IN the third edict of the famous Cyrenaeic inscription most easily cited as Ehrenberg and Jones 311 or S.E.G., IX, 8 Augustus says:

εἰ τινες ἐκ τῆς Κυρηναϊκῆς ἐπαρχη
cτοι τοῦ ὁσιοφόρου ὀδόν ἐλασ<ο>ν ἐμὲ μέρει τῷ τῶν Ἐλλήνων σώματι κελεύω, ἕτοις τῷ ὄντων οἷς κατὰ νόμον ἢ δόγμα συνκλή<του> τοῖ τοῖ πατρῶν μου ἐπικρίματι ἢ τοῖ ἐμοί ἀνεισφορία ὅμοι σὺν τῇ πολειτήματι.

It is easiest to begin, not with the real crux, but with that word in line 58 which others read as τ[ο]ύτων and I read from the photograph as τ[α]υτῶν. One space was left vacant when the engraver failed to cut a letter he had drawn. The next letter seems to be a vertical hasta, and then another letter has been lost before one reaches υτὼν. Surely the word is τ<ο>υτ[ο]ύτων, not τ[α]υτῶν.

The real crux lies in the words ἐμὲ μέρει τῷ τῶν Ἐλλήνων σώματι of lines 57-58. Whereas earlier students of the document tried to interpret the word σώματι in the sense of a “body of men and women,” Fernand De Visscher in his splendid commentary, Les édits d’Auguste découverts à Cyrène, Louvain and Paris, 1940, Chapter IV, pointed out that this usage, even of the Latin word corpus, was late, and he suggested in its place a reference to munera corporalia. That is, he connected the word σώματι with the verb λειτουργεῖν. Basically the interpretation advanced by De Visscher prevailed at once and became the starting point for a new question. Is the text complete as we have it or does it suffer from a short omission?

De Visscher, who like his predecessors had assumed that the text was correct, first interpreted as one phrase the words τῷ τῶν Ἐλλήνων σώματι, but Adolf Wilhelm, “Zu dem dritten der Edikte des Augustus aus Kyrene,” Wiener Anzeiger, LXXX, 1943, pp. 2-10, could not accept the solution that λειτουργεῖν . . . τῷ τῶν Ἐλλήνων σώματι meant λειτουργεῖν τάς τῷ σώματι λειτουργίας τάς τῶν Ἐλλήνων. Wilhelm proposed to separate the words τῷ τῶν Ἐλλήνων from σώματι and take them with the preceding phrase, ὦ ἐμέρει. The phrase ὦ ἐμέρει τῷ τῶν Ἐλλήνων would mean “als Hellenen.” This interpretation was accepted by De Visscher ¹ and has prevailed. But the word σώματι now stands all alone far from the verb it modifies, and it does not sound right all alone in its postponed position. Feeling it needed a qualification, Wilhelm emended τῷ ἔκαστῶν σώματι.
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One comment by Wilhelm calls for special mention. On pp. 8-9 he writes as follows:

Dass De Visscher mit der Deutung des Wortes σώματι im Rechte ist, zeigt auch die anschlies-
sende Bestimmung des dritten Ediktes: καὶ τούτων αὐτοὺς, ὦς ἡ ἁνεισφορία ὑμοῦ σὺν τῷ πολεμήα δέδοται,
toύτων τῶν πραγμάτων εἶναι ἄτελεις, ὦν τότε εἶχον, ἀρέσκει μοι, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν ἐπικτῆτων πάντων τελείν τὰ γενόμενα;
sie ergänzt die erste Bestimmung über das λειτουργεῖν τῷ σώματι durch eine zweite, über die Heran-
ziehung des nach der Verleihung der ἁνεισφορία erworbenen Vermögens der mit dem römischen
Bürgerrechte beschenkten Kyrenaier, also durch eine Bestimmung über ihr λειτουργεῖν τοῖς χρήμασι.

The distinction between what Wilhelm calls the first Bestimmung and what
Wilhelm calls the second Bestimmung does not seem to me to be that between the
case of personal liturgies and the case of financial liturgies. The Greek cities were
not short of men to shoulder the routine decisions of public office; they were short of
men to shoulder the financial burdens of public office. The personal services of Greeks
with Roman citizenship were particularly valuable only in connection with the financial
contribution. In both cases Augustus rules that Greeks with Roman citizenship must
meet their financial obligations to the polis, because the second Bestimmung, intro-
duced by ἐκτὸς τοιούτων ὦς, is nothing more than a special exception to a general rule.
The Greeks with Roman citizenship were trying to evade local financial obligations
by the false precedent of a few cases where exemption from local financial obligations
had been specifically granted by Rome. Augustus denies that these few cases con-
stituted a general rule or could be extended to property acquired later.

Like Wilhelm I too feel that something has fallen out. I believe that the edict
was not translated but actually drafted in Greek and that neither the emperor nor
the imperial chancery would have worded it with σώματι alone immediately after the
unconnected words τῷ Ἑλλήνων. This is not a question of elegance but of fundamental
clarity. Yet the emendation τῷ ἔκτων fails, in my opinion, to produce the right sense.
Linguistic parallels from the sphere of military service do not have full value, because
Augustus is not speaking of service in any local militia. He is talking about ἁνεισφορία.
The emperor could not have risked a misunderstanding by mentioning the personal
liturgy alone. Both the extant text and Wilhelm’s emended text leave out the
main thing.

Since the word ἁνεισφορία implies first of all exemption from financial obligations,
I submit that the extant text must be emended in line 58 to read <χρήμασι καὶ> σώματι
or some variation of this formula.
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