthographic list of individuals, arguably new citizens, from Ilion, [89] *I.Ilion 64* (assigned to the first decades of the 2nd century), lacking a beginning and consisting of three sub-lists, two of which are preceded by short headings (the first at ll. 1–57, the second, χῆρα[ι], at ll. 58–60, the third, καὶ οἷς ἐδόθη ἡ πολιτεία, at ll. 61–70): all the names (that is, names and patronymics, which are sometimes followed by those of wives, sisters, mothers or sons in the first sub-list) are systematically set apart from each other by short dashes at mid-height.¹¹³ Among the lists in which each of the names assembled is preceded by a horizontal stroke at mid-height, one could also include an extremely fragmentary catalogue from Phoetiae (Acarmania), [90] *IG IX.1² 602* (4th century).
- Delphic copy of two Amphictyonic decrees in honour of the Athenian guild of Dionysiac artists inscribed on the Treasury of the Athenians, [91] *CID IV 114* (*FDelphes* III.2 68, ll. 1–61; *Choix Delphes* 194) and the earlier decree *CID IV 12* (*FDelphes* III.2 68, ll. 61–94; *Choix Delphes* 68), which are separated from each other by a horizontal dash at mid-height.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ Cf. Mack 2015, 289 n. 10: “Particular care was taken, presumably because of the length of this list, to separate individual entries with dashes [...], in addition to which *paragraphoi* are also used, especially in the second column, to highlight the beginning of some new entries”. The use of engraved monograms on the left of the right-hand column is also noteworthy.

¹¹² The case of *IG IX.1² 18* also makes it clear that whenever a decree starts a new line (as at ll. 5 and 16, for instance), no mark is placed at the end of the preceding one, before the vacat. For an overview of the inscriptions from Thermos recording grants of *proxenia* (and citizenship) by the Aetolian League, cf. Mack 2015, 288–291.

¹¹³ Photo available at *Illion*, Tafel 14–15 (squeezes). Cf. Berti and Kató 2017, 104 n. 124. On the inscription, see esp. the analysis in Brulé 1990.

¹¹⁴ On the mark, see G. Colin, *FDelphes* III.2, at p. 74, who also justifies the misleading editorial practice of printing thinner horizontal dashes within lines instead of leaving blank spaces: “A la l. 61, les

- Second Delphic hymn to Apollo performed in the Pythais of 128/7, [92] *CID III 2* (*FDelphes* III.2 138; *Choix Delphes* 203-B), composed by Limenios son of Thoinos and inscribed on the southern wall of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi: according to Reinach, the *paragraphos* at col. II, ll. 6–7, strophe X, points to “une modulation rythmique”.¹¹⁵ Elsewhere in the hymn, the sign occurs in the form of a horizontal dash at mid-height within the line to perform a similar function, namely, to mark the beginning of a new strophe.¹¹⁶

The employment of horizontal dashes at mid-height as lectional devices for purposes of separation was not limited to public documents as it can also be traced in another category of inscribed texts, namely, *defixiones* and the like. If compared to the use of the mark in other types of epigraphic sources, the picture here seems less clear and coherent. Jaime Curbera notes that in Sicilian curse tablets, *paragraphoi* are employed “come nei papiri, per marcare le sezioni fraseologiche o concettuali”.¹¹⁷ In this context, however, the evidence does not seem to permit generalisations since the function of the mark varies considerably from case to case. Among the numerous instances, which deserve an *ad hoc* inspection, I single out the following, most significant ones:

- Four *defixiones* from Kamarina dating to the Classical period, in all of which short horizontal dashes at mid-height with unclear separative functions appear within lists of names: [93] *Arena, Iscrizioni II*² 127 (*I.dial. Sicile* I 120; Curbera 1999, 175, no. 4: mid-5th century), ll. 1, 4, 5, 8, an opisthographic tablet resembling a footprint;¹¹⁸ [94] *Arena, Iscrizioni II*² 130 (*I.dial. Sicile* I 119; Curbera 1999, 175, no. 3: end of the 5th century); [95] *I.dial. Sicile* I 123 (Curbera 1999, 176, no. 8: late 4th century), ll. 2, 3; [96] *SEG XLVII 1439* (Curbera 1999, 176, no.

deux décrets sont séparés par un trait. Aux l. 28, 65 et 80, des espaces laissés vides sur la pierre répondent à une forte ponctuation: je le marque ici par un tiret, bien que cette indication soit très capricieusement employée par le graveur”. However, as far as one can judge from published photographs, there are no horizontal lines at mid-height where Colin reproduced them. The same problem applies to the honorary decree of the Delphians for the Athenian guild of Dionysiac artists that took part in the fourth Pythais, which is inscribed on the southern wall of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, *FDelphes* III.2 48 (Le Guen, *Technites* 14; Aneziri, *Techniten* A11; *Choix Delphes* 202: 98/7), since no dashes are visible in the published images (see e.g. Tracy 1969, 389, fig. 19).

¹¹⁵ G. Colin, *FDelphes* III.2, at p. 165, *ad locos*. See further V. Bélis, *CID III*, at p. 127.

¹¹⁶ At col. I, l. 13, strophe III; col. II, l. 21, strophe VI; l. 26, strophe VIII. See V. Bélis, *CID III*, at pp. 99, 106, 113, *ad locos*. Photo available at *CID III*, pl. VII-IX.

¹¹⁷ Curbera 1999, 163–164. On some layout strategies in Greek *defixiones*, see the preliminary remarks in Centrone 2010; cf. further Lamont 2022; Lamont 2023.

¹¹⁸ Cf. L. Dubois, *I.dial. Sicile* I, at p. 126: “On constate l’existence d’un signe de ponctuation fait d’un petit trait horizontal”; *Arena, Iscrizioni II*², at p. 91: “Va notato il breve tratto orizzontale, che funge anche qui da segno divisorio, usato inconseguentemente”. On *defixiones* in the form of either continuous or columnar lists, see Centrone 2010, 95–100; cf. further Gordon 1999; Lamont 2022, 46–49.

10: undated).¹¹⁹ The same holds true of two of the famous lead *tesserae* discovered in the temple of Athena at Kamarina, [97] Arena, *Iscrizioni* II² 126.6 and 126.10 (Cordano 1992), in which the name and patronymic are separated from each other by a straight bar.¹²⁰ In connection with these cases, one could also recall two Sicilian tablets of a financial nature, in which comparable marks serve similar purposes, namely, [98] Arena, *Iscrizioni* II² 119 (*I.dial. Sicile* I 177: ca. 450–400), ll. 1 and 2, and [99] *I.dial. Sicile* I 194 (2nd century), ll. 4–5: in the first, they are unclearly employed as interpuncts;¹²¹ in the second, they set apart the names of the first list of ἄμφοροι (“guarantors”) at ll. 4–6.

- *Defixio* from Selinous, [100] *SEG* LV 1025 (Bettarini, *Defixiones* 5, tav. 5), assigned to the late 5th or 4th century: the function of the mid-line horizontal stroke occurring at l. 2 between an abbreviated name and a sort of *diple* that precedes the vacat (and perhaps at the end of l. 3 between an abbreviated name and a vacat) remains unclear.¹²² According to the *editor princeps*, the sign was probably meant to denote the abbreviation of the name preceding it (the same would hold true of l. 3), but one cannot exclude the possibility that the two marks here should be interpreted as *paragraphoi*, as Jaime Curbera suggests due to the examples from Kamarina.¹²³
- Poetic protective charm (ἐπιφδοῦ) on a lead tablet from Lokroi Epizephyrioi, [101] *IG Locri* 92 (5th–4th century, though a date later in this range seems more probable for palaeographical reasons): drawing on the assumption that the written model used by the engraver was likely “arranged according to *stichoi*”, Jordan argues that the intralinear dashes at mid-height at ll. 3 (after Τετρακο(ς) and before Ὀλβιο(ς) and 4, which could be interpreted as *paragraphoi*, evidently serve “to separate the individual verses – or rather groups of verses”.¹²⁴
- Judicial *defixio* with a triple curse on a long lead tablet from Kerameikos (26 cm wide) dated to the early 4th century, [102] *SEG* LXVIII 101 (Curbera and Papakonstantinou 2018, no. 1), which pertains to three separate legal actions taken against possibly the same defendant: the text is written almost *stoichedon* in three columns, each containing a similar spell cast on three different plaintiffs, separat-

¹¹⁹ Image available at Manganaro 1997, 345. However, as noted in *SEG* XLVII 1439, “it is not clear whether the small horizontal strokes printed by ed. pr. in LL. 1, 3 and 6 indicate small lacunas or have actually been engraved on the tablet; the photo is not helpful”. On the use of *paragraphoi* in tablets from Kamarina’s Passo Marinaro cemetery, see also Lamont 2022, 45–46.

¹²⁰ On the *tesserae* from Kamarina, see also Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 169–173.

¹²¹ L. Dubois, *I.dial. Sicile* I, at p. 202: “Le tiret comme signe de ponctuation est d’une usage fantaisiste”.

¹²² On the possible function of this sign in the form of a *diple*, see Bettarini 2005, 29–30.

¹²³ Curbera 1999, 163–164, 175–176; cf. Bettarini 2005, 29–30.

¹²⁴ Photo available at Costabile 1999, 30, 36, fig. 4, 8; Jordan 2000, 99; on the *paragraphoi*, see also Bettarini 2012, 122. On the continuous long horizontal line below l. 8, see L. Del Monaco, *IG Locri*, at p. 148: “Sotto la lin. 8 è tracciata una linea di separazione con lo scopo di definire il testo e conferirgli un rilievo particolare”.

ed by blank spaces in imitation of the *intercolumnia* found in literary papyrus rolls (as the *editor princeps* puts it).¹²⁵ A distinctive feature of the tablet is the employment of unusual diacritical marks, including a horizontal stroke at mid-height at the beginning of col. III, l. 1 (before *καταδ[έ]ω*), which has been interpreted as a wavy *paragraphos* (the sign, however, has not been included in Curbera and Papakonstantinou's recent edition).

- Lead curse tablet against Macedonians and their supporters from Kerameikos, [103] *SEG LIV 398* (Costabile 2004–2005, no. IV, fig. 47–52, uncertain date, possibly ca. 317–307), II, in which a short horizontal stroke compatible with a *paragraphos* occurs at the very end of l. 1 at mid-level, possibly to separate the names of the first two *defixi*, Πλεΐσταρχον at l. 1, the younger brother of Cassander (mentioned at l. 3), and Εὐπολεμον, Cassander's general in Greece, at l. 2.¹²⁶

After this brief analysis of the use of *paragraphoi* at mid-height in Greek curse tablets on lead, I would like to conclude the section by noting the occurrence of a longish horizontal line resembling “traditional” *paragraphoi* in the most famous of the Selinountine *defixiones*, [104] *Bettarini, Defixiones 23* (Gager 1992, no. 50; Curbera 1999, 179, no. 29; ca. 500–450), between ll. 16 and 17. Its purpose here is to emphasise that the list of names, which begins in the middle of l. 16, belongs in a different section rather than the main text, and thus to divide the entire *defixio* in two parts (ll. 1–16 and ll. 16–19). Nonetheless, the meaning of this division remains unclear.¹²⁷

7. PROSIMETRIC TEXTS ON STONE

The final group of cases that require examination on the use of *paragraphoi* in Greek epigraphical sources consists of inscriptions containing sections in both prose and verse. Most of the examples referred to here are composite texts into which oracular responses have been integrated. Remarkably, the transition from prose to poetry is generally highlighted by layout devices such as reverse indentation and

¹²⁵ This important judiciary tablet was first published by Felice Costabile (*SEG XLVIII 354–356*) and re-edited by Jordan 2004 (*SEG LI 328*). For a discussion of its alleged resemblance to papyri, see Costabile 2001, 173–186, followed by Del Corso 2002, 185 n. 78, who concludes that this is a clear example of an inscription “impaginata secondo forme proprie del rotolo” (cf. further Del Corso 2003, 36–37; Del Corso 2022, 152–153) and Centrone 2010, 99–100. On its formal aspects, see also the remarks in Costabile 1998, 30–34 (though the idea that the tablet is an exceptional document in terms of form should probably be rejected). Faraguna 2020, 121–122 suggests that a *paragraphos* may have also preceded the initial line of the second curse as there is a gap at the beginning of the second column.

¹²⁶ On this *defixio*, see also Gager 1992, 147–148, no. 57. Costabile 2004–2005, 182 supports the conclusion that the curse tablet is “un *katadesmos* ‘politico’ fatto eseguire dalla parte democratica”.

¹²⁷ For a discussion of this point, cf. e.g. Gager 1992, 139–140; Bettarini 2005, esp. 115–117, with further references. Image available at Bettarini, *Defixiones*, at p. 122, tav. 23a.

paragraphoi.¹²⁸ I have extended my analysis to this particular category of epigraphic texts despite my intention to leave inscribed poetry aside since all the cases discussed here have an intrinsic political dimension that extends far beyond their importance as literary texts and should therefore be regarded as primary historical sources. The relevant cases are as follows:

- Isyllos' inscription, [105] Kolde 2003 (*IG IV*².1 128, ca. 280), consisting of seven segments, five of which are in verse with different metres (I at ll. 1–2: prose; II at ll. 3–9: trochaic; III at ll. 10–26: dactylic; IV at ll. 27–31: dactylic; V at ll. 32–36: prose; VI at ll. 37–56: ionic; VII at ll. 57–79: dactylic); *paragraphoi* regularly separate all the segments (at ll. 9–10, 26–27, 31–32, 36–37) save the first two, but this can easily be explained by considering the fact that section I is written in larger letters than the following lines because it is the actual dedication of the stele (ll. 1–2: Ἴσυλλος Σωκράτους Ἐπιδαύριος ἀνέθηκε Ἰ Απόλλωνι Μαλεάται καὶ Ἀσκληπιῶι).¹²⁹ Only in two instances (between sections III and IV at ll. 26–27 and between sections V and VI at ll. 36–37) is the sign combined with a significant interlinear space – 15–18 mm and 22–23 mm, respectively – to mark the transition.¹³⁰
- Mnesiepes inscription from the Archilocheion of Paros on two non-joining orthostate blocks (E₁ and E₂), [106] *SEG XV* 517 (ca. 250–200),¹³¹ containing the remains of four columns of writing – three on the former (E₁ I–III) and one on the latter (E₂ I): the arrangement of the text into columns as well as the occurrence of various lectional devices, such as reverse indentation, *paragraphoi*, vertically aligned triple dots and what has questionably been interpreted by the *editor princeps* as a coronis (at E₁ III, l. 16), has led some scholars to claim that the inscription resembles a papyrus book-roll.¹³² However, one could object to this by pointing out that

¹²⁸ The combined use of *ekthesis* and *paragraphoi* to mark oracle sections is also found in inscriptions of the Imperial era (cf. e.g. *IDidyma* 496A).

¹²⁹ Photo available at Kolde 2003 (ll. 1–60). The worn condition of the stele makes it impossible to assess whether a *paragraphos* once separated section VI from section VII at ll. 56–57 because the left margin is not preserved here. However, it is worth noting that a large *vacat* follows the end of section VI at l. 56 (ἰὲ Παιάν, ἰὲ Παιάν) and that the final segment of the inscription is written in smaller letters. Scholars debate whether this should be viewed as a later addition by Isyllos himself or is instead due to the initiative of the engraver, who realised that there was not enough space for this final segment (on this point, see e.g. Herrero de Jáuregui and Goldhill 2019, 72 n. 1, with further references).

¹³⁰ On this point, see also Baunack 1890, 18–19; Kolde 2003, 5–6.

¹³¹ Photos available at Clay 2004, pl. 3–9; Ornaghi 2009, 359–360, fig. 12–13; Gomis García 2015, 114, fig. 1.

¹³² See e.g. Rotstein 2014, 7, who argues that “[t]he layout is clearly designed to visually represent a papyrus leaf”. On the formal aspects of the Mnesiepes inscription, see most recently Gomis García 2015, 113–117, whose analysis, however, contains some flaws (at n. 10, for instance, she wrongly maintains that “[l]a *paragraphos* aparece en algunos catálogos y otros documentos oficiales, incluso de las Cícladas, pero no en leyes, decretos y otros documentos públicos”). On triple dots as an interpunct in Greek inscriptions, see e.g. Guarducci 1967, 392–393; Threatte 1980, 73–84; Lougovaya-Ast 2017.

the frequent use of the columnar format in inscriptional evidence need not have anything to do with the layout of literary texts on papyrus.¹³³ Moreover, due to the damaged state of the stones, it is not easy to assess the function of the lectional signs in the inscription or distinguish their mutual relationship. This is a problem that applies specifically to *paragraphoi* and *triplai stigmatai*, which are sometimes used in combination (as at the end of E₁ II, l. 7 and, perhaps, l. 13).¹³⁴ Here the *paragraphoi*, in particular, seem to serve three principal functions: first, to further highlight – albeit not consistently – the indented portions of text, which consist of citations of both oracular responses and Archilochus' poetry;¹³⁵ second, to indicate the internal subdivisions of these sections in *ekthesis*;¹³⁶ and finally, to mark temporal or other types of transitions within the main prose narrative.¹³⁷ As for the remaining occurrences of the sign, the text is preserved in such tiny quantities that it is difficult to determine the purpose of the *paragraphos*.¹³⁸

- Oracular inscription from Akrai, [107] *SEG XXXI 822* (2nd century), which may belong with the hexametric dialogue between a goddess referred to as τετραλέα (Artemis?) and Zeus, *SEG XXXI 821*, both re-edited by Leone Porciani in 2014 (*SEG LXIV 810*): the texts incised on the former include a χρησμός (B, ll. 1–20; cf. C, l. 1) as well as two prose sections before and after it (A, ll. 1–5; C, ll. 1–14), whose character remains uncertain due to the poor condition of the stone (only its left margin is preserved).¹³⁹ The χρησμός, like the Mnesiepes inscription, is distinguished from what precedes and follows it by two *paragraphoi*, so that the inscription is composed of three distinct parts.¹⁴⁰

¹³³ As suggested by Del Corso 2002, 186, who, however, does not endorse this argument: “Si potrebbe obiettare che impaginare su più colonne il testo di un rendiconto o di un inventario sia una scelta imposta dal tipo di documento da esporre, e maturata, più che per l’influenza di fattori extra-epigrafici, per la volontà di garantire una maggiore leggibilità al testo”. On this point, see more below, § 8.

¹³⁴ It may be worth emphasising that two other well-known paraliterary inscriptions from the island, the *Marmor Parium*, *IG XII.5 444* (some time after 264/3), and the Sosthenes inscription, *IG XII.5 445* (early 1st century), do not reveal the use of *paragraphoi* or other lectional signs. For a recent comparison of the Mnesiepes inscription and the *Marmor Parium*, see Rotstein 2014, who, however, also points to significant differences between the two inscriptions in terms of layout and formal features.

¹³⁵ Cf. E₁ III, ll. 8–9 (?), 35–36, 46–47, 50–51; E₂ I, ll. 14–15, 44–45. The beginning and end of the oracular sections at E₁ II, ll. 1–15 and 50–52 (namely, the responses given to Mnesiepes and Archilochus' father Telesikles) are apparently not marked by *paragraphoi*, but only through reverse indentation.

¹³⁶ The *paragraphoi* at E₁ II, ll. 7–8 and 13–14 separate the three oracles given to Mnesiepes, while those at E₁ III, ll. 31–32, 32–33, 34–35 and 35–36, as well as at E₂ I, ll. 29–30, 30–31, 34–35, separate quotes of Archilochus' verses (cf. FF 251 and 89 West²). For additional remarks on this point, see Ornaghi 2009, 163–165 (with n. 77), 282–283, 305–307.

¹³⁷ Cf. E₂ I, ll. 50–51 (l. 51 begins with ὕστερόν τε χρόν[ov] and perhaps at E₁ III, ll. 42–43 (μετ' οὐ πολλόν] | χρόνον).

¹³⁸ Cf. E₁ III, ll. 15–16; E₂ I, ll. 2–3, 4–5, 47–48, 56–57.

¹³⁹ On the historical context of the inscriptions, see the remarks in Porciani 2014, esp. 133–134.

¹⁴⁰ Photo available at Manganaro 1981, pl. XLVIII; Porciani 2014, 136, fig. 2.

8. CONCLUSIONS

From what has been shown thus far, it appears that the following factors should be taken into account when examining the use of *paragraphoi* in the Greek epigraphic record: *inter alia*, chronology, geographical distribution, document type, the function of the mark, and layout strategies. The analysis of the evidence here has also shown that though *paragraphoi* may occur alone, they are not infrequently paired with other signs, most often vacats, *diplai stigmatai* and dots of various type. In a few cases, their occurrence is accompanied by a modification of the text's arrangement with indentations. Less frequently, the mark is combined with headings or sub-headings to introduce new sections (as in the Lindian Chronicle, for example).

To a certain extent, *paragraphoi* can also be said to reflect specific epigraphic habits. It may be far-fetched to adopt a regional approach to the analysis of the evidence, as is often done with other phenomena in Greek epigraphy, but it is worth noting that certain areas across the ancient Greek world (for example, Athens, Argolid, Cyclades, and Asia Minor) apparently saw widespread use of the sign.¹⁴¹ Related to this, particular emphasis should be placed on the use of marks compatible to *paragraphoi* in documents written in languages other than Greek, but ones derived from cultural contexts that were somehow influenced by Greek documentary practices. Special mention goes to the Agnone Tablet (Fig. 53), *Imagines Italicae, Pentri / TERVENTVM 34* (ca. 200–150), an opisthographic bronze inscription written in the Oscan alphabet from right to left that refers to the dedication of statues of several deities, since the horizontal incisions at the right margin separating ll. 1–19 from ll. 20–25 on side A and ll. 1–2 from ll. 2–23 on side B undeniably closely resemble the *paragraphoi* known from Greek inscriptions and papyri.¹⁴² The same holds true of one of the most important documents of Latin epigraphy, the Consular Fasti, *Inscr. Ital.*

¹⁴¹ In this respect, I adhere to Del Corso's claim (2017, 44, with n. 10) that though factors such as materiality and palaeography do not traditionally fall within the broad notion of 'epigraphic habit', which has been expanding since its initial use by McMullen (on the development of this notion, see most recently Benefiel and Keesling 2023), "[l]esame di quello che potremmo definire il 'paratesto epigrafico' [...] può rivelarsi prezioso nella definizione degli *epigraphic habits* di una regione o di un periodo". Moreover, the influence of something like a local tradition of 'paragraphing' cannot be excluded: one needs simply to recall cases such as that of the fragmentary regulations of the cult of Asclepius from Kos (ca. 242?), *JG XII.4 289*, l. 6 + *SEG LXVIII 609*, ll. 5, 6, in which new clauses that begin within the lines are marked with a sign resembling ? (photo available at Bosnakis and Hallof 2018, 158, Abb. 3). This also seems true of the systematic use of horizontal dashes at mid-height performing a separative function in inscriptions from Magnesia, for example (in addition to the examples noted above, cf. further *IMagnesia 181* and *IMagnesia 215a*: on this inscription, see F. Santini's chapter in this volume).

¹⁴² There is another incision under B, l. 11, but Crawford *et al.* 2011, vol. 2, 1203 argue that it "marks no obvious division". On *paragraphoi* in the Agnone tablet, see also Del Corso 2010, 11 n. 33, who admits the influence of Greek lectional practices.

XIII, 1.¹⁴³ Much as in the list of grain deliveries from Cyrene, so here long horizontal dashes at the left margin are desultorily employed to indicate when a single entry exceptionally consists of multiple consecutive lines (Fig. 54). There can be little doubt that these marks, which have no parallel in the Latin epigraphic record from the Republican period, closely recall Greek *paragraphoi*. One could even go a step further and conjecture that the author of the *Fasti Capitolini* was thinking of Greek lectional practices when compiling the list.

With regard to shape, it seems that in the 5th century the *paragraphos* already evolved from a fairly long horizontal line to an ever shorter one. One cannot exclude the possibility that the considerable variations in the mark's length over time were sometimes dictated by the need to lend monumentality to the physical appearance of inscriptions (as is clear from the Athenian tribute quota lists or the so-called Athena Promachos accounts, for example).¹⁴⁴ Moreover, the case of *paragraphoi* at mid-line reveals that not only the shape, but also the placement of the sign was subject to change. Whether such modifications of the usual location of the mark at the left margin were actually introduced at the masons' initiative or due to other factors, such as the layout of the draft copies on perishable materials, is open to debate. One may be inclined to favour the first alternative based on other instances of the misplacement of *paragraphoi*, such as those on the Damonon stele or the Cyrenean *lex cathartica*, which arguably arose from mistakes by stonecutters and which seem to reinforce the conclusion that they sometimes incised the main text first, then added paratextual elements such as horizontal dashes at the left margin. All in all, however, it seems unlikely that it was the engravers who decided whether to maintain the original layout of the document that they had been called on to accurately reproduce or change it to enhance its legibility – a question that it is probably better addressed on a case-by-case basis.¹⁴⁵ Instead, one could go a step further and conjecture that those who designed the layout were the compilers of the draft copies, be they secretaries of some sort or other qualified individuals on the boards of authorities who are often named in the publication clauses of Greek inscriptions.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ The resemblance of the horizontal lines used in some sections of the Consular *Fasti* to *paragraphoi* seems to have gone unnoticed thus far. Cf. Degraffi 1947, 21, briefly commenting on the use of such “lineolae”.

¹⁴⁴ Variations in the mark's form and size also occur in papyrological sources: see e.g. Barbis Lupi 1994, 414; Del Mastro 2017.

¹⁴⁵ In connection with this, one may recall Del Corso's (2002, 187 n. 83) remark on the alleged coronis in one of the third-century tablets from Lokroi Epizephyrioi, *IG Locri* 23 (cf. Del Monaco 1991–1992): “è chiaro che la sopravvivenza di questo elemento non epigrafico [...] è dovuta solo alla scrupolosità dell'incisore, il quale, incerto sul valore da attribuire al segno, ha preferito non ometterlo”. On the relationship between cutters and draft copies of inscriptions, see the still fundamental discussion in Robert 1955; cf. further Tracy 1975, 115–120; Mulliez 1998, 824–827.

¹⁴⁶ One may think, for instance, of figures such as the γραμματεῖς οἱ ἐπὶ τοῖς δημοσίοις γράμμασιν mentioned in the decree on the inventory of the treasures stored in the Chalkotheke, *IG II²* 120 (353/2),

This issue, in turn, is related to that of the alleged residuality of epigraphic *paragraphoi*. As noted above, most scholars agree that these marks are redundant or even superfluous elements in inscriptions – ones maintained only sporadically during the transition from soft to permanent materials. However, barring cases where their absence is due to the fragmentary preservation of the medium, many of the examples discussed in this chapter seem to contradict this view and point to the conclusion that epigraphic *paragraphoi* were often conceived as functional signs that could help readers or passers-by navigate difficult texts.¹⁴⁷ Again, one may wonder whether this depended on the choices made by engravers or compilers or whether it was determined by other factors, such as the format of specific document types. Thus, for example, the cases presented in sections 3 and 4 show that *paragraphoi* were employed far more systematically in epigraphic texts that consist of different clauses than they were in catalogues, lists and the like. Yet even in this case, the question has no definitive answer.

In general terms, the importance of examining the use of lectional signs – and of *paragraphoi* in particular – in epigraphy lies in the fact that it may help us better understand the interaction between documents inscribed on durable materials and their copies on ephemeral ones.¹⁴⁸ Many decades of research have led to scholarly consensus on how to interpret this complex relationship in ancient Greek documents. According to common belief, the practice of inscribing texts on permanent media most likely entailed multiple stages that included selecting the relevant pieces of information from a number of sources written on soft media, preparing one or more preliminary copies before the *antigraphon* of the final text that was meant to be publicly displayed was ready, and eventually incising it on bronze or stone.¹⁴⁹ Yet, as has been rightly emphasised, since records written on tablets, papyrus and the like “were not only, or not primarily, used to produce draft or short-lived, temporary documents to be, at a later stage, ‘monumentalized’ on a stele and discarded”, the relationship between inscriptions and documents on perishable media “did not in conclusion only work in one direction”.¹⁵⁰

ll. 16–17. On secretaries and the publication of inscriptions (with particular reference to the Athenian context), cf. e.g. Henry 2002; Pébarthe 2006, 247–254; Osborne 2012.

¹⁴⁷ See e.g. Del Corso 2002, 184, who argues that the *paragraphos*’ function “appare superflua nell’ottica di una scrittura esposta”. Cf. further Del Corso 2003, 34. On the “mostly ‘residual’ character” of epigraphic *paragraphoi*, see also Faraguna 2020, 121, who suggests that “masons only spasmodically and asystematically transcribed and cut them on the stone”.

¹⁴⁸ This is what Del Corso 2010, 6 n. 11 calls il “problema del rapporto tra la prima stesura (non epigrafica) del testo e il suo apografo ‘esposto’”.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. e.g. Del Corso 2002, esp. 180; Davies 2003; Del Corso 2010, esp. 14–15.

¹⁵⁰ Faraguna 2021, 238–239. On this point, see also Chankowski 2020, esp. 65–68, focusing on the organisation of the various registers employed in the preparation of the final account of the Delian sanctuary of Apollo as an instructive case study; on the case of Athenian building accounts, cf. Epstein

In Greek documentary culture, the multifaceted interaction of different types of media – which, in fact, was far from being hierarchical – probably too had a significant impact on the role, functions and distribution of lectional signs. No doubt such signs can be viewed as index fossils since they offer a clue for visualising “the formatting of original records written on perishable materials”, as aptly observed by Del Corso,¹⁵¹ who also points out that the one area in which writings on stone, lead and bronze and writings on papyrus interacted most – even after growing ever more differentiated in the Hellenistic period – is that of individual elements, such as ornaments, diacritical marks and the like.¹⁵² Nonetheless, the question as to whether the use of *paragraphoi* should be regarded as peculiar to papyrological documents still arises.¹⁵³ This assumption ultimately derives from Jean Bingen’s attempt to downplay the influence and impact of inscriptional writing on book-rolls, as in the case of the so-called *Inscriptionstil* of fourth-century papyri such as P.Derveni (TM 65795 / LDAB 7049; MP³ 2465.1) or P.Berol. inv. 9875 (TM 62931 / LDAB 4123; MP³ 1537), and from his related conclusion that it was, in fact, the other way round. Whatever the case, it is probably better to restrict Bingen’s claims to palaeographical matters.¹⁵⁴ In other words, one cannot be certain that the diacritical marks generally regarded as

2013; Carusi 2020; Marginesu 2022, 98–99, who, drawing on instances of “intermedi, forse effimeri, testi redatti su piombo” such as IG IX.1² 874 (see above, § 2), concludes that “[l]e scritture su *chartai, sanides, leukomata* (ed altro) non dovettero sempre essere effimere e solo funzionali alla realizzazione del testo epigrafico”. For additional remarks, see C. Carusi’s chapter in this volume. On wooden tablets in the ancient Greek world, cf. e.g. Degni 1998; Worp 2012.

¹⁵¹ Del Corso 2017, 44, followed by Faraguna 2020, 118 n. 29; see also Del Corso 2002, 184.

¹⁵² Del Corso 2010, esp. 9–11 argues that this divergence originated from the “accentuato conservatorismo proprio delle maiuscole epigrafiche in ogni epoca” and that it occurred despite the convergence of the period between the late 4th and the early 3rd century, which Bingen (1997, 182) termed *koinè*: “Au V^e siècle s’est formée une *koinè* de l’écriture grecque (l’évolution ne se termine pas partout dès ce moment). Disons, en simplifiant un peu trop les choses, que cette *koinè* se généralise indépendamment, d’une part, dans l’écriture gravée des inscriptions, et, d’autre part, dans l’écriture tracée, utilisée pour les livres et dans la formation scolaire”.

¹⁵³ Del Corso 2003, 34 refers to the *paragraphos* as a “segno tipico della scrittura su papiro”. See also Del Corso 2017, 44, who speaks of “diacritici di tipo ‘papirologico’”.

¹⁵⁴ On this point, cf. Bingen 1997; Crisci 1999, 37 n. 15; Del Corso 2003, 32–38; Del Corso 2017, 18–20; Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 85–86. On the interaction between “scritture epigrafiche” and “scrittura non monumentali”, with particular reference to inscriptions that supposedly imitate papyrus book-rolls, see Del Corso 2002, 186–187 and Del Corso 2003, 32–38 (e.g. *ICret.* IV 72, 42, 45; *FDelphes* III.5 23–27); cf. further, e.g., Garulli 2014; Faraguna 2020, 118 n. 29, mentioning the three-column layout of *CID* II 49 (340/39), which, according to Bousquet (*CID* II, at p. 35), looks like “un *volumen* manuscrit semblable à son modèle”. Starting from the assumption that significant interactions among writings meant to be carved on different media (“interferenze tra sistemi grafici strutturalmente diversi”) is particularly visible in epigraphical sources (especially in those from peripheral areas, where Greek epigraphic habits were not well-established), Del Corso 2010, esp. 14–16 analyses cases in which inscriptions on stone, lead or bronze supposedly reproduce the features and even the layout, including the arrangement of lectional signs, of their *antiagrapha* on papyrus.

typical of Greek writing on papyrus should actually be understood as having originated exclusively from it. Instead, and on the contrary, one could conjecture that the occurrence of *paragraphoi* in papyrological sources may have been influenced by older documentary practices, especially in view of the mark's diffusion in Greek texts incised on durable materials from the late Archaic age onward.

Before concluding, I would like to consider one further argument in this context. Scholars have often insisted that when used as writing media, ephemeral materials such as papyrus and tablets were employed in differentiated, albeit strictly complementary, ways.¹⁵⁵ However, it may be preferable to go beyond this functional opposition and consider a plausible scenario in which lectional signs such as the *paragraphos* were also frequently employed in texts written on other soft materials, such as λευκόματα, πινάκια, δέλτοι, γραμματεῖα, σανίδες, κεραμίδες, διφθέραι, πετεῦρια and the like, which were extensively used as record-keeping devices in various contexts across the ancient Greek world, as epigraphic sources clearly indicate. This idea is strengthened by two further considerations: on the one hand, one must always bear in mind that the apparent pre-eminence of papyri as a source of comparison depends solely on their accidental survival; on the other, it seems reasonable to assume that when *paragraphoi* occur in documents inscribed on stone or bronze that, according to ancient literary or epigraphic sources, ultimately derived from records written on a variety of media (in addition to papyrus), they were probably already present not only in the final draft copy, but also in earlier preliminary ones on various perishable materials.¹⁵⁶ Although the devil's advocate could respond to this observation by stating that in the vast majority of cases, it was papyrus that was used for the final draft copy, the two considerations adduced here remain at any rate significant. As a result, one would probably not be too far from the truth when assuming that as a paratextual device attested in documents of an early date, the *paragraphos* intrinsically belonged within the array of Greek lectional signs regardless of the media in which it was actually used.

¹⁵⁵ See e.g. Del Corso 2002, 173–180, who, by drawing on the juxtaposition of βιβλίδιον and γραμματεῖδιον in D. 56.1 (among other sources), concludes that the former was employed for “la fissazione, conservazione e trascrizione di testi nella loro stesura definitiva”, whereas the latter was never used “per la registrazione di testi definitivi”.

¹⁵⁶ Cases in point are, for instance, the σανίδες purchased in addition to χάρται by the Athenian *epistatai* in charge of the Erechtheion project (IG I³ 476, ll. 188–190, 289–292), the λελευκομένη γραμματεῖα employed by the *poletai* (Arist. *Ath.* 47.2–3; Degni 1998, 75, no. 11) or the πινάκιον λελευκομένον employed by the *hellenotamiai* referred to in the decree proposed by Kleinias about the tribute of the Delian League (IG I³ 34, ll. 43 ff.). On the vocabulary of writing media in ancient Greek, cf. e.g. Del Corso 2002, esp. 171–173 (with n. 52: “L'imprecisione del lessico [...] non può essere intesa come indizio di primitivismo nelle tecniche documentarie”); Radici 2018; see now the comprehensive “rassegna terminologica” provided by Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 753–780.

REFERENCES

- Aupert, P. 1980. "Athletica I. Épigraphie archaïque et morphologie des stades anciens", *BCH* 104, 309–315.
- Barbis Lupi, R. 1994. "La *paragraphos*: analisi di un segno di lettura", in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrology, Copenhagen, 23–29 August, 1992*. Copenhagen, 414–417.
- Baunack, J. 1890. *Aus Epidaurus. Eine epigraphische Studie*. Leipzig.
- Benefiel, R.R., and C.M. Keesling. 2023. *Inscriptions and the Epigraphic Habit: The Epigraphic Cultures of Greece, Rome, and Beyond*. Leiden – Boston.
- Berti, I., and P. Kató. 2017. "Listen im öffentlichen Raum hellenistischer Städte", in I. Berti, K. Bolle, F. Opdenhoff, and F. Stroth (eds.), *Writing Matters: Presenting and Perceiving Monumental Inscriptions in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Berlin – Boston, 79–115.
- Bettarini, L. 2005. *Corpus delle defixiones di Selinunte. Edizione e commento*. Alessandria.
- Bettarini, L. 2012. "Testo e lingua nei documenti con ἑφέσια γράμματα", *ZPE* 183, 111–128.
- Bingen, J. 1997. Review of E. Crisci, *Scrivere greco fuori d'Egitto. Ricerche sui manoscritti greco-orientali di origine non egiziana dal IV secolo a.C. all'VIII d.C.* Firenze 1996, *CE* 72, 181–182.
- Blinkenberg, Chr. 1941. *Lindos. Fouilles de l'acropole 1902–1914, 2: Inscriptions*. Berlin – Copenhagen.
- Blok, J. 2010. "Deme Accounts and the Meaning of *hosios* Money in Fifth-Century Athens", *Mnemosyne* 63, 61–93.
- Boffo, L., and M. Faraguna. 2021. *Le poleis e i loro archivi. Studi su pratiche documentarie, istituzioni e società nell'antichità greca*. Trieste.
- Bosnakis, D., and K. Hallof. 2018. "Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos V", *Chiron* 48, 143–158.
- Bouchon, R., and J.-C. Decourt. 2017. "Le règlement religieux de Marmarini (Thessalie): nouvelles lectures, nouvelles interprétations", *Kernos* 30, 159–186.
- Bowman, A.K., C.V. Crowther, S. Hornblower, R. Mairs, and K. Savvopoulos. 2021. *Corpus of Ptolemaic Inscriptions, Part I: Greek, Bilingual, and Trilingual Inscriptions from Egypt, 1: Alexandria and the Delta (Nos. 1–206)*. Oxford.
- Brulé, P. 1990. "Enquête démographique sur la famille grecque antique. Étude de listes de politographie d'Asie mineure d'époque hellénistique (Milet et Ilion)", *REA* 92, 233–258 (reprinted in C. Pébarthe and O. Devillers (eds.), *Histoire de familles dans le monde grec ancien et dans la Rome antique*, Bordeaux 2018, 67–88).
- Bubelis, W.S. 2016. *Hallowed Stewards: Solon and the Sacred Treasurers of Ancient Athens*. Ann Arbor.
- Carbon, J.-M. 2016. "The Festival of the Aloulaia, and the Association of the Alouliastai: Notes Concerning the New Inscription from Larisa/Marmarini", *Kernos* 29, 185–208.
- Carbon, J.-M., and V. Pirenne-Delforge. 2013. "Priests and Cult Personnel in Three Hellenistic Families", in M. Horster and A. Klöckner (eds.), *Cities and Priests: Cult Personnel in Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands from the Hellenistic to the Imperial Period*. Berlin – Boston, 65–119.
- Carusi, C. 2020. "The Evolving Format of Building Accounts in Classical Athens", in A. Jördens and U. Yiftach (eds.), *Accounts and Bookkeeping in the Ancient World*. Wiesbaden, 74–91.
- Cavallo, G. 1983. *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano. Introduzione allo studio dei materiali greci*. Napoli.
- Cavallo, G., and H. Maehler. 2008. *Hellenistic Bookhands*. Berlin – New York.

- Cavanaugh, M.B. 1996. *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.* Atlanta.
- Centrone, M. 2010. "L'impaginazione del testo e gli espedienti grafici", in G. Bevilacqua (ed.), *Scrittura e magia. Un repertorio di oggetti iscritti della magia greco-romana.* Rome, 95-117.
- Chankowski, V. 2020. "Greek Sanctuaries as Administrative Laboratories: Bookkeeping Experience on Delos, from Wood Tablets to Marble Steles", in A. Jördens and U. Yiftach (eds.), *Accounts and Bookkeeping in the Ancient World.* Wiesbaden, 64-73.
- Christesen, P. 2019. *A New Reading of the Damonon Stele.* Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Clarysse, W. 2020. "Headers for Lists and Accounts in Ancient Documents and in Modern Editions", in A. Jördens and U. Yiftach (eds.), *Accounts and Bookkeeping in the Ancient World.* Wiesbaden, 109-121.
- Clay, D. 2004. *Archilochos Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis.* Cambridge - London.
- Clinton, K. 2005-2008. *Eleusis: The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme,* 2 vols. Athens.
- Costabile, F. 1998. "La triplice *defixio* del Kerameikós di Atene, il processo polemarchico ed un logografo attico del IV sec. a. C. Relazione preliminare", *MEP* 1, 9-54.
- Costabile, F. 1999. "*Defixiones* da Locri Epizefiri. Nuovi dati sui culti, sulla storia e sulle istituzioni", *MEP* 2, 23-76.
- Costabile, F. 2001. "La triplice *defixio*: nuova lettura. Processo e norma libraria attica nel V-IV sec. a.C. *Defixiones* dal Kerameikós di Atene - III", *MEP* 4, 143-208.
- Costabile, F. 2004-2005. "*Defixiones* dal Kerameikós di Atene. IV", *MEP* 9-10, 137-192.
- Crawford, M.H., W.M. Broadhead, J.P.T. Clackson, F. Santangelo, S. Thompson, and M. Watmough. 2011. *Imagines Italiae. A Corpus of Italic Inscriptions.* London.
- Crisci, E. 1999. "I più antichi libri greci. Note bibliologiche e paleografiche su rotoli papiracei del IV-III secolo a.C.", *S&C* 23, 29-62.
- Culasso Gastaldi, E. 2004. *Le prossenie ateniesi del IV secolo a.C. Gli onorati asiatici.* Alessandria.
- Cuomo, S. 2013. "Accounts, Numeracy and Democracy in Classical Athens", in M. Asper and A.-M. Kanthak (eds.), *Writing Science: Medical and Mathematical Authorship in Ancient Greece.* Berlin - Boston, 255-278.
- Curbera, J. 1999. "*Defixiones*", in M.I. Gulletta (ed.), *Sicilia Epigraphica.* Pisa, 159-186.
- Curbera, J., and Z. Papakonstantinou. 2018. "Six Legal Curse Tablets from Athens", in W. Riess (ed.), *Colloquia Attica. Neuere Forschungen zur Archais, zum athenischen Recht und zur Magie.* Stuttgart, 211-224.
- Dana, M. 2021. *La correspondance grecque privée sur plomb et sur tesson. Corpus épigraphique et commentaire historique.* Munich.
- Davies, J.K. 2003. "Greek Archives: From Record to Monument", in M. Brosius (ed.), *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions: Concepts of Record-Keeping in the Ancient World.* Oxford, 323-343.
- Decourt, J.-C., and A. Tziaphalias. 2015. "Un règlement religieux de la région de Larissa: cultes grecs et «orientaux»", *Kernos* 28, 13-51.
- Degni, P. 1998. *Usi delle tavolette lignee e cerate nel mondo greco e romano.* Messina.
- Degrassi, A. 1947. *Inscriptiones Italiae, XIII: Fasti et elogia, 1: Fasti consulares et triumphales.* Rome.
- Del Corso, L. 2002. "I documenti nella Grecia classica tra produzione e conservazione", *QS* 56, 155-189.

- Del Corso, L. 2003. "Materiali per una protostoria del libro e delle pratiche di lettura nel mondo greco", *S&T* 1, 5-78.
- Del Corso, L. 2010. "Scritture epigrafiche e scritture su papiro in età ellenistico-romana. Spunti per un confronto", in A. Bravo García and I. Pérez Martín (eds.), *The Legacy of Bernard de Montfaucon: Three Hundred Years of Studies on Greek Handwriting*. Turnhout, 3-16.
- Del Corso, L. 2017. "Segni e layout delle iscrizioni greche in Egitto. Un sondaggio sui testi esposti in prosa", in G. Nocchi Macedo and M.C. Scappaticcio (eds.), *Signes dans les textes, textes sur les signes. Érudition, lecture et écriture dans le monde gréco-romain*. Liège, 43-59.
- Del Corso, L. 2022. *Il libro nel mondo antico. Archeologia e storia (secoli VII a.C.-IV d.C.)*. Rome.
- Del Mastro, G. 2017. "La ponctuation dans les papyrus grecs d'Herculanum", in G. Nocchi Macedo and M.C. Scappaticcio (eds.), *Signes dans les textes, textes sur les signes. Érudition, lecture et écriture dans le monde gréco-romain*. Liège, 77-96.
- Del Monaco, L. 1991-1992. "Breve nota intorno alla coronide di tab. 23 del corpus locrese", *Klearchos* 33-34, 91-95.
- Dimitrova, N., and K. Clinton. 2003. "An Archaic Inscription from Samothrace", *Hesperia* 72, 235-239.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 2000. *Le dialecte des inscriptions grecques de Cyrène*. Paris.
- Driscoll, E.W. 2019. "The Milesian Eponym List and the Revolt of 412 B.C.", *JES* 2, 11-32.
- Epstein, S. 2013. "Attic Building Accounts from *Euthynae* to *Stelae*", in M. Faraguna (ed.), *Archives and Archival Documents in Ancient Societies*. Trieste, 127-141.
- Faguer, J. 2020. "Ventes immobilières et sûretés réelles à Ténos et Paros", *BCH* 144, 155-207.
- Faraguna, M. 2019. "Loans in an Island Society: The *Astynomoi*-Inscription from Tenos", in S. Démare-Lafont (ed.), *Debt in Ancient Mediterranean Societies: A Documentary Approach*. Geneva, 215-234.
- Faraguna, M. 2020. "Interplay Between Documents on Different Writing Materials in Classical Greece: *Paragraphoi* and Columnar Formatting", *ZPE* 214, 115-128.
- Faraguna, M. 2021. "Magistrates' Accountability and Epigraphic Documents: The Case of Accounts and Inventories", in K. Harter-Uibopuu and W. Riess (eds.), *Symposion 2019. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Hamburg, 26.-28. August 2019)*. Vienna, 229-253.
- Felsch, R.C.S., and P. Siewert. 1987. "Inschriften aus dem Heiligtum von Hyampolis bei Kalapodi", *AA*, 681-687.
- Foley, E., and R.S. Stroud. 2019. "A Reappraisal of the Athena Promachos Accounts from the Acropolis (IG I³ 435)", *Hesperia* 88, 87-153.
- Fränkel, M. 1890. *Die Inschriften von Pergamon, 1: Bis zum Ende der Königszeit*. Berlin.
- Fraser, P.M., and G.E. Bean. 1954. *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands*. Oxford.
- Gager, J.G. 1992. *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*. New York - Oxford.
- Game, J. 2008. *Actes de vente dans le monde grec. Témoignages épigraphiques des ventes immobilières*. Lyon.
- Garulli, V. 2014. "Stones as Books: The Layout of Hellenistic Inscribed Poems", in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Hellenistic Poetry in Context*. Leuven - Paris - Walpole, MA, 125-169.
- Garulli, V. 2019. "Lectional Signs in Greek Verse Inscriptions", in A. Petrovic, I. Petrovic, and E. Thomas (eds.), *The Materiality of Text - Placement, Perception, and Presence of Inscribed Texts in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden - Boston, 105-144.

- Gawlinski, L. 2012. *The Sacred Law of Andania: A New Text with Commentary*. Berlin - Boston.
- Ghinatti, F. 2004. *I decreti dalla Grecia a Creta*. Alessandria.
- Giangrande, G. 1978. "Preliminary Notes on the Use of *Paragraphos* in Greek Papyri", *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 3, 147-151.
- Gomis García, V. 2015. "Un documento literario poco convencional: la inscripción de Mnesíepes (fragmento E₁II)", *Emerita* 83, 111-132.
- Gordon, R. 1999. "'What's in a List?' Listing in Greek and Graeco-Roman Malign Magical Texts", in D.R. Jordan, H. Montgomery, and E. Thomassen (eds.), *The World of Ancient Greek Magic*. Bergen, 239-277.
- Graindor, P. 1906. "Fouilles de Karthaia (île de Kéos). Monuments épigraphiques (*Suite*)", *BCH* 30, 433-452.
- Grohmann, A. 1929. "Zur Paragraphos", *ByzZ* 30, 163-165.
- Guarducci, M. 1967. *Epigrafia greca, 1: Caratteri e storia della disciplina. La scrittura greca dalle origini all'età imperiale*. Rome.
- Habicht, C. 1976. "Hellenistische Gymnasiarchenliste aus Pherai", in V. Milojčić and D. Theocharis (eds.), *Demetrias I*. Bonn, 181-197.
- Hamon, P. 2016. "Études d'épigraphie thasienne, IV. Les magistrats thasiens du IV^e s. av. J.-C. et le royaume de Macédoine", *BCH* 139-140, 67-125.
- Hamon, P. 2019. *Corpus des inscriptions de Thasos III. Documents publics du quatrième siècle et de l'époque hellénistique*. Athens.
- Hamon, P. 2022. "Lire le temps à Thasos: note de synthèse sur les listes monumentales d'archontes et de théores de l'agora", *CEA* 59 (mis en ligne le 23 décembre 2022, consulté le 10 janvier 2024, URL: <<http://journals.openedition.org/etudesanciennes/1833>>).
- Helly, B., G.-J. Te Riele, and J.A. van Rossum. 1979. "La liste des gymnasiarques de Phères pour les années 330-189 av. J.-C.", in *La Thessalie. Actes de la Table-Ronde, 21-24 juillet 1975, Lyon*. Lyon, 220-255.
- Henry, A.S. 2002. "The Athenian State Secretariat and Provisions for Publishing and Erecting Decrees", *Hesperia* 71, 91-118.
- Herrero de Jáuregui, M., and S. Goldhill. 2019. "Who Is the Child in Isyllus' Stele?", *ZPE* 212, 72-75.
- Higbie, C. 2003. *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of Their Past*. Oxford.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1903. "Kretische Städtenamen auf einer Inschrift von Andros", *MDAI(A)* 28, 462-464.
- Jeffery, L.H. 1989. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C.*, rev. ed. with supplement by A.W. Johnston. Oxford.
- Johnson, W.A. 1994. "The Function of the Paragraphus in Greek Literary Prose Texts", *ZPE* 100, 65-68.
- Jordan, D. 2000. "Three Texts from Lokroi Epizephyrioi", *ZPE* 130, 95-103.
- Jordan, D. 2004. "Towards the Text of a Curse Tablet from the Athenian Kerameikos", in A.P. Matthaiou (ed.), *Ἀττικά Ἐπιγραφαί. Πρακτικά Συμποσίου εἰς μνήμην Adolf Wilhelm (1864-1950)*. Athens, 291-312.
- Kalliontzis, Y., and N. Papazarkadas. 2019. "The Contributions to the Refoundation of Thebes: A New Epigraphic and Historical Analysis", *ABSA* 114, 293-315.
- Kavvadias, P. 1900. *Τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ καὶ ἡ θεραπεία τῶν ἀσθενῶν*. Athens.

- Kavvadias, P. 1918. “Ἡ Ἀρχαϊκὴ Συμπολιτεία κατ’ ἐπιγραφὰς ἐκ τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν Ἐπιδαύρου”, *AEph*, 115-154.
- Kern, O. 1913. *Inscriptiones Graecae* (Tabulae in usum scholarum editae sub cura Iohannis Lietzmann, 7). Bonn.
- Kirchner, J. 1948. *Imagines inscriptionum Atticarum. Ein Bilderatlas epigraphischer Denkmäler Attikas*, 2nd rev. ed. by G. Klaffenbach. Berlin.
- Kirk, A. 2021. *Ancient Greek Lists: Catalogue and Inventory Across Genres*. Cambridge.
- Kloppenborg, J.S., and R.S. Ascough. 2011. *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary, 1: Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*. Berlin - Boston.
- Knoepfler, D. 2001. “La réintégration de Thèbes dans le *Koinon* béotien après son relèvement par Cassandre, ou les surprises de la chronologie épigraphique”, in R. Frei-Stolba and K. Gex (eds.), *Recherches récentes sur le monde hellénistique*. Bern, 11-26.
- Kolde, A. 2003. *Politique et religion chez Isyllos d’Épidaure*. Basel.
- Koremis, A. 1992-1998. “Μολύβδινο ἐνεπίγραφο ἔλασμα ἀπὸ τὴν Κέρκυρα”, *Horos* 10-12, 347-354.
- Lambert, S.D. 2002. “The Sacrificial Calendar of Athens”, *ABSA* 97, 353-399.
- Lambert, S.D. 2006. “Athenian State Laws and Decrees, 352/1–322/1: III Decrees Honouring Foreigners A. Citizenship, Proxeny and Euergesy”, *ZPE* 158, 115-158 (reprinted in *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1–322/1 BC: Epigraphical Essays*. Leiden - Boston 2012, 93-137).
- Lambert, S.D. 2018a. “Proposers of Inscribed Laws and Decrees and the Distribution of Political Influence in Late Classical Athens”, in *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees in the Age of Demosthenes: Historical Essays*. Leiden - Boston, 171-226.
- Lambert, S.D. 2018b. “Council and Assembly in Late Classical and Hellenistic Athens: An Epigraphical Perspective on Democracy”, in *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees in the Age of Demosthenes: Historical Essays*. Leiden - Boston, 227-271.
- Lamont, J.L. 2022. “Orality, Written Literacy, and Early Sicilian Curse Tablets”, *G&R* 69, 27-51.
- Lamont, J.L. 2023. *In Blood and Ashes: Curse Tablets and Binding Spells in Ancient Greece*. Oxford - New York.
- Lewis, D.M. 1997. “After the Profanation of the Mysteries”, in *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History*, ed. P.J. Rhodes. Cambridge, 158-172.
- Liddel, P. 2020. *Decrees of Fourth-Century Athens (403/2–322/1)*. 1-2. Cambridge.
- Lippolis, E., and G. Vallarino. 2010. “Alkamenes: problemi di cronologia di un artista attico”, in G. Adornato (ed.), *Scolpire il marmo. Importazioni, artisti itineranti, scuole artistiche nel Mediterraneo antico*. Milan, 251-278.
- Lougovaya-Ast, J. 2017. “Some Observations on the Usage of Punctuation in Early Greek Inscriptions”, in G. Nocchi Macedo and M.C. Scappaticcio (eds.), *Signes dans les textes, textes sur les signes. Érudition, lecture et écriture dans le monde gréco-romain*. Liège, 27-42.
- Loukopoulou, L.D., M.G. Parissaki, S. Psoma, and A. Zournatzi. 2005. *Ἐπιγραφές τῆς Θράκης τοῦ Αἰγαίου μεταξὺ τῶν ποταμῶν Νέστου καὶ Ἐβρου (νομοὶ Ξάνθης, Ροδόπης καὶ Ἐβρου)*. Athens - Paris.
- Lupu, E. 2009. *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents (NGSL)*, 2nd ed. with a postscript. Leiden - Boston.

- Mack, W. 2015. *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford.
- Magnetto, A. 2008. *L'arbitrato di Rodi fra Samo e Priene*. Pisa.
- Manganaro, G. 1981. "L'oracolo di Maie per una carestia in territorio siracusano", *ASNP* s. III 11, 1069-1082.
- Manganaro, G. 1997. "Nuove tavolette di piombo iscritte siceliote", *PP* 52, 306-348.
- Manganaro, G. 2000. "Kyme e il dinasta Philetairos", *Chiron* 30, 403-414.
- Marginesu, G. 2017. "Il sistema acrofonico e la notazione delle somme di denaro nei rendiconti ateniesi del V secolo a.C.", in A. Inglese (ed.), *Epigrammata 4. L'uso dei numeri greci nelle iscrizioni*. Tivoli, 117-130.
- Marginesu, G. 2021. "Costruire un tetto a Corcira. Una nota a IG IX I² 4 874 (SEG 48, 604)", *ZPE* 218, 93-98.
- Marginesu, G. 2022. "Rationes dei magistrati e monumenti epigrafici ateniesi d'età classica. Alcune osservazioni", *Aristonothos* 18, 93-114.
- Matthaiou, A.P. 2014. "Four Inscribed Bronze Tablets from Thebes: Preliminary Notes", in N. Papazarkadas (ed.), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects*. Leiden - Boston, 211-222.
- McArthur, M. 2019. "Kittos and the *Phialai Exeleutherikai*", *ABSA* 114, 263-291.
- Mendonì, L.G. 1994. "The Organisation of the Countryside in Kea", in P.N. Doukellis and L.G. Mendonì (eds.), *Structures rurales et sociétés antiques*. Paris, 147-161.
- Meyer, E.A. 2010. *Metics and the Athenian Phialai-Inscriptions: A Study in Athenian Epigraphy and Law*. Stuttgart.
- Meyer, E.A. 2017. "Inscribing in Columns in Fifth-Century Athens", in I. Berti, K. Bolle, F. Opdenhoff, and F. Stroth (eds.), *Writing Matters: Presenting and Perceiving Monumental Inscriptions in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Berlin - Boston, 205-261.
- Millis, B.W., and S.D. Olson. 2012. *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens: IG I² 2318-2325 and Related Texts*. Leiden - Boston.
- Mulliez, D. 1998. "Vestiges sans atelier: le lapicide", *Topoi (Lyon)* 8, 815-830.
- Mylonas, G.E. 1985. *Tò érgon tḗs Arxaiologikḗs Étaipeías katà tò 1984*. Athens.
- Nafissi, M. 2013. "La stele di Damonon (IG V 1, 213 = Moretti, IAG 16), gli Hekatombaia (Strabo 8,4,11) e il sistema festivo della Laconia d'epoca classica", *Aristonothos* 8, 105-174.
- Oliverio, G. 1933. *La Stele dei Nuovi Comandamenti e dei cereali*. Bergamo.
- Ornaghi, M. 2009. *La lira, la vacca e le donne insolenti. Contesti di ricezione e promozione della figura e della poesia di Archiloco dall'arcaismo all'ellenismo*. Alessandria.
- Osborne, M.J. 2012. "Secretaries, *Psephismata* and *Stelai* in Athens", *AncSoc* 42, 33-59.
- Osborne, R. 1988. "Social and Economic Implications of the Leasing of Land and Property in Classical and Hellenistic Greece", *Chiron* 18, 279-324.
- Osborne, R. 1991. "Land Use and Settlement in Hellenistic Keos: The Epigraphic Evidence", in J.F. Cherry, J.L. Davis, and E. Mantzourani (eds.), *Landscape Archaeology as Long-Term History: Northern Keos in the Cycladic Islands from Earliest Settlement until Modern Times*. Los Angeles, 319-325.
- Osborne, R. 1999. "Inscribing Performance", in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge, 341-358.
- Osborne, R. 2022. "The Appearance of Numbers", in R. Sing, T.A. van Berkel, and R. Osborne (eds.), *Numbers and Numeracy in the Greek Polis*. Leiden - Boston, 58-77.

- Paarmann, B. 2004. "Geographically Grouped Ethnics in the Athenian Tribute Lists", in T.H. Nielsen (ed.), *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Stuttgart, 77-109.
- Pébarthe, Chr. 2006. *Cité, démocratie et écriture. Histoire de l'alphabétisation d'Athènes à l'époque classique*. Paris.
- Petrakos, V.H. 1999. *Ὁ δῆμος τοῦ Ῥαμνούντου. Σύνοψη τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρευνῶν (1813-1998)*, 2: *Οἱ ἐπιγραφές*. Athens.
- Petrocheilos, N. 2010. *Συμβολές στην ἱστορία καὶ προσωπογραφία τῆς ἀρχαίας Ἄνδρου. Ἐπιγραφικὲς καὶ φιλολογικὲς μαρτυρίες*. Andros.
- Picard, C., and C. Avezou. 1913. "Inscriptions de Macédoine et de Thrace", *BCH* 37, 84-154.
- Pitt, R. 2014. "Just as It Has Been Written: Inscribing Building Contracts at Lebadeia", in N. Papazarkadas (ed.), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects*. Leiden - Boston, 373-394.
- Porciani, L. 2014. "La Sibilla di Acre: Sicilia e Vicino Oriente nel II secolo a.C. (SEG XXXI, 1981, 821 e 822)", in T. Alfieri Tonini and S. Struffolino (eds.), *Dinamiche culturali ed etniche nella Sicilia orientale dall'età classica all'epoca ellenistica*. Trento, 127-136.
- Prignitz, S. 2014. "Zur Identifizierung des Heiligtums von Kalapodi", *ZPE* 189, 133-146.
- Prignitz, S. 2022. *Bauurkunden und Bauprogramm von Epidauros II (350-300): Abaton · Kleisia · Aphroditetempel · Artemistempel · Theater · Epidoteion · ἐπὶ Κυνὸς σκανάματα*. Munich.
- Radici, L. 2018. "Una conversazione sui βιβλία (Poll. X 57-60; IV 18-19; VII 210-211)", in A. Cirone and L. Radici (eds.), *Commentaria Polluciana*. Pisa - Rome, 11-46.
- Rhodes, P.J., and D.M. Lewis. 1997. *The Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford.
- Robert, L. 1955. "Épigraphie et Paléographie", *CRAI* 99, 195-222 (reprinted in *Opera Minora Selecta*, vol. 1, Amsterdam 1969, 576-600).
- Robertson, N. 2010. *Religion and Reconciliation in Greek Cities: The Sacred Laws of Selinus and Cyrene*. Oxford - New York.
- Rosamilia, E. 2023. *La città del silfio. Istituzioni, culti ed economia di Cirene classica ed ellenistica attraverso le fonti epigrafiche*. Pisa.
- Rotstein, A. 2014. "The Parian Marble and the Mnesiepes Inscription", *ZPE* 190, 3-9.
- Saba, S. 2012. *The Astynomoi Law from Pergamon*. Munich.
- Schuler, C. 2007. "Die Gymnasiarchie in hellenistischer Zeit", in D. Kah and P. Scholz (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Berlin, 163-192.
- Shear, J.L. 2003. "Prizes from Athens: The List of Panathenaic Prizes and the Sacred Oil", *ZPE* 142, 87-108.
- Shear, J.L. 2021. *Serving Athena: The Festival of the Panathenaia and the Construction of Athenian Identities*. Cambridge.
- Sickinger, J.P. 1999. *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*. Chapel Hill - London.
- Summa, D. 2015. "New Light on IG II/III² 2319, the Fragment of the Athenian *Didascaliae* Transcribed by Michel Fourmont", *ZPE* 193, 110-117.
- Tanzi-Mira, G. 1920. "Paragraphoi ornate in papiri letterari greco-egizi", *Aegyptus* 1, 224-226.
- Threatte, L. 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, 1: *Phonology*. Berlin - New York.
- Thür, G., and H. Taeuber. 1994. *Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der griechischen Poleis: Arkadien (IPArk)*. Vienna.
- Tracy, S.V. 1969. "Notes on the Inscriptions of the Pythais of 98/7 B.C.", *BCH* 93, 371-395.
- Tracy, S.V. 1975. *The Lettering of an Athenian Mason*. Princeton.

- Tracy, S.V. 2015. "The Dramatic Festival Inscriptions of Athens: The Inscribers and Phases of Inscribing", *Hesperia* 84, 553-581.
- Tracy, S.V. 2016. *Athenian Lettering of the Fifth Century B.C.: The Rise of the Professional Letter Cutter*. Berlin - Boston.
- Traill, J.S. 1981. "Athenian Bouleutic Alternates", in G.S. Shrimpton and D.J. McCargar (eds.), *Classical Contributions: Studies in Honour of Malcolm Francis McGregor*. Locust Valley, NY, 161-169.
- Turner, E.G. 1987. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 2nd rev. ed. by P.J. Parsons. London.
- Virgilio, B. 2017. "La lettera di Filetero a Kyme eolica e i decreti della città relativi a una fornitura di armamenti per la *phylakè*", in A. La Marca (ed.), *Studi su Kyme eolica VI*. Arcavacata di Rende, 147-168.
- Walbank, M.B. 1982. "The Confiscation and Sale by the Poletai in 402/1 B.C. of the Property of the Thirty Tyrants", *Hesperia* 51, 74-98.
- Walser, A.V. 2008. *Bauern und Zinsnehmer. Politik, Recht und Wirtschaft im frühhellenistischen Ephesos*. Munich.
- Welles, C.B. 1934. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven.
- Worp, K.A. 2012. *A New Survey of Greek, Coptic, Demotic and Latin Tabulae Preserved from Classical Antiquity* (Trismegistos Online Publications, 6). Leiden - Leuven.