

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

part of Jerusalem described as the city of David must be that which was afterwards called the Acra.

As I stated in *Quarterly Statement*, 1888, 108, the City-of-David question is really as clear as a sunny noon, and as easy as A B C, until Josephus' guesses at truth are weakly taken to be truth. It is certainly remarkable that generations of writers should, in this one instance in the "Wars," accept Josephus as infallible, and shut eyes and ears alike to all the counter evidence in the "Antiquities," 1 Maccab., and the Bible. Surely it is time to cease doting over one casual observation, and to take in the new idea that Josephus could change his view as well as his side.

W. F. BIRCH.

GIHON.

REFERRING to the Rev. W. F. Birch's remarks on my paper respecting Gihon: (1) I cannot share his view that it is "most unsatisfactory to have to take 1 Kings i, 33, 45, as speaking proleptically." Such prolepsis in connection with names of places is repeatedly met with in the Old Testament. Thus, in Gen. xii, 8, we read that Abraham "pitched his tent, having Bethel on the west and Hai on the east;" although from Gen. xxviii, 19, we learn that the place got its name of Bethel from his grandson a century and a half later. Unless, indeed, there were two Bethels. In 1 Sam. iv, 1, we read that the Israelites "pitched beside Ebenezer;" whilst from 1 Sam. vii, 12, it appears that the place was not so named until many years later. Unless, indeed, there were two Ebenezers. (2) The date of the construction of the tunnel is a point upon which I did not venture to speculate, there being so few data from which to form an opinion. That such "a gigantic work," as Mr. Birch justly calls it, should have been constructed in haste I find it hard to believe, as for the greater part of its extent only two men could have worked at the same time, namely, one at each end. And if relays of labourers were employed so that the work might go on without intermission, a very long time must still have been consumed in completing the task. I am rather inclined to think that Hezekiah's work of stopping the upper outflow and bringing down the water to the west side of the City of David only involved the short side tunnel and Warren's shaft. Perhaps the same king may have excavated the whole canal in the peaceful days, which preceded and followed Sennacherib's invasion. (Ecclesiasticus xlvi, 17.)

THOMAS CHAPLIN, M.D.
