

ON EDICT III FROM CYRENE

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

- εἴ τινες ἐκ τῆς Κυρηναϊκῆς ἐπαρχῆς*
- 57 *ας πολειτῆται τετείμηνται, τούτους λειτουργεῖν οὐδὲν ἔλασ<σ>ον ἐμ μέρει τῶ τῶν*
Ἑλλήνων σώματι κελεύω, ἐκτὸς τ^νι[.]υτων οἷς κατὰ νόμον ἢ δόγμα συνκλή<του>
τῶι τοῦ πατρός μου ἐπικρίματι ἢ τῶι ἐμῶι ἀνεισφορία ὁμοῦ σὺν τῆι πολειτῆται
- 60 *δέδοται· καὶ τούτους αὐτούς, οἷς ἢ ἀνεισφορία δέδοται, τούτων τῶν πρα-*
γμάτων εἶναι ἀτελεῖς ὧν τότε εἶχον ἀρέσκει μοι, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν ἐπικτήτων
πάντων τελεῖν τὰ γενομένα.

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^νι[.]υτων. 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 υτων. Surely the word is τ<ο>λι[ο]ύτων, not τ[ο]ύτων.

The real crux lies in the words ἐμ μέρει τῶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων 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 τῶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων 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 . . . τῶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων σώματι meant λειτουργεῖν τὰς τῶ σώματι λειτουργίας τὰς τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Wilhelm proposed to separate the words τῶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων from σώματι and take them with the preceding phrase, ἐμ μέρει. The phrase ἐμ μέρει τῶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων would mean “als Hellenen.” This interpretation was accepted by De Visscher¹ 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 <τῶ ἐαντῶν> σώματι.

¹ “La dualité des droits de cité dans le monde romain, d’après une nouvelle interprétation de l’Édit III d’Auguste, découvert à Cyrène,” *Bull. de la Classe des Lettres et de Sciences Morales et Politiques de l’Académie Royale de Belgique*, 5^e sér., XXIII, 1947, pp. 50-59.

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 anschließende Bestimmung des dritten Ediktes: *καὶ τοῦτους αὐτοὺς, οἷς ἡ ἀνεισφορία ὁμοῦ σὺν τῇ πολιτείᾳ δέδοται, τούτων τῶν πραγμάτων εἶναι ἀτελεῖς, ὧν τότε εἶχον, ἀρέσκει μοι, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν ἐπικτήτων πάντων τελεῖν τὰ γεινόμενα*; sie ergänzt die erste Bestimmung über das *λειτουργεῖν τῷ σώματι* durch eine zweite, über die Heranziehung des nach der Verleihung der *ἀνεισφορία* 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*, introduced by *ἐκτὸς τοιούτων οἷς*, 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 constituted 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 ἑαυτῶν* 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 *ἀνεισφορία*. 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 *ἀνεισφορία* 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.

JAMES H. OLIVER