In 1876 Kumanudis edited a fragment, found at Athens, of an inscription which he identified with the text of a treaty which Thucydides had reproduced in Book V, ch. 47. The fragment is only a small one but it can easily be supplemented with the help of Thucydides, and the text thus amplified has found its way into the Corpus and practically all anthologies 1), not on account of the importance of its content alone but especially because it gives an opportunity to check from an authentic example Thucydides' working methods in respect of official acts 2). The differences between Thucydides and the inscription have been studied as far as the fragmentary nature of the inscription allows it. They are slight, to be sure; yet far-reaching observations regarding the nature of classical historiography have been derived from the fact that the classical writer did not copy, or have copied, the original text so accurately as modern writers would 3). I shall not deal with that question here. It is my intention rather to investigate the problem (a) whether the inscription has been correctly supplemented, and (b) whether Thucydides or his copyist had before him the text of the inscription or another text. I shall confine myself to the first part, because it contains some difficulties which justify the question whether the text as it appears in I.G. I² and elsewhere must be regarded as the authentic one.

1) Kumanudis, 'Αθηναίων V, 333; I. G. I² 86; von Scala, Griech. Staatsverträge, 87; Marcus N. Tod, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions (Oxford 1933) 72; Nachmanson, Historische Altische Inschriften, 17.
2) Cp. commentaries on Thucydides, esp. Classen-Steup, Anhang Bk V; Kirchhoff, Thukydides und sein Urkundenmaterial (Berlin 1895); W. Kolbe, Thukydides im Lichte der Urkunden (Stuttgart 1930).
First of all I will set down the text as given there

"Αργείον Μαντινέαν 'Ελείσ[ο]ν

[Σπονδάς ἐποίησαντο ἱεκατόν Ἀθηναίοι ἦτε καὶ Ἀργείοι καὶ Μαντινές καὶ 'Ελείοι] πρὸς ἀλλὰς 1 // [ὑπὲρ σφόν αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν χρυσάμχον ἦν ἄρχοσι ἱεκάτεροι, ἄδολος καὶ ἄβλαβες καὶ] κατὰ γέν τοι καὶ κα[τὰ θάλατταν. ἡσύχα δὲ μὲ ἔχοισαι ἐπιφέρεν ἐπὶ πεμονεὶ μέτε Ἀργείος καὶ 'Ελείος καὶ Μαντινέας καὶ

5 Μαντινέας // καὶ τὸς χρυσάμχος ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίος καὶ τὸς χρυσάμχος ἦν ἄρχοσι Ἀθηναίοι, μέτε Ἀργείος καὶ τὸς χρυσάμχος // [συμμάχος ἦν ἄρχοι Ἀθηναίοι ἐπὶ Ἀργείος καὶ 'Ελείος καὶ Μαντινέας καὶ τὸς χρυσάμχος, τέχνει // μεθὲ μεχανεί μεθεματί. ν. ν. κατὰ τάδε χρυσάμχος ἕνα 'Ἀθηναίος καὶ Ἀργείος καὶ Μαντινέας καὶ 'Ελ [εἰς ἱεκατόν ἐτε. ἔδων πολέμιοι ἱσον ἐς τέν γέν τεν Ἀθηναῖον, βοεθεὶς Ἀργείος καὶ Μαντινέας καὶ // 'Ελείος Ἀθηναίες, καθὸτι ἄν ἐπαγγέλλοι 'Ἀθηναίοι, τρόποι οὗτοι οὐν δύονται ἵσχυσι]οταὶ κατὰ τὸ // [δύνατον κ.τ.λ.

The differences from Thucydides’ text are slight. In the latter the superscription is naturally lacking; furthermore, in para. 2 πρὸς ἀλλὰς; in para. 2 he writes ἐξέστω instead of ἔχεισαι (in inscriptions, too, infinitive and imperative are interchanged); in para. 2 ἕν ἄρχουσι Ἀθηναίοι is lacking; in para. 3 Thucydides writes Ἡλείους καὶ Μαντινέας and once more in the same, ἔς for ἐπί and ὅπατος for ὅτα."