

to have been changed into a quail ($\sigma\rho\tau\upsilon\xi$), and the part played by this bird in the stories of Zeus, Latona, and Asteria has always been a problem; it is ingeniously conjectured that the stories have originated from a philological confusion with the Hebrew $kôrê$, "the partridge," on the supposition that Heracles-Melkart (מלִּיקָרְת) was taken to be connected with קָרְת (= קָרָא) מִלֵּךְ: the ornithological knowledge of the ancients was not above reproach.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

1. *The Acra*.—The new site for the Acra proposed by Sir Charles Watson will stimulate interest in Jerusalem excavations. Josephus, through his statements, at variance with the Bible and 1 Maccabees, has long perplexed topographers. But to try to collocate the Acra on any site once higher than the top of Moriah is to attempt a hopeless task, meet only for Sisyphus.

As objections to the new site are invited, let me tender some remarks. Six conclusions are given as the basis for the site. In No. 3 (*Quarterly Statement*, p. 52) it is implied that the stronghold of Zion was *distinct* from the City of David, while in 5 it is asserted that "the site of these fortresses (named in 4 as the stronghold of Zion, or the Acra of the period of the Maccabees) was *between* the Temple and the City of David." Similarly, in 6, "it (the site of Acra) was north of the City of David."

In the annexed references, however, the Bible states that David (2 Sam. v, 9) and the people (1 Chron. xi, 7) called the stronghold the City of David, while 1 Maccab. i, 33, adds that "Then builded they the City of David with a great wall . . . and made it a stronghold (Acra) for them."

If these statements do not tally with Josephus, then so much the worse for that arch-errormonger.

That the stronghold of Zion was the City of David and the Acra of Maccabees seems indisputable. If to save the face of Josephus the City of David be located on the new site (then, as supposed, higher than Moriah), how would this agree with 1 Kings viii, 1, "bring *up* the ark . . . out of the City of David, which is Zion," into the Temple. We should expect to read *bring down*.

Rev. W. F. BIRCH.

2. *Two Places called Acra.*—I was much interested to read Sir Charles Watson's account in the last *Quarterly Statement* about Acra, although I differ from it. May I be permitted to add my views, in the hope that by every new theory we may come a step nearer the true site, until farther explorations are permitted to be carried on at Jerusalem?

From accounts given by Josephus it appears there were two Acras in the lower city, one west of the Temple and north of the upper city, which was reduced by the Hasmonæans to a less elevation than it was before, that the Temple might be superior to it (Josephus, *Wars*, v, 4, 1).

The other was the fort, or Acra of the Jebusites which David took and called the City of David. Later it became the site of the palace of Helena, the mother of Monobazus, whose palace was in the midst of Acra, or fort (Josephus, *Wars*, v, 6, 1, 3). The Prophet Gad told David to go up to the threshing-floor, and therefore the fort or Acra of the Jebusites, was lower than the threshing-floor or site of the Temple.

The Acra west of the Temple stood no doubt near or at the site where Sir Charles Warren and also the late Dr. C. Schick placed it; whilst the Acra south of the Temple was where the Rev. W. F. Birch also believed it to have been; and so we may get in time more reconciled to Josephus.

J. M. TENZ.

3. *The Apollophanes Inscription.*¹—My contentions regarding the Apollophanes graffito (which I fear I did not express with sufficient clearness) were as follows:—

(1) There are no "doors" between the place of the inscription and the place of the dead, so that the *θυρῶν* of the inscription cannot refer to such.

(2) It is not a formal funerary epitaph, but a graffito. It does not refer to any dead person at all, but to two living, man and woman, and it was cut by them in alternate lines.

(3) Not the last two lines, but the last alone, is of different origin from the rest.

[¹ See above, p. 147.]

I am afraid I cannot follow Col. Conder's rendering of the Greek, as it presents the following difficulties to me:—

(1) Οὐκ ἔχω τί σοι πάθω ἢ τι χαρίσωμαι is a *negative* sentence; "There is nothing I would not suffer or do to please thee" is a double negative, that is *affirmative*.

(2) Φιλοῦσα is *present*; "I who loved thee dearly" is *past*.

(3) Ἐνέχυρον means] "security" in the special sense of a *pledge*, not in the general sense of *safe*.

(4) Ἐγὼ μὲν ἀποτρέχω σοὶ δὲ καταλίπω εὐρυχωρίην means "I run away and leave thee room," not "I am gone from thee and leave room."

(5) Κροῖω means "I knock, tap, strike," not "I hew."

(6) Πνεῦμα means primarily *breath*, then *spirit*, but not *ghost*, the natural word for which would be φάσμα or σκία.

[There are some obvious mistakes in accentuation in the copy of the inscription on p. 56. Οὐκ ἔχω should be οὐκ ἔχω, ἢ τί should be ἢ τι in line 1; ἐγὼ should be ἐγὼ, and δε should be δὲ in line 3. And on p. 61, line 14 from bottom, "anapæsts" should of course be "dactyls."]

R. A. S. MACALISTER.

4. *Carthage and Gezer*.—In a recent description of "Carthage of the Phœnicians in the light of Modern Excavation," by Miss Mabel Moore, an interesting account is given of some of the discoveries made by the White Fathers upon this ancient site, which at once recall similar discoveries in Gezer. In the necropolis of St. Louis was found an amphora containing the skeleton of a child, the head occupying the base whilst the feet touched the orifice. The vase had evidently been broken in order to introduce the body, and the broken parts had subsequently been re-united (p. 82 *sq.*). In another grave, from the niche at the head of the skeleton were found a large vase resting upon an inverted cone, two small short-necked jars, two small phials, and a patera of reddish earth (p. 87). One long funerary amphora contained the bones of an adult and of a child, whilst at the bottom of it were the calcined remains of another child, accompanied by a drinking vessel, a pot blackened by

the action of fire, and a silver ring (p. 103). The model of a duck found at Gezer (*Q.S.*, 1904, p. 217) finds an analogy in a white earthen model of a dove with an arched handle reaching from the tail to the neck; the liquid was poured in at an opening on the tail, and emptied from the bird's beak (p. 111 and figure facing p. 60). A singular feature of the necropolis of *Jebel Khari* was the presence of square and circular cup marks which were found on the surface of the rock above the tombs (p. 122). Finally, an interesting terracotta mask was found which represented the face of a man wearing bronze rings in his ears and a leaden or silver ring in his nose, the latter is analogous to the Hebrew *nézem*, and was evidently an ornament not confined to the female sex alone (p. 142).

S. A. C.
