



---

On the Edict of Severus Alexander (P. Fayum 20)

Author(s): James H. Oliver

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Winter, 1978, Vol. 99, No. 4 (Winter, 1978), pp. 474-485

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/293894>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*The Johns Hopkins University Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*

# ON THE EDICT OF SEVERUS ALEXANDER (P. FAYUM 20)

P. Fayum 20, now E2776 in Philadelphia in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, was examined repeatedly by the writer in 1972 and 1973 in preparation for a still unpublished collection of Greek Communications of Early Roman Emperors. Column II of the papyrus has been much discussed; the principal editions are those of Grenfell/Hunt (1900), Hunt/Edgar (1934) and Schubart (1941). All three identified the author as Severus Alexander. The remnants of column I are less familiar, although in 1921 Wilcken restored the important lines 1-4, the heading of the whole document, which he too recognized as an edict of Severus Alexander. The only edition of both columns was that of Bidez/Cumont (1922) but without knowledge of Wilcken's restoration and without dots or brackets in column II. Moreover, Wilamowitz and Buecheler have made important contributions to the establishment of the text, while Claire Préaux, Moreaux, Bowman and G. Alföldy have elucidated various sections.

Here we are interested only in the fairly intelligible column II, where the writer himself has new readings, emendations and restorations to offer in lines 1, 4, 8, 12-17, 19 and 20, of which one alteration undercuts the argument for a forgery of Julianic date.

EDITIONS: B. P. Grenfell/A. S. Hunt, *Fayum Towns and their Papyri* (London 1900) 116-20, No. 20 with photograph of col. II; O. Gradenwitz in C. G. Bruns, *Fontes*<sup>7</sup> (Tübingen 1919) 268-70, No. 962 as of Julian; J. Bidez/F. Cumont, *Imp. Caesaris Flavii Claudii Iuliani epistulae, leges, etc.* (Paris 1922) 83-87, No. 72; A. S. Hunt/C. C. Edgar, *Select Papyri* (Loeb Clas. L. 1934) No. 216; W. Schubart, "Zum Edikt über das Aurum Coronarium (P. Fayum 20)," *ArchP* 14 (1941) 45-59. G. Crifò, *ANRW* II 15 (1976) 762f. merely reproduces Schubart's text.

OTHER LITERATURE: H. Dessau, "Sur un nouvel édit de l'empereur Julien," *RevPhil* 25 (1901) 285-88; U. von Wilamowitz, *GGA* 1901, 36, n. 3; F. Buecheler, *RhM* 56 (1901) 327 on lines 4 and 20; C. Barbagallo, *Aegyptus* 1

(1920) 348-50; U. Wilcken, "Zu den Edikten," *ZSav* 42 (1921) 150-58; W. Ensslin, *Klio* 18 (1922/3) 128-32; M. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE* (Oxford 1926) 611, n. 56 (= 2nd ed. [1957] 729f., n. 59); C. Préaux, "Sur le déclin de l'empire au III<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère: A propos du Fayum 20," *Cd'É* 31 (1941) 123-31; W. Seston, "Notes critiques sur l'Histoire Auguste," *REA* 44 (1942) 224-33 and 45 (1943) 49-52 after he had seen Schubart's article; A. C. Johnson, P. R. Coleman-Norton, F. C. Bourne, *Ancient Roman Statutes* (Austin 1961) 229, No. 284; J. Moreaux, "Krise und Verfall: Das dritte Jahrhundert nach Christ als historisches Problem," *Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 5 (1961) 128-42; A. K. Bowman, "The Crown Tax in Roman Egypt," *BASP* 4 (1967) 59-74 (very important); F. Grosso, *RendLinc* 23 (1968) 219; A. Plassart, *Fouilles de Delphes* III iv (1970) 142, n. 2 (on lines 1-2 of col. II); G. Alföldi, "The Crisis of the Third Century as Seen by Contemporaries," *GRBS* 15 (1974) 89-111. A translation by N. Lewis, *Greek Historical Documents: The Roman Principate* (Toronto 1974) 14f.

ὁπ[ω]ς μὴ διὰ τὸ τῆς χαρᾶς τῇ[ς] ἐαντῶν δῆλωσ(ιν) ποιήσασθαι ἐθ[έ]λιν,  
 ἣν ἐπ' ἐμοὶ παρελθόντι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν  
 ἔ[χο]υσιν, βιασθεῖεν μείζω ἢ δύνανται, ὅθεν μοι παρέστη τὸ βούλευμα  
 τοῦτο οὐδὲ ἀποδέοντι παραδιγμάτων,  
 ἐν οἷς Τραϊανὸν τε καὶ Μάρκον, τοὺς ἐμαντοῦ προγόνους αὐτοκράτορά(ς  
 τ)ε μάλιστα δὴ θαυμάσαι ἀξίους  
 γεγεννημένους, ( )οιμειεῖσθ(αι) ἐμελλον, ὧν καὶ πρὸς τ(ὰ) ἄλλα (τ)ὴν  
 προαίρησιν (ς)η(λ)οῦν ἐγὼ γνώμην ποιοῦμαι,  
 5 ὥς εἴ γε μὴ τὸ τῆς π[α]ρὰ τοῦς καιροῦς δημοσί(α)ς ἀπορείας ἐνποδῶν  
 ἡ, πολὺν ἂν φανερωτέραν τὴν ἐμαντοῦ  
 μεγαλοψυχίαν ἐπιδικ[ν]ύμενος οὐδ' ἂν ἐμέλλησα, καὶ εἴ τι ἐκ τοῦ  
 παρελθόντ(ο)ς χρόνου ἐκ τῆς τοιοῦτοτρό  
 πον[ς] συντελείας κατιὸν ὠφίλετο καὶ ὁπώσα πρὸς τὴν Καίσαρος  
 προσηγορίαν ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν στεφάνων ὄνομα  
 ἐψηφισμέ(ν)α πρότερον καὶ ἔτι (ποτ)ε ψηφισθησόμενα κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν  
 αἰτίαν ὑπὸ τῶν πόλεων εἶη, καὶ ταῦτα  
 ἀνεῖναι. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν οὐκ οἶομαι, δι' ἃ μικρὸν ἐνπροσθεν εἶπον,  
 ταῦτα δὲ μόνον ἐπαγασφάρειν τὰς πόλεις,  
 10 ὥς ἐκ τῶν παρόντων ὥρῳ, δυνάμενά(ς) οὐ παρείδον. Διόπερ ἴστωσαν  
 ἅπαντ(ε)ς ἐν(μ) ταῖς πόλεσιν ἀπάσαις  
 ταῖς τε κατ' Εἰταλείαν κα[ί] ταῖς ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν: καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ  
 προφάσει τῆς ἐμαντοῦ ἀρχῆς τῆς αὐτοκράτορος,  
 ἐφ' ἣν καὶ βουλομένων καὶ εὐχομένων ἀπάντων παρῆλθον, ἀντ' ἐτ(έ)ρων  
 χρυσῶν στεφάνων χρῆ με τὰ ἀπα[ι]τη

- θέντα ἀνεῖναι αὐταῖς, τοῦτο δὲ οὐ διὰ περιουσίαν πλούτου ποιοῦντα  
 ἀλλὰ δι(ὰ) τὴν ἐμάντου προαίρεσιν, δε[ό]  
 μ[ενον, ἐ]π[ι] Καῖσάρ [ἐ]μει, καίπερ κεκμηκ(ότ)α, τὸ κλῖνον  
 ἀναλήμψασθαι, οὐχ(ὶ φ)όρων ζητήσῃσιν ἀλλὰ σωφρο[σύνη]  
 15 μόνον, οὐ πρὸς τὸ [ῥ]ῖδιον γεινομένων ἀναλωμάτων, οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῦτο μοι  
 σπουδὸν οὐδ' ἄλλο τι ἔσ)ται [ἐ]ν ἐξαπατη[σ]ει τῶν  
 χρημάτων πλὴν μάλλον φιλανθρωπία τε καὶ εὐεργεσίαις συνανξῆσαι  
 τὴν ἀρχήν, ἵνα μόν (ἡ ἀγωγή)  
 καὶ τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν (τῶν ἐθνῶν τοῖς) ται κα(τ') ἐπιτροπία(ς) παρ'  
 ἐμοῦ ἀπεσταλμένοις, οὓς ἐγὼ εἰς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον δοκιμ(ά)σας  
 καὶ προελόμενος [ἀ]πέστειλα, κἀκείνοις συνβουλεύσασα εἴη ὥ(ς)  
 μετριωτάτους παρέχειν αὐτοῖς· μάλλον  
 γὰρ (δ)ῆ καὶ μάλλον [ο]ί τῶν ἐθνῶν ἡγεμόνες (οἱ ἐξία)σι καταμάθοιεν  
 ἂν μεθ' ὧν αὐτοῖς προθυμίας φείδεσθαι καὶ  
 20 [πρ]ο[σ]οράσθαι τῶν ἐθν(ῶν) οἷς ἐπεστήκασι προσ(ή)κει, (δ)όποτε  
 κ(αὶ) ἐξέσ)ται τὸν αὐτοκράτορα ὁρᾶν πάσῃν αὐτοῖς  
 μετὰ τοσαύτης κοσμιότητος καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἐνκρατίας τὰ τῆς  
 βασιλείας διοικοῦντα. Τοῦτον τοῦ ἐμα[ντοῦ]  
 δόγματος ἀντίγραφα τοῖς κατ' ἐκάστην π(ό)λιν ἄρχουσιν γενέσθω  
 ἐπιμελὲς εἰς τὸ δημόσι(ο)ν (ἐκθεῖναι ὅποι)ν μάλιστα ἔστα[ι]  
 σύνοπτα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν) vacat  
 vacat (ἔτους) α, Παῖνι λ vacat

APPARATUS OF COLUMN II: The text is based on that of Grenfell and Hunt but with changes as indicated. 1 ἐθ[έ]λιν Oliver (ἐπ[ε]τινήν H/E, εσ[.]τιν ἦν Schubart, ἐσ[ε]τιν ἦν Plassart). 2 ἐχορυσιν Schubart, ἄγορυσιν Plassart. 3 αυτοκρατοραδε pap., τ)ε Oliver. 4 τηνορν (= τὴν νῦν G/H, ζηλοῦν Buecheler), τηγνν Schubart. 5 καιροῦς Wilcken; δημοσίους pap. 6 εἴ τι Wilamowitz (ἔτι G/H); παρελθοντες pap. 7 τὸ . . . ὄνομα Schubart. 8 (ποτ)ὲ Oliver: see commentary. 9 ἐπαναφέρειν Wilamowitz. 10 δυναμενα pap.; απανταις pap. 12 αντετων pap., αντ' ἐτ(έ)ρων Oliver; χορή με τὰ ἀπα[ι]τη Schubart. 13 τοῦτο Schubart; δι pap.; δε[ο] Oliver (δε[.] Schubart). 14 μ[ενον Oliver; πικαισαρ..μι (= ἐπεὶ Καῖσάρ εἰμι) G/H, γαρ[.]μει Schubart; καὶ περ(ι)κέκμηκα G/H, καίπερ κέκμηκα Schubart, κεκμηκ(ότ)α Oliver; οὐχ ὅρων G/H, οὐ (φ)όρων Wilamowitz, οὐ χορῶν Wilcken, οὐχ(ὶ φ)όρων H/E. 15 σπουδεοται (= σπουδαιότε[ρο]ν) G/H, σπουδῇ [ἐ]σται Schubart, σπουδὸν οὐδ' ἄλλο τι ἔσ)ται Oliver; [ἐ]πὶ ἐξαπατη[σ]ει Schubart. 16 συνανξῆσαι Schubart; μον [ἡ τύχη] Schubart, (ἡ ἀγωγή) Oliver. 17 ταικαεπιτροπιαι (= τοῖς κατ' ἐπιτροπίας G/H, τ(ε) κα(ὶ) ἐπ' (ἐπ)ιτροπία(ς) Schubart, (τῶν ἐθνῶν τοῖς) τ(ε) κα(τ')

ἐπιτροπία<ς> Oliver). 18 συνβουλεύσασα Schubart. 19 τη pap.; ἡγεμόνες {σι} G/H, <οἱ ἐξία>σι Oliver. 20 εθνουσι pap.; προσεκειαποτακται (= προσήκει εἰ ἀποτέτακται) G/H, <ὁ>πότε κ{τ}αῖ Buecheler, κ{αῖ ἔσ}ται Oliver; πασειν (= πᾶσιν G/H, πα<ρ>εῖ<η> Buecheler). 21 ἔμα[υτοῦ] Schubart. 22 παλιν pap.; δημοσιαν pap.; ἐκθεῖναι ὅπου added by Schubart; ἔστα[ι] Schubart.

## TRANSLATION

[Imperator Caesar M. Aurelius Severus Alexander] Pius Felix Augustus, [son of deified Magnus Antoninus Pius, grandson of deified Septimius Severus Pius, pontifex maximus], tribunician [power], consul, pater patriae, [proclaims:

-----]

in order that through their desire to express the joy they have in my accession to the office they not be forced into contributions greater than they can afford. Hence this plan has been designed, and I did not lack models, among whom I would be imitating both Trajan and Marcus who were ancestors of mine and had been emperors particularly worthy of admiration, whose fixed policy also in other respects I plan to imitate. If the inopportune public lack of means did not interfere, I should be making a much clearer show of my 'magnanimity' and should not have hesitated to cancel whatever contribution of this type was still coming in, owed from the past, and to cancel also whatever expenditures for crowns had previously been voted in connection with the appointment as Caesar or were yet about to be voted by the cities for the same reason. But because of what I mentioned just now I do not think that all this is possible. On the other hand, it has not escaped me that the aforesaid are all that the cities can afford, as I see from present circumstances. Therefore, let all men in all the cities both throughout Italy and in the other regions be my witnesses: for other gold crowns, even though occasioned by my accession as emperor, an office to which I arrived with the wish and prayer of all, I must cancel the claims made upon (the cities). I do this not because of an excess of wealth but because of my fixed resolve, [inasmuch as recognizing the need (to do so) ever since] I have been Caesar, weak though I was, (I intend) to

repair the declining state of things, not by searches for revenue but by economy alone, without expenditure being made toward my private satisfaction. For neither this ⟨will be⟩ of concern to me ⟨nor anything else⟩ in asking for money than better to advance the empire with universal kindness and benefactions, in order that my own ⟨conduct⟩ may be of a sort to predispose the governors ⟨of the provinces⟩ and ⟨those⟩ sent out by me as procurators, whom I sent out after a most meticulous investigation and selection, to behave with the greatest moderation. For more and more ⟨those who will go out as⟩ the governors of provinces should learn with how much zeal it behooves them to spare and watch out for the provincials over whom they have been appointed, ⟨when it will be possible⟩ for them all to see the emperor administering the duties of the kingship with so much orderliness and moderation and restraint.

Copies of this decision of mine let the magistrates in each city take care ⟨to expose⟩ publicly ⟨where⟩ they will be most easily visible to the readers.

Year 1, Payni 30 (= June 24).

#### COMMENTARY

The descent of this version from the text of the original edict must have been very complicated indeed. There are errors like the confusion of alpha and omicron which arose in a careless copying of cursive letters, and other errors which are best explained as poor copying of monumental letters. Still other errors are those of hearing. Haplography, dittography and short omissions occur, likewise confusion between delta and tau, omicron and omega, epsilon and eta, epsilon and the diphthong *αι*, and of course between iota and the diphthong *ει*. Grenfell and Hunt dated the handwriting to the period 270–350; Wilcken thought that 362 or even 350 was too late for this hand, but Schubart, who was neutral, apparently did not.

The edict proclaims that money due as *aurum coronarium* in the past both for the preceding emperor and for the new emperor's adoption as Caesar will still be claimed but that no new levy for his succession as emperor will be demanded.

The emperor, originally recognized as Severus Alexander by Grenfell and Hunt, was identified as Julian by Dessau

largely on the basis of line 14. Though Wilcken proved from his restoration of the prescript in column I that the edict was attributed to Severus Alexander, Seston, who accepted Wilcken's version of the prescript, thought that lines 14 and 17 could be understood only with the conditions of Julian's period in mind. Schubart's new version of line 14 undercut his argument but did not convince Seston. Still the theory of a forgery of Julianic date rests on dubious texts of Schubart's predecessors and in my opinion can no longer be maintained because the arguments based on lines 14 and 17 collapse in my version. The attribution to Severus Alexander, who became Caesar in June or July 221 and sole emperor on March 13, 222, seems no longer in doubt, and the appreciation given by Claire Préaux has not lost its value.

Of the three groups, namely the Senate, the army and the cities, to which a new emperor needed to address himself, this edict, in which the emperor actually apologizes, as Claire Préaux says, addresses itself to the cities and admits the decline of the empire. The two women (his mother and grandmother) and their advisers (e.g., Ulpian), the influence and brains behind the boy Severus Alexander, were painfully aware of fiscal oppression, the lack of moral support among curiales, and the general weakness of their own position. Behind the edict, as Alföldy observes, lay the concept that the decline was largely due to the depravity of rulers and that *renovatio* was possible. Moreaux saw in the edict "nur ein rhetorisches Meisterwerk," but the cancellation of the *aurum coronarium* was no small benefaction, as Bowman explains. A thoroughly prepared program could at this moment hardly be expected. The situation called for caution, and one thinks of what a contemporary, Cassius Dio (74, 10, 3), said of the death of Pertinax: οὐδὲ ἔγνων, καίπερ ἐμπειρότατος πραγμάτων ὢν, ὅτι ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν ἀθρόα τινὰ ἀσφαλῶς ἐπανορθοῦσθαι. Yet rhetorical the edict certainly was, and we here find important evidence of a change in the chancery style.

Lines 1-2: In line 1 the word after ποιήσασθαι may, I think, be read as ἐθ[έ]λιν (= ἐθέλειν). Plassart's readings ἐο[ρ]τήν in 1 and ἄγουσιν in 2 are not possible, because Schubart's ἔχουσιν is certainly correct, though not all visible perhaps.

Lines 3-4: The reference to Trajan and Marcus Aurelius as ancestors constituted for Grenfell and Hunt an indication that Severus Alexander was the author, because no one later than he could claim Trajan and Marcus as ancestors. Editors faced with the infinitive *ομειμείσθε* have understandably chosen the simple verb *μμεῖσθαι* over *ἀπομμεῖσθαι*, because the latter would indicate an exact or faithful reproduction and Severus Alexander cannot have been allowed to seem so presumptuous. But the omicron must be explained. The vestige may have been part of the infinitive (e.g., *ὑπ*ομμεῖσθαι: cf. the manuscript reading of Diodorus 13, 95, 5, *ὑπομμούμενον*) or of a preceding word. For the precedent established by Marcus see the epistle to the Delphians, *FD* III iv 313.

Line 4: If the reading is *τηνονν*, the tau is an easy error from a zeta of a monumental type. Buecheler's emendation *ξ*η*λ*οῦν, which Schubart does not accept, restores the flow of the Greek. Buecheler's interpretation of *προαιρησιν* as *προαίρ*(ε)*σιν* finds support in the analogy of *ζητησιν*, which in line 14 stands for *ζητήσ*(ε)*σιν*.

Line 6: On megalopsychia see R. A. Gauthier, *Magnanimité: l'idéal de la grandeur dans la philosophie païenne et dans la théologie chrétienne* (Paris 1951) 17-176, especially 170-76. Cassius Dio 79, 15, 4 criticized Macrinus for not displaying megalopsychia.

Line 8: One may compare the document of the Dionysiac Artists from Smyrna published by G. Petzl, *ZPE* 14 (1974) 77-87, lines 24-26: *τοῖς δὲ Π]αναθηναίοις καὶ ταῖς ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐψηφισμέναις δημοτελέσιν [ἐορταῖς καὶ ταῖς] αὐθις ποτε ψηφισθησομέναις ἐκ τῶν δημοσίω[ν καὶ] κοινῶν προσό[δων]*, which supports also our emendation *καὶ ἔτι* (ποτ)ε rather than *καὶ ἔτι* (δ)ε. The epsilon has to be explained.

Line 9: The word *ἀνεῖναι* at the beginning needs no dots.

Line 10: The particle *τε* which Schubart read as certain is harder to find than the *μ* read by the first editors.

Line 11, *ταῖς τε κατ' Εἰταλείαν καὶ ταῖς ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν*. The word *ἔθνη* means *provinciae*, and *provincia* often means merely "region." An inscription of the second century, *ILS* 1362a, mentions *cives Romani* [e]x *Italia et aliis provinciis in Raetia consistentes*. Gaius, *Inst.* 3, 121a wrote,

*Sed cum lex Furia tantum in Italia locum habeat, evenit ut in ceteris provinciis*, etc. Paul, *libro primo ad legem Aeliam Sentiam*, cited in *Digest* 40.2, 15, 5, said *Hi qui in Italia vel alia provincia domicilium habent*. A sepulchral inscription of the third century published by S. Dušanič, "A Roman Inscription from Taurunum," *Ziva Antika* 11 (1961–62) 127–31, was erected for *Aur. Bitelliana ex provin(cia) Ital(ia)*. See also J. Triantaphyllopoulos, *Studi in onore di Giuseppe Grosso*, V (Turin 1972) 196f.

Lines 11–13: The second καί of line 11 is concessive and should not be canceled. In line 12 the reading *αντετων* retains in the epsilon part of the word *ἐτ(ἐρ)ων*. Bowman has shown by his collection of evidence that whereas "the arrears and regular contributions *ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν στεφάνων ὄνομα*, comparatively small amounts," were not remitted and continued to be paid, large amounts as in other reigns were not paid. The levies which Severus Alexander remitted must be distinguished from those contributions *ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν στεφάνων ὄνομα* made for his appointment as Caesar (lines 6–8). It is not enough to read *ἀντ(ι)* for *αντε*. Iota and epsilon are not confused. We must, I think, read *ἀντ'* (or *ἀντ(ι)*) *ἐτ(ἐρ)ων χρυσῶν στεφάνων*. Severus Alexander remitted the larger amount he might have expected for his accession as emperor, and this was a real concession.

Line 14: The readings of Grenfell and Hunt and of Schubart diverge strikingly, the former reading *Καῖσαρ* without a single letter dotted and the latter reading only *γαρ* with all three letters dotted. An examination of the papyrus supports the reading *Καῖσαρ* if one accepts the kappa as of a monumental type unlike any other kappa on this papyrus (otherwise a tall iota and a lunate sigma). The scribe who often separates words, though sometimes erroneously, treated *καίπερ* as a complete word. It should not be emended. The word Caesar thus remains but the working Caesar (*καὶ περ(ι)κέκηκα*) disappears. Inferring the certainty of *καίπερ*, however, we cast doubt on *κέκηκα*, because *καίπερ* normally demands a participle. The phrase then should read *καίπερ κεκμηκ(ότ)α*, and since short omissions frequently occur, it is better to emend it thus than to read *κέκηκα* with Schubart, let alone *κεκμηκ(ώς)*, supported neither palaeographically nor grammatically. Before *Καῖσάρ* [*ι*]μει (read *εἰμι*) the con-

junction may have been *ἐπεί* as Grenfell and Hunt supposed; in fact the reading *ἐ]π[ι]* can be recommended with a reference to LSJ s.v. *ἐπεί* A 2. For *δε[ό]*|*μ[ενον]* in the sense “desire” see the speech of Pertinax in Cassius Dio 74.1, 4, and for the whole clause contrast the above cited passage from Cassius Dio 74.10, 3 on the death of Pertinax. With the announced policy of economy rather than more oppressive taxation one may compare the economy which Cassius Dio 52.35, 4 imagines Maecenas recommending to Augustus.

Line 15: At the beginning there should be punctuation after *μόνον*. At the end the word that Schubart reads *ἐξαπαιτή[σει]* instead of *ἐξ ἀπάντων* would, if correct, be new, but the sense is good and the formation regular. The emperor claims to be *κοινωνητικὸς περὶ τὰ χρήματα*, as Diotogenes (p. 40 Delatte) says a true king would be. Where Grenfell and Hunt read *σπουδεσται*, the choice for the first word would lie between *σπονδ(ή)* and *σπονδ(αῖ)ο(ν)*. Schubart persuaded himself that he could read *σπονδῇ* [ἔ]σται, but the omicron looks certain, hence rather *σπονδεο(ν ---ἔ)σται*. More, however, is lost than three letters, because the word *πλήν* in the next line requires a phrase like *οὐδ’ ἄλλο* here. *Nec hoc mihi studio nec aliud erit . . . quam*, etc.

Line 16, *φιλανθρωπία τε καὶ εὐεργεσίαις*. The conjunction of the two nouns is reflected in *Nov. Val. XXXIII* [6] (*humanitatis nostrae beneficio*) and *Nov. Val. XIII* [5] (*humanitatis nostrae beneficiorum*). *Philanthropia* or *humanitas* became the royal or imperial quality, an active concern, with a claim upon the loyalty of the governed. It was a theme capable of developing into the emperor’s reception of the grace of God; “for when benefits gush forth from us and the lot of mankind is thus improved, there is assured to us, we believe, the benevolence of God, whence all that is hoped for in return is expected” (*Nov. Theod. XXII* 1, cited by R. M. Honig, *Humanitas und Rhetorik in spätrömischen Kaisergesetzen* [Göttingen 1960] 26). The older works on *humanitas* are cited by Honig, p. 27; studies of *philanthropia* are cited by H. Martin Jr., *AJP* 82 (1961) 164-75 and H. Hunger, *Wiener Anzeiger* 100 (1963) 1-20, notably J. Kabiersch, *Untersuchungen zu dem Begriff der Philanthropia bei dem Kaiser Julian* (Kl.-phil. Studien, Heft

21, 1960). With the phrase *συνανξῆσαι τὴν ἀρχήν* may be compared the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, p. CXV (Henzen) 45f., *aeternitate(m) imperi, quod* (the emperor) [*susci*]piendo *ampliauit*, and Nov. Maioriani I, *ut imperium . . . augeatur*. This is the old theme, *τὸ κοινὸν αὖξεν*, of Xenophon, *Hell.* 1.4, 13 and Demosthenes 3.26. See M. Holleaux, *Études d' épigraphie et d'histoire grecques I* (Paris 1938) 448, n. 2 and Heberdey/Keil, *Forschungen in Ephesos* III No. 48. At the end of the line a vacant area of about six or seven letters remains where the scribe may have had difficulty in reading his text. The feminine participle read by Schubart in line 18, *συνβουλευσασα*, shows that a phrase lost or omitted at the end of line 16 was a feminine noun and its article. Schubart restored *ἡ τύχη*, which seems neither to match the sense nor to fill the space available. For *ἡ ἀγωγή* one may consult, in addition to LSJ s.v. II 4, *GRBS* 12 (1971) 223, *βίον ἀγωγῇ* in a decree of A.D. 38, line 91 (and 94), also P. Herrmann, "Ergebnisse einer Reise in Nordostlydien," *DAkWien* 80 (1962) No. 3, *τὴν παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον ἀγωγὴν καὶ σωφροσύνην*.

Line 17: The word *ἐπιτροπία* or the phrase *κα(τ') ἐπιτροπία(ς)*, following soon after the phrase *τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν*, should never have been taken as applying to governors who were senators. Furthermore, the word *ἡγεμόσιν* was not immediately clear without identification, especially as it is being used for the first time. The meaning of the whole combined phrase appears by comparison with *Digest* 49.1, 25, where Severus Alexander in writing to the Commonalty of the Hellenes of Bithynia uses the phrase *τοῖς ἐπιτρόποις καὶ τοῖς ἡγουμένοις τῶν ἐθνῶν*, and with the climax of Dio-Xiphilinus 80.18, 2: *οὐ στρατιώτης, οὐκ ἐπίτροπος, οὐχ οἱ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἡγούμενοι*. So here the emperor refers to "the provincial authorities and my procurators," *τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν (τῶν ἐθνῶν τοῖς) ται κα(τ') ἐπιτροπία(ς) παρ' ἐμοῦ ἀπεσταλμένοις*. The letters *ται* which follow the word *ἡγεμόσιν* are, as Schubart said, the enclitic *τε*, but the indispensable qualification *τῶν ἐθνῶν* and a second *τοῖς* on which the enclitic depended have fallen out. The Latin phrase *rectores provinciarum* similarly requires the word *provinciarum* for precision. So the loss of *τῶν ἐθνῶν* must be assumed. The emendation *δοκιμ(ά)σας*, made by Grenfell and Hunt, is better than the reading of the papyrus, *δοκιμείσας*, which

Schubart retains. Compare *Nov. Theod.* XXIV 1: *Eos* (sc. *duces*) . . . *quos nostra aestimatio . . . promovendos esse censuerit*. Cassius Dio 79.15, 1 reports criticism of appointments made by Macrinus, μήτ' ἄλλην τινὰ ἀρετὴν ἔχοντας μήτ' ἐν πολλαῖς πράξεσιν ἐξητασμένους.

Lines 17-18, οὗς . . . [ἀ]πέσστιλα. This refers only to the procurators, <τοῖς> τε κα<τ'> ἐπιτροπία<ς> παρ' ἐμοῦ ἀπεσταλμένοις, οὗς ἐγὼ . . . [ἀ]πέστειλα, because of the repetition of the word ἀποστέλλω. For Seston, who had a text wherein ἀπεσταλμένοις modified ἡγεμόσιν, this was a proof of Julianic date, for, he argued, in the time of Severus Alexander the proconsuls were sent out by the Senate.

Line 19: It will not do merely to delete with Grenfell and Hunt the letters σι which appear after ἡγεμόνες. They have to be explained. The two letters are a remnant of a clause that has fallen out, <οἱ ἐξία>σι, which balances the clause οἷς ἐπεσστήκασι below.

Line 20: The corrections προ{σ}ορᾶσθαι and ἐθν<ῶν> and προσ<ή>κει made by Grenfell and Hunt have been accepted by all. The following section provokes disagreement, particularly whether to read with Buecheler <ὁ>πότε κ{τ}αῖ or to revert with Schubart to <εἰ> ἀποτέ<τα>κται, where the papyrus has ἀποτεκται. Is the first error haplography of the diphthong after προσέκει or is it alpha for omicron as twice clearly in line 22? The argument against κ{τ}αῖ is that the word is not one likely to be misspelled and that ται represents the end of a verb. Buecheler's further reading παρεῖη for πᾶσιν is palaeographically weak, in fact impossible. It is necessary to leave πᾶσιν (= πᾶσιν) unchanged and look for the verb elsewhere, as Schubart did. Still Buecheler's ὁπότε καί is stylistically just right, while Schubart's version <εἰ> ἀποτέ<τα>κται does not produce a likely verb. A causal clause introduced by ὁπότε καί at the end of a long sentence occurs in Juncus, an elegant writer of the second century after Christ excerpted by Stobaeus, *Anth.* 1108 Hense. In a similar situation Cassius Dio (see Boissevain's index) would have used ὁπότε γε καί as *siquidem*. Keeping Buecheler's conjunction but supplying a verb in the future indicative, we interpret ἀποτεκται as <ὁ>πότε κ<αἰ ἐξέσ>ται.

Line 21: For the separate virtues of orderliness, sophrosyne

and restraint, which merge into one another, though orderliness and restraint are sometimes subvirtues of *sophrosyne*, see Helen North, *Sophrosune: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 25, 1966) and especially her sections on Xenophon and Isocrates for the king teaching *sophrosyne* by example. For an emperor himself referring to kingship see the epistle of Elagabalus and Severus Alexander to the Delphians, *FD* III iv 332.

Line 22: In P. Beatty Panop. 2 a later procurator writes *γενέσθω . . . ἐπιμελές*. In the clause introduced by *ὅπου* (Schubart's convincingly formulaic addition) the formula is like that known from the SC *de Bacchanalibus*, ILLRP 511, line 27, *ubi facilumed gnoscier potisit*, and the Tabula Hebana, *AJP* 75 (1954) 229, lines 20-21, *quo loco commo-[dissime legi] possint*.\*

JAMES H. OLIVER

BALTIMORE, MD.

\* The writer thanks the curators Lanny Bell and Daniel B. O'Connor and the registrar, Dr. Ellen R. Kohler, at the University Museum in Philadelphia for allowing him to study the papyrus under favorable conditions and Professor Robert E. A. Palmer for facilitating the arrangements and for discussing problems of reading and interpretation with him.