Trouble in Alexandria in a Letter of the Sixth Century

Margaret Maehler

Among the papyri from Hermoupolis now in the papyrus collection of the Egyptian Museum in West Berlin, a fragment of a letter has come to light which, although found at Hermoupolis, must have been written in or near Alexandria: P.Berol. 25009 measures 14.7 cm. by 31.7 cm. and is incomplete at the top and the bottom. The text of the letter is written across the fibres in a handwriting which can be compared with R. Seider, Paläographie der griechischen Papyri I nos. 55 (probably written in A.D. 551) and 57 (A.D. 595) and appears to belong to the second half of the sixth century (see Plate 2). Apart from diacritical marks on initial iota and upsilon, the writer uses no lectional signs and does not write ἤτα ἀνεκφώνητον. The surface of the other side of the papyrus has been partially rubbed away, but the beginning of the address of the letter is still legible. It is written roughly in the middle of the fragment parallel to the fibres in the narrow, stylized uncials often used for addresses and runs: ΧΑΕΣΠ(ΟΘΗΙ) Μ(ΟΥ) ΤΑ Π(ΑΝΤΑ) ΜΕΓΑΛΟΠ(ΕΙΠΕΣΤΑ­ΤΩΙ) ΚΟΜΙΤΙ . . . . . . As the addressee is called comes, he must belong to the 'upper class', presumably of Hermoupolis where the papyrus was found, and might be, for instance, an official in the administration or the owner or steward of an estate.

Above and below the address are, in all, eight lines of what appears to be a draught written later than the letter and in a different hand. The few phrases of this badly preserved text which can be read are:

---

1 Ägyptisches Museum, Schloss-Str. 70, D-1000 Berlin 19. For another letter from this collection see GRBS 15 (1974) 305-11. I am indebted to Dr Herwig Maehler for a photograph and a transcript of the papyrus and the permission to publish them, and I thank him, Professor Gustav Karlsson and Herr Hansjörg Wölke, for an interesting and useful discussion of the text. Professor Karlsson and Dr Maehler will be publishing more Byzantine letters from Berlin in ZPE and JOBG.

2 For a letter of the same period with accents and mute iota see P.Cair.Masp. 077.
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The words in line 3, "all the persons of good reputation and the landowners said [possibly to the dux Thebaidis? See line 1] that some respectable people ought to be sent to Alexandria," and the reference to dikes in line 6 suggest that this text may reflect the reaction in Hermoupolis to the news contained in the letter itself. This hypothesis is too uncertain, however, to be of use in the interpretation of the letter, the text of which follows:

Text

... eicχ[, ]η eic 'Alexandriaiν po [. . .]ο[ ]καὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας τὰς οὔσας ἐν τῇ Νέῃ Πόλει ὕδατος ἐπληρώσεν καὶ θέαμα καὶ νόν ἔστιν σήμερον ίδειν 'Alexandriaiν. τοῦ οἴνῳ τα[ν]οι ἔφυμον ὑπάτου τῇ ἔξης τουτεστὶ τῇ νεωμνίᾳ τοῦ παρόντος μηνός Χ[ο]ιάκ ἀναπλεύσαντ[ο]ς ἐπὶ τὴν Χορτακο οἰκ ἐπίκεψις τῶν εἰρημένων τόπων, ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ τῇ δευ[τ]έρᾳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ παρόντος μηνός εἰσήλθαμεν ἐν 'Alexandri(ε)ρ) βραδεῖας ὑφα μετ-
[αλ]λάξαντες το σχῆμα ἡμῶν, ἵνα μὴ κρατηθῶμεν, καὶ μετὰ πολλοῦ κόσμου[ καὶ] ἔνιμα πολλῆς ἔδυνήθημεν αὐτὰ τὰ ημάτια ἡμῶν τὰ καὶ ὑπολειφθέντα ἕισ-

Translation

"... and he (it) filled the warehouses in the New Town with water, and Alexandria is a strange sight to see today. Well, after the Most Honourable Consul sailed up to Chortaso the next day, that is, on the first of the current month, Choik, to inspect the places I mentioned, we for our part came into Alexandria on the second of the same current month, late in the evening and in disguise so that we should not
be caught, and with a lot of trouble and a lot of expense (or loss) we managed to... only our cloaks which in fact were left, since nothing else of ours was left because of the number of days we had spent on the river (or canal). And on the sixth of the current month, Choiak, after the return of the..."

NOTES ON THE TEXT

LINE 1. εἰκο[ν]ή: The subjunctive εἰκονή is the most probable reading, but the verb is not common. After that, εἰκ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν with a proper name, e.g. 'Ρουβ[ή]ν[ε]ς, 'Ρουβ[ή][ν]ος or 'Ρουβ[ή][ν]ος[ν] ἔρχομαι τ...[ν]ος[ν]ος are possible. If a proper name is to be read, this person may have been helped to enter or prevented from entering Alexandria by the subject of ἐπλήρωσεν in line 2. I cannot tell whether R. could be identical with the consul in line 3, nor can I identify him, but it may be worth mentioning a Rufinus who was military commander in Africa and, apparently, dux Tripolitanae around A.D. 540.3

LINE 2. ἐπλήρωσεν may be governed by a human or by a natural agent: for instance a tidal wave after an earthquake or torrential rain; see infra p.201. For the Νέα Πόλις in Alexandria see A. Ausfeld in Philologus 63 (1904) 481-97, who comes to the conclusion that this name was given to the part of the city on the eastern harbour which had to be rebuilt after the fire in the civil war of 48 B.C. It is known from papyrus documents of the first to fourth centuries that the grain levied in Egypt was brought by boat via the canal connecting Alexandria with the Nile to the public granaries in the 'New Town', where it was stored before being shipped to Rome or, later, Constantinople.4 These granaries are usually referred to as δημόσιοι θησαυροί or δημόσια ὅρρια, so ἀποθήκες in line 2 may be a general term for public and private warehouses: cp. Cass. Dio 42.38.2 (on the civil war) ὅστε καὶ τὸ νεότερον τάς τε ἀποθήκες καὶ τοῦ εἰσοῦ καὶ τῶν βιβλίων... καυθῆσαι.


LINE 3. σήμερον: The warehouses were still flooded when the letter was written, that is, sometime after the sixth of Choiak (see line 10), so if the narrative at this point follows the order of events and the flooding took place the day before the consul left Alexandria, they will have been under water for a week or more. It does seem a little strange, however, that the consul should leave town immediately after a catastrophe, and it is possible that the flooding actually took place after his departure and that τοῦ αὐτοῦ resumes a narrative which the writer interrupted before line 1 in order to describe the flooding: see LSJ s.v. σήμερον II.

3 See RE 1A (1914) 1198, s.v. Rufinus 35.
4 See A. Calderini, ΘΗΣΑΥΡΟΙ (Milan 1924) 26f and 57 (plus P.Oxy. 2408, 3 and 9).
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υπάτον: With the exception of the emperors themselves, there are no more regular consuls after the year 541; if, therefore, the assignment of the papyrus to the second half of the sixth century is correct, this consul will be an ex consule ordinariorum or an honorary consul. "Υπάτος is used loosely instead of ἄπο ὑπάτων ὑδρωπαίων in P.Oxy. 1911, 148 (A.D. 557); 1913, 8; 1917, 2 and P.Kl.Form. I 86, 2 (Stud.Pal. III) of Flavius Strategius Apio, who was consul ordinarius of the eastern empire in 539, and of people of consular rank in P.Oxy. 1991, 8 (A.D. 616, of Apio's greatgrandson, Strategius); ibid.”; in P.Cair.Masp. 002 iii 24; 004, 21; 097 V 20; P.Fuad 86, 10; SB 9616, 15 (of the dux Thebaidis); cp. SB 4671, 2.

Line 4. Choiak 1st = Nov. 27th, in the Gregorian calendar Dec. 10th. The level of the water in the Nile and in the canal to Alexandria would have started to sink by this date.

Line 5. Χορτασο is written with final omicron also in SB 9590, 22 (seventh century), but with omega, ibid. 5 and 11 and in Stud.Pal. X 233 ii 5 (fifth century). It was a village near Heracleopolis in Arcadia. After the coming into force of Justinian's thirteenth edict, issued probably in 539, according to which Arcadia and Alexandria with Northern Egypt became separate administrative units placed directly under the control of the praefectus praetorio Orientis, the ‘consul’ presumably would have needed special authorization from the emperor or the p.p.O. to act in an official capacity at both Alexandria and Chortaso. If his private interests were involved, it may be worth noting that the consul Apio mentioned above owned land in the vicinity of Heracleopolis.

ἐπίσκεψις: The regular official land inspection of Roman times seems to have been discontinued in the Byzantine period, so presumably something unusual, perhaps a natural disaster, had occurred at Chortaso and was described in the missing part of the letter. For ἐπίσκεψις in a non-technical sense see SB9397, 2 (sixth/seventh century) ἐξηλθον εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν τῆς . . . ἀδελφῆς.

Line 6. ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρει(εῖ): In line 1 the writer apparently remembered to write εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, but here he has lapsed into normal late Greek usage: cp. PSI 953, 68 and 78; P.Amh. 157, 1; 158, 1f; P.Oxy. 151 and 1904, 2.

βραδεῖς ἡρξ also occurs in P.Cair.Masp. 077, 8.

Lines 8–10. The writer and his companions had spent so long on the river that their resources were exhausted and they had only their personal clothing left:


6 For a doubtful parallel see Dioscorus' eulogy of Athanasius, P.Cair.Masp. 097* V 18 γῆς Φαρέως κρατῶν ῥῆ Ἀρκαδίου μετὰ Θῆβας (cp. ibid. 055*, 2), regarded by Maspero as a poetical exaggeration.

7 See E. R. Hardy, The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt (New York 1931) 82.

to ἄντι = 'only' see Kühner-Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache 3 II.1 652f § 468, Anmerk. 2.
eυκ [. . . ευ: -ευ is preceded by a letter on the line followed by one with a tail, e.g. ρῆ or ταυ; ἐκφερεν would fit, and Professor Rudolf Keydell has suggested that the writer and his companions had to leave their own clothes on the ship when they stole into Alexandria in disguise. Afterwards, they managed to bring them (or have them brought) into town with a lot of trouble and expense (i.e. they probably had to bribe someone to help them).
kατὰ τὸν ποταμὸν could mean either travelling by boat to Alexandria or hiding among the rushes on the Nile or the canal: cp. John of Nikiu's account of the insurrection of Heraclius, cap. 108, 15, during which the adherents of Phocas concealed themselves in their boats on the canal after failing to take Alexandria; and Justinian, Edict 13, capp. 17 and 22, which mention that insurgents from Alexandria often took refuge in the Mareotes. As the writer and his companions entered Alexandria in disguise, it is likely that they had been obliged to escape from the city and lie low.


The flooding of the warehouses can have been the result of a natural catastrophe which might also have caused damage at Chortaso, or of an act of sabotage. The latter is perhaps more likely, considering Alexandria's reputation for riots and the precautions taken by the writer to avoid detection in the city. The main causes of the unrest in Alexandria during the sixth century were the taxation policy of the imperial government and its attempts to bring the Monophysite church of Egypt into conformity with the Melkite or imperial church by imposing patriarchs of its own choosing upon it. Justinian's main concern in Edict 13 (see supra on line 5) is to safeguard the supply of corn to Constantinople: the augustalis of Alexandria and Northern Egypt is made a military governor and authorized to use his troops against people who instigate disturbances to avoid paying taxes. His troops, however, do not seem always to have had the situation in Alexandria under control, and sometime before 560 whenProcopius wrote his work On Buildings, the place in Alexandria where the corn

10 Cp. John of Ephesus, Lives of the Eastern Saints, ed. E. W. Brooks, PO 18.4 (Paris 1924) 528: "and severe fighting and much slaughter took place, as is common in that great city."
11 See the article of Hardy (supra n.5) and his p.1 n.1 for further literature.
12 See Edict 13, capp. 1 and 11, and supra on line 10 of the papyrus.
barges were unloaded—and, presumably, where the state granaries stood (see supra on line 2)—had to be fortified: ἐπειδὴ τῷ ὅμω ἐς εὐτάσιν πολλάκις καθισταμένῳ ἐνταῦθα διολωλέναι τῷ εἴτε ἐξυνέβη, βασιλέως Ἰουστινιαιώς τειχίσματο τόνδε τῶν χώρων περιβάλων τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ εἴτε ἐπιβουλὴν ἀνεχαίτισσε (Procop. Aed. 6.1.3–4). This place was called Φιάλη,13 which suggests that it may have been the former royal harbour basin mentioned by Strabo at 17.1.9 cap. 794. (I suppose that even after the fortification it may have been possible to flood this area by diverting the water from the canal, or perhaps by opening the sluices.14)

In 546–ca 551 Alexandria was governed by a competent augustalis called Hephaestus, who reduced the amount of corn available to the Alexandrians to ensure that the full quota might be sent to Constantinople and even so managed to “stop the riots.”15 After that, there appears to be no more definite evidence for resistance to the grain levy until 600, when a rebellion broke out in the Delta during which the rebels intercepted the grain transport on the Nile.16 An attack on the granaries in Alexandria is not mentioned explicitly in connection with this rising, but both it and that on behalf of Heraclius in 609 would be likely occasions for one.17

On at least three occasions in the sixth century the arrival of a patriarch nominated in Constantinople and escorted by a bodyguard of soldiers led to fighting in the streets of Alexandria: a couple of years before Edict 13 was drawn up, after the restoration of Patriarch Theodosius in 536;18 in 546 when the Alexandrians drove out Patriarch Zoilus19 and were brought to order by Hephaestus (see supra p. 202); and in 551 or 552 when Justinian had Apollinarius, a former military commander installed as patriarch.20 In 566 Belisarius’ stepson,

13 See A. Adriani, Repertorio d’arte dell’Egitto greco-romano C I–II (Palermo 1966) 235 s.v.
14 Could the Portae Petrinae on the eastern branch of the canal in Alexandria have been connected with a lock? On these see Adriani, op.cit. (supra n.13) 236 s.v., and P. M. Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria II (Oxford 1972) 79f n.184.
16 See John of Nikiu (supra n.9) cap. 97; J. Jarry, BIFAO 62 (1964) 187–206.
17 See John of Nikiu 97, 17 (“and John found that much devastation had been wrought in the city of Alexandria”) and 107, 17.
18 See Liberatus, Breviarium cap. 20, Migne PL 68, 1037v = Acta Conc. Oecum. II.5 (Berlin 1936) 135, and John of Ephesus (supra n.10) 528.
19 See Sévère, Évêque d’Achmounine, Réfutation d’Eutychius, publ. P. Chebli, PO 3.2 (Paris 1909) 197; and Stein, loc.cit. (supra n.15).
20 See the Jacobite authors, Severus (supra n.19) 203f, and Petrus Ibn Rahib, Chronicon orientale, CSCO 46, 128; and the Melkite, Eutychius, Ann., Migne PG 111, 1069a–d.
Photius, who had reached the ὑπατικὸν ἄξιωμα before being obliged to become a monk,21 was in Egypt with orders from Justin II to “reconcile all its churches,”22 but it is not known whether this mission provoked any serious disturbances.

The papyrus letter must be seen in the light of these events, although it does not seem possible to connect it directly with any of them. Apart from the absence of mute iotae, the spelling βραδίς and the lapse into colloquial speech (εἰς ἔλθαμεν ἐν Ἁλεξάνδρει) in line 6, it is written carefully, and the chiasmus in line 7f (μετὰ πολλοὶ κόποι [καὶ] ἔμμεσος πολλῆς) and the elegant turn of phrase in 2f (θέαμα καινῶν ἐστιν εἴμερον ἰδεῖν) show that its author is a man of some education. Although he gives the consul the usual complimentary epithet, πανεύφημος, he does not appear to be a supporter of the government: his description of the flooding gives the impression that he was not particularly distressed about it, and ἵνα μὴ κρατηθῶμεν without an agent (line 7) is more naturally taken of arrest by the authorities23 than of capture by insurgents. He might be a Monophysite bishop, as they were forbidden by Apollinarius and his successors to enter Alexandria,24 but the letter contains no pious expressions. His education is not necessarily an argument against his being a brigand.25 However, the most likely reason for him to write a letter to a dignitary in Hermoupolis describing the plight he has been in is that he is the steward or business partner of the addressee and must explain to him why he has not been able to transact his business in Alexandria.

Berlin-Lichtenfelde
March, 1976

21 See Procop. Anecd. 2.7 and 3.29.
22 See Theophanes, Chron. A.6058, Migne PG 108, 525 = de Boor 1, 242, 4; cp. John of Nikiu (supra n.9) 94, 17.
23 See Preisigke, WB s.v. κρατεῖν 3.
25 For a freebooter from the upper class see John of Nikiu (supra n.9) 97, 10.