

DAVID WHITEHEAD

FIVE (?)UNPUBLISHED GREEK INSCRIPTIONS IN H. P. BORRELL'S NOTEBOOK

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 131 (2000) 80–82

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## FIVE (?) UNPUBLISHED GREEK INSCRIPTIONS IN H. P. BORRELL'S NOTEBOOK

In *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 99C (1999) 73–113 ('From Smyrna to Stewartstown: A numismatist's epigraphic notebook') I proffered a general study of an anonymous nineteenth-century notebook which contains annotated transcripts of 212 ancient inscriptions, predominantly Greek, from the eastern Mediterranean. The chief aims of that study were twofold: (a) to identify the notebook's original compiler, and (b) to explain how the book came to light in a small country town in Northern Ireland. As regards a, I was able to show that the book had been owned and filled by Henry Perigal Borrell (1795–1851), best known as an amateur scholar of numismatics and a supplier of coins to the British Museum, via the Bank of England. As to b, the crucial link turned out to be the relationship between Borrell and Revd Dr James Kennedy Bailie (1793–1864), classical scholar, and rector of a Church of Ireland parish only a few miles north of Stewartstown. From Smyrna Borrell sent Bailie his book, and the unscrupulous Bailie repaid this generosity by plagiaristically publishing many of its contents in the second and third volumes (London & Dublin 1846–1849) of his *Fasciculus inscriptionum Graecarum*.

My ultimate identification of H. P. Borrell as the notebook's original owner and compiler naturally stemmed, in large part, from the process of tracking down the transcriptions themselves. The results of that process are summarized in the Appendix (101–13) to the article above-mentioned, and they appear there with a level of detail appropriate to an Academy journal not intended for readers with a special interest or expertise in epigraphy. By the same token, I did not dwell for long there on the fact that my search for these documents in the public domain had proved successful in 207 out of the 212 instances but had failed in a stubbornly residual five. These five stones are my concern here. If, on seeing them presented more fully, readers of *ZPE* can recognize any or all of them as published items, that will be very much in line, as indicated, with the rest of Borrell's material. If not, let this be their (long-delayed) publication.

1. [no. 14 in the book, on its p. 24] 'Sepulchral inscription from Thessalonica'.

ΑΔΗΑΙ ΘΡΑΣΩΝΙ ΑΔΗΑΙ ΘΡΑΣΩΝΙ  
ΣΑΜΟΥ ΔΙΜΝΟΥ ΑΡΧΕΔΑΟΥ ΑΡΧΕΔΑΟΥ

Not in IG X.2, or anywhere else that I can discover. Evidently a grave monument for four men, two of them brothers and presumably all four inter-related: Adeas Samou, Thrason Dimnou, Adeas Archedaou, Thrason Archedaou. The patronymic of the last two, the brothers, obviously invites correction to Archelaou, though the transcript's Δ (not Λ) is unequivocal for both; see further below. Concerning the other names:

(i) The η version of Adeas, appearing twice as it does, should probably be accepted; compare, nevertheless, the anomalous ΔΡΑΚΟΝΤΙΣ ΜΗΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ elsewhere in the notebook (no. 123, on its p. 116).

(ii) Dimnos is an extremely rare name: cf. perhaps Διμν- on an Athenian graffito, Agora 21. F206a; but in the present context its most noteworthy bearer is the Macedonian *philos* of Alexander the Great, one of the minor players in the Conspiracy of Philotas episode (see in brief e.g. H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* I–II (Munich 1926) no. 269; A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, I (Oxford 1980) 359–61). 'Dimnos', at any rate, is that individual's name according to Diod. Sic. 17. 79; Plut. *Alex.* 49 has 'Limnos'. The latter was championed by K. Ziegler, *Plutarchstudien*, *RhM* 84 (1935) 369–90, at 378–9 (reversing his earlier preference), but the case for 'Dimnos' ('Dymnus' in Curt. Ruf. 6. 7. 6–13) even without a parallel is well made, in brief, by J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch, Alexander: A commentary* (Oxford 1969) 135. The existence of a Thrason Dimnou in Thessalonike might now seem to confirm Diodorus' version beyond

doubt. I note merely the tiresome (as well as ironic) fact that, in the inscription too, Δ/Λ discrepancies may arise. (See above, on Archedaos/Archelaos. By contrast Adeas – rather than Aleas – one would regard as secure.)

2. [no. 109 in the book, on its p. 112] ‘on another’ (*sc.* ‘votive altar’ in Kos, from the journal of David Ross of Bladensburg [on whom see generally D. Whitehead, David Ross of Bladensburg: A nineteenth-century Ulsterman in the Mediterranean, *Hermathena* 164 (1998) 89–99]).

ΓΝΑΙΟΥΠΟΛΛΙΟΥΦΟΡΙΟΥ

Bailie's annotation, on the facing page (p. 111): ‘Γναίου Πολλίουφορίου? Πολλίου Φουρίου? Ποπλίου? Vid. Bö. n. 2518’. But in fact *CIG* 2518 (subsequently W. R. Paton & E. L. Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos* (Oxford 1891) no. 316), a grave monument for <Φ>ουρία Λευκίου [lapis Θ], does not help much; and ‘Ποπλίου?’, a second praenomen, would be very odd. I venture to think that Gnaios Pollios Pho(u)rios is unproblematical enough: cf. Gnaios Pollios Zenon, son of Gnaios Pollios Kallisstos (sic), on an imperial-period grave monument from Aphrodisias (Th. Reinach, *REG* 19 (1906) 277–9, no. 172 → D. F. McCabe, *Caria Aphrodisias* (Princeton 1989) no. 527).

3. [no. 127 in the book, on its p. 118] ‘Another, on a marble Column at Cos’.

ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΜΕΝΙΠΠΟΥ ΣΕΛΤΕΥΣ

Presumably a grave monument. Though Σελτεύς is perfectly clear in the transcript, I have suggested that this must be an error – whether by the mason or the copyist – for Σελγεύς; and indeed Bailie's miniscule version on the facing page (p. 117) has Σελγεύς without comment. For another T which must be Γ see below, item 5.

This stone (and the individual it commemorates) cannot, as transcribed, be the same as the oft-published grave monument Μενάνδρου Σελγέως, from Avlana: P. M. Fraser & G. E. Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands* (Oxford 1954) 42 no. 29, whence SEG 14. 706; W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften der Rhodischen Peraia* (Bonn 1991) no. 241; J. Nollé & F. Schindler, *Die Inschriften von Selge* (Bonn 1991) no. 43.

4. [no. 146 in the book, on its p. 128] ‘In a Street at Lyndus’.

ΜΑΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ

ΜΥΡ:ΑΙΟΣ

Again, presumably a grave monument. Bailie's comments (p. 127) are confined to the form of the ethnic: ‘Μυράιος, id est, Myrensis Lyciae, dicitur, quod in nummis apparet Μυρέυς. Vide [J. H. von] Eckh[el], *Doctrina numorum veterum* (Vienna 1792–98)] III. 5. a.’. Μυράιος (which even Steph. Byz. *Ethnika*, s.v., does not countenance) is still, to the best of my knowledge, unparalleled; and Μυρέυς is the standard form on inscriptions as well as on coins.

The colon-like sign : seems to be something Borrell employed, on occasion at any rate, for a letter or letters which he (or his informant, if the transcript was not his own) could not make out at all or regarded as lost: see e.g. the opening of the notebook's no. 129 (on its p. 120), ΕΠΙΜΟ:ΑΡΧΟΥ ΝΙΚΟΦΡΟΝΟΣ (ἐπὶ μο[ν]άρχου Νικόφρονος, Paton–Hicks no. 387). Did he therefore regard the ethnic in the present instance as Μυρ[-]αίος? Bailie evidently disregarded that possibility, but we should not follow him, when Μυρ[ι]αίος would so neatly solve the problem.

5. [no. 151 in the book, on its p. 132] ‘On an ancient tomb at Tatza, on the continent opposite Rhodes’.

ΓΝΟΙΑΣΘΡΑΣΥΚΛΕΟΣΘΥΓΑΤΡΟΣΙΑΣΟΝΟΣΔΕΤΥΚΑΙΚΟΣ

That is, ]γνοιίας Θρασυκλέος θυγατρός, Ίάσονος δὲ γυναικός. (The two consonantal errors in the word γυναικός are more likely to be those of the copyist than of the mason.) I dot the first preserved letter, the gamma, of the deceased woman's name because it appears to have been transcribed with circumspection. And Bailie, doubtless prompted by that, comments (p. 131): ‘Fortasse Εὐπλοίας etc.

Nomen habemus in Antiphelleus. Fellows n. 180 p. 421'. In fact, elsewhere in Asia Minor too. Certainly a proper name Agnoia seems inconceivable. But a suggestion better than Bailie's – in preserving the clear NOIAΣ of the transcript – would, I believe, be E]ΥNOIAΣ. For that, as a woman's name, cf. e.g. IG XII.1. 967.

I have noted that this stone is not in either of the two recently-published corpora of putative relevance, Blümel's *IRhodPer* (cited fully above, under item 3) or Alain Bresson's *Recueil des inscriptions de la Pérée Rhodienne* (Paris 1991). Prof. Michael Crawford points out to me that provided Borrell's 'Tatza' is, as it surely seems to be, the 'Datça' of Fraser and Bean (cited fully above, under item 3) 64, it is part of Knidian territory; apparently, indeed, the site of Old Knidos itself. But one draws a blank with *Die Inschriften von Knidos* (W. Blümel, Bonn 1992) too.

For δέ in this context cf. e.g. Paton–Hicks no. 177: Καλλινίκης τῆς Ἠγεστράτου, Ἡλιοδώρου δὲ γυναικός (and where the marital relationship comes first, *I.Knidos* no. 428: ]λοθέας Τιμακλεῦς γυναικός, ]ίσκου δὲ θυγατρός).