

for this Article, and must draw to a close. Yet we may nevertheless remark, that in the treatment of this subject little account has been taken of the differences of opinion expressed thereon during the past year by various writers, for the reason that much has been written that appeared, not only a little pedantic, usefully so we trust, but premature. Revision has been the task of nearly all those who have labored on the Moabite inscription not in vain. And in the future we shall, it is to be hoped, have a more perfect text, and also learn more of the methods employed to secure the present so-called *fac-simile*. Still the general views of the subject most recently laid before the public, will probably, in the main, be permitted to stand. At the outset a somewhat exclusive advantage was claimed for the inscription by several individuals; and hence Professor Rawlinson insisted upon the paleographical value of the stone at the expense of its historical character, averring that it fell far behind the Assyrian inscriptions in respect to the illustration of Sacred History, and that stones with the cuniform letter, equal in value to the Moabite stone, are being brought to light every year, without attracting any special notice. Yet while no one can easily undervalue the revelations from Nineveh, it is still undeniable that the Moabite inscription asserts its lessons in a peculiarly pointed manner, and that, few as may be its words, they necessitate a revision of a numerous class of cognate educational and philological works relating to the Hebrew language and literature. Accordingly, we believe that no competent critic will be found at last cherishing a desire to take away aught from *any* of the special values now claimed for the inscription, but that scholars and antiquaries will, with a general consent, allow the high and enduring usefulness of its varied peculiarities. And this suggests the importance of keeping in mind the great difference between the Moabite Stone, and that of Marseilles and Eshmunazer. As valuable as may be the latter, they cannot after all be compared with the new-found pillar of Mesha. While the Marseilles slab, and the coffin lid of the Sidonian King, after furnishing valuable material for the compilation of Phœnician grammar, pass into comparative obscurity, the Moabite Stone must hold its place in the practical studies of the Biblical scholar, and form a sort of standard reference on certain questions in theological schools.