

never again be Sovereign. Abandoning for ever its proud independence and its great temporal power, the Order re-dedicated itself to the service of the sick; and its golden record in this respect, and especially during the war, shows us what a strong and vigorous life still animates it. We look back with wonder and with pride at the long roll of the Order's fame, and we remember the days when its shining ranks went out to battle for the Cross in Palestine. It was always the bulwark of Christendom against every danger that menaced the Faith, as it was quick to render service to the sick and the defenceless: it is now a golden link between the past and the present—between Jerusalem of the Christian kings and our own more prosaic days.

The knights' bones are dust,
 And their good swords rust;
 Their souls are with the saints, I trust.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS ON THE MODERN INHABITANTS OF PALESTINE.

By Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN and Prof. R. A. S. MACALISTER.

(Concluded from *Q.S.*, 1917, p. 125.)

A Story of Sheikh Badr in Jerusalem.

THERE is a *makām* near Jerusalem, where the road to 'Ain Kārim branches off from the Jaffa road, called Sheikh Badr. This Sheikh was one of the warriors in the train of Sultān Badr, and his name was formerly Badrān. Around this *makām* there are vineyards, and olive and fig trees; and in the summer many of the inhabitants of Lifta and Mālḥah visit the spot. It is said that a man and his wife were once in a vineyard in the neighbourhood of the *makām*, and they found a mill-stone which they carried off. When those who looked after the vineyard found it had been taken, they questioned all the neighbours, but everyone denied any knowledge of the theft. After a time suspicion fell upon a certain man, and accordingly they asked him to take an oath of purgation at Sheikh Badr. This he did, although he was the real culprit, reassuring himself with the reflection that, if this Sheikh really had any power,

people would not have been able to rob the olive and fig trees attached to the *makam* as they had been doing.

When the grape harvest was over, the thief returned to his village; but as he was making a handle for the stolen mill-stone, the hammer which he was using fell on his foot and so injured it that, after five days, it became blue (*i.e.*, gangrenous) and he died. After a year his widow also died, and he left no descendant except a girl, and she is blind.

A Story of Sheikh 'Aisa.

There was a man once who opened an eating-house near the Jaffa Gate at Jerusalem; and, as his was the only restaurant in the vicinity, he prospered greatly. Another man who had a similar but less prosperous shop at the Damascus Gate, made up his mind to take a vacant shop near the Jaffa Gate, and to outrival the restaurant already there. The owner of the latter said to himself: "Is not the business at the Damascus Gate enough for this man? Why should he come to my neighbourhood and spoil my business?" So, when the day's work was over, he went home in a surly mood. His wife, seeing him in this unusual condition, asked him what was wrong. He told her, adding: "I have not done this man any harm that he should come and settle close to me and spoil my business." His wife cheered him up and said: "Do not worry, God will provide His children with food." However, he could not subdue his angry thoughts. One night his wife said to him: "Put these thoughts out of your mind and I will do something for you, that your work may prosper as it does now, if not better. I will make your rival dislike the place he proposes to take and return back to where he was. At least I will make him keep his distance from you. Just give me two or three beshliks." Taking the money, she went to Sheikh 'Aisa el-Akhras¹ and laid the matter before him. The Sheikh said: "I will not do any harm to that man, but I will do something to keep him away from your neighbourhood and make him stay where he is, so as not to bring harm upon you." When the woman had agreed to this he said: "First, your husband needs a *hijab* (amulet) for himself, and some things for his shop. Take this *hijab*, which is a *hijab* of affection; if your husband wears it, everybody will like him. He must also place some roots of oleander (دلفي) above his shop. After that he must secretly smear some

¹ See Q.S., 1917, pp. 76-80.

of the dung of a dog and of a black cat upon the lintel over the door of the shop which your rival is proposing to take. From that moment your rival will take a dislike to the place, and so will everybody who enters the shop. In my belief, he will very soon give up the place and return to his shop at the Damascus Gate."

The woman returned and carried out the Sheikh's instructions. As it happened, the time for renting houses had passed, and the man had been so busy that he had let the occasion slip. All his friends, when they heard that he was going to move his business from the Damascus Gate, tried to persuade him to stay there, protesting that everyone in the northern part of the city had been accustomed to take their meals at his establishment, and that if he moved to the Jaffa Gate no one would come to him there, and that he would be much wiser to stay where he was. And one day, when he went to look at the Jaffa Gate shop, he found that it had been let to some one else as a barley store, and on looking at it he took an aversion to it. As he was passing along the road the other man saw him and invited him in, and gave him coffee, and then said to him: "I hear you thought of taking a place here, and becoming my neighbour. Why have you given up the idea?" The man replied: "I have no longer any such idea. My work is going on satisfactorily, but if I come here I shall lose all my friends." The eating-house keeper then replied: "That is true, as the popular proverb says, 'Faces and thresholds (وجوه وعتاب)'" But he thought of the threshold which he had defiled; and he, and those in the secret, believed that this was the real cause of his rival's change of plan.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOTES ON JEWISH ANTIQUITIES.

By JOSEPH OFFORD.

(Continued from Q.S., 1917, p. 143.)

XXXVI. *The Israelite Wars against Damascus, and Recent Discoveries.*

THE information derivable from the Assyrian historical inscriptions of Shalmaneser II and Rammanu-nirari—omitting the pacific intermediate monarch Šamši-Rammanu II—as illustrating events in Palestine under the Israelite kings Jehu, Jehoahaz, and Joash, has

been excellently set forth by Dr. Theophilus G. Pinches in his *Old Testament in the Light of the Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, Chapter X.¹ Since that work was published, however, two monuments have been found with texts illustrating that period of international warfare in Syria, both of them concerning affairs of the kingdom of Damascus with which Assyria most of the time, and Israel during all the time, were fighting. The first of these is the Aramaic inscription, now well known to scholars, of Zakir, king of Hamath and Laas, in which he relates that Ben-, or (Aramaic) Bar-, Hadad (? III), son of Hazael of Damascus, whom he calls king of Aram, had organised against him a confederacy of a number of princes, and besieged him in Hazrak.² He, however, by the help of his god, Baal-Shamaim, defeated them. It will be seen at once that this weakening of the Syrians may explain Joash's victory over Ben-Hadad, and the recapture of the Israelite cities lost to Damascus by Jehoahaz. Ben-Hadad being absent warring to the north of Damascus, Joash found the opportunity favourable to invade the country to the south successfully.

The second new record is a black bead obtained from Babylon, bearing a cuneiform text upon it stating that Shalmaneser (II) brought it from the temple of the deity Sêr of Melaha, the residence of Hazael of the land of Damascus.

The inscription undoubtedly concerns Shalmaneser's 18th year campaign in 842 B.C. against Haza-ilu, a war which the Assyrian again summarises in his Black Obelisk record. Unless Zakir's victory was the cause, it also tends to confirm the old view, as against Schrader, that the helper, or saviour, of Israel of 2 Kings was Shalmaneser and not Rammanu-nirari. Schrader suggested the

¹ The Old Testament references to these events are, under Jehu—2 Kings x, 32, "Hazeal smote the Israelites in all their coasts." (At this time Jehu was Assyria's vassal.) 2 Kings xiii, 3, "The Lord delivered Israel into the hand of Hazeal, king of Syria"; verse 5, "The Lord gave Israel a saviour (or helper), so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians" (time of Jehoahaz); verse 22, "Hazeal oppressed Israel all the days of Jehoahaz"; verse 24, "Hazeal died and Ben-Hadad reigned in his stead, and Joash took out of the hand of Ben-Hadad the cities he had, and three times did Joash beat him." Amos i, 4, "I will send a fire into the house of Hazeal which shall devour the palace of Ben-Hadad."

² Hazrak should be the זררר of Zechariah ix, 1, and, as Zakir's inscription is of the ninth-eighth centuries B.C., it makes the probability very strong that Zechariah, chapters ix, x and xi, are pre-Exilic; see Matthew xxvii, 9. Hazrak is the Assyrian Hatarika, and wars with it are recorded in cuneiform texts.

latter king because the second term of his name, nirari, "helper," was, he thinks, probably familiar to the mind of the writer of Kings, who made a verbal point of it.

Verse 5 of 2 Kings xiii certainly appears to show that the relief to Israel occurred in Hazael's time, which would be too early for Rammanu-nirari's reign, who was more a contemporary, or later than Ben-Hadad III; his father, Šamsi-Rammanu, having reigned perhaps for thirteen years after Shalmaneser before coming to the throne. Joash recaptured the Israelite cities from Ben-Hadad apparently immediately after Hazael's death, whilst Adad-Nirari gives the name of his royal enemy of Damascus as Mari'u.¹

The view that the "saviour" who helped Jehoahaz to lighten the Syrian yoke, and Joash to regain Israel's cities which had been incorporated with South Syria, was Shalmaneser (or Rammanu-nirari) may, however, be incorrect, because the aid possibly resulted from Ben-Hadad's disastrous campaign against Zakir of Hamath, as revealed to us by his Aramaic inscription mentioned in our preliminary paragraph.

It should be noted that the cause of Hazael's hostility, as set forth in 2 Kings x, may have been his annoyance, because Jehu accepted Shalmaneser as suzerain and paid him tribute, as disclosed by the Black Obelisk. Zakir attributes his deliverance and raising of the siege of Hazrak and rout of his foes to Baal-Shamaim, his name for his God. If this Zakir was the "saviour" whom Jehovah raised up, then the Lord (Baal) of the heavens, must have been another title of Jehovah-Shamaim (Gen. xxiv, 7). If so, this is not the only occasion upon which Jehovah and Baal, in the prolific pantheon of Semitic Syria and Palestine, have become somewhat intermingled. Upon an altar, said to have come from Gezer, and to be of Maccabean times, is an inscription: Ἡρακλέους νείκη Εὐνήλου πόσις upon one face; upon the other: Εὐνήλου Τωνος Ἰάω Ἰνάσιου ἑορτῆ διθύρα(αμσω), "Eunelos vaunts a victory with a dithyramb at the fêtes of Iao Inasios," a synchronism of Jehovah with the Baal of Ina at the base of Mount Hermon.²

XXXVII. *The Title of "King of Persia."*

In the *Princeton Theological Review* for January, 1917, Prof. Dick Wilson discusses the question as to whether the use of the title of

¹ M. R. Dussaud thinks that Mari'u is a title of Ben-Hadad III.

² See *Arch. Anzeiger*, 1909, 398 and 575: articles by Thiersch and Wünsch.

"king of Persia" by the authors of Chronicles, Daniel,¹ Ezra, and Nehemiah, as if it were the Palestinian idea of the correct formula to ascribe to the Persian dynasty, indicates that these books, or the sentences in which this phrase occurs, were written at the time to which they assign themselves, that of the early Achemenid empire, *circa* 539–432 B.C., or later. Some critics have alleged that the title could not have been used until the Greek period, and they have argued for a very late date of composition for all or part of these books, and, consequently, the question is of importance for Hebrew history.

Prof. Wilson shows, by a most careful collection of contemporary cuneiform inscriptions, both historical and commercial, that Nabonidus used it in reference to Cyrus between 547 and 539 B.C.; that Darius Hystaspes does so in the Behistun inscriptions, both in the Persian and the Susian recensions; and also that Herodotus reports this monarch as having done so upon a stele he erected at Tearus, in Thrace.

He cites thirteen cuneiform contract tablets terming Xerxes king of Persia. Xenophon also applies it to Darius II. Altogether either the monuments or the early classics use it for Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius I and II, and Xerxes. The Old Testament for Cyrus, Darius I, Artaxerxes I, and Darius II. He is able to produce thirty-eight instances of its use in cuneiform and the classics between 545 and 400 B.C., whilst the earliest in the Old Testament is of 539 B.C., and the latest 422 B.C., between which dates it occurs thirteen times.

Incidentally, in his essay, Prof. Wilson illustrates the term Medes and Persians of the Old Testament by adducing twenty-five instances of the occurrence of the phrase, "king of Persia and Media" in cuneiform.

A further proof of the early date of the Hebrew writings which use the title king of Persia—supposing that they naturally conformed to the custom in vogue at their time—is that no single inscription later than Darius Codomanus employs the title king of Persia. The four Old Testament books, therefore, are not in any way impugned as to their genuineness, or as to their being composed during the Persian era, by their usage of the title.

¹ The presence of *KZ* in Daniel's spelling of Persian words agrees with the early South Persian inscriptions, whilst it is absent in the oldest MSS. of the Avesta, which are not much more recent than the Achemenid dynasty. This indicates the date of Daniel as about the sixth or fifth century B.C.

A few words may be added to Dr. Wilson's remarks as to the non-usage of king of Persia in many Babylonian and in all Egyptian references to the Achemenid kings, whilst in Palestine, as in Persia, it was accepted. Babylonians and Egyptians, by so doing, acknowledged that each individual Persian monarch was their own lord. They were conquered countries, and so, as a sign of subjection, expected to term the king king of Babylon, or of Egypt, or of the "Two Lands," meaning Upper and Lower Egypt. Palestine was not conquered by Persia; it fell into Persian hands as an appanage of Babylon, with its people in captivity in Mesopotamia. These exiles Cyrus and Darius restored to their own country, and, whilst remaining their suzerain, gave a semi-independence and absolute religious freedom. For the Jews, then, it was legitimate not to acclaim the king as king of Palestine. They and the Persians were monotheists, and it was probably, apart from any Divine providence, for that reason, that an amount of liberty was permitted to them beyond that of the other Satrapies.

XXXVIII. *Sardis the Site of Sepharad.*

The excavations up to the outbreak of war carried on by the United States explorers at Sardis, in Asia Minor, resulted in the discovery of a number of Greek inscriptions, and more than thirty in the unknown language and but partially known script of the Lydians. One of these, fortunately, was a bilingual text having what is apparently, to a certain extent, a duplicate version in Aramaic, a language in which, it is to be remembered, parts of the Books of Daniel and Ezra are extant, and also one or two other Old Testament fragments.

This inscription was first edited by Prof. Enno Littmann, but the Aramaic part has now been republished and translated by Mr. Stanley A. Cook, M.A., in the *Journal of the Hellenic Society*, and, although it is but a short sepulchral memorial, is of great interest, because it gives to Sardis the title of Sepharad, thus confirming the view of Lassen and Pusey that Sardis was the city called by this name by Obadiah.

The interesting portion of the inscription, because of the occurrence of the word twice over, is as follows: "Upon the fifth of Markhesvan, of the tenth year of Artaxerxes the king, in Sepharad the city. This stele and the cavern and the funerary

couches (?) and forecourts, which is above Sepharad, etc." The occurrence of the title Sepharad not only confirms the reading of the word in the Hebrew of Obadiah, as against the LXX which reads Εφραθα, but renders unfounded any suggestion as to the late period of the composition of the book because of the use of the name Sepharad.

There are other matters in the inscription of importance to Hebraists. Thus the word for city is *birethā* (בִּירְתָּא), the same word as used for a fortress in the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine, of Achmetha, Ezra vi, 2; compare the Assyrian word *virtu* and Kassite *bi-ir-ta*. We know from other sources that Sardis was a garrisoned town.

Artaxerxes is spelt as in the Elephantine papyri, and not as in the Hebrew of the Old Testament.

XXXIX. *Jewish Colonists in the Nile Delta.*

In Prof. Naville's account of his excavations at Tell el-Yahudieh, not far from Cairo, published in 1889 by the Egypt Exploration Fund under the title of "The Mound of the Jew and the City of Onias," he printed several Greek inscriptions from Jewish sepulchre stones, bearing such names as Barchias, *i.e.*, Barak, or Barachiah; Nethaneus, *i.e.*, Nathan or Nethaniah; Mikkos, ? Micah, and Eleazar. These texts left no doubt as to the Hebrew race being represented among the inhabitants of the place in Ptolemaic times. There are, however, some more similar steles from the same site preserved among the Jewish antiquities in the Louvre. These relate to personages named Elazaros, John son of John, and a certain Sabbataios son of Somoelos (Σομοηλν). They are of the time of Augustus. Sabbataios is a Jewish name that has been found for a Hebrew or Aramean at Nippur, in the Persian period, where Dr. Hilprecht reads it as Shab-ba-tai. It of course occurs in Ezra and Nehemiah, and again in the list of names in Aristeeas, as one of the LXX translators. It has also been found upon a Jewish grave-stone at On, or Heliopolis.

The earliest note in the Graeco-Egyptian papyri concerning a synagogue in Egypt, is the complaint of a lady that her cloak was stolen when she was attending a service; whether she was a Jewess is uncertain.