

Taubenschlag, Rafał

"More Funerary Stelae from Kôm Abou Bellou", Zaki Aly, "Bull. Soc. Arch. Alex.", 40, 1953 : [recenzja]

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 9-10, 553-554

1955-1956

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.

Διόνυσον issued on the occasion of the ceremony of the great Capitolia in Oxyrhynchos in BGU IV 1074 (250 A.D.).

W. L. Westermann, *The Prefect Valerius Eudaemon and the Indigent Liturgist* (*J. E. A.* 40 [1954] 107—111).

The papyrus — P. Wisconsin No. 23 — is a brief extract culled out of the record (ὑπομνηματισμός) of a trial, held in the court of Valerius Eudaemon, prefect of Egypt, of a village scribe named Callinicus. The hearing occurred on 11 February A.D. 143. The circumstances of the action against the village scribe were these. He held compelled a man in the jurisdiction of his village district, who was listed as an ἄπορος, a poor man to undertake a liturgy. The nature of his compulsory service is not disclosed in the extract which we have; but it is clear that the *aporoï*, as a recognized class, were exempted from whatever service it was. The author would assume that it lay in the field of the collection of some tax payable in money. There must have been a deficit in the amount collected on this occasion. The plaintiff was then made responsible for a part, at least, of this deficit. Not being able to make up the discrepancy, whether in part or in its total amount, out of his current resources, his meagre property was confiscated and sold to meet, or to help meet, the difference. It is not open to doubt, that he had served as liturgist contrary to then existing law on the immunity of indigent persons. It was after the public sale of the possessions of this *aporos* that the suit for redress was entered against the *comogrammateus* Callinicus. In his decision the prefect, Eudaemon, separated the case into two parts. The first was that of having broken the law upon the immunity of the class of the „indigent”. The second was the question of recompense to the plaintiff for the loss of his property.

Zaki Aly, *More Funerary Stelae from Kôm Abou Bellou* (*Bull. Soc. Arch. Alex.* 40 [1953] 101—150).

From these stelae are especially interesting Stele VI devoted to Archibioapis styled παῖς i.e. a boy or a son or even a slave depicted as good natured and serviceable (χρηστός), pitied and dying untimely at the age of 14 and Stele VIII, dedicated to an Egyptian, whose father has a Greek name, Heron but has given an Egyptian name to his son, as might be expected in a mixed marriage bet-

ween a Greek and an Egyptian woman. There is however as the editor points out also the possibility that Heron is a name assumed by an Egyptian in order to facilitate his dealings with the foreign community.

Apokrimata: Decisions of Septimius Severus on Legal Matters. Text, Translation and Historical Analysis by W. L. Westermann. *Legal Commentary* by A. Arthur Schiller (New York, Columbia University Press 1954).

P. Col. 123 appears to be a complete copy of the decisions rendered by the imperial bureau (cf. A. A. Schiller, *Chronique d'Égypte* XXX, No. 60 [1955] 345. A reedition of the text by H. C. Youtie see *l.c.* 327 ff.). The new readings in v. 21 and 40 make it perfectly clear that the scribe copied the subscripts to a group of petitions which were posted on three successive days, Phamenoth 18th, 19th and 20th.

I. Subscript Number 1 v. 5—7 concerns probably tax arrears including penalties and criminal fines. The question asked by the official Ulpus is whether the indulgence affects Alexandrians and Egyptians. The term $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ strengthens the view that a time limit to the benefaction of the emperor was indicated. The imperial *responsum* was based upon a previous general amnesty which Severus here declared applicable in the case either of the class of Alexandrians or that of Egyptians (cf. on amnesty my *Law*² 551; on Alexandrians *ibid.* 571 ff., 583 ff.; on Egyptians *ibid.* passim v. index).

II. The significance of the 2nd rescript lies in the fact that it is also to be found as the first of the two rescripts published as P. Amh. 63. The context of the rescript itself gives little opportunity for legal comment. The sense is clear, however: "Artemidorus, you have waited too long to complain of the decision for you accepted the findings". It must be remembered that the person to whom the prescript was directed was familiar with the circumstances of the case. The bureau *a libellis* to whom the petition had been submitted also knew these circumstances. Today we possess the brief answer only; hence the meaning of this rescript is enigmatic.

III. The shortest of the rescripts refers to administrative findings "obey the findings made".