

STONE TO STONE. PATTERNS AND LAYOUTS IN RE-ENGRAVED DEDICATORY INSCRIPTIONS

Leon Battista Borsano

The aim of this chapter is to analyze whether and to what extent layout played a role in re-engraved inscriptions. By these I mean new versions of older texts that were carved into new blocks of stone or elsewhere on the original stone at a later point in time.¹ In particular, I discuss whether stonecutters who re-engraved older epigraphic texts reacted to their original layout, whether they recognized specific features and tried to reproduce them, or whether they dismissed them as irrelevant in order to meet new requirements in terms of layout. While some aspects of re-engraved texts, such as the transition from dialects to *koine* and from one alphabet to another, have been thoroughly investigated,² layout issues – as far as I know – have not been addressed.

This chapter has two parts. In the first, I discuss – by drawing on several examples – the factors we must preliminarily consider when dealing with re-engraved texts. In the second, I focus on case studies drawn from the genre of dedicatory inscriptions, where layout issues may or may not have been affected by the existence of previous versions of the inscription. Before getting to the heart of the matter, however, I must note several caveats. First, even if we assume that many texts are later copies of pre-existent ones, this phenomenon can be ascertained

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all dates are BCE. For the sake of convenience, I use the word “original” for older versions even though they were clearly copied from perishable texts. For the distinction between original and copy, cf. Rousset *et al.* 2015, 443 n. 8 following the considerations of G. Rougemont in *CID I*, p. 87 n. 363. I do not consider here media engraved with different texts at different times or multiple engravings of the same text made on different media at the same moment – two widespread phenomena in ancient epigraphy. I thank the editors of the volume and the anonymous referees for their advice, which prompted me to better clarify my line of argument, as well as M. Santini and M. Garré for their suggestions in the early stages of this chapter.

² Cf. the stele from Sigeion (*IG I³ 1508*) and especially Minon 2009.

Leon Battista Borsano, Scuola Normale of Pisa, Italy, leon.borsano@sns.it

Referee List (DOI 10.36253/fup_referee_list)

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

Leon Battista Borsano, *Stone to Stone. Patterns and Layouts in Re-Engraved Dedicatory Inscriptions*, © Author(s), CC BY 4.0, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0456-9.14, 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. 235-255, 2024, published by Firenze University Press, ISBN 979-12-215-0456-9, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0456-9

only in a few cases.³ Even rarer are cases in which multiple versions of the same text are at least partly preserved. To my knowledge, there has been no systematic study of these cases to date, of which a preliminary survey allowed me to identify seventeen (Table 1).⁴ Second, not all the inscriptions that I have collected have been published with high-quality photos, squeezes, or facsimiles of both versions. This means that observations on layout cannot be made in some cases because the visual evidence is inconclusive. Finally, the small size of the corpus does not allow for any quantitative assessments.

1. RE-ENGRAVING EPIGRAPHICAL TEXTS

Not all re-engraved texts are alike. When considering the relationship between original and copy, three different factors must be taken into account: distance in space, distance in time, and distance in purpose.

The first, distance in space, refers to the spatial distance between the original and its subsequent versions. When that distance is zero, the later version of the inscription is re-inscribed over the previous one, after the latter has been deleted. This is a borderline case, and it may be difficult to verify it when the erasure was properly carried out. For example, on the funerary base of Parmenon, son of Nikias (Fig. 57), a Cretan who died in Cyrene, the previous version can still be read – just barely – beneath the later one.⁵ Since the name (Παρμένων) is long and both the patronymic (Νικία) and the ethnic (Κρής) are short, the stonecutter initially decided to arrange the text on two lines of approximately equal length. They slightly increased the spacing in the first line and the width of the first *ny* in order to align the two lines along both margins. Later, a portion of the text was erased, probably by the same hand, and the same name was re-engraved but in a different arrangement, so that the patronymic was now in the first line and reconnected with Parmenon. The stonecutter reused some of the previous letters (notably, *pi* and the right stroke of *my*), but was “forced” to tighten the letters of the first line and to center the text of the second. Rubrication may have partly hidden the pastiche. Although the reasons behind this decision are difficult

³ Chaniotis 1988, 234–257 is the indispensable starting point, though the documents he collects are based on a wider selection, i.e., all cases in which texts (regardless of the status of their originals) were published on stone at a later time.

⁴ In my survey, I was not able to include short funerary inscriptions on which single names of the dead were later re-engraved. Re-engraved funerary inscriptions are difficult to identify as descendants bear the same names as their ancestors, and their brevity generally has a modest impact on layout issues. Moreover, from a chronological point of view, I do not take into consideration “original” documents later than the Hellenistic period.

⁵ Oliverio, *Doc. Africa italiana* 81 (with photo and facsimile). Cf. Beschi 1970, 204 (for base typologies in Cyrene) and *IG Cyrenaica*² 024000.

to determine,⁶ the case shows how a stonemason could engage with the layout – albeit hesitantly and with after thought – during the process of re-engraving.

In terms of spatial distance, cases in which the two versions cohabit the same medium and, when possible, the same surface are more common: in such instances the dialogue between the two texts is particularly meaningful, as both versions must have been visible simultaneously to passers-by (more on this below). Such cohabitation on the same medium also led to major physical constraints for the layout (in terms of size, space already taken, etc.). In cases where the old and new version do not cohabit the same medium, the new one may appear at an increasing spatial distance from the older one: on a medium that replaces the older one at the original setting, on another medium elsewhere in the same city, or even in places far away from it. A case in point is that of the late Hellenistic aretology of Isis from Aeolian Cyme, which, according to its own words, was copied from a stele standing in the temple of Hephaestus (i.e., Ptah) in Memphis.⁷ Few other inscriptions are as specific in reporting the previous epigraphic versions from which they derive and their precise sites. The so-called “Cippus of the Labyadai” in Delphi specifies that some of the regulations reported on it “are written at Panopeus on the rock, inside”, and then proceeds to quote them.⁸ The rupestrian inscription mentioned in the Cippus happens to have survived in Panopeus, where it was recently rediscovered and published, without, however, shedding any light on the meaning of the adverb ἔνδω (“inside, inwards”), used on the Cippus to describe the precise location of the original.⁹ A third example comes from Halicarnassus, where a list of priests of Poseidon was re-engraved circa the year 100. Although we do not have the original version, the prescript assures us that the list was transcribed from a specific stele.¹⁰

⁶ Since the funeral base is limestone rather than marble, C. Dobias-Lalou in *IG Cyrenaica*² 024000 thinks that the inscription was simply an exercise for an apprentice stonemason. However, the block has two moldings: it seems too much effort for a simple exercise.

⁷ *IKyme* 41, ll. 3–4: τάδε ἐγράφη ἐκ τῆς στήλης τῆς ἐν Μέμφει, ἥτις ἔστηκεν πρὸς τῷ Ἱφαιστιάῳ, “these things were written from the stele in Memphis that is located at the temple of Hephaestus”.

⁸ *CID I 9; Choix Delphes* 30D, ll. 29–31: Τοιάδε κῆμ | Φανατεῖ γέγραπται ἐν τῷ πέτραι ἔνδω.

⁹ Rousset *et al.* 2015, no. 1 (*SEG LXV* 361). Cf. especially p. 443 for ἔνδω: the inscription “lies in the open”, not in a cave. The first editors thought this might mean inside the *temenos* of an open-air sanctuary or other structure. I would add that ἔνδω may simply indicate a location inside the upper city, in the part protected by the walls.

¹⁰ *Syll.*³ 1020, ll. 1–2: μεταγράψαι [ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας] | [σ]τήλης τῆς παρεστῶσης τοῖς ἀγά[λμασι κτλ., “(proposed to) transcribe from the [ancient] stele found at the simulacra etc.”; cf. Isager 2015, 132–133 and n. 6 (*SEG LXV* 956). Even if ἀρχαίας is restored, a similar adjective is required. Lists are a type of epigraphic document that is easily subject to re-inscription. One outstanding example is the list of *stephanephoro*i from Miletus (*IDelphinion* 122), of which an older partial copy was recently found: see Blümel 1995, 56–58 (*editio princeps*), *IMilet* 1360, *INordkarien* 170, and Driscoll 2019 (minor improvements in the reading of the text). The lack of context for the older copy – it was found reused in a mosque 20 km from Miletus – and its fragmentary state make it difficult to establish whether the more recent list was copied directly from the previous one. In this respect, the only item of interest here con-

The greater the spatial distance, the potentially greater the number of intermediate steps. It seems unlikely, however, that these intermediate stages, presumably transmitted through perishable media such as papyrus or parchment, retained specific features of the original epigraphic version such as layout and letterform. Between the third and second centuries, the people of Iasos passed a decree stipulating that a two-century-old Attic decree concerning the granting of proxeny to three Iasians be engraved (again?).¹¹ The antiquity of this latter decree is suggested by the discovery of three fragments of the Attic stele bearing the same text, all aspects of which – paleography, iconography, prosopography, etc. – point to the years 410–390.¹² The text of the decree must have been brought to Iasos on perishable media. It may have been engraved at that time, or simply kept in the city archives. Although the practice of re-engraving inscriptions is well documented for Iasos, it is impossible to establish whether the Hellenistic re-engraving was based directly on some perishable copy of the decree or on a locally erected older inscription.¹³ Certainly, a comparison of the Athenian to the Iasian version shows that one feature – the heading with the name of the *grammateus*, which was clearly conceived for the layout of the former – was partly misunderstood in the layout of the latter. Thus, what in the Attic stele was written in larger letters and placed in full view beneath the frieze, in the Iasian version is not set apart from the rest of the text, which leads to an unnecessary repetition of the name of the *grammateus* (ll. 16–17 and 21–22).

The second factor to consider in the relationship between original and copy is distance in time. In terms of chronological distance, zero-value occurs when versions of the same text are engraved at the same time. Multiple engravings of the same text, however, are a borderline (and widespread) case that falls beyond the scope of this chapter.¹⁴ At least one or two generations, if not several centuries, separate the different versions of most of the inscriptions analyzed here, including those that originated in the Classical Age and were re-engraved during the early Principate. In such cases, the survival of both ancient and more recent versions ensure that we are not

cerns the use of *obeloi* for every ten names in both lists. In the second column of the more recent list, six of these *obeloi* are engraved incorrectly and later corrected. The stonemason of the more recent version should have been able to avoid this mistake if he had the older version (on which the *obeloi* were engraved correctly) before their eyes. See also D. Amendola's chapter, cases nos. [41] and [42].

¹¹ Maddoli 2001, 16–21 (SEG LI 1506).

¹² IG IP² 3+165. Cf. Culasso Gastaldi 2004, 71–87.

¹³ At least two other cases testify to this: the regulations concerning the priesthood of Zeus Megistos (*Iasos* 220 and Fabiani 2016, 163–164 (SEG LXVI 1186)) and the decree for the sons of Peldemis (Pugliese Carratelli 1985, 154–155 (SEG XXXVI 983) and Pugliese Carratelli 1987, 290–291 (SEG XXXVIII 1059); for both versions, see also Fabiani 2013, 318–322).

¹⁴ Examples are countless: e.g., the so-called Athenian Standards Decree (IG P³ 1453).

dealing with late “forgeries”, that is, retrospective recreations of the past.¹⁵ When only the allegedly later version has been preserved, caution is in order. Versions of texts far removed in time from their antecedents can easily be identified when there are noticeable inconsistencies between dating prescripts, language, and/or paleography. A case in point is the dedication of Droaphernes, *hyparchos* of Lydia, to Zeus of Baradates: here, the prescript dates the dedication to the thirty-ninth year of Artaxerxes, possibly Artaxerxes II Mnemon (365/4), while letterform clearly points to the second century CE.¹⁶ In general, however, the authenticity of the alleged originals is difficult to ascertain, as in the case of the controversial letter (composed in Greek? Or in Aramaic?) putatively sent by Darius I to Gadatas, and preserved in an epigraphic copy from Magnesia on the Maeander dated several centuries later.¹⁷

Along the same lines, one may wonder whether the aforementioned Isis aretalogy from Cyme was actually copied from a previous epigraphic version in Memphis, either in Egyptian or in Greek, even if the cultural milieu on which it originated was definitely Greco-Egyptian.¹⁸ Other later copies of the same aretalogy have been preserved elsewhere in the Mediterranean: a Hellenistic one in Telmessus (Lycia), and three Roman ones in Thessalonica, Ios, and Kassandreia that range from the late first century BCE to the third century CE.¹⁹ A slightly different version of the same aretalogy is reported by Diodorus, who traced it back to another (epigraphic and fictitious) original, a stele on the tomb of Isis at Nysa, in Arabia.²⁰ A brief comparison of certain formal aspects of the different epigraphic versions suggests that all of these texts were derived from a literary original. The versions from Telmessus and Kassandreia both begin with a reference to the Egyptian stele in Memphis.²¹ By contrast, the one from Ios begins with a standard heading (the names of the honored deities), before continuing with the aretalogy *ex abrupto*.²² Since the sentence

¹⁵ Chaniotis 1988, 265–267 concerning the concept(s) of authenticity, and 270–273 on identifying forgeries. For the concept of intentional history, cf. Gehrke 2019 (with p. 95 n. 1 for his previous works on the topic).

¹⁶ The dedication was published by Robert 1975 (cf. *SEG* XXIX 1205). According to Briant 1998, 210–213 and 222–224, probably only the first section of the inscription (the dedication itself) is the result of re-engraving. For an overview of the subject, see also Debord 1999, 367–374. A similar example is the Roman decree from Tralles (*I.Tralleis* 3), whose prescript is dated to the time of Artaxerxes and Idrieus.

¹⁷ *IMagnesia* 115; Briant 2003. The authenticity is still supported by some scholars: see e.g., Tuplin 2009.

¹⁸ Žabkar 1988, 156–158; on aretalogies, cf. Jördens 2013.

¹⁹ *RICIS* 306/0201 (Telmessus), which to the best of my knowledge is still unpublished (cf. Moyer 2017, 319 n.2); *RICIS* 113/0545 (Thessalonica), 202/1101 (Ios), and Veligianni and Kousoulakou 2009 (*SEG* LVIII 583; Kassandreia).

²⁰ D.S. 1.27.3.

²¹ Veligianni and Kousoulakou 2009, ll. 3–4.

²² The beginning of the version from Thessalonica is missing.

on the epigraphic origin of the aretalogy is not specific to the stele from Cyme, we can assume that it was not a local innovation by its author. Most likely, the author of the Ios version (which is dated to the mid-third century CE) either discarded the narrative framework or relied on a later copy from which this feature was already missing. In any case, all of these versions, though chronologically distant from each other and belonging to different epigraphic milieus, show some similarities in their layout, namely, the use of vacats or dots to separate sentences, which is consistent with a common (literary) model.²³

The third factor to consider is distance of purpose, that is, the extent to which the original purpose of the first inscription was re-functionalized in subsequent versions. Here too we can posit a zero-value when the re-engraved text is a simple replacement of the previous one, generally due to the deterioration of the latter.²⁴ However, replacement is not necessarily a straightforward process. In fact, the decision to re-engrave a text can result in either the obliteration or preservation of the previous version. In the first instance, the new version tends to cancel the previous one, as if the latter had never existed. In the second instance, the new version acknowledges the existence of the previous one; therefore, the relationship between the two goes beyond replacement and explicitly enters the realm of quotation.

The distance in purpose may also increase. During the process of re-engraving, previous inscriptions can be modified, merged with other texts, quoted within them, or even totally decontextualized. For example, we can well understand the astonishment experienced by Louis Robert when he published a *graffito*, found in a cave located in the surroundings of Teos and dated from the late Roman Age, bearing the phrase βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος ἐπέγραψε.²⁵ The author of this *graffito* – clearly not Antiochus the Great – was certainly aware of the many letters the Seleucid kings had sent to the city of Teos, some of which must have still been visible in their time. The phrase βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος was thus recontextualized in what can be interpreted as nothing but a joke.

Replacement and quotation follow different principles, which may affect many features, including layout. In principle, we might expect that in the case of simple replacement, stonemasons were likelier to retain the layout of the original version, whereas in that of quotation they would have given precedence to the layout of the secondary text. I will put this theoretical assumption to the test later in the chapter. Yet, while the reasons behind mere replacement are self-evident, those behind quotation are more intriguing. All the examples of explicit quotation mentioned above – the aretalogy of Isis, the Cippus of the Labyadai, and the list of priests from

²³ Moyer 2017, 324–326.

²⁴ See the Kallippos base below (§ 2, no. 3).

²⁵ Baran and Petzl 1978–1979, 305–308 (SEG XXVII 724); BE 1980, 443.

Halicarnassus – show that direct reference to previous epigraphic versions is a phenomenon closely related to the sacredness of the text.²⁶ This is particularly true for the text from Halicarnassus, where the epigraphic antecedent is said to have been set up amidst other votive offerings (*ἀγάλματα*). The explicit quotation of texts from earlier epigraphic versions makes the link with the past, be it real or fictitious, particularly tight and holy.

In these cases, special layout choices could emphasize the link. For example, the two facsimiles of the Halicarnassus list examined by S. Isager confirm A. Wilhelm's hypothesis that the original version corresponded to the first column of the later version. Afterwards, Athenippos, who held the priesthood when the list was re-engraved, added his own name at the beginning of the second column.²⁷ Following his death, other hands added the years of his tenure and the names of the next four priests. The two-column layout was clearly an innovation of this new version, meant to set the name of the incumbent priest, Athenippos, at the beginning of the right-hand column and thus on an equal footing with the first priest listed in the left-hand column (the mythical Telamon, son of Poseidon). While the left-hand column reproduces the original list, the right-hand one signals a new beginning of sorts. This decision is entirely understandable in the atmosphere of the erudite recovery of the past that characterized the Hellenistic Age.

In sum, these three factors (time, space, purpose) interact with one another in multiple ways. In terms of layout, the most interesting cases are those in which the space between and function of the original text and its re-engraved version are contiguous. More specifically, this means a very short spatial distance, possibly the same medium, and significant adherence to the original purpose. As for time, a certain distance needs to exist between the two for us to rule out cases of multiple engravings. Only in cases where all three factors are so combined can we imagine that stonemasons had a chance to see previous versions and possibly became interested in

²⁶ A fourth example might concern the famous maxims of the Seven Sages. An inscription from Aikhanoum in Afghanistan (Robert 1968, 421–450; *IG Iran Asiae centr.* 97) attests that a certain Klearchos carefully copied (*ἐπιγραδῆως ἀναγράψας*) the sapiential maxims at Delphi and brought them to Bactria. According to this text, the original of the maxims *ἀνακεῖ[τα]* (...) Πυθοῖ ἐν ἡγιαθέαι (ll. 1–2: “are dedicated in the most holy Delphi”). The verb *ἀνάκειμαι* is generally used for votive offerings, so one can imagine that the original referred to what was written on stone somewhere in the Delphic shrine. Although Robert's hypothesis that Klearchos was Clearchus of Soloi is nowadays questioned (see e.g., Lerner 2003–2004, 391–395; Mairs 2015), the emphasis on the careful copying of the maxims in Delphi itself suggests that copies of lesser quality (without autopsy) could be around. *IMiletupolis* 2 (late fourth century), from the Propontis region, preserves part of these maxims, with a good degree of correspondence to the literary version of the list. Unfortunately, we lack the beginning of this list, so we do not know how it was introduced to readers in Miletupolis.

²⁷ *Syll.*³ 1020, ll. II 8–9. Although the stone is allegedly preserved in Liverpool at the Garstang Museum, there is no existing photo of it. For the facsimiles, cf. Ormerod 1914 and Isager 2015, 136.

reproducing them as faithfully as possible. Otherwise, the existence of intermediate versions makes layout choices less meaningful.

Understanding how layout affected engraving and re-engraving helps us restore texts more effectively and better visualize epigraphic “originals” of which we only have re-engraved versions. It also sheds light on the reception of monuments. These questions are also key to understanding the extent of stonecutters’ awareness of layout issues in their two-fold capacity as readers and re-writers of ancient monuments.

2. SEVEN CASE STUDIES

1. The monument dedicated by the Athenians after their victory over the Boeotians and the Chalcidians in 506 consisted of a bronze chariot on a stone base,²⁸ of which we have a first version (a), i.e., a two-block base dating to the aftermath of the war and probably damaged during the Persian invasion, and a second version (b), consisting of a single block, dating half a century later. Despite the fragmentary state of both versions, the epigram, which consists of two elegiac couplets, is well known thanks to Herodotus.²⁹ However, the hexameters of version (a) are reversed in version (b) (the one Herodotus saw); this is proven by the fact that the vertical alignment of the pentameters in version (a) and (b) differs, which can only be explained if we accept the possibility that the hexameters of the two versions were reversed, as confirmed by Herodotus’ version.

From the standpoint of layout, the most remarkable feature is that the four lines of poetry were engraved on two lines of text instead of four. This has no parallel in other contemporary Athenian epigrams, where generally each line of poetry occupies one line of text, space permitting.³⁰ This decision is completely understandable in version (a), since the two couplets of the original epigram have nearly the same number of letters (l. 1: 37 (hex.) + 30 (pent.) = 67; l. 2: 34 (hex.) + 33 (pent.) = 67).³¹ Here, punctuation consisting of three dots was used to separate the hexameters from the pentameters. Another detail that sheds light on the relationship between poetic composition and epigraphic layout is the fact that the second epigraphic line (the poem’s lines 3–4) is divided perfectly in half on the two blocks: the three-dot punctuation was carved precisely on the left edge of the right block (Fig. 58, left).

Both lines of the first version reveal guidelines engraved above and below the writing line, with a space between them. The so-called “*plinthedon* layout” has been

²⁸ IG I³ 501A–B; cf. DAA 168 and 173, and Kaczko, *Attic Dedicatory Epigrams* 1a–b. See Appendix, no. 1.

²⁹ Hdt. 5.77. On the relationship between the literary and the epigraphic version, see Kaczko 2009, 112–114 and S. Kaczko, *Attic Dedicatory Epigrams* at pp. 3–6.

³⁰ IG I³ 608; 635; 642; 647; 652; 722 etc.

³¹ For the restoration of the adjective ἀχνύεντι or ἀχνυόεντι, cf. the comprehensive analysis of S. Kaczko, *Attic Dedicatory Epigrams* at pp. 7–11.

proposed for the vertical alignment of the letters.³² Such a layout consists of a grid wherein letters are arranged in a checkerboard pattern rather than in vertical rows, as can clearly be seen in the stele commemorating the members of the Erechtheis tribe who died at Marathon.³³ In my opinion, however, this is not the case for the inscription discussed here. First, all alleged examples of the *plinthedon* layout, scarce as they may be, lack space between the lines.³⁴ In fact, the absence of spacing and the *plinthedon* layout always appear to go in tandem. On the one hand, the checkerboard pattern makes it easier to compress the space between the lines; on the other, the lack of space between the lines necessitates a checkerboard to ensure that the letters in different lines do not overlap each other. Second, it is difficult to detect a regular *plinthedon* pattern in the preserved fragment. The space between the letters in the second line varies quite a bit, and the *plinthedon* style is limited to a mere portion of the text.³⁵ Perhaps it is no coincidence that the increased spacing of l. 2 corresponds to the three-dot punctuation of l. 1. Whereas the punctuation of l. 2 (carved on the edge) does not occupy any space on the line, the punctuation of l. 1 needs its own space, potentially disturbing the visual balance of the two couplets. In my opinion, the first stonecutter's primary concern was to emphasize the length of the monument base as well as the visual balance of both hexameters and pentameters and the two couplets.³⁶

As for the second version (b), the common view is that this base is a mid-fifth-century remake, possibly executed after one of the coeval Athenian victories over the Boeotians (e.g., Oinophyta, in 457).³⁷ Two priorities seem to have guided the stonecutter's re-engraving: maintaining the two long lines, each consisting of one hexameter and one pentameter, and updating the layout according to the taste of the time, namely, by adopting a perfect *stoichedon* arrangement (Fig. 58, right).³⁸ As noted

³² Keesling 2012, 141–143.

³³ Steinhauer 2004–2009 (*SEG* LVI 430).

³⁴ S. Kaczko, *Attic Dedicatory Epigrams* at p. 6 n. 23. In addition to the Marathon stele, see *DAA* 54 and 190; in *DDA* 71, 88, 94, 226 and 228 the *plinthedon* style is not consistent (the starting and/or ending of lines are vertically aligned in *stoichedon*) and randomness appears to prevail.

³⁵ The first preserved letter of l. 1 and the first preserved letter of l. 2 are almost vertically aligned. The *plinthedon* alignment occurs in the middle part of the preserved section, while at the end letters appear to be moving back towards a vertical alignment.

³⁶ The stonecutter of (a) may not have worked alone: the *ny* has a quite different shape and the *pi* has been engraved in a much smaller size than allowed by the guidelines of the second line; nevertheless, the result is well balanced.

³⁷ For an overview of the historical context, cf. A.E. Raubitschek, *DAA* at pp. 203–204.

³⁸ For a theoretical overview of the *stoichedon* arrangement, cf. Osborne 1973; Keesling 2003, 45–47. Regardless of what S. Kaczko proposes in *Attic Dedicatory Epigrams* at p. 9, nothing suggests that a less regular *stoichedon* was used, and specifically that one single *iota* shared a *stoichos* with another letter as a result of a “slight adaptation”. In the perspective of the stonecutter of (b), there was clearly no need to balance the two lines. Each preserved *iota* occupies its own *stoichos*, and the second line is longer than

above, the two hexameters have switched places in this version. The reason for this inversion is difficult to determine; perhaps, the Athenians wanted to place greater emphasis on the peoples over whom they had triumphed. While this information follows the first long line in the original version, it appears at the very beginning of the epigram in the new version. In any case, this inversion had an impact on the layout: the two lines that were of the same length in the original version, are clearly not so in the new version (l. 1: 34 (hex.) + 30 (pent.) = 64; l. 2: 37 (hex.) + 33 (pent.) = 70).³⁹ The difference in length amounts to six letters. The use of the *stoichedon* in this version is fairly sophisticated as it prevents a single line of poetry from being broken down into different lines of writing: in fact, an empty space is left at the end of the first line of poetry, while the second hexameter starts at the very beginning of the second line of writing.

2. At about the same time, the Athenian knights set up on the acropolis an honorific base with a knight leading a horse (IG I³ 511).⁴⁰ In the first version of this monument (a), the non-metrical inscription is a perfect *stoichedon*, providing the names of the three *hipparchontes* under whom the knights fought as well as that of the sculptor. Following a strict *stoichedon* principle, each line ends by cutting words in the middle, and three-dot punctuation is used throughout the text. The inscription was re-engraved twice during the early Imperial Age: once on the same base upside-down on the back (b), and a second time on a different base (c). This monument was seen by Pausanias, who speaks of it when describing his tour of the acropolis as he crosses the Propylaea.⁴¹ However, since Pausanias mentions multiple horsemen, it is unclear whether the two bases existed at the same time or whether Pausanias saw only the replica, which bore more than one horseman.

In any case, at some point the original base had so deteriorated that the block had to be turned over and reinscribed – a widespread practice in both the Hellenistic and Roman Ages. What is remarkable is that at least one of the stonecutters, the one responsible for the second base (c), tried to replicate not only the shape of the letters, but also the *stoichedon* layout and the three-dot punctuation, which he clearly perceived as key features (Fig. 59). By contrast, the stonecutter of (b) did not reproduce the layout and eliminated all punctuation (Fig. 60). A.E. Raubitschek argues that this stonecutter's failure to recognize the *stoichedon* arrangement led them

the first one, so no such adaptation seems necessary. S. Kaczko also reflects on the fact that if version (a) was indeed in *plinthedon* style, then the second line must have been indented on the left, and thus could have had one letter less than the first line (66 instead of 67). To me this seems unlikely for, as mentioned above, version (a) is hardly arranged in the *plinthedon* style. In any case, the caution that the scholar shows in their final assumptions (p. 11) is entirely understandable.

³⁹ Keesling 2003, 51–52.

⁴⁰ DAA 135. Later versions are 135a and 135b. See Appendix, no. 2.

⁴¹ Paus. 1.22.4.

to expand and contract the spaces between letters in a highly irregular manner.⁴² As the stonecutter of (b) lacked a direct view of the original, which was on the other side of the base and turned upside down, it may have been more difficult for them to replicate the layout with the same degree of accuracy as did the stonecutter of (c), who worked on a different block.

3. A honorific base for the astronomer Kallippos, son of Euhippos, from Cyzicus, was set up in Delphi most likely soon after his death in the late fourth century.⁴³ The dedicatory epigram consists of two couplets, in this case arranged in four lines. The epigram shows a close relationship between poetic composition and layout: since the two hexameters are of the same length (38 letters), the stonecutter opted for a *stoichedon* layout in which the longer lines fully occupy the writing area of the base, while the pentameters fall short of eight and four *stoichoi*, respectively.⁴⁴ As in the previous case, so here the monument eventually required restoration. In around 200, its base was turned upside down so that the lower surface could be used as a new support for the statue of Kallippos. The stonecutter tried to chisel away the old inscription, but with mixed results. As they did not finish the job, we can still read the old version. After the base was turned 180 degrees, the stonecutter rewrote the epigram, adjusting it to their own taste.⁴⁵ First, they suppressed the *stoichedon*, which at this point was no longer perceived as fashionable. Then, they indented the two pentameters slightly and increased the spacing between the letters to grant visual uniformity to the hexameters and the pentameters that make up the poem. The elimination of the *stoichedon* also enabled limited changes to the text to make it more readable and understandable (e.g., αἶα instead of αἰών). In my view, the stonecutter also increased the spacing between the third and fourth lines, emphasizing the final pentameter, which is syntactically autonomous with respect to the three other verses.

4. A base in honor of Tellon, son of Daemon, a boy who won a boxing competition, was set up in Olympia in the fifth century (Fig. 61).⁴⁶ The first, late archaic version of the dedication is engraved on the left side of the upper face of the block on which the statue stood. The three lines run alongside the slots for the figure's feet and perpendicular to the actual statue's front. The inscription is quite unobtrusive and does not exceed the length of the front foot. This decision forced the stonecutter to arrange the elegiac couplet in three lines, despite the abundance of space elsewhere on the base. The late Hellenistic version of the same couplet was also inscribed on the upper face, but in front of rather than next to the statue. On

⁴² A.E. Raubitschek, *DAA* at p. 148.

⁴³ Bousquet 1992, 180–183; cf. *CEG* 881.

⁴⁴ See Appendix, no. 3.

⁴⁵ The whole process is perfectly illustrated in Bousquet 1992, 182.

⁴⁶ *CEG* 381. This dedication was also seen by Pausanias (6.10.9).

the one hand, this decision did not entail a total departure from the previous version, as the second stonecutter did not move the inscription to the block's front side; on the other, it served as an update of the inscription, as it deeply modified its layout. More specifically, the three-line arrangement was abandoned in order to restore the elegiac couplet to its more usual two-line arrangement.

5. One of the two epigrams from Thebes recently published by N. Papazarkadas probably pertains to Theban soldiers who died in war.⁴⁷ It was first inscribed (*ante* 450) in the local archaic alphabet on one face of a slim stele. At least one century later, it was re-engraved in the Ionic alphabet immediately below the first inscription, with one blank line between the two versions. The second version, save minor adjustments to the Ionic alphabet, accurately reproduces the earlier one. The damage on the left side of the stele seems to date to a later time in the life of the stone as it affects both versions. There is thus no evidence that the replacement was due to this physical deterioration. Unfortunately, the poor condition of the left side does not allow us to compare the lines' alignment. In any case, the second version is a visual double of the first though updated to new graphic standards. Here, the rationale lies not only in the replacement, but also in the re-enactment of the dedication. The emphasis on the visual continuity of the two versions was meant to enhance the pious act with additional symbolic meaning.

6. The second epigram from Thebes recently published by N. Papazarkadas was inscribed twice on opposite sides of a slim, non-fluted *kioniskos*, a type of medium that in itself signals the dedication's antiquity.⁴⁸ This epigram explicitly evokes the shield that Croesus dedicated to Amphiaras and possibly echoes a famous passage in Herodotus, where the historian speaks of the votive offerings set up in Greek shrines by the Lydian king.⁴⁹ Despite the epigram's complexity (see the text in Appendix, no. 4), we may assume the following sequence of facts: (i) at the end of the sixth century, a supposed shield of Croesus was present at a Boeotian sanctuary; (ii) something was stolen and found again beneath the shield with the help of divination; (iii) the overseer (?) of the temple dedicated an *ex-voto* to Apollo, which was displayed above the *kioniskos*; (iv) a century and a half later, the dedication was re-engraved on the same *kioniskos*. In the first version (a), the eight lines of poetry are vertically aligned from top to bottom, each corresponding to one of the eight lines of text. Since the top of the *kioniskos* is not well preserved, the first two to three letters of each line of poetry are missing. Furthermore, as the second hemistichs are lost, we

⁴⁷ Papazarkadas 2014, 224–226 (with photos). See also *SEG* LXIV 409.

⁴⁸ Papazarkadas 2014, 245–247. See also *SEG* LXIV 405. Another (fluted) *kioniskos*, which was discovered in Thebes and is probably contemporary, was published by Aravantinos 2012 (*SEG* LVI 521).

⁴⁹ *Hdt.* 1.50–51. For two different historical interpretations of the correspondence between Herodotus and the epigram, see Porciani 2016 and Thonemann 2016.

must assume that the text continued on another drum below. Both the paleography and arrangement of the text point to the late sixth century.

Differently from the previous case, there was no space left on the inscribed face here when need arose for a re-engraving. For this reason, during the re-inscription phase, the *kioniskos* was rotated 180 degrees – a common practice, as we have already seen elsewhere. Version (a) ended up hidden from sight and replaced completely by version (b) (Fig. 62). The vertical alignment of version (a) was suitable to the slimness of the *kioniskos* (diameter 29 to 31.5 cm). However, by the time of version (b), this vertical alignment seems to have been regarded as outdated, which is probably why a re-engraving came to be seen as necessary and a horizontal alignment was chosen. Nevertheless, the elongated form of the *kioniskos* remained a major constraint for the second stonecutter, as can be seen from the fact that the lines of text are rather short, and each line of poetry extends across about two and a half lines of text. This outcome could have been avoided either by making the letters smaller or forcing viewers to move around the *kioniskos* to read lines that extended beyond the front surface of the *kioniskos*. Apparently, the stonecutter rejected the former solution and tried to minimize the need for the latter because they wished to preserve as much as possible the visual similarity to version (a) and the way in which viewers enjoyed the monument. Dedications are generally engraved in larger letters than are other documents because they need to attract the attention of viewers. It is also possible that the layout of version (b) was meant to recall the elongated layout of version (a). Although version (a) was not visible, version (b) occupied virtually the same space. These two examples (nos. 5–6) show how even in the same place, in the same period, and in the case of similar artifacts (two dedications), stonecutters could intervene in different ways during the re-inscription process.

7. In 1962 G. Pugliese Carratelli published two versions of the same text inscribed on two different blocks, both found in the 1930s in the area of the Fountain Terrace in Cyrene.⁵⁰ The first block was already in poor condition when discovered and was later lost in the 1960s (Fig. 63), while the second is well preserved (Fig. 64). The text, consisting of two elegiac couplets, is a dedication to Artemis by Hermesandros, son of Philon, after a hecatomb (see Appendix, no. 5). Based on their paleography, L. Gasperini argued that version (b) had to date at least a century later.⁵¹ Since the dimensions of the first block are unknown, it is impossible to determine whether the second one was an exact replacement of it made for the same monument. While the left edge of the first block is not pre-

⁵⁰ *Suppl. Cirenaico* 160–161. Cf. the thorough analysis of Dobias-Lalou in *IG Cyrenaica Verse*² 023 and 054. I am indebted to E. Rosamilia for bringing this case to my attention.

⁵¹ Gasperini 1996, 366–368.

served, a clamp-hole is visible on its right edge. This block, therefore, seems to have been anchored to something on its right, possibly due to some repair.⁵² In the second version, no such holes are carved into the block. Nothing is known about the upper side or back of this second block, but the slab is so narrow (12.5 cm) that we can assume that it was inserted into some sort of slot.⁵³ Indeed, though the dimensions of the first block are unknown, the photo suggests a greater ratio of length to height vis à vis the second one (at least 2.3, versus 1.8 of the second block).⁵⁴ Perhaps, what had been a larger monument at the time of the dedication of Hermesandros was later rearranged in a different format, possibly to meet the needs of a restoration.⁵⁵

The difference in layout is likewise striking. On the first block, each line of poetry fits into one line of text. Lines are set well apart, and the longest one (l. 1) dictates the size of the letters and the alignment of the text on the left.⁵⁶ The general layout emphasizes the length of the monument. On the second block, each line of poetry fits into two lines of text. Nonetheless, the stonemason managed to overcome the discrepancy between line lengths by aligning both margins of the text. Therefore, the decision to separate lines of poetry into hemistichs was probably intended to create sub-units that were more regular than those of hexameters and pentameters. If the height of the two blocks was similar, the writing area of the second block was put to better use because the large blank spaces between the lines of the first block were avoided. The result is a perfectly “justified” text, the neatness of which suits both the stand-alone nature of this later dedication and the reference to κόσμος (l. 4) – all the more so if the epigram is praising itself rather than a statue.⁵⁷ These differences, along with the shape of the blocks and the paleography, go against the idea of multiple contemporary dedications by Hermesandros, as proposed particularly by F. Chamoux: the two layouts probably derive from different visual needs.⁵⁸

⁵² For repairs, cf. Ismaelli 2013, 298–300. The precise archaeological context of the dedication of Hermesandros is unknown: the two blocks were found on the so-called Fountain Terrace, and, according to the text, were probably placed above the fountain itself (ὑπὲρ κρήνης). However, there is no trace of an inscription slot in the rock’s surface. Cf. Ensoli Vittozzi 1996, 90–94 and Ismaelli 2018, 377–379.

⁵³ Although the dimensions of the first block are unknown, judging from the photograph (Fig. 63) it too could be a slab. However, we do not know whether this was its original shape or the result of reuse.

⁵⁴ Even more so since the left side of the block is broken.

⁵⁵ Gasperini 1996, 364; *IG Cyrenaica Verse*² 054.

⁵⁶ However, the restoration of l. 3 seems a bit too long. One wonders if the first version had the Doric form βῶς instead of βοῦς. See also Dobias-Lalou 2000, 98.

⁵⁷ This conclusion is retained by Dobias-Lalou in *IG Cyrenaica Verse*² 054 (cf. n. 50 above).

⁵⁸ Chamoux 1975, 272–273, partially reaffirmed in Chamoux 1991, 26–29.

3. CONCLUSIONS

As we have seen, it is not easy to draw general conclusions. The context of any re-engraving is crucial to understanding whether the layout of the earlier version of the same inscription was valued or set aside. However, in dedicatory inscriptions a general departure from the initial layout can be recognized in the phase of re-inscription. Even in cases where the second version intervened to replace the previous one, prolonging its life to some extent, few elements of its layout were retained. The tendency was to omit the most characteristic visual aspects of earlier versions: hence the rejection of vertical alignment in the Classical Age, and of the *stoichedon* arrangement in the post-Classical period – two features that later stonemasons considered outdated and unacceptable. Indeed, in some cases (e.g., the *kioniskos* from Thebes) the desire to replace the old layout was among the reasons for the re-inscription. A partial exception to this lies in the late imitation of the *stoichedon*: it occurred only in Athens as part of a broader, archaizing trend.⁵⁹ What is important to note, however, is that this was not a pure stylistic quirk, but probably an attempt to recover the material aspect of the monumental heritage of Athens, as *IG I³ 511* proves. Yet, the general trend seems to be different; although later stonemasons occasionally entered into dialogue with older versions, the demand to update layout arrangements usually prevailed, even in cases of replacement.

APPENDIX

1. *IG I³ 501*

- (a) [δεσμοῖ ἐν ἀχνύεντι (?) σιδερέοι ἔσβεσαν ἡύβ]ριν : / παῖδε[ς Ἀθηναίων ἔργμασιν ἐμ πολέμο] / [ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων δαμάσαντες] : / τὸν ἡίππος δ[εκάτεν Παλλάδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν].
 (b) ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων δαμά]σαν[τες] / [παῖδ]ες Ἀθηναίων ἔργμα[σιν ἐμ πολέμο] / [δεσμοῖ ἐν ἀχνύεντι (?) σιδερέοι ἔσβε]σαν [ἡύβριν] / [τ]ὸν ἡίππος δεκάτ[εν Παλλάδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν].

(a) “The sons of the Athenians by their deeds in war extinguished the arrogance with painful iron chains | taming the peoples of the Boeotians and Chalkidians; as a tithe of this they dedicated to Pallas these horses”.

(b) “Taming the peoples of the Boeotians and Chalkidians, the sons of the Athenians by their deeds in war | extinguished the arrogance with painful iron chains; as a tithe of this they dedicated to Pallas these horses”.

⁵⁹ Archaizing style is a concept explored especially for sculpture and literature. For epigraphic cases, albeit quite fragmentary, cf. a limited list in A.E. Raubitschek, *DAA* at p. 149, and a short comment by Guarducci, *Epigrafi greca*² at pp. 389–390.

2. IG P 511

hoi hi[ππ]ῆς [:] ἀπὸ τῶν [πο]λεμίων : hiπαρ[χ]ό[v]-
 τον : Λακεδαιμονίο [:] Ξ[ε]νοφόντος : Προν[ά]π[ο]-
 ς : Λύκιο[ς] : ἐποίησεν [:] Ἐλευθερεὺς [:] Μ]ύ[ρ]ο[γ]ος].

“The knights (dedicated this monument) from the enemy spoils under the command of Lakedaimonios, Xenophon and Pronaps. Lykios son of Myron of Eleutheræ did it”.

3. Bousquet 1992, 180–183

- (a) [οὔτ]ι[v]ά σοι [με]ρόπων, [ἄσ]τ[ρ]ων περὶ θεῖον [ἀ]ριθ[μό]ν,
 [Κάλλιππ' Εὐ]ί[ππο]υ, Κύ[ζ]ικ[ος] ἔ[σ]χ[ε] πάτρα
 [θνητῶ]ν ἴσον, [ἔ]σους τε [φ]έρει Διὸς ἄμβροτος αἰών·
 [Φ]οίβωι δ' [ἔ]ν[θα σ]έ[θε]μ [μνη]μα πέλ'· εἰν ἐτάροις.
- (b) οὔτινά που μερόπων, ἄστρων περὶ θεῖον ἀριθμ[όν],
 ν Κάλλιππε Εὐίππου, Κύζικος ἔσχε πάτ[ρα]
 θνητῶν ἴσον, ὄσους τε φέρει Διὸς ἄμβροτος αἶα·
 Φοίβωι δ' ἔνθα σέθεμ μνημα πέλ' εἰν ἐτάροις.

“Kallippos son of Euippos, no man, as far as the divine science of the stars is concerned, your homeland Cyzicus had equal to you among mortals, those whom the everlasting epoch (version b: earth) of Zeus brings forth. There where your grave is, become one of the companions of Phoebus!”.

4. Here I reproduce the reconstruction of the text based on N. Papazarkadas' edition (2014, 245–247) and my transcription of version (b), with some changes from the first edition of this version.

- [σοῖ] χάριν ἐνθάδ', Ἄπολο[v, ~ - ~ - ~]
 [κε]πιστὰς ἰαροῦ στᾶσε κατ[ευχσά]μενος
 [μα]ντοσύναις εὐρὸν ὑπὸ τὰ[γ χρυσ]οῖο φαενὰν
 4 [ἀσπ]ίδα τὰγ Ὀροῖσος κα[λφ]ῶν ἀγαλ[μα θέτο?]
 [Ἀμ]φιάρειοι μνᾶμ' ἀρετ[ᾶς τε πάθας τε ~ - ~]
 [. .]μεν ἂ ἐκλέφθε ΦΟ[~ - ~ ~]
 [Θε]βραίοισι δὲ θάμβος Ε[~ - ~ - ~]
 8 [. .]πίδα δαιμονίος ΔΕ[~ - ~ ~]

1. Ἄπολογ ἄ[ναχς Porciani 2. [θεσ]πιστὰς Thonemann, [hδ]πιστὰς Tentori Montalto 3. Porciani; TA[....]OIO Papazarkadas 6. [...?] ἀίχμην ἄ Porciani, [...]μενα Thonemann, [κε]μμένα Tentori Montalto 8. [ἀσ]πίδα Porciani, Thonemann.

“In gratitude to you, Apollo, [...] overseer of the temple erected (this) as an ex-voto, after having found by divination under the shining [golden] shield that Croesus dedicated, as a stupendous offering, to Amphiaraus, in memory of his own virtue [...] that was stolen [...] and for the Thebans a cause for amazement [...] heaven-sent [...]”.

Π ... ΙΑ
 ΩΣΤΑΣΕΚΑΤ
 ΜΕΝΟΣΜΑΝΤΟΣ
 4 ΣΕΥΡΩΝΥΠΟΤΑ
 ΟΙΟΦΑΕΝΝΑΝΑ
 ΙΔΑΤΑΝΓΡΟΙ
 ΟΝΑΓΑΛΜ
 8 ΑΡΕΩΙ

In l. 2, an *omega* is clearly visible at the beginning of the line before the first *sigma*. In late classical Boeotian epigraphy, $-\omega$ is the standard form for the genitive ending;⁶⁰ the end of the word ἰαρ]ῶ can be recognized thanks to version (a). Like στᾶσε instead of στήσε etc., this confirms that the Ionic-Attic influx is limited to the alphabet. In l. 3, the initial and final letters (*my* and *sigma*) are not visible from the photo's angle. This means that viewers had to move around the *kioniskos* to read the entire text. One can say the same about the first letter of l. 4 (*sigma*), the strokes of which are barely visible on the edge. At the end of l. 5, after the last *ny*, I detect the left side of an *alpha* (left diagonal stroke and its conjunction with the horizontal one). This must be the first letter of the accusative ἄσπίδα , which is only partly preserved in both versions.

L. 1 remains quite a mystery. Only one letter, the central *alpha*, is certain. A vertical stroke is visible on the left of this *alpha*.⁶¹ M. Tentori Montalto sees a letter at the very beginning of the line, but his suggestion that it is a *gamma* is questionable: a second vertical stroke makes it look more like a *pi*.⁶² A reconstruction of the number of letters that need to be restored between each of these short lines may be helpful. Ll. 3-5 in (b) correspond to l. 3 in (a), i.e., the hexameter of the second distich. Between one and the other of these three short lines, which are the least damaged of (b), several letters (between four and five) need to be restored. Since the preserved portion of l. 1 is shorter than the following lines, we must restore three more let-

⁶⁰ Blümel 1982, 238.

⁶¹ Interpreted as a *my* by Papazarkadas 2014, 239; as a *ny* by Porciani 2016, 105.

⁶² Tentori Montalto 2017, 134. The *theta* seen by Thonemann 2016, 156 after the *alpha* is imperceptible to me.

ters between the *alpha* and the beginning of l. 2, thereby bringing their number to seven/eight. This leads to an impasse: if we counts back from the *omega* of l. 2, the middle of l. 1 should correspond to the first preserved letters of -]πιστάς. It is impossible to read the hypothetical end of l. 1 of version (a) in this section of l. 1 in version (b), except at the price of compressing too many letters (eleven to twelve) on the right-hand side of (b) l. 1.⁶³ I wonder whether we could interpret the traces of this line – Π... !Α – as -]π[ισ]τά[ς].⁶⁴ This would lead to the opposite problem – not enough letters – which, at any rate, can more easily be justified than can the other case (e.g., if the surface was already damaged and the stonemason was forced to leave some spaces blank). Therefore, the caution of the first editor is entirely in order. At the same time, we must bear in mind that the *kioniskos* is slightly flared. This means that the circumference varies up to 15 cm between the top and bottom of the preserved section: one should therefore expect progressively longer lines as we go down the *kioniskos*.

5. IG Cyrenaica Verse² 023

[Μνᾶ]μα τόδ' Ἑρμήσανδρος ὑπὲρ κράνας ὁ Φίλωνος
 [θῆ]κε θεᾶι θύσας Ἀρτέμιτος τελεταί,
 [βοῦς] ἑκατὸν κατάγων καὶ ἵκατι τῶν τάδε κεῖται
 4 [κόσ]μος καὶ μνάμα καὶ κλέος εὐδόκιμον

“Hermesandros son of Philon dedicated this monument above the water source, after sacrificing one hundred and twenty oxen to the goddess during the celebration of Artemis by leading them down. Of them these (words) stay as ornament and memory and honored fame”.

REFERENCES

- Adak, M. 2021. “Teos und die hellenistischen Könige von Alexander bis Antiochos III”, in P. Brun, L. Capdetrey, and P. Fröhlich (eds.), *L'Asie Mineure occidentale au IIIe siècle a.C.* Bordeaux, 231–258.
- Aravantinos, V.L. 2012. “A New Inscribed Kioniskos from Thebes”, *ABSA* 101, 369–377.
- Baran, M., and G. Petzl. 1978–1979. “Beobachtungen aus dem nordöstlichen Hinterland von Teos”, *MDAI(I)* 27–28, 301–308.
- Beschi, L. 1970. “Divinità funerarie cirenaiche”, *ASAA* 48, 133–341.

⁶³ As in Thonemann 2016 and Tentori Montalto 2018.

⁶⁴ Perhaps, after the *alpha* of (b) l. 1, the lower stroke of a *sigma* is visible (better than a *theta*: cf. n. 62 above).

- Blümel, W. 1982. *Die aiolischen Dialekte. Phonologie und Morphologie der inschriftlichen Texte aus generativer Sicht*. Göttingen.
- Blümel, W. 1995. "Inscripfen aus Karien I", *EA* 25, 35-64.
- Bousquet, J. 1992. "Inscriptions de Delphes", *BCH* 116, 177-196.
- Briant, P. 1998. "Droaphernès et la statue de Sardis", in M. Brosius and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Studies in Persian History. Essays in Memory of David Lewis*. Leiden, 205-225.
- Briant, P. 2003. "Histoire et archéologie d'un texte. La Lettre de Darius à Gadatas entre Perses, Grecs et Romains", in M. Giorgieri, M. Salvini, M.-C. Trémouille, and P. Vannicelli (eds.), *Licia e Lidia prima dell'Ellenizzazione*. Rome, 107-144.
- Chamoux, F. 1975. "L'épigramme d'Hermésandros à Cyrène", *ŽAnt* 25, 272-273.
- Chamoux, F. 1991. "La génoise d'Herculanum. Un aspect de la sculpture animalière chez les Grecs", *MMAI* 72, 9-32.
- Chanotis, A. 1988. *Historie und Historiker in der griechischen Inschriften. Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechische Historiographie*. Stuttgart.
- Culasso Gastaldi, E. 2004. *Le prossenie ateniesi del IV secolo a.C. Gli onorati asiatici*. Alessandria.
- Debord, P. 1999. *L'Asie Mineure au IVe siècle (412-323 a.C.). Pouvoirs et jeux politiques*. Paris.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 2000. "Le dialecte des inscriptions grecques de Cyrène", *Karthago* 25.
- Driscoll, E.W. 2019. "The Milesian Eponym List and the Revolt of 412 B.C.", *The Journal of Epigraphic Studies* 2, 11-32.
- Ensoli Vittozzi, S. 1996. "I rifornimenti idrici del Santuario cireneo di Apollo dal IV sec. a.C. alla fine dell'età tolemaica", in L. Bacchielli and M. Bonanno Aravantinos (eds.), *Scritti di Antichità in memoria di Sandro Stucchi*, 1. Rome, 79-110.
- Fabiani, R. 2001. "Un decreto ateniese riproposto a Iasos (IG II² 3 e Iasos 3926)", *PP* 56, 69-100.
- Fabiani, R. 2013. "Iasos between Maussollos and Athens", in P. Brun, L. Cavalier, K. Konuk, and F. Prost (eds.), *Euploia. La Lycie et la Carie antiques. Dynamiques des territoires, échanges et identités*. Bordeaux, 317-330.
- Fabiani, R. 2016. "Iasos 220 and the Regulations about the Priest of Zeus Megistos", *Kernos* 29, 159-184.
- Gasparini, L. 1996. "Note di epigrafia cirenea", in L. Bacchielli and M. Bonanno Aravantinos (eds.), *Scritti di Antichità in memoria di Sandro Stucchi*, 1. Rome, 142-156.
- Gehrke, H.-J. 2019. "Intentional History and the Social Context of Remembrance in Ancient Greece", in W. Pohl and V. Wieser (eds.), *Historiography and Identity I: Ancient and Early Christian Narratives of Community*. Turnhout, 95-106.
- Isager, S. 2015. "On a List of Priests: From the Son of Poseidon to Members of the Elite in Late Hellenistic Halikarnassos", in J. Feyfer, M. Moltesen, and A. Rathje (eds.), *Tradition: Transmission of Culture in the Ancient World*. Copenhagen, 131-148.
- Ismaelli, T. 2013. "Ancient Architectural Restoration in Asia Minor. Typology, Techniques and Meanings Discussed with Reference to Examples of Large-Scale Public Buildings in Hierapolis of Phrygia, a Seismic City in Western Turkey", *MDAI(I)* 63, 267-324.
- Ismaelli, T. 2018. "Teatralità e illusione nel Santuario di Apollo a Cirene: il Propileo di Praxiadas e il Donario degli Strateghi", in M. Livadiotti, R. Belli Pasqua, L.M. Caliò, and G. Martines (eds.), *Theatroideis 1. L'immagine della città, la città delle immagini*. Rome, 373-392.
- Jördens, A. 2013. "Aretologies", in E. Stavrianopoulou (ed.), *Shifting Social Imaginaries in the Hellenistic Period*. Leiden, 143-176.

- Kaczko, S. 2009. "From Stone to Parchment. Epigraphic and Literary Transmission of Some Greek Epigrams", *Trends of Classics* 1, 90-117.
- Keesling, C.M. 2003. "Rereading the Acropolis Dedications", in D. Jordan and J. Traill (eds.), *Lettered Attica. A Day of Attic Epigraphy*. Athens, 41-54.
- Keesling, C.M. 2012. "The Marathon Casualty List from Eua-Loukou and the Plinthedon Style in Attic Inscriptions", *ZPE* 180, 139-148.
- Lerner, J.D. 2003-2004. "Correcting the Early History of Āy Kānom", in *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 35-36, 373-410.
- Maddoli, G. 2001. "Nuovi testi da Iasos", *PP* 56, 15-32.
- Mairs, R. 2015. "The Founder's Shrine and the Foundation of Ai Khanoum", in N. Mac Sweeney (ed.), *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*. Philadelphia, 103-128.
- Minon, S. 2009. "La stèle diglosse de Sigée en Troade (IG I³ 1508, ca 550 a.C.)", in B. Bortolussi, M. Keller, S. Minon, and L. Sznajder (eds.), *Traduire, transposer, transmettre dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine*. Paris, 91-105.
- Moyer, I. 2017. "The Memphite Self-Revelations of Isis and Egyptian Religion in the Hellenistic and Roman Aegean", *Religion in the Roman Empire* 3, 318-343.
- Ormerod, H.A. 1914. "Greek Inscriptions in the Museum of the Liverpool Royal Institution", *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 6, 99-108.
- Osborne, M.J. 1973. "The Stoichedon Style in Theory and Practice", *ZPE* 10, 249-270.
- Papazarkadas, N. 2014. "Two New Epigrams from Thebes", in N. Papazarkadas (ed.), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects*. Leiden - Boston, 223-251.
- Porciani, L. 2016. "Creso, Anfiraio e la nuova iscrizione da Tebe", in S. Struffolino (ed.), *Ἡμέτερα γράμματα. Scritti di epigrafia greca offerti a Teresa Alfieri Tonini*. Milan, 101-112.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1985. "Cari in Iasos", *RAL* 40, 149-156.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1987. "Ancora su Iasos e i Cari", *RAL* 42, 189-292.
- Robert, L. 1968. "De Delphes à l'Oxus, inscriptions grecques nouvelles de la Bactriane", *CRAI* 112, 416-457.
- Robert, L. 1975. "Une nouvelle inscription grecque de Sardes. Règlement de l'autorité perse relatif à un culte de Zeus", *CRAI* 119, 306-330.
- Rousset, D., J. Camp, and S. Minon. 2015. "The Phokian City of Panopeus/Phanoteus, Three New Rupestral Inscriptions, and the Cippus of the Labyadaï of Delphi", *AJA* 119, 441-463.
- Steinhauer, G. 2004-2009. "Στήλη πεσόντων τῆς Ἐρεχθίδος", *Horos* 17-21, 679-692.
- Tentori Montalto, M. 2018. "Erodoto e due epigrammi di recente scoperta (*BE* 2015, nr. 306; *SEG* 56, 430): la dedica di Creso ad Amphiaraios e la battaglia di Maratona", in F. Camia, L. Del Monaco, and M. Nocita (eds.), *Munus Laetitia. Studi miscellanei offerti a Maria Letizia Lazzarini*, 1. Rome, 126-154.
- Thonemann, P. 2016. "Croesus and the Oracles", *JHS* 136, 152-167.
- Tuplin, C. 2009. "The Gadatas Letter", in L. Mitchell and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Greek History and Epigraphy. Essays in honour of P.J. Rhodes*. Swansea, 155-184.
- Veligianni, C., and K. Kousoulakou. 2009. "Ἀρεταλογία Ἰσιδος ἀπὸ τὴν Κασσάνδρεια", in E.K. Sverkos (ed.), *Πρακτικὰ Β' Πανελληνίου Συνεδρίου Επιγραφικῆς*. Athens, 49-72.
- Žabkar, L.V. 1988. *Hymns to Isis in Her Temple at Philae*. Hanover.

Table 1. (*) indicates that the two versions coexist on the same face of the same medium. A = Archaic, LA = Late Archaic, C = Classical, LC = Late Classical, H = Hellenistic, LH = Late Hellenistic, EE = Early Empire. The last column refers to case studies discussed in part two of the chapter.

"Original"	"Copy"	Primary Place	Secondary Place	Same Medium	Span of Time	No.
IG I ³ 1508	IG I ³ 1508	Sigeum	Sigeum	yes*	LA / LA	
Syll. ³ 4	Syll. ³ 4	Cyzicus	Cyzicus	yes*	LA / H	
IG I ³ 501A	IG I ³ 501B	Athens	Athens	no	LA / C	1
SEG LXIV 409	SEG LXIV 409	Thebes	Thebes	yes*	LA / C	5
SEG LXIV 405	SEG LXIV 405	Thebes	Thebes	yes	LA / C	6
SEG LXV 361	CID I 9	Panopeus	Delphi	no	LA / LC	
I.Nordkarieten 170	IDelphinion 122	Miletus	Miletus	no	LA / H	
IG I ³ 511	DAA 135a	Athens	Athens	yes	C / EE	2
IG I ³ 511	DAA 135b	Athens	Athens	no	C / EE	
I.Iasos 220	SEG LXVI 1186	Iasos	Iasos	no	C / LC	
SEG XXXVI 983	SEG XXXVIII 1059	Iasos	Iasos	no	C / H	
IG II ² 3+165	SEG LI 1506	Athens	Iasos	no	C / H	
CEG 381	CEG 381	Delphi	Delphi	yes*	C / LH	4
CEG 794	CEG 795	Pharsalus	Delphi	no	LC / LC	
Bousquet 1992, 180–183	Bousquet 1992, 180–183	Delphi	Delphi	yes	LC / H	3
IG Cyrenaica Verse ² 023	IG Cyrenaica Verse ² 054	Cyrene	Cyrene	no	LC / H	7
IG Cyrenaica ² 024000	IG Cyrenaica ² 024000	Cyrene	Cyrene	yes*	H / H	
I.Labraunda 1A	I.Labraunda 1B–2	Labraunda	Labraunda	no	H / EE	
Dubious cases (an epigraphic original version is mentioned but missing)						
-	IG Iran Asie Centr. 97	Delphi	Ai-Khanoum	no	- / H	
-	Syll. ³ 1020	Halicarnassus	Halicarnassus	no	- / LH	
-	IKyme 41	Memphis	Cyme	no	- / LH	
-	RJGIS 306/0201	Memphis	Telmessus	no	- / H	
-	SEG LVIII 583	Memphis	Cassandrea	no	- / EE	