

Fikhman, Itskhok Fiselevitch

"Pekhleviyskie papirusy sobraniya GMII imeni A. S. Pushkina = The Pahlavi papyri from the collection of A. S. Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts", A. G. Perikhanian, "VDI", 1961, nr 3 : [recenzja]

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 15, 423-424

1965

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.

logical interpretation of this term as „the possession by god Sarapis” rejected Krüger’s interpretation while L. Wenger has fully accepted it (cf. L. Wenger, *Eine juristische Erwägung zum — (κατοχή-Problem)*. *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, Bd. 28 (1938), p. 117). Upon a very careful analysis of the UPZ 59 and 60 O. O. Krüger reconstructs the course of events discussed in these letters and comes to the conclusion that the κατοχή, is not, as U. Wilcken has assumed „the possession by the god”. Οἱ ἀπειλημιμένοι has never signified ἐγκάτοχοι, but the men who are surrounded or made prisoners. Such was the situation of Hephestion, Conon and others. Pressed by this great danger Hephestion made appeal to god Sarapis and in return for his rescue promised to go for a certain period to the temple of Sarapis in Memphis. So the κατοχή „is the result of a spontaneous submission of oneself to the will of god Sarapis”, in consequence of „a vow” pledged to this god.

S. J. Lurie, *K voprosu o proiskhojdenii kul'ta khristianskikh celiteley = A contribution to the question of the origin of the cult of Christian healers*. *VDI*, 1960, No. 2, pp. 96–100.

An emended reedition (with a translation and a commentary) of the amulet of Gorgippia, published by T. V. Blavatskaya in a collection entitled „*Issledovaniya v chest' na akad. Dechev = The studies in honour of the Academician Dechev*. Sofia, 1958, pp. 231–239. S. J. Lurie considers this amulet to be an appeal to the goddess-healer from Menouphis (κυρά, *Isis medica*). The reedition is preceded by an introduction devoted to the history of the cult of the goddess-healer from Menouphis and to the demonstration of her identity with Isis, one of the functions of the latter was healing. By his declaration that the bones found in the church of St. Marc Evangelist are the relics of the martyrs Kyros and John, as well as by an order to transport these relics to the ancient temple of Isis in Menouphis, the patriarch Cyrill made possible to utilize in the interests of the Christian Church the population’s faith in the healing proprieties of the ancient sanctuary. “Henceforth the miraculous cures began to be performed not by the pagan κύρος or κυρά but by the Christian Κύρος.”

A. G. Perikhanian, *Pekhleviyskie papirusy sobraniya GMII imeni A. S. Pushkina = The Pahlavi papyri from the collection of A. S. Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts*. *VDI*, 1961, No. 3, pp. 78–93.

The editress publishes 14 from the 40 Pahlavi papyri (from the former collection of V. S. Golenishchev) kept in the A. S. Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow. The papyri belong to the times of the Persian conquest of Egypt (619–629 A.D.). The place of the discovery of the papyri is not exactly

known; perhaps it is Fayyûm. The state of preservation is bad; the reading presents great difficulties. Essentially the papyri are letters or fragments of letters of the representatives of the Persian administration or their agents and fragments of economic records. No. 1: a letter addressed to a certain master Huvasnîč(?) by a subordinate which stationed perhaps in Elephantine. In this letter mention is made of a release of a girl (a servant?), of a manumission of a slave, but the context is not clear. No. 2: a letter in which is mentioned a receipt of an unknown number of denârs. No. 3: a fragment of a letter speaking of a certain Šahrvarâz. It is possible that the letter concerns Šahrvarâz, commander of Chosroes Aparvaz. No. 4: a letter. No. 5: a letter of a certain Yazdân — ahrây to a certain Yazdân-abbyyât. No. 7: a fragment of a letter in which is mentioned a pledge. No. 8: a letter, perhaps an order to take measures to catch a runaway slave bought formerly for 64 denârs. No. 9: a letter. No. 10: the end of an economic record and a fragment of a letter. No. 11: fragments of two letters. No. 12: a fragment of a letter. No. 13: three fragments. In the third fragment appears štr'l'nywč'(n) whom A. G. Perikhanian identifies with Σαραλακειοζαν from BGU II, 377. She proposes to read in BGU Σαραλανεοζαν. In her opinion this is Šahrâlányōzân, the steward of the court (kārframân i dar), perhaps a Persian administrator in Fayyûm. No. 14: the beginning of an economic record. The edition is illustrated by the photographs of all published 14 texts. The commentary is detailed and expertly written. In many cases the editress proposes the improvements in O. Hansen's readings (cf. *Die mittelpersischen Papyri der Papyrussammlung der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin. Abh. d. Preuss. Ak. d. Wiss.*, 1939, No. 9), and closes the publication of the texts with an analysis of the historical evidence contained in the published Pahlavi papyri.

N. N. P i k u s, *Izuchenie istorii ellinisticheskogo Egipta v XIX v. Drevniy mir. Sbornik statey v chest' akademika V. V. Struve = The study of the history of the Hellenistic Egypt in the XIX century. The Ancient World. A collection of essays in honour of the Academician V. V. Struve.* Moscow, 1962, pp. 603–610.

A catalogue and a brief analysis of the publications of the texts and the research works done in the field of the history of the Hellenistic Egypt. The author devotes much attention to the works of Russian scholars.

Academician V. V. S t r u v e, *Obshchestvennyi sroy ellinisticheskogo Egipta = The social structure of the Hellenistic Egypt. Voprosy Istorii*, 1962, No. 2, pp. 67–95.

The author rejects the view that the conquest can account for the peculiarity of social and economic relations in the Ptolemaic Egypt. He also refutes the