

to Horonaim, (the men of Edom) dwelt therein (from of old). And Chemosh said to me, Go down, make war against Horonaim and take it. And I assaulted it and took it, and) Chemosh (restored it) in my days. Wherefore I made....."

The story told by Mesha and the account given in the Bible supplement one another. Mesha delivered Moab from the yoke of the Israelites during the reign of Ahaziah, the successor of Ahab, and Joram, Ahaziah's successor, was subsequently driven out of Jahaz. It was at this moment of national victory that Mesha erected the monument recording his success. Then, however, the tide of fortune turned, Joram summoned his allies from Judah and Edom, Moab was ravaged, and Mesha besieged in his capital at Kirkha. In his despair he sacrificed his eldest son upon the wall of the city; "and there was great indignation against Israel; and they departed from him and returned to their own land."

The chief interest attaching to the inscription in our eyes, lies, perhaps, in the language and characters in which it was written. The language is almost exactly the same as that of the Old Testament, and shows that the dialect of Moab differed much less from Hebrew than does one English dialect from another. The very phrases recur which the Old Testament has made familiar to us, and at times we might fancy that we were listening to a chapter of the Bible. The characters, too, in which the text is written, belong to a form of the Phoenician alphabet

which must have resembled very closely that used by the Jews. We may thus see in them the mode of writing employed by the earlier prophets, and correct by their means the corrupt readings which the carelessness of copyists has allowed to creep into the sacred text.

A. H. SAYCE.

N. B.—The imperfections of the stone necessitating parenthesis is due to a dispute with the Arabs about it which first led to its being broken into pieces. Most of the fragments have been recovered and fitted together.—*Bible Light Stand.*

Words of Warning.

In our investigations after truth much care and caution is requisite as to the accepting of the various opinions of different writers whose works we may be perusing. We should, in the first place remember that none of the historians or literary critics of our day are inspired or hold the faith of the Apostolic churches, at least in its fulness and purity, and therefore all their writings are sure to be more or less marred by deficiencies, either in not accepting enough or accepting too much.

The only writings now in existence, in any degree pure, are the Hebrew Scriptures, commonly known as the "Old Testament"; but as these have been translated into our language by men whose minds were prejudiced by false dogmas, these scriptures have been made in many places to reflect the ideas of the translators, rather than the views of the originals, and with the different books of the (so-called) New Testament, the case is much worse, for