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Plate I, II, III

P. Cair. Mus. inv. S. R. 3805 (14) is one of a collection
of papyri, found in Aphrodisio; restored and photographed by Mrs.
Müller of Köln. She sent these photographs to the authorities of
the Egyptian Museum. From there, the photographs were transferred
to me because I work on this collection.

Comparison of the photograph of this papyrus with the
papyrus published by me (see Alia HANAFI, A Document from the
Archive of Dioscorus, Atti del XVIII Congresso Internazionale
that it joins the last at its right edge.

The piece measures 11,5 x 6,5 cm. It contains the ends of
eight lines (ll. 3-10), and read as follows:

* An excellent photograph made by Mr. Bülow-Jacobsen Adam
of Denmark facilitated transcription considerably.
This piece made changes and threw lights on the published part. So, the letter should be read as follows:

Recto

5 ὑποδεικνύοντων μοι ὑστροχὶ κτ. ἐρωτευόμενος λέγω· πρὸς μὲν πάντος λόγον ἄλθησομεν καὶ πρὸς...
κυνῷ τὴν υμετέραν [4 36]
ἀξιωθόν αὐτὴν κατάπιν [4 9 2-3]...\[2-3]\n
10 Ἰωάννου Εὐπρεπεῖου.

Ἰωάννου Εὐπρεπεῖου.
ἐμοῦ μὴ δυνατὸς ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ ἐλθὼν [τος 4] Ἰδα

to δή (ομα)
tοῖς λαμπαδοῖς τραντευτοῖς καὶ τῷ βοχῆῳ καὶ

τῷ κόλπῳ δεσποτῇ τῇ μυρᾷ

Μην ή ποτὲ ἐγνώσαν τὸ δή (ομα) ἐν κελυφί ἢ ἢ [έ]γ τῷ τόπῳ

ἱππαρκάρου ἔστιν

ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ Τακυμίας καὶ παρεγγέλθησαν οἱ ποιμένες

ἀπὸ τότε χωρῆσαι

I5 [ά 29]

]κατ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀπεστήσαν
tοῦ γεωργοῦ

**Verso**

† καταξιώσατε καὶ υμὲς μαθεῖν τοῦτο αὐτόν καὶ μὴ

ἔδοσι υμᾶς


συναρπαγήσατε ὡς κάτω μελετοῦμενος ἁδηνῶς υμῖν

ὑποργήσεις

ἐλάχιστα δὲ τίνα ἀπεστείλα υμῖν τοῦτ’ ἔστιν

ζία πεντήμοντα

...... μὴ ὀνειλθω δέξασθαι εἰς ὡς Νυ............. σος

(vac. 7,5 cm. deep)

5 ..............................

L.I3, L. ἐπεζυτ
Translation:

From L.4,r.: .........................through Macarius the shepherded of Phthia and his brother Victor who warned me...............as they say, because it comprises my name. Now, let him maintain to refuse to be robbed (or seized) by any one. As I have hired the 48 arourae for one year, because if that marginal land has once become unproductive, I shall be in debt; but Collouthus, one of the deadotae, when he had exercised authority, bore hardly upon my farmer to collect the lease from him for a pretender (Lit. a false name) called Johannes son of Euprepius...........Since I am not in the village and ......................the name to the illustrious tractores, the assistant, and our common Lord, Master Menas, and they recognized that the name was in that neighbourhood, in the place of Carcarus. There is under (the name of ) the son of Tachymia, and the shepherds were ordered from then to leave.............against him, and they stood off the farmer.

Deign, not only that you have known, yourself, this matter, but also there was no way in which you could be seized as I was at least ordered to help you without fear. Now, I have sent you the least thing; that is fifty eggs. Don't let so- and-so hesitate to come next to ..................
This document had already been recognized as important for continuity conflict between Dioscorus and the authorities of his village.

The new fragment gives us new lights on the contents of the letter although there are still some difficulties of reading in L.5 and L.8. The main unsolved problem is the reading of L.5 and its relationship to the feminine participle περιέχουσαν in Ll.5-6.

Yet we may notice the followings:

1- If Victor of L.4 is the same person Victor's son of Ψαῖος and Ταχυμία of L.14 (see Aria Hanafi, ibid., Atti dei XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli, (1984), vol. III, P. 839; and PCM 67113,3, note 3 "παρὰ Φθλα Βι[κτορος Ψαῖου, μη(τρός) Ταχυμίας ἀπὸ κόμης 'Αφροδίτης") his brother's name should be Ἄκαρπος son of Ψαῖος.

So the shepherd Ἄκαρπος could be Ἄκαρπος son of Ψαῖος whose son appears in P.Fl. 297,49 (cf. P.Fl. 297,49 where Ὁλτωρ Μακαριου Ψαῖος may be the nephew of Victor son of Ταχυμία named after his uncle).

2- It seems that Apollonios son of Dioscorus who was arrested by the pagarch Menas, as mentioned in P.Lond. 1677,49 (566/7 A.D.) under the pretext that he was responsible for his uncle's debts (see P.Lond. 1677, introd.P.69) has not been seized yet when our document had been written, because
Dioscorus seemed to advise his son Apollöös, through the addressee to refuse to be robbed or seized and carried off (see Ll. 6-7). If that is so, our document might be written before P.Lond. 1677, dated in 566-567 A.D. in which Apollos son of Dioscorus seems to be actually arrested (i.e. Dioscorus may have written this letter shortly after reaching Antinoopolis in 566 (cf. L.11 " ἐμοῦ μὴ δυντος ἐν τῇ καμη " ).

3. If the date 566/567 A.D. is accepted, τῇ κοινῷ δεσποτί (τη) τῷ κυρίῳ Μηνᾶ should be Menas, the pagarch of Antaepolis of the year 566/567 A.D. in spite of the omission of the title pagarch in L.12, r. (cf. P. Lond. 1677,10 (566/567 A.D.) Μηνᾶς ὁ λαμπρότατος συμμιστής μαί παγάρχης τῆς 'Ανταεπος L. 18 " ὅσος τότε τῷ εἶρηντῇ κελευσάντης ἀνδρί where the editor assumes that the word ἀνδρί here could be Menas, the pagarch).

4. Consequently in that date, it seems that Dioscorus has actually begun to get promises and orders to solve his problems with the pagarch Menas (cf. L.2, v. " ὅπως καὶ ἐφεξεὶ κελευθεροῦν μνημής ὑμῖν ύπουργησαι " ) after his great struggle (see the Imperial rescripts which Dioscorus had obtained in PCM 67024 duplicated 67025; 67026 duplicated 67027; 67028; 67029 and the recommendation letter in JEA, XV; (1929), pp. 96-102).

5. The expectant person who ordered Dioscorus to help his family should be Duke of Thebaid because A) that person might have occupied a higher position than the pagarch who
always was the subject of the complaints of Dioscorus. B) all the Imperial rescripts and the recommendation letter that Dioscorus had obtained (see the note above) were addressed to the Duke of Thebaid. C) the residence of Dioscorus in Antinoopolis which was the capital of the Thebaid and the seat of the Dux (s.e Wilcken, Grundzüge, p.82; Kuhn, Antinoopolis, p. 163ff) may support the idea that Dioscorus had got the orders from the Duke. Consequently if the date 566/567 A.D. is accepted for our document the Duke was Fl. Marianos (see introduction of P.Lond. 1677 P. 69; PCM 67002; 67003; 67004, 1 "Φλαύτω Τριαδίω Μαριάνω Μιχαήλι Αβραμίω Κωνσταντίνω Θεόδωρω Καντυρίω Ιουλιανω Ανασιω τω ενδοξητα πατρικιω πραγματω Ιουστινω δομινί και αυγουσταλιω της Θηβαιων χώρας το Β" ).
Commentary:

L.5 The reading after ὑποδειξάντων μοι is still very doubtful inspite of the clarity of some letters. The general meaning of verb ὑποδεικνύμενος is 'to indicate, to show, to warn'. The choice of the meaning 'to warn' depends on the fact that Victor son of Tachymia in a certain time was one of those who had hired pastures from Dioscorus (see PCM 67319, 20 it is a list of pastures, possessed by Dioscorus and destroyed by his enemy) and logically Victor and his brother Macarius might warn Dioscorus from another plot.

περεχομαι: the participle after ὑποδειξάντων is usually found in Papyri instead of ὧτι - clause (see B.G. Mandilaras, The Verb in the Greek non-Literary Papyri, Athens, 1973393) but the cause of declining the participle in feminine gender is still unknown because of the difficulty of reading the clause after ὑποδειξάντων μοι.

L1 6-7 τὰ νῦν καταξιοθετήτω...παρὰ τίνος: It seems that Dioscorus, dependent on the orders which he has got (see PCM 67024 (duplicated 67026); 67026,(duplicated 67027); 67028;67029); and the recommendation letter ( see V.Martin, A Letter from Constantinople, JEA, XV, 1929, PP. 96-102; cf. also L.2,ν.ὅπως κάγῳ κελευθήσομενός δένυμος ὑμῖν ὑπορηγήσαι) has encouraged his son Apollos (see P.Lond. 1677, note L.49; introd. P. 69 f.) to struggle by refusing the seizure or to be robbed by any one.
One may ask why Dioscorus has allowed himself to leave his village, fleeing to Antinoopolis far away from the hand of the pagarch Menas while he encourage his son to stay and struggle? The answer is probably as Dioscorus had been compelled to leave his home Aphrodite, he suffered very much in a strange land with his children, as we saw in a petition written by his hand to Duke of Thebaide "καὶ ἀνευοδικητος ὑπαρχει ὁ ἄνθις ἐώς νῦν ἐπὶ ἔννης σὸν τέκνος, ἀληθῶν ὡς καὶ ἐκδικήσας ἡγαθὴς ἴμων τὸχειν δεσποτὰ" (see PCM 67002, I, 19). So it seems that Dioscorus wanted his son to stay and struggle the injustice of the authorities in his home Aphrodite rather than to suffer in a strange land as he did.

L.7 κατ' ἔνων ἡγισθηκα μὴ ἄρδρος ("for I let the 48 arourae out for hire for one year"); the omission of the second \{ου\} is necessary here since in L1. 7-10 Dioscorus refers to his financial dependance upon the hire of this marginal land.

L.8 τοῦ ἄπορου : usually the ἄπορος land was leased by village officials (cf. P.Gen. 66-67; 69-70). Therefore, most probably Dioscorus, when he was the πρωτοκωμητης of the village of Aphrodite, had leased this land and hired it to a farmer. (see L.9, r.). After Dioscorus had been exiled, the local authorities (cf. L.9, r. "λολ- λούθος ὁ ἀπὸ διαδήτων " ) perhaps might get this land
back after the confiscation of Dioscorus' properties and transferred it to Johannes son of Euprepius who got its hire. (cf. PCM 67002, I, 17; P.Lond. 1677, 12).

οὐ γεωργῆμι(ἐνοῦ) : the reading is still doubtful in spite of the clarity of some letters. Grammaticaly, the participle is suitable here to compose genitive absolute. So the sentence may bear the meaning "since the marginal land, once, has become unproductive, I shall be in debt". This perhaps indicates that this marginal land was the last land Dioscorus had owned. For the confiscation of Dioscorus's lands which were transferred to the βοηθός Κύρος and the shepherds of Aphrodite see PCM 67002, I, 17; P.Lond. 1677, 12.

L.9 τὸν / γεωργῆ[ν μ]οῖ: cf. P.Lond. 1682, 4-5 "τοῖς γεωργοῖς σου" ibid. 1677, 20"τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἀνθρώποις" and its note). Also the restoration may confirm the omission of {οὐ} of L.7, r., because we have here the farmer to whom Dioscorus had hired his 48 aourae.

Κολλοθοῖς ὁ ἀπὸ διαδότων: almost means "one of the διαδοταὶ not one of the late διαδοταῖ (see Wilcken, Grundzüge und Christomathie der Papyrskunde, Hildesheine, (1963), no. 420, note 12). Because in my artical published in the same bulletin "Note from the archive of Dioscorus, Apollon son of Dioscorus, BACPS, vol. III p. 117, I had concluded that the expressions ἀπὸ παγάρχων, ἀπὸ ἀρχῶν and
ἐπὶ ἐπάρθην mean "one of the pagarch, one of the rulers, and one of the praefectus, agreeing with Hunt, and not "one of the late or ex-pagarchs" In this document we have an evidence that may prove my previous conclusion. It is the expression ὥστε ἀποικοῦσαν when he had exercised authority" in L.9. This expression means that at a certain time Collouthus was perhaps a διοικητῆς. A part of his job was to collect the confiscated money. But here the document stated that he is one of the διαδοταῖ. His job was originally to distribute the provisions to the soldiers (see PCM 67139, V.r., Note 21; P.Rein. 56.9; P.Lond. III, 1245, 3; BGU 1025 XVI, 15). For the nomination of the διαδότης and his function see P.Glæs. 54; A.Johanson/L. West, op.cit. p. 220.

L.10 ἀπαίτ[ῶν] ὀρκαίτ[εἰν] : as participle of purpose or as infinitive of purpose may be grammatically restored (see B. Mandilaras, op.cit.899 §; 770 §).

Ἰωάννου Εὐπρεπελου : Johannes son of Euprepius seems to be one of those to whom the land of Dioscorus was confiscated, since the hire of the 48 aouras of Dioscorus was collected for the sake of him. Also, he may be the same person who appears in P.Flor. 297, 428:] Εὐπρεπελοῦς ἡπ/ γ. If that is so P.Flor. 297, 428 may be restored as Ἰωάννης Εὐπρεπελοῦ For the interchange of ι and ιτ see F.Th. Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papri of the Roman and
Byzantine Periods. Milano, (1976), P. 208. After ἔδηπεπε θεύ there may be two or three letters.

Παρέγγελσα: this name composed from the Coptic article ἰ and a name of place called Καρμάρου τόπος (see PCM 67319,20).

L.14 ὑπὸ τοῦ υζου Ταχύμας: the lines from 13-14 may mean that this marginal land situates in the Carcarus place, and was leased by Dioscorus to Victor son of Tachymia who was a shepherd (see PCM 67319) and perhaps he worked also as a tenant farmer (cf. L.9 τὸν/γεωργὸνυ [ιου]). For shepherds as tenant farmers in Aphrodite, see G.Keenan, Village Shepherds and Social Tension in Byzantine Egypt, Yale Classical Studies, Combridge, 1985, P. 254; note 20.

Ll. 14-15 καὶ παρεγγέλθησαν οἱ ποιμ. ἔνες ἀπὸ τότε χωρῆσαι... καὶ ἀπεστήσαν ὑπὸ γεωργοῦ: It seems that the local authorities of Aphrodite responded to the complaint of Dioscorus, therefore they ordered the shepherds perhaps to leave the land. Consequently, the shepherds obeyed and stood off the farmer (cf. P.Lond. 168 Where a shepherd has been officially ordered to cease harassing Dioscorus's tenants).
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