INSCRIPTIONS COPIED BY COCKERELL IN GREECE.

I HAVE been requested to examine a MS. collection, bound in two volumes, and entitled *MS. Inscriptions collected in Greece by C. R. Cockerell, 1810-14*.¹ A fuller description of the contents is added on the title page, apparently by the hand of the collector himself—'*Inscriptions collected in various parts of Greece by C. R. Cockerell, from the year 1810-14; they were copied from the original manuscripts in this form by Signor Amati, in Rome, in 1815, and examined by Mr. Akerblad, who made all the notes and corrections in red ink. Mr. Walpole has made copies of those marked "Cd.," and has noted those already in print.*' It is evident, therefore, that we have here documents of considerable importance, especially as all trace of the original manuscripts referred to has been lost. Signor Amati, the transcriber, seems to have done his work with great care and accuracy, even the forms of letters being, in most cases, faithfully preserved. A comparison with other independent transcriptions from the same originals will soon show that we may rely on his copying; where mistakes occur, they are almost always such as would arise from indistinctness on the stone itself. This statement is of importance, for other transcribers, whether

¹ [On the occasion of one of his lectures at University College, Mr. Newton asked his auditors to let him see any MS. collections of inscriptions lying in private possession of which they might be aware, such collections having been commonly made by English travellers in past times, and often merely laid aside. As a result of this request, Mrs. Frederick Cockerell sent

to Mr. Newton the collection here described of inscriptions copied by her father-in-law, Mr. C. R. Cockerell. The laborious and somewhat unattractive task of investigating whether these inscriptions were unpublished, or whether they amended existing texts, was undertaken, on behalf of the editors of this journal, by Mr. E. A. Gardner. *Ed.*]

independent or immediately deriving their material from this book, often show a carelessness which can easily be corrected by a reference to it, and which has, in many cases, affected the copies preserved in the *Corpus* itself.

The book contains 240 inscriptions in all, of which some fifty, probably, are as yet unpublished. This computation may have to be modified, but is confirmed by a more careful search for the earlier ones. The rest afford considerable material for correction of the copies preserved in the *Corpus* and elsewhere, but are hardly, in most cases, worth separate publication.¹ They enable us, also, to check the accuracy of copies derived immediately from this book, especially those of Walpole; and such a check is by no means superfluous. For instance, in *C.I.G.* 391, derived from Walpole, common forms are given throughout; in this book we find ΑΑ, Δ, λ, ζ, ε; again, in *C.I.G.* 464, the distinctive forms Α, ε, λ, ς, ω, are completely lost. One more instance under this head may suffice. In *C.I.G.* 1593, Walpole represents Cockerell as giving ΒΟΙΩΤΩΝΤΑ . . . ΟΔΑΝ; he really has ΒΟΙΩΤΩΝΤΑ . . . ΤΟΔΑΑΝ, thus being nearer to the true reading Βοιωτοὶ τὸν τρίποδα ἀνέθεικαν; here, in ΩΝ, Walpole has given as resting on good authority a false and misleading emendation, which is written in red ink above the line in Cockerell's book. It is therefore clear that a careful collation is advisable in the case of all inscriptions in the *Corpus* derived from this source.

Another question arises which cannot be fully answered until more of our material has been published. Many English travellers of the beginning of the present century seem to have examined this book of Cockerell's; Akerblad, Walpole, and Leake, have all left traces of their revision in it; and some of these drew from it the inscriptions which they published. How far others may have done the same is not yet clear; but in *C.I.G.* 1707, for instance, a transcription quoted in the *Corpus* as made directly by Hughes from the stone, shows too many correspondences, even in mistakes, with Cockerell's version for us to believe the two versions are independent. In l. 6, for instance, Hughes gives ΑΝΕΙΛΗΠΤΟΝ for ΑΝΕΦΑΠΤΟΝ: now Cockerell has ΑΝΕΙΑΠΤΟΝ, differing only from the true reading

¹ A collation with published copies has been made in the case of all not here reproduced.

by the omission of part of the ϕ : but over the line is written the very emended form given by Hughes in his copy. This fact, which is not isolated, tends to throw serious doubts on the independent value of such copies. Perhaps it will be worth while later to return to this question; for the present, this indication will suffice.

Specimens follow of such inscriptions as are new, and, therefore, worthy of reproduction; some are included which materially increase already published inscriptions. These specimens comprise all that were found upon the mainland of Greece, and are taken from the first sixty examples in Cockerell's book. A complete list of these follows. An asterisk is placed against those reproduced below.

1 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 336	23 = Le Bas and Wad.	40 = Le Bas and Wad.
2 = „ 373	II. 12	II. 806
3 = „ 471	(24 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 2139)	41 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 1620
*4 Unpublished ¹	25 = Le Bas and Wad.	42 = „ 1608
*5 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 300	II. 453	43 = „ 1689
6 = „ 464	*26 Unpublished	44 = „ 1715
7 = „ 177	*27 „	45 = „ 1721
*8 Unpublished	*28 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 1632	46 = „ 1694
9 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 830	29 = „ 1579	47 = „ 1716
*10 Unpublished	30 = „ 1663	48 = „ 1707
11 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 917	31 = „ 1564	49 = „ 1764
12 = „ 653	32 = „ 1593	50 = „ 1297
13 = „ 660	33 Rang. <i>Ant. Hell.</i> 1315.	*51 Unpublished
14 = Kumanudes, 3251	34 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 1574	*52 „
15 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 958	35 = Le Bas and Wad.	*53 „
16 = „ 808	II. 603	54 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 1501
17 = „ 610	36 = Le Bas and Wad.	55 = „ 1504
*18 Unpublished	II. 601	56 = „ 1187
19 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 438	37 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 1628	57 = „ 1186
*20 Unpublished	38 = „ 1595	58 = „ 1184
21 = <i>C.I.G.</i> 386	39 = „ 1596	59 = „ 1183
22 = „ 391		60 = „ 1185

Before proceeding to the inscriptions themselves, I need only add that a few marks, both in pencil and red ink, are

¹ Inscriptions not to be found in the new or old *Corpus*, in Le Bas and Waddington, in Kumanudes' *Sepulchral Inscriptions*, in Rangabé's *Antiquités Helléniques*, &c., are here treated as unpublished. I have also referred

to periodicals, where I had any clew to guide me; but a complete and systematic search through all these would have been laborious and almost impracticable.

found in the book as well as Amati's copies: but these are seldom, if ever, more than obvious restorations, and do not seem to have any authority from the original manuscripts, or other sources. Signor Amati has sometimes recorded in *Italian* both the place of finding and other details; these have been, in every case, reproduced below. Inconsistencies in his copies, especially when two forms of a letter occur in the same inscription, have also been as far as possible preserved.

4. ΖΩΣΙΜΗΚΑΛΛΙΝΙΚΟΥΜΙΛΗΣΙΑ
ΦΩΚΙΩΝΟΣΟΤΡΥΝΕΩΣΕΥΝΗ

Ζωσίμη Καλλινίκου Μιλησία
Φωκίωνος Ὀτρυνέως [γ]υνή

The name Ζωσίμη seems to have been common among Milesians; cf. *C.I.G.* 711, 712, 714. For the question whether Miletus ranked as a deme of Athens, and the Milesians as Athenian citizens, cf. Boeckh, *ibid.* 692. A discussion of more recent opinions upon the subject is given by Mr. Hicks (*Brit. Mus. Inscriptions*, I. p. 150). It seems that Milesians, though very numerous at Athens, had no peculiar rights of citizenship; even the form of the inscription, with the local name in the fem. nom. instead of the masc. gen., to agree with the father's name, would be unusual for an Attic deme. Intermarriages such as that here recorded have been adduced as evidence for the Athenian citizenship of Milesians, but the balance of authority seems to be on the other side.

5. This is identical with *C.I.G.* 300, but preserves so much more of the original that it seems worth while to add a new transcription.

In tre corone:—

ΑΘΘΣ	· Δ : : Σ	ΥΜΙΣ
		Α
ΠΟ/	ΙΣ	ΠΩ ^ ΑΙΑΝΟΣ
ΑΧΛ . ΝΕΥΣ		ΑΧΑΡΝΟΥ

ΟΞΕΝΟΣ	ΒΑΚΧΙΟΣ	ΔΙΟΣ
ΔΑΛΩΝΙΟΣ	ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΣ.	ΣΤΗΙ: ΟΣ
ΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ	ΔΗΜΟΣΕΝ : : :	ΚΛΕΙΔΙ
ΛΩΝΙΑΣ	ΛΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ	ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ
ΥΨΙΣ	ΞΕΡΟΣ	Χ: ΔΟΦΩΝ.
ΟΣ	Ι: Ε: : : :	ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΟΣ
ΛΩΝΟΣ	ΦΙΛΑ-Ι: ΟΣ	ΞΙΚΤΑΣ
ΜΕΝΟΣ	ΣΕΡΑΠΙΣ . .	ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ
=	ΙΣΑΣ	ΑΜΑΡΑΝΤΟΣ
ΛΑΣ	ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΟΣ	ΛΥΚΟΣ
ΩΝ	ΑΠΟΛΛΟΝΙΔΗΣ	ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ
ΣΙΟΣ	ΑΞΙΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΑΣ	ΝΙΚΩΝ
ΨΟΓΓ.	ΙΞΙΚΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ.	

Nel giardino della κύρα Κουτρικού.

(*Sic*; altered in pencil to *κυρά Κοτ*—.)

The dotted line indicates the amount extant in the *C.I.G.* copy. It will be observed that in one case Λ, in two Α is given, probably by mistake.

If the inscriptions in the three wreaths belong to the text below them, they may help to explain these mere catalogues, of which several occur in the *Corpus*. In the second wreath we have Δ.....ς Πο[...]ς 'Αχαρνεύς; in the third, —ς Πωλλίανος 'Αχαρν[ε]ύ[ς]. In the new columns are clear the names

Φιλ }] ὄξενος, 'Απ]ολλώνιος, Σωσ]ίπατρος, 'Απολ]λώνι[ο]ς.
 Δημ }

The rest are too fragmentary for probable restoration. Turning next to the part preserved also in the *Corpus*, we find, in the left column l. 1, the conjecture Βάκχιος confirmed; in l. 5 the -ος confirms again Boeckh's emendation. In l. 9 we find 'Ισᾶς for 'Ισίας. In l. 7 Cockerell's transcript suggests Φιλάδελφος; this is confirmed by 'Αδελφός in l. 6 of *C.I.G.*, if one may assume a confusion of the two lines.

In the right column we find, l. 6, the form 'Απολλώνιος, and in 10, Λύκος quite clear, thus confirming Boeckh's emendation in both cases.

8. ΙΣΜΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ : ΑΓΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ
ΚΛΑΙΟΜΕΝΙΟΣ

Θε]σμόςβουλος [Ἀπ]ολλοδώρου
Κλαζομένιος.

The form of ζ, ι, indicates an earlier period ; also, probably, π, which has often, in other cases, been mistaken for γ by the transcriber.

10. ΤΟΒΟΥΛΗ

ΣΣΓΙΚΗ

Ἀρισ]τοβούλη
Θε]σ(?)σπική

If the second word be rightly restored, we have here a peculiar form of the adjective. For the ΣΣ, on the accuracy of which, however, too much stress must not be laid, cf. Boeckh on *C.I.G.* 25. Such doubling is found both in Attic and Boeotian inscriptions.

18. ΙΕΡΟΚΛΗΣ

ΠΟΡΙΟΣ

Ἱεροκλῆς
Πόριος.

Poros is a deme of the tribe Akamantis.

Above this is written 'Vaso,' by the original copyist. This probably means that the inscription was on one of the marble lekythi often found on tombs in Attika.

This, and all that precede it, seem to come from Athens.

20. Apparently from Eleusis ; those before and after it certainly are so ; and geographical order is usually preserved.

ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝΔΟΙΕΝΑΝ

ΣΕΒΑΣΤΗΝΛ:ΣΕΠΤΙΜΙΟΥ

ΣΕΟΥΗΡΟΥΕΥΣΕΒΟΥΣ

ΠΕΡΤΙΝΑΚΟΣΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ

ΑΡΑΒΙΚΟΥΑΔ:ΑΒΗΝΙΚΟΥ

ΓΥΝΑΙΚΑΜΗΤΕΡΑΚΑΣΤΡΩΝ

ΗΠΟΛΙΣ

Ἰουλίαν Δόμναν

Σεβαστήν Λ[ε.] Σεπτιμίου

Σεουήρου Εὐσεβοῦς
Περτίνακος Σεβαστοῦ
Ἀραβικοῦ Ἀδ[ι]αβηνικοῦ
γυναῖκα Μητέρα Κάστρων
ἡ πόλις.

This string of titles of Septimius Severus is found pretty frequently repeated. Julia Domna's last title is found both in this merely transliterated form, and also in the translated one, *Μήτηρ στρατοπέδων*.

26. 'In Platea,' written over 25, but probably applies to this also, which is transcribed immediately underneath. λ and Λ, Α and Α, occur with strange inconsistency in the copy.

ΤΙΣ ΠΛΑΤΑΙΑΝ ΕΥΛΗΣΕΝΤΙΕΨΑΝΤΕΣ ΕΝ ΟΡΜΟΝ. ΑΠΑΝΤΩΝ
ΣΚΕΠΤΙΑΝΗΝ Π. ΩΓΕΥΣ ΦΙΛΟΞΕΙΝΟΝΙ . . ΦΙΛΟΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ
ΟΥΝ ΕΚΕΝΕΝ ΠΑΡΑΔΙΣΩ. ΑΘΑΝΑΤΟΙΣ Λ. ΧΕΚΛΗΡΟΝ
ΑΥΤΗ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΙΕΙΣΟΙ. ΟΝΔΕΛΙΨΙΤΟ ΤΑΦΟΝ
ΕΣΑΘΕΡ . . Ρ. ΤΟΝΥΣΟΔΩΡΟΦΙΛΟΠΤΟΛΙΣ

Τίς Πλάταιαν σύλησεν, τίς ὤλεσεν ὄρμον ἀπάντων
Σκεπτιάνην Π[ρ]ώ[τ]εως φιλόξεινον [καὶ] φιλόχριστον
οὐνεκεν ἐν Παραδίῳ συ[ν] ἀθανάτοις λ[ά]χε κλήρον
αὐτῇ καὶ πόσει σοὶ [τ]όνδ' ἐ[δέμε]το τάφον.

———— Δι]ονυσόδωρος φιλόπτολις

'Who robbed Platea, who destroyed that refuge of all Skeptiane, daughter of Protes, friend to strangers and to Christ? Since she hath won a portion with the immortals in Paradise, for herself, and thee, husband, she built this tomb.'

If the restoration ἐδέμετο in l. 4 is right, it is scarcely harsher than Πλάταιαν, φιλόξεινον. We might read ἐπονείτο, or some such word, but this would depart further from our copy. The pentameter following three hexameters is hardly unusual. Other obvious irregularities of scansion hardly call for remark in such an inscription.

27. Perhaps still Platea; at any rate Boeotia, as the next is 'in Tebe.'

ΥΣΙΝΙΚΟΣ

ΚΙΠΠΙΔΑ

Να]υσίνικος

Γλαυ }
'Αλ }] κιππίδα.

52. See 51.

ΣΩΣΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ

Σωσικράτης

'Αριστοκλῆς

53.

1. ΝΙΚΟΔΑ

:Ι

ΣΩΣΙΚΙ

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕ

5. ΠΥΡΙΛΑΜΠΟ

ΕΙΦΙΛΙΝΟΣΞΕ

ΚΛΟΥ

ΔΑΜΑΡΙ

ΩΣΙΚΙΑΣ

ΨΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΣΩΣΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ

ΙΚΛΥΩ

ΣΦΚ

ΑΥ

ΑΒΗΤΟΣ

10. ΧΙΜΕΝΗΣ

ΙΣΩΝΔΑΜΙΝΟΣ

ΩΝ

ΚΑΛΑΙΣ'Ι,Α

ΙΣΟΔΑΜΟΣΦΙΑ

15. Κ

ΡΑΤΟΚΛΗΣ

ΜΕΝΙΩΝ ΚΑΛΑ

ΣΙΛΑΣ.

Clearly a mere catalogue of names.

1. 1. Νικόδα[μος.
1. 3. Σωσικ[ράτης.
1. 4. 'Αριστομέ[νης.
1. 5. Πυρίλαμπο[ς.
1. 6. Φιλίνος.

- l. 7. Κτ]ησικράτης, Σωσίπατρος.
- l. 10. Ἀλκ]ιμένης.
- l. 11. Δαμῖνος
- l. 13. Καλαῖς,
- l. 14. Ἰσόδαμος.
- l. 16. Ἐρατοκλῆς.
- l. 18. Κρη]σίλας.

This, probably, also belongs to Messene, as it follows immediately on 51 and 52. 54 was found 'in Sparta.'

ERNEST A. GARDNER.