NOTES

THE PHILIPPIANS AND THEIR MAGISTRATES.

[Professor Ramsay has kindly allowed the following note, written in answer to a question addressed to him, to be printed in the Journal of Theological Studies.—Ed.]

1. ON THE TITLE OF THE MAGISTRATES AT PHILIPPI
   (Acts xvi 19-22).

The title of the supreme board of magistrates in the Colonia Philippensis is not certain. As Professor Pelham points out to me, it is not impossible that Philippi may have been one of those coloniae in which the supreme magistrates were called praetores. This is one of the many questions in which we must wait for excavation to give certainty.

The probability, however, is that the colonia had duo vii for its chief magistrates; but even in such cases courtesy permitted the more honorific title to be substituted. But apart from any question of mere courtesy, it is by no means easy to render the Latin title in Greek.

The Latin duumvir, duo vii, are with strict technical accuracy rendered in Greek by ἄρχων δύο: ἄρχων is so used at Col. Caes. Antiochis or Pisidian Antioch (see inscription in Sterrett, Epigraphic Journey, i 39, and Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, 3979'), δύο ἄρχον Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, i 186. But these were un-Greek renderings, obviously mere shifts to express a foreign title; compare δίκαιόν for decemvir, τριῶν ἄρχον for triumvirum, &c. If one desired to have a real Greek word of literary type to express the Latin name, what would one use?

The board of supreme magistrates in a Greek city of the Roman period was called sometimes ἄρχων, sometimes ἀρχηγός. It is established by indisputable examples that, at least in later time, these

1 Wrongly in text δυαρχον, and wrongly explained as = duumviralis; it is = duumvir, which in singular is hard to express in Greek. Sterrett gives the correct form.
titles became interchangeable, so that the same person is called sometimes στρατηγὸς, sometimes δροχοῦ; see Cities and Bishops of Phrygia, pt. ii, p. 600 f. Perhaps in such a case we may understand that δροχοῦ is the more general term, meaning 'member of the supreme board,' while στρατηγὸς was the more exact and precise designation of the board by its official title.

On this analogy the Greek-speaking peoples used both terms to express δυσμύτηρ, δούς ψηλι, as is pointed out by S. Reinach, Manuel d'Épigraphie Grecque, p. 527. δροχοῦ is used in a Greek rendering of a decree of entirely Latin form at Naples (a colonia with δούς ψηλι), Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, 5836; but the example which he gives for the use of στρατηγοὶ (Lebas-Waddington, 3597) from Palmyra is not sufficient, and merely proves that at Palmyra there was a board of two στρατηγοὶ: in fact, Palmyra was not organized on the Italian style, and in that very inscription the βουλή and διοικ are mentioned, implying Greek organization. A clear case, however, occurs in Pisidian Antioch, Sterrett, Epigraphic Journey, 96, ἡ βουλὴ τῶν σκεύων ἐν τῇ στρατηγίᾳ. Here the ordo of that colonia is called βουλή, and it seems beyond question that Secundus was honoured as having filled the office of δυσμύτηρ. It is remarkable that Greek was used in this case, for Latin is the ordinary language of Antiochian inscriptions, even of private inscriptions, much more of an official inscription like this. Yet we are apparently precluded by the Latin name Secundus from dating this inscription in pre-Roman times.

It was therefore quite possible for a Greek writer like Luke to hesitate whether he should use δροχοῦ or στρατηγοῖ for the chief magistrates of a colonia; and so evidently Luke did, Acts xvi 19, 20. Here he says the same thing twice over, 'dragged them into the agora before the archons,' and 'brought them to the presence of the strategoi.' It is unquestionable that these two clauses are two variants, one of more literary and Greek character, the second, presumably, more technical. Luke had not decided between them, and the existence of both in the text is a proof that the book had not here received its final form (St. Paul the Traveller, p. 217). It is quite possible in Greek to use either δροχοῦ or στρατηγοῖ to designate the δούς ψηλι; but it is hardly possible to use both in one sentence to designate the same persons.

But, further, στρατηγὸς was the regular Greek translation for the Latin prætor. Examples are too many and familiar to need quoting.

It is, therefore, not possible to say with certainty what was the intention in Luke's mind as regards Philippi and its magistrates. He may have intended to use στρατηγοῖ as the regular translation of prætores, meaning that the supreme magistrates were so called (either by courtesy or because they were so strictly); or he may have intended to use
στρατηγοί in a more general way as a common Greek title for 'the supreme board of magistrates.' Each is a possible view.

But the probability is, (1) the magistrates at Philippi were duo viri, called in courtesy praetores: (2) Luke used στρατηγοί as the regular Greek translation of praetores: (3) he did for a moment hesitate, when first he mentioned these magistrates, whether in more literary style to call them by the general term 'magistrates' (δημοκτείνες), or to use the more technical translation of their title (στρατηγοί); and he wrote both, but decided for the second, and kept it throughout the rest of the story: (4) the rejected term δημοκτείνες has been preserved owing to the book not having received the finishing touches. And that is the view taken in St. Paul the Traveller, leaving the other possibilities unnoticced. Whether it is right, or needs to be modified, excavation will determine. Here is one of the many cases in which the progress of discovery must be patiently waited.

2. ON THE GREEK FORM OF THE NAME PHILIPPIANS.

It is worth noticing that St. Paul uses the technical and un-Greek rendering of the city name. He speaks of Φίλιππησι, which is a monstrum in Greek, being merely the transcription of Philippenses. A writer who kept to literary Greek might use Φιλίππης or Φιλίππησι: Stephanus Byz. says that Polybius uses the latter, implying apparently that the former was (as we should expect) the ordinary Greek form. The suffix -ήσις was only used in Greek to reproduce Latin names, as Μούτονήσις for Mutinensis, &c. St. Paul, therefore, regarded Colonia Augusta Julia Victrix Philippensium (Head, Historia Numorum, p. 192) as a Latin town, and marks this by the name, which implies doubtless that the inhabitants were proud of their rank (as all colonies in the provinces naturally were), and he respected courteously a justifiable feeling in his correspondents.

This is one of the little noticed indications of Paul's preference for technical Latin forms to indicate Roman administrative ideas: compare Ἰλυρίκη for the Roman province. The regular Greek for Illyricum was Ἰλυρίς, and even Ptolemy uses it when describing the Roman province. Paul and Dion Cassius (twice) are the only writers that render the Latin term in the most severely technical form; and Dion was a Roman historian.

W. M. RAMSAY.