

The first begins—

ἐπι σοῦ (= σοί) κ(υρι)ε ἠλπιστα μὴ κατ(αισχυν)ῶμαι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα).
 “O Lord in thee have I trusted, let me never be confounded.”

The second—

† ο κατοικω(ν) ἐν βο(ηθ)είᾳ του υ(ψιστο)υ.
 “Whoso dwelleth under the defence of the most high.”

Possibly some of your readers may have collected similar Christian inscriptions in Palestine tending to show the liturgical or general use of certain psalms.

Faithfully yours,
 JOHN SARUM.

THE NATIVE NAME OF PALMYRA.

THE revised version has given us Tamar for Tadmor (1 Kings ix, 18), but retains Tadmor in 2 Chron. viii, 4. Tadmor in the Wilderness, according to the detailed account of Josephus (8 Antiq. vi, 1) was the later Palmyra, and the name Tamar signifies “Palm,” yet it is allowable to doubt whether the reading Tadmor to which we are accustomed is not the true one, for we have a bilingual text of Herennius, son of Odenathus I, dating about 251 A.D. In the Greek he is called ἑξαρχὸν παλμυρηῶν, and in the Palmyrene רש תדמור. Thus down to the middle of the 3rd century A.D. the Palmyrenes called their city Tadmor. The alteration might therefore very well have been dispensed with, being contrary to the balance of even literary evidence.

C. R. C.

THE MOABITE STONE.

It is much to be regretted that attempts have been made to cast discredit on one of the most important of the monuments of Palestine, and even countenanced by a learned Hebraist, though not by any other scholar. I have not had the opportunity of reading M. Clermont Ganneau's recent paper in defence of the stone, but it seems to me that there can be no two opinions as to its genuineness, for many reasons. It was found before the forgeries of Jerusalem forgers began to multiply, and by a missionary whose character sufficiently attests its genuineness. It is carved on hard basalt, difficult to engrave and heavy to transport, and the worn surface of the stone could only be produced by age.

The cavils are of three classes: 1st, as regards the letters; 2nd, as regards the language; 3rdly, as regards the history of the conquest and the geographical names.

1st, as regards the letters. If the photograph of the stone is placed side by side with that of the stone of Jehumelek, king of Gebal, it will be seen that it presents the same appearance of antiquity. It has been argued that the letters are sharp, and may have been engraved on an old monument by a forger. Such sharpness of incised letters is common on other genuine texts which I have found in ruins. It is due to the mud which fills the letters, and thus preserves them while the face of the stone remains exposed.

2nd. As regards the language, it seems to have been supposed that at so early a date the Moabite should coincide with Hebrew. The objectors have called the dialect Chaldee, and "full of grammatical blunders." It is clear that they have given little attention to Phœnician inscriptions, and have not been acquainted with Assyrian grammar. The Moabite peculiarities it shares with these two dialects, as for instance, **אִי**, "I," as in Phœnician; **זֶה**, "this," Phœnician and Assyrian. The plural masculine is Aramean. The verbal forms to which exception has been taken, as not being ancient, occur in Assyrian. There is not a single objection that has been urged against this inscription that cannot be met by comparison with yet older texts.

3rd. The date given by the objectors for the stone is too early by half a century, and is not founded on any solid basis. The objections are also in some cases due to following the earlier and less correct translations of the stone, and they disappear when more correct renderings are followed. The word *Aral* does not mean a "champion," but an "altar." Whether we are to understand an altar of the god Dodo (well known to the Assyrians as a Phœnician god), or whether we understand by *Aral Dodo* Ariel of David, a town conquered, it is equally certain that the term does not apply to human beings.

Difficulty has been made as to the notice of Machærus in the text. It seems to me very doubtful if Machærus is mentioned at all, and possible grammatically that the word so rendered only means "afterwards."

If a forger had attempted such a work he would probably have written in Hebrew; at all events, he would not have used verbal forms only known in Assyrian, unless he was himself a good scholar. Nor would he have invented the peculiarities of the alphabetical forms on the stone, which are of the greatest value, or the name Istar-Chemosh, which preserves the old Akkadian form *Istar* instead of the Biblical Ashtoreth, another most important note of antiquity.

It will be highly interesting to compare the newly-found Aramean text of Panammu with the Moabite Stone. Language and lettering alike will then be elucidated further, for the text shortly to be published is even older than that of King Mesha. Meanwhile, it may be asserted with confidence that the genuineness of the stone is only disputed by those whose monumental studies are not far advanced, and who forget that Moabite is not Hebrew.