



Three North Delta Nomes

Author(s): D. G. Hogarth

Source: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 24 (1904), pp. 1-19

Published by: [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/623979>

Accessed: 11/12/2014 01:51

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THREE NORTH DELTA NOMES.

[PLATE I.]

BEING desirous, after the revelation of intimacy between prehistoric Crete and Egypt which the Cnossian excavations had made, to know if there were indeed no 'Aegean' remains in the Lower Delta, I searched the authorities for an account of the extant antiquities of its north central region—north, that is, of the 'Berari' railway, which links Dessuk on the Rosetta Nile with Sherbin on the Damietta arm. But in vain. Nor, for that matter, could I find any description of the scenery of the region itself, more detailed and recent than the romantic sketch of the marshes with which Heliodorus opened his *Aethiopica*. I had myself visited the extreme south-west corner of it in 1896, following in the steps of Messrs. Petrie¹ and Griffith to Tell al-Farain; and the last named scholar had gone on thence a few miles north to the district of Tida. North and east of that point stretched unknown land. So I was forced to undertake an exploration of the region for myself. The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies generously gave a grant in aid; and almost every kind of assistance was furnished on the spot by the *Société Anonyme du Behéra*, through the great goodwill of its Managing Director Mr. E. W. P. Foster, C.M.G. I should have fared badly in the marshes without the use of the Inspection Houses, men, animals, and boats, of that Society, and the unique local knowledge of its officers, among whom (after Mr. Foster) I must thank especially Mr. Smith, the Agricultural Director at Constantinia, Monsieur Monnerat, the Assistant Manager in chief, and Messieurs Boutros and Passalides, the local Directors at Sidi Salem and Kum Wahal respectively. If I did not find anything 'Aegean' in this North Delta district, I hope this article will shew that its exploration was not made wholly in vain.

The coastal belt of the Delta is divided by Ptolemy into five Nomes. (1) The *Metelitic*, capital, Metelis; (2) the *Phthenetic*, capital, Buto; (3) the *Sebennyitic Inferior*, capital, Pachnemounis; (4) the *Mendesiac*, capital, Thmuis; (5) the *Nesyitic*, capital, Panephris. But a sixth coastal Nome,

¹ See Petrie, *Naukratis*, i. p. 93, and compare his remarks on our ignorance of the Delta, *ibid.* p. 1.

known from the local coinage of Hadrian's reign, that of *Diospolis Inferior*, was certainly in existence just before Ptolemy's day².

My exploration, however, extended over only some of these Nomes. Parts of the Phthenetic, and the Lower Sebennytic and Diospolite Nomes form the subject of this paper. I found the second of these (assuming for the moment the lines of division between the three nomes to fall on or about the existing Bahr Nashart and Bahr Tirah) to be studded with large mounds: the third to contain only one site of importance, and not many minor mounds. No one of these mounds was identified before my visit with any known ancient town; and, that being the case, no probable courses could be assigned to the branches of the Nile, which, according to Ptolemy and others, divided or traversed the Nomes, wherein the known towns lay; nor could the Nomes themselves be placed precisely on the map.

Thanks to various authorities, principally lists of Coptic bishoprics, certain town-names can be relegated generally to that area of the North Delta which I visited. As the precise situations of some of these towns depend on the situations of others, I shall take the names in groups; and then discuss the question which their identification with certain sites raises as to the courses of the ancient Nile arms.

A.—BUTO (PTENETO); PHRAGONIS; PACHNEMOUNIS; DIOSPOLIS INFERIOR.

The last three names (the first two as *Φρανύνης* and *Παχνεμόνης*) are in the order in which they occur in Hierocles' *Synecdemus*, the trio being enumerated between *Ζωῆς* (*Xois*) and *Σεβόννυτος* (*Sebennytytus*), whose sites are certainly identified with the mounds of Sakha and Samanud. In the same order they precede Sebennytytus, but succeed *Κάβασα* (modern Shabas), in the earliest Notitia³.

Hierocles' order is always most intelligible if related to main avenues of communication. In enumerating the towns in the Lower Deltaic Eparchy, he first ascends the western Nile from Alexandria to the southern limit of the province at Nikiu, mentioning every town within easy reach on either hand, *e.g.*, on the east, Buto and Kabasa (Shabas), the latter of which towns was certainly not on the stream itself. Thence he passes to Xois in the north-western interior; takes next three towns, of which we know this at least, from other sources, that they all lay in the north of the province; and next

² The variations in the Nome-lists, as given by divers authorities, present an insoluble puzzle. See *e.g.* the discrepancies between Strabo's list and the lists in the *Revenue Papyrus of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (cols. 31, 60, ed. B. P. Grenfell). No one of Ptolemy's five coastal Nomes, except the Mendesiac, appears in that Papyrus: but it is not impossible that Nome No. 7, in col. 31, *Δέλατα*, included one or more of them. Evidently there were frequent changes made in the distribution and nomenclature of Nomes,

especially in the Delta, perhaps owing to gradual changes which took place in natural conditions by processes of reclamation. It is impossible to regard any list as final, but it is equally impossible not to regard certain lists, *e.g.* this in the *Revenue Papyrus*, as authoritative and comprehensive for the moments at which they were compiled.

³ *Ed.* Parthey I. nos. 730-734. Later Notitiae seem to follow no geographical order; cf. *Byz. Zeitsch.* ii. p. 25.

again Sebennytus on its extreme eastern limit. Thereafter he makes a circuit westward through a series of towns, known to have lain in the south interior, and swings round east again to Busiris. And finally he adds three towns, of which one, Paralos, is known to have lain on the coastal sand-belt, north of the marshes, and another to have been also in the extreme north. It is probable, therefore, that all these three last were cut off by the lagoons from the interior, and lay in a district reckoned apart. In the early Arab period at any rate, when the province of Gharbieh did not include the province of Nesteraweh, the central coast-belt was certainly so divided administratively from what lay to south.

In our ignorance, however, of the ancient lines of communication in the central Delta, we need independent evidence for the precise position of certain towns in Hierocles' list.

(1) **Phragonis**, besides its occurrence in the town-list of Hierocles, and in bishopric-lists, Greek and Coptic⁴, appears in the Athanasian *Tract to the Antiochenes*⁵ as the see of a bishop, who signed *Φραγώνεως καὶ μέρους Ἐλεαρχίας τῆς Αἰγύπτου*. This was in 362 A.D. In a Greek, Coptic, and Arabic list of famous bishoprics, of which de Rougé and Amélineau have made great use, and the latter has published two MS. versions as the fourth appendix to his geographical work,⁶ this bishopric is cited as *ΦΡΑΓΩΝΙΝ ΘΕΝΕΩ = ΤΘΙ+ = Tida and al-Faragin*. Tida and al-Faragin are found similarly conjoined in several Coptic *scalae*, which equate *ΘΟΙΤΕ ΦΕΡΟΥΩΙΝΙ* (or *ΠΕΡΥΟΙΝΙ ΘΟΙ+* or similar corruptions) with the same pair of Arabic place-names, connected by the copulative. The latter appear also in connection, both in the work of Calcashandi⁷ and in the valuable list of provincial assessments, made in 1376, and first printed by Sylvestre de Sacy.⁸ Now *Tida* exists still as a village territory some fifteen miles N.N.E. of Sakha (Xois). About seven miles on a bee-line west of it and beyond the Bahr Nashart are the great mounds known as Tell *al-Farain*. The latter name, occurring just in the locality where the relation of Phragonis to Xois in Hierocles' list, and to Kabasa in Notitia I., would incline us to put that bishopric, can hardly but be a survival. The form in Hierocles, *Φραγώνης*, pronounced probably *Fravínis*, is very close.⁹

Must Tell al-Farain, then, be identified with the site of Phragonis? It has been claimed by Mr. Petrie for no less a city than **Buto**; and after much

⁴ Cf. Amélineau, *Géog. de l'Égypte à l'Époque Copte*, p. 179.

⁵ *Athanasius* ed. Migne, p. 619.

⁶ De Rougé published it first as app. to his *Géog. de la Basse Égypte*. He had got his copy from Revillout.

⁷ See Wüstenfeld's trans. in *Abh. d. Kön. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, vol. xxv. Hist. Phil. Classe 1. 2.

⁸ At the end of his edition of Abdallatif's *Relation de l'Égypte*, pp. 593, ff.

⁹ The signature of a bishop at the Council of

Ephesus, *Φλαβονίας*, is interpreted by an ancient gloss as *Φραγώνεως Αἰγύπτου* (in the Coptic Acts ed. by V. Bouriant in *Miss. Fr. au Caire* viii. 1, the reading is *Πλακωνεος*); so perhaps there was some phonetic uncertainty about the sound, variously rendered by *γ*, *ν*, and *β*. In the Arabic form (if one may trust de Rougé and Amélineau for exact collation of MSS.) this sound appears variously as *jim* and *hā*: and in local pronunciation to-day there seemed to me to be the trace either of a soft *g* or an *ain* in this place.

doubt, I incline to accept his identification still, on the double ground that (1) these mounds are so large and have so important a temple-area in their midst, that if they do not represent the one Pharaonic city of the first rank in this corner of Egypt, one does not know where else to look for a site which will satisfy the geographical data concerning Buto: (2) the little hamlet at their foot is still called *Ebtu*, which seems a survival of the old name. Nothing has been found in the mounds in question, I believe, of Pharaonic date; but they have never been excavated except by *sebakhin*. The site lies about ten miles on a bee-line from the east bank of the Rosetta Nile, and therefore comes as appropriately into Hierocles' enumeration, as Kabasa (Shabas).

To justify, however, the consequent hypothesis that the site of Buto bears now a survival of the name of Phragonis which Hierocles shews to have been a town distinct from Buto up to the sixth century at any rate,¹⁰ I must call attention to two points. (1) In what I will call henceforth for convenience the 'Equivalents List,' published by de Rougé, the name ΘΕΝΕΩ is associated with ΦΡΑΓΩΝΙΝ. That can hardly be anything but a slight corruption of ΦΘΕΝΕΟΥ, inscribed on the Hadrianic coinage of the Phthenetic or Butonic Nome. (2) Buto does not appear as a bishopric either in the Equivalents List, or any of the *scalae*. But its name does occur in the first named list coupled with that of Pachnemounis, apparently as descriptive of the locality of the latter (see below p. 5). It seems fair, therefore, to infer that the old name clung to the district and even the town. Buto perhaps still existed as *Phtheneo*, after the Arab invasion; but the town was utterly decayed, while a neighbouring place, Phragonis or Faragin, had taken its place as the local centre.¹¹ But the old and the new centres were so close together, that the name of the old may have been still in use as an explanatory title of the new—*Phragonis of Phtheneo*, in Coptic *Thoiti*; and when both had fallen equally into the ruin and oblivion in which they now lie, the name which was last of importance, *Faragin*, possibly attached itself in Arab tradition to the more extensive of the two desolate sites.

Where, then, is the lesser site, that of Phragonis? Obviously near Tida. There are two mounds near the locality (for the village has come to be split up into two or three small groups of huts, widely separated). One is a small mound, *Kum ed-Daba*, very near the northernmost group. It is probably an older Tida. The other is a much more important site, situated about two miles further to E.N.E., and now called *Kum al-Hawalid*. Nearly a mile in circumference and some thirty to forty feet high, it is the third mound in point of size in the western half of the north-central Delta. It yields the best Roman brick found in the district, and an exceptional amount

¹⁰ Cf. also the occurrence of both names in the signatures to the Council of Ephesus.

¹¹ A see, ΠΤΕΝΕΤΟ, also occurs both in the Equivalents List and the *scalae*; and Amélineau (p. 105) is probably right in locating

it beyond Shabas and near the river. But its name must also be a survival of the old Nome title (*Ptenetu* in Pliny), and doubtless the place was a successor to Buto on the western side, as Phragonis on the eastern.

of worked stone. I noticed two Byzantine capitals of good workmanship lying on the surface. Here I suggest was the see of the western Marshes, Phragonis—Thoiti.

(2) **Pachnemounis.** The position of Phragonis being narrowed in any case to the immediate neighbourhood of Tida, Pachnemounis is to be looked for east or north-east of that point. Its bishop signed the Athanasian Tract, quoted already, as Παχνεμούνεως καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ μέρους τῆς Ἐλεαρχίας; which distinction leads one to expect to find its marshes divided from those of Phragonis by some considerable interval. The Equivalents List cites it as ΠΑΧΝΟΜΕΝΟΣ = ΚΒΟΥΤΟ ΘΕΡΟΣ (see above), but unfortunately omits to add an Arabic identification: and there is no other literary authority but Ptolemy's for the location of a place important enough to have been the capital of the Lower Sebennytic Nome.¹²

In the course of my journey, however, I came across a piece of epigraphic evidence. At the Behéra Society's Inspection House near Kum Wahal are preserved three inscribed slabs, found by diggers for brick in the large mound of *Khanziri*, about ten miles due north. Two of these bear parts, not consecutive, of a single text, and it is probable they were once facing slabs of a pedestal. A head was found near them; but this well preserved life-size portrait in Parian marble, (also at Kum Wahal) cannot be that of Marcus Aurelius, and, though not unlike both Trajan and Domitian, represents probably neither one nor the other, but a private individual. The inscription, so far as recovered, is as follows:—

(1) Two slabs of coarsish white marble with rough backs, displaying parts of one inscription. The longer (right-hand) fragment measures .845 × .413 × .044. The letters are slender and of very varying height and disposition: they are without apices. The right-hand slab is the most worn, and appears to have been used at some period in a pavement or threshold. Copy and squeeze of the most worn parts. Complete except at bottom.

¹² The name probably occurs also in the *Anon.* does not help us to locate it. *Ravennas* disguised as *Pessimines*: but this

ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΑΚΑΙΣΑΡΑΜΑΡΚ
 ΑΡΜΕΝΙΑΚΟΝΛΗΔΙΚΟΝΠΑΡΘΙΚ
 ΔΙΑΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΥΕΝΑΡΧΟΥΕΞΗΓΗΤ
 ΚΑΙΕΙΚΟΣΤΟΥΑΠΟΔΕΔΕΙΓΜΕΝΟΥΑ
 ΕΝΠΑΧΝΕΛΟΥΝΙΣΑΡΑΠΕΙΟΥΓΕΝΟΜ
 ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΥΑΔΕΛΦΟΥΙΣΙ
 ΣΑΡΑΠΕΙΟΥΚΑΙΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΩΣΚΑΙΑΓΟΡ
 ΑΔΕΛΦΟΥΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥΑΓΟΡΑΝΟΜΟΥ
 ΣΚΟΡΟΥΠΡΩΤΟΥΤΩΝΑΠΑΙΩΝΟΣΓΥΜ
 ΡΑΝΟΜΟΥΚΑΙΕΞΗΓΗΤΟΥΚΑΙΓΥΜΝΑΣ
 ΕΞΗΓΗΤΕΥΣΑΝΤΩΝΕΚΓΟΝΟΥΔΙΔΥΜ
 ΚΑΙΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑΡΧΟΥΑΔΕΛΦΙΔΟΥΠΡ
 ΑΔΕΛΦΙΔΟΥΠΡΟΣΜΗΤΡΟΣΔΙΔΥΜΟΥ
 ΜΟΥΠΡΟΣΜΗΤΡΟΣΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥΑΓ
 ΠΡΟΣΠΑΤΡΟΣΩΡΕΙΩΝΟΣΚΑΙΙΣΙΔ
 ΡΟΥΔΙΔΥΜΟΥΑΡΖΑΝΤΟΣΤΑ. ΑΥΤΑΣ
 ΠΡΟΣΜΗΤΡΟΣΔΙΔΥΜΟΥΥΙΟΥΥΤΟΥ

Α. Τ. ΝΕΙ. . ΝΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΝ

ΤΟΝΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΗΝΚΑΙΣΩΗΡΑΤΗΣΟΛΗΘΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗΣ
 ΙΣ

ΣΙΑΡΧΟΥΠΡΩΤΟΥΤΩΝΑΠΑΙΩΝΟΣΕΚΤΟΥ
 ΟΥΑΠΟΛΛΑ ΡΟΥΤΟΥ
 ΟΜΟΥΚΑΙΕ . Η Κ Σ . . ΡΧΟΥ
 ΝΟΥΝΕΩΚΟΡΟΥΤΟΥΕ . . ΑΧΝΕΜΟΥΝΙ
 ΗΓΗΤΟΥΚΑΙΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑΡΧΟΥΚΑΙΔΙΔΥΜΟΥ
 ΚΑΙΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑΡΧΟΥΥΙΩΝΟΥΘΕΩΝΟΣΔΙΟ
 ΩΝΘΥΓΑΤΡΙΔΟΥΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΥΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥΑΓΟ
 ΟΥΩΡΕΙΩΝΟΣΠΡΩΤΟΥΤΩΝΑΠΑΙΩΝΟΣ
 ΝΟΜΕΝΟΥΑΓΟΡΑΝΟΜΟΥΚΑΙΕΞΗΓΗΤΟΥ
 ΣΚΟΡΟΥΑΡΖΑΝΤΟΣΤΑΣΑΥΤΑΣΑΡΧΑΣ
 ΣΑΥΤΑΣΑΡΧ . ΣΑΝΕΨΙΟΥΔΙΔΥΜΟΥΔΙΔΥ
 ΑΡΖΑΝΤΟΣΤΑΣΑΥΤΑΣΑ . . ΑΣ . ΝΕΨΙΟΥ
 ΝΤΑΣΑΥΤΑΣΑΡΧ ΙΣΙΔΩΡ
 ΟΥΑΡΖΑΝΤ ΑΥΤ ΑΝΕΨΙΑΔΟΥ
 ΣΤΑΣΑΥΤΑΣ ΩΝΠΡΟΣΜΗ
 ΩΝΤΑΣΑΥΤΑ ΧΑΣΑΝΕΨΙ ΡΙΛΛΟΥ

D. G. HOGARTH

- Ἀυτοκρατορα Καίσαρα Μάρκε[ον Δυρήλιου] Ἄ[ν]τ[ω]νέ[ν]ο[ν] Σέβαστον
 Ἄρμενιακὸν Μηδικὸν Παρθικὸν Μέγιστον] τὸν εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτήρα τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης
 [ἡ Πόλ]ις.
- 5 Διὰ Ἰσιδώρου ἐνάρχου ἐξηγητῶ καὶ γυμνασιάρχου πρώτου τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἔκτου
 καὶ εἰκοστού ἀποδεδειγμένου ἀρχιερέως τῶ ἀπόλλ[ωνος καὶ νεωκό]ρου τοῦ
 ἐν Πασχόμενυι Σαραπίου γενομένου ἀγορανόμου καὶ ἐξ[ῆ]ρηγητοῦ κ[αὶ] γυμνασ[τ]ιάρχου
 γενομένου στρατηγού· ἀδελφού Ἰσιδώρου γενομένου νεωκόρου τοῦ ἐν Π[α]σχόμενυι
 Σαραπίου καὶ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἀγορ[ανόμου καὶ ἐξ]ηγητοῦ καὶ γυμνασιάρχου· καὶ Διδύμου
 ἀδελφού· γενομένου ἀγορανόμου [καὶ ἐξηγητοῦ?] καὶ γυμνασιάρχου· υἱοῦ τοῦ Θέωνος Διο-
 10 σκόρου πρώτου τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος γυμνασιαρχησάντων· θυγατρίδου Ἰσιδώρου γενομένου ἀγο-
 ρανόμου καὶ ἐξηγητοῦ καὶ γυμνασ[τ]ιάρχου· ἐκγόνου Ὀρείωνος πρώτου τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος
 ἐξηγητευσάντων· ἐκγόνου Διδύμου? γε]νομένου ἀγορανόμου καὶ ἐξηγητοῦ
 καὶ γυμνασιάρχου· ἀδελφίδου πρ[ὸς πατρός Διο]σκόρου ἀρξάντος τὰς αὐτὰς ἀρχάς·
 ἀδελφίδου πρὸς μητρὸς Διδύμου [ἀρξάντος τὰ]ς αὐτὰς ἀρχ[άς]· ἀνεψιοῦ Διδύμου Διδύ-
 15 μου πρὸς μητρὸς γενομένου ἀγορανόμου καὶ ἀρξάντος τὰς αὐτὰς ἀρχ[άς]· ἀνεψιοῦ
 πρὸς πατρός Ὀρείωνος καὶ Ἰσιδ[ώ]ρου ἀρξάντων] τὰς αὐτὰς ἀρχ[άς]· ἀνεψιοῦ Ἰσιδώ<ρ>
 ρου Διδύμου ἀρξάντος τὰ[ς] αὐτὰς [ἀρχάς]· υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀρξάντος τὰς αὐτὰς ἀρχ[άς]· ἀνεψιαδού
 πρὸς μητρὸς Διδύμου υἱοῦ τοῦ [Διδύμου] ἀρξάντος τὰς αὐτὰς ἀρξάντων πρὸς μη-
 τρὸς ἀρξάντων τὰς αὐτὰς ἀρχ[άς]· ἀνεψιαδού Κλυτίλλου

The slab on the right is a little longer than that on the left. Beside the narrow slab which is wanting between these two, others doubtless are missing from below, which continued the catalogue of honours to even remoter relatives. The date of this inscription must fall later than 166 A.D. when the titles here enumerated were first assumed by Marcus Aurelius.

Ll. 4, 5. *πρώτου κ.τ.λ.* As this phrase, so common in inscriptions of Asia Minor, refers invariably to the office which follows it (cf. ll. 10, 11), we can hardly translate *ἔκτου . . . Ἀπόλλωνος* as it would most naturally be translated '26th to be designated high priest, etc.', but must suppose the office to have been annual and translate the whole phrase '*first of men in all ages to be designated for the 26th time high priest, etc.*'

Beyond its general revelation of the complete civic organization of the town on Khanziri, this text contains nothing else worthy of special remark except its mention of Pachnemounis. At first sight this specification of the locality of the Neocorate might seem to argue that Pachnemounis was a foreign place, not the πόλις in which all the other offices were held. Some will probably take this view,¹³ and be inclined, therefore, to look elsewhere for Pachnemounis. But the superior size of the site itself and the full civic organization, shewn by the inscription to have been enjoyed by the πόλις on Khanziri, strongly suggest that on this mound stood Pachnemounis itself; and its situation suits best with Ptolemy's position for the Nome capital, due north of Xoïs and far down towards the sea. I therefore propose definitely to place Pachnemounis at Khanziri, and to suppose the particular mention of the city-name in connection with the Serapeum to imply that, had the latter stood without qualification, there was danger of its confusion with some more famous Serapeum, *e.g.*, that in Alexandria, with which town the two other inscriptions¹⁴ shew the πόλις on Khanziri to have had intimate relations.

I spent two days on Kum Khanziri, and, by the kindness of M. Passalides, the local Director of the Behéra Society, had the disposal of four labourers, who probed the site to the basal mud at several points. The mound has also been deeply and extensively cut into by diggers for brick. I found a contractor employing there some forty hands and a Decauville railway; and from his men learned the exact spot at which the head and slabs, now at Kum Wahal, were found. It is in the south-western part of the hollow, which divides the high western mound from the lower eastern. Many Delta and Fayum mounds shew this sort of division; and the hollow in them probably represents the ancient market-place with surrounding temple-enclosures, in which the rise of level by accumulation was naturally much

¹³ I took this view myself at first, and still feel a difficulty in rejecting it. But there is not another unassigned site in the whole N. central Delta of sufficient obvious importance to be that of a Nome capital, except Tell al-Balamun close to the Damietta Nile (see below

p. 11): and to place the capital of Sebennytes Inferior so far east is to introduce great difficulty into the understanding of Ptolemy's geographical arrangement of Nomes and Niles.

¹⁴ See *infra*.

slower than in residential quarters. Neither here nor in any part of the Mound did I find the accumulation so deep as I had expected. The core of the site is a mound of solid Nile mud, no doubt artificially heaped to raise the settlement, at its foundation, well above flood-level. The buildings, architectural fragments, pottery, and coins, which I saw on the site were none of them older than the Roman period. Nor, I am convinced, does anything earlier lie under the surface. If the site of Pachnemounis was indeed here, then the place must have owed its existence as a Nome-capital to some late re-arrangement of the provincial division.

The town was connected with a water-course passing to south-west, by a canal, whose bed and embankments are still visible. This can hardly be other than the stream of which the Bahr Kassed is the modern representative. This canal now runs out into the swampy tracts west of Khanziri. Except in late spring and summer, Khanziri is now surrounded by water. I append a photograph shewing the Mounds at the head of the ancient canal.



KUM KHANZIRI AND ITS ANCIENT CANAL, FROM THE S.

The other inscriptions found on this site, and now preserved at Kum Wahal, are as follows:—

2. Slab of coarse marble $\cdot 885 \times \cdot 720 \times \cdot 025$. Inscribed on both faces. The obverse is broken top left and much worn below. Long ornate letters with apices, varying from $\cdot 060$ to $\cdot 040$ in height.

//////IIIIIIIONIEPAKA > TONKA . .
 ///ANTΩNEINON > KAIΩCXPHMATIZH//
 KAIAGOPANOM////
 BOYΛEYTHNTHCLAMPPOΤATHCΠOΛEΩC
 TΩNAAEΞANΔPEΩNYIONANΔPOMAXIΩNOC
 . OMONIΩCEKΠPOΓONΩNEYΓENH

..... ΦΙΛΟΤΕΙΜΙΑΣΧΑΡΙΝ
 ΗΠΟΛΙΣ
 ΔΙΑΣ . ΤΗΡ////////ΑΝΔΡΟΜΑΧΙΩΝΟCΤΟΥΚΑΙ
 ΙCΙ//////////ΑΥΡΗΛΙΑCΙCΙΔΩΡΑCΘΥΓΑΤΡΟC
 ΙΕΡΙ//////////ΗΜΟΝΙΔΟCΤΗCΚΑΙCΩΤΗΡΙΔΟC
 ΘΥΓΑΤΡΙΔΟΥC Ϟ

? Δούκ. ? Δικίνν]ιον 'Ιέρακα, τὸν κα[ι .
 . . . 'Αντωνείνον καὶ ὡς χρηματίζη,
 βουλευτὴν καὶ ἀγορανόμ[ον] τῆς λαμπροτάτης πόλεως
 τῶν 'Αλεξανδρέων, υἱὸν 'Ανδρομαχίωνος,
 ? ἀρ]μονίως ἐκ προγόνων εὐγενῆ,
 ἀρετῆς καὶ] φιλοτειμίας χάριν
 ἢ πόλις.

Διὰ Σ[ω]τηρ[ίδος τῆς] 'Ανδρομαχίωνος τοῦ καὶ
 'Ισι[δώρου, ? θυγατρὸς· καὶ] Αὐρηλίας 'Ισιδώρας θυγατρὸς·
 'Ιέρ[αξ ὁ τῆς 'Ηγ]ημονίδος τῆς καὶ Σωτηρίδος,
 θυγατριδοῦς·

The name in l. 1 is restored at a venture from *C.I.G.* 4688, an Alexandrian inscription of about the same time. Four letters seem lost before 'Αντωνείνον, of which the last is Λ and the second probably Ο. Read ΙΟΥΛ(?) l. 5 = *noble consistently with his ancestry*. 'Αρ]μονίως fits the epigraphic indications. The end is rather asyntactical, but the readings, so far as given, are fairly certain. Soteris and Aur. Isidora were daughters of the person honoured. Hierax, son of Soteris, and therefore grandson of L. Licinnius Hierax, added his name in the nominative regardless of the *διὰ* clause. In l. 2 *ὡς χρηματίζει* would have been more according to common usage.

3. Reverse of same slab. Flat coarse letters, much worn at R. bottom.

ΗΓΛΥΚΥΤΑΤΗΠΑΤΡΙ////
 ΡΗΛΙΟCΔΙΟCΚΟΡΟCΚΑΙΕΛΛΑΔ////
 ΠΙΚΛΗΝΑΚΩΡΕΙΤΗCΑΡΞΑC////Υ
 ΛΕΥΤΗCΤΗCΛΑΜΠΡΟΤΑΤΗC//////Ε
 ΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΑCΚΑΙΔΙΟCΚΟΡΑΙΝ////ΑΙ
 ΒΗCΟΔΩΡΑΜΑΤΡΩΝΑCΤΟΛ//////
 ΚΡΑΤΙCΤΗΤΕΚΝΑΑΥΡΗΛΙΑ//////ΔΙΟC
 ΚΟΡΟΥΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥC//////ΑΡ
 ΧΟΥΚΟCΜΗΤΟΥCΞΗΓΗΤΟΥ
 ΝΠΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΟΓΡΑΦΟΥ
 ///ΟΥΛΕΥΤΟΥΤΗCΛΑΜΠΡΟ
 ///ΑΤΗCΠΟΛΕC//////
 ΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΝ//////
 ΕΠΑΓ//////

Ἡ γλυκυτάτη πατρί[ς]
 Αὐ]ρήλιος Διόσκορος (ὁ)? καὶ Ἑλλάδ[ιος ?
 ἐ]πίκλην Ἀκωρειτῆς, ἄρξας [βο]υ-
 λευτῆς τῆς λαμπροτάτη[ς Ἀλ]ε-
 ξανδρείας, καὶ Διοσκόραι[α κ]αὶ
 Βησοδώρα, Ματρῶνα, Στολ[ίς καὶ
 Κρατίστη, τέκνα Αὐρηλία[ς τῆς] Διοσ-
 κόρου, γενομένου ε[ὕθενι]άρ-
 χου κοσμητοῦ ἐξηγητοῦ
 ὑπομνηματογράφου
 β]ουλευτοῦ τῆς λαμπρο-
 τ]άτης πόλε[ω]ς [τῶν Ἀλε-
 ξανδρέων, [? ἀνέστησαν
 ἐπ' ἀγ[αθῶ].

Aur. Dioscorus and several granddaughters dedicate to their native town.

I took squeezes of the most difficult parts of this inscription, which (as well as my copy) establish that there is no τ at the beginning of line 1, so we must read as above—a *nominativus pendens*. For the name *Dioscoraena* see Oxyr. Pap. I. 43 v^o iii. 23 (Διοσκούριανα). For *Besodora* see Berlin Pap. No. 34. In ll. 6, 7 the reading is certain so far as I give it; for Στολίς see *C.I.A.* III. (1) No. 2575. Κρατίστη I have not found elsewhere as a name, but Κράτιστος occurs. Ἀκωρειτῆς in l. 3 means evidently a native of the town *Acoris* in the Nome of Cynopolis on the east bank of the Nile (Ptol. *Geog.* iv. 5. 59).

(3) **Diospolis Inferior** is *omnium consensu* the town indicated by coins of Hadrian's time bearing legend ΔΙΟΠΚ [= Διοπ(όλεως) κ(άτω τόπων)], as the capital of a distinct Nome,¹⁵ worshipping the ram of Zeus Ammon. Strabo¹⁶ alludes to the place and αἱ περὶ αὐτὴν λίμναι as lying πλησίον Μένδητος; and according to a fragment of Hermippus, it was the burial place of Demetrius of Phalerum. In the *Equivalents List* it is cited as ΔΙΟΣΠΟΛΙΣ ΚΑΤΩ = ΠΟΥΝΕΜΟΥ = *Al-Falmun*. The site proposed by de Rougé, namely Kafr al-Baramon, east of the Damietta Nile and north of Mansura, seems not to be ancient. But it is possible he was confusing it with a mound which does indeed exist on the west of the Damietta Nile north of Sherbin. This, the only one which in height and extent is a rival in the north Delta to Khanziri and Farain, is that now known as Tell al-Balamun, about three miles west of Ras al-Khalig railway-station.

I visited this site on May 23. I had noticed the mounds as a conspicuous landmark on the horizon, when staying at the Behéra Society's Inspection House at Constantinia, near Bessendila; but having found no mention of them in any modern book, nor even heard much rumour of them in the

¹⁵ See B.M. *Coin Cat. Alexandria*, p. 343. The lower Sebennyitic Nome had coins with distinct cult type, stamped $\Sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\kappa$, a fact, which, even had Hierocles and the *Notitia* left

any doubt, would serve to negative the proposal of Brugsch and de Rougé to identify Pach-nemounis and Diospolis Inferior.

¹⁶ p. 802.

neighbourhood, I was amazed, on reaching the spot, at their size and importance. Their circumference must be nearly two miles¹⁷: their summit fifty feet above the plain. The western part is low; the eastern high and steep, so that the site is very conspicuous from the Damietta railway. The soil being very salt (wherefore the mounds are sometimes known as Tell *Malha*), it has not been much disturbed by diggers for either *sebakh* or brick: nor has it ever been probed by an archaeologist. The Department of Antiquities has no information at all about the site. The skin of the mounds is of course made up of late stuff, but among the sherds of glass occurs more perished blue faience than is usual on north Delta sites.

The coincidence of the name, *Balamun*, with the form in which *Pachnemounis* might well have survived on Arab lips is tempting: but Balamun may equally well represent the Coptic *Pounemou* (perhaps the *Pinamys* of Stephen of Byzantium). In any case it is almost impossible, in the face of Ptolemy's scheme of Nomes, to place Pachnemounis so far east; nor would the latter's name identified with a site in this position agree nearly so well either with the order which the Equivalents List seems to follow in descending to *Tamiathi* (Damietta), or with that of the *Synecdemus* and *Notitia I.* For Hierocles obviously describes a curve from Xoïs through the north of the province to Sebennytus (possibly the line of a road or main canal), just as after Sebennytus he describes a curve through the south to Busiris. We therefore expect to find Phragonis, Pachnemounis, and Diospolis lying in order on this northern curve, the latter farthest to eastward. On this account and relying especially on the hint in Strabo, who resided some time in Egypt, I have no hesitation in proposing Tell al-Balamun as the site of Diospolis Inferior. I reserve till later some remarks about its Nome.

B.—OASES; HELEARCHIA; PARALOS.

There are three names remaining in the list of Hierocles which seem to belong to the northernmost Delta. They are grouped apart (*v. p. 3, supra*) and are all to be looked for with probability in the sandy region north of the marshes.

(1) **Paralos** may be taken first, since its general position is practically certain.¹⁸ It was the town on the sands N.E. of the central Lake, whose name (*Parallos* in the Coptic lists) has survived as *Burlos* (in native pronunciation *Buráillos*) and given a title to the Lake. Under this name, Abulfeda¹⁹ mentions it as a station on the coast track from Damietta to Rosetta, and the Assessment of 1376 puts it in the province of Nesteraweh.

Its bishop, Athanasius, signed at Ephesus. In the Equivalents List it is cited as ΠΑΡΑΛΛΟΥ = ΝΕΚΕΔΟΥΛΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΛΙΑ = *al-Burlos*. Now-a-days the name *Burlos* is given to a district of scattered houses, unusually rich by reason of fisheries, palm-plantations, and gardens, and extending from Borg

¹⁷ The new Survey shows the greatest length, N.W.—S.E., to be about 900 metres, and greatest breadth, 600 metres.

¹⁸ In *Notitia I* 'Ρεγέον occurs between

Ἐλεαρχία and Πάραλος, and it has been reasonably conjectured that this = *Regio Maritima*.

¹⁹ Reinaud's trans. ii. p. 161.

on the 'Boghaz' or outlet of the Lake south-eastward along its shores to Baltim (Balkim). I found Roman glass and sherds lying on the sandhills in three places in this belt; but where dunes shift so constantly, the exact site of an ancient town is probably not to be found.

(2) **Helearchia**.—As the lists of Hierocles and the Notitia pass to this group from the south-east of the Province, one would naturally expect the enumeration of the three towns in question to proceed from south or east to north or west; and would look for Helearchia either in the sand-belt east of Burlos, or on the south-east margin of the Lake. As we have seen, the Athanasian Tract mentions *Helearchia* as the name of a large district, divided between the Sees of Phragonis and Pachnemounis. But Hierocles and the Notitia have it as a town distinct from either of these last, and the Coptic lists know it as a bishopric apart.²⁰ In the *Equivalents List* the citation ΗΛΙΑΙΧΙΑ = ΠΙΨΑΡΩΤ = *Al-Sharut*, no doubt refers to ΕΛΕΑΡΧΙΑ. One may suppose it a settlement which grew up as an administrative centre for a part of the newly reclaimed marshes, at a distance from Phragonis, Pachnemounis, or Diospolis. I noticed glass and sherds strewn over a wide area of dunes just east of Abu Madi and some fifteen miles south-east of Baltim: and Mr. Tottenham, the Inspector of the Second Circle of Irrigation (Gharbieh), marks in a map, with which (among other benefits) he mostly kindly furnished me, two *Kums* immediately north-west of the same Abu Madi. I was not able to visit these, but in a district of such constant superficial change, should in all likelihood have been little wiser if I had. Hereabouts one would be most inclined to place Helearchia.

(3) **Oases**.—Nothing further is known of this place (or these places) which neither the Notitia nor the Coptic lists mention, and Wesseling (*ad Hieroclem* s.v.) wished to transfer to the Mariut region. In any case it is uncertain whether the name (occurring in the relation it does) ought to be reckoned with the coast group at all, or not rather to be located near Busiris. The name suggests, however, palm tracts such as occur in the northern sand-belt, and therefore I group it with Helearchia and Paralos, and propose a situation for it nearer Damietta than either one or the other.

C.—AGNOU; NIKETOU.

These two towns are not in the list of Hierocles; but Agnou occurs in the Notitia, and both are in the lists of Coptic bishoprics. The *Equivalents List* cites them thus:

ΑΓΝΟΥ = ΠΙΨΙΝΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΒΑΨΟΥΡ = Nestaraweh.
 ΝΙΚΕΤΟΥ = ΠΨΕΝΞΡΟΥ = Singar.

Both these places are mentioned under their Arabic names in the *Assessment of 1376* where the second is reckoned in the province of the first, which was distinct from that of Gharbieh, and evidently included all the sand-belt between the Rosetta and the Damietta mouths.

²⁰ Athanasius in *Festal Letter* xii probably indicates this bishopric as *Bucolia*. Cf. his *Life of St. Antony* 49.

(1) NESTERAWEH occurs in the Itinerary, given by Abulfeda, between Burlos and Rosetta. In his time it and not Burlos gave a name to the Lake (so also according to Calcashandi). Its wealth was in fish, and its contribution is given in the Assessment of 1376 without mention of lands, —as is the case also with all the other places in its province, which included Rashid (Rosetta). On the "Domains" map of the Delta (revised in 1897) a "*Kum Mostoru*" is marked in the sand-belt some distance west of the Boghaz; and the similarity of name (in Calcashandi the town appears as *Nestoru*) renders the identification of that mound with Agnou-Nestaraweh probable.

(2) SINGAR. From the order in which the names occur in the Coptic lists, this place would seem to have been in the west of the Nestaraweh province: and it should be looked for north-west of the Lake rather than on the desert islet at the east end, still called Sangar. The only other *Kum* marked on the Domains Map west of the Boghaz is *al-Akhdar*; but this is probably the mound of that name, distinguished from Singar in the Assessment under the name *al-Rus*.

D.—BANABAN.

Mentioned only in the best of the ordinary Coptic *scalae*, and not in the Equivalent List. I include it in the north Delta because of the existence of a *Bahr Banawan*, a branch of the *Bahr Belkas*, which turns north above Biela, and runs past two small kums (*Asfar* and *Nus*) and a considerable one (*Kum Kebir*) which is a conspicuous object due N.E. from the Behéra Society's Inspection House at Dar es-Samra near Salahieh. Owing to the flooded state of the marshes I was unable to visit Kum Kebir, which is probably the site of Banaban. In the Assessment List of 1376 I note an entry *al-Binawanein*, which points to two villages near together having borne the same name.

I cannot with confidence place any other ancient name in the district that I visited north of the railway line: but at least three towns which occur in Notitia I between Paralos and Xoïs, may have been there. These are Παριανή κώμη, Κύμη and Ῥηχομήριον. Also Πανάλλου and Θάσματος occur later between Agnou and Tamiaithi (Damietta). The important monastery of *Gemiana* (or *Damiana*), north of Belkas, has a small ancient mound hard by it. Is this the *Damelliana* of Amélineau's authorities? ²¹

There are, however, a score of mounds south of the Lake awaiting identification. I have shewn their position on the accompanying map, which is traced from the hand-chart of the Irrigation Service. For their general characteristics the following notes will suffice. The superficial remains upon one and all are late Roman, Byzantine, and early Arab.

²¹ Mr. W. E. Crum has referred me to various authorities concerning this monastery, which are mentioned by him in *Egypt Expl. Fund*

Arch. Report 1899-1900 p. 51, also to Wansleben, who visited the place in 1672 (*Hist. de l'Église d'Alexandrie* p. 160).

Bahr Nashart District.

(1) *Sidi Salem*: oval, about 500 paces by 200. All bricks baked, late painted 'Coptic' sherds in abundance. Very little stone, and moderate depth. Has been much dug for brick and seabakh.

(2) *Daba*: about the same size as the foregoing, but some earlier sherds, e.g., moulded Samian, and many fragments of worked syenite occur. To judge by the abundance of slag, it must have yielded much stone. Dug out almost to the basal mud by natives.

(3) *Mesk*: about half as big, but higher and hardly dug at all. No sherds of the better class, but necks and bases of 'kitchen' vessels common. No sign of stone.

(4) *Bunduk*: in size between Daba and Mesk, shews many stone fragments on the surface and good baked brick. Painted sherds and fragments of good glass. The bed of a broad ancient water-course is apparent west of the mound. Very little dug.

(5) *Haddadi*: larger than any of the foregoing, but so completely untouched (owing to salinity) that its contents are not apparent. A village called al-Haddada appears in this region in the Assessment of 1376.

(6) *Ahmar*: very small but shewing bits of syenite. Site of a farmstead?

(7) *Khubeza*: unusually prolific in large drums of syenite used as mill-stones, and in good glass, painted 'Coptic' sherds, and copper coins. But in size less than Haddadi, though larger than Bunduk. The line of a large dyke is seen running from S.W. to N.E. to north of the mound, which may be the old limit of the Lake. I picked up an Alexandrian billon coin of Diocletian.

(8) *Hawazin* (or *Nashowan*): about the same size as Haddadi, divided into two parts, north and south, by a deep and narrow depression, looking like the line of a canal. Prolific in brick, and shews more unbaked bricks than the foregoing *Kums*. Looks like a slightly older site than they.

(9) *Khirbeh*: a circular mound of about 250 paces diameter. Fragments of rather good character, e.g., of marble paving and ribbed glass, and painted 'Coptic' ware. Much dug.

(10) *Sheikh Ibrahim* on the west of the Bahr, like *Miyetein*, whose twin mounds lie on both banks, is apparently almost wholly a cemetery, now rifled. But like all the other mounds it has a large red brick vaulted building at one corner, which was probably a tank-house fed from a canal.

(11) *Hawalid* has been described on p. 4. It has about three times the area of any of the foregoing. The only legible coin picked up was a Roman *minimus* of the fifth century.

Kassed Canal District.

(12) *Wahal*: about the size of Haddadi, very much dug, and shewing traces of having contained much stone. A small limestone 'Horus' shrine from it is preserved in the Inspection House. I picked up an Alexandrian bronze coin of Hadrian.

(13) *Shalmeh* (or *Misri*?): so completely dug that even its area is uncertain.

(14) *Dabaa*: larger than any of the foregoing except Haulid, which is about the double of it. A double mound. Fragments of brick, ware, glass, and stone of the better class.

(15) *Makhezn*: I did not see this, but it is very small.

(16) *Umm Sin*: has a village on it and there is almost nothing left of the mound.

(17) *Khanziri*: See above p. 8. I picked up or bought from brick-diggers fifteen legible bronze coins. Two (of Tiberius and Caligula) precede Hadrian. The rest are later; the last is of Heraclius. The only coin of numismatic interest is thus described for me by Mr. J. G. Milne:

ANTONINUS PIUS.

Æ. 34 mm. Obv. legend effaced; head r. laur.: rev., bust of Helios r. rad., wearing chlamys; in field [L] Z. (Cf. Dattari, *Numi Alex.* 3288 of Faustina sen. for rev. type.)

(18) *Asfar*: very small.

Bahr Tirah District.

(19) *Kharuf*: about the size of Sidi Salem. but very low: of no importance. Picked up an Alexandrian follis probably of Constantine IV.

(20) *Nimra*: unimportant, about the same as Mesk.

(21) *Mansur*: about the area of Haddadi, but very shallow. Double divided by a wide depression, apparently the old course of the Bahr. Superficial remains of poor quality.

(22) *Nus*: both high and large, being about equal to Dabaa. Remains of stone and syenite frequent. The bed of the Bahr passing W. is very clearly marked.

(23) *Tin*: I never reached this mound, but to judge by its appearance at five miles' range it should be as big as Nus.

(24) *Shughraia*: very small.

(25) *Kebir*: See p. 14.

Bahr Shibin District.

26. *Ahmar*: very small = a farmstead only.

27. *Gemidana*: ditto, ditto.

28. *Naghla*: small, not so large as Mesk, and very shallow.

29. *Terzi*: not visited, but through the glass it seemed not bigger or higher than Naghli.

30. *Daba*: ditto.

31. *Balamun*: see p. 11.

THE NILES.

All the considerable mounds of the northern Delta are disposed in three chains running north and south. The first chain (reckoned from the east), is that which aligns the old channel of the Bahr Tirah. The second lies along the line of the Kassed canal, and continues the mound of Sakha in Kums *Wahal*, *Dabaa*, and *Khanziri*. The third is a double chain: the eastern part of it runs north from Tida through *Daba—Hawalid—Khirbeh—Hawazin* to *Khubéza* and the Lake; the western from *Tell al-Farain* through *Gir—Sidi Salem—Mesk—Bunduk* to *Haddadi*. I do not propose to place a Nome boundary at the Kassed canal, for that does not divide the space at all equally. But the important Bahr Nashart, which now sweeps north partly through, partly to west of, the double third chain of mounds must represent both a considerable main channel of antiquity and the western limit of the Lower Sebennytic Nome. Beyond it began the Nome of Phtheneto or Buto, continued up to the Great River (or Agathodaemon) and the Taly stream which are now represented respectively by the upper and lower courses of the Rosetta Nile.

The Bahr Nashart then must represent the *Thermuthiac (Pharmuthiac) Nile* which issued at the Sebennytic estuary,²⁰ *i.e.* traversed all the length of the Lake Burlos to the Boghaz. Its earlier course to south of the Lake lay, I believe, somewhat to east of its present course, and close under the Sidi Salem—Mesk—Bunduk—Haddadi chain of mounds. It probably passed close to Tida.

The *Athribitic Nile*, which bounded the Lower Sebennytic Nome on the east, cannot well be the Bahr Shibin—at least not the lower course of that stream, despite its present independent estuary; for no mounds rise on its banks. We must identify the Athribitic arm rather with the *upper* Shibin, continued by the Bahr Tirah past the eastern end of the Lake to an artificial estuary (*ψευδόστομον*) now blocked. The actual channel, in which the Athribitic Nile flowed in its lower course, may still be seen, dry, but with dykes well preserved, sweeping past the mounds of Nimra, Mansur, and Nus in succession. To come on this conspicuous ancient channel was a complete surprise, since neither maps nor local authority had given me any warning of it. I paced it at several points in the five mile stretch which I followed, and found its average breadth to be about 350 feet.

Ptolemy places so much ground between the Athribitic and Busiric Niles, and in particular the Nome and City of Mendes, that I cannot see how to regard the lower part of the existing Damietta Nile as the *Busiric*, or its mouth as the *Pathmetic*. Unless Ptolemy's authority is to be rejected in a matter of broad division, on which it is hard to see how a resident in the country could

²⁰ Ptolemy makes it clear that Sebennytus itself was not on this Nile, in spite of the name of the estuary; but was on the Athribitic.

Perhaps the Sebennytic estuary was so called after the Lower Sebennytic Nome.

go wrong, it seems inevitable that the Busiric arm and the Pathmetic estuary should be placed in the region of Lake Menzala: and the Mendesian, Tanitic, and Pelusiac estuaries be located still further east. Overcrowding of the Eastern Delta with Nile arms need not result if it be remembered that the Mendesian and Tanitic (Sanitic?)²¹ were rather estuaries than arms, according to all accounts, and probably branched off low down.

The only ancient channel that the lower reaches of the actual Damietta Nile can therefore represent is the artificial *Diolkos*, which Ptolemy places between the Pineptimic and Phatmetic (Pathmetic) estuaries.

THE NOMES.

Enough has been said to shew how I propose to arrange the three Nomes on the map:—(1) The *Phthenetic* between the lower course of the Rosetta Nile (ancient Taly) and the Bahr Nashart. (2) The *Lower Sebennytic* (temp. Hadrian) between the Bahr Nashart and the Bahr Tirah. (3) The *Lower Diospolite* (temp. Hadrian) between the Bahr Tirah, and the Damietta Nile, the old *Diolkos*. The southern limits must be left uncertain. On the north was the sea. For the last named Nome and its limits there is of course no authority in Ptolemy. It is necessary to add a few remarks on this omission.

The authority for the separate existence of an Inferior Diospolite Nome, in the time of Hadrian at any rate, is the Nome coinage: for the existence of Diospolis, the town, apart from Pachnemounis, we can point to the conclusive evidence of Hierocles. Therefore the contention of de Rougé (and H. Brugsch), that there was not more than one Nome in question, and that Pachnemounis and Diospolis are two forms of the name of only a single town, is untenable. But there is probably this much basis for it. (1) In Pharaonic times there was but one Nome covering all the area in question, that of *Pi-Khen-amen*, the seventh in the hieroglyphic lists (de Rougé *op. cit.* p. 115 ff.), which lay north of the twelfth Nome (Sebennytus), and extended to the sea. Of the full name of this Nome, *Pachnemounis* is a Graecized rendering; and *Diospolis* is an exact translation of its abbreviated name, *Pi-Amen*. (2) If we follow Ptolemy's authority implicitly, we must assume that there was but one Nome again in the time of the Antonines, that of Sebennytes Inferior with Pachnemounis for capital. That is to say, a more complicated arrangement, made perhaps only in the time of Hadrian, had again been simplified, and the Inferior Diospolite Nome had ceased to have a separate existence. (3) Under the Hadrianic arrangement two Nome capitals were needed and the two seem to have borne names of equivalent meaning, derived alike from the old Nome-name.

Which of these two, then, was the original capital of Pharaonic times?

²¹ In spite of the easy confusion I do not feel sure that Herodotus' 'Saitic' mouth ought to be read Sanitic. He has no other name for the

Taly, which certainly flowed very near Sais: for 'Bolbitinic' is the epithet of the estuary only, not of the stream.

If either, the present indications are clearly in favour of the city which stood on Tell al-Balamun, *i.e.*, in my view, the Diospolis of later times. The city on Kum Khanziri is beyond doubt of later foundation. Indeed it may well be not earlier than Roman Imperial time, to judge by the remains on the level of its basal mud. I suggest, therefore, that when the old Lower Sebennyitic Nome was divided, a new capital was constituted on Khanziri, on which the old Pharaonic name was conferred in the Graecized form, Pachnemounis. The earlier capital, now the centre of the eastern half only, the original Pi-khen-amen or Pi-amen, had come to be best known under the Greek translated form, Diospolis. When the earlier Nome arrangement was restored by the Antonines, the more central Pachnemounis was found the more convenient capital and it remained, after all, capital of the reunited Nomes. It was perhaps the remote position of the old capital close to the eastern border that led in the first instance to the division of the Lower Sebennyitic Nome. When a new capital had come into existence on Khanziri, it was probably found central enough for both Nomes, and the maintenance of the separation, which necessarily involved extra expense and complication of the administrative machine, was seen to be superfluous.

D. G. HOGARTH.

[I greatly regret that, until the above was in its final proof, I did not know of M. G. Daressy's article in *Rev. Arch.* iii^{me} Série, 25, p. 195; and I must offer all apology to a scholar better fitted than myself to discuss these Coptic questions. M. Daressy has covered much of my ground and anticipated me in many points, especially in the identification of Phragonis, Agnou, and the two mid-Delta Niles. I would gladly accept his general situation for Pachnemounis and place it precisely at Hualid, were his reading of the *Equivalent*s List in this connection open to less objection. I believe he is right in identifying the *Leonton* of that List with Buto, and so supplying a see, which is well known to have existed till Arab times: but the further equation with Dautau is less convincing, entailing as it does a MS. correction and the elevation of a little mound of no obvious importance to the honours of Buto. So much does M. Daressy feel this last objection that he suggests that the Butonic *oracle* was nevertheless at Farain, and so anticipates me in the confusion of Buto with Phragonis, though on other grounds. His low estimate of Ptolemy's authority will perhaps lead him to suggest Diospolis for Khanziri. I own to too much respect for the Alexandrian geographer to admit this. Space does not allow me to add more than that, had I known of M. Daressy's article in time, I should have confined myself to points on which I differ from it, and to an account of the actual mounds.—D. G. H.]

