

NAUKRATIS.

CHAPTER I.

THE SITE OF NAUKRATIS, AND ITS HISTORY.

1. The question of the position of Naukratis has long been an undecided one; and for the very good reason that no part of the world, so close to a large Western population, and so essential to archæology, is such unknown ground as the Delta of Egypt. There are hundreds of English travellers who are familiar with Upper Egypt and its towns; but it would be easier to find anyone to give a scientific personal account of the sources of the Nile, than one who could give an archæological account of the remains thickly scattered about its mouths. Yet this ground is within a week's journey of our homes.

The first search for Naukratis, if I may call it so, is described in a paper by Silk Buckingham, in the original papers of the Syro-Egyptian Society, 1845. This, however, only describes a visit to Sa-el-Hajar, which he assumed to be the site of Naukratis. No excavations, or evidence for this identification, are mentioned; and it is now recognised by all that the Arab Sa is Sa of the Egyptians, the Greek Sais. So this paper brings us no nearer to Naukratis. Then it has been supposed, on the strength of Herodotos and Strabo, that Naukratis was near Desuk. I went there, and inquired for any mounds known up or down the east bank of the stream, but none were to be seen or heard of.

2. All this while the two most accurate and definite authorities on the subject were disre-

garded—the *Geographia* of Ptolemy, and the Peutingerian map. Let us see what they say. Ptolemy expressly describes Naukratis as being on the west of the Great River. Now the Great River is not the Saitic branch, but the Kanobic branch, which is westward of the Saitic; thus he places two rivers—the Saitic and the Kanobic—between Sais and Naukratis. Further, he gives the latitude and longitude of it, which, when compared with those of the neighbouring sites, indicate the position of the mound of Nebireh (at which I have been working this year) within two or three miles. For the details of the treatment of Ptolemy's *Geographia*, I must refer to Chapter XI., where the whole subject is discussed. The most superficial view will, at least, show that a city which is placed by Ptolemy with two branches of the river between it and Sais, and in the same latitude as Sais, but a quarter of a degree further to the west, cannot be on the same side of the same river as Sais, some miles north of it, and in the same longitude. Both by description of its site, and by position on the rivers, Ptolemy distinctly excludes, without the risk from bad copyists, the possibility of Naukratis being near Desuk, and, furthermore, places it certainly within a few miles of the mound of Nebireh.

3. The next most distinct authority is that of the copy of a Roman road-map, which first came to notice in the hands of old Conrad Peutinger. This would be a supreme authority were it not for its numerous omissions and errata.

But these errata are natural consequences of bad copying from injured material; such as corrupting Thmuis into Tmu, misstating numerals, or omitting names and numerals altogether: they do not affect the arrangement of it, so far as we can judge, and its value for our purposes is therefore scarcely impaired. A glance at the copy in pl. 39 (enlarged to double the scale from the only edition in the British Museum, Ortelius, 1618), will show that its agreement with Ptolemy concerning the position of Naukratis is as close as could be expected from its distorted form. The broad fact that the city lay some way to the west of the Kanobic branch is as plain there as in the text of Ptolemy; and we further see Naukratis did not lie on the road to Alexandria from Memphis, but on the road to the Libyan desert, which did not lead to Alexandria, but lay entirely to the west. The distances are evidently corrupt on any supposition; but as Nebireh is about twelve or thirteen miles from the probable site of Niciu (Ed-Dahariyeh), the numeral xliii. may well have been xiiii.; the farther numerals may be correct, as xxxii. + xxiii. miles would reach from Nebireh to the hills on the west of Lake Mareotis, the place where the road would naturally run, to join the North-African coast road. We should therefore look for Melcati near Tell-abu-Gaud; but the numbers of miles are such evident multiples of eight, probably half a day's journey, that we cannot attach much value to the precise locality.

The third great authority for ancient geography, the Roman road-book, commonly called the Itinerary of Antoninus, or the Theodosian Table, is useless in this question, as it does not mention Naukratis. There is at least, however, a possibility that Nithine may be a corruption of Naukratis, since it is placed between Andro and Hermopolis, on the line in which Naukratis lies.

4. Turning now to secondary geographical authorities, Herodotos gives more than one statement which bears upon the site of Naukratis.

First he says (ii. 97):—"During the inundation, to a person sailing from Naukratis to Memphis, the passage is by the pyramids; this, however, is not the usual course, but by the point of the Delta and the city of Kerkasoros; and in sailing from the sea and Kanobos to Naukratis across the plain you will pass by the city of Anthulla and that called Archandros." Now there is somewhat to be gleaned from this notice. First, it was possible to go up from Naukratis to Memphis by a canal without going by the point of the Delta and Kerkasoros. This would be an impossibility if Naukratis lay on the Saitic arm, or in fact anywhere within the branches of the Delta; it must therefore lie outside of the westernmost or Kanobic branch. Next, it is strongly suggested that it lay on a canal and not on the river, since it is said that a passage could be made from Naukratis to Memphis past the pyramids, or rather "alongside of the pyramids themselves" (*παρ' αὐτὰς τὰς πυραμίδας*). This plainly refers to the canal still to be seen running just below the pyramid hill, in contradistinction to the ordinary Nile stream. I was informed by an old Arab some years ago that this canal can be traced as far north as the Barrage, and I noted the course of it in detail by the position of the villages as he described them; while from the Barrage it is still possible to sail to Nebireh by the canal skirting the desert, without once entering the Nile. Thus the old line described, by which the Greeks sailed up from Naukratis to Memphis past the pyramids, is still visible, and nearly all in use as a canal at the present day. The Greek route during low Nile, when there was not enough water in the canal for a vessel, must then have been to pass out from the Naukratis canal into the Great River, or Kanobic branch, probably near the modern Selamun, where the canal still joins the Nile.

Another passage of geographical value is in ii. 179:—"If a man arrived at any other mouth of the Nile, he was obliged to swear that he had come there against his will; and, having taken such an oath, he must sail in the same ship to the Kanobic

mouth so great were the privileges of Naukratis." Here we learn that the way to Naukratis lay up the Kanobic mouth, and, moreover, that the Saitic would not even lead to Naukratis directly, since from any other mouth the Saitic would be nearer than the Kanobic; yet the storm-strayed mariner must go to the Kanobic mouth to reach his only port. Naukratis therefore cannot possibly have been on the Saitic branch, but must have lain so that its water-way opened up the Kanobic stream, or Great River.

5. Strabo gives two geographical indications. He says (xvii. 1. 23), that above Momemphis are two nitre mines, and the Nitriote nome; in this nome, and near this place, is Menelaos; on the left, in the Delta, upon the river, is Naukratis; at two schœni from the river is Sais. Now we must first see what river he means. Sais is two schœni, or about thirteen miles distant from it, and he is mentioning the line of sailing from Schedia (near Alexandria) to Memphis. He is therefore probably referring to the Great River, or Agathodaimon of Ptolemy, the Kanobic branch; and the distance from Sais, somewhere between one and a half and two and a half schœni, or ten to sixteen miles, would just agree with this, as Sais is nine miles direct from the nearest point of the Kanobic arm, and was therefore probably about twelve miles by road or canal. Naukratis he places on this river, and therefore clearly on the Kanobic and not the Saitic branch. The position on the left of the river is ambiguous. A modern so speaking would of course mean on the west of the Nile, unless he were describing a journey up the river; this, however, seems to be the case with Strabo, who must therefore mean the east by the left of the river. This is further shown by his naming the Menelaite nome as on the right of the Kanobic mouth, on the west of which it lay, according to Ptolemy. The other mention of many villages on the right hand of the river, as far as Lake Mareia, again points to the right being the west. The regular custom of the country at present is to speak of

Lower and Upper Egypt as if looking south; and the natural habit of northerners, as the Greeks were, would regard the country from the north. We must therefore read Strabo as saying that Naukratis lay on the east of the Great River. This is so directly contradicted by all the other authors, who indicate the position, that we must seek its explanation, rather than consider it as causing any uncertainty. When we know that the canal for sea-going ships, by which the mound of Nebireh was reached, was on the west of the site, it is not hard to suppose that Strabo was informed that Naukratis lay on the left or east of the river by which the shipping arrived, and concluded that that was the Great River. Such a slip would be very liable to occur to any writer who was not careful to distinguish in his information between a navigable canal and the river from which it branched, and within three or four miles of which it ran.

The other mention by Strabo is that the Milesians sailed up to the Saitic nome, and having conquered Inaros in a sea-fight, founded Naukratis not far above Schedia. This indicates but little: the Great River was probably reckoned as passing through the Saitic nome, before the Naukratian nome was separated, so that we cannot conclude which arm is here indicated; and the mention of Schedia is not decisive, inasmuch as it means a raft, or perhaps a bridge of boats, and so the name might occur anywhere on a river, just as a Klusma might be found on any shore. So far as we can identify it, Schedia is said by Strabo to be four schœni from Alexandria. This would place it as far inland as Abu Homs; and "not far above Schedia," would hardly perhaps suggest a site nearly as far from Schedia, as Schedia was from Alexandria. At least we cannot say there is anything here to contradict the other authors; and if there was but one Schedia, this again would show Naukratis to have been near the Kanobic arm, on which Schedia lay, and not on the Saitic.

Pliny mentions the Naukratian nome in the list of nomes (v. 9); but nothing precise as to place

can be deduced from so irregular a catalogue. He names Naukratis, however, in the towns of the Delta (v. 11), and gives a valuable indication, saying, "from which some writers call that the Naukratic mouth, which is by others called the Herakleotic, and mention it instead of the Kanobic, which is next to it." Here we have yet another distinct testimony to Naukratis being near the Great River, and not on the Saitic branch.

Stephen of Byzantium mentions Naukratis, without any exact indication of its site.

6. We now have seen that all the ancient authorities, Ptolemy, the Peutingerian map, Herodotos, Strabo, and Pliny, each mention such details about Naukratis, as to show independantly that it lay near the Kanobic branch of the Nile, or Great River, and not on the Saitic branch, where it has so perversely been supposed to exist. The only possible origin for such an idea seems to be the statements of Strabo, that the Milesians sailed into the Saitic nome when they founded Naukratis, and that it was on the left, or east, of the river, which seems to have been assumed to be the river of Sais, though Sais is said to be thirteen miles from this river. This very description shows that Naukratis was near the Great River, besides the mention of Schedia, which probably shows the same. The only contradiction that can be alleged, is that Strabo says Naukratis was on the east of the river, while Ptolemy, Peutinger's map, and Herodotos, all show it to have been on the west of the Kanobic arm: the fact of its lying on the east of the canal, by which ships approached it, is enough to explain this difficulty.

Having now shown how the mound of Nebireh, or its immediate neighbourhood, is the site of Naukratis, according to our geographical information, I shall henceforward apply the name of Naukratis directly to this mound, and to the ancient city which it covers; the mound in which the only known decree of the city of Naukratis, and the only two autonomous coins of that city, were found; the mound which contained archaic temples of

Apollo and of Aphrodite, as Naukratis did, according to Herodotos and Athenaios; the mound which covers a great commercial emporium abounding in weights, and a centre of Greek trade and manufactures; the mound, whose whole history, from its flourishing times in the archaic Greek period downwards, agrees with the history of Naukratis, and of no other Greek city known to have existed.

7. We now turn to the history of Naukratis, so far as it is known to us from ancient authors, and from the remains of the city. First, we may clear the ground by dismissing the statement of Strabo, that the Milesians founded Naukratis after conquering Inaros in a sea-fight: this would place its foundation in the fifth century B.C.; whereas, to say the least, Amasis granted it privileges in the sixth century. It may be that it was resettled by Milesians after it had decayed under the Persian rule, or possibly another and earlier Inaros is intended. Whatever the explanation may be, we cannot make use of this statement.

From Herodotos we may see that the city of Naukratis existed before the reign of Amasis, since he says that that king "gave the city of Naukratis for such as arrived in Egypt to dwell in." This shows that the city existed already, or the expression would have been that he gave the Greeks the privilege of founding a city at a place which they named Naukratis. Before 570 then is the literary date for the foundation of Naukratis. An incidental proof of the early date assigned by the Greeks to the settlement at Naukratis is in a passage of Athenaios (xv. 18) in which he quotes Polycharmos of Naukratis as describing a certain Herostratos, a merchant of Naukratis, trading there from Cyprus in the twenty-third Olympiad, or 688 B.C.; and dedicating a statue of Aphrodite there in a temple of that goddess. The statue is said to have been a span high, and of very ancient workmanship. This at least shows that in the time of Polycharmos the foundation of Naukratis must have been supposed to have taken place in very remote times.

On turning to the city itself, we meet with two ways of dating its earliest remains, by the style of the pottery, and by the historical remains found. The style of the earliest pottery here is such, as is at the lowest date placed in the seventh century B.C. The Phœnician-Greek ware, as it is called, is often found; and found in the temenos of Apollo some way above the earliest remains. This would then bring the foundation of the city to at least the middle of the seventh century. Another guide, and the most exact, is the factory of scarabæi; they were made here in large quantities, and though moulded at the back the designs were always hand-cut, so that the use of old moulds is out of the question for the under side. The design must belong to the time of manufacture. Now many of Psamtik I. are found, and some of Psamtik II., and several which belong either to Psamtik I. or Uah-ab-ra, and probably to the latter. This brings the factory as low as about 580 B.C. But here it stops, and not one scarab of the great, prosperous, and long-reigning king, Amasis, who patronised the Greeks so largely, is to be found. This distinctly marks the factory as extinct before his reign, and therefore about 570 B.C. But below the bottom of the stratum in which the scarabs were found, there lies two feet lower a black burnt stratum full of charcoal and ashes, which forms almost the earliest stratum of the whole southern half of the town. According to the average rate of accumulation of earth during Greek times this bed of two feet would represent about half a century. And half a century before the beginning of the scarab factory would lead us to about the middle of the seventh century B.C.

If then we find that a general conflagration of the city took place about this period, we should turn to historical sources to see what events are probably connected with it. There are two suppositions the choice of which must depend on the age to be assigned to the earliest pottery. Most probably the Greeks had settled here during the disruption caused by the Assyrian invasions, when

the absence of a native government—the power being contested by Assyrians and Ethiopians—would leave the restrictions against foreigners in a lax state. This would then give a date of before 670 B.C. for the foundation of the Greek city; that it was somewhat early in these troublous times may be supposed, from the burning down of the town; this would most likely occur in a war, and the only wars to which we can assign it are those before the settled period of Psamtik I., *i.e.* the wars of the Assyrians and Tahraka about 670 B.C. Probably such a trading settlement would not be a very permanent or important place at first, and the great quantity of charcoal and ash from the burning suggests that it may have been mainly of wood, and of wattle and daub. The more permanent houses, with thick walls of mud-brick were probably begun under the firm government of Psamtik I., who favoured the Greeks, and gave settlements to his auxiliaries toward the eastern frontier of the Delta. After the Greeks were firmly established here with a regular town of houses, they would then have erected solid temples and dedicated the valuable vases and bowls which we have found. This would place the beginning of the temple period about 650 to 630 B.C.: and this, which is the earlier scheme of dating, seems to fit best to historical facts.

On the other hand it is quite possible that the first settlement may not have been until the reign of Psamtik I., about 650; that the burning might be an accidental conflagration in peace and not in war, perhaps 630 or 620; and that the reconstruction of the town, and the foundation of important temples might not occur till 610 to 600 B.C. This however would be somewhat a strain on the dating of the earliest figured pottery found here: and the earlier dating appears the more likely one.

8. From the character of the pottery dedicated in the temple of Apollo, we may conclude that the first temple would be in existence as early as 610 or 620 B.C., and perhaps before that. There are no fragments of any temple earlier than those

represented on pl. iii., and hence these may be dated to about 620 B.C., or the end of the reign of Psamtik I. An indication of the Milesian Apollo being prominently known and honoured in Egypt, and therefore doubtless having a temple there, in the seventh century, may be seen in the fact of Neqo in 608 dedicating his corslet to Apollo of the Milesians at the mother temple of Branchidæ (Herod. ii. 159). The temenos wall of the temple seems to be of a later age, as by the level of it it may probably be about 550 B.C., and the bricks are most like those of even two centuries later. I should be inclined to suppose that the ground in the sacred enclosure did not rise rapidly by accumulations as in the town, and that perhaps digging a foundation has lowered the foot of the wall, so that we might attribute it to the building of the second temple about 440 B.C. Some temenos doubtless existed from the earliest dedication of a temple, but it may have been entirely ruined when the first temple was destroyed.

The Great Temenos we have no exact means of dating at present; if it were the Pan-Hellenion, which seems to follow from the statement of Herodotus that that temenos was the largest at Naukratis, then it would probably be as early as the other temenē in the town. That it was injured, and the block of chambers in it in a damaged state, at about 300 B.C., we may be certain, as at that time Ptolemy II. (as we shall see in Chapter IV.) largely repaired it. Hence its age would well agree with its being the Pan-Hellenion. The most distinct evidence of its age is that afforded by the brickwork. So far as I have collected the sizes of bricks in Egypt, it appears that from the twenty-sixth dynasty down to late Roman times the sizes steadily decreased, about an inch in length per century; and in scarcely any case of plainly dated bricks that I know of is there a variation of as much as one inch or one century from this scale. In the walls and citadel of Sais the bricks are 17.2×8.0 (the thickness is always variable) at about 650 B.C.; at Kom Afrin, perhaps about 600 B.C., the size is 16.3×7.4 ; at Naukratis, about

600 or 550 B.C., according to pottery, the size is 16×7.9 ; and the Great Temenos and chambers within it are of bricks 16.3×8.3 . Hence we should expect that the Great Temenos belongs to the earlier part of the twenty-sixth dynasty, and not to the Persian period. In contrast to these sizes of bricks, those of the Ptolemaic building, about 260 B.C., in the gateway, are 14.8×7.2 , or rather less than those which we can date to about 350 B.C. All the details will be found in Chapter X. Historically speaking, we should expect the Pan-Hellenion to have been founded at about the same time as the other archaic temples, perhaps about 620 B.C., when the town was evidently in a flourishing state, as shown by the quantities of archaic pottery found, and its wide distribution on the site.

9. A reverse to the prosperity of Naukratis may be seen in the total cessation of the considerable manufacture of scarabæi; if other trades carried their age in their faces in the same manner, we might very likely see the same thing in all the manufactures; but in the scarabæi the change is striking, as I have already mentioned, and points to a check of a temporary but sharp nature at about the beginning of the reign of Amasis. This exactly agrees with what Herodotus records of the usurpation of Amasis over his adoptive brother and co-regent Apries, in ii. 163: "When Apries heard of this, he armed his auxiliaries and marched against the Egyptians; he had with him Carian and Ionian auxiliaries to the number of thirty thousand. . . Now Apries' party advanced against the Egyptians, and the party of Amasis against the foreigners. . . 169. . . and the foreigners fought well, but being far inferior in numbers, were, on that account, defeated." Here there must have been an immense disruption of all Greek business, when thirty thousand Greeks—all that could be drawn for levies in the greatest emergency—were defeated and scattered, and the conqueror marched on the capital, Sais, and occupied it, within a few miles of the head-

quarters of the vanquished Greeks at Naukratis. Such a blow must have upset all commerce for some time; and, even apart from any revenge on the Greek city, would give good cause for the cessation of fancy manufactures.

This breach, however, was healed before long; and Amasis, conscious of the valuable qualities of his opponents, the Greeks, and knowing that to mercenary troops a change of masters is not difficult, threw himself warmly on the Greek side, and appears to have reckoned on securing himself by the mutual jealousy of Greeks and Egyptians. He adopted the Greek troops, which Psammitichos had settled in the east of the Delta as his body-guard, and removed them to Memphis (Herod. ii. 154). In this we may perhaps see, however, a back-handed favour to the Egyptians. This settlement, which Psamtik I. had granted to his Greek auxiliaries, was a powerful connection with Greece, and therefore doubtless a centre of trade; Herodotos says, "From the time of the settlement of these people in Egypt, we Greeks have had such constant communication with them, that we are accurately informed of all that has happened in Egypt, beginning from the reign of Psammitichos to the present time." To realize how much such a connection was worth for history in the time of Herodotos, we might make the parallel between this settlement and the English at Calcutta; the first settlement there being under William and Mary, as long ago now as Psamtik was before Herodotos, events under George the First would be about parallel to the reign of Apries; the "good old times" of George the Third, a long and prosperous reign, would parallel the days of Amasis; and the history of our own times, since Waterloo, is as fresh as the Persian period was to Herodotos.

Now Amasis had seized the supreme authority with the aid of the old Egyptian party, as against the Phil-Hellene, Apries; and he was bound to satisfy his followers to some extent; but, seeing the value of the Greek mercenaries, though they were opposed to him, he could not afford to

remain on bad terms with them. That the Greek trading in Egypt was a sore subject, and a state of affairs which the Egyptians bitterly resented, we may see plainly from the strong measures taken against Greek trading by Amasis, and the strict limitations by which it was bound. To gratify the Egyptian policy, therefore, Amasis destroyed the oldest Greek settlement and mart in Egypt, that in the east of the Delta, for as Herodotos says (ii. 154), "the docks for their ships, and the ruins of their buildings, were to be seen in my time in the places from which they were removed." At the same time, to avoid alienating the Greeks, and to secure them to his service, he took them to Memphis as his own body-guard. This stroke of policy gratified both parties, and at the same time strengthened the position of Amasis. Thus it came about that Naukratis was the only centre of Greek trade remaining, and stringent laws prevented any additional settlements or trading of Greeks in other places. "Amasis being partial to the Greeks, both bestowed other favours on various of the Greeks, and, moreover, gave the city of Naukratis for such as arrived in Egypt to dwell in . . . Naukratis was anciently the only place of resort for merchants, and there was no other in Egypt: and if a man arrived at any other mouth of the Nile, he was obliged to swear 'that he had come there against his will;' and having taken such an oath, he must sail in the same ship to the Kanobic mouth; but if he should be prevented by contrary winds from doing so, he was forced to unload his goods, and carry them in barges round the Delta, until he reached Naukratis. So great were the privileges of Naukratis." (Herod. ii. 178, 179.) That this phrase, "anciently the only city of resort," refers to the days of Amasis we may well believe; first, because it would be in contradistinction to the liberty allowed under the foreign rule of the Persians, and in point of time it is much as we might now say "formerly the Americans were at war with England;" and also because Herodotos particularly mentions the docks of the colony in

the eastern Delta, showing that trade went on there, and says, "we Greeks have had such constant communication with them." A mere settlement of troops as Egyptian mercenaries would not need shipping; and if it had been a naval station for the Egyptian fleet Amasis would not have destroyed it.

10. During the reign of Amasis, Naukratis flourished on its monopoly of Greek trade; and being within a short distance of the capital, Sais, its advantages were natural as well as artificial. The Persian invasion, however, told seriously on the prosperity of the city. This is curiously evident in the proportion of the pottery which I have found there. In a perfectly impartial collection of pottery of all periods found in the town, there is fifty or a hundred times as much belonging to the century, or century and a half, before the Persian invasion, as to the century and a half of the Persian dynasty; a simple but clear proof of the falling off in the richness and importance of the city. The temples, however, seem to have been still standing in the days of Herodotus, 454 B.C., though not apparently in great renown, as he does not mention any special offerings dedicated in them, as he so often does in describing other temples. The archaic temple of Apollo then was still standing in 454, and yet the second temple of white marble was built about 440 B.C., according to its style. To what event we are to attribute the destruction of the first temple is not clear; if it could be placed as late as 400 B.C. we should see a most likely cause of the destruction of a Greek temple in the rebellion of the Egyptians against the Persians; and the favour to the Greeks shown by Amyrtæos and his successor Naifaurut (Nepherites) would encourage the Greeks to rebuild their sanctuaries. But such a date seems to be too late for the style of the fragments of this second temple.

From this time to the second Persian conquest, in 345, it is probable that Naukratis, though shorn of its original monopoly, was still a city of the

first importance to the Greeks, as Sais was still one of the capitals, though it had lost its pre-eminence. The conquest by Artaxerxes would not perhaps disturb the west of the Delta so much as the east, and its duration was but twelve years. Under Alexander and the Greek predominance, a new life would be imparted to the Greek cities; but the foundation of Alexandria would naturally absorb this new vitality and gradually sap the strength of the older settlement.

11. Naukratis, however, shows an independence which never appeared before, in issuing an autonomous coinage about this time, and probably during the breach of government between the Macedonian and Ptolemaic lines, while Ptolemy Soter was governor of Egypt, 323 to 305 B.C. Two coins only of this period are known (see p. 66), found last May in our digging at Naukratis; bearing on one side the head of the city of Naukratis (?) with the inscription **ΝΑΥ**; and on the other, a head, apparently intended for the youthful Alexander, with **ΑΛΕ**, possibly standing for Alexandria. If it were a head of Alexander as king, he would be in the lion's skin, as on his coins, and have his title; whereas his head would naturally be the type, as being the hero, of his city of Alexandria.

Ptolemy Philadelphos, who so greatly enriched the cities of Egypt with monuments and public works, did not neglect Naukratis. He built a large structure of limestone, about 330 feet long, and sixty feet wide, to fill up the broken entrance to the Great Temenos; he strengthened the great block of chambers in the Temenos, and re-established them; and that the city flourished for some time after his reign, we may see by the quantity of imported amphoræ, of which the handles, stamped at Rhodes and other places, are found so abundantly. The number of Greek authors which the city produced during the Ptolemaic period also shows that leisure and study found a home there at that time. Philistus, Apollonius, Polycharmos, Charon, and Lykeas are known to us of the Ptolemaic age;

and Chairemon, Athenæus, and Julius Pollux, in the Roman period.

12. Under the empire the city, however, steadily decayed; the Great Temenos was finally ruined, the fine building of Ptolemy Philadelphos was entirely removed in the first century, stone by stone, for large houses then being erected on the mounds; the great block of chambers, the old store-house and fort of the early days, was half filled up, and used for dwelling-houses; and the city declined so much by the end of the second century, that it was hopeless to maintain its old schools, and Proklos, the last teacher, removed to Athens about 190 A.D. The removal cannot be placed much earlier, as Athenæus and Julius Pollux were probably at Naukratis thirty or forty years before this; and after Proklos removed to Athens, Philostratus was one of his pupils. As Philostratus was born about 172 A.D., this shows that Proklos was probably at Athens between 190 and 200 A.D. It is said, however, that he moved away from Naukratis in consequence of civil commotions; this seems most likely to refer to the Bucolic War in 175, and this would be quite a possible date, though rather earlier than we might have assigned from the age of Philostratus. Perhaps the ruin and decay of Naukratis, which seems rather sudden between 150 and 250, and the sudden cessation of all literary eminence there, just after producing three historical characters, should be referred to the city being ruined in the Bucolic War and the revolt of Cassius, and its suppression. That the city was still important in the middle of the second century, is shown by its being named in Ptolemy; and its presence in the Peutingerian map shows that it was not extinct for some time later; while the mention of it by Stephen of Byzantium, in the end of the fifth century, shows that it was at least not forgotten then. There are, however, no remains in the city which can be dated later than the middle of the third century; the common coins of Alexandria, under the later emperors, Probus and Aurelian, are scarcely ever found at Naukratis,

and only one or two stray ones have appeared out of the abundance of the Constantine family. The common Byzantine weights, square with a cross, have not occurred among the large quantity obtained. And, in short, we may say that as a city it was extinct about the beginning of the third century, though a few houses lingered on here for perhaps a century or more later. A Coptic chapel was built on the top of the great mound apparently, as pieces of coloured fresco with a cross were found in digging there; and two lumps of plaster with cross devices also show that some Christians lived here. A Kufic glass stamp from a bottle, of about the eighth century, is the last trace of life that has left any remains in the place.

13. The present extent of the ruins may be seen from the plan (pl. xl.). The length of the mound is rather over half a mile, including the Great Temenos, and its width a little over a quarter of a mile. About a third of this area has been cleared out already by the Arabs, in digging for earth to lay on their fields, and thus the streets of the archaic Greek settlement are now exposed. This ground is heaped over with the broken pottery, which has been found and cast aside by the Arabs in their removal of about thirty feet of earth, the heaps being from a few inches to five or six feet in depth. This pottery, and the loose earth lying about, make it very troublesome to trace the original lines of the walls and streets; and the preparation of the street plan (pl. xli.) occupied all my spare time for some weeks. Often the determination of a single piece of wall would take half an hour of examination; and the bricks, being of native mud, cemented with mud, ounded on mud, and then subject to a pressure of two tons to the square foot, continuously wet for two thousand years, are in many cases almost indistinguishable from the mud below and around them. Sometimes a cutting had to be left to dry for a few weeks; so as to detect, by the course of the cracks in it, where the brickwork ceased. The earliest foundations are now some ten feet below the present

surface of the country; hence so soon as the Arab diggings reach out to the cultivated land, the excavated site will be flooded by the inundation, and so form a permanent lake, which will for ever prevent anything more of early Greek times, or before the Ptolemaic period, being recovered in future. Some slight cause or whim on the part of the Arab diggers might easily occasion this any year. The highest part of the existing houses is twenty-nine feet, and the general mound surface about twelve feet, above the present plain. The modern huts on the mound are those of Bedawin, who have settled from time to time while camping on the ground. In the spring many families live here in the low Bedawi tents, and move off about April. The slag heaps marked on the plan are mounds of slag from limestone burning, eight or ten feet high, which adjoin large substructures of red baked Roman brick, some chambers of which show many successive coats of painted frescos. This slag is evidently the last state of the limestone, which the Romans had built their large houses with, when they stripped away the great limestone building of Ptolemy Philadelphos. Wherever a heap of slag is seen on an Egyptian mound, it shows that a great limestone building has existed at the place; it was thus that I was led to the site of the Ptolemaic temple at Tanis.

14. The present canal, which runs from the Barage, and which is the representative of the ancient canal which led from Memphis, past the pyramids, lies at about five minutes' walk from the town, with cultivated fields between. That there was a navigable canal for sea-shipping up to Naukratis, the remains found here testify; a piece of thick pottery, with oyster-shells on it, was found in the early strata of the temenos of Apollo; and a piece of Roman brick, similarly incrustated, was picked up elsewhere in the town: though it might be alleged that they were brought for the sake of the oysters, yet that objection will not hold in the case of a piece of stone covered with small barnacles; such could only have been brought up as ballast from the sea.

The great quantity of large fish-hooks, suitable for sea-fishing, which are found here, also point to this intercourse. The small size of the present canal must not therefore be considered any argument against its free navigation; and it is now larger than the continuation of it past the pyramids, which we know to have been navigable for shipping in the time of Herodotos. It must be remembered that the whole surface of the country has been raised by deposits about ten feet, and hence that the surface level of the old canal is now below the bottom level of the present canal. Hence no connection should be sought, either in size or exact position, between the two. That the ancient canal ran close by the side of the town we cannot doubt; the town, for commercial reasons, would be sure to adjoin the canal, and the canal at present makes a long curve to the west around the town, a straight line between two points on its present course skirting the side of the town. If this were the ancient course, a deflection of six inches washed off the wearing side, and deposited on the shoaling side each year, would suffice to bring the canal to where it now is. On digging at the border of the town, about west of the temenos of Apollo, we reached a thick bed of black mud, foul-smelling and offensive. This was probably some old dock or pond by the side of the ancient canal, filled up with sewage and refuse. Further pitting along this part may perhaps show us the old bed of the stream.

It may well be asked what inducement the Greeks had to settle in such a place, and why this spot was fixed on rather than any other. At the rise of the twenty-sixth dynasty, Sais was the capital, and hence the settlement in the east of the Delta, granted by Psamtik, was not the best place for trade. At the same time the jealousy of the Egyptians would hinder the Greeks from establishing themselves at the capital. We must remember what the object of the Greeks was at Naukratis; it was trade; and facilities for trade were therefore the first consideration. In this—as in all the internal economy of the country,