

Elżbieta Weronika Loska, Ph.D.

ZAŁĄCZNIK NR 3

SELF-PRESENTATION

with teaching and science popularizing achievements

1. Name and surname

Elżbieta Weronika Loska

2. Diplomas and degrees – full name, place and year of obtaining, along with the title of the Doctor of Philosophy thesis

In the fourth year of my studies I received an Erasmus scholarship, which allowed me to go to Naples for six months, where, apart from attending lectures, I started collecting materials for my master's degree thesis in the Roman Law library of the Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II.

I obtained a Master of Arts degree in Law at the Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Warsaw, upon the thesis entitled 'A Legacy in Roman law and 19th-century codifications', supervised by prof. dr. hab. Maria Zabłocka. The thesis defense took place on May 11, 2001 at the University of Warsaw. I graduated from university with *summa cum laude*.

In 2002, I obtained a postgraduate diploma in Intellectual Property Rights at the Faculty of Law and Administration of the University of Warsaw with a very good overall grade.

Employed at the Faculty of Law and Administration of the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, I obtained several Socrates / Erasmus study scholarships at the Università degli Studi in Cassino. There I conducted research on the following subjects: *Adulterio nel diritto romano* (2005), *Animus occidendi nel diritto romano* (2006), *Cicerone e le legittima difesa* (2007), *Legittima difesa nelle fonti romane* (2008).

As an post-graduate student, I also took part in Collegio di Diritto Romano. *La repressione criminale fra norma persuasione nella Roma repubblicana*, Università di Pavia, Pavia, 9-26 I 2007, and again a year later I participated in Collegio di Diritto Romano. *Homo, caput, persona. La costruzione giuridica dell'identità nell'esperienza romana* - Università di Pavia, Pavia, 21-25 I 2008, this time as an assistant.

From January to June 2008, I took part in the *Corso di alta formazione nel diritto romano* at the La Sapienza Università in Rome.

I obtained the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy in Law based on the dissertation *Vim vi repellere licet (self-defence in Roman law)* supervised by prof. dr. hab. Jan Zabłocki. The public defence of the doctoral thesis took place on May 26, 2009 at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, Warsaw. The doctorate degree in Law was granted to me by the resolution of the Council of the Faculty of Law and Administration of the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University on the same day.

3. Information about employment in scientific institutions

2002 – 2003 Faculty of Law, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, lecturer at the Department of Roman Law, contract work

2003 to date Faculty of Law, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, senior lecturer (first research-and-teaching assistant, from 2009 assistant professor of the Department of Roman Law)

2006 - 2009 Faculty of European Studies, University of Warsaw, lecturer

4. Scientific achievements referred to in Article 16 §2 of the Act of March 14, 2003 on academic degrees and academic title, and on degrees and title in the field of Arts (Dz. U. of 2017, item 1789):

a) title of scientific/artistic achievement

A scientific achievement as required in the above-mentioned Act is a monograph *Pozycja prawna aktorów w prawie rzymskim* [*Legal Position of Actors in Ancient Rome*]

b) author/authors, title/titles of the publication, publishing date, publishing house, publishing reviewers

Elżbieta Loska, *Pozycja prawna aktorów w starożytnym Rzymie* [*Legal Position of Actors in Ancient Rome*], Warsaw 2018, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University Publishing House, *Arcana Iurisprudentiae* series, pp. 369. Prof. dr. hab. Anna Pikulska-Radomska and prof. UG dr. hab. Jacek Wiewiorowski were publishing reviewers.

c) examination of the scientific objective of the work and the results achieved together with their possible use

The scientific objective of the work was to present and analyze the legal status of actors in Rome in the period of the Republic and the Principate with particular emphasis on the mutual influence of their social and legal position. My curiosity prompted me to undertake research which was, on the one hand, related to my interest in the theatre, and on the other hand, to the difference in the social perception of actors in ancient and contemporary times. I wondered whether the treatment of actors in ancient Rome different from the contemporary one had a legal basis - and if so, what was this foundation. In particular, this concerned the issue of infamy attributed to people performing on stage. In the world of Polish science, such research on the legal position of certain professional groups in ancient Rome has already been

conducted, as indicated by the work of prof. dr. hab. Andrzej Sokala regarding *meretrices* and *lenones*, or the work of prof. dr. hab. Joanna Misztal-Konecka on the legal position of the Vestals. The presented monograph is the first legal book in Polish devoted entirely to issues related to the theater and actors. The monumental work of prof. Mirosław Kocur (*In the power of the theatre. Actors and Spectators in Ancient Rome*, Wrocław, 2005) is a piece of a theater historian, not a lawyer. Therefore, it is primarily a historical elaboration, with legal issues being presented in a general and brief manner, and not being subject to a deeper analysis.

In my research, I used the historical-legal method. Its main subject was the analysis of preserved source texts, both legal and non-legal ones. The latter type of sources allows for a greater degree of observation regarding the relationship between the law and the functioning of the society. Especially in antiquarian sources one can find information on the mutual influence of law and social perception of specific groups of people. I limited the chronological scope of the research to the period of the Republic and the Principate due to the significant distinction of the post-classical law. The book consists of an introduction, five chapters and an ending.

In chapter one, I presented the source texts related to the beginnings of the theatre in Rome, the manner of organizing the audience and terminological issues related to the profession of actors and their social position. The most information about the beginnings of the theatre in Rome is contained in the *Ab Urbe condita* by Livy. The historian reported that the first actors had arrived to the city from Etruria for a strictly defined purpose - they were to enable the organization of a new type of the games, the *ludi scaenici*. The event was necessary to relieve the anger of the deities and extinguish the plague that had been decimating the city. Thus, the art of acting was brought to Rome, and it was not created by its citizens, which could have had a significant impact on the perception of both acting and actors. Also, the terminology associated with the theatre sphere was largely taken over (or even calqued on) from Greek via the Etruscans to Latin. This foreignness of the theatre could have been one of the reasons for an unfavourable attitude towards people doing the profession of an actor. Many actors were *peregrini* or slaves, which, in my opinion, could also have had an impact on the perception of all those doing this profession, including Roman citizens.

I also indicated that in order to show the most complete image of the legal position of the actors possible, it is necessary to refer to the sources related to *personae probrosae* and *personae turpes*. The analysis of the source texts confirmed the validity of the current position of historians and researchers of Roman law, who undoubtedly include people appearing on

stage into these two groups. The legal position of actors was therefore a resultant of the regulations referring to *personae probrosae* and *personae turpes*, as well as those that concerned them specifically. Both ancient and contemporary authors often put actors appearing in Rome on an equal footing with prostitutes and gladiators of both sexes, not paying attention to the differences between these professions, making it the wrong approach. One of the assumptions of the work is to show the distinctiveness of the actor's profession as compared to the other dishonourable jobs.

In this chapter I also studied legal acts regulating the order of sitting in the theatre audience. The most important of them is the *lex Roscia theatralis* granting privileged places in the theatre to the representatives of the *ordo equester*. They are claimed to sit in fourteen rows just behind the orchestra, where, in turn, were the best places reserved by the old custom for senators. The best places were awarded to the political elite for the first time during the Games of 194 BC and from then on that fact was never undermined.

Chapter two was devoted to the presentation of an extremely important issue of the social position of actors. As I managed to demonstrate, it had a great impact on their legal status. I focused my consideration on the diverse roles actors performed in the society as well as relations between actors and those in power. The latter had a twofold character. First of all, any criticism or praise of a given politician proclaimed on stage using more or less direct allusions could shape the political tastes of the audience gathered in the theatre. Secondly, actors could sustain more private relationships with influential politicians. The friendship of Roscius with the dictator Sulla, and the turbulent relations between mime Laberius and Julius Caesar are the best confirmed in the sources. The issue of relations between actors and the public does not directly refer to the legal position of the actors. Yet discussing this topic was necessary for me, because social perception had a huge impact on shaping the legal status of certain groups of people, and the audience's reaction to actors both in and outside the theatre constituted the best test of their usefulness in a society. As I showed in further chapters, this assumption was right.

Against this background, I compared the position of actors with that of orators. People who performed these professions drew on each other's workshops, and often carried out their tasks in a way that was superficially indistinguishable – there were similar gestures, way of speaking, moving or expressing oneself. Orators were also helped by the ‘stage movement’ and an appropriate use of the voice, and they often observe the technique (or even learned it) from the actors. And yet both groups were perceived as completely different. Orators were usually the most respected members of the community, and actors on the

contrary. In my opinion, it is extremely likely that it was the external similarity between the behaviour of actors and orators that influenced the former to have a different position from other *personae probrosae*.

The audience following a spectacle of any kind (whether it was a judicial, political or theatrical one) could have received the very 'show' similarly although the content and purpose of these performances were fundamentally different. And it was this distinction that significantly influenced various perceptions of the main characters of these spectacles. One of the reasons for the drastic difference in the social status of orators and actors was that the art of acting was generally perceived as almost exclusively entertaining and therefore giving pleasure. Oratory art was considered useful. Thus the performers of both activities were perceived in an utterly different way.

From the moment the first actors were brought to Rome, the demand for theatrical performances was constantly growing. Stage performances, according to their original function, remained an element of the games devoted to deities and, therefore, of sacred rituals. For this reason, actors were initially respected. However, entertainment shows also began to appear, and even when commenting on reality, they were primarily intended to provide the audience with amusement (or catharsis). Still, the role of actors in the society was unquestionable – they were needed during sacred ceremonies, both during the games devoted to deities and funeral celebrations. It was actors who shaped the opinions of the audience, and they were teachers to orators. The fact that they additionally provided entertainment, however, influenced their position negatively. Also the origin of people appearing on stage was of considerable importance. The first actors were foreigners, then the profession was also learned by slaves who were supposed to bring income to their owners. So it was not a profession that could make one proud.

It happened, though extremely rarely, that an actor was promoted socially. There are two confirmed cases in which a stage artist was elevated to the status of an *eques*. Judging by the course of such upgradings, however, these were unusual situations. It happened in the case of Roscius, who was awarded by the dictator Sulla (privately his friend) with a gold *eques* ring to honour a long career. Becoming an *eques*, Roscius stopped accepting remuneration for his performances. Julius Caesar, in turn, elevated Laberius to the position of an *eques* but it was most likely a restoration of his status lost on stage. The members of the elite also happened to appear as actors, which is evidenced by the ban on such conduct ultimately confirmed by Tiberius and passed on in the partly preserved resolution of the Senate found in Larinum.

The analysis of the provisions of this resolution is a very important part of the reflections in the chapter. The *senatus consultum* from Larinum adopted in 19 AD is probably the legal act of most importance for the issues discussed. So far this is the only text of the legal act discovered which refers to working in disgraceful professions, especially as an actor and a gladiator. Finding it made it possible to get acquainted with the regulation in a direct way. In addition, the fragments of the resolution that relate to earlier regulations allow us to verify the relations about them known only from literary sources. Unfortunately, the preserved text is not complete, which makes its interpretation difficult. However, the existing reconstructions of the *lacunae* are largely convergent. The confirmation of the prohibition on any *eques* appearance on stage in this resolution of the Senate is beyond dispute.

Interpreting the literary texts on the beginnings of the theatre in Rome and the roles assigned to actors at that time (chapters one and two), I came to the conclusion that the social perception of them shortly after bringing them to the city was not significantly worse than the perception of an average Roman citizen. In unknown circumstances, however, there was a breakthrough difficult to explain, which resulted in the situation changed for no reason at all. The actors who held Roman citizenship were reduced almost to the position of *peregrini* or even slaves. Their legal position became notably worse than the situation of other citizens.

Thus, it all came to a point in which persons working in the profession of an actor were condemned for actions that once had saved Rome from the plague. The change was also reflected in social relations. Being in the company of actors was not considered commendable. However, this concerned only the situation in which an actor was off stage, 'out' of the role and acted as a private person, as the elite of the Roman society, senators and the *equites* were fond of watching theatrical performances and demanded that seats be provided in the best sectors of the audience. Apparently, therefore, the situation in which an actor was on stage and was thus separated from the audience did not produce social condemnation.

A joint analysis of relations between actors and the elite, and actors and orators led me to an intriguing conclusion. The legal situation of the actors was strongly influenced by the desire to separate the real world and the world of fiction. The representatives of the first one, that is the recognized and important world, were the members of the elite (including orators). The world of fiction, represented by people appearing on stage, did not seem so crucial. The law was thus a reflection of the proper order of the world in which serious people were involved in the 'real' life, and actors presented only its illusory reflection. Breaching this order was seen as inadequate – even if formally everything was in order, as the case of

Laberius shows. According to the findings, even if appearing on stage was really disgraceful (or was created as such), the desire to watch shows was something completely normal.

In chapter three, I presented the status of actors in public law. The main topic of reflection is the issue of actors' civil rights while being Roman citizens. There, I also discuss the sources connected with associations which various representatives of this profession were members of.

The analysis of the source texts led me to the conclusion that those Roman citizens who appeared on stage were deprived of almost all rights under public law. This was partly due to the fact that these rights were interrelated. There is no doubt that all actors (with the exception of the Atellana actors), did not have the right to serve in the legions and were moved from a better tribe to a worse one by censors. This finding allowed a very likely hypothesis to be made about the serious limitation of *ius suffragii*. Depriving actors of the right to military service eliminated the weight of their vote at the *comitia centuriata*, and exclusion from major tribes – at the *comitia tributa*. In turn, the limitation of this right could entail the inability to exercise the right to appeal to the Assembly of the People against decisions of officials equipped with an *imperium* (*provocatio ad populum*). Assigning actors to *centuriae* and *tribus*, which voted last or did not vote at all, meant that in principle they were deprived of *ius suffragii*, even if they could take an active part in the assembly – the votes of individuals assigned to these units had virtually no impact on the final result. The actors did not enjoy the *ius honorum* either. Of the studied sources, this is clearly stated only in the *Tabula Heracleensis* but there are many reasons to project its regulations in Rome. In my opinion, all these restrictions can be linked to the lack of public trust. The only civil right people appearing on stage were most likely to benefit from was the right to get help from a plebeian tribune. I therefore stated that by contrast to citizens enjoying all rights in the sphere of public law (*cives optimo iure*) actors were *cives pessimo iure*.

The existence of associations bringing actors together remains an issue that arouses many unanswered doubts. It is a known fact that there existed actors' associations in Rome, as it is confirmed by sources, especially epigraphic ones. However, it is not entirely clear whether the institutions borrowed from Greece became adapted to the Roman law, or remained unchanged. This research problem remains therefore an open question.

Chapter four deals with the issue of infamy actors were burdened with, its existence, and (if it existed) its causes and ways of applying it. Here I also discussed the sources related to actors' responsibility for illegal activities, both in the field of criminal and civil law. I commented on the criminal responsibility of actors on the example of the *adulterium*, and the

civil one in the context of the *iniuria* tort. I chose these actions because of their connection with the acting profession, their reputation and measures.

Infamy is an ambiguous concept. It cannot always be distinguished from ignominy which is the result of a censorship note. This difficulty stems from the fact that the legal source texts in which these terms appear, come to light at a time when the censor office had no longer existed, but the words related to this form of infamy were still in use. The analysis of the sources devoted to these issues posed a lot of difficulties.

In preserved source texts, the terms ignominy and infamy have a similar meaning, as evidenced for example by a fragment of the *Institutes* of Gaius (G. 4, 182), in which the jurist used the phrase *ignominiosus* definitely in the meaning of a person burdened with infamy. That is why for the times later than the Republic it is not possible to separate the cases of infamy from the cases of generally understood disgrace. In turn, there are no juridical sources preserved regarding this issue from the Republican period. Therefore, there is a great difficulty in establishing the catalogue of people who were affected by infamy, since when such a group was added to the catalogue and what effects it caused. Allusions to infamy in the texts by classic jurists included in the Digest are considered to be interpolations; the position of the researchers of Roman law is uniform in this respect and I share it too. Taking this into account, I put forward the thesis that infamy was imposed on actors only in a later period.

It is also worth noting that only a concrete person could be burdened with infamy or a censor's note – if, therefore, they could not be identified, it was not possible to say that a given individual was guilty of infamy. That is why the issue of wearing masks by actors (and especially the option of covering the face after the performance) seemed so crucial to me. The Atellan actors had such a possibility – this may have been the reason why they were not removed from military service, or not transferred to worse *tribus*. The likelihood of this assumption is also indicated by the fact that mime actors, who were perceived as the worst among all actors, did not wear masks at all.

It is not entirely possible to determine what actions or behaviours caused infamy. A strictly defined catalogue of infamous people (and hence a list of behaviours resulting in infamy) appeared only in the times of Justinian. The list is contained in the Digest in the fragment D. 3,2,1. There we can find people that infamy was imposed on by court, some *personae probrosae*, and persons committing certain crimes. This list therefore included both persons who were imposed a censor's note during the Republican period, as well as those burdened with praetorian infamy. Therefore, the only satisfactory solution is the assumption that in the post-classical law period the list of people stigmatized by ignominy was merged

with the catalogue of those infamous ones. This is an acceptable explanation of the issue why actors were placed in this catalogue, despite the clear separation from other people mentioned in this passage.

As I was trying to show, it is also uncertain whether in the time of the Republic the Praetor's Edict contained an enumeration of people submitted to infamy. We can even assume that, if we accept the truth of Gaius' words, there was no such a list. The only certainty is that the Edict contained a catalogue of persons whose right to the *postulatio* was restricted, which was later interpreted as imposing infamy on them. Therefore, it is not legitimate to argue on that basis that praetors imposed infamy on actors already during the Republic. The source texts show the connection of stage performances with discredited honour. As I pointed out above, only Justinian compilers wrote about actors' infamy, summarizing the tendency to perceive acting as infamous as a result of law, and not social reception.

It should be emphasized that the fact that infamy initially did not refer to all the actors does not mean that no actor was an *infamis*. Infamy could be imposed on individual representatives of the acting profession if they were held liable for breaking the law. With adjudication or conviction in some cases, infamy was imposed as an additional sanction, along with the appropriate punishment for a crime or tort.

On the basis of the preserved sources, I was able to justify that not all persons working in the profession of the actor were subject to infamy. Not all and, what is even more important, not during the whole period under consideration. Initially, actors enjoyed social respect; it only changed over time and under the influence of many various factors. Therefore, I was able to highly substantiate the thesis of the late stigmatization of actors with infamy. Its complete verification does not seem possible with the current state of preserved sources.

The source texts indicate that the position of all *personae probrosae* (regardless of their sex) in the criminal law related to adultery was different from the legal position of other people. Due to the specificity of their professions they were generally more exposed to criminal law sanctions. On the one hand, women in *quas stuprum non comittitur* (and *feminae probrosae* were considered as such) were free of penalties for *stuprum*; on the other hand — those who had sex with them against their will were also free of penalties. In turn, men belonging to this category caught in adultery could be killed either by the adulteress's father or by her husband. In a case of women it was possible to speak about the limitation of liability for crimes specified in the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coërcendis*. In a case of men including them in the *personae famosae* category resulted in a worsening of their legal situation. This was the case both when the man was the perpetrator of an offense and when he was its victim.

The actor's profession is significantly related to the *iniuria* tort, and especially its aspect manifested by the verbal insult. The analyzed sources show that in the theatre opinions were expressed both by viewers and actors, with the latter not necessarily expressing their own. Such behaviour could be an indication of the *iniuria* tort if it led to insulting other person. However, rarely did such proceedings meet legal consequences – if they were present, they concerned actors, not the public (and sometimes also authors of the words spoken by an actor). And again it is important to be able to accuse a particular person of committing an act. Actors were undoubtedly easier to identify than individuals from the audience as there were concrete people appearing on stage. A member of a mostly anonymous crowd was more difficult to hold accountable.

The case of the poet Naevius is symptomatic for bearing responsibility for words. It is not possible to determine whether he was sent to prison to await the trial for producing or just delivering some defamatory verses insinuating that the new consul had been appointed to cause the downfall of Rome. I assume, however, his fate indicates that responsibility was also available for the authorship of words considered offensive. The preserved source texts do not allow to determine in what circumstances the poet's ambiguous words came to light, but the Metellus' violent reaction can let us presume they were not the only addressees of these verses. In my opinion, this means that Naevius suffered the consequences of the fact that he had published these words, or that they were delivered on stage, even if he did not say them. It is not known whether Naevius was condemned but undoubtedly he was in prison waiting for the trial, and the very stay there was cumbersome. The use of this preventive measure, however, reinforces the impression that the poet could have been condemn in the trial for insulting.

Obviously, in a case of actors, the responsibility for the *iniuria* tort related to their profession could have been about words spoken from stage. However, this responsibility did not always arise. The preserved source texts do not allow any definite arrangements. We can find descriptions of different situations there – and their different results. Sometimes an actor was punished, sometimes they made unpunished allusions on stage. The greatest problem is caused by the examples cited in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* – they point to different legal effects of the same behaviour. Despite the apparent homogeneity of the basis of the lawsuit, trials against actors ended with the issuing of dissimilar sentences.

In chapter five, I discussed the position of actors in private law and in private legal transaction. I devoted it to presenting issues related to family law (mainly the possibility of

marriages and paternal authority), inheritance law and the possibility of acting as a witness. I also presented conclusions regarding the possibility of actors to contract obligations.

In the matrimonial law of the Republic and Principate, there were many changes regarding the legal position of actors and actresses. The preserved source texts allowed for their thorough analysis. My reflections focused on the possibility of marriages and its limitations. In particular, they concerned marriages between the actors of both sexes and the representatives of the upper classes of the society.

In the period of the Republic, the only consequence of entering into marriages between the members of the *ordo senatorius* and *ordo equester* and persons appearing on stage was probably social disapproval. Since Augustus' marriage legislation such relationships began to carry the reduced legal significance, and the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* provided for restrictions in inheritance law for unmarried persons – and such was a status of married persons, whose marriages were prohibited by this plebiscite. Thus, from that moment on, a marriage concluded, for example, between a senator and an actress still had legal effects, such as entering a child under the power of the father or the possibility to hold the wife responsible for the *adulterium*, while according to the *lex Iulia* both partners remained *coelibes*. Since the time of emperor Hadrian, some marriages concluded with violation of the provisions of the *lex Iulia* were clearly considered non-existent. The source texts from the post-classical law period concerning the abolition of the prohibition of marriages between actresses and senators indicate that such a ban was introduced at some point.

The thesis that *feminae probrosae* (and thus also actresses) could not marry was ultimately falsified by me. This statement has no basis in the available source material. It is much harder to conclude from the preserved texts about the situation of actors in this section of law. We can only assume with great probability that since the time of issuing Augustus' marriage laws at the latest they could not enter any relationships with women from senate families - analogically as in a case of actresses. Whether and when this ban was lifted will remain unknown for now. For there are no texts informing us whether the position of men working in the acting profession in marital law changed, and if so, how it happened. It would be abusive to draw any conclusions from information about marriages concluded by emperor Nero, who was after all performing himself. His social and legal position was too exceptional to form the basis for making any hypothesis regarding actors in general.

The consideration regarding paternal authority led me to the conclusion that in this legal sphere there are no differences between actors and other Roman citizens. The only

limitation that can be presumed here is the low probability of allowing an actor to perform *adrogatio* due to the immoral lifestyle attributed to the representatives of this profession. This, however, did not affect, as we might suppose, any restriction of the *patria potestas* actors had over their own children.

When examining the source texts on family law, I came to the conclusion that the profession of an actor performed by any parent affected the child's legal position, regardless of whether it was born in or out of wedlock. This influence took various forms, depending on which of the parents worked in the profession and who was their partner but it always manifested in the child's rights limitation.

The analysis of sources concerning the law of succession referred to women only – an inference regarding the situation of male actors on the basis of preserved sources is not possible. This analysis showed that at first the position of actresses was not different from the legal position of other women. Like all Roman female citizens, since the time of Augustus' marriage legislation, they had the right to testamentary disposition if they were married in the legally prescribed age. Their situation within inheritance law was primarily determined by their membership in the *feminae probrosae* category. The changes to the detriment of actresses were introduced only by emperor Domitian, and Hadrian supplemented them – the lawmaking activity of these emperors made all *feminae probrosae* (and thus actresses) completely deprived of the right to inherit.

In intestacy, the changes were introduced by the *SC Tertullianum*. As in the case of testamentary succession, initially, actresses could inherit if they were married. Since the time of Hadrian *feminae probrosae*, including actresses, generally did not have the possibility to inherit. The exceptions were mothers who inherit *ab intestato* their children's property under the aforementioned Senate resolution.

The social perception of actors was once again proved to be extremely important within procedural law and private law (mainly contract law). People working on stage were not considered trustworthy. Regulations regarding the possibility of testifying as a witness, both during legal actions and the trial, show that this lack of trust influenced actors' legal situation. Special caution was advised to persons conducting the proceedings in the event of testimony given by *personae probrosae*. Their words were not reliable, just like themselves.

The lack of credibility attributed to actors was of less importance in a case of legal transactions concluded by them in their own affairs. I assumed that the reason for this state was an analogy with the *ius honorarium* related to a trial: actors could file lawsuits, bring charges and submit trial motions in their own affairs or those of people close to them.

However, they could not be representatives of other third parties. I concluded that dishonesty were not attributed to the actors who did legal acts in their own name. Actors concluded lease contracts with the organizers of the *ludi scaenici*. It is even known that Roscius was a party to the *societas* – a contract that was based on mutual trust between the parties.

According to my research, the legal situation of actors in ancient Rome was indeed specific. It was the resultant of many factors. They were not the only ones to perform in public, to accept remuneration for working in their profession, to be perceived as disgraced. But only them brought all these features together, and each of them was the cause of some legal restrictions. This meant that the legal position of actors in ancient Rome was distinct from the status of other professional groups. They stood out even against the background of those who worked in infamous professions. Therefore, presenting the position of this group may contribute to broadening knowledge about the impact of the profession on the legal and social situation of people.

5. Presentation of other scientific and research achievements

a) general outline of scientific interests

For several years, my scientific and research activity has focused on the legal position of people in Roman public and private law. The main subject of my research were atypical cases; I dealt with both the competences of Roman magistrates as well as people whose legal status was subject to various limitations. However, I have not abandoned interests related to the subject of my doctorate – Roman criminal law is a field in which there is still much to discover, including in the field of the influence of ancient law on modern law.

I presented the results of my research by delivering presentations at conferences, both national and international. I also published the results in a number of articles in Polish and foreign journals as well as in chapters of post-conference monographs.

Below is a list of the most important articles; the full list can be found in annex no. 4 (Scientific and research achievements)

b) publications:

In addition to the monograph indicated as an achievement, after obtaining the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Law, I published the book *The Self-defence in Roman Law* (Warsaw 2011, pp. 203). This is a modified version of my doctoral dissertation. I also dealt with criminal law and criminal procedure in three articles. The first of them, *The role of the praetor in questiones perpetuae* ([in:] *Private Interest and Public Interest in Roman Law*, ed.

B. Sitek, K. Naumowicz, K. Zaworska, Olsztyn 2012, p. 95-109), presents the participation of officials in the creation and operation of criminal tribunals. The second one, *Some Remarks on the Slaves' Testimonies in the Criminal Trial* (*Zeszyty Naukowe KUL*, 60 (2017), no. 3 (239), p. 449-464), mainly concerns Roman views on the possibility of using slaves' testimonies in a trial against their owner. And finally the article *Few Remarks on obstructing the criminal trial by the prosecutor in Roman Law* (*Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego. Seria Prawnicza, Prawo* 22, vol. 101/2018, p. 93-103) is my first publication on the subject of procedural offences in Roman law – issues that I would like to explore in the future.

Along with the research on actors, I was dealing with issues concerning the competence of the Roman magistrates during the Republic. The result of this investigation is a number of articles. Research on the participation of officials in the legislative procedure was presented in several articles, being the effect of the grant of the National Science Center no NN 110 009038 *Offices in ancient Rome in Republic and the Principate*, headed by prof. dr. hab. Jan Zablocki. These were: *The role of Consul and Praetor in the Legislation Process in the Republic* (*Opolskie Studia Administracyjno-Prawne* 14.2/2016, p. 31-44); *'Contra tribum plebis furiosum et audacem'. Disputes between Officials as a Threat to the Security of the Republic?* ([in:] *Protection of Security and Public Order in Roman Law*, ed. K. Amiełańczyk, A. Dębiński, M. Kuryłowicz, Lublin 2010, p. 173-182). The influence of conducting auspices on the legislative procedure was presented in the article *Some Remarks on the 'obnuntiatio' Procedure* (*Zeszyty Prawnicze* 11.1/2011, p. 195-213).

The issue of various functions of the Roman treasury was presented in two articles: *'Aerarium' and storing legal acts* (*Zeszyty Prawnicze* 13.2/2013, p. 27-43) and *Some remarks on the subject of the 'aerarium Saturni'* (*Studia Prawnicze KUL* 56.4/2013, p. 37-41).

I also published eight articles in foreign languages (English and Italian). They mainly concern the legal position of actors but also the night thief and the reception of Roman law in pop culture. These are:

- *'Artificum scaenorum studium amoremque inhonestum probrosumque esse'. The Actors and their Audience in Roman Law* (*Classica Cracoviensia* 17/2014, p. 145-163) – in this article I analyzed the anecdote about a young man who was spending time in the company of actors given by Aulus Gellius;
- *Some Remarks on the Legal Status of Thespian's Children in Ancient Rome* (*Iura & Legal Systems* 3/2016) – here I took up the topic of the influence of the profession performed by parents-actors on the legal position of their children;

- *Actors and Orators (Classica Cracoviensia 19/2016, p. 129-141)* – the topic of this publication is to compare the social and legal status of actors and orators
- *Death Wears A Mask. Roman Law in Popular Culture – The Example of Steven Saylor's Short Story* ([in:] *Antyk w zwierciadle literatury i kultury popularnej*, ed. A. W. Mikołajczak, K. Dominas, R. Dymczyk, Poznań 2015, p. 81-87) – on the example of a short story based on the speech of Cicero *Pro Quinto Roscio Comoedo*, I showed how we can smuggle information on the legal position of actors resulting from source texts in popular culture;
- *'Testamenti factio passiva' of Actresses in Ancient Rome* ([in:] *Mater familias. Scritti romanistici per Maria Zabłocka*, ed. Z. Benincasa, J. Urbanik, Warszawa 2016, p. 465-486) – in this article I analyzed the legal position of actresses within testamentary succession;
- *Actor, beware of what you're saying!*, [in:] *"They Called Me to Destroy the Wicked and the Evil". Selected Essays on Crime and Punishment in Antiquity*, ed. Stefan Nowicki, Münster 2016, p. 113-120 – in this publication I showed the legal consequences of actors giving their opinions;
- *Public Opinion and Conflict Resolution: a few Comments* ([in:] *Alternative Dispute Resolution: From Roman Law to Contemporary Regulations*, ed. B. Sitek, J. Szczerbowski, K. Ciućkowska-Leszczewicz, C. Lázaro Guillamón, S. Kurska, A. Bauknecht, Warsaw 2016, p. 163-168) – here, in turn, I showed the role of the theatre as a place for expressing opinions;
- *Il ladro nella legge della XII Tavole* ([in:] *Roma Hukuku ve Güncellik*, ed. Y. Ünver, Istanbul 2017, p. 183-211) – this article is an extension to the doctoral thesis on the regulations regarding the night thieves and the possibility of repelling their attack.

c) participation and research work presented at conferences

After obtaining the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy in Law, I have taken part in many national and international scientific conferences devoted to public and private Roman law, as well as comparing ancient and contemporary institutions. I delivered research papers at twenty-nine of them. A detailed list of the conferences is included in annex no. 4 (Scientific and research achievements).

I have also been an active participant at many national Romanist meetings organized by the Department of Roman and Ancient Law of the University of Warsaw and the Section

of Ancient Laws of Committee on Ancient Culture of the Polish Academy of Sciences. I delivered a lecture at one of these meetings.

d) scientific projects

After obtaining the doctoral degree, I took part in the implementation of two grants from the National Science Center.

1. Contractor in the grant no. NN 110 009038 *Offices in Ancient Rome in the Republic and the Principate.*
2. Main contractor in grant no. 2013/09/B/HS5/01384 *Madmen, liars, prostitutes. The Legal Situation of Actors in Roman Public and Private Law from Republic to Dominate.*

I was also a scholar of the Brzezcie Lanckoronski Foundation. In June and July 2014, in London libraries, I carried out a project entitled *Causes and effects of infamy of actors in ancient Rome and application methods.*

I have also received numerous funds for research as part of support for young scientists, and later on funds for maintaining the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University research potential.

e) teaching activity and achievements

Since the beginning of my work at Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University I have been conducting classes on public Roman law for administration students. In the academic year 2009/10, I also conducted a course lecture in this subject for students of part-time administration studies.

Since the moment of being hired with a permanent contract, every academic year I have also conducted classes on Roman law for law students.

In the academic year 2013/14, I conducted classes on the introduction to law studies for full-time administration students at the Faculty of Law and Administration of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University.

In addition, in the years 2006-2009 I conducted classes on *Roman roots of private law* at the Faculty of European Studies of the University of Warsaw.

After obtaining the doctoral degree and employment as an assistant professor, I have been conducting monographic lectures for law and administration students. I started with the monograph *Roman Criminal Law*. For several years, I have been delivering the subject *The Criminal Law of Romans* in English. Due to the expansion of my scientific interests since the

academic year 2014/15 I have also been teaching *The Legal Status of Actors in the Roman Private and Public Law*, after some time extended to *The Position of Persons in Roman Public and Private Law*.

Under my supervision, the two first-year students of the Faculty of Law and Administration of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University won the historical-legal contest organized in 2014 by the University of Warsaw.

f) organizational activity

Since 2003, I have been continuously the secretary of the Department of Roman Law of the Faculty of Law and Administration at Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University. Almost every year I take part in the work of the team verifying documents during recruitment for the following academic years.

In the academic year 2007/2008, I was appointed the representative of the Dean for Student Internships. I was forced to give up this function due to the scholarship trip to Rome.

Since 2019, I have been the secretary of the editorial office of the journal *Zeszyty Prawnicze*.

- co-organization of the conference
 - 23rd Congress of Historians of the State and Law, *Law at the turn of the centuries*, Warszawa-Zegrze, September 17-19, 2010;
 - National Romanist Symposium *Roman models of contemporary legal solutions*, Sucha Beskidzka, May 1-4, 2013;
 - international conference *Diritto romano ed attualità* on „*Assemblee popolari*”, Sucha Beskidzka, April 29 – May 3, 2017.