

of southern Moab as reliable as that which we possess for the northern part.

In conclusion, I must draw attention to the way in which Professor Brünnow's results have revolutionised our knowledge of the tributaries of the Mōjib and of the wadies which combine to form at el-Kerak the Wady el-Kerak. Hitherto the latter have been supposed to rise far to the east of el-Kerak, near the Ḥajj road. But Professor Brünnow has proved the existence of a high ridge immediately to the east of Kerak, and the rise of the Kerak wadies to the west of this and south of el-Kerak; and shown that the northern tributaries of the Mōjib extend east of el-Katraneh and the Ḥajj road, and far south over the plateau to below the latitude of el-Kerak.

Professor GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

Correction.—On p. 282 the reference to the "holy fire" should read, "Under the date April 21st, 1101 (Easter Day), we read that, in consequence of the non-appearance of the 'holy fire' on Easter Eve, the Patriarch," &c.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

1. *Remarks on the Gezer Tablet.*—It will be admitted that the personal names in this tablet can be read in various ways; and they perhaps add to the indications.

The date being 649 B.C., and the name of the Assyrian eponym for the year being as yet unknown in Gezer, it seems impossible that the expression *Bel Pikhati Bar Khalši*, "Local Governor of Bar-Khalšu" can apply to the official succeeding *Assur-dur-ušur*, as no one could say if he belonged to that place.

This title therefore would seem to stand alone, as meaning "The local ruler is the ruler of Bar Khalši." If this be admitted, the local ruler would appear to be specified as having his head-quarters at Beer-Khalši, which might be very well Eluša, south of Beersheba. This would represent an Assyrian province in the lowlands of Palestine, extending from the borders of Egypt to Gezer.

In the obverse (line 5) we have the signs (in their original language) GUM-UKU-MES. AL-RI AN-AA. Dr. Pinches has probably reasons for rendering this "slaves" (*GUM-UKU-MES*), but I should have supposed the natural meaning to be "natives" of

the place. The first of these was AL-RI AN-AA. The divine name AA (as Dr. Pinches himself has pointed out) often stands for *Yah, Yahu*, or Jehovah, and also—according to others—for *Malak* or *Melech* “King”

It will be admitted that the sign AL (or TU) very often in Akkadian stands for the causative of the verb, and that RI has the meaning of *nadu* “to present.” So that, taken ideographically, AL-RI might be read in Hebrew *Nathan*.

If this is admitted, the name, provisionally rendered Turi-aa, may really be read *Nathan-Melech*. This we know as a historical name among Hebrews, rather earlier than the date of the Gezer tablet (2 Kings xxiii, 11). We have also Nethaniah (2 Kings xxv, 23).

C. R. CONDER.

2. *Remarks on the Gezer Tablet.*—A word of comment upon Colonel Conder's interesting notes and queries may be allowed. The scribe of the Gezer Tablet might have known that the next eponym must, in the course of a regular rotation, be the *bél pahāti* of Bar Ḥalši, though he did not yet know his name. It is not necessary, however, to resort to such an explanation; for the title was not given by him to the unknown eponym, but to Ašur-dūr-ušur himself. He was the *šaknu* or *bél pahāti* of Bar Ḥalši, as recorded on No. 533 of my *Assyrian Deeds and Documents*.

It is not clear what Colonel Conder reads *GUM-UKU*, but *nīšē* is the accepted rendering in such a connection. The meaning “people” may be taken, if by a man's “people” we understand the whole of his household. A man is often said to be sold “with his people,” and these included slaves as well as closer relations. As to the name *A-A*, which Professor Jensen would read *Aya*, it was once the name of an independent divinity (Jastrow's *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 74). In process of time this divinity became subordinated to Šamaš, at any rate in the religion of Sippara. That resulted in his losing his sex, and becoming merely a consort, or “face” of Šamaš, and as such feminine. In this form of the cult the divinity *A-A* was called *Malkatu*, that is, she was the Queen of Šamaš. It is a long step to argue that when masculine and independent *A-A* was called *Malik*. That may be true, and there certainly was a god *Ma-lik*, whose name occurs occasionally, at all periods. There is no evidence that he

was identified at any period with the divinity *A-A*. On the other hand, the signs *AN-A-A* occur in the Assyrian period so frequently, and in such connections, that it is simply impossible to suppose them to denote any separate divinity. They must be read *ilai*, that is, phonetically not ideographically. They interchange with *ili*, and either represent a verb, such as *ili'*, "is powerful," or the like, or else they are a way of writing *ili*, "my god." The difficulty of the latter view is that we should have to make *Tûri-lai* mean "*Tûr* ('Rock of Ages' ?) is my god," which seems less likely than "my rock is strong." As for Colonel Conder's reading *AL* in place of *TU* it is very unlikely. Further, it is not easy to see how Nathan could be derived from *nadu*. The cuneiform writing corresponding to Nathan is *Natanu*.

With these small criticisms we may feel grateful for the illuminating suggestions and identifications proposed by Colonel Conder.

Rev. C. H. W. JOHNS.

3. *Note on Objects in the Government Museum at Jerusalem.*—When in Jerusalem last July I had the pleasure of spending a day assisting His Excellency Makridi Bey to arrange the antiquities displayed in the Museum, and made the following notes:—

(1) *The Zakariya Jar-handle* (see above, p. 211).—I examined the stamp on this handle with great care, and satisfied myself that there is no inscription upon it, the characters between the angles of the pentacle being purely conventional.

(2) *The Table of Oblations with Greek Inscription from Tell el-Hesi* (Bliss, *M.M.C.*, p. 104).—I took a rubbing of this inscription, a facsimile of which is subjoined. It seems to me rather too formal

A P H E B A L

to be a mere graffito, and I do not think it is so archaic as has been suggested. It is not easy, however, to see any meaning in it. The horizontal stroke at the foot of the last letter does not belong to the inscription, but the loop at the head, whatever it may signify, seems intentional.

R. A. S. MACALISTER.