

Taubenschlag, Rafał

"Deditizier, Doppelbürgerschaft und Personalitäts-Prinzip", E. Schönbauer, "Journ. Jur. Pap.", VI : [recenzja]

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 7-8, 379

1953-1954

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.

Fr. v. Schwind, *Zur griechisch-ägyptischen Verschmelzung unter den Ptolomäern* (Studi in onore di V. Arangio-Ruiz II, 435-451).

Soter, the founder of the dynasty, as a Macedonian military king leant exclusively on his Greco-Macedonian supporters in the army. Only in religious matters he respected the feelings of his Egyptian subjects. Philadelphos by his lucrative though fatal in the end economic system made national equality for ever impossible. After the prosperity of the outside power under Euergetes I, Philopator had partially at least introduced the equality of military rights, causing thus quite unintentionally a long series of revolts, which broke persistently during the reign of Epiphanes and Philometor. Weak attempts of Euergetes II to counteract revolutionary movements and to create a uniform State by leaning upon both groups of the population proved unsuccessful due to the economic system, the weakness of the kings and because the times were then unfavourable to his designs. This evolution reaches its climax and tragic end during the regency of Cleopatra, the last queen of the dynasty of Lagides.

E. Schönbauer, *Deditizier, Doppelbürgerschaft und Personalitäts-Prinzip* (Journ. Jur. Pap. VI, 17—72).

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

Henri Henne, *De l'antisymbolon à l'antapocha?* (Studi in onore di V. Arangio-Ruiz IV, 127).

The antapochon of the papyri of the Byzantine epoch is virtually used on every occasion for deliveries of fiscal character. The antapochon appears as the declaration of delivery made by the debtor who is responsible for it (or his proxy) and remitted to the receiving party *πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν*, then for the security of this party.

The antisymbolon is a different matter. Probably there is the question of a duplicate but of somewhat special nature; it is in fact the duplicate of control. In the Ptolemaic epoch the antisymbolon was returned e. g. to the *ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων* whilst the accountant kept the symbolon. In the Roman epoch the antisymbolon was returned to the true payer of the customs-duties whilst the symbolon remained in the hands of the carrier who worked for him. Nevertheless these suggestions are tentatively only set down.