

Taubenschlag, Rafał

Some notes on W. L. Westermann's article "Slave Maintenance and Slave Revolts", *Classical Philology*, XL, 1945

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 1, 151

1946

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.

NOTES

Some notes on W. L. Westermann's article *Slave Maintenance and Slave Revolts*. *Classical Philology* XL (1945), 1ff. cf. supra p. 91.

As mentioned above, Westermann found out that there were in the Hellenistic world two different types of sustenance, one for free persons, another for slaves. Some remarks confirming this idea may be well in place.

In one of the oldest papyri, Eleph 1 (marriage-contract of 310/11 B.C.), we read that the husband takes upon himself the liability (l. 4): *παρεχέτω δὲ Ἡρακλείδης Δημητρίαι ὅσα προσήκει γυναικὶ ἐλευθέραι πάντα*. And it is amazing to see that a marriage-contract of the Byzantine era, CPR. 30, II, 8 = M. Chr. 290, contains a similar arrangement almost in the same words: *ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ πρέποντα ἐλευθέραις γυναιξίν παρὰ ἀνδράσι σεμοῖς ἐνδείξασθαι εἰς αὐτὴν κτλ*. It may be added that in SB. 4658 of the same period four citizens of Arsinoe act as surety for a husband that the husband (l. 11): *φιλιοθῆναι τῇ [αὐ]τοῦ γαμετῇ Μαρῖα καὶ θάλπειν αὐτὴν ὡς ἀξιώ[ν ἐστι]ν τῶν ἐλευθέρων γυναικῶν κτλ*, (cf. Wenger *Rechtsh. Pap. Stud.* p. 54; Wilcken, *Arch. f. Pap.* V, 208).

We can even go a step farther. The papyri show that the standard of maintenance among free people varied according to their legal or social position. The standard of maintenance is different for women who are *γαμεταί* and women who are only concubines. This is proved for instance by Giss. 2, 18 (173 B.C.) (cf. Gen. 21, 3; Tebt. 104, 16) where we read: *[τὰ δὲ δέοντα καὶ εἰ]πιπλα καὶ ἱματισμὸν καὶ τᾶλλα ὅσα προ[σῆκει γυναικὶ γαμετῆ]* while in other documents no such a difference is made (cf. my article in *Studi Riccobono* I 514). In the Byzantine era the social class to which the woman belongs is also taken into consideration. Lond. V, 1711, 27 (560-573 A.D.) (cf. Cair. Masp. 67, 310, 1. 10) provides: *διαθρῆψαι σε γησιῶς καὶ ἐνδιδάσκειν καθ' ὁμοιότητα πάντων τῶν [σ]υνμετρίων*. (cf. my art, l.c. 515).

It may be finally mentioned that the adoptive-contracts show a different standard of maintenance for legitimate and illegitimate children. In Lips. 18 = M. Chr. 363 (381 A.D.) the adoptive father promises: *θρέψω καὶ ἱματίξω εὐγενῶς καὶ γησιῶς ὡς υἱὸν γνήσιον καὶ φυσικὸν ὡς ἐξ ἐ[μ]οῦ γενόμενον κτλ* and in Oxy. 1895, 9ff. (554 A.D.) the mother gives her daughter in adoption on condition: *παρα[δεδοκέναι αὐτὴν — εἰς θυγατέρα νομίμην] ὥστε ὑμᾶς χορηγοῦντας τὰ δέον[τα χῶραν γον]έων εἰς θυγατέρα ἀποπληρῶσαι εἰς α[ὐτήν] κτλ*.

R. T.