

DAVID WHITEHEAD

FIVE (?)UNPUBLISHED GREEK INSCRIPTIONS IN H. P. BORRELL'S NOTEBOOK  
(*ZPE* 131, 80–82): ADDENDUM

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 132 (2000) 161–162

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



FIVE (?) UNPUBLISHED GREEK INSCRIPTIONS IN H. P. BORRELL'S NOTEBOOK  
(*ZPE* 131, 80–82): ADDENDUM

Four at most, it turns out. I did predict that '[i]f . . . readers of *ZPE* can recognize any or all of them as published items, that will be very much in line . . . with the rest of Borrell's material'; and Dr Richard Catling, Assistant Editor of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Oxford, has been quick (as well as courteous) in notifying me that my no. 1, at any rate, bears the prediction out. I am indebted both to Dr Catling and, still more, to his Oxford colleague Dr Charles Crowther, Administrator of the Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents, for most of the information which here follows. This four-man gravestone – now in the Louvre (Louvre 817) – was published (in majuscule) by Philippe Le Bas; it is no. 1362 in the uncompleted second volume of *Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*. It was republished (still in majuscule) by M. G. Demitsas, *H MAKEΔONIA EN ΛΙΘΟΙΣ ΦΘΕΓΓΟΜΕΝΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΜΝΗΜΕΙΟΙΣ ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΟΙΣ* (Athens 1896: reprinted as *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum et Latinarum Macedoniae*, Chicago 1980) I 152, no. 557. And it has recently been cited by A. B. Tataki, *Macedonian Edessa: Prosopography and Onomastikon* (Athens 1994) 29–30, no. 5 ('Αθήα Σάμου), and *passim*; she dates it to the second century BC.<sup>1</sup>

Nor does my embarrassment end there. I saw fit to comment on the particular interest of this stone (for a discrepancy in nomenclature familiar to students of Alexander the Great) in proffering the name Dimnos in a Macedonian context. Tataki's book was reported, in 1995, in both SEG and BE. SEG 44.527 mentions the special onomastic interest of (*inter alia*) Dimnos, and this leads to the name being in the volume's index (where I ought to have noticed it). And as to BE 1995, no. 175, O. Masson is explicit: 'On notera une rareté, le masculin Δίμνος (no. 79 au IIa), lequel vient utilement confirmer l'exemple littéraire, chez Plutarque, *Alexandre* 49, et Diodore XVII, 79 (on a parfois préféré "Λίμνος").' It is therefore Professor Masson, not I, who deserves whatever credit should attach to bringing together these two strands of bibliography.<sup>2</sup>

The matter cannot quite be allowed to end there, however, when the stone's provenance is uncertain. According to Tataki 29: '[i]t has been attributed to Thessalonike, to Macedonia in general and to Asia Minor; its origin from Edessa was recently confirmed by official sources of the Louvre. The rarity of the name Σάμος is added as a further indication of an attribution of it to this city (cf. Samos Chrysogonou, reign of Philip V).'

Asia Minor as the provenance appears to derive from Froehner's catalogue entry for the stone: 'trouvée en Asie Mineure et donnée, en 1833, par M. Despréaux de Saint-Sauveur, consul à Salonique' (W. Froehner, *Les inscriptions grecques* (Paris 1865) 255–6, no. 146). This stands in flat and unexplained contradiction to the attribution to Thessalonike in Le Bas (and, following him, Demitsas). The 'official sources of the Louvre' consulted by Tataki disagree with Froehner and Le Bas alike, but do support Le Bas to the extent of looking to Macedonia and not Asia Minor; cf. also, in that regard, J. Charbonneaux, *La sculpture grecque et romaine au Musée du Louvre* (Paris 1963) 118, no. 817.

If then Macedonia could be regarded as a given, and the real choice, within it, the choice between Thessalonike or Edessa, there would seem to be two arguments for each. In favour of Edessa are:

(1) Tataki's point (quoted above) about the name Samos. But I venture to say that it is not a very strong point, since on her own showing (Tataki 81 n. 9) the name is fairly common – albeit not, admittedly, within Macedonia.

<sup>1</sup> Dr Tataki was kind enough to send me a copy of her book – hereinafter Tataki – while I was already digesting the observations of Drs Catling and Crowther; so my thanks go to her too. See further below.

<sup>2</sup> Tataki 83 confined herself to commenting that '[t]he name Δίμνος borne by a Friend of Alexander the Great is . . . rare'.

(2) What Tataki's Louvre sources told her. This could well be crucial, and Dr Tataki has been good enough to elucidate as best she could (letter of 12 September 2000): 'Prof. M. B. Hatzopoulos, our Director, was informed by Mrs Amyot-Fuentes, who is (or was) working at the Louvre, that she had found the information about Edessa in the records of the Museum; as I understand it, she was or still is working on a new catalogue of the inscriptions of the Louvre.' On learning this I immediately contacted the Louvre myself, in the hope of discovering more about this scholar and her work; but I have drawn a blank.

Unless and until it has become clear that there is solid documentary evidence, at the Louvre, to refute what was said in Froehner's 1865 catalogue (and other indicators of provenance), we must, I think, take seriously the two considerations that appear to weigh in favour of attributing Louvre 817 not to Edessa but to Thessalonike. One, as Dr Catling reminds me, is that Chalastra, named by Plutarch as the home city of Alexander's friend (D)imnos (Plut. *Alex.* 49: Χαλαίστρα), was one of the cities which, a decade later, were subsumed under Cassander's new foundation at the head of the Thermaic Gulf (Strab. 7 fr. 21): Thessalonike.<sup>3</sup> And the other is that, as we now know, the attribution to Thessalonike can be traced back beyond Le Bas: to the epigraphical notebook, filled in the 1820s and 30s, of H. P. Borrell.

The Queen's University of Belfast

David Whitehead

---

<sup>3</sup> To be explicit: this would link the only two men (prior to late antiquity: John Malalas, *Chronographia* 433–4 tells of one during the reign of Justinian) known to have borne the name Dimnos.