

Taubenschlag, Rafał

"Titus and Alexandria : A new document", C. H. Roberts, "Journal of Roman Studies", 39, 1949 : [recenzja]

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 5, 262-263

1951

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.

Antinoite privilege of ἐπιγαμία with the Egyptians is applied. The father is an Antinoite, the mother is „from the metropolis”, the daughter again has full citizenship. The respective provision is all the more characteristic as it was not in force in Alexandria (cf. Oxy 56 = M. Chr. 320).

N^o 51 = SB 5342 (206 A. D.) and N^o 52 (208 A. D.) are returns of inundated land (cf my *Law* II 34). The ἀφῆλιξ in N^o 51 acts (v. 12) δι' ἐπιτρόπου (cf. my *Law* I 124).

N^o 18 (117—8 A. D.) is a notification of an appointment. Heraclides Valerius has recently been designated as *episkeptes* (cf. Oertel, *Liturgie* p. 182) for the Oxyrinchite nome by the strategos of his own district. The exact nature of this liturgy is not known.

N^o 53 B 1 (219—220 A. D.) is noteworthy for the problem of double citizenship (cf. my *Law* II 20). After the C. A. Marcus Aurelius Philosarapis receives Roman citizenship; nevertheless he remains citizen of Antinoopolis. He styles himself (B2 Marcus Aurelius Philosarapis).

Cl. Préaux, *Ostraca de Pselkis de la Bibliothèque Bodléenne* (*Chronique d' Egypte* No 51 1951 p. 121 ff).

These ostraca give some data as to the life of the garrison at Pselkis. The names of the soldiers confirm the indigenous recruitment of the Roman army in Egypt, being besides certified by the „fatherlands” of the soldiers indicated in the main text. The chief interest of the receipts of Dakkeh consists in the fact that they bring us some particulars as to the pay.

Especially interesting for the jurists are Nos 2970 and 2992 (177 A. D.) where we read διὰ Ἑρμίνου κουρά[τορος ?] Ἰσίδορος Ἀθαμόνις [ἰ]ππεύς (τούρμη) Γέμελος Ἀλεξάνδρω καθαριάτορι χαίρει.

It is a case of proxy (cf. my *Law* I 233); as to the κουράτωρ cf. Lesquier, *L'armée romaine* p. 122, 144, 145. The reading of κουρά[τορος] is very uncertain. In N^o 3005 (v. 5) we are reading κουράτωρ [ἔ]γραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ.

Nos 3001—3002 (II cent. A. D.), being a fiscal document brings very interesting particulars on the ἐπιτηρητῆς εἰδῶ[ν — Ἰν][[δικ(ῆς) θαλάσσης] who collected the taxes imposed upon the goods arriving along the two routes — the southern and the eastern one — which joined at Syene.

C. H. Roberts, *Titus and Alexandria: A new document* (*Journal of Roman Studies* 39 (1949) pp. 79—80).

Mr. Roberts publishes under this title an unedited papyrus of the Rendell-Harris collection. These few mutilated lines belong to the *Acta Alexandrinorum* unknown as yet. By their action (78—81 A. D.) these acts are situated between the *Acta Isidori* and *Acta Hermanisci*. Titus announces that he is going to judge in public(?) and summons twice the Alexandrines to defend themselves. But they declare of being not ready to proceed to that defence.

Hubert Metzger, *Zur Stellung der liturgischen Beamten Ägyptens in frühromischer Zeit.* (*Museum Helveticum* vol. 2 (1945) fasc. 1, p. 54—62) (editio princeps of Pap. Gr. Vindob. 25824 a) and 25824 b). (II cent. A. D.) in connection with a new revision of Amh. 65).

The papyrus under discussion contains the extracts from the official journals of various prefects. The purpose of the record is clearly to give an assortment of such acts that speak about the thema of „the liturgy” and are apt to show the usage practised in this branch of the administration. Noteworthy in this respect is the ἐντολή, the instruction of the prefect for the strategos, especially in Col. IV and VI recorded, wherein the requirements are specified with the smallest details, which the liturgies have to follow.

In the protocoll Vind. 25. 284 a) I, there is made a hint at the edict of the prefect Ursus which presumably contained the provision that three brothers should not be called simultaneously to the liturgical office. Also the remaining official documents are concerned with this prescription.

Amh. 65 I 9—11 and Amh. 65 II with Vind. 25824 b) I are concerned with the revision of certain official posts by the prefect, and may be divided into two parts. First there is made a reference to an earlier official act of the prefect, that is to a letter, which he in his time has written to the strategos Glaukias, wherein he charged the blame on him for not having followed the existing official rules on occasion of a presentation of the liturgical officials since he has sent him two names from the same house. The letter being read aloud obviously to justify the dismissal—sentence pronounced upon the eclogistes Anubion. The prefect reminds, that the order had been passed unto all the eclogistes wherein he had made the official prescriptions for them. He reproaches the eclogistes Anubion for having gone beyond his authority.