



*DICCIONARIO
GRIEGO-ESPAÑOL*



I/II d.C.

Acta Alexandrinorum (A.Al.)

Musurillo, H. y Parassoglou, G.M., «A new fragment of the Acta Alexandrinorum », *ZPE* 15, 1974, pp. 1-7.

Musurillo 1974.pdf

A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE ACTA ALEXANDRINORUM

(Plate 1 a)

A striking new fragment of the *Acta Alexandrinorum* has turned up at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.¹⁾ P.Yale inv. 1385 is a tattered and abraded sheet of a rather thick papyrus of light tan color measuring 12 x 14 cm. The script is written on one side only, across the fibers. The hand is of the sloping oval and almost bilinear style, to be dated, in all likelihood, to the middle or the second half of the second century; although a date early in the third century may not be definitely excluded.²⁾ The text consists of the ends of nine lines of one column and the first seventeen lines of a second. The upper margin survives. The provenance of the papyrus is not known.

A comparison of the Yale papyrus with excellent plates originally supplied by J. Schawe reveals that it belongs to the same papyrus of which eight fragments were acquired by the Library of the Ludwig-Universität, Giessen, and were first published in 1936 by Anton von Premerstein and Karl Kalbfleisch as P.Bibl.Univ.Giss. 46.³⁾ An improved text with full discussion was subsequently published as P.Martyrs III, and again as P.Acta Alex. III.⁴⁾

1) This is the second papyrus of the Yale Collection containing a text of the *Acta Alexandrinorum*. For P.Yale inv. 1536 (= P.Acta Alex. XI.A) see C. Bradford Welles, "A Yale Fragment of the Acts of Appian", TAPA 67 (1963) 7ff.

2) See Eric G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford and Princeton 1971) 26f. Literary fragments of a similar date may be seen in plates 27 (II cent.), 32 (III cent.) and 66 (II/III cent.). The description of the script of plate 66 (the Dublin Chariton) could well apply to that of the Yale papyrus: "Quickly written, medium sized, flattish, 'capital cursive', sloping slightly to right, of nondescript character".

3) "Alexandrinische Geronten vor Kaiser Gaius. Ein neues Bruchstück der sogenannten alexandrinischen Märtyrer-Akten (P.Bibl.Univ.Giss. 46)", *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrus-sammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek*, Part V (Giessen 1936).

4) "P.Martyrs" and "P.Acta Alex." are the abbreviations we have employed for Herbert Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs. Acta Alexandrinorum* (Oxford 1954), and *Acta Alexandrinorum. De mortibus Alexandriae nobilium fragmenta papyracea graeca* (Leipzig 1961), respectively. The text of P.Bibl.Univ.Giss. 46, iii, 20ff. was also reprinted in V. A.Tcherikover and A.Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, II (Cambridge, Mass., 1960) no. 155; it bears no. 2218 in Roger A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt* (2nd ed., Ann Arbor 1965). A possible new fragment of the *Acta*

According to the portion preserved on the Giessen papyrus, a group of Alexandrian delegates, members of the "gerousia" of the city,⁵⁾ arrive in Rome via Ostia, where it would appear that they were detained for at least a month. After having been greeted by a cubicularius of Tiberius who, in all probability, announces the emperor's death, they finally have an interview with Gaius, probably after Tiberius' public funeral on 3 April 37.⁶⁾ A series of salutations follows, exchanged between the new emperor and the Alexandrian legates (the names Eulalus and Arius are mentioned), and then a speech is delivered by Arius; after which an unnamed accuser, who is described as ξενικὸς (P. Acta Alex. III, 76), i.e., an Egyptian or perhaps merely not an Alexandrian, is summarily condemned by Gaius to be tortured or, most likely, burnt to death.⁷⁾ Unfortunately, the point of his accusation or challenge to the Alexandrian delegation is not evident, but it should be noted that there is no indication in this part of the text of any Greek-Jewish confrontation. Gaius then addresses a letter to Alexandria demanding, among other things, that a certain group μὴ ἐχέτωσαν μίσην ἀρετῆς στέφ[α]νον (P. Acta Alex. III, 89-90).

It is in the second column of the Yale fragment that we can detect the beginning of the confrontation between the unnamed challenger and Arius, who becomes the spokesman for the Greek delegation. Arius greets the emperor Gaius and declares that he is ready to take on the challenge of the accusers of the Alexandrians, one of whom, as he later claims, is ξενικὸς (line 18). At his request Gaius apparently allows an interchange between the Alexandrian legate and the unnamed accuser, in the course of which the latter contrasts his own native city (line 24) with that of Arius, obviously Alexandria.

It would appear, therefore, that the Yale piece should be located after the preserved opening words of Arius' salutation to the emperor (P. Acta Alex. III, 53-5) and before Gaius' final condemnation of the accuser (P. Acta Alex. III, 80). The only reasonable place

Alexandrinorum in Athens (P. Soc. Athen. 58) was also published by Musurillo in CE 39 (1964) 147ff., while one in Milan (P. Med. inv. 275) was published by S. Daris in ZPE 12 (1973) 237f. On the relationship between the pagan and the Christian protocols see Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford 1972) I-lvi.

5) On the problem of the Alexandrian gerosia see P. Martyrs 108ff.

6) For the dating of these events see P. Martyrs 110ff.

7) On the nature of the penalty see P. Martyrs 112ff. The new Yale fragment unfortunately throws no further light on the problem.

that would allow for this would be the beginning of column iii of the Giessen fragment - and this would mean, first, that the placement of fragment (C) at the beginning of column iii by A. von Premerstein is mistaken, and second, that the extra strip of papyrus on the right hand side of the same column (i.e., lines 1-13), placed there by R. Ibscher on the basis of fiber alignment, ought also to be removed and located elsewhere.⁸⁾ Thus it would be no mere coincidence that column ii of the Giessen papyrus ends σὺ εἶ ὁ τ[ο]ῦ κόσμου, and column ii of the Yale piece begins θεὸς καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἐκράτησας.

If we accept, then, that the second column of the Yale fragment is the lost beginning of column iii of the Giessen papyrus (and this would seem incontrovertible in view of the content of each piece), then the fragmentary ends of lines from column i of the Yale papyrus should provide us with some at least of the missing letters from the right-hand side of column ii of the Giessen fragment (where the estimated number of letters missing was from two to four). Indeed, when the Yale papyrus was placed side by side with an actual-size photograph of the Giessen fragment, the two papyri appeared to fit together almost perfectly, and this seemed confirmed by the reading of line 23, Εὐλα[]λος, and of line 29, ὁ [] δε. At line 21, πλεετ[ε. | τ]τ γάρ; (see *infra*, note ad loc.) seems most acceptable in the context. The chief difficulty with the juncture are the readings which result at the end of line 24, κε[] στοίς, and at 26-7,] ετοις / ἄπονον (if the older reading of the Giessen portion is correct). The only other alternative would be that an entire column has been lost in the account of the arrival of the Alexandrians in Italy between P.Bibl.Univ.Giss. 46 cols. ii and iii; and this is possible, since the Giessen fragments of cols. i-ii and iii are not joined at this point. Thus the ends of the lines of the first column of the Yale fragment would have come from this lost column, in which the delegates would have greeted the emperor Gaius. P.Yale col. ii (and P.Bibl. Univ.Giss. 46 col. iii) would then recount a second audience with Gaius, during which the credentials of the "foreign" challenger were questioned before he was condemned by the emperor.

The new Yale fragment, for all its interest, creates still further problems. In the transcript which follows, however, we shall adopt the hypothesis that col.i of the Yale

8) See A. von Premerstein (*supra*, n.3) 22f. The original reconstruction of the column, and especially Ibscher's placing of the piece containing lines 1-13 at this position, was already viewed with scepticism in P.Martyrs 115; cf. P.Acta Alex. 8.

papyrus does indeed supplement the first nine lines of P. Bibl. Univ. Giss. col. ii, and so tentatively at least shall attempt to explain it.

(a) P. Acta Alex. III, 21-30

P. Bibl. Univ. Giss. 46, ii

+ P. Yale inv. 1385, i

21	[.....]...ρος εἶπεν· πλέετ[ε. τ]ι γάρ;	1
22	[..... τῶν κύρι[ω]ν; ἔπλευσαν [] δέ	2
23	[.....] ρογ διὰ τοὺς ρογ καὶ Εὐλα[]λος	3
24	[καὶ ἤλ]θον εἰς Ὀστίαν. [ἐκ]εῖθεν κε[.]]στοις	4
25	α[.....]σαν ὄντων μυ[ρί]ων ἡ [.]... η [.]...	5
26	δευ[τέρ]ῳ μηνί καταβά[λ]λουσι [ε.]] εἰς	6
27	ἄπονον. Τι[σί]ων συνήντησεν ια[...]....]	7
28	ὁ κοιτωνίτης Τιβερίου. [οἱ] δέ ἄσπα[]σάμε-]	8
29	νοι αὐτῶν ἡρώτων· τί δ[ι]ρῶ ὁ κύρι[ω]ς; ὁ [] δέ	9
30	εἶπεν· τέλος ἔχει ε[.....]	10

(b) P. Acta Alex. III, 53-80

P. Bibl. Univ. Giss. 46, ii

53	[.....] "Αρειος εἶπεν· κύρι[ε], χαῖρε.
54	[.....] χάρις με[]ν] Ἀλεξαν-
55	δρέων]ετα[.....] η σὺ εἶ ὁ τ[ω]ῦ κόσμου

P. Yale inv. 1385, ii

56	θεὸς καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἐκράτησας. Καῖσαρ εἶ-]	1
57	πεν· "Αρειε, χαῖρε. καὶ δευτέρ[ον] ;]	2
58	"Αρειος εἶπ[εν]· οὐκ οἶδα, κύριε, [.....]	3
59	ω καὶ ἔτοιμος εἰμι πρὸς ἀπολογίαν κατὰ τῶν]	4
60	ἡλιατηγῶρων Ἀλεξανδρέων [.....]	5
61	ε...ου φονο[.....] διαμαχεσ[.....]	6
62	[...]φιτο...μ. θεωρ[.....] τῶν Ἀλεξαν-]	7
63	δρέων θ[έ]λω. "Αρειος εἶπεν·]	8

64	[.]...., κύριε. οὐκ ἐνι ξενικῷ	9
65	καὶ διάλογος. δι' ὃ ἐπιτρέψον	10
66	[.] [.] πρὸς τὸν κατήγορον α[.....]	11
67	[.] ἦσαι ἐπιτρέπω. "Αρειος δ[ε] πρὸς τὸν κατή-]	12
68	[γ]ορον ἀποβλέψας εἶπεν· ι[.....]	13
69	ὁ δὲ λέγει· τί γάρ; σὺ τοῦτο ἔξει[ς]	14
70	ἁπέχου τῆς πατρίδος μου κ[.....]	15
71	[....]. ἴσως κἀγὼ τῆς σῆς πατρίδος]	16
72	[.... "Αρειος] εἶπεν· "Αλεξανδρεὺς εἶ; ...]	17
73	[.....]	
74	[..... ὁ κατήγο-]	

P. Bibl. Univ. Giss. 46, iii

75	ρος εἶπεν· [.....] γ[.... "Αρειος]	20
76	εἶπεν· ἴδ[ε] δὴ ξενικὸς] γὰρ μάλλον κατα-]	21
77	λαβὼν πολ[ι]τεῖται ἀ[να]παγραφῶν	22
78	ξω. ὥστε ἀπέδειξεν [τὸ]ν κατήγορον οὐ δι-]	23
79	καιον. Γάτος Καῖσαρ ἐκ[ε]λευσεν τὸν κα-]	24
80	τήγορον καῖναι.	25

Notes on the Text

[In the following notes it will be assumed that the reader is familiar with the commentary on the Giessen papyrus in P. Martyrs 105ff.]

21. Someone, perhaps the notorious Isidorus - on whom see H. Box, *Philonis Alexandrini in Flaccum* (Oxford 1939) xlix and passim -, is exhorting the delegates as they are about to sail from Alexandria. It would seem that hardly more than one letter have been lost between the edges of the Giessen and the Yale papyri, if Εὐλα[ι]λος in 23 is correct. In the context τ[ι] γάρ; seems better than εἴ γάρ, though both are possible. But there is a possibility that no letters have been lost in the juncture, in which case the so far unattested in classical literature but quite normal form πλέε, followed by τ[ι] should be read.

22. At the beginning perhaps δέδειτε (with πλέετ[ε]) or φοβοῦ (with πλέε). At the end, instead of δέ we should perhaps restore δέ/[κα ἐκ τῶν] ῥογ διὰ τοὺς ῥογ, "ten

(members) from the 173, on behalf of the 173", in spite of the reservations regarding such a use of the preposition *διὰ* expressed in P. Martyrs 114.

24. *ἵατ' ἤλθον*, or the like, seems almost certain. At the end of the line the juncture of the two papyri offers difficulty in *κε[]στοις*. In the Giessen half, *κο[]* is also possible. As we have already stated, possibly one, or at the very most two, narrow letters may have been lost in the gap between the two scraps, but it is difficult to find an adequate supplement. If our reconstruction is correct, possibly a Roman place-name beginning *Ce-*, *Co-*, or *Ci-*, lies concealed here.

25. At the beginning perhaps *ἀπὲβησαν*, *ἀνέβησαν*, or the like.

26. At the end perhaps *ἐὼθετοις*, but the sense remains unclear.

27. In the earlier editions, the beginning of this line was read *ἄρονον. Τισίων*, following von Premerstein. The traces are indeed not against such a reading, but the words remain difficult to interpret; and become now doubly so, if preceded by *]ετοις*. Instead of *Τισίων* one might read *ποιών*, but the sense would remain obscure. In any case, the name of Tiberius' cubicularius may lie at the end of the line.

31-55. These lines of the Giessen fragment are not affected by the discovery of the Yale papyrus.

57. Though somewhat difficult palaeographically, *δεύτερον* is a possible reading. For the use of the adverb see P. Acta Alex. II (= P. Oxy. 1089), 39-40, and P. Acta Alex. VIII (= P. Oxy. 1242), 43-4; cf. also the Index to P. Acta Alex., 81, s.v. At the end of the line we may perhaps supply *δεύτερον αὐτοῦ πάρει;*. If Gaius is here implying that this is Arius' second appearance before him, it may be that an entire column has been lost between cols. ii and iii of the Giessen portion, in which Arius addressed the emperor with a similar flattering speech. But perhaps Arius' first appearance was before Tiberius.

58. Cf. P. Acta Alex. XI (= P. Oxy. 33), 93-4, *τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ οἶδα*.

59. Cf. P. Acta Alex. VI (= P. Rendel Harris), 10-11, *οὐκ εἰμι ἔτοιμος ποιεῖσθαι - τ]ὴν ἀπολογίαν*.

60. At the end of the line *ἐξίέναι* or the like. After it we should perhaps supply *Καῖσαρ εἶπεν*, or perhaps at 61-2, if, as seems likely, Arius' reply continues down to *διαμαχεσ[]*.

61. At the beginning perhaps $\xi\tau\iota$ or $\alpha\tau\iota$; then $\phi\acute{o}\nu\omicron[\omega]$ or $\phi\omicron\nu\epsilon[\omega]$; after the lacuna there is a vertical stroke (ι , ν , or η); at the end $\delta\iota\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ or $\delta\iota\alpha\mu\alpha\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, followed perhaps by Καῖσαρ εἶπεν .

64. $\xi\epsilon\nu\iota[\omega]$: the dotted letters are mere traces; but cf. 76.

65. The papyrus is broken off before $\kappa\alpha\iota$ but almost certainly no letters have been lost. $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, of course, "debate" or "discourse", as often. Arius, as an Alexandrian citizen, refuses to debate with the challenger, since the latter lacks the proper credentials. At the end, if Arius is still speaking to the emperor, we should perhaps supply $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\rho\epsilon\psi\omicron\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$, or the like.

66. In this line, since the emperor is speaking, perhaps $[\Gamma\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\varsigma]$ at the beginning and $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\rho\epsilon\psi\alpha\varsigma$ at the end (with $\epsilonἶπεν$ omitted); but other supplements are possible, e.g., 65-7 may read $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\rho\epsilon\psi\omicron\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$. $\text{Καῖσαρ}] / [\epsilon]\tilde{\iota}[\pi\epsilon\nu]\cdot\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\omicron\nu \delta[\iota\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu] / [\pi\omicron\iota]\tilde{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\rho\epsilon\psi\omega$.

68. At the end perhaps $\tilde{\iota}\delta\epsilon \delta\acute{\eta}$, as in 76.

69. At the end $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\iota[\varsigma \kappa\alpha\tau' \acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\tilde{\upsilon};]$?

70. $\tilde{\omega}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\upsilon$, "keep away from", as in Xen., Hellenica 7, 3, 10, though startling, is palaeographically possible and makes good sense here.

71-2. Perhaps $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\mu\iota.$] / $[\acute{\omega} \delta\acute{\epsilon}]$, or $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}] / [\chi\omega]$, or the like.

72. At the end other supplements are possible.

73-4. If our juncture is correct, only two lines should be missing between the break at the end of the Yale papyrus and the first lines of the Giessen fragment (col. iii), seeing that in this papyrus the rule is 35 lines to the $\sigma\epsilon\lambda\tau\varsigma$.

77. Read $\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$.

78. Since it would seem clear now that Arius is still speaking (and quite likely to the "foreign" challenger), the letters $\xi\omega$ may well be the ending of a second person aorist middle, e.g., $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega$ or the like. Thus Arius' speech comes to an end here, while the sentence beginning $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon \acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\epsilon\nu$ would be part of an editorial comment by the reductor of the document.