

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## The History and Significance of Carthaginian Sacrifice.

STEPHEN LANGDON, A.M., B.D.

FELLOW IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

**T**RADITION affirms that Carthage was founded about 850 B.C., a century after the separation of Israel and Judah. It is my object to put together and discuss the sources for the study of sacrifice at Carthage from the earliest times to the period of the Punic Wars. The inscriptions and votive tablets from Carthage number nearly a thousand, and yield sufficient material bearing upon the subject to make possible a very adequate account of the Carthaginian sacrificial system.

The Carthaginian sacrificial system affords the only available parallel among the Semites to the sacrificial system of the ancient Hebrews, for it is hopeless to seek such a parallel in the religion of Assyria and Babylonia. That religion, it is becoming more and more evident to students of the subject, derived most of its ideas and institutions from the Sumerians, who from the beginning were completely taken up with mysticism and speculation. Nor is it at all likely that future investigation and discovery in that direction will yield more than occasional points of resemblance to the purer forms of Semitic sacrifice preserved and elaborated by the Hebrews.

It is curious to observe at the outset that primitive stories of human sacrifice are reflected in both the Carthaginian and the Hebrew tradition. The story of Isaac points to a period when peculiar human sacrifice was becoming distasteful to the worshippers of Jahweh, and the idea had gained currency that the sacrifice of the sacred totem animal was a valid substitute for that of a tribesman. On the other hand, the story of Dido's self-destruction points to the notion that the sacred victim must in some way or other be made to slay itself. Moreover, tradition and modern exploration establish the fact that the scene of the first human sacrifice at Carthage was in

a mysterious and awful place outside the city; and the sin sacrifice of the Hebrews was burned 'without the camp.'

The idea that sacred victims might be replaced by victims less sacred was common also at Carthage. Diodorus Siculus says that the Carthaginians attributed their ill luck in battle to the fact that slaves, instead of the best youths of the city, had been offered to Baal-Hammon, the Sun-god. That the Carthaginians carried the practice of human sacrifice to excess, is too well known to need mention. With the numerous references of the Greek and Latin historians should be compared an inscription from Carthage which gives a list of large sums of money paid by prominent citizens in behalf of their sons. This money was doubtless paid to the temple treasury for the redemption of first-born sons.

The designs on the votive tablets from Carthage show a few totem animals: the horse, sacred to Baal-Hammon (*CIS* 186); the sheep (419); the elephant (182). And Justin informs us that the dog was sacred among the Carthaginians.

The extraordinary number of votive offerings in the form of small stone tablets, placed in the temples in memory of answers to prayers or of the fulfilment of oracular promises, shows how markedly the Carthaginians had developed this side of their religion. And when we consider that votive tablets set up in fulfilment of vows are almost unheard of among other Western Semites, it becomes evident that the vow offering was one of the most prominent offerings at Carthage.

The inscriptions which contribute most to our knowledge of the Carthaginian sacrificial system are seven in number, *CIS* 165-170 and 175. I give here a detailed examination of these inscriptions, as they have not thus far been studied with the idea of arranging them in their chronological order and of tracing through them the development of sacrifice at Carthage. From the artistic forms of the tablets conclusions may be drawn which are of assistance in the criticism of the inscriptions themselves.

I discuss first inscription 166, whose importance for the study of comparative religion seems to have been generally overlooked. The inscription gives regulations for the feast of the fall harvest, the Hebrew Feast of Tabernacles. The original of this fragment which was found at Carthage in 1872 is now lost, and only casts and one photograph remain. According to reports it was of white marble, like all the sacrificial tablets of Carthage. If the restoration of this tablet, which is given at the end of this paper, be correct, the

original was about 18 inches wide by 8 high, and contained three columns.

While describing the physical structure of this tablet, it may be in place to note the fact that all the sacrificial tablets from Carthage were made of the same kind of marble, polished on the obverse side only. All of them have a raised edge running around the entire border. They are all about three-quarters of an inch thick. As the regulations of the system grew more complex, the size of the tablets increased. The earliest of the great codes is only 16 by 15 inches, and dates, I should conjecture, from the sixth century B.C. The latest of the codes was much larger and was written upon a tablet more than twice the size of that which bears the early code. A large tablet belonging to the later period, dating perhaps from the third century, was found at Marseilles. A tablet from Cyprus of uncertain date (*CIS* 86 A and B) gives a list of temple dues for the month Fa'alath and Etanim, intended perhaps for the temple of Ashtoreth at Citium, and among the temple beneficiaries is one Abdabastu the Carthaginian; a man whose name is broken away is called the tablet-writer. It is well known that at Carthage a college of priests existed who were called 'the ten men over the sacred things.' It is tolerably certain, therefore, that in the sixth, fifth, and fourth centuries B.C. Carthage was the centre of religious influence in the Western Semitic world. Carthaginian religious laws became the model for the temple cults throughout the West, and priests went out from Carthage to serve at the temples of other nations.

To return to our tablet, No. 166. It has been stated that this tablet contains laws concerning the feast of the fall harvest. It is the only tablet that deals with this subject. It cannot be dated, as there are no other tablets of its kind with which to compare it. Fragments of the second, fourth, and fifth days of the festival are preserved. Enough can be made out of the first column to render certain the main points of the provisions for the second day. The remnant of the column enumerates offerings of grain mixed with oil and a holocaust of a perfect fat goat. It also provides that the priest must dress in fine linen. This sacrifice of the goat at the fall harvest festival is the only certain example of a whole burnt offering among the Carthaginians, excepting of course human sacrifices, which were burned by them as by all Semitic peoples who practised human sacrifice. The whole burnt offering was characteristic also of the Hebrew festivals. Indeed to such an extent was this kind of sacrifice associated with the Hebrew feasts that in the later codes the

meal offering<sup>1</sup> is no longer prominent at any of the great feasts and disappears entirely from the feasts in the Priests' Code.

The offerings for the fourth day were made in the holy chamber and consisted of small cakes, a branch of fruit, a fair fig, and incense. As in the case of the Holy of Holies no animal sacrifices came within the veil. The offering of the branch of fruit is a close parallel to the ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles (*Lev.* 23<sup>34-43</sup>) where a branch of fruit, palm branches, myrtle boughs, and willows were brought before Yahweh and kept there during the seven days of the festival.

Enough can be made out of the provisions for the fifth day to enable us to see that on that day additional fruit and grain offerings were brought into the holy place.

This festival appears therefore to be a harvest feast accompanied by a whole burnt offering which evidently has peculiar significance. The burnt offering was accompanied by an oblation of grain mixed with oil. No reference is made to a perpetual daily offering, nor is there any indication of one even during the days of the festival.

The fundamental code of general sacrifice appears in the Davis Inscription (*CIS* 167). It compares with the elaborate code of the Marseilles Inscription (*CIS* 165) much as the primitive codes of Exodus (10<sup>25</sup> 18<sup>12</sup> and 20<sup>24</sup>) do with the late codes of D, P, and H. Two kinds of sacrifice appear in this code, the whole offering and the common meal offering. The word for whole offering is כָּלִיל, which denotes simply that the victim was made over wholly to the god. It will appear from the regulations of the Marseilles Inscription that part of the flesh of the whole offering was eaten by the priests. The idea then of a whole offering was that the offerer gave the whole victim to the god and the priests, who might divide it according to the regulations of the law on that point. No regulation appears at the time of this early code regarding how much of the victim the priest might eat; it is probable that when the practice of making whole offerings arose, the priests ate all but the sacred parts.

Among the Hebrews, however, the notion of a whole offering is that it must be entirely burned, an idea which comes in only after the idea that it is primarily a gift made over entirely to the god. The word therefore in Hebrew for whole offering is עֹלָה 'that which rises up,' a word which does not appear at all in the sacrificial language of the Phoenicians. But the more simple idea of a whole

<sup>1</sup> The translation 'Peace offering' for שְׁלָמִים or זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים is not used in this paper, the term 'Common meal offering' or 'Meal offering' being substituted for it.

offering of an animal as one made over to the god and his priests, and as something too holy for the layman to eat, but which might be eaten by the priest, appears to have been also the *primitive* notion among the Hebrews. The Carthaginian term כָּלִל appears in Deuteronomy 33<sup>10</sup> as the ancient name of the whole offering, which is displaced in later times by the term עֹלָה; this can only mean that the Hebrew term and practice were once the same as those of Carthage. But the Hebrews soon developed the notion that this kind of offering was too holy even for priests to eat, and so the victim was entirely burned. The circumstance that Carthage maintained the stage of development which the Hebrews passed through and left behind, throws much light upon the history of Hebrew sacrifice.

The list of sacrificial animals of this code is the same as that of the OT. except that the young of deer appears at Carthage. Fowl were in every case a whole offering accompanied by a small tax of two silver pieces. The skin of all animal sacrifices went to the priests. An exception, however, was made of the skin of the sheep. No mention is made of the disposition of the skin of the sheep, and I cannot account for this exception, unless the sheep was an especially tabooed animal whose hide was too sacred to be kept. The sheep is the only sacrificial animal that appears on any votive tablet as a sacred totem animal.

In the case of the meal offerings, the priests received the short ribs and shoulders; the shin-bones and feet and all the rest of the flesh went to the offerer. It will appear from a later inscription that the shin-bones (שֵׁלֶבֶם) and feet (פְּעָמִים) were in no case to go to the altar. One must infer therefore that these parts were considered naturally unclean, as the כִּרְעִים among the Hebrews, who washed the shin-bones before putting them upon the altar. It is this analogy of ideas that has led me to identify שֵׁלֶבֶם with the Hebrew כִּרְעִים. (The etymology of this word שֵׁלֶבֶם will be discussed in the notes.) By thus dividing the victim of the meal offering the ancient notion of sacrifice is emphasized; it is a common meal at which the people and priests commune with the gods.

Along with animal sacrifices provisions are made for taxing offerings of first fruits, baked food, and oil offerings. Following these comes the *minḥa*, in which category were reckoned grain mixed with oil (בִּלֵּל), milk, and other oblations of a similar sort not specifically mentioned. It would seem, from the peculiar way in which the *minḥa* is separated from all other kinds of offerings in the arrangement of the code, that it was to be used on a particular occasion, or

on certain occasions only. Grain mixed with oil occurs in connection with the whole burnt offering of the feast of the fall harvest as already noted ; it may be, therefore, that the *minḥa* was made only with animal sacrifices.

The inscription provides for all cases not in this inscription by referring to a larger written code made by an official commission for sacrifices, a commission which is known from other sources to have consisted of ten men.

This tablet, therefore, is only an excerpt of a much larger code written by the official commission and containing all the regulations on the subject. There can be no doubt that these regulations were as extensive as the Levitical legislation. Indeed so extensive was the written code that only its more important regulations were publicly inscribed in the temples, or transmitted to other cities along the Mediterranean. With what regret must we record the fact that none of this sacred literature of Carthage has been preserved !

The arrangement of the material selected from the mass of written laws and inscribed on this tablet, was followed in all later tablets until the fall of Carthage. The arrangement of the early code is as follows :

- 1st. The date when the laws were passed.
- 2d. Provisions for the sacrifice of an ox, a young steer, sheep or goat, lamb or kid, or suckling deer.
- 3d. Provision that the priest should take nothing at all from a person poor in flocks and herds (which can refer to the meal offering only).
- 4th. Provision for the part of the meal offering which is to go to the priests.
- 5th. Provisions for the non-animal sacrifices.
- 6th. Provisions for cases not included under any of the laws of the tablet. (If 167 can be filled out by identifying it with 169 in its general arrangement, there followed also a list of fines for priests and laymen who violated this law. See the translation of 169 at the end of this article.)

It appears, then, that Carthaginian sacrifice at the period from which this inscription dates was in a stage corresponding to the codes of J and E. The whole offering and the common meal offering were the only ones known at that time. It must be mentioned again, however, that the Hebrews, even at this early stage, had advanced to

a different conception of the whole offering than that maintained by the Carthaginians. The victim was never burned at Carthage except at the great feast, and (owing to the uncertainty of the date of the inscription on the fall harvest already discussed) we cannot be sure that the whole offering was burned during this early period even at the feasts.

The Marseilles Inscription presents a code which has developed many new ideas of sacrifice. Although it followed different lines of development, yet it shows great similarity to the code of P in the Old Testament. This tablet is of the same physical structure and material as the Davis Inscription, but much larger. The original stone must have been 30 inches wide by 16 high. The arrangement for animal sacrifice is identical with the earlier arrangement. But a new kind of sacrifice had arisen in the period between the two codes. Not only do the whole and meal offerings appear, but another is added, called the **שלם כלל**. Attention has already been called to the fact that at Carthage great emphasis was laid upon the making and paying of vows. The verb **שלם** in its intensive form means to requite or pay. Now in the inscription from Citium (*CIS* 86, line 4 of *B*) a great **שלם** is ordered for the lord of days, the deity or genius of the month Fa'alath, to whom this sacrifice is to be paid. The offering is then a *pay offering*, which at Carthage is to be explained as a *vow offering*, made in fulfilment of a vow, a prayer having been answered or an oracle fulfilled. In the Hebrew system the vow offering was a meal offering, in which the offerer shared; but at Carthage it becomes a whole offering made over entirely to the priests. This is to be explained by the increased emphasis laid by the Carthaginians on this part of their religion. The vow offering corresponds in importance to the sin offering of the Hebrews.

Moreover the taxes are altered and greatly increased in favor of the priests. It is here stipulated that a considerable sum of money should be paid to the temple with each animal sacrifice, the tax decreasing with the size of the animal. The priests are also to receive a large portion of the flesh of oxen and calves offered as whole offerings. It is probable that the rest of the flesh of the whole offering was to be burned along with the sacred parts. I conjecture that the early code which does not take up this point about giving part of the flesh to the priests took it for granted that all of the flesh was to be eaten by them. This accounts for the absence of any tax with the offerings of oxen and larger animals in the early code. However, the idea soon grew up that in case of a whole offering at least part of the flesh should

be burned. The law therefore came into force that of an ox the priests should eat **only** 300 pounds and of a young bull only 150 pounds. However, the tax paid in with each of these whole offerings in some way recompensed the priests for the loss of the burned portions.

It is most probable that the flesh of all of the smaller animals, such as the sheep, deer, and goat, which were offered as whole offerings, was to be eaten entirely by the priests. But here the skin is in every case retained by the worshipper. Accordingly money fees are substituted for the skin.

The regulations concerning the offering of fowls evidence the development of new ideas. Fowl could only be whole offerings in any case, as appeared from the study of the Davis Inscription. But in the later code they are used for three kinds of whole offerings, viz., the whole pay offering, the purification offering, and the oracle offering. By whole pay offering I mean the **שְׁלֵם כָּלֵל** or vow offering. The word translated here 'purification offering' is **שִׁטֵּף** which is the same root as Hebrew **שָׁטַף**, Arabic **شطف** 'to wash out.' The regulation for the purification of the leper in Leviticus 14<sup>1-22</sup> is a parallel development. The oracle offering was apparently unknown among the Hebrews; its development at Carthage corresponds to the emphasis there laid upon the vow.

The inscription makes mention of classes of men who must offer sacrifice, enumerating natives, immigrants, and servants of the gods.

The code follows a somewhat new arrangement of details. It places all the sacrifices except the *minha* together, before the regulation concerning the part of the meal offering which the priests should receive. This last regulation was superfluous in any case, for the subject is covered in this code by special laws with regard to each species of animal. This redundancy is a clear illustration of how slavishly the form of the older code was followed. The old code of the Davis Inscription had a special law regulating the portions of the meal offering which should go to the priests. This was necessary in that code, for nothing had been said about it under the head of the regulations for each kind of animal. But in the later code the priests' portions of each was assigned to them under the several heads. However, the early form of the code had a separate rule on this subject, and the religious conscience of the later age compelled it to follow the forms of the fathers. This curious repetition afforded me a clew for the arrangement of the Carthaginian inscriptions in some kind of historical sequence and for dating them with comparative certainty.

The provision for the poor in flocks and cattle is here made to follow the law of the *minḥa*, thus immediately preceding the regulations for fines. The law of the *minḥa* is thus separated from the non-animal sacrifices by the law of the priest's portion and followed by the law for the poor. This brings out the fact that the *minḥa* differed from all other kinds of sacrifice, and did not include first fruits, baked foods, or oil, but only grain mixed with oil, milk, and similar offerings.

A much mutilated inscription, 170, seems to have been still larger than 165. I have restored this inscription as far as possible from the knowledge we have of Carthaginian sacrifice. The original tablet must have been 36 inches wide; it is too badly mutilated for its height to be computed. It adds the interesting information that the feet and shin-bones of the victims were too unclean to be put upon the altar. It also contains minute regulations concerning the disposition of the portions of the meal offering. The meal offering is made prominent by being given the first place in the inscription. It was followed apparently by regulations making possible the redemption of the whole offering by the payment of sums of money. If this interpretation of the inscription be correct, it shows an interesting contrast in the development of sacrifice among the Western Semites. The meal offering became less and less important among the Hebrews, and was thrust into the background by the growing importance of piacular sacrifice, *i.e.* the sin offering. At Carthage, however, the meal offering held its place and in later times increased in favor.

A comparative study of Western Semitic sacrifice brings into clear light many facts in the history of religion. Compared with the other Semitic nations to whom they were most nearly related the Carthaginians exhibit a growing tendency to mysticism, vows, and oracular responses, which may have been caused by their contact with Greece and Rome. Most valuable also for the study of religion is their word for meal offering *צוֹרֵת* (Ethiopic *ጸዕፀ* to call together, to invoke or call upon), the meal for which the people are called together to supplicate the gods. This notion takes us back to the most primitive times when the meal with the gods was the only sacrifice.

It is evident that both Carthaginians and Hebrews at an early time developed the whole offering from the meal offering. This is the only course of development which will explain the fact that the whole offering is really a form of meal offering at Carthage. It was a meal offering too sacred for the layman to eat of, but not too sacred for the priests. This explains also the early Hebrew term *כליל* which was

displaced by **עולה** when the idea of the offering changed. The custom of burning the whole offering seems to have been practised only at the feasts, and it is not improbable that the custom began thus among all Semitic peoples. The notion that it was a piacular sacrifice atoning for the sins of the people at the national gatherings probably afforded the basis for the whole development of piacular sacrifice. We may call to mind the doctrine preached by the Hebrew prophets, that the sin of the individual is the sin of the whole brotherhood. The sins of the people were removed by the great sacrifice at the national festival. The Carthaginians never reached the stage of offering sacrifice for individual sin. The emphasis on the individual and the consciousness of personal guilt are at variance with their conception of the social solidarity of the race.

It also becomes clear by our study of terms how comparatively modern are the sacrificial terms of the Hebrews. The word **עֹרֶת** of the Punic language appears to express nearly the primitive notion of sacrifice. It goes back to the time when the presence of the deity was invoked at the festive board. No trace of this primitive notion remains in Hebrew, for the early term **זבח** merely describes the rite and the later term **שלם** is certainly a theological one, behind which it is impossible to discover the primitive conception.

The historical consciousness of the Hebrews that their laws went back to a great lawgiver appears to find a parallel at Carthage. In the tablet which treats of the feast of the harvest this phrase occurs, "*A branch of fair fruit consecrate thou, and . . . consecrate thou in the holy chamber.*" Unfortunately, too little of this fragment remains for us to determine with certainty whether the Carthaginians acknowledged an early lawgiver like Moses or Lycurgus, but the lines quoted point in that direction. The fragments of Sanchonjathon mention an ancient Phoenician culture hero of letters.

The development of an elaborate code from primitive codes which has long been recognized in the history of the Hebrews is thus seen to have its parallel in the history of Carthage. The Hebrews, on the one hand, starting with the idea of religious communion in sacrifice, develop their system along the line of purification from sin and the maintenance of purity both in the individual and the community. The Carthaginians, starting with the same idea, seem to attach more weight to the promotion of material welfare, by cultivating the favor of the gods with vows and offerings.

NOTES.

I.

CIS No. 166. — (The lines are numbered from the remnants of each column.)

The first letter that can be made out in the right column is ל which is certainly the end of the word בלל, 'grain mixed with oil.' Line 3: לטרת, Ar. شوى roast, Syriac ܫܘܝ holocaust, Eth. ሠወደ be ripe, therefore ሠወደት ripe fruit, the notion coming from heat which ripens grain; accordingly לטרת = for a (whole) burnt offering.

The regulations of the fourth day we observe occupy six lines. Counting six lines from line 1 in the first column, it appears that the next or seventh line did not extend to the left of the column. It is therefore certain that this line began with י' שלש י' third day. Apparently, then, line 1 of the fragment is the first line of the regulations for the first day, although this is of course uncertain, since the regulations for the second day may have been longer than those for the fourth. If the space occupied by the provisions for the third day was about the same as that for the fourth day, this section beginning with the seventh line must have concluded the first column and been continued on the second for three or four lines. According to this estimate the third column, which is entirely gone, must have contained the last one or two lines at the end of the fifth day, and all the regulations of the sixth and seventh days.

Column II. Line 3. קט at the end of the line must be for קטן, which with לחם stands for Heb. חלות small round cakes, used in the meal offerings (Lev. 7<sup>12</sup>).

Line 4. רב at the end is probably from רבך to mix, Heb. מִרְבְּכָה (Lev. 7<sup>12</sup>), a kind of unleavened bread; cf. Ar. رَبَّكَ, and رَبِيكَة a small cake made of dates and kneaded with butter.

Line 6. כמ from כמצם, identical with קמצו handful.

Line 8. שת passive participle of שית; cf. Num. 28<sup>23, 4</sup>. ט at the end to be filled out טשר ten.

Col.	TRANSLATION.
1.	
1. . . . .	
2. . . . .	
?	
a. Upon the second day,	
b. . . . .	grain mixed with oil,
c. . . . .	first fruits,
d. (And ye shall take an) he goat for a burnt offering upon	
e. (the altar, and shall take . . . . .) which is beautiful and fat,	
f. (And the priest shall put on) fine linen and be robed in ?,	
g. (and shall put with the burnt offering) grain mixed with oil and first fruits.	
h. Upon the third day,	
? . . . . .	

COL.  
II.

- i. . . . .  
 ? . . . . . (end of the third day).  
 a. Upon the fourth day,  
 b. A branch of fair fruit consecrate thou (and . . . . .),  
 c. consecrate thou in the holy chamber, and small bread (and cakes mixed with oil shalt thou put with them there).  
 d. Holy things shall be this bread and these mixed cakes (in the holy place. . .).  
 e. And a fair white fig shall thou care to take (for this sacrifice in the holy place),  
 f. and small white incense grain seven handful (thou shalt put with these).  
 g. Upon the fifth day,  
 h. To the fixed regulations for the holy chamber, honey ten (pounds thou shalt add).  
 i. and of . . . . . two hundred pounds and . . . . .,  
 j. and of . . . . . five pounds and . . . . .,

The second column is broken off here.

## II.

CIS No. 167.— [DAVIS INSCRIPTION.]

2. (Concerning an ox, whether whole offering or common meal offering, there shall be) *the skin to the priests and the rejected parts to the sacrificer* (the shin-bones and the feet).

The word תברת is probably to be connected with the root תבר to separate, clean away, therefore 'the parts cleaned away,' removed from the sacred parts destined for the altar; the word is then explained in the inscription by שֶׁלֶבֶם and שֶׁלֶבֶם.

7. Concerning the domestic or wild fowl, it is not stated whether it is whole or meal offering; but whole offering is doubtless understood, in view of the Hebrew practice and of the regulations of the Marseilles Inscription on that point, which last requires that fowl should be a whole pay offering, an oracle offering, or a purification offering.

## III.

CIS No. 169.

Inscription broken from the top as far down as the regulation for the poor, of which but one line is preserved. This is line 6 of 167, to which 169 is similar in size and arrangement. Two reasons may be given for identifying this fragment with the earlier forms of the codes. The language concerning fines at the end of the fragment differs from that of the Marseilles Inscription on that point. In the late code the law of the poor does not occur until after the laws pertaining to sacrifice proper, and just before the restrictions and fines. In this fragment of 169, however, a space for about five lines is left vacant between the regulations

for the poor and the law concerning exceptions. This agrees with the arrangement of the early code, not with that of the later.

- a- 6 on 167. (Concerning the sacrifice which any one shall make) *who is poor in flocks* (not shall the priest have any of it).
- b- 7 on 167. (Concerning domestic or wild fowl, two silver Zer with each.)
- c- 8 on 167. (Concerning every meal offering which shall be brought before the gods, there shall be to the priests short ribs and shoulders.)
- d- 9 on 167. (Concerning all holy first fruits and sacrifice of baked food and sacrifices of oil . . . . .)
- e-10 on 167. (Concerning grain mixed with oil and concerning milk and concerning sacrifices of any oblation and concerning . . .)
- f-11 on 167. (Every tax which is not put down in this tablet shall be given according)
- g-12 on 167. (to the writings of) *the men who were over the taxes* (in the time of . . . . .).
- h-13 on 167. (Whatever priest shall take contrary to this law shall pay a fine of) *ten shekels and give also* . . . . .
- g-14 on 167. (There shall be a fine of . . . and) *a half upon every man who* (withholds the tax laid down in this tablet).
- i-15 on 167. (This was inscribed in the time of . . . . .) *son of Baal-Ames son of Jathon* (Baal the judge and of . . . . .)
- j-16 on 167. . . . .

## IV.

## CIS No. 165. — [MARSEILLES INSCRIPTION.]

3. *Concerning an ox, whether a whole offering or common meal offering or whole pay offering, to the priests ten shekels of silver with each animal, and in case of a whole offering there shall be to them in addition to this tax, flesh of the* (weight of three hundred pounds),
4. *and in case of a common meal offering the short ribs and shoulders, but the skin and shin-bones and feet and the rest of the flesh to the offerer.*

In the division of the animal the short ribs קלרר, Ar. <sup>قصرى</sup> go to the priest instead of the breast <sup>היה</sup>; also both shoulders, יצלח literally limbs, Ar. <sup>مصل</sup>, that is the <sup>שיק</sup> from the shoulder to the knee. The words denoting the parts of the flesh which go to the offerer present difficulties. Both Nos. 167 and 165 assign the שלבם, the שפמם, and the אחרר השאר to the offerer. The last phrase must mean the rest of the flesh. But why distinguish these parts from 'the rest of the flesh'? No. 170 says of שלבם and שפמם that they are not to go to the altar, nor to the priests; evidently they were parts of the animal which were sacrificially unclean. According to Hebrew ritual the ברשים shin-bones had to be washed before being put on the altar (Lev. 1<sup>o</sup> Ex. 29<sup>17</sup>). The root שלב means to join, the noun would therefore mean the part which joins, i.e. the part reaching from the knee to the foot.

5. *Concerning a calf whose horns have come out, which has not yet come under the yoke* . . . . . etc.

The common translation "A calf whose horns have not yet come out, which is uncastrated" is impossible, for the animal must yield a 150 weight of flesh. The text is **למי לם בעל אש קרני לם במהסר באטומטא**. **למי לם** seems to be for **למי**. The letters **באטומטא** are probably an error for **באי קמטא**. In the Hebrew ritual the ox and calf are generally put under one head of **בקר**, cattle. A distinction was made at Carthage because the offering was not all burned, but a certain weight (according to the kind of sacrifice) went to the priests.

The text of the inscription was apparently carelessly copied; **צטר** in line 12 is certainly a copy from **צטר** above it in line 11. **על הלב** is repeated in line 14.

## V.

CIS No. 170. — [FRAGMENT OF THE TOP OF A LARGE INSCRIPTION OF THE LATE PERIOD.]

The first line, engraved in much larger letters than the body of the inscription, indicates that the date and names of the shophets must have been contained entirely in that line. The width of the inscription may be obtained therefore by adding the short second line of the Marseilles Inscription to the first line of that inscription; this would make the first line of 170 about 36 inches long. It is evident then that much has been broken from both the right and left sides. From the fragment of line 2 it is evident that the line contained a provision for the common meal offering. It is impossible that before **שאר**, the first word of the fragment in that line, provisions for the whole offering could have been crowded into the line along with considerable part of the law for the meal offering. The most probable conjecture is therefore that line 2 has to do only with the law of the meal offering of an ox. Inasmuch as the remnant of line 3 deals also with the meal offering it is most probable that this line dealt with the meal offering of a young steer. **ם** at the ends of lines 2 and 3 appears to begin new regulations, giving option as to who should receive portions for the offerer. Perhaps conflicting claims arose when the offerer was unable to consume his share, and the law gave permission to the relatives to partake. The space for the sum of money which the priest is to receive, in line 4, is so large that the sum probably constituted the redemption for the whole offering of an ox. The regulations in this inscription are expanded from the earlier legislation and much of this is new. The **צטר** is put first, and not thrown into the background, as in the Hebrew legislation. The text of 170 may be restored as follows:

1 [בת בעלחמן בעת המשאתה אש כנא האשם אש על] המשאתה עת ר בעלשלך  
 . . . . . [ . . . . . ]  
 2 [באלף צטר יבן לכהן כסף . . . ? וקצרת רצלת וכן אחריי האש] האשלבם  
 . . . . . המעטם אש בל עלם עלת מוכח אם ל.  
 3 [בעל יבן לכהן כסף . . . ? וקצרת רצלת וכן אחריי השאר האשלבם ופמ]ם  
 . . . . . אש בל עלם עלת מוכח אם ל  
 . . . . . לכהן כסף ? ל . . . . .

1. (Temple of Baal-Hammon, the index of taxes which the men over the) *taxes instituted in the time of our lords Baal-Shilek son of Bod-Melkarth son of Shophet and Eshmun* (-Hilleš son of . . . son of . . . and their associates).
2. (Concerning an ox, a common meal offering, to the priest silver . . . and the short ribs and shoulders, but the rest of the) *flesh and shin-bones and feet which must not go to the altar either to* (the offerer or his relatives . . . . .).
3. (Concerning a calf, to the priest silver . . . . . and the short ribs and shoulders, but the rest of the flesh and the shin-bones and) *feet which must not go upon the altar either to* (the offerer or to his relatives . . . . .).
4. (Concerning an ox whole or pay offering, if the offerer desires to redeem it let him pay) *to the priest silver* . . . . . In line 3 it seems that the word *𐤒𐤓𐤕*, or some other word, has been omitted, for the line is shorter than the second line.