

A New Fragment

From The Archive of Dioscorus

P. Cair. Mus. inv. S.R. 3805 (14)

By

Alia HANAFI

P. Cair. Mus. inv. S.R. 3733(17 A)+3733(19)+

Provenance Aphrodiro

P. Cair. Mus. inv. S.R. 3895(14)\*

about 566/567 C.A.D.

31 x 12,8 cm.

Plate 1, II, III

P. Cair. Mus. inv. S.R. 3805 (14) is one of a collection of papyri, found in Aphrodito; restored and photographed by Mrs. Mülner 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 di Papirologia, Napoli, (1984), vol. III, pp. 833-846), shows 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.

]·[2-3]·[2-3].....ων  
 ]ορος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ  
 5 ]·ουσι ὡς λέγουσιν περι-  
 ]τω μὴ ἀνέχεσθαι  
 ]ου οὐ γὰρ ἐμισθωσα μῆ  
 ]·χρεωστῶ ἀλλὰ τὸν  
 ]ιαδότην ὅτε ἐδιοίκησεν  
 10 ]μς Ἰωάννου Ἐυπρεπείου

This piece made changes and threw lights on the published part. So, the letter should be read as follows :

Recto

† πρὸ μὲν παντὸς λόγ[ου † 21 ἀσπάζομαι καὶ προσ-]  
 κινῶ τὴν ὑμετέραν [ † 36 ]  
 ἀξιῶ αὐτὴν κατόπιν [ † 9 ]·[2-3]·[2-3].....ων  
 διὰ Μακαρίου τοῦ ποιμ(ένου)ς Φθλαῖ (καὶ) Βίκτορος τοῦ  
 ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ  
 5 ὑποδειξάντων μοι ῥστραμ' ἀτ.χε..ουσι ὡς λέγουσιν περι-  
 έχουσαν τὸ ὄν(ομα) μου. τὰ νῦν καταξιοῦτω μὴ ἀνέχεσθαι  
 συναρπαγῆναι παρὰ τινος, κατ'ἔνου {ου} γὰρ ἐμισθωσα μῆ  
 ἀρούρας ποτε τοῦ ἀπδρου οὐ γεγενημ(ένου)υ χρεωστῶ ἀλλὰ τὸν  
 γεωργό[ν μ]ου ἐπίασεν Κολλοῦθος ὁ ἀπὸ διαδότην ὅτε  
 ἐδιοίκησεν  
 10 ἀπαιτ[2-3] αὐτὸν μισθωσιν (ὑπέρ) ὄν(δρατος) λεγομ(ένου)  
 Ἰωάννου Ἐυπρεπείου...

ἐμοῦ μὴ ὄντος ἐν τῇ κώμῃ καὶ ἐλθόν [τος † I4 ]α  
 τὸ ὄν(ομα)  
 τοῖς λαμπρ(οτάτοις) τραυτευτ(αῖς) καὶ τῶ βοήθῃ καὶ  
 τῶ κοίνῃ δεσπο(τη) τῶ κυρίῃ  
 Μηνῶ καὶ ἔγνωσαν τὸ ὄν(ομα) ἐν κελύφῃ ὄν [έ]ν τῶ τόπῳ  
 Πικαρμάρου ἐστίν  
 ὑπὸ τὸν υἱὸν Ταχυμίας κ(αί) παρεγγέλοθησαν οἱ ποιμ(ένες)  
 ἀπὸ τότε χωρῆσαι  
 I5 [† 29 ]κατ' αὐτοῦ κ(αί) ἀπεστήσαν  
 τοῦ γεωργοῦ

## Verso

† καταξιώσατε κ(αί) ὑμεῖς μαθεῖν τοῦτο αὐτοῖ καὶ μὴ  
 ἐᾶσαι ὑμᾶς  
 συναρπαγῆναι ὅπως ἐγὼ κελευόμενος ἀδίκως ὑμῖν  
 ὑπουργῆσαι  
 ἐλάχ(ιστα) δὲ τῖνα ἀπέστειλα ὑμῖν τοῦτ' ἐστίν  
 ὧρα πεντήκοντα  
 ..... μὴ ὀκνεῖτω δέξασ[θ]αι εἰς Μν..... πός

(vac. 7,5 cm. deep)

5 τ.....ος.....

L.I3, L. ἐκεῖνῃ

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 Euprepus.....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' son of Ψαῖος and Ταχυμῖα of L.14 (see Alia 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 Ψαίου, μη(τρὸς) Ταχυ]μῖας ἀπὸ κώμης 'Αφροδίτης" ) his brother's name should be Μακάριος son of Ψαῖος.

So the shepherd Μακάριος could be Μακάριος son of Ψαῖος whose son appears in P.Flor. 297,49 (cf. P.Flor. 297,49 where Βιτωρ Μακαρίου Ψαῖος may be the nephew of Victor son of Ταχυμῖα named after his uncle).

2- It seems that Apollos son of Dioscorus who was arrested by the pagarch Menas, as mentioned in P.Lond. 1677,49 (566/7A.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 Apollōs, through the addressee to refuse to be robbed or seized and carried off (see L1. 6-7). If that is so, our document might be written before P.Lond. 1677, dated in 566-567 A.D. in which Apollōs 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 ὄντος ἐν τῇ κώμῃ " ).

3. If the date 566/567 A.D. is accepted, τῷ κοίνῳ δεσπο(τη) τῷ κυρίῳ Μηνᾷ should be Menas, the pagarch of Antaeopolis 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 σκρινιάρτος καὶ παγάρχης τῆς Ἀνταίου; L. 18 " ὁ δοῦξ τότε τῷ εἰρημέτῃ κελευσάντες ἀνδρῖ where the editor assumes that the word ἀνδρῖ 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 γὰρ κελευόμενος ἀδίνως ὑμῖν ὑπουργῆσαι " ) 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 (see Wilcken, Grundzuge, 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 " Φλαυΐω Τριαδιω Μαρριανω Μιχαηλιω Γαβριηλιω Κωνσταντινω Θεοδωρω Μαρτυριω Ιουλιανω Αθανασιω τω ενδοξοτα πατρικιω πραιφεκτο Ιουστινοδουκι και αυγουσταλιω της Θηβαιων χωρας το Β " ) .

## Commentary:

L.5 The reading after ὑποδειζάντων μοι is still very doubtful inspite of the clarity of some letters. The general meaning of verb ὑποδεικνυμι 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.

περέχουσαν : the participle after ὑποδειζάντων is usually found in Papyri instead of ὅτι - clause (see B.G. Mandilaras, The Verb in the Greek non-Literary Papyri, Athens, 1973, 893§ ) but the cause of declining the participle in feminine gender is still unknown because of the difficulty of reading the clause after ὑποδειζάντων μοι .

LI 6-7 τὰ νῦν καταλιούτω..... παρὰ τινος ; 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, v. ὅπως κἀγὼ κελευόμενος ἀδύνατος ὑμῖν ὑπουργῆσαι) 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 ἀνεκδιήκτος ὑπάρχει ὁ ἀθλιός ἕως νῦν ἐπὶ ξένης σὺν τέκνοις, αἵτων ὧν καὶ ἐκδικίας ἀγαθῆς ὑμῶν τύχειν δεσποτά" (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' ἔνου {ου} γάρ ἐμισθωσα μὴ ἀρούρας ("for I let the 48 arourae out for hire for one year"): the omission of the second {ου} is necessary here since in Ll. 7-10 Dioscorus refers to his financial dependance upon the hire of this marginal land.

L.8 τοῦ ἀπόρου :usually the ἀπορος land was leased by village officials (cf. P.Gen. 66-67; 69-70). Therefore, most probably Dioscorus, when he was the πρωτοκωμήτης 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. "κόλλουθος ὁ ἀπὸ διαδότων ") perhaps might get this land

back after the confiscation of Dioscorus' properties and transferred it to Johannes son of Euprepus who got its hire. (cf. PCM 67002, I, 17; P.Lond. 1677, 12).

οὐ γεγενημ(ένου) : the reading is still doubtful in spite of the clarity of some letters. Grammatically, 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 / γεωργό[ν μ]οῦ : cf. P.Lond. 1682, 4-5 "τοῖς γεώργοις σου" ibid. 1677, 20 "τ]οῖς ἐμοῖς ἀνθρώποις" and its note). Also the restoration may confirm the omission of {ου} of L.7, r., because we have here the farmer to whom Dioscorus had hired his 48 arourae.

Κολλοῦθος ὁ ἀπὸ διαδότων : almost means "one of the διαδοταί not one of the late διαδόται (see Wilcken, Grundzuge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, Hildesheim, (1963), no. 420, note 12). Because in my artical published in the same bulletin "Note from the archive of Dioscorus, Apollos son of Dioscorus, BACPS, vol. III p. 117, I had concluded that the expressions ἀπὸ παγάρχων, ἀπὸ ἀρχῶν and

ἀπὸ ἐπάρφων 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 ὅτε ἐδιοίκησεν when he had exercised authority" in L.9. This expression means that at a certain time Collouthus was perhaps a διοικήτης . A part of his job was to collect the confiscated money. but here the document stated that he is one of the διαδόται 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.Glcs. 54; A.Johanson/ L. West, op.cit. p. 220.

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

Ἰωάννου Εὐπρεπεῖου : Johannes son of Euprepus seems to be one of those to whom the land of Dioscorus was confiscated, since the hire of the 48 arourae of Dioscorus was collected for the sake of him. Also, he may be the same person who appears in P.Flor. 297, 428] Εὐπρεπεῖου κερ/ γ ". If that is so P.Flor. 297, 428 may be restored as Ἰωάννη]ς Εὐπρεπεῖου For the interchange of ι and ει see F.Th. Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and

Byzantine Periods. Milano, (1976), P. 208. After Εὐπρεπέλου there may be two or three letters.

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

L.14 ὑπὸ τὸν υἱὸν Ταχυμίας : the lines from 13-14 may mean that this marginal land situates in the Carcarus place, and was leased by Dioscorusx 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/γεωργό[ν μ]ου). 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.

L1. 14-15 καὶ παρεγγέλθησαν οἱ ποιμ(ένες) ἀπο τότε χωρῆσαι... καὶ ἀπεστήσαν τοῦ 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).

Alia Hanafi