

Reproduced from the Library of the Editor of
www.theSamaritanUpdate.com
Copyright 2011

THE NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE,
AND
JOURNAL OF THE NUMISMATIC SOCIETY.

EDITED BY
JOHN YONGE AKERMAN,
FELLOW AND SECRETARY OF THE SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES OF LONDON.
VOL. XIV.
April, 1851- January 1852
LONDON:
JOHN RUSSELL SMITH, 36, SOHO SQUARE.
M.DCCC.LII (1852)

LONDON:
PRINTED By J. WERTHEIMER AND CO.,
FINSBURY CIRCUS.

(p. 89) XI.

THE USE OF THE SAMARITAN LANGUAGE BY THE JEWS UNTIL THE REIGN
OF HADRIAN, DEDUCED FROM THE COINS OF JUDEA.

Cork, July 28th, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR,

I HAVE to apologise to the Numismatic Society, for soliciting their indulgence, and calling their attention, not so much to a Numismatic subject, as to the consequences of a Numismatic subject, to the evidence afforded—and, in my mind, to the proof established—by the Samaritan inscriptions on the coins of Judea, that the Jews did *not* change their language and character of writing during, or on their return from the captivity at Babylon; but that they retained the use of the Samaritan character, and consequently language, certainly down to the reign of Hadrian, when we lose sight of them as a nation.

When we call to mind the really astounding ignorance and popular delusion which exists even at this moment in England, as to the supposed "only three farthings of Queen Anne," and their consequent priceless value, we should be very indulgent to a similar ignorance and misapprehension so generally, existing among Biblical scholars — men most deeply learned indeed in all the depths and obscurities of the sacred and deceased *languages* of the East, but totally uninformed, and practically unacquainted, with the *coinage* of the East; as an instance of which, I may refer to a letter of the celebrated author of a Chronology of the Bible, the late Rev. Dr. Hales, of Killesendva, in Ireland, dated Jan. 14th, 1819, in reply partly to one of mine, (p. 90) on a so-called " Hebrew medal" of our Saviour, in which I maintained that the Samaritan language had continued to be used by the Jews after their return from Babylon, which Prideaux states to have

been in the year 536 before Christ; that coinage commenced in Judea with Simon Maccabeus, 143 years before Christ, and that the inscriptions on the coins were in the Samaritan character; those purporting to be Jewish coins, with the square or Chaldaic characters, being, comparatively, modern forgeries.

For these opinions, Dr. Hales pronounced me ignorant and presumptuous; and asserted that " the silver shekels of David and Solomon's reign are as exquisitely beautiful in their engraving, and elegance of the sacred character, as they are genuine;" that "the Samaritan character was a ruder imitation of the beautiful *sacred character* on the ancient coins;" and that "the Samaritan rude character was supplanted by the elegant Chaldee after the captivity and before the time of Christ," pages 40 and 41. "A Short Memoir of an Antique Medal, 1819."

On this I may notice, that according to the chronology adopted in our authorised version of the Bible, the reigns of David and Solomon extend from the year 1055 to 975 before Christ; while the earliest Greek coin, that can be certainly and positively assigned, is to Alexander the 1st of Macedon, whose reign commenced about the year 500 B.C., and that there is not any coinage of the native, or Pharaonic sovereigns of Egypt, whose rule extended down to 525 B.C. How great, then, the absurdity of supposing that a people so low in mechanical ability in the reign of Saul as to be without smiths (I Sam. xiv. 19), and obliged, in the reign of Solomon, to hire Tyrian workmen to build "the temple," whose dimensions were only 105 feet in length, 35 feet in breadth, and 52 1/2 feet in height, yet coined money (p. 91) centuries before the Greeks; an art which even their neighbours, the builders of the pyramids, never attained to.

As before noticed, the Jews returned from the captivity of Babylon B.C. 536, and Judea remained a province of the Persian empire, and then of the Macedonian, until the Maccabee family, by their valour and policy, recovered the liberty and independence of the kingdom, B.C. 143, when Simon Maccabeus was chosen high priest and sovereign of Judea by the people, and was also so acknowledged by Demetrius II., King of Syria, Judea having been part of that kingdom, in the partition of the empire of Alexander the Great on his death; and Antiochus VII., the successor of Demetrius, when confirming his brother's treaty with Simon, adds—" I give thee leave, also, to coin money for thy country, with thine own stamp" (Maccabees xv. 6), a convincing proof (if any doubt existed on the subject) that the Jews never had been allowed to coin money by their Persian or Greek masters; the privilege of coining in the East, then as now, indicating the supreme and sovereign power. Our own East India Company, until very lately (in William IV.'s reign), coined most of their money in the name of the Great Mogul; and Mohammed Alee Pasha, and his successors in Egypt, have coined only in the name of the reigning Grand Seignor.

From Prideaux I have compiled this view of the rulers of Judea, of the Maccabee and Herodian families.

MACCABEE FAMILY.	HEUODIAN FAMILY.
MATTATHIAS, B.C. 168	ANTIPATER, Procurator of Judea. B.C. 47
JUDAS MACCABEUS, B.C. 166	HEROD, his Son, Governor of Galilee. B.C. 47
JONATHAN MACCABEUS B.C 161	HYRCANUS deposed, and AN TIGONUS, younger Son of Aristobulus, made King of

	Judea by the Parthians, B.C.40
SIMON MACCABEUS, 1st Prince. B.C. 143	HEROD the Great declared King; of Judea by the Roman Senate, B.C. 40
JOHN HYRCANUS, 2nd Prince. B.C, 135	Established as King by the capture of Jerusalem B.C. 37
(P. 92) ARISTOBULUS, 1st King. B.C. 107	ANTIGONUS, at the solicitation of Herod, put to death by orders of Mark Antony B.C.37
ALEXANDER JANNEUS, 2nd King. B.C. 106	HYRCANUS put to death by Herod, B.C. 30
ALEXANDRA, Queen. B.C. 79	ARCHELAS } Succeed HEROD ANTIPAS } Herod, PULIP } their Father.
HYRCANUS, for three months 3 rd King. B.C. 70	
HYRCANUS, restored by Pompey, B.C. 63	

The independence of Judea being acknowledged by the King of Syria, by Greece, and by Rome, as also the election of Simon Maccabeus by the Jews, as their high priest and prince three hundred and ninety-three years after their return from the captivity in Babylon, we are informed in the 1st Book of Maccabees, xiii. 42 — "Then the people of Israel began to write in their instruments and contracts, in the first year of Simon the high priest, the governor and leader of the Jews."

And on the coinage, which, in the exercise of his sovereign power, Simon now struck, the dates are from the era of the Jewish freedom. I believe that they are only in silver and copper; I am not aware of any in gold. The silver coins are shekels and half-shekels; the copper coins are about the size of our halfpence and farthings; how denominated I am ignorant. The type of the silver coins is generally, on the obverse, the pot of manna; on the reverse, Aaron's rod budded. One variety has, obverse, a building, which Bayer, page 145, considers to represent the monument that Simon erected at Modin, to the memory of his father and brothers (see 1 Maccabees, xiii. 30); reverse, a thistle. The copper coins are much more abundant than the silver, (p. 93) and have a great variety of types —the pot of manna, a vine leaf, bunch of grapes, palm tree, citron tree, and fruits detached and in baskets; and in Bayer's 6th plate, No. 3, is a copper coin, having, on the obverse, a lyre with three strings; reverse, a palm branch within a wreath. The dates given by Bayer, page 171, are " First," "Second," "Third," "Fourth year." Thus, obverse, "Shekel of Israel, year one;" reverse "Jerusalem the Holy." On another, reverse, "The redemption of Israel, year one." Another, obverse, " Simon;" reverse, "Liberation of Jerusalem." Another, obverse, "Simon, Prince of Israel;" reverse, "redemption of Israel, year," etc. In his sixth plate Bayer gives coins in silver and copper, having on them the name of Simon, but without any year or date. All these coins have their inscriptions in the Samaritan character; and these characters only are used on the coins of the succeeding princes of the Asmonean family. John Hyrcanus (Bayer, page 190), Alexander Janneus and Aristobulus (Bayer, page 202), until you reach the last reign, that of Antigonus (who, it is to be remembered, was placed on the throne of Judea, by the Parthians, whose coins bore inscriptions in the Greek language). Of this prince, Bayer, page 183, gives a copper coin,

obverse in Greek characters, "Antigonus, the king;" reverse, in Samaritan characters, "Hyrcanus, the high-priest."

Herod I., or the Great, as he is usually called, was an Idumaeen. Idumaea was conquered by John Hyrcanus, B.C. 129, and the inhabitants were obliged either to quit the country or profess the Jewish religion. Herod may, therefore, have been no Jew at heart and in belief; and, owing his elevation to the throne to the decree of the Roman Senate, through the influence of Mark Antony and Octavius, policy and probably inclination led him to adopt (p. 94) names and customs complimentary to the power by which he was upheld in Judea. When he rebuilt Samaria he called it Sebaste, as also another city which he built, Csesarea, in honour of Augustus. The Jewish coinage was assimilated to those of the neighbouring dependencies of Rome, by having Greek inscriptions on both sides, and types apparently borrowed from the coins of Syria and Macedon. All the Herodian dynasty continued the Greek inscriptions, and the latter princes added the busts of the reigning emperors of Rome. On some of the coins of Agrippa II. we have the tabernaculum, or umbrella, the Eastern type of royalty, inscription, "Basileus Agrippa." The antiquity and permanence of this type is curious and interesting. Mr. Layard's discoveries at Nimroud shew it as the indication of sovereignty, at least B.C. 1250. We find it again at Persepolis, in the time of Darius Hystaspes, B.C. 521. It appears on a rupee which I have of Shah Allum, coined at Delhi A.H. 1218, A.D. 1803, and on a papal "Sede Vacante" coin, A.D. 1829, a period of more than 3000 years from the Nimroud sculptures.

We now come to the reign of the Emperor Hadrian, when a rebellion was raised against the Roman power in Judea, headed by a Jew named Simion or Simeon Barchochab (Simon, son of the star). And a number of Greek and Roman (more I believe of the former than of the latter) coins, of the preceding Emperor, Trajan, restruck, and now bearing Jewish types; and inscriptions with the same Samaritan characters, as are on the coins of Simon Maccabeus, and the other Asmonean princes, but with traces of the imperial types and inscriptions, remaining visible and legible. These coins are described by many writers; but I shall refer only to Bayer, pp. 237, 238, and Supplement, 13-17. And to Eckhel, "Doctrina Numorum Veterum," (p. 95) vol. hi., pp. 471-477, where the various specimens are fully described, and the cabinets in which they were are specified. I pass them by, however, to come to one of the actual coins, which is within our reach and examination, being in the British Museum, and as more satisfactory and decisive on the question. It is a silver denarius of the Emperor Trajan, which bore his bust on the obverse, inscribed "Trajano, Aug. Ger. Dae. P.M. Imp.;" and on the reverse was the figure of Arabia, with a camel standing close to her on her right, over which Arabia extends her arm, holding in it a branch, possibly of palm, with this inscription, continued from the obverse, "Cos. v. P, P; S P, Q. R. Optimo Princ."

On the obverse, the coin now bears a bunch of grapes, with the word, in Samaritan characters, " Simion." All the back part of Trajan's bust, the ribbon and neck remain distinctly in outline. On the reverse are two trumpets, and in Samaritan characters " Lacherut Jerusalem," or "Liberation of Jerusalem;" the arm of Arabia, palm branch, and head and breast of the camel, remain visible in outline; and the coin is, as to its Jewish type and inscriptions, in the very finest preservation.

These details establish as facts that, 393 years after their return from captivity in Babylon, or B.C. 143, the Jews first coined money under a ruler, who, being of the house

of Aaron, combined in himself the offices of high priest and Prince of Judea, after a bloody war, by which they had preserved their religion, and recovered their independence as a nation. That the types of this coinage were Jewish and sacerdotal, with inscriptions in the Samaritan characters, allusive to their newly-acquired freedom, and the person and family by whom they had been guided in the arduous contest. That these Samaritan inscriptions continued to be used on their coinage until the Asmonean family were destroyed by a foreign, and, probably, Pagan dynasty, the Herodian, who brought in Greek types and Greek inscriptions.

That about A.D. 130, or perhaps rather earlier, the religious enthusiasm which had raised the nation against the Syrians, drove them into resistance against their Roman masters, and a coinage is struck with inscriptions again Samaritan, and with types again national, and allusive to their then circumstances; for as Moses (Numb, x.) had commanded two trumpets to be made to summon the Twelve Tribes of Israel to their civil and religious duties, so Bar-cochab places two trumpets on the coinage, now to summon the Jewish nation to a warfare, for their religion and their lives. In this warfare he failed, and A.D. 134 Bethor, or Bethoron, after a siege of three years, was taken by the Romans, and Bar-cochab and his followers were all put to the sword. "In this war 580,000 lives were destroyed" (*Sephardim, by Finn, page 35*). The consideration of these circumstances, I may repeat, convinces me that the Jews did not change their language, or its character, during their captivity in Babylon. That on their return the Samaritan was the national language and character, and continued so down to their final dispersion as a nation, by the Emperor Hadrian, A.D. 134; and, as we naturally cling, in adversity, to what has been our pride in prosperity, the probability is, that for centuries afterwards, the dispersed and wandering Jews continued to speak and to write in the Samaritan of Israel and Judea.

It has been (literally as I think) *assumed*, by some learned men, and taken by their unlearned followers as a matter-of-course-fact, that the Jews lost their Samaritan writing and language during their captivity of seventy years; and (p. 97) adopted, on their return to Judea, the language and writing of Babylon, which is further *assumed* to have been the Chaldaic, as we now understand it, with the square or Hebrew character. But I have never seen any proof adduced, nor do I believe that any can be given. The only shadow that might give rise to such a suspicion, that I am aware of, is in Neh. ix. 7, 8; but remember also that this occurred 103 years after their return from Babylon, when, on Nehemiah's second coming to Jerusalem, he found the people and the priesthood assimilating to their pagan neighbours; and, among other reformatations, he had them instructed in the law of Moses. "And the Levites caused the people to understand the law, and the people [stood] in their place. So they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused [them] to understand the reading."

I take this transaction to have been analogous to our Church Catechism, or other commentaries, or the instructions given by the clergy to the young and the ignorant of their congregations. And we are afterwards informed that the people rejoiced "because they had *understood* the words that were declared unto them" (ver. 12).

The seventy years' captivity of the Jews is considered to have commenced when Nebuchadnezzar carried away King Jehoiachin and ten thousand of the nobility and superior classes to Babylon. But the nation at large remained eleven years longer, when, on Zedekiah's rebellion, Jerusalem was burnt, and Judea left desolate. This, therefore,

reduces the residence in Babylon of the larger portion of the people, to rather less than sixty years. Bearing these circumstances in recollection, the probability is, that most of the Jews who returned to Judea, under the decree of Cyrus, were the children of those taken captive by (p. 98) Nebuchadnezzar, or, at the furthest, grandchildren, brought up at the knees of those captives, and by them taught and instructed in the language, laws, and religion of Sion, now doubly dear to the exile and the slave. And, as the tottering infant clung to those knees for support, or stood by them, in holy wonder, listening to the account of the glories of that temple, now no more! and of the loveliness of that land of milk and honey, of the vine and the pomegranate, which the speaker could never hope to see again, how bitter may have arisen, in the soul of many an ancient, the feeling and the sad conviction, that for his idolatries and other transgressions, while in Judea, against the ordinances of Jehovah, and the warnings of HIS prophets, this innocent and helpless child was an outcast from Israel; and heathen lords had dominion over him.

We know, from Ezra iv. 12, that some of the captives taken by Nebuchadnezzar returned to Jerusalem, and were present " when the builders laid the foundation of the temple of the Lord" in the second year of their return. The prophet Daniel, who is supposed to have been carried captive to Babylon with King Jehoiachin, was living in the first year of Cyrus, in which year Cyrus issued his decree, allowing the Jews to return to Jerusalem.

Now, as human nature is essentially the same at all periods, we may ask ourselves what would we most likely do if captives in a foreign land, but fully believing that, as a nation, we were to return to our native land at a certain and appointed time? The prophet Jeremiah having announced to them that " the captivity " was to end in seventy years, the answer, I think, will be, .we should learn the language of the country in which we were captives, for our own convenience; but we should continue the use of our own language, and anxiously bring up our children, (p. 99) born there, in the knowledge and practice of it. Is not this the custom and practice of the Jews, all over the world, at this present moment? They speak and write the language of the nation in which they happen to reside, but they also retain the knowledge of the Hebrew, and use it only in their religious services and books, and private conversation; though now without any definite idea of any return, as a nation, to Judea; nor, indeed, so far as my limited intercourse with Jews enables me to judge, have they the slightest wish to quit England for Judea.

Very different, however, on this subject, were the feelings of the Jews when captives in Babylon, as may be seen by the prophet Daniel's prayer, when he considered the period of seventy years drawing to its close (Dan. ix). Read also Ps. cxxxvii., "By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion," where to the bitterness of exile is added the still deeper bitterness of retributive vengeance against their captors. "O daughter of Babylon who art to be destroyed, happy (shall he be) that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy (shall he be) that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." And so conformable to that of the nation must this feeling have been, and so perfectly justifiable must it have been considered, that the composition was admitted into the sacred canon, and consequently formed part of the service of the subsequent temple at Jerusalem. People so feeling, and wanting only the opportunity of so acting, would never give up their own language for that of those whom they so detested.

These were my views of this subject in 1819, since which the publication of the researches of Rich, Porter, Botta, Layard, and Rawlinson, have thrown a flood of light over it, and strengthened probabilities into certainties. At (p. 100) Nimroud we find existing evidences that, from a period of at least 1250 B.C., which we can follow down to the overthrow of the Persian empire, by Alexander the Great, B.C. 330, " the cuneiform or arrow-headed character, appears to have been in general use in Assyria and Babylonia, and, at various periods, in Persia, Media, and Armenia." No other character of writing is met with on the buildings, sculptures, and bricks, at Nineveh or at Babylon; consequently, had the Jews changed their language and character of writing, at Babylon, they must have brought home the cuneiform or arrow-headed. This strikes me as quite decisive of the question, for no one has yet dreamt of the arrow-headed character ever having been used in Judea. Had the Jews adopted at, and brought home from, Babylon, the language and characters which we now know to have been spoken and written by Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, that is the arrow-headed, Layard, Rawlinson, and Hincks, would not have been puzzling their brains to decypher the records disinterred at Nineveh and elsewhere, after their sleep of 3000 years. They would have been in the present mother tongue of Rabbi Adler, and the synagogue of St. Mary Axe, Loudon; and, by this time, we should probably be as well informed of the building of the Tower of Babel as we are of that of the Temple of Solomon.

I shall now ask those who assume that, in a captivity of seventy years at farthest, the Jews *must* have changed their language,—what became of the language which Jacob and his family took down with them into Egypt, which we know differed from the Egyptian, as Joseph, while assuming to be a native of the land, spoke to his brothers through an interpreter. When the children of Israel went up out of Goshen, whether their residence there was 215 or 430 years (or, as more probably, a yet longer period), if they (p. 101) had changed their language, they could only have substituted the Egyptian for it. And as Moses was learned in all the wisdom of Egypt, they would have transplanted even the sacred hieroglyphic characters into Palestine; and in them Moses would have recorded his annals of the world. Then, where and when could they have got the Samaritan, which they certainly took with them to Babylon?

It is generally, and I think with every appearance of reason, supposed, that the copy of the Book of the Law found in the house of the Lord by Hilkiah the high-priest, and by him sent to King Josiah, was the autograph copy, deposited by Moses in the ark of the covenant; and this book Shaphan, the scribe, read before the king. It was therefore in the language and character of Judea, thirtysix years before Jerusalem was burnt by Nebuchadnezzar, the Samaritan.

I may further ask, when the children of Israel had established themselves as a nation, by the conquest of Palestine, why should they have changed from the Egyptian, had they brought that language into Canaan? To shew that they may have preserved (as I believe they did) their language in Egypt, take an analogous case in our own kingdom. It is now more than 500 years since our Edward I. conquered Wales, but the Welsh is still a living language. In the land of Goshen the Israelites formed a nation by themselves, and, like the Welsh, were under foreign dominion; yet, as the Welsh have done, so may the Jews also have preserved their own language, though in the house of bondage, their prison-house, in the land of Shinar.

Return we now to the fact, that coinage first commenced in Judea, 393 years after their return from Babylon; and, reverting to the suggestions of common sense, what were they likely to do? And what should we ourselves do, were (p. 102) we to commence coining, for the first time, A.D. 1851? If the Jews had ceased to use the Samaritan character and language in Babylon, why should they place it on their coins four centuries afterwards? They could have no value for what they had voluntarily abandoned; and, had they abandoned the Samaritan in Judea, it must have been voluntarily, as they were free agents as to the language they used there. In 1851 we surely should not go back either to old English or to Saxon for the inscriptions on our first coinage. We do indeed continue the absurdity of Latin inscriptions on English coins; but then, childishly silly as our conduct is, we only copy the folly of our forefathers. In this day we should never originate anything so hopelessly stupid as to engrave an inscription, which is to give information, in a language totally unintelligible to 99 persons out of 100, by whom that information is presumed to be required, and for whose edification it is placed on the coin.

Also, when we consider the types and terms placed by Simon Maccabeus upon his coins, they all appeal to the national and religious feelings of the moment; and common sense and common policy would imperatively suggest their being conveyed to the people in the clearest manner, which could only be in the common vernacular language of the country; and, as the inscriptions are in the Samaritan character, I have always felt assured that Samaritan was the character in use. We find the Samaritan inscriptions continued to the coins of the last descendant of Simon Maccabeus, King Antigonus, B.C. 40.

The change of inscriptions by the Herodian sovereigns, from Samaritan to Greek, was clearly state policy, and, consequently, does not infer any change of language in the nation. But when the nation again became intensely, fanatically, and entirely Jewish in their uprising against the (p. 103) Romans, under Bar-cochab, as their ancestors had been under the Maccabee family against the Syrians, the same policy appeals to the same feelings, and with Jewish types and in Samaritan characters, the coins of Bar-cochab declare to the Jewish nation " The liberation of Jerusalem" under the banner of another "Simon." All the motives which induced Simon Maccabeus to address the people, through the coinage, in the clearest and most intelligible mode, must have pressed infinitely stronger on Barcochab. Simon had brought the nation through its struggle of life and death, and had then only to keep alive the feelings that had upheld them in the conflict; while Barcochab, like the prophet Ezekiel in his vision of the valley of dry bones, had to re-create and re-animate the dead. Jerusalem and the temple had been more than sixty years reduced to ashes, and the very foundations of Sion had at the same time been ploughed up by Titus. It was not the mere official imitation and continuance of an established, though senseless custom, like the Latin inscriptions on the English coinage, for it was now 170 years since money had been coined in Judea with Samaritan inscriptions. If, therefore, the Samaritan character and language had not continued to be the national character and language of the people, what inducement could Bar-cochab have had to make use of it on the coinage, the types and inscriptions on which were addressed solely to the political and religious feelings of the Jews: while to the Romans they were as so many standards and declarations of rebellion? His object was to raise the people in arms, and he made the coinage one mode of addressing them; but this he could only do by addressing them in their common, vernacular, and everyday tongue. We have the proof in the many Greek and Roman coins of the Emperor Trajan, which have come

(p. 104) down to us with the types and inscriptions of Bar-oochab, that he made this address to his Jewish countrymen in the Samaritan character and language: and to me this appears clear and decisive proof that in the reign of the Emperor Hadrian, A.D. 134, the Samaritan continued to be the written and spoken language of Judea.

Numismatists are sometimes asked, of what utility is their pursuit?

My answer is, that coins are national records, and frequently enlighten the darkness of national history; and if the view which I have taken of, and the inferences I have drawn from, the Jewish coinage, are correct, the coins of Judea prove that the Jews brought back from Babylon the same language they used when led into captivity, and retained the same when they were finally expelled from the land of Judea by the Emperor Hadrian.

Believe me to remain, my dear sir,

Yours truly,

RICHARD SAINTHILL.

J. B. BEKGNE, ESQ., etc., etc, *London*.

POSTSCRIPT.—While this paper was in type, having- referred to Mr. Akerman's Numismatic Illustrations of the New Testament, I find that he assigns this coin to Archelaus, a son of Herod the Great, the inscription being "Ethnarch," which title Archelaus obtained from Augustus, whereas his father's titles were, first, " Tetrarch" and then " King;" and I think Mr. Akerman's correction of its previous appropriation, cannot be disputed. Mr. Akerman mentions coins of King Herod with the helmet and Macedonian shield. He has also engraved one of King Herod's coins, having on one side a helmet between two palm branches, and over it a star (a most remarkable type, as Mr. A. remarks, when the great event of the first Herod's reign is taken into consideration): on the other side of the coin is, apparently, an altar with the fire kindled.

Comments on this section from the Editor of theSamaritanUpdate.com

This reference is #4186 located in *A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Third Edition, Revised, Expanded, and Annotated*, by Alan David Crown and Reinhard Pummer, ATLA Bibliography, No. 51, **The Scarecrow Press, Inc.** Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford. 2005