

Taubenschlag, Rafał

"Beiträge zum Recht der Parapherna",
E. Gerner, "Münch. Beitr z. Pap.", 38,
1954 : [recenzja]

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 9-10, 513-514

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.

the will of the latter, forced or not, to liberate a slave. It was originally a real dedication to the divinity through which the liberated slave became in fact a slave in the temple. This ownership subsequently became fiduciary. The dedication did not imply a physical attachment to the god, but rather a moral one. The author defends his thesis on the basis of Greek inscriptions. Papyrological material is not used.

THE LAW GOVERNING DOMESTIC RELATIONS

M. I. Finley, *Marriage, Sale and Gift in the Homeric World* (*Seminar: Annual Extraordinary Number of the „Jurist“*, XII [1954] 7—33).

Although this article deals with the ancient Greek law it will be also of interest for papyrologists, cf. the author's remarks on ἔδνα p. 16 ff.; on the verbal exchange of solemnities — ἐγγυῶ-ἐγγυῶμαι p. 27; on marriage by purchase and the later ἐγγύησις p. 33.

J. Černý, *Consanguineous Marriages in Pharaonic Egypt* (*JEA* 40 [1954] 23—29).

Outside the royal families, we know of the certain occurrence of consanguineous marriage in the Twenty — second Dynasty and two practically certain cases in the Middle Kingdom. In all cases the best we can prove is that the married couple were half-brother and half-sister, that is children either of the same father or of the same mother. We have no certain instance of a marriage between full brother and sister.

E. Gerner, *Beiträge zum Recht der Parapherna* (*Münch. Beitr. z. Pap.* 38 [1954]).

Besides the φερνή (or προίξ), that is besides goods belonging to the s. c. dowry existed in Greek and Greco-Egyptian law a special mass of goods called παράφερνα. They used to be established by the wife and in case of her minority by her ἐπίτροπος, by her relatives (ascendants) or other relatives. The παράφερνα consist (cf. my *Law*² 126) mostly of ἰμάτια, jewelry, articles of dress, household furniture. They are the property of the wife and must be returned

to her after the termination of the marriage. Besides the *φερνή* and the *παράφερνα* Greek marriage contracts contain provisions for additional gifts (*προσφορά*). As far as the origin of the *παράφερνα* is concerned they correspond to the things for women to be found in Demotic contracts and the author assumes that they were taken over from these contracts to the Greek ones.

H. J. Wolff, *Zur Geschichte der Parapherna* (*Sav. Z.* LXXII [1955] 335—347).

In this article, being at the same time a criticism of the work of E. Gerner, the author tries to explain how it came to the particular custom of granting the husband — besides the real, estimated dowry — still another "extra-dowry" which at least principally was not estimated. It consisted of the same kind of objects designed for the personal use of the wife and of household furniture and was ascribed or to the one mass or to the other and even distributed among the two masses in the same document. The author comes to the conclusion that the legally little sharp conception of parapherna arose from the particular conditions set by the development of the Hellenistic marriage law.

B. Cohen, *Dowry in Jewish and Roman Law* (repr. from: *Annuaire de l'Inst. de Phil. et d'Hist. Orient. et Slaves* XIII [1953] = *Mélanges I. Lévy*, p. 47—85).

The study of comparisons between Jewish and Roman law is often complicated by the fact that in Talmudic law, civil and religious law are frequently inextricably intertwined, and the rabbis were in the habit of transferring legal principles that were first developed in civil law into the realm of the ritual and vice versa. However, dowry is an element of human situation where we might naturally expect a number of spontaneous resemblances in the Jewish and Roman legal systems. In both systems, dowry was originally customary and voluntary, and in the course of time it became a sort of legal obligation. The concept of *onera matrimonii* is found in both systems. On the other hand, Justinian's *donatio propter nuptias* betrays Jewish influence. Even more evident familiarity with Hellenistic law is betrayed by the rabbis where they employ such Greek terms as *φερνή*, *παράφερνα* and *γαμικόν*.