

the time of the Hyksos at least. The Phœnician influence in Egypt, before the Exodus, is an established fact generally allowed.

City of David.—I mean no disrespect to those who hold another view, and especially none to H. B. S. W. (by whose corrections I have often profited), when I say that the papers to which he refers seem to me to be inconclusive. I do not see any contradictions in the sentences of mine which he quotes. Perhaps they are obscure. I do not think Jerusalem was as large in David's time as in Hezekiah's, or as large in Hezekiah's as it afterwards became; but I think David's Jerusalem was larger than a fourth-rate Fellah village of our own times. I have expressed no opinions as to the dates of books of the Old Testament, but no scholar supposes the Book of Chronicles to be as old as the Book of Kings.

It is quite possible, of course, that I may be wrong as to the application of the term "City of David," but this remains a matter of opinion in the present condition of exploration in Jerusalem; and I have of late been very fully occupied with matters from which I think results of greater value may spring than would result, even if we all agreed how to understand this much debated term; Elizabeth, Bessy, and Bess (p. 252) are forms or corruptions of one word, but Zion, Ophel, Millo, and Akra do not appear to be forms of one word. Solomon's palace on Ophel was not in the City of David.

C. R. C.

THE MARASH LION.

IN the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology, Mr. Rylands has just given some excellent copies of the Hittite inscription on this lion from the cast in the British Museum. I differ in a few cases from his copy of certain forms, but anyone who has seen the cast will know how difficult it is to make sure of some of the forms on this very crowded text, and the copy, as a whole, is very reliable.

Mr. Rylands seems to regard the text on the left side as the only Hittite text in which the first line begins from the left, but the same is the case in the fourth Hamath stone, which there is every reason to regard as complete, and also probably in one of the texts at Ibreez.

Mr. Rylands does not attempt any decipherment, but it is encouraging to see, in his general remarks, the influence of the publication of "Altaic Hieroglyphs." He says the lion stood at a corner, and compares it with the great Assyrian lion standing close by. He also speaks of "compound emblems" as occurring in the text. These remarks will not, I believe, be found in any other work before my book was published. Mr. Rylands does not allude to the curious "included emblem," which is unique.¹

¹ These "included emblems" occur not only in cuneiform, but also in a good many cases in Egyptian; but in Hittite they seem very rare—another indication of the early character of the Hittite script.

His drawing of a demon head I have verified from the cast and find very correct. Speaking of the emblem accompanying the oft-repeated *altar*, he confuses, I think, two distinct Hittite signs, viz., C, which is usually a suffix, and IC, which is always a prefix. It is the first which is found so often attached to the altar, and which compound I read *Bar-d*, but the altar occurs without this suffix C = *d* (or *ak*), and when alone probably reads *Bar*.

C. R. CONDER

REPLY TO CAPTAIN CONDER'S NOTES ON ZION.

IF silence gives consent, the opponents of Ophel being the site of the City of David are convinced of their error, and it only remains for me briefly to notice Captain Conder's objections in *Quarterly Statement*, 1887, p. 105.

1. He asks, "Is it certain that the words City of David are always used with the same meaning" in the Bible. I answer, without hesitation, Yes, as no evidence placing it elsewhere than on Ophel has yet withstood investigation.

2. He takes "the field of burial of the Kings," "the Garden of Uzzah, near Solomon's Palace on Ophel," to be a different place from "the Tombs of the Kings of Israel," *i.e.*, of David and other kings. Here are several mistakes.

a. The "field" and the "garden" were distinct places. For Manasseh was buried "in his house," or "in the garden of his house, in the garden of Uzzah." This house or palace was that built by Solomon near the Temple (within the "enclosure of Herod's Temple," "Handbook," 340), but "the Sepulchres of David," which Captain Conder (106) takes to be equivalent to this "field of burial," were not only, as he admits, on Ophel, but also between the Pool of Siloam and the pool that was made (Neh. iii, 15, 16), and so certainly not north of the Virgin's Pool. In other words, Manasseh's tomb was at the north end of Ophel, so called, and Uzziah's towards the southern side, so that the two localities were quite distinct.

b. Captain Conder admits that the field of burial where Uzziah was buried was on Ophel, but 2 Kings xv, 7, states that he was buried with his fathers in the City of David. Therefore the City of David was on Ophel, and my position is proved by Captain Conder himself. This mistake of his, which I pointed out six years ago (1881, 95), seems to show that "disputants retain their opinions," probably because they do not carefully examine the evidence bearing on the question under discussion, even to comparing Chronicles with Kings.

But further, Uzziah was buried with "his fathers." As all the kings after David and Solomon downwards to Uzziah, with only one exception,