

Posted initially 28 February 2008

## “... the stones will cry out”

I happened to notice an old book in my library the other day. I do not recall when I picked it up. The book was published in MDCCCLXXXIII (= 1883). The title is: *Delectus Inscriptionum Graecarum (A Collection of Greek Inscriptions)* and its author or rather editor is Paulus CAUER. It was published in Lipsiae at the expense of Salomonis Hirzelii.

As I looked at a few of its pages, I noticed a number of orthographical mistakes. They reminded me of my past labors in reading a long list of volumes containing ancient inscriptions. It was the same story over again. What was new this time was that whereas in the past I had read primarily Attic inscriptions (tens of thousands of them) and only peripherally inscriptions from a few of the other dialects, here was a book that contained only dialectal inscriptions, that is, a large number of inscriptions written in dialects other than Attic.

This made me want to read the book through just to see in how far the change of pronunciation that had started in Attika and Boiotia in the VI-V century B.C.—of which I have written at length in my “The Error of Erasmus and Un-Greek Pronunciations of Greek” and especially the sixth chapter (“The Historical Greek Pronunciation and the Dichotomy of the Language”) of my book *The Development of Greek and the New Testament. Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*.

It must be explained that for the purpose of establishing the changes that came over the pronunciation of main-line Greek, these dialects are not of momentous importance. Because the Attic dialect—in which the pronunciation changes have been established without a shadow of doubt—was the dialect that overshadowed all other dialects on account of its literature; it was used by the States belonging to the Athenian Commonwealth; it became the official language of Makedonia; it was the form of the language spread by Alexander; and it was the dialect on which all post-classical Greek was based all the way to Neohellenic, the question whether the other dialects moved along with it in pronunciation change is really immaterial. These dialects were so overshadowed in importance, that they could not really play an arbiter’s role in the matter. However, the fact is that these dialects, too, moved along with Attic into the new pronunciation, i.e. the Historical Pronunciation of

Greek. Thus, the change in the pronunciation of Greek was not a local phenomenon confined to the inhabitants of Attika; it was a panhellenic phenomenon influencing the pronunciation of all dialects.

Paul CAUER's book shows just that. Even though he, as an Erasmian, did not make it his concern to choose inscriptions evincing the Historical Greek Pronunciation, yet the inscriptions contained in his volume show precisely that in connection with all possible shifts in pronunciation.

The inscriptions contained in this book come from many sources, such as *CIA* (*Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*), *IGA* (*Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae*), *CIG* (*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*), *Roel, Bechtel, Keil, Foucart, Le Bas, Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, Ἀθηναῖον*, etc. The dates of the inscriptions vary from the very early inscriptions contained in *IGA* down to the end of B.C. times.

In this article I shall take up the evidence relating to the pronunciation of the various vowels (mainly) as a *parergon*, which can help those who have already read my main studies on the pronunciation of Greek in antiquity, to broaden their understanding by seeing the same phenomena that I discussed with regard to the Attic dialect, obtaining in the other dialects as well.

What we are looking for in the inscriptions are the orthographic mistakes of the stone cutters. These people, being generally not professional grammarians, when in doubt spelled their words in the way in which they pronounced them. This means that most of the time they spelled correctly. Just like the moderns. But some times, when they did not remember how a word was spelled, they spelled wrongly. It is these mistakes that divulge to us the way they pronounced! Thus, the mute cuttings on the marble or stone, all of a sudden assume life and speech and voice—**the stones cry out!**—and they tell us how the ancients pronounced their Greek letters and combinations of letters.

In the various sections of this article, to which I will add from time to time, I intend to take up the wording in various inscriptions contained in CAUER's book in order to show the pronunciation that is presupposed.

## 1. Writing **ι** instead of **ει**

CAUER offers many inscriptions in which the stone cutter, forgetting that the particular word was spelled with **ει**, he wrote down the wrong letter, ie. **ι**. An example of this is Inscription no. 40 (IV B.C.) (pp. 18-25). This *Inscription* comes from Magna Grecia (South Italy). In line 24 the text reads:

### ἑβδομήκοντα τρῖς σχοῖνοι

Now the Greek numeral for “three” is not spelled **τρῖς** but **τρῆϊς**. Our ‘writer’, the stone cutter, ‘wrote’ down the simple vowel **ι** because he had obviously forgot that the word was spelled with **ει**. Now, if he had been used to pronouncing this word as “t-r-e-i-s”, that is like the Erasmians pronounce it, he would have remembered to spell it correctly. But because he knew the pronunciation of the word as “tris”, he spelled it in the most straightforward manner, exactly as he pronounced it, and so he wrote down **τρῖς**. We see, therefore, that **ει** was at this time pronounced as a **ι**.



Another inscription with the same type of mistake is *Inscription no.121* (III B.C.) on p. 78. This inscription comes from Kreta. It reads:

### ἑξαγγελίῳ τοῦ κόσμου τοῖς πλίασιν

The word **πλίασιν** should have been spelled as **πλείασιν**. Because the stone-cutter was no expert in the Greek orthography, he spelled as he pronounced: **πλίασιν**. Once again we see that **ει** was at this time pronounced like **ι**.



*Inscription 132* found on the Apollon temple on the Island of Delos (dated to 168 B.C.), reads:

### καὶ τοῦτο πεδὰ πλίονος σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτ[ιμί]ας

The word **πλίονος** should have been spelled as **πλείονος**. For the same reason as above, namely, his ignorance of orthographically correct writing, the stone-cutter spelled the word wrongly as **πλίονος**, revealing that he pronounced **ει** as **ι**.

It is interesting to compare this word spelled wrongly with *Inscription 147 H 2*,

## ὁ καὶ δόξει τοῖς πλείοσι τοῦ κοινοῦ, ταῦτα ἔστω

where he spelled the same word correctly as **πλείοσι**. This stone-cutter either knew how to spell this word or he just had good luck. For he has spelled a number of other words wrongly.

\*\*\*

Inscription 170 (no date) has committed a mistake that is often committed in the inscriptions.

**ἡμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς εἴσπλουν καὶ ἔκπλουν εἰς Τῆλον ἀσυλὶ  
καὶ ἀσπονδὶ καὶ ἐμ πολέμῳ καὶ ἐν ἱράνα**

Here are several words spelled with an **ι** which should have been spelled with **ει**. The correct forms would have been:

**ἀσυλεῖ καὶ ἀσπονδεῖ καὶ ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ ἐν εἰράνα**

The combination of **ἐμ πολέμῳ** is quite understandable, since as is also the case in Neohellenic, **ν** before **π** is sounded as **μ**, cf. e.g. the Neohellenic word **ἐμπόλεμος** (“in war”), which is pronounced as “e<sup>m</sup>bolemos”, exactly the same pronunciation that the stone cutter used, which led him to spell **ν** as **μ**.

\*\*\*

## 2. Writing **ει** instead of **ι**

Exactly the opposite mistake occurs in *Inscription 111* from Olbia on the Euxeiros Pontos (= Black Sea). The text reads:

**ὕπὸ πάντων μὲν μαρτυρεῖται τῶν εἰς τὸ Πόντον πολειτᾶν**

As is well-known the last word must be spelled **πολιτᾶν** with **ι** instead of **ει**. This time the anorthographous scribe made the opposite mistake to the ones we have considered so far.



### 3. Writing η instead of ει

Here is another type of mistake: the stone-cutter wrote η for ει. In *Inscription 111* (Olbia) (no date), we read:

πολλὰ δὲ καὶ Βυζαντίων πόλει κατὰ τε τὰς δημοσίας χρήας

Here it is obvious that the inscription writer pronounced the η as ει, which in turn was pronounced as ι, since he wrote down η instead of ει. The correct form would have been: *χρείας*.



*Inscription 120* from the Apollon temple in Delos (II B.C.) confused ει with η: He wrote:

ἔς Δᾶλον ἑξαποστηλάντων

The correct spelling was:

ἔς Δᾶλον ἑξαποστειλάντων

And again, in the same inscription, he wrote:

ἔς Δᾶλον ἀποστηλάντων

Our friend betrayed how he pronounced his η.



### 4. Writing ο instead of ω

There are several inscriptions that have confused the **ο** with the **ω** or vice versa. Thus *Inscription 90* from Kerkyra writes:

**τὸν δὲ ταμίαν δόμεν τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα**

Although as the word **ἀνάλωμα** as well as other words in the inscription show, the **ω** was in full use at this time and the stone-cutter knew it, in writing **δόμεν** with an *omikron* he perpetrated an orthographic mistake. He should have written **δῶμεν!**

\*\*\*

Inscription 105 also mixes up *omikron* with *omega*. It reads:

**Ἐπὶ βασιλέος Διογένεος**

The omega is well-known to him, since he uses it many times, e.g. **Διοδώρου, Ἄστακῶν, δεομένω**. There is no doubt that he here made a mistake, because his memory did not assist him, and because his pronunciation did not differentiate between the **ο** from the **ω**.

\*\*\*

*Inscription 108* (dated to 197-159 B.C.) has mixed up the *omega* (**ω**) with the *omikron* (**ο**). It reads:

**ἐπειδὴ Ἰκέσιος Μητροδ[ώρου] Ἐφέσιος ὁ κατασταθεὶς ἐπ'  
Αἰγίνας ὑπ[ὸ τοῦ βασι]λέος Εὐμένεος**

Here the stone-cutter spelled the genitive **βασιλέος** wrongly with an **ο** instead of the correct **ω**. The reason for this mistake was that in the current pronunciation no differentiation was made between the two vowels.

\*\*\*

## Additions 10 March 2008

### 5. Writing η instead of ει

*Inscription* 180, dated to III-II B.C. confuses ει—which was pronounced as ι—with η.

εἶ τις κα κοινὸν ἀδικῆ

The correct form would have been ἀδικεῖ. Our stone-cutter pronounced the ει in the same way as he pronounced the η.



### 6. Confusing ι with ει

*Inscription* 224, dated to Roman times, confuses ι with ει:

Ἄρχοντας ἐν Στεῖρι

ἅ τε γενηθῖσα δουλαγωγία

The correct forms would have been γενηθεῖσα. The inscription maker obviously pronounced ει and ι in the same way. For the form Στεῖρι see the following inscription.



*Inscription* 223, dated to 192 B.C. confuses ι with ει several times:

Ὁμολογία τὰ πόλει Στειρίων ... Συνεπολίτευσαν Στείριοι ... εἶμεν τοὺς Μεδεωνίους πάντας Στιρίους ... μετὰ τὰς πόλιος τῶν Στιρίων ... μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν σταθέντων ἐν Στίρι ... λειτουργεῖν τοὺς Μεδεωνίους ἐν Στίρι ... ἐκ τῶν Στιρίων... πᾶσαν Στιρίαν ... τὰν θυσιᾶν τᾶν ἐν Στίρι ... Στίριοι τᾶν ἐν Μεδεῶνι πασᾶν... ἀπὸ τῶν Στιρίων μηδὲ τοὺς Στιρίους ... δόντων δὲ τοὶ Στίριοι

Here the reader can see how our stone-cutter constantly moves back and forth between spelling the ι-sound sometimes as εἰ and sometimes a ι.

\*\*\*

*Inscription 250* from Dodoni in Ipiros, confuses ι with εἰ:

καὶ νῦν καὶ ἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον

Here ἰς should have been spelled as εἰς.

\*\*\*

*Inscription 283* from Aigosthena near the boundary of Boiotia, dated to 223-192 B.C., also confuses εἰ with ι:

ὅτι τὰν ὁμόνοιαν διαφυλάττι

The verb διαφυλάττω in the third person singular, should be written as διαφυλάττει, with εἰ, not with ι as this inscription.

\*\*\*

## 7. Multiple Mistakes: **η** instead of **ει**, **ο** instead of **ω**, **ει** instead of **υι**, **υ** instead of **υί**

The long *Inscription* 148, of the III-II B.C., contains a long line of spelling mistakes, where the stone-cutter has confused several letters and diphthongs, because they were sounded indentially:

καὶ δόμεν τῷ κοινῷ should be spelled δῶμεν  
 ἐπιτετελεκεῖα should be ἐπιτετελεκυῖα  
 ἔστακεῖα should be ἔστακυῖα  
 συναγαγοχεῖα should be spelled συναγαγοχυῖα  
 ὁ τᾶς θυγατρὸς μου ὑὸς Ἄνδραγόρας should be spelled υἱός  
 τὰν ἀσφάλεινα δόμεν should be δῶμεν  
 κατὰ δὲ ὑοθεσίαν should be υἰοθεσίαν  
 ποτεῖριον should have been spelled as ποτήριον

This inscription shows that the mistakes were not occasional slips of the hand, but that these stone-cutters, not being experts in orthography, were liable to commit all sorts of mistakes, because in their writing they were guided by their living pronunciation.

## 8. More Multiple Mistakes: **ει** instead of **η**; **ι** instead of **ει**, **ο** instead of **ω**, and **ω** instead of **ο**.

*Inscription* 282 from Orchomenos in Boiotia probably of the III B.C., contains several types of mistakes:

Βοιωτοὶ τὸν τρίποδα ἀνέθεικαν. It should be ἀνέθηκαν  
 ἄρχοντος Σαμίαο Ἰσμεινικέταο Θειβήω should be  
 Ἰσμηνικέτου Θεβαίου  
 Θειβήω should be Θεβαίω  
 Καλλιγίτονος should be Καλλιγείτονος

Ἐροτίωνος should be Ἐρωτίωνος

Once again we see that the many orthographical mistakes in the inscriptions divulge to us the pronunciation of the ancients.

Additions 24 March 2008

## 9. Writing ο instead of ω

*Inscription 119* is a marble inscription from Krêtê that has been moved to Britain. It is dated to the III B.C. In line 37 the technician chiseled an ο in a word that should have been spelled with an ω. The text goes:

Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἠροῖ[κοῖ]ς καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἑορταῖς οἱ παρατυγχανόντες ἐρπόντων παρ' ἀλλάλος ἐς ἀνδρήϊον καθὼς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πολῖται

Although at a very early date the letter ο did serve for ο, for ου, and for ω, and the word ἀλλάλος may consequently be taken to stand for ἀλλήλους, and furthermore, the η in ἀνδρήϊον may be a survival of the earlier ε, which did work also for η, it is difficult to explain the ο in ἠροῖ[κοῖ]ς as an earlier form of ω before the ω was established, since the ω does occur in this inscription (several times). The spelling must be understood as a spelling mistake, in which the chiseller wrote ο instead of ω, on account of his pronunciation.



*Inscription 121* from Krêtê dating to the III B.C. contains the same mistake as the above inscription. The stone-cutter wrote the genitive of "grammateuv" with an o instead of with an w:

[B]ισιῶνος, γραμματέοϛ δὲ Φιλίππου τάδε ὠμόσαν

Although the stone-cutter was well aware of the existence and use of ω, he wrote ο in its place. The correct form is γραμματέωϛ.

\*\*\*

*Inscription 123* (undated) also makes the same mistake as the above. In line 30 it writes

βουλόμενοι χαρίζεσθαι Περδίκκα, δίδομεν

The correct spelling would have been δίδωμεν.

\*\*\*

*Inscription 125* similarly exchanges the correct ω for an incorrect ο:

βουλόμενοι χαρίζεσθαι Περδίκκα, δίδομεν ...

The word δίδομεν should have been spelled as δίδωμεν.

□□□

*Inscription 12* is a dedicatory inscription by the Plataeans to the Delphic Apollon. The list of names that it presents, contains mistakes not only in Σεκυονίοι but also in the name of the god to whom the inscription is dedicated: Ἀπόλλωνι.

The correct form of these names are: Σικυωνίοι and Ἀπόλλωνι.

\*\*\*

## 10. Writing ει instead of η

*Inscription 282* from Orchomenos has spelled several words wrong, having confused both ει in lieu of η, and ο in lieu of ω.

Βοιωτοὶ τὸ τρίποδα ἀνέθεικαν ... Ἴσμεινικέταο Θειβήω, ... Θειβήω Ἐρωτίωνος.

Since both η and ω do occur in this inscription, the mistakes must be due to pronunciation, not to another way of writing. Read ἀνέθηκαν, Ἴσμηνικέταο (-ου), Θειβήω Ἐρωτίωνος.

\*\*\*

## Additions 16 May 2009

The following inscription from Boiotia contains a many orthographical errors, the ει-ι or ι-ει exchange being very frequent.

Boiotia  
b. Akraiphioa  
c  
d p37p  
Ω 2745  
0030 001 2712 26

ἀπ' ἐκθέμ]ατος ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ, μηδ[ένα π]αραλιπῶν οὐ μόνον τῶν ἐνοί[κων] αὐτῶν, [ἀλ]λ' οὐδὲ τῶν παρεπι[δη]μού[ν]των ξένων σὺν παι-σὶν ἐ[λευ]θέροι<σ> καὶ τοῖς τῶν πολειτῶν δού[λοι]ς <δ>ι[ά] τὸ φιλόδοξον ἦθος. [παραλαβ]ῶν [δὲ] τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν μεγίστην [οὐ] διέλι[π]ε<γ> [ἐνδ]εικνύμενος τὴν μεγαλο-  
30

ψυχ[ί]αν· [ταυ]ρο[θυ]τήσα[ς γ]ὰρ τοῖ[σ] Σεβαστοῖς ἐ[πε]θείνησ[εν]  
μιᾶ ἡμέρα τὴν πόλιν ἐπιτελῶν [τ]ὸν λε[γ]όμενον πα 3 ἐν τ[ῷ]  
γυμνασίῳ, <ὡς> τὸ <ὑπερ[β]άλλον τῶν δαπανημάτων καὶ ἀδι[άλ]ει<π>το<ν> ο[ὐ] μόν->  
[ν]ον παρ' ἡμ[ῶ]ν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ταῖς πέρι<ξ> πόλεσιν θαυμ[ά]ζ<ε>σθαι. τοῦ τ[ε]

μεγίστου [κ]αὶ [σ]ώζοντος [ή]κμων τὴν χώραν χά[μ]ατος παραλελει<μ>[μένησ]

35

τῆς κον[ιά]σεως <ἐ>ν τῇ ἐγδόσει, τοῦ ὅλον ἐπισκε[υ]ασθῆναι καὶ κονι<α>θῆ-  
να[ι] μόνος προενόησε }N{ προσμείνας καὶ κατωρθώσατο ὑπὲρ ἐξ[ακισ]-  
χίλια δηνάρια οὔσης τῆς ἐπισκευῆς ἰς δώδεκα σταδίους. ἤδη δὲ τὸ μεγ[α]-  
λό[φ]ρον τῆς γνώμης ἐκτείνας καὶ [ἰσ] τὸ Βοιωτῶν ἔθνος, πρεσβίας

[ζη]του-

40

μένης πρὸς τὸν νέον Σεβαστὸν ἐν τῷ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Πανελλήνων  
συνεδρίῳ ἐν Ἄργει, πο[λλ]ῶν τε συνεληλυθότων εὐσχημόνων καὶ πρῶ-  
των ἐκ τῶν πόλεων καὶ πάντων ἀρνούμενων καὶ ἐπι[κ]αλουμένων, πάντ[α]  
ἐν ἐλάσσονι θέμενος τ[ὰ] ἑαυτοῦ προθυμότερα ἐπεδέξατο τὴν πρεσ-  
βίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Βοιωτῶν ἔθνους, προσθεὶς τῷ εὐ[γ]ενεῖ τοῦ φρονήματος [κ]αὶ τὸ

45

μεγαλόψυχον [εἰσ] ἄδωρ[ο]ν πρέσβευσιν. θαυμ[ασ]θί<ς> οὖν ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ἀπο-  
δοχῆς ἀξιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς Πανέλλησιν τειμᾶς ἔλαβεν, μαρτυρούμενος καὶ δι-  
ὰ τῆς [πεμ]φθίσης ἐπιστολῆς ὑπ' αὐτῶν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν. τελέσας  
δὲ τὴν πρεσβείαν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν καὶ τὸ ἀπόκριμα ἐνεκῶν παρὰ  
[Γαῖου Καίσαρος, τειμᾶς] ἔλαβεν μετὰ τῶν συμπρεσβευτῶν, τό τε κοινὸν

50

Παμβοιωτῶν συνέδριον ὑπομιμησκόμενον τὴν αὐτεπάγγελτον χάρι[ν]  
καὶ [εὖ]νοϊαν τειμᾶς ἐψηφίσαντο [τὰς] πρεπούσας καὶ ἀπέστειλαν πρὸ[σ]  
τὴν [πό]λιν [ή]μῶν, ἔπιτα δὲ κα<ι> ἄ[λ]κ[αι] πόλει[ς] καὶ κ[ῶ]μαι [ε]ὐχάριστον  
πρᾶγ<μ>α

[ποιούσ]αι καὶ αὐταὶ [ψηφίσ]μασιν κα[ὶ] πο]λειτεί[α] καὶ εἰκόνων [ἀναστάσει]  
[ἐ]τειμῆς}T{α[ν] {26[ἐ]τειμῆσα[ν]}26 <α>υτόν. ὑπερ[εβάλλετο] δὲ τῇ μεγαλοψυχίᾳ καὶ  
ἀρετῇ πάντας τοὺς

55

[προτέρους, τρέψασ] ἑαυτὸν πρὸς τὸ φιλόδοξον [καὶ] φιλάγαθον ταῖς [ἐπαλ]-  
λή[λ]οις δαπάναις, εἷς φιλόπατρις καὶ εὐεργέτης νομ[ιζ]όμενος· ἐγ[λε]λοιπό-  
τος γὰρ ἤδη τριάκοντα ἔτη τοῦ τῶν Πτωϊῶν ἀγῶνος, κατασταθῆς ἀγνοθέ-  
της προθυμότερα ἐπεδέξατο φιλοδοξήσας τὸ ἀνανεώσασθαι τὴν ἀρχα[ι]-  
ότητα τοῦ ἀγῶνος, τῶν μεγάλων Πτωϊῶν καὶ Καισαρήων κτίστης ἀνωθε

60

γενόμενος· ἀναλαβὼν τ[ε] τὴν ἀρχὴν εὐθέως ἐπετέλει τὰς θυσίας καὶ  
τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μαντεῖα ἐστιῶν ἄρχοντας καὶ συνέδρους κατ' ἔτος πεντά-  
[κ]ις μεγαλομερέσι δ[ίπ]νοις καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀριστί[ζ]ων ἐπὶ πενταε[τί]αν, μηδε-  
μίαν ὑπέρθεσιν ποιησάμενος ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις μήτε θυσίας μήτε δαπ[ά]-  
νης μηδέποτε. <ἐ>γσ[τ]άντος δὲ τοῦ ἀγῶνος τῷ ἔκτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ τὸ ἐπὶ πόλεος

65

διάδομ[α ἰσ] τὴν μέλλουσαν ἑορτὴν ἔδωκεν πᾶσι τοῖς πολεῖταις καὶ παροί-  
κοις καὶ ἐκτιμῆνοις διδοὺς κατ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστον κόφινον σείτου καὶ οἴνου  
ἡμί[ναν]. τ[ὰς] δὲ πατρίους πομπὰς μεγάλας καὶ τὴν τῶν συρτῶν πάτριον  
ὄρχησιν θεοσεβῶς ἐπετέλεσεν, [τ]αυροθυτήσας τε τ[οῖς] θεοῖς καὶ Σε-  
βαστοῖς κρεαδοσί[ας καὶ] ἄριστα καὶ γλυκισμοὺς καὶ δίπνα οὐ διέλιπεν ποιῶν

70

[καὶ] κατὰ τάξις ἀπὸ εἰκάδος μέχρι τριακάδος πρὸς ἑνπασι τοῖς ἀρίστοις  
παῖδας τοὺς τῶν πολε<ιτ>ῶν καὶ δούλους ἐνηλίκους τὰς τε γυναῖκας τῶν πολει-

τῶν ἢ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Νωτί α ἠρίστισεν καὶ παρθένους καὶ δούλας ἐνηλίκους· οὐ παρέλιπεν δὲ οὐδὲ [τοὺς] σκηνίτας καὶ συνκοσμοῦντας τὴν ἑορτήν, ἠρίστισεν δὲ [αὐ]τοὺς ἀπ' ἐ[κ]θέματος κατ' ἰδίαν, ὃ μηδεὶς ἄλλος τῶν προτέρων ἐποίησεν, μηδένα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ φιλανθρωπίας βουλόμενος ἄμ[ο]ιρον γενέσθαι· ἔν τε [τ]αῖ[σ] γεινομέναις θεωρίαις τοῦ θυμελικοῦ πάντας τοὺς [θε]ωμένους καὶ τοὺς συνελθόντας ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων ἐγλύκισεν ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, [πέ]μματά [τε] ἐποίησεν μεγάλα καὶ πολυτελῆ, ὡς διάκουστα καὶ ἐν ταῖς πέριξ πόλεσιν τὰ δαπανήματα αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι· ἔν τε τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ ἀγῶνος μ[ε]-  
80

τὰ τὸ πάνδημον δῖπνον [τὴν] ἀρχ[ὴ]ν ἄνωθεν πάλιν ποιούμενος τῆς δαπ[ά]νη[σ] κατὰ τρίκλεινον διαδόματα ἔδωκεν [ἔ]νδεκα δ<η>ναρίων, καὶ [κε]ρά<μ>ιον οἴνου παλαιοῦ [καὶ] δηνάρια ἐξ ἱς [ἐπ]όψημα τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς δαπά[ν]ης. μετὰ δὲ τὴν πάντων τούτων συντέλειαν καταβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν πανδημ[ε]ῖ [ἀ]πήνησαν οἱ [πο]λεῖται  
85

πᾶσαν φιλοτειμίαν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἐνδεικ[νύ]μενοι· ὁ δὲ μὴ [ἐκ]λαθόμενος τῆς ἑαυτοῦ μεγαλοφροσύνης ταυροθυτήσας Διὶ τῷ Μεγίστῳ ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως παραχρήμα εἰστ[ία]σεν τοὺς συν[ελ]θόντας ἐπὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν· ὅθεν ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ μεγαλοψύχους καὶ [φι]λο[πά]τριδας ταῖς προσηκούσαις τειμαῖς τε καὶ  
90

δωρεαῖς προσῆκόν ἐστιν κοσμουμένους μαρτ<υ>ρῖσθαι· δι' ἃ δὴ πάντα ἔδοξεν τοῖς τε ἄρχουσι καὶ συνέδροις καὶ τῷ δήμῳ ἐ[π]αινέσαι [μ]ὲν τὸν προειρημένον ἄνδρα Ἐπαμεινώνδαν ἐφ' ἣ πρὸς τ[ὴ]ν πατρίδα ἔ[σ]χ[ηκ]εν ἐκτενεῖ εὐνοία καὶ πρὸς τὸ Βοιωτῶν ἔθνος μεγαλοψυχία συνκοσμῶν καὶ τὴν πατρίδα τῇ  
95

πρεσβείᾳ, στεφανῶ[σ]αι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ καὶ εἰκό[ν]-[ι γραπτῆ, τύχ]η τῇ ἀγαθῇ, τοὺς τε μετὰ <τα>ῦτα κατασταθησομένους [ἀγω]-νοθ[έ]τασ] ἐν [τ]οῖς ἐπιτελεσθησομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀγῶσιν [κα]λεῖν αὐτὸν ἱς [προε]δρία[ν] καθάπερ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους εὐεργέτας, ἴν[α τού]των οὕτω συντελουμέν[ων] ἢ πόλις ἡμῶν εὐχάριστος φαίν<η>ται πρὸς  
100