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Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.
According to the author’s opinion, the two palinodes do not belong to Stesichorus. The papyrus from Oxyrhynchus says rather that Chamaeleon, who edited the works of Stesichorus in the 3rd—2nd cent. B.C., divided the palinode into two parts.


On the visit of Strabo to Egypt and on his sources concerning Egypt cf. pp. 777, 788.


In this last essay published before his death, V. V. Struve sums up the researches of the Soviet historians and marks the fundamental problems upon which it is necessary to concentrate and the ways to their solution. On Ptolemaic Egypt cf. pp. 104—105, 108.


The Demotic documents nos. 113, 115 and 116, which constitute a part of the archive of a priest’s family (especially the papyrus no. 113 which is a very usurious transaction concluded by the priest Peraios with the Greek Antenor), testify that the Greeks exploited not only the lower strata of society but also the members of the ruling class of Egypt. It was the usurious opera-
tions of the Greeks which provoked this hatred of Egyptian people towards the Greeks and found its most sharp expression in the papyri from Sarapeum.

V. V. Struve. Obshchiny Egipta i Shumera i obshchiny Indii. (The Communities of Egypt and Sumer and the Communities of India). Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta, XVIII, 1965, no. 20, the series of history, language and literature. Issue 4, pp. 52—64.

The first part of the essay (pp. 52—56) is devoted to the characterisation of the Egyptian village in Greco-Roman times, the organisation of which was close to the Indian community described by K. Marx. The Egyptian community, the history of which begins in the last centuries of the 4th millennium, preserved its vital power owing to a rising of the masses in the second half of 18th cent. B.C.; but in Ptolemaic times the community begins to decline because of a ruthless collection of taxes and towards the end of the Roman epoch finally perishes, with it the ancient Egyptian culture and the language of ancient Egypt perish too.


The chapter “Egypt”— pp. 17—31.


In this essay an attempt has been made to examine the correctness of A. S. Zhebel’ev’s hypothesis who in his interpretation of a well-known letter of Apollonius to Zenon on an embassy of Pairisades II, unlike M. Ros-tovtsev, came to an assertion accepted by many Soviet historians that a competition in the corn trade existed between Egypt and the Bosporus which caused a slow extinction of the Bosporus. According to the author, although the production of corn in the 3rd cent. B.C. brought with it the possibilities of a competitive struggle, since it was not a predominant or unique form of production in the Mediterranean area, and in the circumstances of the strongly applied methods of extra-economic compulsion, it could not cause a commercial competition similar to modern forms. The Bosporus decays because of a defeat on the international corn market. The study of the Bosporan eco-