

Prostko-Prostyński, Jan

"The Census register P. Oxy. 984 : The reverse of Pindar's Paeans", Roger S. Bagnall, Bruce W. Frier, Ian C. Rutherford, Bruxelles 1997 : [recenzja]

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 29, 256-257

1999

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.

autres: les contribuables. N'aurait-on pas plutôt affaire, avec le pouvoir omeyyade, à une conception différente de la répartition des richesses, de la condition de serviteur de l'État, de la fiscalité et de l'autorité publique ? La question, manifestement, ne pouvait être ici traitée en profondeur: elle mériterait qu'on y revienne. Ce n'est pas le moindre profit tiré de la lecture de ce livre, par ailleurs un modèle de rigueur méthodique, que de soulever d'aussi stimulantes interrogations.

[Jean-Michel Carrié]

Roger S. BAGNALL, Bruce W. FRIER, Ian C. RUTHERFORD, *The Census Register P. Oxy. 984: The Reverse of Pindar's Paeans* (= *Papyrologica Bruxellensia*, vol. 29), Bruxelles 1997, 150 pp. + 14 plates + 2 folding diagrams of the papyrus, without ISBN.

The papyrus kept at the British Museum and catalogued under the number 1842 consists in fact of several various papyri. The census list, which the reviewed book investigates, is one of the (at least) two documents which were joined in order to write the text of the Paeans of Pindar on their reverse. When publishing the Paeans of Pindar (*P. Oxy.* V 841), Grenfell and Hunt described the census list as well, although they published only a small excerpt from this document as *P. Oxy.* VI 984¹ (Bagnall designates it now as "*P. Oxy.* 984 A", and quotes it as "984 A"). The census list had been preserved in a good condition, while the other document, a property list written by another hand and marked "*P. Oxy.* 984 B," had preserved very badly, and was not published in the reviewed book. The authors have divided the tasks among themselves as follows: Ian C. Rutherford attempts (which deserves admiration) to reconstruct the verso of 984 A, i.e., Pindar's Paeans (pp. 12-18), based on the recto, and in the process combines the possible with his own far-reaching guesses. Roger S. Bagnall has published the census list (pp. 19-26), and compiled the supplement to the catalogue of census declarations which may be found in R. S. Bagnall, B. W. Frier, *Demography of Roman Egypt*, Cambridge 1994, pp. 179-312. Besides, he offers a detailed discussion of the personal names appearing in the papyrus 984 A, proposes a new reading of the papyrus *P. Bon.* 34 (pp. 125-127), and has compiled the indexes. Bagnall argues, not without sound reasons, against Grenfell and Hunt's postulate that the papyrus comes from Oxyrhynchos, and suggests that "[...] both Lykopolis and Ptolemais [in Upper Egypt] seem possible provenances [...]" (p. 56). The date of the register has not survived. Bagnall is in favor of A.D. 91/92, assuming that the register was based on the tax census of A.D. 89/90 (pp. 20-22). His main argument hinges on the declaration in AR 12. 7-8 (p. 35), where the third year of Emperor Titus' reign is mentioned: "[...] τῶν γ (ἔτει) Τίτου θεοῦ [...]" Titus is referred to here as a deceased person ("*divus*"). The third year of Titus' reign began on June 24, (*dies imperii*)

¹ A certain inconsistency may be discovered in the text: in the Preface, line 4 from the top (Roger S. Bagnall), we read: "[... the] register, which had been described but not published [...]" while on p. 1 we find the following statement: "Grenfell and Hunt originally described, but published only a small part of, the census list [...]" (Ian C. Rutherford).

81, and the Emperor died soon afterward, on September 13, 81.² Bagnall writes: "The third year of Titus was 81 (1/2); as Titus is dead, the date must be after 81" (p. 21). However, Titus' third year lasted only from June 24, 81, to September 13, 81, and not until the year 82, and that date is the proper *post quem* for 984A. Bagnall notes that there is a reference to the 9th year in the declaration AR 30.3.367; he construes "the 9th year" as the ninth year of Domitian's rule, when a census was indeed taken. And yet we do not know if this is in fact a reference to Domitian, and in my opinion the only certain fact is the *post quem* of the papyrus, while the exact date of its writing remains an open question. In one of the declarations we read of a *proxenos* of a *boule*, which shows that we are dealing with the inhabitants of a city rather than of a nome metropolis (pp. 23 ff., 48 ff.), since no Egyptian metropolis had a council until the time of Septimius Severus' visit in A.D. 200 Bruce W. Frier presents a demographic study of the census register (applying the same method as in *Demography of Roman Egypt*); with a strong conviction (which is not all that well-grounded, if we remember what Bagnall has said about the provenance of the papyrus 984A), he asserts that the census covered the households of 256 inhabitants of *Ptolemais* (p. 89). Frier emphasizes that unlike in the cities of Middle Egypt, the mortality rate in "Ptolemais" was much higher, "at least among females" (p. 112). If I understand him correctly, this was so either because the declarations were collected in a poor district of the city, or else because "Ptolemais" was "a rustic backwater" (p. 112) in comparison with the opulent metropoleis of Middle Egypt (although cf. Bagnall, p. 25).

The book deserves a warm reception, and not only among papyrologists, but also among historians of the economy and demography of the Roman Empire, whom it supplies with new source material. The reliable analyses and generally convincing overall conclusions are its strength.

[Jan Prostko-Prostyński]

Giuseppe CAMODECA, *Tabulae Pompeianae Sulpiciorum. Edizione critica dell'archivio puteolano dei Sulpicii (Vetera. Ricerche di storia epigrafia ed antichità 12)*. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 1999, ISBN 88 7140 145 X. Tomo I (edizione), Tomo II (fotografie e apografi), 685 pp. + pianta di Puteoli antica nel tomo II.

Our knowledge about legal practice in Ancient Rome is mostly based on data furnished by the papyri. However the situations described therein do not necessarily show us the way Roman law was applied in provinces other than Egypt. Only rarely do we have any information about legal practice outside Egypt. The available sources, chiefly epigraphic and as scarce as they can possibly be (confront V. Arangio-Ruiz, *Fontes Iuris Romani Anteiustiniani*, III: *Negotia*, Florentiae 1969, *passim*; R. Pintaudi & P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Tavolette lignee e cerate da varie collezioni*, Firenze 1989, *passim*), have often been transmitted to our times thanks to some extraordinary circumstances. This is the case of the so

² D. KIENAST, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, 2nd ed., Darmstadt, 1996, p. 111.