

LX. *Farther Remarks upon M. l'Abbé Barthelemy's Memoir on the Phœnician Letters, containing his Reflections on certain Phœnician Monuments, and the Alphabets resulting from them. In a Letter to the Rev. Thomas Birch, D. D. Secretary to the Royal Society, from the Rev. John Swinton, B. D. F. R. S. Member of the Academy degli Apatisti at Florence, and of the Etruscan Academy of Cortona in Tuscany.*

Reverend Sir,

Read Dec. 13, 1764. **M.** L'Abbé Barthelemy's memoir on the Phœnician letters has again, with very large additions, been just (1) communicated to the learned world. Some at least of those additions have been made, as there is exceeding good reason to believe, if not very lately, several years after the memoir itself was read. This, as M. l'Abbé is said to be the first antiquary in France, and must undoubtedly have a great influence over the members of that illustrious body which he has so long adorned, cannot well fail of being considered by many people as a confirmation of the suspicion for some time

(1) *Mémoires de Littérature, tirés des Registres &c.* Tom. XXX. p. 405-426. A Paris, 1764.

entertained in several parts of Europe, and hinted at by me in (2) a former paper. It will therefore enable us to account for the late publication of a piece, which seems to have been cried up by M. l'Abbé's admirers as one (3) of the most valuable literary productions of the present age. What degree of attention to this performance from the lovers of antiquity is really due, I shall not at present take upon me to decide. My sentiments of it, however, if not yet sufficiently known, from the following short additional remarks, submitted with the utmost deference to the superior judgment of the Royal Society, will very clearly appear.

I.

M. l'Abbé still asserts, that צִרָא, TZORA, or TZVRA, in the first line of the Maltese-Phœnician inscription, [TAB. XXII.] denotes the city of Tyre. To which I shall only beg leave to reply, that this assertion is utterly repugnant to the testimony of the Tyrian coins; which constantly exhibit the word צִרָא, TZOR, or TZVR, as the name of that city. This is a fact expressly allowed by (4) M. l'Abbe himself, though he produces it in support of the notion here advanced; with which it must, even at first sight, be considered as altogether incompatible.

To the first letter of the next word he still likewise attributes the power of *He*, (5) and consequently affirms that word to be הַנְּרִי, HOC VOTVM, THIS VOW.

(2) *Philosoph. Transf.* Vol. L. Par. II. p. 799. Lond. 1759.

(3) *Journ. des Sçavans*, Decembre 1760. p. 348. M. de Guign. *De l'Orig. des Chin.* p. 60. A Paris, 1760.

(4) *Mémoir. de Litter. &c.* ubi sup. p. 409.

(5) *Ibid.* p. 410, 413.

But

Two Transcripts of the Maltese-Phoenician Inscription.

9 4 5 4 4 9 12 6 0 9 11 9 9 7 5 4 5 5 4 4 5
9 4 4 9 7 4 7 11 4 7 9 7 4 9 0 4 9 0
 0 4 4 7 9 7 4 9 0 5 9 9 4 4 9 7 4 5 9 5 4
 4 7 9 9 7 4 5 9

5 9 0 9 4 5 4 4 9 12 6 0 9 11 9 9 7 5 4 5 5 4 4 5
 5 9 5 4 9 4 4 9 7 4 7 11 4 7 9 7 4 9 0
 4 5 9 0 4 4 7 9 7 4 9 0 5 9 9 4 4 9 7 4 5 9 5 4
 4 7 9 9 7

But as the absurdity of this notion was clearly demonstrated in my former remarks, to which no reply has yet been made, I shall take no farther notice of it here.

We are also told by this learned (6) author, that the first word of the second line was either עבדן or עבדנא, with the *Nun* and *Aleph* so closely connected as to form a kind of monogram; the faintest traces of which are, however, scarcely, if at all, to be seen.

That the word cut originally in the stone was עבדו, FECERVNT, in my former remarks (7), I have rendered sufficiently clear. And that the two elements *Nun* and *Aleph* should be so confined as to occupy a space barely sufficient for one of them, will not be readily admitted by any person moderately acquainted with the manner of writing observed in the later Phœnician inscriptions. But to waive all other considerations relative to the point in view, that the verb here is expressed in the third person plural, the last word of the inscription, בִּנְדִיכָא, BENEDICAT IIS, seems evidently to prove. 'Tis worthy observation, that M. l'Abbé represents Count Caylus's copy of the inscription as much superior in point of accuracy to Father Gori's; and yet, in determining, or rather attempting to determine, the form of the last letter of עבדו, he apparently prefers the latter to the former. For he adduces Father Gori's copy in support, or rather confirmation, of the other. But such conduct as this, in M. l'Abbé's situation, is to me no great matter of surprize. It is plainly intended to serve a favourite hypothesis, which cannot be easily maintained.

(6) *Mémoire de Littér.* &c. ubi sup. p. 410.

(7) See above, p. 126, 127.

With regard to the proper name עבדאסר, ABDASAR, or ABDASARVS, I can by no means believe it to be the same with ABDASTARTVS. That those two words had not the same origin, seems to me, at first sight, self-evident. This is likewise confirmed (8) by a writer of great erudition. But the account I have (9) already given of the Phœnician name עבדאסר, ABDASAR, supported by the best authorities, will, I flatter myself, set this matter in the clearest light.

(10) I formerly observed, that ASERIMOR, ASERIMAR, or ASERIM-HAMMAR, was probably composed of ASERIM, or ASERYM, ΑΣΕΡΥΜΟΣ, the name of one of the kings of Tyre, according to Menander Ephesius, and מר, MAR, or rather המר, HAMMAR, IPSE DOMINVS. But M. l'Abbé, (11) in the piece before me, takes it to be perfectly equivalent to the word ΑΣΕΡΥΜΟΣ itself; the Greeks seeming to him to have terminated in ΟΣ the Phœnician proper names ending in OP, as the other natives of Greece did several words used by the Lacedæmonians of the same termination. To which I shall beg leave to reply, that the Greek dialect of the Lacedæmonians was widely different from the Phœnician tongue; and consequently that all arguments drawn from their supposed agreement, or affinity, must be fallacious and inconclusive. Nor will the composition of the name אסרם־מר, or אסרם־המר, ASERIM-HAMMAR, viz. אשרה־מר, ASHERAH-MAR, LV-

(8) Matth. Hiller. *Onomast. Sacr.* p. 590. Tubingæ, 1706.

(9) See above, p. 127, 128.

(10) See above, p. 129.

(11) *Mém. de Litter.* ubi sup. p. 410, 411.

CVS DOMINVS, which he exhibits to our view, afford a proper degree of satisfaction to any rational person engaged in such philological inquiries. Farther, it is obvious to every smatterer in the Greek language, that in the words ΕΙΡΩΜΟΣ, ΑΒΔΑΣΤΑΡΤΟΣ, ΑΣΕΡΤΜΟΣ, ΒΑΛΕΑΖΑΡΟΣ, ΒΑΔΕΖΩΡΟΣ, &c. HIROMVS, ABDAS-TARTVS, ASERYMVS, BALEAZARVS, BADEZORVS, &c. handed down to us by Josephus (12), from Menander Ephesius, ΟΣ is no part of the Phœnician names, but only a Greek termination superadded to them. The word ASERIMAR therefore, or ASERIMOR, would have become, when adopted by a Greek, ΑΣΕΡΙΜΑΡΟΣ, or ΑΣΕΡΥΜΩΡΟΣ, not ΑΣΕΡΤΜΟΣ, as M. l'Abbé has been pleased to assert. So the Tyrian, or Phœnician, proper name חִירָם, HIRAM, or HIROM, as it occurs in Scripture, (1 King. ix. 12.) is rendered by the Septuagint and Josephus, after Menander Ephesius, ΕΙΡΩΜΟΣ, HIROMVS. But the most striking instances, or rather those directly in point, are ΒΑΛΕΑΖΑΡΟΣ, ΒΑΔΕΖΩΡΟΣ, or BALEAZAR, BADEZOR, when stripped of their Greek termination; with which ASERIMAR, or ASERIMOR, does most perfectly agree. This amounts to the strongest presumption, that M. l'Abbé's notion of the composition of that name is destitute of every support. Hence we may fairly conclude, that the account by me formerly given of the constituent parts of this word was strictly agreeable to truth; and consequently that the fourth element was *Mem*, and not *He*, as I then incontrovertibly proved.

(12) Menand. Ephes. apud Joseph. *Cont. Apion.* Lib. I. p. 1043.

With respect to the four first letters of the third line, " they form a difficulty, says (13) this celebrated " writer, embarrassing enough. The two last give " the word בן, BEN, FILIVS, SON; but this word " here ought to be read in the plural number. Was " not the plural number sometimes pointed out " amongst the Phœnicians by the addition of an *He* " and a *Nun*, in the same manner as the Chaldees " had an *Aleph* added to the beginning and the end " of this word also in the singular? Or rather did " not the two letters, *He*, *Nun*, forming the pro- " noun הן, IS, ILLE, give us to understand, that " Abdassar and Asseremor were brothers only by " adoption? I dare not decide in this matter, and " shall content myself with observing, that the dif- " ficulty regards only the language of the Phœni- " cians, of which we are totally ignorant, and by " no means the powers of the letters, which have " been sufficiently established in this memoir."

Here 'tis obvious, at first sight, that M. l'Abbé is not only embarrassed, but seems actually to sink under the weight of the difficulty he has himself proposed; as of this, notwithstanding his uncommon sagacity and penetration, he has not been able to supply his readers with an adequate solution. For 1. The word הנבן cannot be of the plural number, as he supposes, or rather positively asserts; both the correspondent Greek and the tenor of the inscription, unless I am greatly deceived, being utterly repugnant to such a supposition. 2. The Chaldee term he mentions being of the singular number, and absolutely dissimilar to the pretended Phœnician word,

(13) *Mém. de Litter.* ubi sup. p. 411.

𐤊𐤍𐤁; the adduction of it seems altogether impertinent, on the present occasion. 3. The pronoun 𐤊 is equivalent to the Latin *EARVM*, not *IS*, *ILLE*, as *M. l'Abbé* is pleased to affirm; and being a suffix, or affix, adheres to the end, not the beginning, of a word. But if it should be taken for a separate pronoun, it answers to the Latin *ILLÆ*, not *IS*, *ILLE*, as it is rendered by *M. l'Abbé*. That *Abdasar* and *Aserimar* therefore were brothers only by adoption, is a chimerical notion, void of even the least shadow of rational proof. 4. He in effect declares the difficulty to be insoluble, when he owns himself incapable of deciding in this matter. 5. He makes the same declaration, when he asserts the difficulty to regard only the Phœnician language; which he affirms to be utterly unknown, though both he and *M. de Guignes* have in express terms affirmed it to be almost intirely the same with the Syriac, and he has himself attempted to explain several inscriptions in it. Nor will it in the least avail him to refer the difficulty to the Phœnician tongue, or rather our ignorance of that tongue. For he undertook the interpretation of the whole inscription he has here so minutely considered, in order to deduce a Phœnician alphabet from it; and unless he has, in some measure at least, effected this, how can he take upon him to ascertain the powers of the letters of which his alphabet is composed? I would therefore, in my turn, beg leave to ask him the following question. Is it not more ingenuous, more liberal, and more worthy *M. l'Abbé Barthelemy's* (14) exalted merit, to retract an error

(14) *Journ. des Sçavans*, Aout 1760. p. 277. (1).

than to persist in it? To give up a point than to attempt the defence of it, when he seems even to look upon it himself as altogether indefensible?

The last word but one of the inscription M. l'Abbé represents by the Hebrew characters **מהמעקל**, taking the second letter for *He*. He has likewise given us a pretty good account of **מעקל**, the latter part of it; but has only just mentioned the particle **מה**, formed of the two first letters. And in this he has, perhaps, acted prudently enough. For none of the significations of that particle, at least none that I can find, will accord with the sense of that part of the inscription in which it occurs; whereas if we suppose the second element to be *Mem*, as I am fully persuaded it is, every difficulty will immediately vanish. This I have clearly demonstrated in my former remarks. I must beg leave farther to observe, as pertinent to the present occasion, that as a variety of winds will give a variety of directions to a ship's motion, any navigation effected by different winds may be termed crooked, any voyage performed by their assistance oblique. So that we cannot infer from either of M. l'Abbé's translations of the word in question, that the two Tyrians mentioned in our inscription were thrown upon the island of Malta by a tempest, as this learned author has been pleased to assert. The latter of those translations was owing, as he informs us, to "the favour of certain suppositions, which, for brevity's sake, he has suppressed."

From what has been said it appears, that the character denominated *He* by M. l'Abbé, and by me *Mem*, is an object of some importance, with regard to the explication of this inscription. If it be taken

for

for the former element, two or three parts of the monument are so involved that they are scarce, if at all, intelligible; if for the latter, the sense runs throughout unembarrassed, consistent, and clear. Nor does this character differ more from that allowed to stand for *Mem*, by M. l'Abbé, than do several of the acknowledged somewhat different forms of *Mem* from one another. A draught of it, however, seems not to have been yet published, by M. l'Abbé, that can be absolutely depended upon. For in the copy he first communicated to the learned world, represented by him as a transcript perfectly agreeing with the original, this character approaches a little nearer to his figure of *Mem* than it does in the first plate of of the memoir before me, and consequently the latter seems a little more favourable to his hypothesis. Whether this minute alteration, which is too inconsiderable to affect the point in question, ought to be attributed to the inattention or incapacity of the engraver, or to some other cause, I shall not take upon me to decide. How that matter really stands is best known to M. l'Abbé.

“ But the power of the letter *He*”, says M. l'Abbé, “ is fixed by other examples which I shall soon produce.” Now that a character representing *He* does not occur in the monument under consideration, has already, I flatter myself, been rendered sufficiently clear; whether or no it is to be met with on any of the coins produced in the paper before me, by M. l'Abbé, comes therefore next to be considered here.

II.

My explications of the first, second, and sixth medals in M. l'Abbé's plate of coins may be seen in a small Latin dissertation, put to the press at Oxford, in 1753. That of the sixth, however, which is a medal of Laodicea, must be owned to be incomplete; the four last letters of the inscription having been defaced on my coin, by the injuries of time. Nor am I intirely satisfied with M. l'Abbé's interpretation of the latter part of this inscription, as it seems very forced and unnatural, and even contrary to the faith of history. Nay, it seems not perfectly to please M. l'Abbé himself, as he has not absolutely settled the power of one of the letters of which it is composed; but contents himself with (15) observing, "that this slight difficulty will hereafter be removed by other monuments." His interpretation of the inscription exhibited by the coin of Sidon, which he makes coeval with the reign of Antiochus IV. is likewise liable to exception, as will appear to every one moderately versed in this branch of literature, who examines it with proper attention. The other two pieces of Sidon present nothing very remarkable to our view. One of them has nevertheless handed down to us the very character asserted by me to represent *Tzade*, but taken by M. l'Abbé Barthelemy for *Thau*, immediately preceding certain numeral characters, which have been fully explained in one of my former papers, on the reverses of several Sidonian coins.

(15) *Mém. de Litter.* ubi sup. p. 417.

Now the letter *He* does not appear on any of these medals, and consequently nothing can be inferred from any of them in favour of the form of that element contended for by M. l'Abbé. On one of those coins, however, said by this learned antiquary to have been struck at Marathus, but which in reality ought not to be attributed to that city, now in my possession, the very same character occurs, with the power of *Mem*, that M. l'Abbé exhibits on two of the medals of Menæ as occupying the place of *He*. My explication of this coin, which I then took to belong to Marathus, was printed here, in 1753. But I afterwards observed, that the Phœnician inscription on this medal consisted of four letters, מרת, the last of which was *Beth*; and that on all the similar medals, or draughts of them, which I had seen, four characters likewise appeared, the fourth of which was either *Beth* or manifestly a part of that element, not *Ajin* or *Ain*, as M. l'Abbé, without any manner of foundation, seems to imagine. Hence I concluded, that these pieces could never have been struck at מרת, MARATH, or MARATHUS, and therefore scrupled not a moment to explode my former opinion. To this I was farther excited by the numeral characters in the exergues of two of them, at present a part of my small collection of Phœnician coins; which, if I am not greatly mistaken, clearly point out the years of Rome 748 and 749. But about that time Marathus was either in ruins or intirely razed, and the territory appertaining to it occupied by the Aradians, according to Strabo (16).

(16) Strab. *Geograph.* Lib. XVI. p. 753. Lutetiæ Parisiorum, 1620.

I therefore cancelled that part of my small work in which the interpretation of the inscription, preserved by one of these Phœnician medals, was contained. The cancelled part is, however, still in my hands.

Of the Sicilian medals in M. l'Abbé's plate four are to be attributed to one city, and two to two others. Of the latter M. l'Abbé assigns one to Imachara, and the other to Carthage; with what truth, I shall not take upon me at present to decide. But that a person so justly celebrated for his knowledge of ancient medals, particularly Punic and Phœnician medals, as is M. l'Abbé, should first ascribe the former to I know not what *Castra Cæcilia*, or *Castra Julia*, and afterwards to *Panormus*, now *Palermo*, is to me, I must confess, real matter of surprize. For the Punic name on these coins is evidently מַחְנֹת; MAHHANOTH, MEHNOTH, or, as *Hbeth* is sometimes divested of even the force of an aspirate (17), MENOTH; which apparently answers to the Greek ΜΗΝΑΙ, and the Latin MENÆ, the name of a city in Sicily, called *Menéo* by *Cluverius* (18), several of whose medals adorn the cabinets of the curious at this day. Nay, one of the Punic coins of *Menæ* published by M. l'Abbé, though without any explication of the Punic inscription, and consequently without sufficient proof of the point in view, has been expressly attributed to *Menæ*, or *Menéo*, by *Goltzius* (19). An accurate description of a medal of *Menæ*, together with a complete interpretation of the Punic inscription it exhibits, may

(17) *Bochart. Phal. Lib. I. c. i.*

(18) *Phil. Cluver. Sicil. Antiq. Lib. II. c. ix. p. 339.*

(19) *Hubertus Goltzius, in Num. Sicil. Tab. XII. num. 5, 6.*

be seen in the Latin dissertation (20) above referred to, which it would be superfluous to touch upon here.

With regard to the Punic element taken for *He* by M. l'Abbé, on two Siculo-Punic coins, he seems to give up in one part of his memoir the form of it so warmly by him: contended for in another. For he expressly allows, that this character on one of the Siculo-Punic medals exhibiting it may represent *Mem*, as well as *He*. From whence we may infer, that the correspondent letter on the other, as the word to which this character belongs is on both medals the same, may likewise, with no small appearance of truth, be taken for *Mem*; and consequently that, according to M. l'Abbé, the letter *He* may be supposed never in reality to have existed on either of those Siculo-Punic coins.

'Tis observable, that on one of the coins of Menæ, in M. l'Abbé's plate, the words קרת הרשת, VRBS NOVA, seem to appear; and that the first element of this inscription, if the draught of it here may be depended upon, is the *Koph* of nearly the Chaldee form. I have, however, a Punic medal in my collection, (see TAB. XXI.) with the old Phœnician *Koppa* on the reverse, and the names of two Sicilian cities, in Punic characters, never hitherto published. A galeated head, with a sprig of laurel before it, on one side, presents itself to our view; and the triquetra, or symbol of Sicily, with a human face in the middle of it, appears on the reverse,

(20) Swint. *De Num. quibusd. Samaritan. & Phœnic. &c. Dissert.* Oxon. 1753.

attended by the words *MAGEL*, *CAMIC*, the Punic names of two Sicilian towns. The latter of these was the *CAMICVS* (21) of Diodorus Siculus and Herodotus, and the former the *MACELLA*, or *MAGELLA*, from whence the *MAGELLINI* of Pliny (22), of Dio (23) and Polybius (24). The letters of the inscription are drawn from the left hand to the right, contrary to the usual Punic manner of writing. But such accidental mistakes of the moneyers as this are sometimes visible on antient coins. This valuable medal, which formerly had a place in Lord Winchelsea's noble collection, corrects the famous Bochart, with respect to the origin of the name *CAMICVS*; and has preserved an unusual Punic form of *Lamed*, agreeing with a Samaritan (25) one of the same element, as well as a figure of *Ghimel*, that not seldom occurs on the Siculo-Punic coins. Some may, however, consider this medal as of Greek extraction; the third letter so nearly resembling *Lambda*, and the antient Sicilian Greeks, on certain occasions, having used the Phœnician *Koppa* upon their coins, as appears from the medals of Syracuse. But as the *Mem* is plainly Punic, or Phœnician, and both the Greek terminations wanting here, I can by no means prevail upon myself to subscribe to such an opinion.

(21) Diod. Sic. Lib. IV. & XXIII. Herodot. Lib. VII.

(22) Plin. *Nat. Hist.* Lib. III. c. viii.

(23) Dio in Excerpt. apud Porphyrogenet. p. 637.

(24) Polyb. Lib. I. p. 24.

(25) *Numism. Antiq. &c.* à Thom. Pemb. & Mont. Gomær. Com. *Collect.* P. ii. T. 85. num. 5.

As the Carthaginians therefore used, on certain occasions, the old Phœnician *Koppa*, or one of the earliest forms of *Koph*; we may from thence conclude, that the character (26) on a Punic coin by me long ago explained, so similar to that form, must undoubtedly be taken for the same element, as I then most clearly evinced. Nor has either M. l'Abbé, or any other French writer, hitherto overthrown this notion; though it has been called in question, if not denied (27), by M. Pellerin. Nay, it has been, in a manner, adopted some months since, in the *Journal des Sçavans*, (28) and even by M. l'Abbé himself, in the (29) celebrated memoir that is the object of my attention here.

It has been just observed, that the *Lamed* on the Sicilian coin last described is of an unusual form. Give me leave to add, that another of my Punic medals struck in Sicily has preserved a form of that letter, somewhat more similar to the correspondent character in the alphabet deduced by M. l'Abbé from several Siculo-Punic coins. This medal has on one side the head of Jupiter, and on the reverse two ears of corn, attended by the Punic inscription ALICA, or HALICAH, the ΑΛΙΚΥΑΙ, or HALICYÆ, of (30) Diodorus Siculus, situated between Entella and Lilybæum, according to (31) Cellarius. The

(26) *De Num. quibusd. Samaritan. & Phœnic. &c. Dissert.* p. 86, 87. Oxon. 1750.

(27) *Recueil de Medailles de Peuples & de Villes, &c.* Tom. III. p. 141, 142, à Paris, 1763.

(28) *Journ. des Sçavans*, Aout 1763. p. 280.

(29) *Mém. de Litter. ubi sup.* p. 414.

(30) *Diod. Sic. Lib. XIV. c. 25.*

(31) *Christ. Cellar. Geograph. Ant. Lib. II. c. 12.*

coin has not hitherto been published, I believe, by any author whatsoever.

Amongst my Siculo-Punic coins there is likewise one with the letters *Hbeth* and *Beth*, on the reverse. Those elements undoubtedly form part of the word חבלא, HIBLA, or HYBLA, the Punic name of a town, or rather three towns, of Sicily, according to Bochart. That a mint was erected in one of them, at least, from an antient medal, with the words ΤΒΛΑΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΑΣ impressed upon it, may be certainly inferred. The Greek cities of Sicily not seldom exhibited on their money only part of their names, as we learn from (32) several of the Greek Sicilian coins; and that the towns there under the dominion of Carthage did the same, we have all the reason in the world to believe.











Another medal also appears in my little cabinet with the character representing *Hbeth* only, on the reverse. That character may be taken for the initial letter of the Punic proper name חבלא, HIBLA, or HYBLA; and may indicate this piece to have been struck in the city so called, as well as the former. Instances of such initial letters as this pretty frequently occur, on several of the (33) Greek Sicilian coins.

Two of my small Carthaginian medals have preserved the letter *Ghimel*, on their reverses, of the usual Punic or Phœnician form. This seems to be

(32) Erasim. Froel. in *Notit. Elementar. Numism.* pass. Filippo Parut. in *La Sicil. descrit. con Medagl. &c.* pass. In Roma, 1649. Vid. etiam Hubertum Goltzium, in *Sicil. Numism.* pass. Antverpiæ, 1617.

(33) Erasim. Froel. in *Notit. Elementar. Numism.* p. 83. Viennæ, Pragæ, & Tergesti, 1758. Parut. et Goltz. ubi sup.

SICULO-PUNIC Coins.



the initial letter of GELA, the name of a town of Sicily, with several of whose (34) coins the cabinets of the curious are adorned.

Another of my Punic medals, struck in Sicily, presents to our view the two elements *Aleph* and *Beth*. These plainly point at the ABACÆNA of (35) Ptolemy, an antient town of Sicily; many remains of which, according to Cluverius, were some time since to be seen.

One of the Siculo-Punic coins in my small collection has handed down to us two alphabetic characters, the powers of which are not yet, perhaps, sufficiently known. The second of them, however, from the great resemblance it bears to the form of that element in the Maltese inscription, we may venture to pronounce *Tzade*; and the first, according to M. l'Abbé Barthelemy, occupies the place of *Aleph*. I am nevertheless rather inclined to believe, that it ought to be taken for *Koph*. This seems to appear from the draughts of several coins, published by (36) writers of good authority, as well as from the concurring sentiments of those writers themselves. If this notion should hereafter be adopted by the learned, the medal may be supposed to have been emitted from the mint at Catana, as *Tzade* sometimes in power answers to the Latin T; but if M. l'Abbé's opinion should be held more consonant to truth,

(34) Frcel. Parut. & Goltz. ubi sup.

(35) Ptol. *Geograph.* Lib. III. c. 4. Phil. Cluver. *Sicil. Ant.* p. 386.

(36) *Veron. Illustrat.* Par. Terz. cap. sett. p. 258, 259. In Verona, 1732. Ridolfin. Venut. in *Saggi di Dissertaz. Accademich. pubblicamente lette nella Nobil. Accadem. Etrusc. dell' antichissima Citta di Cortona.* p. 35. In Roma, 1735, Parut. *Lastanof. &c.*

from that at Afforus, the same element being likewise not seldom equivalent to the Latin S. On another of my Siculo-Punic medals, that letter somewhat resembles the *Kappa* of the Greeks. Admitting the second element to be *Tzade*, as I am fully convinced it is, both ASSORVS and CATANA may, with (37) great propriety, be considered as Punic proper names.

For the farther illustration of what has been here advanced, it may not be improper to exhibit draughts of the Sicilian medals just described, as well as of several others, now in my possession, adorned with Punic characters. From these (TAB. XXIII.), at first sight, will be deducible a Siculo-Punic alphabet [TAB. XXIV.]; which, though incomplete, may, perhaps, not prove unacceptable to the learned.

Before I conclude my remarks on the Siculo-Punic coins, published by M. l'Abbé, I must beg leave to repeat, that only two of them, which were struck at Menæ, are produced, in order to evince the reality of his form of *He*; and that he has himself allowed this character, on one of those medals, (which concession will likewise extend to that on the other, as has been already observed) to be as properly expressive of *Mem* as of *He*. I say, his form of *He*; because I cannot help taking the character he denominates *He* for *Mem*, as it so nearly resembles the common and usual form of that element, and as the sense it communicates even here, supposing it *Mem*, is so perfectly consonant to the tenor of such inscriptions. This will be readily admitted by every

(37) Val. Schind. *Lex. Pentaglot.* p. 113, 114, 1641. Hanovix, 1612.

one not totally unacquainted with the medallic science, and not an intire stranger to the first principles of oriental literature. For מַעַם מַחְנֵה, EX POPVLO MENENIO, A POPVLO MENENIO, POPVLO MENENIO, (scil. CVSVS, vel PERCVSSVS, NVMMVS) is certainly altogether as proper as הַעַם מַחְנֵה, IPSE POPVLVS MENENIVS, (scil. CVDIT, vel PERCVSSIT, NVMMVM) if not really much more so. That s. c. i. e. SENATVS CONSVLTO, D. D. i. e. DECRETO DECVRIONVM, EX D. D. i. e. EX DECRETO DECVRIONVM, &c. not feldom occur on antient coins, is a point too well known, (38) even to smatterers in antiquity, to be disputed amongst the learned.

III.

As my Latin differtation upon the second Citiean inscription, of which I have already given a Latin translation, inserted in the MARMORA (39) OXONIENSIA, is almost ready for the press; I might easily excuse myself, at present, from taking any notice of M. l'Abbé's pretended explication of that inscription. But as this, in conjunction with his attempt to interpret the fourth, is undoubtedly by far the most exceptionable (40) part of his whole performance, since he seems totally to have mistaken the sense of both inscriptions; I shall beg leave to

(38) Lud. Debiel, è Soc. Jes. in *Utilit. Rei Numar. Veter.* p. 99, 100, 112, &c. Viennæ Auftriæ, 1733.

(39) *Marmor. Oxon.* Par. Secund. Tab. III. p. 7. Oxonii, 1763.

(40) *Mémoir. de Litter.* ubi sup. p. 421, 422, 423.

submit to the consideration of the Royal Society the following short strictures upon it, reserving to myself the liberty of being more explicit and particular on this head in my future dissertation.

1. With regard to the second Citiean inscription, the third letter of the first word is not *Mem*, but *Caph*; as most evidently appears from the autograph itself, now in the possession of the University of Oxford. Farther, that **דמ** ought to be rendered DORMIAM, DORMIO, or JACEO, as M. l'Abbé asserts, had that been the first word of the inscription, as most certainly it is not, we shall scarce be able to learn from any lexicographer.

2. The sixth word of the first line is *Hbur*, *Cbur*, or *Hur*, not *Cbad*, as M. l'Abbé seems to imagine; the last letter of that word being manifestly *Resch*, and sufficiently distinguished by its length from *Daletb*, which occurs twice in the beginning of this line.

3. The term **מעברת** cannot bear a relation to any particular city, town, or country, as our learned antiquary is pleased to suppose; because this would imply, that the sepulchral inscription had only a single person for its object. But this notion is intirely overthrown by the word **נרתו**, in the second line, and **מתו**, in the third; both of which are evidently plurals in construction, and consequently cannot refer to less than two particular persons. Besides, as the most antient inscriptions were probably the shortest and most simple, the age of the monument itself seems to announce a duality of persons at least to have been pointed at by the inscription.

4. I can at present see no reason why M. l'Abbé should suppose this inscription to run in the first person, rather than the third. Perhaps he will say, that the Maltese inscription, as by him explained, affords us a remarkable instance of such an uncommon mode of expression. But this, I humbly conceive, is no reason at all; because in one particular inscription some peculiarities may appear, as is often the case, that in others do not occur. Besides, the postulate he begs, or rather assumes, will, I am persuaded, not be so readily granted him by the learned.

5. M. l'Abbé has added a fictitious *Schin* to the beginning of the second line, not the faintest traces of which are discernible on the stone. Nay, that *Schin* could never have been there, is self-evident, at first sight, from the very face of the inscription.

6. The word **שלום**, PAX, formed, according to M. l'Abbé, of the fictitious *Schin* and the two first letters of the second line, was most certainly never a part of this inscription.

7. He supposes an *hiatus* in the second line, and another in the third; whereas not a single letter is wanting in the inscription, nor any of the words so effaced as to be rendered illegible, by the injuries of time.

8. For the words **מכב, מתי, לאמת, נם, תרה, עלם,** which clearly present themselves to our view in the inscription, he has taken the liberty to insert **על, משכב, שתת, אשתי, מתרת, שלם, בחי,** without the least shadow of a reason for such an arbitrary insertion; several of his letters being purely imaginary, and not the faintest traces of them having ever existed on the stone.

9. The

9. The name TAM, or, as he corruptly writes it, THAM, is taken by him for only part of a word; whereas it is a perfect and complete proper name, as most clearly appears from the face of the inscription, and from some antient writers of good authority, who will hereafter be referred to in these remarks.

10. He has not translated the words גַּם, תָּרַח, עֵלָם, מִכָּב, נַחֲתִי, לְעֵלָם, כִּלְאֵי, מַתִּי, לְאַמֶּת, though they form so considerable a part of this monument; and though a translation of them is so essentially necessary, in order to arrive at a true interpretation of the inscription.

In confirmation of what has been here advanced, I shall beg leave to subjoin a short and concise explication of this inscription; which, I flatter myself, will not be found very remote from truth, as it is consonant to the faith of history, and supported by two or three Greek authors of very considerable note amongst the learned.

It may, however, be previously requisite to observe, that the plate hereunto annexed [TAB. XXV] exhibits the most perfect representation of this monument, both with regard to the magnitude of the stone, and the forms and size of the letters, that can possibly be communicated to the learned world. As the copy therefore now presented to the public is the result of a fresh and most careful examination of the autograph itself, and by me, since the publication of the MARMORA OXONIENSIA, immediately deduced from it; this may be considered as the most accurate transcript of our Citiean inscription, in all respects, that has hitherto appeared.

tion.

q z x q g o y z x
x y z . n . n n | g y z
q z x a r y x l' n r y

1. The first word, אַנַּךְ, ANAC, or ONEC, seems to have denoted the same thing in Syriac (41) and Phœnician that ΟΝΥΞ did in Greek, and ΟΝΥΧ in Latin. But the same species of marble was denominated both ΟΝΥΧ and ALABASTRITES, as we (42) learn from Pliny, and other good authors: It cannot therefore well be doubted, but that אַנַּךְ, ANAC, or ONEC, here may either be translated strictly and literally ALABASTRITES, or be rendered with sufficient propriety by the more general term MARMOR. The Cyprian stone itself, on which the inscription has been preserved, being a fine white alabaster, or perfect ALABASTRITES, puts the point here insisted on almost beyond dispute.

2. I have already given so full and particular an account of the second word עַבְרָאִסְרַ, which is a Phœnician proper name of a man, in my former remarks, (43) that it would be intirely superfluous and unnecessary to take any notice of it here.

3. That the third word, בֶּן, BEN, which occurs afterwards in the first line, is equivalent to the Latin FILIVS, I have (44), in a former work, rendered incontestably clear.

(41) Johan. Buxtorf. *Lex. Chaldaic. & Syriac.* p. 25. Bafileæ, 1622.

(42) Plin. *Nat. Hist.* Lib. XXXVI. c. 7, 8. Lib. XXXVII. c. 5, 6. Hor. *Carm.* Lib. IV. od. 12. Martial. *Epigram.* Lib. VII. ep. 93. Dioscorid. Lib. V. c. 153. Isidor. Lib. XVI. c. 15.

(43) See above, p. 127, 128.

(44) *Inscript. Cit.* p. 22. Oxon. 1750.

4. The fourth word, עבדססם, ABDESVSIM, or ABDESASIM, is another Phœnician proper name of a man, not to be met with in any antient author. If we read it ABDESVSIM, it answers to the Latin SERVVS, or CVLTOR, EQVORVM; if ABDESASIM, (45) to REGENTIVM (viz. DEORVM Mundum REGENTIVM) CVLTOR, or SERVVS. The latter seems to be by far the most eligible lection. Which if we admit, it will seem to follow, that the Phœnician term ססם, SASIM, was sometimes at least equivalent to DII, SVPERI, or rather DII Mundum REGENTES, amongst the Latins.

5. The sixth word, חר, HHVR, or HVR, is also a Phœnician, as well as a (46) Biblical Hebrew, masculine proper name. The first letter, *Hbeth*, here is of a pretty unusual form. I have another Phœnician inscription, never hitherto published, with the very same character in it; of which, if God grants me life and health, I intend to communicate an interpretation to the learned world.

6. The seventh term מצברת, from יצב, ought to be rendered in Latin LAPIS (47) SEPVLCHRALIS. It seems to begin a new sentence, and to be intirely detached from the preceding words. The genuine

(45) Vid. Jac. Gol. *Lex. Arabic.* in voc. ساس, five ססם, REXIT PRO ARBITRIO. Sam. Bochart. *Hierozoic.* p. 16. Franequeræ, 1690. Jo. Leonhard. Reckenberg. *Lex. Hebr.* p. 1072. Jenæ, 1749.

(46) Matth. Hiller. *Onomast. Sacr.* p. 99, 789. Tubingæ, 1706.

(47) Leonhard. Reckenberg. ubi sup. p. 690. Jenæ, 1749. Christian. Stocki *Clav. Ling. Sanct. Vet. Test.* p. 470. Jenæ,

signification of this word is consonant enough to the tenor of the inscription, which will not admit the sense assigned it by M. l'Abbé. The figure of the *Tzade*, which is a very uncommon one, occurs in the inedited inscription I hope hereafter to explain.

7. The eighth word, **למב**, LEMB, or LEMEB, is probably another Phœnician proper name. That it was used as a proper name in Syria, from Josephus is (48) abundantly clear. It occurs also as the proper name of a man in Festus. The substantive **בן**, BEN, FILIVS, does not follow **למב**, LEMB, with the father's name, according to the manner of writing not infrequently seen in the Phœnician inscriptions. But other instances of such an omission (49) as this have been observed, on several of the antient stones found in the ruins of Citium.

8. The verb **״ן** next presents itself to our view, and ought to be rendered VIXIT, according to the Hebrew lexicographers. A suppression of the relative pronoun **אשר**, QVI, is observable here. But such ellipses as this were antiently not uncommon, according to Noldius (50).

9. The following character, though in a manner the same with the Citiean form of *Jod*, is likewise somewhat similar to the Palmyrene numeral character representing TWENTY, (51) and not diffi-

(48) Joseph. *Antiquit. Judaic.* Lib. XIII. c. 15. p. 599. Ed. Hudson. Oxon. 1720. Sex. Pomp. Fest. Lib. XVI. p. 455. Amstelodami, 1699.

(49) *Inscript. Cit.* 17, 21, 23, &c.

(50) Christian. Nold. *Concordant. Particular. Ebræo-Chald.* p. 102. Jenæ, 1734.

(51) *Philosoph. Transf.* Vol. XLVIII. Tab. XXIV. Inscript. III.

milar to one of the equipollent characters used (52) at Sidon. As the word ך, VIXIT, therefore manifestly requires a numeral, I have taken the liberty to translate this TWENTY. The learned world may expect a farther account of this numeral in my future dissertation.

10. The next character sufficiently resembles (53) the Palmyrene form of *Schin*, on a Parthian coin by me formerly explained, as well as in the Palmyrene alphabet. It may therefore pass for that element, though it is somewhat longer; especially, as the Syrians were neighbours to the Phœnicians, and the letter *Schin* here begins a word so consonant to the tenor of this part of the inscription. That word is apparently שְׁנָאָרָה, which comes very appositely after ך ך עֶשְׂרִים, VIXIT VIGINTI, or rather QVI VIXIT VIGINTI. As it appears here in construction, it is a singular; but must nevertheless be translated ANNOS, the genius of the Phœnician language in this respect being probably the same with that of the Hebrew. The *Aleph* is to be considered as a *mater lectionis*, in the term before me; the letters *Aleph*, *Vau*, *Jod*, (54) not infrequently occupying the places of vowels amongst the earlier Hebrews, and consequently, as there is great reason to believe, amongst the Phœnicians also. But of this more hereafter.

11. The Phœnician substantive עֶלְם, as in Hebrew, is undoubtedly equivalent to SECVLVM, ÆTERNITAS, DURATIO HOMINIBVS ABSCONDITA, &c.

(52) *Philosopb. Transf.* Vol. L. Tab. XXXII. p. 805.

(53) *Philosopb. Transf.* Vol. XLIX. Tab. XVIII. p. 593.

(54) Campeg. Vitring. *Observat. Sacr.* p. 186.

It frequently occurs, both in a limited and unlimited sense, in the Old Testament; and accommodates itself, according to (55) Guffetius, to the nature of the subject to which it is applied. Which if we admit, when applied to men, it must denote the term or period of human life. And in this signification it (56) sometimes may be met with in holy writ, as it manifestly is in our inscription. The *Vau* here, in conformity to the Phœnician custom, is suppressed. But for a farther account of this word, recourse may be had to the learned Sontagius, in (57) his dissertation upon the terms עולם and יום, printed at Altorf, in 1695.

12. The Hebrew noun מְכֹאֵב, from whence מְכֹאֵבִים and מְכֹאֵבִי, is deduced from the (58) verb כָּאָב, DOLUIT. By the extrusion of the two quiescent letters, *Aleph* and *Vau*, the substantive becomes מְכָב, (the same in pronunciation with מְכֹאֵב) as it appears in our inscription. Nor is it to be wondered at, that, before the invention of the vowel-points, the quiescent letters should have sometimes been suppressed, as they had in reality no power at all. Instances of such a syncope, or extrusion, as that here observed, are not seldom found in the sacred writings of the Old Testament. And that this was really the case with regard to the word מְכָב, the Chaldee term

(55) Jacob. Guffet. *Comment. Ling. Ebraic.* p. 1160, 1161. Lipsiæ, 1743.

(56) PSAL. LXXXIX. 1. CXIX. 44. & alib.

(57) Christoph. Sontag. in *Dissert. de עולם periodico & יום æterno*, Altorfii, 1695.

(58) Leonhard. Reckenberg. ubi sup. p. 738.

כבא, (59) agreeing perfectly in signification with it, seems incontestably to prove.

From what has been advanced we may conclude, that the Phœnician words עלם מכב, on our stone, are equivalent to SECULI, or VITÆ, DOLORIS, i. e. VITÆ INFELICITER ACTÆ, as I have taken the liberty to render them here.

13. The next word is נחתי, DESCENDENTES, or rather DESCENDUNT, the verb SVNT being suppressed, as amongst the Hebrews it frequently happened to be. The radix of this participle is נחרת, DESCENDIT, a verb well enough known to the Hebrews, but frequently used by the Chaldees; who generally applied to it the signification of the verb ירד, as it prevailed amongst the Hebrews, according to (60) Buxtorf. It must be remarked, that נחתי לעלם כלא ought to be deemed the same expression as לעלם כלא נחתי; the word לעלם having had different positions antiently assigned (61) it in a sentence by the Hebrews, and therefore undoubtedly by the Phœnicians. In the Chaldee several passages similar to this part of our inscription are to be found. So הוה נחתי נוכא, SICVT DESCENDENTES IN FOVEAM sepulchri, occurs, in PROV. i. 12. נחתי ימא, DESCENDENTES AD MARE, in ISA. xlii. 10. And in PSAL. cxliiii. 7. we meet with גוב בירת קבורתא עם נחתי, CVM DESCENDENTIBVS IN FOVEAM SEPVL-

(59) Johan. Buxtorf. *F. Lex. Chald. Talm. & Rabbin.* p. 1001. Basileæ, 1639.

(60) Johan. Buxtorf. *F. Lex. Chald. Talm. & Rabbin.* p. 1330.

(61) F. Mar. de Calasi. *Concordant. Sacror. Biblior. Hebraicar.* in voc. עולם, p. 592-602. Lond. 1747.

CHRI; which seems to be a phrase of the very same import in Chaldee that the נַחְתִּי כְּלָא, DESCENDENTES sunt, or rather DESCENDVNT, IN CARCEREM, of our inscription is in Phœnician. The participle נַחְתִּי, being in construction here, may, however, be considered either as a Chaldee, Hebrew, or Phœnician word. As for the terms לְעֵלָם כְּלָא, IN ÆTERNVM CARCEREM, they are so obvious and clear that they require no farther discussion in this place.

14. The two following words, מְתִי לְאַמְתָּ, with the three preceding, form the third sentence, or part of the inscription. The first of them, מְתִי, deduced from מוֹת, MORI, EMORI, and in construction, is a participle converted into a noun, and may be translated MORTVI, or rather OCCISI, here. In this latter sense it occurs, in ISAI. xxii. 2. It may also be rendered HOMINES, or VIRI INSIGNES, according to Cocceius. But the former seems to be the most obvious and natural signification. The second of these words, לְאַמְתָּ, is undoubtedly the name of Amathus, a celebrated city of Cyprus, that was governed by it's own princes for a considerable period of time. The particle לְ points out the genitive case in our inscription, as it does in the proper names לְצִדוֹן, LETZIDON, לְצֹר, LETZOR, or LETZVR, on the Tyrian and Sidonian coins. The same thing may sometimes be said of this particle, when the word immediately preceding it is in construction, (62) as we find manifestly to be the case here. From the inscription before me it appears, that the Phœnician name of Amathus was אַמְתָּ, AMATH,

(62) Vid. Reckenberg. ubi sup. p. 828.

not חמרת, HAMATH, or CHAMATH, as it has been written by Bochart (63).

15. The next word, נם, apparently to be deduced from the obsolete verb נם, ALTVM EST, ELEVATVM EST, &c. in the infinitive mood נם, from whence נמה, EXCELSVM, may with sufficient propriety be interpreted MONVMENTVM SEPVLCHRALE; as במרה, a word of the same origin, has actually been interpreted by (64) Schindler and Clodius. Farther, נם may be considered as no other term than the Syriac נים, SVGGESTVM, TRIBVNAL (65), TVMVLVS, &c. the excision of *ƒod* being common, as in צון, for צון, and צנם, for צונים, amongst the Phœnicians. Nor is the signification affigned נם here more consonant to the true import of the radix, from whence it is derived, than to the tenor of that part of the inscription to which it belongs.

16. That the Phœnicians wrote the Hebrew word מירה, STRUCTVRA, or rather STRUCTVRA ORDINATA, תרה, and in construction תרת, cannot well be denied; since מירה was no other (66) term than תור, or תר, and it was common with the Phœnicians to expunge *ƒod*, as has been just observed. The verb substantive, in conformity to the Hebrew and Phœnician custom, has been apparently suppressed here.

(63) Sam. Bochart. *Chan. Lib. I. c. 3.*

(64) Val. Schind. *Lex Pentaglot.* p. 171. Hanovizæ, 1612.
Jo. Christ. Clod. *Lex. Hebraic. Select.* p. 72. Lipsizæ, 1744.

(65) Johan. Buxtorf. *Lex. Chaldaic. & Syriac.* p. 54. Basileæ, 1622.

(66) Reckenberg, ubi sup. p. 598, 1563.

17. For **נרת** the Carthaginians wrote **נרת**, without *Jod*, as we learn from the Punic inscription explained in (67) a former paper. And that the Phœnicians wrote this word in the same manner, considering their frequent omission of *Jod*, I see not the least reason to doubt. The Ethiopians in this term most certainly never made use of that element. In our inscription it is to be therefore considered as equivalent to **DOMVS, GENS, FAMILIA, &c.** in which signification it not seldom occurs; sometimes being applied to a whole family, and at other times to a part of a family only, in the (68) sacred writings of the Old Testament. The three last words of the inscription, **תאם נן עברמלך**, **TAMI FILII ABDEMELECI**, are so intirely clear of all difficulties, and so obvious to every one in the least acquainted with antient history, and oriental literature, that it would be superfluous to expatiate upon them here.

It may, however, not be improper to remark, that the use of the proper name **ABD'ALMALEC**, the same with **ABDEMELEC**, was retained by the Arabs long after the first appearance of our inscription. For the Khalîf Abd'almâlec, who succeeded Merwân I. above half a century after the death of Mohammed, departed this life (69) in the year of the Hejra 86, or of **CHRIST 705**. Nay, 'tis more than probable, that the same name prevails amongst the Arabs even at this day.

(67) *Philos. Transf.* Vol. LIII. p. 275, 276.

(68) Reckenberg. ubi sup. p. 130.

(69) Al Makin, Greg. Abu'l Faraj, Eutyck. Ism. Abu'lfed. Ebn Al Athîr, aliique scriptor. Arab.

18. If what has been here advanced should meet with the approbation of the Royal Society, the following Latin and English versions of this inscription, which has so well escaped the injuries of time, may not prove unacceptable to the learned.

אנך עבדאסר בן עבדססס בן חר—מעצבת
 למב ח"י כ שנאת עלם מנב—נחתי לעלם כלא
 מתי לאמת—בם תרת בת תאם בן עבדמלך

MARMOR ABDASARI FILII ABDESASIMI FILII
 HHVRI—LAPIS SEPVLCHRALIS LEMBI (vel LE-
 MEBI) QVI VIXIT VICENOS ANNOS SECVLI DO-
 LORIS (i. e. ÆTATIS five VITÆ INFELICITER
 ACTÆ)—DESCENDVNT IN ÆTERNVM IN CARCE-
 REM sepulchri MORTVI hi AMATHVNTIS (feu
 potius OCCISI hi AMATHVSII)—MONVMENTVM
 STRVCTVRA est DOMVS (vel FAMILIÆ) TAMI
 FILII ABDEMELECI.

THE MARBLE (OR MARBLE TOMB-STONE) OF
 ABDASAR THE SON OF ABDESASIM THE SON
 OF HHUR (OR HUR)—THE SEPULCHRAL STONE
 OF LEMB (OR LEMEB) WHO LIVED TWENTY
 YEARS IN TROUBLE AND SORROW — These
 AMATHUSIANS WHO WERE SLAIN ARE GONE
 FOR EVER TO THE PRISON of the grave—THE
 MONUMENT WAS ERECTED BY THE HOUSE OF
 TAMVS (OR TAM) THE SON OF ABDEMELEC.

Hence it seems to appear, that the names of two
 Amathusians, probably of the first distinction, one
 of whom was unfortunate enough, have been handed
 down

down to us, and perhaps to all succeeding ages, by this sepulchral inscription.

19. It must be farther observed, that this curious monument consists of four short periods; every one of which may, in some respect, be taken for a complete inscription. But this is a property it has in common with other similar remains of antiquity. Thus the Sigean inscription (70) is composed of four such periods, and three are exhibited by the Punic (71) inscription that in a former paper I have attempted to explain.

20. I have hinted above, that the inscription before me is come down to us perfect and incorrupt; not so much as one of its letters having been either lost, or greatly damaged, by the injuries of time. To which I shall now beg leave to add, that the words formed of these letters are, for the most part, distinguished from one another by points, placed between them; which must, in a good measure at least, ascertain the lection here, and of course greatly facilitate the explication. The Etruscans sometimes separated their words from one another by two points, and sometimes by a single one only, as we learn from the Etruscan inscriptions on the celebrated tables of Gubbio, and others published by Sig. Gori, in (72) the learned work referred to, which may be considered as a noble repository of all kinds of Etruscan antiquities. The earlier Greeks also used the first kind of interpunction, as we learn from the

(70) Chish. *Antiquitat. Afiat.* p. 30, 31. Lond. 1728.

(71) *Philos. Transf.* Vol. LIII. p. 279.

(72) Anton. Francisc. Gor. *Mus. Etrusc.* Vol. I. II. pass. Florentiæ, 1737. & Vol. III. pass. Florentiæ, 1743.

Sigean, (73) Teian, and other antient inscriptions. That they likewise applied three points for the separation of their words, on (74) some occasions, tho' more rarely, as well as the Etruscans, is not unknown to those who have been conversant with the antiquities of these nations. I must farther observe, that this minute kind of mark, though generally termed a point, was originally of a triangular form; as may be inferred both from our Citiean inscription, in which some of the minute black triangles plainly appear, and one at least of those preserved by the tables of Gubbio (75), of which so accurate a transcript has been communicated by Sig. Gori to the learned world. That these points are a certain indication of a pretty remote antiquity, is by the most competent judges of such matters (76) readily allowed. How far therefore this interpunction and antient history may conspire, in order to settle the age of the monument under consideration here, I am next to inquire.

Abdemon, the Citiean, one of the Persian (77) monarch's friends, having been expelled Salamine by Euagoras, that prince meditated the reduction of

(73) Chish. *Antiquitat. Asiaticæ*. p. 6, 14, 97, 98. Paul. M. Paciaud. *Monument. Peloponnes.* 207, 209—213, 218. Romæ, 1761.

(74) *Mus. Veronens.* p. 407. Veronæ, 1749. Anton. Francisc. Gor. *Mus. Etrusc.* Vol. III. P. III. T. XVI. Florentiæ, 1743.

(75) Anton. Francisc. Gor. *Mus. Etrusc.* Vol. I. Prolegom. p. 55. Florentiæ, 1737.

(76) Vid. Chish. *Antiquitat. Asiaticæ*. p. 3, 6, 14, 97.

(77) Theopompus in Excerptis Photii, Cod. CLXXVI. *Inscript. Cit.* p. 24—28. Oxon. 1750. Diod. Sic. *Bibl. Hist.* Lib. XVI. p. 447. Isocrat. *Evag.* p. 282.

the whole island of Cyprus; in which, within the course of a few years, he made a very considerable progress. This alarming the Amathusians, Citicians, and Solians, governed then, as it should seem, by their own princes, they (78) made the proper dispositions for opposing his ambitious designs. But not believing themselves able alone to cope with him, they applied to the Persian (79) court for assistance. Artaxerxes Mnemon, who then sat upon the Persian throne, was also himself become jealous of the growing power of Euagoras, and therefore readily entered into an alliance with the three confederated cities against him. To this he was farther excited by the murder of Agyris, king of Amathus, and one of his most faithful allies, of which Euagoras (80) was accused; and by the engagement the three Cyprian states had entered into, to put the whole island, if possible, into his hands. In order therefore to crush Euagoras at once, Artaxerxes sent an army of 300,000 men, under the command of Orontes, one of his sons-in-law, to invade Cyprus (81), in the third year of the ninety-eighth Olympiad, or the year before Christ 386. This formidable army was attended by a fleet of above 300 (82) sail, of which Gaus, the

(78) Diod. Sic. ubi sup. p. 447.

(79) Id. ibid.

(80) Id. ibid.

(81) Diod. Sic. ubi sup. Lib. XV. p. 458.

(82) Id. ibid. The Phœnician name TAM seems to have been written by the Greeks TAMΟΣ, as it is exhibited by a MS. of Thucydides, in the French king's library; and not TAMΩΣ, as we find it written in other manuscripts of that author. This is rendered not a little probable, at least in my opinion, by the Oxford-Citian inscription.

Vid. Thucyd. *De Bell. Peloponnes.* Lib. VIII. c. 87. p. 557. Edit. Duker. Amstelædami, 1731.

son of Tamus, or, as the Phœnicians wrote and pronounced the word, Tam, probably the TAM of our inscription, was (83) admiral. This Tamus is said to have been born at Memphis, and consequently by birth to have been an Egyptian, though he was probably of Phœnician extraction. Being a person of great valour, and uncommon skill in maritime affairs, he first served Tiffaphernes as a naval officer; but was afterwards employed by Cyrus, who rebelled against his brother Artaxerxes, and was killed in the battle (84) of Cunaxa, as chief commander of his fleet. He also had been appointed governor of Ionia by that prince. Tamus was treacherously cut off, with all his family, except his son Gaus, now the Persian admiral, who staid behind in Asia, by Psammitichus, king of Egypt (85), about fourteen years before. Euagoras's fleet of 200 sail was defeated near Citium (86) by Gaus, the son of Tamus, or Tam, with the loss of most of his ships; though Euagoras had, before this naval engagement, gained a (87) considerable advantage over a part of the combined army of Persians, Amathusians, Citians, and Solians, almost immediately after the descent had been made. From this short narrative, extracted from writers of the best reputation and authority, are naturally deducible the following observations.

(83) Id. *ibid.*

(84) Xenoph. *De Cyr. Expedit.* p. 89. Oxon. 1735. Plutarch. in *Artaxerx.* p. 1014, 1015. Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1624.

(85) Diod. Sic. *Bibl. Hist.* Lib. XIV. p. 415.

(86) Diod. Sic. *Bibl. Hist.* Lib. XV. p. 459, 460.

(87) Idem *ibid.*

Three of the Citeian Inscriptions illustrated here. p. 429, 432, &c.

N^o.3. 4 4 7 7 9 7 7
7 7 7 4 4 4
W 9 9 9 9

N^o.21. 4 7 7 4 4 7 4

N^o.23. 4 7 9 9 7 9 7 7
9 0 7 7 7 7 7
9 7 4 9 7 7 7 9
7 7 4 9 7 4 7

1. Tamus, or Tam, probably the TAM of our inscription, admiral of a Persian fleet, and governor of Ionia, was cut off by Psammitichus, king of Egypt, together with his whole family, except his son Gaus, about fourteen years before the commencement of the Cyprian war.

2. Gaus, the son of Tamus, or Tam, admiral to Cyrus, who was killed on the plains of Cunaxa, actually commanded the Persian fleet, and defeated that of Euagoras, near Citium, in the beginning of that war.

3. Part of the combined army of Persians, Amathusians, Citicians, and Solians, was routed by Euagoras, a little before the naval engagement.

4. From what has been (88) intimated by Diodorus Siculus we may infer, that this action certainly happened at no great distance from Citium; as the battle by sea was fought near that place, and as the fleet and army must have acted in concert, both at the debarkation of the troops, and for some time after that event.

5. It must therefore be allowed probable, that the two Amathusians mentioned in our inscription, who seem to have been persons of distinction, were killed either in the aforesaid action, in the naval engagement that immediately followed, or in some other affair that happened much about the same time.

6. The monument recorded by our inscription was probably erected by some of Gaus's family, who might call themselves the house of Tamus, his father, several instances of such an appellation occurring

(88) Diod. Sic. ubi sup. p. 459, 460.

in antient history. This might have happened after Gaus's death, which was about two years posterior to the commencement of the Cyprian expedition. The erection of it certainly ought not to be attributed to Tamus's daughter, as some may perhaps pretend; all that admiral's family, except Gaus, having been cut off with him, (89) by Psammitichus, king of Egypt, fourteen years before.

7. From the preceding narrative we may infer, that antient history, particularly that of Diodorus Siculus, from whence it is chiefly extracted, and our inscription mutually strengthen and support each other.

8. Hence it seems pretty clearly to appear, that the death of Abdafar and Lemb, or Lemeb, the event commemorated by our inscription, preceded the commencement of the Christian æra 386 years; and consequently that this inscription is coeval with those, found likewise in the ruins of Citium, by me some years since explained.

Many things relative to this inscription, for want of room, I am obliged at present to supersede; but these, as well as several other points slightly touched upon here, may perhaps meet with a more particular discussion, in another piece upon the same subject; which, if God grants me life and health, will soon be communicated to the learned world.

As the autograph of the fourth inscription [TAB. XXVI.] does not now exist, having been destroyed by Bekir, bashaw of Cyprus, about the year 1749; we cannot arrive at any degree of certainty, in relation to the

(89) Diod. Sic. *Bibl. Hist.* Lib. XIV. p. 415.

characters of which it was originally composed. Of those, however, exhibited by the transcripts only the last of the first line and the last of the inscription seem to have deviated from their primitive forms. The last character of the first line I can by no means take for *He*, as M. l'Abbé Barthelemy supposes it to be, since it scarce bears a remote resemblance even to his pretended new form of that element. Besides, M. l'Abbé has in effect given up this new form, by allowing that on the coins of Menæ it may be taken for *Mem*. Nor can such an uncouth proper name as תַּרְאָאָמֶה, THARAAME, with three *Alephs* in it, and two together in the middle of it, I believe, be found in the whole circle of Hebrew, Syriac, or Phœnician antiquity. I should therefore rather call it *Tbau*, one form of which it greatly resembles, if part of the curve behind be considered as an accidental addition; which might easily have been made, in the course of so many ages. With regard to the last letter of the inscription, this seems to be purely adventitious, and of a recent date. For Dr. Porter's accurate copy of this inscription, taken upon the spot, which the late Rev. George Drake, M. A. and Fellow of Balliol College, received of Charles Gray, Esq; Member of Parliament for Colchester, and gave to the University of Oxford, exhibits a character resembling the modern form of *Schin*, though made in a very bungling irregular manner. In short it presents to our view not the least appearance of antiquity. Nay, it seems to have been formed upon the ruins of a *Nun*, the upper part of which is plainly visible in this character. I would therefore, with the permission of the critics, read the

last word of this inscription חרן, CHEREM, CHERIN, KEPIN, or KEPTN; which if we admit, together with what has been advanced, relative to the preceding dubious character, we may readily propose to the consideration of the learned world the following interpretation.

תארא אמרת
מלך כיתן
רב חרן

DVCTOR AMATHVNTIS
REX CITII
PRINCEPS CERYNIÆ.

In the first word of the second line I suppose an apocope of the letter *Caph*, on account of the following one; something analagous to this having been observed, as not unusual amongst the Phœnicians, by the learned Bochart, in the origin he assigns the name MELCARTHVS. Nor has M. l'Abbé himself disapproved of M. Bochart's notion. If the liberty of making this and the other slight alterations should be indulged me, and I think it would be no unreasonable indulgence, the inscription would be illustrated by (90) Diodorus Siculus; seem to prove that the Cerynians joined the Citieans, Amathusians, and Solians, in the Cyprian war, though (forming then, perhaps, a much more inconsiderable state than any of the others) they are not mentioned by that historian; and appear to be coeval with the Citiean

(90) Diod. Sic. ubi sup. Lib. XIX. p. 703, 705, 715, &c.
inscriptions,

inscriptions, that have been already explained. A strong presumption this of the propriety, not to say necessity, of those alterations! Nor can I allow the last letter of the second line to be *Lamed*, as M. l'Abbé has been pleased to assert, it being in both the copies brought from Cyprus apparently *Nun*. That the first element of the third line was originally *Koph*, that some words are wanting in the latter part of the monument, and that this part imported **WAS BURIED IN THE MONTH &c.** are notions so extremely singular, however espoused by M. l'Abbé, so intirely unsupported, both by reason and authority, that it would be superfluous to enter upon a discussion of them. But as I have long since largely expatiated upon this (91) inscription, I shall drop all farther particulars relative to it here, and content myself with referring the lovers of Phœnician antiquities to the piece wherein a full and copious explication of it (though I there took for *He* and *Tzade* the characters representing *Jod* and *Thau*) may be found.

IV.

Before I conclude this memoir, it may not be improper to illustrate two more of the Citiean inscriptions [T.A.B. XXVI.], that have hitherto escaped the attention of the learned. Nor will this, I flatter myself, be deemed altogether foreign to the present subject; as those inscriptions may probably throw some addi-

(91) *Inscript. Cit. sive in bin. al. inscript. Phœn. &c. conject.*
p. 15, 16. Oxon. 1753.

tional light upon part of the preceding remarks, and more clearly evince a point of considerable importance, with regard to the true explication of the Oxford inscription, that has been manifestly opposed by M. l'Abbé.

1. The twenty-first of the Citiean inscriptions, which consists only of the two words לֹא־מָמֹן חָל , or לֹא־מָמֹן חָלֵל , had probably lost a *Lamed*, before the autograph itself was destroyed; unless we will suppose the Phœnicians of Cyprus, when it first appeared, to have used even the participle *pahul* itself of the radix חָל , or חָלֵל , in the contracted form. The original Phœnician is equivalent to the Latin *AMAMONO INTERFECTO*, *AMAMONO in acie INTERFECTO*, or *AMAMONI in prælio CONFOSI*, scil. *lapis sepulchralis, i. e. the grave-stone of AMAMON KILLED in war*; which seems to imply, that this Amamon, who was probably an officer of some note, fell in the affair that happened between a part of the combined army of Persians and Phœnicians and a body of Euagoras's troops (92) near Citium, soon after the commencement of the Cyprian war. Whence we may infer, that this inscription is coeval with those I have already endeavoured to explain; that it points, clearly enough, at the same event; and consequently that it brings a fresh accession of strength both to my opinion of the age of those monuments, and also to the authority of Diodorus Siculus himself in the point before us.

As for the Phœnician proper name *AMAMON*, I have formerly expatiated so (93) largely upon it,

(92) *Diod. Sic. Bibl. Hist. Lib. XV. p. 459, 460.*

(93) *Inscript. Cit. p. 20, 21, 22. Oxon. 1750.*

that

that nothing farther relative to this word will be expected from me here. The figure of the *Hbeth*, according to Dr. Porter's transcript, not a little resembles the unusual form of the same element as presented three times by the Oxford-Citian marble to our view.

2. The twenty-third Citian inscription is formed of six words, five of which are evidently proper names. They are ranged in four lines, and may be represented by Hebrew characters thus.

רקים	מצבת
עב	אסיעוא
לאר	דאסר
רכתא	ילא

LAPIS SEPVLCHRALIS RECIMI
 ASIAVÆ AB
 DASARI LAR
 ILÆ RECATÆ

The fifth letter of the second line, which seems to have been intended for *Vau*, is pretty much deformed. This appears from Dr. Porter's accurate copy of the inscription. The original itself does not now exist. I take this character to have represented (94) *Vau*, because it somewhat resembles the Æolic *Digamma*, which answered to that element. The minute strait line preceding the first word is evidently an accidental blemish, and therefore cannot be considered as a letter. This, from its size

(94) Chish. *Antiquitat. Asiat.* p. 17, 19. Lond. 1728.

and position, as well as from the term that immediately follows it, is incontestably clear. The two words forming the first line of the inscription are apparently **מצבת רקים**, LAPIS SEPULCHRALIS RE-CIMI, THE TOMB-STONE OF REKIM, OR REKEM, the latter of which is (95) a Biblical proper name. The third of the proper names preserved by this inscription, ABDASAR, occurs on the Oxford and Maltese stones, and has been already explained; but the others I remember not elsewhere to have seen, nor are they, as I apprehend, to be met with in any antient author. The persons that bore them were probably killed in the action near Citium, mentioned by Diodorus Siculus, referred to on a similar occasion in these remarks, and buried in one grave. That action, as I have formerly observed, preceded the commencement of the Christian æra about 386 years.

The substantive **מצבת**, in the beginning of a sentence, immediately preceding the proper name of a man, not followed by the term **בן**, BEN, SON, and the father's name, appears in this sepulchral inscription, that has more than one person for its object. This word also occurs, attended by the very same circumstances, in the first line of our Oxford inscription. Now in the Citiean monument before me it is undoubtedly equivalent to the Latin LAPIS SEPULCHRALIS, and the English TOMB-STONE. Why then should it not have the same signification assigned it in the other? Most certainly it should. Can any thing therefore be more forced and unnatural than M. l'Abbé Barthelemy's notion of this term in the

Oxford inscription, when he makes it to refer to I know not what obscure town called Tfabeth, the faintest traces of which are not to be met with in any antient writer? A notion this void of the least appearance of authority, and destitute of the very shadow of a reason for its support!

The twenty-third Citiean inscription is also remarkable for the exhibition of a very antient form of *Koph*, and of a pretty unusual one of *Tzade*, resembling the character that represented the same element amongst the Palmyrenes. This likewise sometimes appears upon the Phœnician (96) coins. The figure of *Vau* here seems by some accident to have been deformed, before the autograph was destroyed. It nevertheless bears a sort of rude resemblance to the *Æolic Digamma*, which (97) owed its origin to this letter. As it has deviated, however, considerably from the primitive character, cut at first in the stone; I have not assigned it a place in the Phœnician alphabet, deduced from the inscriptions found amongst the ruins of Citium, and now attending these remarks.

Thus have I finished my remarks upon M. l'Abbé Barthelemy's reflections on certain Phœnician monuments, and the alphabets resulting from them; and endeavoured to rectify some mistakes, that occur in this celebrated performance. How far I have succeeded in my design the learned world, with candour and impartiality, will decide. I have also attempted to explain four of the Citiean inscriptions, in the course of these remarks; and hope the explications

(96) Joan. Baptist. Biancon. *De Antiq. Hebraeor. & Græcor. Lit.* p. 32. Bononiæ, 1748.

(97) Chish. ubi sup.

given, even upon the most critical examination, will not be found very remote from truth. The alphabets deduced from these inscriptions and the Siculo-Punic coins, illustrated here, will, I flatter myself, not a little facilitate the interpretation of other similar remains of antiquity. Nor will M. l'Abbé, for whose superior merit I have a real esteem, find the least reason to complain of any illiberal treatment in this memoir. For as on the one hand, ever averse to flattery, I have delivered my sentiments with a becoming freedom, when I thought myself obliged to differ from him; so on the other, notwithstanding the provocations received from certain authors, I have studiously endeavoured to avoid every thing that might seem to have the least tendency to a diminution of his character, as well as all undue warmth and asperity of expression. Nor am I conscious of having misrepresented him in any one particular. Truth stands in no need of such supports, nay it utterly disclaims them; and truth is considered as the sole object in view here by,

S I R,

Your much obliged,

And most obedient,

Humble servant,

Christ-Church, Oxon.
Nov. 24, 1764.

John Swinton.

The Oxford-Citician Inscription.

𐤀 𐤁 𐤂 𐤃 𐤄 𐤅 𐤆 𐤇 𐤈 𐤉 𐤊 𐤋 𐤌 𐤍 𐤎 𐤏 𐤐 𐤑 𐤒 𐤓 𐤔 𐤕
 𐤖 𐤗 𐤘 𐤙 𐤚 𐤛 𐤜 𐤝 𐤞 𐤟 𐤠 𐤡 𐤢 𐤣 𐤤 𐤥 𐤦 𐤧 𐤨 𐤩
 𐤪 𐤫 𐤬 𐤭 𐤮 𐤯 𐤰 𐤱 𐤲 𐤳 𐤴 𐤵 𐤶 𐤷 𐤸 𐤹 𐤺 𐤻 𐤼 𐤽

The Cyprio-Phoenician Alphabet, deduced from this Inscription.

𐤀 𐤀 𐤀 𐤀 𐤀	Alph	𐤌 𐤌 𐤌 𐤌	Lamed
𐤁 𐤁 𐤁 𐤁 𐤁	Beth	𐤍 𐤍 𐤍 𐤍	Mem
𐤂 𐤂 𐤂	Gimel	𐤎 𐤎 𐤎	Nun
𐤃 𐤃 𐤃	Daleth	𐤏 𐤏	Samech
	He	𐤐 𐤐 𐤐 𐤐	Ajin or Ain
	Vau		Pe
	Zain	𐤑	Tzade
𐤒 𐤒 𐤒	Heth		Koph
	Teth	𐤓 𐤓	Resch
𐤔 𐤔 𐤔	Jod	𐤕	Schia
𐤕 𐤕 𐤕	Caph	𐤖 𐤖 𐤖	Thau