CHAPTER 11

The linouphoi of P. Giss. 40 II Revisited

Applying the Sociological Concept of Ethnic Colonies to Alexandria’s Linen-Weavers

Elena Koestner

1 Introduction

Mobility has a large impact on many sociological factors within a community and varies between different regions depending on both formal policies and responses to it in different societies. Migration and integration can be seen as vital characteristics of society in general. Migrants leave their home country voluntarily or are compelled to move because of economic, religious, or other individual reasons. When they reach their destination country, one possibility for them is to settle down; however, there is a chance that they might not become integrated. Hence, integration is a dynamic, long-lasting and differentiated process of assimilation. Integration as well as migration can be regarded as essential features of the Roman Empire, too, as Horden and Purcell argued.1 Verboven added in his paper of the ninth workshop of the international network Impact of Empire that “ethnic groups and civic communities were bound together in a continuous exchange of outsiders frequenting and settling in each other’s communities, spreading news and establishing links between distant places.”2 This process is based on reciprocity, but challenges may occur, too.

In this paper this topic shall be analysed on the basis of Alexandria’s linen-weavers mentioned in P. Giss. 40 II (215 AD). After a riot in Alexandria, in which also linen-weavers took part, the ξένοι, foreigners, were expelled. Only a few occupational groups were not expelled: the Alexandrian λινουφοί were allowed to stay in town, but apparently not the Egyptian workers.3 First of all, the internal relations of the linen-weavers and particularly the distinction between

1 P. Horden and N. Purcell, The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History (Oxford 2000), 4.
2 K. Verboven, ‘Resident aliens and translocal merchant collegia in the Roman Empire’, in O. Hekster and T. Kaizer, eds., Frontiers in the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the Ninth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Leiden and Boston 2011), 335.
3 P. Giss. 40 II tells that all migrants will be expelled from Alexandria (l. 16–17). But only the λινουφοί are mentioned in particular. This paper will focus on this guild.
Alexandrians and ‘genuine Egyptians’ (l. 27) will be of interest. To analyse this, I want to try out the concept of ethnic colonies which was established by the German sociologist Friedrich Heckmann in the 1990s. My assumption is that Egyptian linen-weavers, who had already settled down in Alexandria, served as an ethnic colony for Egyptian workers, who only just arrived. According to our source material it is not possible to state clearly where the migrants came from who settled down in Alexandria. It can be assumed that Alexandria’s inhabitants perceived the newcomers as ξένοι and as ‘others’. As Goudriaan argued, this discrimination might be regarded as a fundamental process, as a universal trait of human nature. Hence, these newcomers are called Egyptian migrants or Egyptian linen-weavers in this paper. As a second key topic, the role of the linen-weavers as guild and their networking with other textile guilds in Alexandria will be stressed. Thirdly, one may assume that the term λινουφοί not only labelled linen-weavers, but also all unwanted persons from Alexandria, who were meant to be expelled. This may be regarded as a strategy of the πόλις-administration to settle conflicts.

2 Alexandria’s λινουφοί and the Expulsion of the Egyptian Workers Mentioned in P. Giss. 40 II

The second text of P. Giss. 40, which deals with the expulsion of Egyptians from Alexandria, is assumed to be an excerpt of an edict made by Caracalla in 215 AD. More than likely Caracalla stayed in Alexandria while passing this edict, because of the use of ἐνθάδε (l. 26) and the reference to the festivities in honour of Sarapis (l. 20–22).

---

4 F. Heckmann, Ghetto oder ethnische Kolonie? Entwicklungschancen von Stadtteilen mit hohem Zuwandereranteil (Bonn 1998), 29.
5 K. Goudriaan, ‘Ethnical strategies in Graeco-Roman Egypt’, in P. Bilde et al., eds., Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt (Århus 1992), 75.
6 A. Łukaszewicz, ‘Some Berlin papyri reconsidered’, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 82 (1990), 130; P.A. Kuhlmann, Die Gießener literarischen Papyri und die Caracalla-Erlasse. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar (Gießen 1994), 246–255; C.D. 77.3.3; HA Carac. 3.1; Dig. 50.2.3.1; Cod. Just. 10.61 (59); P. Oxy. 36.2755; W. Chr. 22 = Sel. Pap. 2. 215. For the assumption that there is not enough evidence for an edict written by Caracalla, see H. Wolff, Die Constitutio Antoniniana und Papyrus Gissensis 40 I (Köln 1976), 131–134; W. Williams, ‘Caracalla and the authorship of imperial edicts and epistles’, Latomus 38 (1979), 81–83.
7 Kuhlmann 1994, op. cit. (n. 6), 247; A. Harker, Loyalty and Dissidence in Roman Egypt. The Case of the Acta Alexandrinorum (Cambridge 2008), 133.
All Egyptians in Alexandria, especially rural peasants, who have fled hither from other parts of Egypt and are easily recognizable, in every possible way must be driven from the city. However, dealers in swine, river boatmen, and those persons who bring down reeds for heating the baths are exempt. Expel the others who by mere numbers keep disturbing the peace to no good purpose. I understand that Egyptians are in the habit of bringing down sacrificial bulls and other livestock at the festival of Sarapis, on certain other festival days, and also at other times. For such visits they must not be prevented. Those persons who leave their homes to avoid work in the fields must be prevented from entering the city, but not those who come down from a desire to see the most famous city of Alexandria or for the sake of a more cultured life or for incidental business obligations. For genuine Egyptians can be recognized easily among the linen weavers by their different dialect, appearance, and dress. Moreover, their way of living and their customs reveal them as country peasants.\(^8\)

\(^8\) P. Giss. 40 II, l. 16–29; A.C. Johnson, P.R. Coleman-Norton and F.C. Bourne, Ancient Statutes. A Translation with Introduction, Commentary, Glossary, and Index (Austin 1961), 277; Kuhlmann
The text tells about an expulsion of indigenous Egyptians living in Alexandria because of their numerous, but presumably useless presence which allegedly led to riots in Alexandria (l. 19–20). However, a few exceptions were mentioned, too: pig traders, inland sailors, and cane-deliverers for the baths (l. 18–19). According to Kuhlmann, these workers made sure that the Greeks and Romans living in Alexandria could keep up their life style. Moreover, visitors of the festivities in honour of Sarapis and business men were not expelled either (l. 20–22; 24–26).

In order to expel the unwanted Egyptians coming from the χώρα, they had to be identified and distinguished from Alexandria's inhabitants. Buraselis dealt more intensively with this part of the papyrus and noticed that it was practical to distinguish them according to their vernacular, life-style and appearance (l. 27). Likewise, Moatti stated that “appearance also (clothes, objects, particular signs, behavior, voice . . .) was an important way of identifying migrants.” However, the text shows how arbitrarily and hastily the authorities dealt with the identification of migrants, and it also demonstrates how easily incorrect categorisation could take place. Maybe this procedure and the categories used to distinguish migrants from inhabitants make clear that the πόλις-administration was not interested in identifying Egyptian linen-weavers. One may assume that the expression λινουφοί was used as an excuse in order to expel almost everybody from Alexandria who was regarded as unwanted and too rebellious.

3 The Concept of Ethnic Colonies and the Multi-Ethnic Metropolis of Alexandria

P. Giss. 40 II refers in particular to the linen-weavers and the necessity to distinguish between Alexandrian and Egyptian workers among them. This implies that the working and living conditions of the linen-weavers, in particular, attracted Egyptian migrants coming from the rural areas. In this context I want to try out the concept of ethnic colonies. In sociological literature this term

9 Kuhlmann 1994, op. cit. (n. 6), 246.
10 Buraselis 1995, op. cit. (n. 8), 167; R. MacMullen, ‘Nationalism in Roman Egypt’, Aegyptus 1 (1964), 183–184.
11 C. Moatti, ‘Translation, migration and communication in the Roman Empire: Three aspects of movements in history’, Classical Antiquity 25 (2006), 120.
means formal and informal structures of ethnic self-organisation of migrants.\textsuperscript{12} Ethnic colonies arise through a voluntary gathering of intra-ethnic relations by migrants on foreign territory. Thereby, forms of economic and socio-cultural organisation as well as family connections coming from the home country will be continued.\textsuperscript{13} In doing so, it was not their intention to create a distinction between their community and the majority of a society. It was closeness to family and friends that they strove for. Additionally, kinship- and chain-migration are crucial, which means that migrants are attracted by personally passed-on information of the destination country from relatives and friends.\textsuperscript{14} Structural precondition for an ethnic colony is a sufficient number of migrants who are in the same situation; additionally, ethnic colonies help the migrants to orientate in the new milieu.\textsuperscript{15} Ethnic colonies thus function as an institutional answer to the migrants’ needs. The assumption that the Egyptian linen-weavers, who already lived and worked in Alexandria, served as an ethnic colony for the Egyptian newcomers shall be analysed against the background of Caracalla’s edict and the riot of 215.

A constitutional separation between Alexandria and its χώρα existed, as the phrase *Alexandria ad Aegyptum*—Ἀλεξάνδρεια πρὸς Αἰγύπτῳ—sufficiently shows.\textsuperscript{16} However, this separation did not play a decisive role in structuring mobility in practice. The differentiation between Alexandrians (originally Macedonians and Greeks) and the Egyptian population was based on a long tradition which was already mentioned by Aristotle.\textsuperscript{17} “Alexandrian citizenship was a hereditary institution, though it was also granted to a small minority of Egyptians.”\textsuperscript{18} Since 31/30 BC Roman law created new categories: Egyptians, Roman, and Greek citizens.\textsuperscript{19} A Roman perspective towards Egypt came

\textsuperscript{12} Heckmann 1998, op. cit. (n. 4), 29; R. Ceylan, *Ethnische Kolonien, Entstehung, Funktion und Wandel am Beispiel türkischer Moscheen und Cafés* (Wiesbaden 2006), 50; 67.
\textsuperscript{13} F. Heckmann, *Ethnische Minderheiten, Volk und Nation* (Stuttgart 1992), 98; Ceylan 2006, op. cit. (n. 12), 51.
\textsuperscript{14} Ceylan 2006, op. cit. (n. 12), 53–54.
\textsuperscript{15} Heckmann 1992, op. cit. (n. 13) 97–98; Ceylan 2006, op. cit. (n. 12), 52–53.
\textsuperscript{16} SB 5.8328.
\textsuperscript{17} Arist. *Ath. pol.* 1329b. The majority of Alexandria’s population were Greeks and Macedonians. They got Alexandrian citizenship because of a μεταβολή πατρίδος (*BGU* 6.1213; 6.1250; D. Delia, *Alexandrian Citizenship During the Roman Principate*. American Classical Studies 23 [Atlanta 1991]).
\textsuperscript{18} M.S. Venit, ‘Alexandria’, in C. Riggs, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2012), 104.
\textsuperscript{19} My paper takes as a basis the description of Alexandria’s population mentioned in K. Vandorpe, ‘Identity’, in C. Riggs, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2012), 260–264.
along; quite often Roman literature alludes to an apparent dependence on the granary that was Egypt. At the same time the historiographic and literary sources used topoi of refusal and aversion towards Egypt and its population. The behaviour towards Alexandria is peculiar, because on the one hand the city was praised for its commerce and culture, but on the other hand its inhabitants were described as frivolous, quarrelsome, and violent. Nevertheless, a citizen body existed which differed from the mass of the Egyptian population. The differentiation between Egyptians and Alexandrian citizens was not developed by Roman emperors, but they adopted this distinction, which was already established in Ptolemaic times. Ethnicity was used as a way to organise cultural differences. The participants were divided in a ‘we’ and a ‘they’. Applying Heckmann’s concept of ethnic colonies to antiquity, I start from the premise that the marking of boundaries is a universal trait of human experience.

Papyrus texts occasionally provide a glimpse of internal migration, which is also a central theme in P. Giss. 40 11: those Egyptians who had fled from the rural areas to the city were now requested to leave Alexandria. “From the available papyrology documents one can clearly discern the existence in Alexandria of a dense rural population from the villages of Middle Egypt.” According to Abd-el-Ghani, the working opportunities in Alexandria may be regarded as decisive for some of the migrants. Braunert regards the expulsion of the Egyptian linen-weavers as a measure of the emperor to counteract rural migration.

---

20 C.D. 50.24.6; Lucan. 8.543; 10.54; Flor. 2.13.66; Plin. Paneg. 31.2; Tac. Ann. 12.43.4; Hist. 1.11; Juv. 15.33–38; 15.75–83.
21 D. Chr. 11.32; 11.37–39; Philostr. VA 3,32; W.D. Barry, ‘Aristocrats, orators, and the “mob”: Dio Chrysostom and the world of the Alexandrians’, Historia 42 (1993), 82–103.
22 N. Lewis, Life in Egypt under Roman Rule (Oxford 1983), 196; B. Isaac, The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity (Princeton and Oxford 2004), 352–370; A.Z. Bryen, ‘Visibility and violence in petitions from Roman Egypt’, Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 48 (2008), 181–200; A.Z. Bryen, Violence in Roman Egypt. A Study in Legal Interpretation (Philadelphia 2013), 28–40; denied by R. Meyer, ‘Roman attitudes towards Egyptians’, The Ancient World 3 (1980), 97–103.
23 J. Rowland and A. Harker, ‘Roman Alexandria from the perspective of the papyri’, in A. Hirst and M. Silk, eds., Alexandria, Real and Imagined (London 2004), 81–82.
24 Goudriaan 1992, op. cit. (n. 5), 75; Vandorpe 2012, op. cit. (n. 19), 268.
25 M. Abd-el-Ghani, ‘Alexandria and Middle Egypt: Some aspects of social and economic contacts under Roman rule’, in W.V. Harris and G. Ruffini, eds., Ancient Alexandria between Egypt and Greece (Leiden and Boston 2004), 163.
26 Abd-el-Ghani 2004, op. cit. (n. 25), 163; P. Oxy. 4.744 = Sel. Pap. 1.105; P. Oxy. 1.36; 2.294; 8.1158; 8.1160; 38.2860; 41.2981; 41.2983; BGU 7.1572.
(ἀναχώρησις).27 Up to the third century AD massive rural-urban migration occurred because of an oppressive tax burden. Since the beginning of the second century AD the emperors and prefects tried hard to take countermeasures through decrees and amnesties, but without success.28 According to Sünskes Thompson, Caracalla showed with his edict his concerns about the increasing number of people without any possessions and land who overcrowded the cities, such as Alexandria, and who caused lots of problems such as dissatisfaction and riots.29

4 The Situation of the Linen-Weavers in Alexandria

Dion of Prusa calls Alexandria the greatest commercial centre of the eastern Mediterranean.30 Besides the production of papyrus, textile production was one of the most important branches of the economy in Alexandria and it also played a major role for export, especially for luxury clothing.31 “Textile production had several specifications that moved through the entire production process, from raw materials to finished goods.”32 Additionally, well elaborated networks existed between the λινουφοί and other branches of textile production such as fullers, cutters, dyers, sewers whose workshops were located in

27 H. Braunert, *Die Binnenwanderung. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte Ägyptens in der Ptolemäer- und Kaiserzeit* (Bonn 1964), 164–167; Lewis 1983, op. cit. (n. 22), 202; Kuhlmann 1994, op. cit. (n. 6), 248–249; denied by Williams 1979, op. cit. (n. 6), 86. For further examples see SB 1.4284; P. Flor. 1.6; P. Lond. 3.904 II; BGU 2.252 = SB 20.14662; P. Oxy. 2.252 = W. Chr. 215; P. Oxy. 2.253.

28 For further examples see P. Lond. 3.904 = W. Chr. 202; SB 6.9526 = P. Col. 6.123; P. Oxy. 47.3364; A. Papathomas, ‘Ein neues Reskript der Kaiser Septimius Severus und Caracalla’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 131 (2000), 129–134. A petition of a στρατηγός from 207 tells about permanent failures in managing rural-urban-migration (SB 1.4284; P. Col. 6.123; P. Westminster Coll. 3; P. Flor. 1.6; BGU 2.252 = W. Chr. 19).

29 J. Sünskes Thompson, *Aufstände und Protestaktionen im Imperium Romanum. Die severischen Kaiser im Spannungsfeld innenpolitischer Konflikte* (Bonn 1990), 166.

30 D. Chr. 32.36; Str. Geogr. 17.1.13.

31 Lewis 1983, op. cit. (n. 22), 134–135; P. Oxy. 14.1647; 66.4534; 51.3626; 51.3621; BGU 1.24; 3.855; 4.1021; P. Tebt. 385; PSI 3.241; P. Lips. 1.89; P. Bodl. 1.6; P. Oxy. 14.1705 = Sel. Pap. 1.36; P. Strasb. 7.618; SB 14.11575.

32 M. Gibbs, ‘Manufacture, trade, and the economy’, in C. Riggs, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2012), 45. A few examples may illustrate this kind of specification for the production of linen: BGU 15.2471; P. Bub. 1.212.
town, while linen-farmers could be found in the rural areas. To guarantee the excellent quality of Alexandria’s linen-products and the large quantities for export, there had to be a smooth cooperation between these different textile branches. Because of its commercial and strategic location, Alexandria developed into a hub for the linen trade.

According to Braunert, Egyptians from the χώρα, who were used to work as farmers, found work in Alexandria’s linen-workshops. The motive of earning money in Alexandria is mentioned explicitly. Several papyri tell us about individuals who migrated to Alexandria and settled down there, but in most of these cases it is not clear where they came from exactly and in which occupations they found work. “The phenomenon of country-people frequently staying in Alexandria seems to have been so grave at times that it required official reactions and interferences to control.” This explains why there existed the necessity to distinguish between Egyptian and Alexandrian linen-weavers in P. Giss. 40 11 (l. 27–29). In the light of this development Alexandria’s administration regarded migrants from the χώρα as useless for the city. They used xenophobic stereotypes in order to create an atmosphere which suggests a feeling of overpopulation and overcrowding. Hence, the disturbance of the city life—ταράσσουσι τὴν πόλιν—, was linked to the linen-weavers with γὰρ in P. Giss. 40 11 (l. 27). This phrase suggests that Caracalla took the riot in Alexandria seriously. Maybe this is because he stayed in town at that time.

In the light of all these factors it is highly probable that there is a connection with the expulsion Cassius Dio is writing about:

---

33 W. Broekaert, ‘Occupational associations and monopolies in the Roman economy’, in preparation, 13.
34 Braunert 1964, op. cit. (n. 27), 175; Gibbs 2012, op. cit. (n. 32), 42; P. Oxy. 22.2340.
35 P. Oxy. 3.487 (156) = M. Chr. 322.
36 P. Oxy. 8.1160; 14.1678; 14.1670; 3.487 = M. Chr. 322; P. Tebt. 2.418 V; PSI 3.162; P. Merton. 2.83; P. Mich. 3.121; P. Giss. 1.79 IV. Some papyri tell us about middlemen, who looked for workers from the χώρα to bring them to Alexandria: P. Oxy. 38.2860; 41.2981. Other texts inform us about journeys to Alexandria because of administrative affairs or of visiting relatives and friends: P. Col. 8.216 = SB 5.7661; BGU 7.1680; 7.1572; SB 5.7662 = P. Col. 8.225; PSI 13.1332 = SB 5.7992; P. Oxy. 8.1158; 10.1296; P. Merton. 1.28.
37 Abd-el-Ghani 2004, op. cit. (n. 25), 168.
38 Buraselis 1995, op. cit. (n. 8), 170 with further remarks.
39 Buraselis 1995, op. cit. (n. 8), 186; A. Łukaszewicz, ‘Quelques remarques sur l’expulsion des Aigyptioi d’Alexandrie’, in G. Nenci and G. Thür, eds., Symposion 1988. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Köln 1990), 341–347; Łukaszewicz 1990, op. cit. (n. 6), 129.
taúta mén oi ἐπιχώριοι ἐπαθον, oi δὲ δὴ ξένοι πάντες ἐξηλάθησαν πλὴν τῶν ἐμπόρων, καὶ δήλον ὦτι καὶ τὰ ἐκείνων πάντα διηρπάσθη καὶ γὰρ καὶ ιερὰ τινα ἐσυλθή, καὶ τούτων τὰ μὲν πλείω αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀντωνῖνος παρὸν καὶ ὄροι ἐποίει, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Σεραπείου προσέταττέ τισιν· ἐν γὰρ τῶ τεμένει διητᾶτο κἂν ταῖς τῶν μιαφονιῶν αὐτῶν νυξὶ καὶ ἡμέραις.

The foreigners were all expelled, except the merchants, and naturally all the property of these was plundered; for even some shrines were despoiled. Antoninus was present at most of this slaughter and pillaging, both looking on and taking a hand, but sometimes he issued orders to others from the temple of Serapis; for he lived in this god’s precinct even during the very nights and days of bloodshed.40

Kuhlmann and Buraselis convincingly argued that the ξένοι mentioned in Cassius Dio’s report are identical with Egyptians from rural areas, the ἐπιχώριοι with the Alexandrians.41 How can this riot and the following massacre be interpreted in regard to the linen-weavers? In general, Alexandria enjoyed the reputation of being particularly derisive towards Roman emperors. Also Caracalla had this experience; he was among other things verbally attacked because of murdering his brother Geta. Herodian as well as Cassius Dio claimed that revenge was his central motive for the ensuing massacre.42 The ancient authors wanted to show the emperor’s cruelty and arbitrariness. At the same time, their reports reveal their own prejudices. In fact, it can be assumed that the riot transpired because of Caracalla’s stay in Alexandria. This was the chance for

40 C.D. 77(78).23.2 (Cassius Dio, Roman History, ed. E. Cary, Loeb Classical Library, [London 1968]); Hdn. 4.8–9; HA Carac. 6.2–3. The Acta Alexandrinorum-literature does not shed light on the λινουφοί and the expulsion of Egyptians mentioned in P. Giss. 40 II (Harker 2008, op. cit. (n. 7), 57–58; 133–138).

41 Buraselis 1995, op. cit. (n. 8), 172; 186–187; Kuhlmann 1994, op. cit. (n. 6), 248; denied by Lukaszewicz 1990, op. cit. (n. 6), 131: “It is not sure whether Dio’s ξένοι are really to be interpreted as Αἰγύπτιοι, ἄργοι Αἰγύπτιοι, ἀλθινοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι (according to the terms of P. Giss. 40 II).” Neither Herodian (4.8–9) nor Cassius Dio (77[78].23.1–3) or the Historia Augusta (Carac. 6.2–3) tells about riots, but they all report verbal attacks against Caracalla.

42 F. Kolb, Literarische Beziehungen zwischen Cassius Dio, Herodian und der Historia Augusta (Bonn 1972), 97–111; Sünkses Thompson 1990, op. cit. (n. 29), 34–35; 159–166; D. Baharal, ‘Caracalla and Alexander the Great: a reappraisal’, in C. Deroux, ed., Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History. Vol. 7 (Bruxelles 1994), 529; A. Bérenger-Badel, ‘Caracalla et le massacre des Alexandrins: entre histoire et légende noire’, in D. El Kenz, ed., Le massacre, objet d’histoire (Paris 2005), 121–139; Harker 2008, op. cit. (n. 7), 133–134; C.D. 77(78).17.1–4; 77(78).22.1–23.3; Hdn. 4.7.2; 4.8.6–9.8; HA Carac. 6.2–3; P. Oxy. 12.1406; 43.3094.
the population to address their complaints about fiscal burdens directly to the emperor. After the riot and the massacre Caracalla took steps to re-establish calm and order by separating the town through a wall, building up fortifications, and forbidding spectacles and public messes (συσσίτια). Meetings and communication of the inhabitants were regulated. All these measures served as a more effective way of controlling and reassuring the city and of preventing further riots:

Yet, why do I mention this, when he actually dared to dedicate to the god the sword with which he had slain his brother? Next he abolished the spectacles and the public messes of the Alexandrians and ordered that Alexandria should be divided by a cross-wall and occupied by guards at frequent intervals, in order that the inhabitants might no longer visit one another freely:

The passage mentions public messes (συσσίτια). According to Buraselis we may see here that Caracalla’s special attention was targeted on branches of the economy. Cassius Dio used συσσίτια as a term for symposion or convivium. In this case τὰ συσσίτια τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων must refer to collegia, more precisely community meals of Alexandrians and therefore Alexandrian collegia. However, collegia of Egyptians were not mentioned in Cassius Dio’s report. Either, both Alexandrian and Egyptian collegia were meant and consequently were involved in the riot, or Cassius Dio’s report is not precise. The evidence of other civitates show that collegia of peregrini existed. The case of Lugdunum demonstrates clearly that “local craftsmen and resident foreigners (the consistentes) of a single trade apparently did not join a single association, but

---

43 Sünskes Thompson 1990, op. cit. (n. 29), 34–35; P. Giss. 40 11; SB 1.4284; P. Oxy. 47.3364.
44 C.D. 77(78).23.3.
45 Buraselis 1995, op. cit. (n. 8), 180; for further details see K. Buraselis, ‘Eine Notiz zu Augustus, Caracalla und den syssitia in Cassius Dio 54.2.3 und 77(78).23.3’, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 124 (1999), 300; A. Favuzzi, ‘Ancora su Caracalla e i syssitia degli Alessandrini’, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 121 (1998), 251–256.
established different *collegia.*\(^{46}\) *Collegia* strengthened the ties between the foreigners because they offered their members social and religious opportunities, and economic benefits. Additionally, they served as a link with other *collegia* in the same branch. This seems similar to the duties and tasks of an ethnic colony. “Collegiate life revolved around social gatherings for communal eating and drinking.”\(^{47}\)

Comparing *P. Giss. 40 II* with Cassius Dio’s text on the linen-weavers, Buraselis notices a special treatment of the Egyptian workers; only these men should be expelled.\(^{48}\) This constitutes a massive intervention into the internal structure and freedom of linen-weavers’ *collegia.* Here two aspects are important. First of all, it is possible that also Alexandrian linen-weavers were involved in the riot. Because of the linen-weavers’ close cooperation with other branches of textile production, a high degree of organisation existed, and consequently a high potential to mobilise enough people to perform a riot, too. Even though we are not informed about the exact motives of the linen-weavers for their participation in the riot, we may assume that there was a connection to Caracalla’s campaign against the Parthians. Because of the preparations for this campaign, it is likely that there was a higher demand for linen-products, for example for soldiers’ clothing and equipment.\(^{49}\) Thus, there was a higher pressure on the linen-weavers to comply with this much greater demand. It is quite possible that the linen-weavers used Caracalla’s visit in Alexandria to call attention to their problems and worries. At the same time, other dissatisfied people used this platform for their protests, too.

Secondly, the categories mentioned in the papyrus to distinguish between Egyptian and Alexandrian linen-weavers are not suitable for a clear differentiation. Clothes and particular signs, that Moatti and Buraselis regarded as suitable for distinguishing migrants, did not work in practice, because these objects could be changed quickly.\(^{50}\) To a Roman outsider or even to an Alexandrian magistrate, it may have been less easy to discriminate between Egyptians and Alexandrians than Caracalla’s edict states.\(^{51}\) One may assume that a serious interest in creating a useful instrument for distinguishing migrants did not

---

46 Broekaert, op. cit. (n. 33), 13; P. Oxy. 13.11750; 13.6453; for further details see Verboven 2011, op. cit. (n. 2), 333–348.
47 Verboven 2011, op. cit. (n. 2), 344; Gibbs 2012, op. cit. (n. 32), 41.
48 Buraselis 1995, op. cit. (n. 8), 182.
49 Buraselis 1995, op. cit. (n. 8), 182–183; *BGU* 7.1564; 7.1572; *I. Éph.* 215 = *SEG* 4.512 = *PHI* 247938.
50 Buraselis 1995, op. cit. (n. 8), 167; Moatti 2006, op. cit. (n. 11), 120.
51 Rowland and Harker 2004, op. cit. (n. 23), 103.
exist. The labels λινοφοί and ξένοι remained stereotypes which were used to justify the expulsion. Cassius Dio’s passage about the prohibition of public messes may be regarded as supplementary information to *P. Giss.* 40 ii. The latter indicates that only Egyptian workers were expelled. The term λινοφοί was used as a stereotype to define people who probably were expelled in order to manage overpopulation and to prevent riots. According to this classification nearly everybody could have been affected by expulsion.

5 The Guild of the Alexandrian Linen-Weavers as an Example for the Process of Integration

Probably, the linen-weavers of Alexandria fought for the improvement of their financial situation. The aspect of payment was not only of interest to the Egyptian workers, but to the Alexandrian weavers, too. In this regard we can find no difference between both. Therefore it is more than likely that both Alexandrian and Egyptian linen-weavers expressed their complaint together in the riot. It is likely, too, that not only linen-weavers came together and went out to rally in the streets. The λινοφοί were especially well connected to other collegia of textile branches and consequently, they could quickly mobilise a huge number of people who were willing to participate in a riot. According to the texts mentioned above, the linen-weavers were associated with riots which threatened public order. In my opinion, their depressed financial situation may be regarded as their basic complaint. In the case of Alexandria, a subversive connotation comes to mind, too, because the riot was directed against Caracalla. As already mentioned, this was the chance for the population to show their dissatisfaction and address their complaints directly to the emperor. This would have carried much more weight than just complaining to the πόλις-administration.

The Alexandrian linen-weavers of the time of Caracalla did not only produce goods for sale on the free market, but also equipment for military campaigns. They had to work harder to cope with the higher workload. Consequently, the linen-weavers’ social status raised their self-confidence, too. One may assume
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that a chronological connection between the beginning of the campaign’s preparations, Caracalla’s stay in Alexandria, and the riots existed. The linen-weavers of Alexandria protested in the streets because of the increasing workload and their precarious financial situation. The reproach of uselessness as mentioned in *P. Giss. 40 II* fits well with the πόλις-administration’s strategy to generate negative emotions against unwanted persons, no matter how far removed from reality this may have been.

Another central aspect is the excessively large number of linen-weavers living and working in Alexandria. A feeling of overpopulation and overcrowding seemingly led to resentment. Because of the linen-weavers’ network including other collegia of the textile branch, it was quite easy for them to mobilise enough people willing to participate in a riot. Other dissatisfied inhabitants were ready to follow them, too. A certain amount of people is necessary to perform a riot; a critical mass has to be reached. In the field of game theory, critical mass means that not the whole group must be convinced of an idea; just a certain number of people have to follow. If this threshold is passed and the critical mass is reached, the idea will become effective. This will have applied to the linen-weavers and those who were supporting them, too. At the same time, their number, which was regarded as excessive, was connected to their alleged uselessness. It is quite interesting that a link was made between these two concepts; as a result, the linen-weavers’ perceived value for the πόλις was diminished. In the case of Alexandria this stereotype certainly did not reflect reality, because an extensive linen-production was located there. The labelling may have functioned as a justification for the expulsion of unwanted Egyptian workers.

And what about the other key topic: can Egyptian linen-weavers who already settled down in Alexandria be regarded as an ethnic colony for migrants from the χώρα? As previously mentioned *P. Giss. 40 II* particularly refers to the linen-weavers and the apparent necessity of distinguishing between Alexandrian and Egyptian workers among them. In my opinion, the branch of the linen-weavers will have been especially attractive to Egyptian workers. The concept of ethnic colonies describes the establishment of migrants’ relationships within their own ethnic community, their new home country and the continuity of family relations. Perhaps there existed a linen-weavers’ quarter in Alexandria, similar to those we know from Oxyrhynchos, Arsinoe, Karanis,

55 Heckmann 1992, op. cit. (n. 13) 98; Ceylan 2006, op. cit. (n. 12), 51; 53; Braunert 1964, op. cit. (n. 27), 175.

56 Heckmann 1992, op. cit. (n. 13) 98; Ceylan 2006, op. cit. (n. 12), 51.
Theadelphia, and Tebtynis. A structural requirement for an ethnic colony is a sufficiently high number of migrants. Because Alexandria’s linen-production was of paramount importance for the city and occasionally also for the military sector, workers were always needed. Probably, Egyptians from Alexandria’s χώρα looked for jobs there. Financial incentives fuelled this rural-urban migration. Another important point is that the population in Alexandria did not have to pay taxes. Finally, the effect of kinship- and chain-migration must also not be underestimated. The story of a successful migrant, showing that working as a linen-weaver in Alexandria was an opportunity, might reach his home village and incite friends and relatives to do the same.

To conclude, the linen-weavers mentioned in P. Giss. 40 11 shed light on the interweaving of Alexandrians and Egyptians in the multi-ethnic landscape of Alexandria. Ethnic colonies may be regarded as a supportive community for migrants so that they can adapt to a new environment. Similarly, collegia may be regarded as providers of “a framework for urban life.” In Alexandria, Egyptian linen-weavers provided support for migrants from the rural areas in terms of job offers, and thus, they provided the basis for them to settle down. They connected the migrants to the formal structures of the πόλις. In these micro-communities they offered the basis for the migrants to increase their social capital. With regard to the expulsion of Egyptians mentioned in P. Giss. 40 11 the procedure to distinguish Egyptian from Alexandrian linen-weavers was not a practical one. Distinguishing according to life-style and appearance was not possible. Perhaps it was not intended either. The term λινοφόι seems to work as a label used by the πόλις-administration to expel all unwanted inhabitants, not only linen-weavers. As shown here, the concept of ethnic colonies may be regarded as a useful approach to gain a glimpse at migration and integration in Alexandria.

Regensburg, November 2015
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