

passages and halls surveyed by the R.E.s in 1874. The explanation "cave of refuge" seems open to objection, and the word *Meis*, which Mr. Birch connects with *Masa*, is the name of a well known tree.

Mr. Birch identifies the "hold" (1 Samuel xxii, 5, 1 Chronicles xi, 16) with the Cave, but the word is *Metzed* "a mountain Castle") applied to the "Stronghold of Sion" (2 Samuel v, 7, &c.), which was not a cave. Josephus says that the Cave was at the City of Adullam (Ant. vi, 12, 3) and there seems no reason to suppose that David's band of 400 men lived in the cave with him. They may properly, it seems to me, be considered to have garrisoned the "hold" or fortress, that is the City of Adullam on its strong hill, close to or even within which was the cave described in "Tent Work" (vol. ii, p. 159).

As to the position of the *City of Adullam* there is I think no dispute. The situation of 'Aid el Ma corresponds exactly with the Adullam of the Onomasticon, and the name is radically preserved. The position agrees also with the accepted identifications of Socoh Jarmuth, Zoreah and Eshtaol and other places mentioned in the Adullam group (Josh. xv. 35). It is also noticeable that David is spoken of whilst in the hold of Adullam as not being in the territory of Judah (1 Sam. xxii, 5). This agrees with the position of Adullam in the Shephelah beyond the mountains to which Judah was confined when the Philistines were too powerful for the Jews.

Naarath.—Mr. Birch quotes a paper (Quarterly Statement 1877, p. 44) by Mr. Kerr as proving Naarath to have been on the north boundary of Ephraim. He seems, however, scarcely to have followed the meaning of the writer. Mr. Kerr points out nearly the same position for Naarath which I had previously advocated, and uses the same arguments. The accepted identifications of Janohah and Taanath Shiloh preclude the possibility of placing Naarath much farther north than the site proposed in the "Handbook to the Bible" and the aqueduct still existing, with the distance given for Nearah from Jericho by Eusebius, seem to afford strong indications in favour of the identification with Khurbet el Auja which I proposed some years since.

24th April, '80.

C. R. C.

HIRAM, KING OF TYRE.

(From the "Athenæum," April 17, 1880. By permission of the Proprietors).

SOME years ago M. E. Renan, in one of his lectures at the Collège de France, that have contributed so much to the progress of Semitic epigraphy, exhibited and explained before his audience a copy of a Phœnician inscription originated in Cyprus. The copy—imperfect and fragmentary, made, it appears, by an inhabitant of Cyprus whose name is unknown—had been found, if I remember rightly, among the papers left by a German scholar,

who died in the East (M. Sigismund, I think), into whose hands it had come in some indirect way. For its transmission M. E. Renan was indebted to the attention of M. J. Euting, the renowned Phœnician scholar. Unfortunately it had not been possible to obtain information respecting the form, the finding, or the ultimate destiny of the original inscription. It was not known even where it had been found, or in whose possession. All that was known was that its characters had been engraved in bronze.

M. E. Renan, noticing the extremely archaic aspect of the characters, nearly similar to those on the Moabite Stone and to the oldest of Greek inscriptions, did not hesitate to say that the text was of great palæographical importance. The copy,³ as arranged in five lines, might thus be given in square Hebrew characters :—

נלבעללבנ (1)
 ללבננאדני (2)
 ר[?]דשתעבדחור (3)
 דני (4)
 סכנקרתח (5)

In deciphering the characters there was no great difficulty. Several words were easily recognised:—בעל (Baal), אדני (his or my lord), עבדחור (apparently a proper name, Abdhor, signifying servant of Horus), and סכן (inhabitant). In line 5 קרתח seemed a mutilated word, to be completed as קרתח [דשת] (Carthage or the “new city”). I even proposed to connect line 5 with line 3, and—taking as *daleth* the first letter of line 3, also uniting the end of line 5 with the first three letters of line 3—to read in full the name קרתחדשת. True, this new arrangement was opposed to the indicated disposition of the lines; but I suspected that their order as given in the copy did not truly represent the order of the original inscription. This idea also led me then to compare together the lines 1 and 2, and to suppose they might originally contain the same dedicatory sentence; לבעל לבנ אדני (“to his lord Baal-Lebanon”). In this Baal-Lebanon I proposed to recognise a divinity of a new kind, the Baal of Lebanon, *i.e.*, the mountain Lebanon itself adored as a god; for we find the mountains Carmel, Hermon, &c., treated as gods, and Sanchuniathon (edit. Orelli, p. 16), whose names as Phœnician gods, Casius, Libanos, and Antilibanos, gives an account of their mythological filiation. This conjecture of mine might well at that time seem adventurous—the more so as it would transfer us rather unexpectedly from Cyprus to Syria—but it has been, as will be seen, fully verified by the sequel.

In 1876—thanks to an obliging indication given by General Palma di Cesnola—I was made acquainted with the name of the possessor of this inscription, M. Laniti, a merchant at Limasol. My further success in the acquisition of a monument of which the scientific value had already been sufficiently shown was largely due to the interposition of a dear and now regretted friend—one whose early decease is a serious loss for archæology

—M. Georges Colonna-Ceccaldi. His influence in Cyprus won for me the opportunity of purchasing the inscription. M. E. Renan and M. Waddington, the latter then Minister of Public Instruction, kindly consented to aid our negotiation, and to defray the expense required to secure for the Bibliothèque Nationale, the monument of which we were in quest—say, rather, monuments; for, in fact, we obtained not one inscription alone, as we expected to, but a group of texts engraved upon eight fragments of different bronzes, which at first view seemed to be the *débris* of cups, *patera*, or tripods.

In January, 1877, M. E. Renan, in the Collège de France, resumed his scrutiny of these texts with collation of their originals, and rather later he made the Académie des Inscriptions a memorable communication, followed by a memoir, which appeared, with an illustrative plate, in the "Journal des Savants," in August of the same year (*see* "Journ. des Sav.," p. 487).

Of the texts now examined five fragments corresponded with five lines of copy already noticed, and served to define certain characters doubtful or wanting in the copy, viz., in lines 2, 4, 5 :—

עללבננאדני (2)

אדני (4)

סכנקרתח [ו] (5)

But, moreover, there are now three fragments containing three epigraphs, wanting in the copy already noticed :—

מבסכנקרתחדשת (6)

מלכצדנמאזית [ז] (?) (7)

בראשתנחשת (8)

The two conjectures above-mentioned were materially confirmed by these new elements. The name of the city, קרתחדשת—let it mean strictly Carthage proper, or any "new city" of like name—was here seen engraved in full on one fragment, and the existence of a Syrian god named בעל לבנן (Baal-Lebanon) was now made clear. The mention of a "king of the Sidonians"—מלך צדנמ—in line 7 added new interest to these fragments; but unfortunately the name of this king was wanting. One might notice a trace of a letter just visible after the *mem*, and so guess that the required name ended perhaps with a *nun*. On the fragment 8 the word נחשת (brass, brazen) detached itself perspicuously from the word, or vestige of a word, preceding and very obscure.

At a first glance the eight fragments of bronzes—bent, twisted, cut, flattened, and variously oxidized—would suggest the notion that they belonged to as many distinct monuments. But four of them obviously were connected, as two and two, by their inscriptions, viz., the fragments 5 and 3 (as I supposed at first), and again, those known by the numbers 1 and 4 thus :—

רשתעבדחור + סכנקרתח [ו] (5) + (3)

נלבעללבנן [ז] (1) + (4)

Moreover, the fragments marked 7 and 8, though showing no material signs of contact with each other and making no sequence, seemed by their likeness of engraving to have been parts of one and the same inscription. The two fragments numbered 2 and 6 seemed isolated. On the whole, the fair conclusion seemed to be this: that the eight fragments might well be disposed in five groups belonging to five distinct objects, whether pateræ or tripods.

It has been my study to make a careful examination of these antiquities, in order to give a graphic representation of them in the "Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum," published by the Académie des Inscriptions, and last year I had the opportunity of pursuing my researches with sufficient leisure. My examination of the remains has been minute and prolonged, and has led me to unhopèd conclusions respecting the right arrangement of the fragments, and the true interpretation of their seemingly incoherent inscriptions. After many experiments, of which details may here be spared, I have established, with almost complete certainty, this fact: that all the fragments are parts of one and the same vase of bronze, which was purposely broken into pieces in some time far remote. I have connected as parts of a whole seven of the fragments, and this has been done by making due allowance for such accidents as twisting, bending, flattening, and cutting. One fragment still refuses to be brought in contact with the rest; however, as I believe, even this odd fragment belongs to another part of the same vase. By my reconstruction of the original form I obtain, instead of a series of phrases or broken words without sequence, one inscription, or a large part of one inscription, having a consistent general tenour and a character entirely novel. Many obscurities vanish when the parts are rightly put together, and a grand historical light is shed over the whole inscription by the appearance of an historical name recorded in the Old Testament. Thus I put together these fragments. In the plan of reading here shown, * marks a junction of lines that is quite certain, ** marks a junction extremely probable. At the top I put and set apart the fragment still isolated, which gives I think, the aim or address of the inscription, but is insulated from the series by a lacuna of which the extent is not readily guessed. I divide the words here, and restore in brackets some letters obviously implied.

(A) [לב]על לבני אדני

 (B) [ו]סכן קרת ח **
 (C) דשת עבד חר *
 (D) [ם] מלך צדנם אז ית **
 (E) ן לבעל לבנ **
 (F) ן אדני **

† Cf. סנן; and perhaps there was some reference to the mysterious cherub, מוכך, at Tyre, to which Ezekiel alludes in xxviii, 14, 16.

(G) בראשת נחשת ה ?
 (H) טב סכי קרתחדשת [N]

.....

The inscription ran on in one line all around the lip or margin of a bronze vase, having a large circular opening, and was engraved on the exterior convex surface. The fragment H still shows some part of the original curvature. With this aid I have calculated that the opening of the vase was a circle with a diameter obviously equal to a Babylonian foot, or say 0·315 mètre. In its general shape the vase was a section of a sphere, and the wall of the part most bulging was very thin. The thickness of metal was increased towards the opening, and here its strength was aided by a sort of swelling border. The vase, showing signs of being wrought under the hammer, was apparently the work of a coppersmith. The inscription—a dedication of the vase itself to Baal-Lebanon—may now be read in one continuous line by following the order already shown by the letters A,...B, C, D, E, F, G, H :—

[לב] על לבנ אדני ... וסכן קרתחדשת עבד חר[ם]
 מלך צדנם או יתן לבעל לבנ אדני בראשת נחשת
 ה? טב סכן קרתחדשת א.....

That is to say, “To Baal-Lebanon, his lord,.....[mention of a vow, name, and rank of the author].....(? and) soken of Qarthadachat, servant of Hiram, King of the Sidonians; has given it [or “he has given it”] to Baal-Lebanon, his lord, in excellent brass [or “in heave-offering of brass”] —H.....tob, soken of Qarthadachat [“who”? or “that”? “it”?—.....”

The point to which I would especially invite attention is the appearance here of the name of HIRAM, described as “King of the Sidonians.” The final *mem*, which I have put in brackets, may be accepted for a restoration *quasi*-certain. Its stem is visible at the end of the line C, and the zig-zag is seen at the beginning of the line D. A blow from the edge-tool used in ancient time for cutting up the vase has hit exactly the middle of the *mem*, and pressed out the metal towards the right and the left. The material junction of the two fragments cut away by the tool, though less perfect than the proofs of junction left on other fragments by breaking, is still as satisfactory as may be.



Here is a fac-simile of this capital passage, including the words—

עבד חרם מלך צדנם

“Servant of Hiram, King of the Sidonians.”

The word *soken* seems, at a first glance, well translated by “inhabitant”;

yet it may be asked, might not this word refer to a function, as in Isaiah xxii, 15? or be applied to a personage who, in the name of King Hiram, governed Qarthadachat? The name of this personage would probably be followed by his patronymic, ending perhaps in *vau*. Or if the *vau* is here a conjunction, it should be preceded by some word designating another quality or function. The word here lost would be contained in the lacuna above noticed. The whole turn of expression would correspond exactly with such a title as we find in 2 Kings xxv, 8:—

נבוזראדן רבטבחים עבד מלך בבל

i.e., "Nebouzaraddan, chief of the *tabbakhim*, servant of the King of Babel."

The exact interpretation of this inscription, mutilated at the beginning and at the end, gives rise to many queries of detail, which cannot be noticed in this *précis*, but will be treated in the critical memoir which I am preparing respecting the monument: for example, the exact division of phrases, the grammatical character of the demonstrative **אן**, the construction of **יתן ב**, the real sense of **בראשת**, the difficulty of knowing if there are here named two distinct *sokens* of Qarthadachat—one having made the vow, the other having executed the vase—and other queries that may possibly arise. But here I must limit myself, and add but a few words respecting these famous names, Hiram, Carthage, and Lebanon, as revealed to us in this inestimable inscription. "Hiram, King of the Sidonians"! This at a first glance is surprising; for we know of no Hiram save the King of Tyre. But here "King of the Sidonians" (not "King of Sidon") can mean only King of the Phœnicians. Of this we are assured by a reference to the remarks of Gesenius ("Scripturæ...Monumenta," pp. 263-4). The facts there noticed had already been well observed by Des Vignoles ("Chronologie de l'Hist. Sainte," p. 25), and we might refer also to the judicious observations of M. de Vogüé ("Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions," Sav. Étr., VI, i, 64). According to Homer, Sidonian = Phœnician; Ethbaal, in the Bible, is King of the Sidonians, and is described by Fl. Josephus as King of the Tyrians and Sidonians. Solomon, referring to Hiram's subjects, calls them Sidonians (1 Kings v, 20), when speaking of their going to cut down timber on that mountain Lebanon to which our monument ascribes a sacred character. Apparently Hiram is called King of Tyre in the Bible, because his residence was Tyre. Still, his official title might be King of the Sidonians, or Phœnicians. But is the Hiram of our vase identical with Hiram the contemporary of David and Solomon? The characters of the inscription are very archaic; the palæography would not peremptorily contradict such a supposed date. But it should be noticed that several Phœnician kings might have this name Hiram. (There was also, we know, a Hiram the architect.) Under the dynasty of one house the same name might be transmitted to several kings, from grandfather to grandson, as Semitic peoples were fond of onomastic atavism. Assyrian documents show a Hiram, King of Tyre, paying tribute (*c.* 742) to Tiglathpileser II (and at that time there is

no question of Sidon : these documents are interesting as showing intermittent occupations of certain large cities in Syria). A third Hiram, King of Tyre, flourished in the time of Cyrus (Menander ap. Fl. Josephus c. Ap. i, 21a).

Another question arises respecting the city Qarthadachat. Is the city identical with Carthage proper, or did the name belong to some other "new city"? The name occurs often, in various times and among various peoples. M. Renan has pertinently noticed the Syrian habit of denoting old cities by such names as Palæ-Tyros, Palæ-Byblos, &c., to distinguish them from new cities. Even in Phœnicia itself might there not be a Carthage, or "new city"? M. Renan might even be tempted to find in Qarthadachat a synonym of Tyre itself, set in contrast with Sidon ; one might think also of Sidon named in contrast with Tyre, or refer to the Sidonian colonization of Aradus (c. 760). Several colonies (in Cyprus, for example) might have been also called Qarthadachat. After all, it is not impossible we may be led to regard our inscription as one made a little subsequent to the foundation of the Tyrian Carthage, and this would bring us near that Hiram who lived in the former half of the eighth century B.C.

Where on Lebanon was the sanctuary of Baal-Lebanon, for which this bronze vase was destined ? I leave the inquiry for further research, while I would suggest that the place was not far from the sea. The fragments were found in Cyprus, and at first sight it seems strange to find there an inscription clearly belonging, in the first instance, to the coast of Syria. But it should be remembered there were long disputes and wars carried on between Cyprus and Phœnicia. In the expedition of Apriès, for instance, his squadron ravaged the Phœnician coast, seized Sidon, and stayed there long enough to pack and carry off their plunder. In a similar raid invaders, coming in galleys from Cyprus, might have pillaged the sanctuary of Baal-Lebanon, and carried away to Cyprus its precious things, which would probably be partly vessels of bronze. For convenience of lading it was apparently a general habit to break up, bend, and pack such vessels, which were chiefly valued as pieces of metal that might be recast to other uses. This habit is expressly referred to in the Bible. The passage—relating especially to the sack of Jerusalem by Chaldeans—has not been, perhaps, sufficiently considered hitherto. "The Chaldeans," we read, "broke [שברו] the columns of brass, the *mekonot* and the sea of brass which were in the temple of Jehovah, and they carried away the brass to Babylon" (2 Kings xxv, 13).

Our vase, we conclude, was thus seized, and so broken in pieces. Then the fragments were twisted or bent to suit them for stowing away, with other spoils, in the hold of a galley. Brought to Cyprus, they were cast in a heap with other metals destined to be melted down for various uses ; but the *débris* of our vase luckily escaped their projected conversion. During many centuries they remained buried in the ground, and this was their state when they were covered with their second patine, very distinct from the former, the vase being already oxidized before its cutting and breaking up. Or possibly the previous consecration of the vase suggested it might

well be reserved *in statu quo*, as booty to be offered to the gods worshipped by the captors. Mesa, we remember, makes a boast of the fact that he threw down before the face of Chamos vases taken from the sanctuary of Jehovah at Nebo. It would, therefore, be important to know exactly the spot in Cyprus whence these fragments came, as there may be a chance of finding there more of the sort: this hint, I hope, will not escape the attention of English antiquaries residing at Cyprus.

My own observations may, perhaps, serve to confirm the truth of the remark of M. Renan about the palæographical rank of these fragments, "which may claim the second place, immediately after the Moabite Stone," and to show that their historical is not under their palæographical value.

C. CLERMONT-GANNEAU.

A FIND OF COINS IN JERUSALEM.

By Dr. AD. ERNAN.

(From the *Zeitschrift* of the German Palestine Association).

ON the 5th of April, 1872, an earthenware lamp containing 41 gold coins and a pot 118 silver pieces, were found in the ground belonging to the German Johannites in Jerusalem.

Most of the coins date from the fourth century of the Hejira and the latest of these particular years is 325 Hej. A.D. 936-7. This leads in all probability to the year of grace 937, having been the time when the coins were hidden. Putting aside a few coins that are indecipherable, the others date from:—

The 5 years 320-5 of the Hej.	G. 16 S. 14, thus in the decade 60				
" 10 "	310-20 "	" 4 "	" 38 "	" "	42
" 10 "	300-10 "	" 1 "	" 14 "	" "	15
" 20 "	280-300 "	" 1 "	" 27 "	" "	13,5
" 50 "	230-80 "	" 4 "	" 3 "	" "	1,4
" 30 "	200-30 "	" 6 "	" 3 "	" "	2
" 50 "	150-200 "	" 9 "	" 9 "	" "	3,6

It is apparent from this that the oldest coins were not the most uncommon.

Many of the coins in this find were of course struck in Syro-Palestine, and hardly any such have been discovered in the northern finds. Next comes Filistia (Palestine) by which Jerusalem is undoubtedly meant. One silver piece of 320, and several gold pieces of 320, 323, 325 are extremely rare; silver coins issued by this place were long unknown, Tabariyeh (Tiberias) possessed a gold and silver coinage, both of which were issued in 320 Hej.; only one of these latter coins has as yet been discovered.

Damascus ceased to be an important mint under the Caliphate of the descendants of Abbas; thus there was but one dirhem belonging to that place in our find. Two silver pieces issued at Homs (one of them in 323)