These fragments, known collectively as the *Didascaliae*, appear to be part of a long inscription—perhaps better conceived of as a set of four inscriptions—that offered complete records for performances in tragedy and comedy at the City Dionysia and the Lenaea, including non-competitive events. Preserved dateable portions extend from 421/0 BCE (*IG II² 2319* Col. III; tragedy at the Lenaea) to sometime in the 140s or 130s BCE (*IG II² 2323*; comedy at the Dionysia). The series of at least four hands in *IG II² 2323* makes it clear that these inscriptions—like *IG II² 2318* and 2325—were updated from time to time.

The records for each year all begin with the dating formula ἐπὶ + archon-name in the genitive. For the Dionysia, notices of non-competitive events (satyr plays and “old” tragedies, on the one hand, and “old” comedies, on the other, with authors’ names and titles, and actors’ names, where appropriate) follow. Competitive results are given next, with the first-place poet and his title or titles listed first, along with his actor or actors; followed by the second-place poet and his title or titles and actor or actors; and so forth. The final line gives the name of the victorious actor. There is no mention of *chorêgoi*. Years in which no competition was held receive the summary notice ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνα οὐκ ἐγένετο.

The backs of a number of fragments of the *Didascaliae* survive and are all rough-picked, showing that they were not intended to be seen; the original thickness of the stones, where preserved, varies between 0.192 (*IG II² 2323* fr. i+b+c/d) and 0.237 (*IG II² 2323a*). A wall with smooth interior and exterior faces, produced by setting two such blocks back to back with the rough faces inward, will have had a minimum thickness of ca. 0.385, but probably greater, to which must be added some quantity of interior rubble fill. The architrave blocks on the interior of which *IG II² 2325* (the Victors Lists) is inscribed, were intended to be seen from both sides, as the presence of moldings and a dedicatory inscription on the exterior make clear; the original thickness of the architrave was 0.365–0.366 (frs. o’ and q respectively). Reisch (1907) 303–5, argued that the blocks on which the *Didascaliae* and the Victors Lists were inscribed were all part of a single structure, and his thesis has been widely accepted. But the architrave blocks are too small to cover the walls on which they are supposed to have rested, and the Victors Lists must in fact belong to a different monument (for the shape of which, see *IG II² 2325* general introductory remarks).¹

Some sense of the size of the wall or structure on which the *Didascaliae* were inscribed can be got from the dimensions of the blocks (which can be calculated by analysis of the preserved borders and connected columns of *IG II² 2323*) and the approximate number of columns the complete catalogue must have required. Fr. f of *IG II² 2323* (which contains portions of Cols. I and II) preserves a left-hand margin, which runs down the middle of Col. I; fr. a (which contains part of Col. III) preserves an upper margin; and fr. h (which contains part of Col. VI) preserves an upper and a right-hand margin. Frs. i + b + c/d

¹ This objection, conclusive by itself, leaves aside the additional question of whether the wall space available in Reisch’s reconstruction would have been sufficient to contain the *Didascaliae* if they were in any sense complete; for an estimate of the space required, see below. Supposing that only one face of the wall, e.g. the interior, was inscribed still results in the rejection of Reisch’s theory: the problem of insufficient space for the inscription is exacerbated, and the blocks for the uninscribed face cannot have been substantially less thick than the extant inscribed examples without the wall losing its structural integrity.
contains upper portions of cols. II–V, all of which must have been inscribed across a single block (hereafter “Block 1”); since fr. f contains part not just of Col. II but of the right-hand side of Col. I, this portion of Col. I must have been inscribed on Block 1 as well. The right-hand margin on fr. h can scarcely belong to a different block, and Block 1 must thus have contained 5½ columns of text. Of the six columns partially preserved on Block 1, Col. III extends the lowest and contains 50 lines of text (almost entirely in Hand 3), which represents the minimum height of the block.\footnote{This reconstruction is consistent with the placement and dimensions of frs. g + e below. Frs. g + e contain portions of cols. III and IV; only the first half of the lines in Col. IV are preserved. The lowest line preserved on fr. g + e is the 100th line on Col. III (still in Hand 3). While no margins survive on frs. g + e, therefore, what is preserved is consistent with the existence of another block (“Block 2”) the size of Block 1, below it and set plinthedon-style three columns to its left, and containing 50 lines of text or slightly more.} If the Didascaliae were comprehensive—and we have no reason to believe that they were not—they would have occupied 70 columns of text or more, even at 130 lines per column. This would require a wall or set of walls equal in length to at least twelve large blocks of the sort reconstructed above, and at least three blocks high.

IG II\textsuperscript{2} presents the fragments of the Didascaliae in an order seemingly chosen with typographical considerations to the fore. We organize them instead by festival and genre, in the same (in this case largely arbitrary) order as within IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2325: tragedy at the Dionysia (IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2320); comedy at the Dionysia (IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2323a; 2323); comedy at the Lenaea (IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2319 col. I; 2322; 2321); and tragedy at the Lenaea (IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2319 cols. II–III; SEG XXVI 203).