

The three letters here quoted are thus the earliest monumental notices of the Hebrews, carrying back our history to the time of the conquest; while Hittite history is carried back even to 1600 B.C. in the annal of Thothmes III.

SOUTHAMPTON,  
16th June, 1890.

C. R. CONDER.

NOTES ON THE QUARTERLY STATEMENT,  
JULY, 1890.

*Identifications.*—Mr. Flinders Petrie says that in fixing ancient sites we have been obliged to “trust to names,” but such a method is not safe by itself. I have often pointed out that ancient remains must also occur. We have trusted mainly to the *form of tomb*, which has now been established in consecutive periods. I regard this as perhaps safer than deductions from pottery, which are apt to mislead.

*Pillar at Tell el Hesi.*—It is important to have a drawing of this. Pillars such as Mr. Flinders Petrie seems to describe were used by the Romans in Palestine. Still the volute was used in Assyria (or in Elam) about 600 B.C., and in later times in Phœnicia.

*Isaiah's Chapel.*—This illustrates the mediæval notice of Isaiah's Tomb (traditionally so-called) by the Bordeaux Pilgrim, speaking of the Kedron Valley: “in unum positus est Isaias Propheta et in alium Ezechias rex Judæorum.”

John of Wirzburg places the Quercus Rogel at Siloam, where Isaiah was said to have been slain. Isaiah's tomb is also mentioned in the “Citez de Jherusalem.”

*Drafted Masonry.*—No monument is known in Phœnicia with such masonry before the Greek period. The old part of the Tyre aqueduct, which is pretty certainly Phœnician work, is not drafted. It is curious that so little is ever said in considering this question of the palace at Arak el Emir, which is described in the “Eastern Survey Memoir.” Here we have masonry very like that of the Jerusalem Haram, dating from 176 B.C.

It is also curious that all writers assume the marks on the lower courses of the temple wall to be Phœnician letters. That Dr. Deutch thought they were so is well known, but when he wrote we knew very little of such matters. The chief group of these markings does not recall any Phœnician shapes, and another mark  $\text{H}$  is certainly not an early Phœnician form. It is the form of the letter  $\text{H}$ , as used about the Christian era, or it might be the Greek  $\text{H}$ . The only other distinct sign,  $\text{†}$  is most like the Greek  $\Gamma$  (*Gamma*). There is not a single clearly Phœnician letter among the marks on the wall. Greek mason letters occur at Baalbek.

*Lachish.*—There is no reason for accepting Umm Lakis as Lachish on

account of name. It is spelt *أم لقس*, and the letter *ق* is the Hebrew *ק*. The place is the *Malagues* of the Crusaders, so that the *M* is not a modern addition. On the other hand, *ק* and *כ* are often interchanged, and consequently *Elhesy* is much closer to Lachish as a word than any other name in the region. Robinson's errors, unfortunately, survive as well as his great discoveries.

*Sun-Birds*.—The sun-birds of Jaffa are mentioned in "Tent-work in Palestine."

*Sutekh*.—Mr. St. Clair seems to forget that we have a statue of this god. He is represented with a head resembling that of an ass, and *Set* was ass-headed, according to the Patristic writers. *Set Ra* also has the *Set* head, apparently of an ass. For this reason I have supposed that the ass-headed god of the Hittite hieroglyphs was Sutekh or Set.

---

### THE GUTTER (Tsinnor).

In Mrs. Finn's identification (*supra* 195) of the "Gutter" (ii. Sam., v. 8) with the great aqueduct under Robinson's arch, two points seem to call for notice.

1. The wall that cuts through the rock-hewn cistern connected with that aqueduct is *Herodian*, not *Solomonic*. In "Jerusalem Recovered," p. 319, Sir C. Warren writes, "A square of 300 feet at the south-west angle I suppose to have been built by King Herod." The cistern is only 150 feet north of that angle, so that only by a misapprehension can it be said to be demonstrated that the aqueduct existed before Solomon built the Temple.

2. Two passages are quoted from Josephus ("Wars" V, iv. 1, and "Ant." VII, iii. 1), and are said to establish the identity of Zion, the city of David, with the Upper City, or Market-place. But if here, in the "Wars," Josephus practically in one instance speaks of the Upper City as being the fortress which Joab entered, still in his later work, the "Antiquities," he *four times* distinctly describes the very same fortress as the Acra; and every reader of the "Wars" will know that the Upper City and the Acra were two distinct hills. It is most unreasonable to suppose that Josephus, who was well acquainted with Jerusalem, should repeatedly in the "Wars" give the existing title of Acra to one hill, and afterwards in the "Ant." give the very same title to the other. To do so would be utterly to bewilder, and not to instruct his readers. If, however, he found out the error of his solitary statement in the "Wars," that "the Upper City was called the Citadel (*φρούριον*) by David," he would, like an honest writer, correct his mistake in his later work.

Again, if here, in the "Wars," Josephus practically places the city of David (in whole or part) on the Upper hill, it must also not be overlooked that 1 Maccab. recognises Acra alone as the site of the city of David, and that in the Biblical passages, in four cases at least out of the five, the