

Taubenschlag, Rafał

"Coptic Ostraca from Medinet Habu", E. Stefański, M. Lichtheim, Chicago 1952 : [recenzja]

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 9-10, 574-575

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.

latives seems possible only when there are no direct descendants and no consort of the testator. In fact in the testament neither the wife nor the children of the testator are mentioned. They certainly do not exist. It is not clear from the testament why the testator's sister was not taken into consideration. A sister had evidently no right to succession *contra tabulas*. Perhaps she was considered to be satisfied what often was the case with the establishment of her dowry.

There follows the enumeration of the testator's debts which after his death the heirs i.e. his two brothers are responsible for (v. 29—35). After this follows the clause (v. 35) that nobody has the right to contest the testament. It is remarkable that not all the possible grades of relationship are mentioned, but only the circle of those persons who are taken into consideration, are indicated in general terms.

The text B comprises parts of three documents. The first two are delivery contracts. The price is not mentioned here like in many other documents of this type. The drawer confirms only that he had duly received it. Only the beginning of the third document mentioning the partners of the contract has been preserved.

In all these texts the particular points are that they were partially written first in Greek and then in Coptic; that they were not attested by the drawer neither by the witnesses nor by the scribe of the document; that all these texts were written by the same hand at a stretch and without breaks in spite of the drawer and the receiver of the document being different persons in the single documents. All these details point to the documents not being real ones but only forms written on the reverse of a worn-out testament which should serve for a notary as a model when writing real documents. Both the documents are provided with a penalty clause in the event, the delivery should not be made in due time and secured by a hypothec *omnium bonorum*.

E. Stefański — M. Lichtheim, *Coptic Ostraca from Medinet Habu*. The University of Chicago, Oriental Institute Publications vol. LXXI, Chicago University Press 1952 (cf. A. Steinwenter, *Sav. Z.* LXXI, 497 ff.).

For the continuation between the Greek and the Egyptian documents the O. 82 may be referred to. I did not see it. I know this

edition only from Steinwenter's commentary l.c. Out of the rich contents of the collection noteworthy is a sea fright agreement in which the freighter promises his partner to bring himself and his σκεύη μετὰ καλοῦ χωρὶς θεοῦ βίας to Antinoupolis (cf. my *Law*² 383).

V. Martin, *Letter of Recommandation for three Monks* (*JEA* 40 [1954] 74—75).

Neither the identity nor the status of the sender and the recipient can be fully ascertained. There is no positive argument for Nicole's view that Johannes was an official of the *cursus publicus*. On γραμματηφόρος in v. 2 cf. my *Law*² 683.

H. Zilliacus, *The Stolen Anchor* (extr. from *Arctos, Acta Philologica Fennica Nova* series vol. I [1954] 199—208).

The complaint in this Bodleian document catalogued as Ms. Gr. Class. c. 42 (P.) is written by a certain Timotheus acting on behalf of the corporation of monks or the monastery in Ankyron polis; he himself being a member of the corporation. The subject of the complaint is robberies made by some soldiers and the request is written to a certain Heron, addressed as πατρῶν. This may at first hand suggest the land-lord of a large estate in which the monastery was situated and who guaranteed the monks his protection.

The complaint concerns two robberies, possibly connected one with another. The first part of the letter (l. 4—17) tells about the soldier Paulus having stolen the anchor from the brothers. He obviously did it as reprisals for an unsettled debt of the deacon Horus (acting on behalf of the monastery?). It is understood that the debt of 24.00 myriads (of denars) did not correspond to the value of the anchor. In this connection the writer refers to an authoritative pronouncement of his superior, the presbyter Oiantinos, concerning the aforesaid debt and he stresses that the *procurator* did not take or lay claim to more than half the sum.

In the latter part of the letter (l. 17—23) Timotheus gives a report on another plundering. Soldiers — or possibly the same one — have robbed the wine-boat belonging to a certain Komon of not less than 200 big double-measures of wine, and he presents as witness a brother acting as fisherman to the monastery. In this connection