THE EPISTLE OF CLAUDIUS WHICH MENTIONS THE PROCONSUL JUNIUS GALLIO

IN 1970 Fouilles de Delphes, III, iv, 286, A. Plassart's edition of the epistle of Claudius, which mentions the proconsul Gallio and so constitutes the basic document for the chronology of St. Paul's visit to Achaia, marked a considerable advance over previous editions and made the subject of the epistle much clearer. It poses, however, two big problems for anyone who uses it. Is Plassart right in omitting reference to the office of pontifex maximus from the emperor's titles in line 1? And is he right in concluding that the first letters]ειασε of line 17 must be divided]εια σε and interpreted as containing the pronoun of the second person singular and so proving that the recipient of the epistle was not a community but an individual, probably Gallio's successor as proconsul of Achaia?

After much hesitation I accept the short line 1 without the reference (ἀρχιερεύς) to the office of pontifex maximus. That title, one of the only two titles which Augustus or someone selected for the imperial titulature in Edicts II-V at Cyrene, is omitted in another epistle of Claudius, one published by Th. Wiegand, *Milet*, III, 1914, pp. 381-3, no. 156 (= Smallwood 373 b). This omission was not customary, but the shorter line thus achieved for the whole inscription can be restored in so many cases that I am encouraged to accept it.

On the other hand, the pronoun of the second person singular in line 17 does not satisfy me. If it were the dative σoi to accompany $\epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \mu ai$, I should be more open to persuasion. It seems easier to visualize the letters $\sigma \epsilon$ as the end of a verb. Two verbs together are not good, but one would be in a subordinate clause. In line 7, where Plassart has restored $\epsilon [\nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \mu ai \sigma \epsilon$ because of the alleged $\sigma \epsilon \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \mu ai$ in line 17, I prefer to change the restoration to $\epsilon [\nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \mu ai \nu \mu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu]$ or, less likely, σoi . If, moreover, the epistle were addressed to Gallio's successor, would Gallio still be called the proconsul? Gallio seems to have been proconsul at the moment the emperor was writing. I incline, therefore, to the view that the recipient was a community, either the city of Delphi or the Amphictyonic Council.

The following text is based on that of Plassart but it incorporates alterations in lines 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 17.

A.D. 52.

1 ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος τιμητής Deissmann (Paulus: Eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze, Tübingen, 1911, Beilage I), cetera Bourguet (De rebus Delphicis imperatoriae aetatis capita duo, Montepessulano, 1905, pp. 63 f.). 2 ὅπατος τὸ ε΄ Deissmann, Δελφῶν τῆι πόλει χαίρειν Pomtow (S.I.G.3, [1917] 801 D), cetera Bourguet. 3 Πάλ [αι μὲν Deissmann, πάλ [ιν τ] η̂ι π [όλει τ] ων Δελφ [ων προθ]υμό [τατα χαίρειν Bourguet, πρόθ]υμο [ς γενόμενος Deissmann, πρόθ]υμο [ς ἐγενόμην Pomtow, καὶ εὔνους ἐξ ἀρ] $[\chi \hat{\eta}$ ς Hiller von Gaertringen (S.I.G.³, 801 D), εὐτύ] $[\chi \eta \sigma a$ Deissmann, π [όλει τ $\hat{\eta}$] τῶν Δ ελφ $[\hat{\omega}v \hat{\eta} o] \hat{v}$ μό $[vov \epsilon \hat{v}vovs \hat{a}\lambda\lambda] \hat{\epsilon}\phi$ ρόντισα τ $\hat{\eta}s$ τ $\hat{v}]|χηs$ Plassart, $\hat{\eta}v o] \hat{v}$ μό $[vov \epsilon \hat{v}vovs \hat{a}\lambda\lambda] \hat{\epsilon}\pi$ ιμελής Oliver. 4 ἀεὶ δ' ἐτήρη[σα Hiller, ἐ[πε] τήρη[σα τὴ]ν θρησκεί [αν Bourguet, τ]οῦ ᾿Από [λλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου Deissmann, ὄσα δὲ Pomtow, Ἐπεὶ δὲ Plassart. 5 [πολ]ειτῶν Deissmann, ἔρη<math>[μο]ς εἶναι ὥς μοι ἄρτι ἀπήγγειλε Plassart. 6 Λ Ἰού]|νιος Γαλλίων δ φ[ίλος] μου κ $[a \lambda \dot{a} v \theta \dot{v}] \pi a au \sigma$ ς ['Αχαιίας Bourguet, etaουλόμενος τοὺς Δελφοὺς Plassart. 7 ?πρ[ότερον, ?δρισμόν, ἄλ] λων Bourguet, τὸν πρ[ότερον κριθέντα δρισμόν· τῶν δὲ ἄλ] λων A. J. Reinach (R.E.G., XX, 1907, p. 49), κόσμον ἐντελ]ῆ ἐ[ντέλλομαί σε καὶ ἐξ ἄλ] Plassart, ὑμεῖν Oliver. 8 κα[ὶ τῆς πόλεως τῶν Δελφῶν Reinach, καλ[εῖν εἰς τοὺς Δελφοὺς νέους κατοίκους καὶ] Plassart, καλ[εῖν εὖ γεγονότας εἰς Δελφοὺς ὡς νέους κατοίκους καὶ] Oliver. 9 ἐπιτρέ [πεσθαι Reinach, ἐπιτρέ [πω ${
m Deissmann, \ \Delta}$ ελ] $|\phi$ ῶν ${
m Pomtow, \ \epsilon}$ πιτρέ $[\pi\epsilon$ ιν] π ρεσ[βεῖa πάντa ἔχειν τὰ τῶν Δ ελ] $|\phi$ ῶν Plassart, έκγόνοις τε τὰ] Oliver. 10 πολε[ίταις γεγονόσιν "Οσοι Plassart, πολε[ίταις ἐπ' ἴσῆ καὶ ὁμοία· ε]ί μὲν γάρ τι[νες Oliver, ὡς πολεί] |ται Plassart. 11 μετφκίσ[αντο εἰς τούτους τοὺ]ς τόπους, κρ[ίνω Plassart. 12-17 Plassart. 18 γεγραμ[μένων Α. Brassac (Revue biblique, N.S., X, 1913, pp. 36-43), cetera Plassart.

It is here assumed that as Plassart shows with a new reading of line 5, Gallio reported Delphi's depopulation and the emperor wishes to see new settlers invited to Delphi to keep up the city's ancient glories. If so, the new settlers should not be freedmen but ingenui, and we borrow for line 8 the term εὖ γεγονότας from the epistle of Marcus Aurelius published in Hesperia, Supplement XIII, 1970, p. 7, line 66. Secondly grants of citizenship normally have to be made not only to the settlers themselves but to their future offspring and this must be expressed in line 9. Thirdly the familiar formula in a grant of citizenship is πολεῖται ἐπ' ἴση καὶ ὁμοίᾳ (sc. δίκη), and this important specification should be accommodated in the restoration of line 10. Parallels for these formulas may be found in S.I.G.³, 312, 333, and even 742, line 47, and E. Szanto, Das griechische Bürgerrecht, Freiburg i. Br., 1892.

For Gallio see PIR², J 757, for Claudius PIR², C 942.

JAMES H. OLIVER