

he was mayor of the town in which the tablet was written would be strengthened.

P. 210. *The Inscribed Weight*.—On reconsidering the question, I have come to the conclusion that the symbols as represented on p. 209 are printed upside down, and that they should be given as  $\mathfrak{Q}|\mathfrak{I}$ ,  $\mathfrak{Q}|\mathfrak{II}$ ,  $\mathfrak{Q}|\mathfrak{L}$ , and  $\mathfrak{Q}|\mathfrak{L}$ . Semitic syntax requires the numeral to precede the substantive in all ordinary cases, and Semitic epigraphy requires the writing to read in the direction from right to left. Both these requirements are satisfied by adopting this suggestion, and the resemblance to the Greek abbreviation, which I still regard as misleading, disappears.<sup>1</sup>

## INSCRIBED WEIGHTS.

By Professor A. H. SAYCE, LL.D.

IN his last report (*Quarterly Statement*, July, 1904, p. 209), Mr. Macalister describes a fresh weight, found by himself at Gezer, with a character upon it which he erroneously identifies with the late Greek cursive  $\mathfrak{B}$ . With this, however, it can of course have nothing to do. It is, in fact, the Cypriote  $\mathfrak{X}$  *ro*, and the inscriptions quoted by him read *ro I*, *ro II*, *ro IV* (?), and *ro VIII* (?). The last (No. 6) is incorrectly given, since the facsimile published in *Excavations at Jerusalem*, p. 267, has  $\mathfrak{Q}|\mathfrak{L}$ , not  $\mathfrak{T}$ . In Cypriote,  $\mathfrak{A}$  has been supposed to represent the numeral V, but it would appear from Mr. Macalister's argument that it ought rather to be IV, unless, indeed,  $\mathfrak{V}$  is IV and  $\mathfrak{A}$  is V. At the same time  $\mathfrak{IIII}$  and  $\mathfrak{IIIIII}$  are found in Cypriote texts. Another Cypriote numeral is  $\mathfrak{+}$ , which Mr. Macalister suggests may represent  $\frac{3}{4}$ .  $\mathfrak{L}$  has not yet been met with in

<sup>1</sup> [Mr. Macalister accompanied his paragraph with a defence of his interpretation of the inscribed weight which we have held over. Now that the amounts of the weights are published, Professor Petrie writes that he fully agrees that the sign  $\mathfrak{B}$  must have another and earlier meaning beside that of *uncia*.—ED.]

Cyprus. It is noticeable that, like the name of the weight itself, all the numerical ciphers denote characters involving the vowel *o*, **⊥** being *o*, **Λ** *ko*, and **+** *lo*. The only exception is **√**, which would be *sa*, if we are not to regard the sign as a form of **Λ**.

The name of the weight is found on Cypriote coins. On one weighing 2.52 gr., and representing, perhaps, the quarter-stater, we have simply *ro* (see de Luynes *Numismatique et Inscriptions Cypriotes*, II, Nos. 10, 16); on another we have *ro-se*, i.e., *rōs*, with *ba-si*, i.e. *βασι*[*λεῖος*], on both sides. This last coin weighs 9.81 gr. (see de Luynes, VI, No. 2), and the form *rōs* prevents us from supposing that *ro* is an abbreviation of the Greek *ροπή* or *ρόμβος*.

In the *Quarterly Statement* for January, 1893, p. 31, I have published a Cypriote inscription of two lines on a weight found under the pavement of Robinson's arch at Jerusalem, and now in the Museum of the Fund. The last character of the line on the front might tempt us to regard it as written in the linear characters of Krete, discovered by Dr. A. J. Evans since my paper was printed, rather than in those of the Cypriote syllabary. But, apart from the fact that the object cannot go back to the age when the Kretan characters were in use, the inscription on the back removes all doubt on the subject. We now know from the excavations at Tell es-Zakariya, Tell Ta'annek, and other places that in the post-Solomonic period Cypriote pottery found an important mart in Palestine, and that intercourse between Cyprus and that country must have been close and frequent. Hence there is no difficulty in understanding how weights with Cypriote inscriptions should come to be met with in Palestine.

---

#### NOTE ON PROFESSOR SAYCE'S COMMUNICATION.

Having been favoured with a proof of the foregoing article, I beg leave to offer the following remarks upon it:—

1. So far from identifying **8** with *ov*, I expressly said that such an identification was untenable (*ante*, p. 210, line 14), and directed my whole argument against an interpretation based on such an identification.

2. The difference between the facsimiles of the sixth weight (not the *last*, but the *last but one*) in *Excavations at Jerusalem*, and in the