

"men of Gad" are mentioned as living in the same district—the plateau east of the valley occupied by Reuben. The Reubenites were probably "few in number," while Gad was a strong tribe.

Geshur.—The name of this region near Hermon—now *Jeidur*—has been rendered "bridge," which has no particular meaning. We should perhaps compare the Assyrian *gisru*, "strong."

Shenir was the Amorite name of Hermon (Deut. iii, 9). The Amorites, we now know, were an Aramean people, speaking a language like Assyrian. In Assyrian records Hermon is called *Saniru*.

The Utmost Sea.—It has been proposed to regard this (in Deut. xxxiv, 2) as being the Dead Sea, though the word (הַיָּם הַמִּזְרָחִי) means, properly, "the Western Sea." It appears hardly possible that this term can apply to the Dead Sea in another passage of the same book (Deut. xi, 24), especially as in Deuteronomy the "Salt Sea" is mentioned (Deut. iii, 17), evidently being the Dead Sea.

The Escaped Slave.—The law forbids (Deut. xxiii, 15, 16) giving up an escaped slave to his master. It is interesting to contrast the clause in the treaty of Rameses II with the Hittites, which provides for extradition of such fugitives.

Captivity.—It is not necessary to suppose that the references in the law to a people of strange speech, and to foreign captivity (Deut. xxviii, 49, 68, xxix, 22, 28) refer to Assyrian or Babylonian captivity. The earlier Assyrian raids have been already noticed. Thothmes III, long before the Hebrew conquest, took prisoners and hostages from Palestine. The Cassites in the fifteenth century B.C.,¹ and the Aryans from Asia Minor in the fourteenth, spoke languages which would be unknown to the Hebrews, and invaded Palestine. The Assyrian was a language known to the Hebrews in the eighth century B.C. (2 Kings xviii, 26), and it was only when the Scythians invaded Judah, in the seventh century B.C., that a non-Semitic language was again heard in Palestine. The danger of being carried captive to Egypt "in ships" was great in the time of Moses, but it had ceased to be probable in the time of David and afterwards.

NOTES ON THE "QUARTERLY STATEMENT," OCTOBER, 1898.

By PROFESSOR CLERMONT-GANNEAU, LL.D.

P. 246. *The Inscription of the Crusades and the Arabic Inscription from Jaffa*.—The marble flagstone in question, which is now in Baron Ustinow's collection, was discovered by me in 1874 in the sanctuary of Sheykh Murád. The Latin epitaph and the bishop's portrait on the one side and the

¹ See, for instance, the letter of the Cassite king, Ammi Satana, written in Akkadian ("Records of the Past," New Series, V, p. 103).

Arabic inscription on the other have been printed and commented upon at length in my "Matériaux inédits pour servir à l'Histoire des Croisades" (1875, pp. 29-41), and again in my "Archæological Researches in Palestine" (vol. ii, pp. 152-154). The date of the mediæval inscription is 1258, not 1198; that of the Arabic inscription written on the back is 736—the figure of the hundreds was still in a perfect state of preservation when I saw the original; further, the patronymic of the founder of the mosque, the Emir Jemâl ed-dîn, was still legible upon it.

P. 252. *Greek Inscriptions from Syria*.—I apologise to Dr. Murray for having fathered upon him an incorrect reading, for which, as he justly observes, Professor Porter is responsible. However, he will, I hope, allow me to remark that there was every indication that he himself unhesitatingly accepted this reading, by speaking of the "name of *Zeus Hypsistos* as that of the Deity to whom the altar is here dedicated," and insisted upon the importance of this pretended name which might have been "adopted by Jews as the equivalent of Jehovah." I am glad to see that he has come round to the reading *Megistos*=*Maximus* which I have proposed, and which makes his learned commentary upon *Hypsistos* superfluous. As for the interposition of Σωτήρι between Δι and Μεγίστῳ, I am quite ready to bow to Dr. Murray's conjecture which tends to supplement my own, the more so as he has over me the very great advantage of having the original photograph before him, whereas I have nothing to go upon except the copy of it given in the *Statement*, which is, of course, inferior, nevertheless, after examination, and under reserve of this last observation I must say that I doubt the existence, at the end of line 1, of the two letters **Ω**, on the basis of which Dr. Murray establishes his restoration **Ω**[**ΤΗΠΙ**]: with the best intention in the world, I can only distinguish the curvilinear elements of a **Μ** (*Mu*), identical in form with those of the rest of the inscription, and the initial of **Μ**[**Ε**]ΓΙΣΤΩ. I further think that there would not be room for the eight letters [**Σωτήρι με**] at the end of the line.

I believe that Dr. Murray agrees with me as to the reading Ἡλιοπολείτη in place of Ἡλιοπολεῖων.

As for the mutilated inscription from Jerash, Dr. Murray cannot really be annoyed with me for having informed him of a fact which had escaped him, viz., that the complete copy of this text had been published a year before,¹ and for having remarked at the same time that his restoration was obviously divergent from the original text; in epigraphy it is always interesting to have the opportunity of seeing how far the inevitable part played by hypothesis diverges from or more closely approaches the reality; it is at the same time a controlling influence over the conjectural method to which we all constantly find ourselves obliged to have recourse with more or less success. My remark had no other object; I know by experience that we are all fallible in this respect, and I make no pretensions to being "wiser" than others, either before or "after the event."

¹ The date 1879 is a typographical error for 1897.