

TOY ΣΙΛΩΑΜ—חַשְׁלָה ISA. viii 6.

Σιλωάμ does not represent Heb. חַשְׁלָה through confusion of פ and ב. A careful search throughout the proper names of O. T. has not produced a single instance of פ- becoming -αμ, or, indeed, of final פ becoming -μ. חַשְׁלָה would naturally be transliterated as Σιλωε; cf. Μανωε, Νωε, &c. I suggest that τοῦ Σιλωάμ represents a Hebrew *dual* form, either as defectively written or, more probably, as compressed in pronunciation, חַשְׁלָהּ.

The original form of the name, as Isaiah wrote it, was חַשְׁלָהּ = 'the Out-gushing' (חַשְׁלָהּ has the same meaning)—the spring is intermittent. Isaiah's phrase, חַשְׁלָהּ מִי, refers to the waters of the *Spring* ('Gihon', 'The Fountain of the Virgin', 'Birket Sitti Maryam') as brought by the (old) conduit to the (old) pool, and not to the waters as in that *Pool* itself (see Cheyne *SBOT*: Isaiah Engl. p. 143).

When Isaiah 'went out to meet Ahaz' (Isa. vii 3), that king was engaged in hurriedly superintending the making of new waterworks for the supply of Jerusalem. These were intended to supplement, or perhaps entirely to supersede, the existing Shiloah supply, and were at the opposite extremity of the city, that is, at or near the north-west angle of the walls. 'The waters of Shiloah', at that time, were brought by the *old* conduit (discovered by Schick, see *PEFQS*. 1891, pp. 13-18) to the 'Old (or, "Tower") pool' ('Birket el-Hamrâ'). This old conduit was a serious danger to the defences of 'the city of David': it was also liable to be cut, or tampered with, by a besieging force. Isaiah, however, not only deprecated the king's panic in face of 'these two tails of smouldering firebrands' (v. 4): he supported the claims of the Shiloah-supply.

Afterwards, it may have been by Isaiah's advice and with his co-operation, that Hezekiah carried out his extensive alterations and improvements in that supply. Briefly stated, what Hezekiah did was this: he stopped altogether the existing upper outflow of the Spring of Gihon ('Fountain of the Virgin'), probably also covering in and protecting the spring itself. In place of the old conduit (thus rendered useless) to the old pool, he brought the water by means of the new conduit (famous for its inscription) to the new pool ('Birket Silwân', 'Pool of Siloam'), which he made to receive it. At the same time he

built the dam for the old pool ('Birket el-Hamrá'); which pool of course henceforward yielded in honour to the new pool with its wonderful means of supply, but at the same time served a new purpose as a reservoir for the surplus waters. (In plans of Jerusalem the 'Upper' and 'Lower' 'Pools of Gihon' have nothing whatever to do with the Biblical 'Gihon', 'Fountain of the Virgin'—see *BDB.* גִּיחֹן 2 b.)

See Isa. xxii 9, 11; 2 Chron. xxxii 4, 30 (render 'to the west side of the city of David'); Ecclus. xlvi 17. In Isa. l. c. LXX's variations should be specially noticed. There is obvious confusion in the Greek, but it is not difficult to see what the translator, or the Hebrew scribe whom he followed, understood to have happened; e.g. 'they had diverted the water of the old pool into the city . . . and ye made for yourselves a water between the two walls, further inwards than the old pool (ἐσώτερον τῆς κολυμβήθρας τῆς ἀρχαίας)'.

In view of these engineering achievements, it would not be surprising if, side by side with the old name 'Shiloah' (שִׁלּוֹחַ), a new dual form 'Shilohayim', shortened into 'Shiloham', came into use as applied to the *two pools*. The dual significance, however, would in process of time pass from the name, as the old pool ('Birket el-Hamrá') sank into disrepute, and the old conduit became, in all probability, wholly forgotten. The name, 'the Pool of Siloam', thus remained as belonging to the new (upper) pool only. Such, I suggest, was the history of this word.

The Greek translator, accordingly, would have used the dual form, as the form of the name familiar to him. But it is also possible that his Hebrew text already contained השלחם; for this would have arisen easily, especially during a period when it was the usual, and therefore the expected, form of the name, from MT השלח ההלכים, through confusion of ה and ם (as often).

With regard to the form השלחם as a *dual*. That dual forms in ם־ and ם־ (cf. the Arabic 'Silwân') existed side by side with forms in ם־, ם־, for the same place-names, may be seen from the following list:—

רתן	Gen. xxxvii 17	Δωθαεμ A
רתניה	"	"
חרנים	Isa. xv 5	חורני Mesh. Inscr. l. 31
סברים	Ezek. xlvi 16	Σεβραμ B
עינים	Gen. xxxviii 14	Aivan A
׃	עינם	Josh. xv 34 (Maivai B) Hvaeμ A
		Num. i 15 Aivan B
׃	חצר עינן	" xxxiv 9 Αρσενεμ B
		1 Chron. vi 58 (MT עַיִן, but) Aivan B

{	קרייתים Num. xxxii 37	Καριαθαμ B
	קרייתמה (בת) Ezek. xxv 9	
	קרתן Josh. xxi 32	קרייתן Mesh. Inscr. l. 10

also perhaps

וחצור ויתנן Josh. xv 23 Ασπιριωναι B
(? יתנן = יתנין, 'two perpetual springs').

On such dual place-names, the dual significance being, in many cases, disputed by some authorities, see Ges.-K. (2nd Eng. ed. 1910) § 88 c: Hast. *DB.* iii p. 213 a, footnote (Stenning).

[Another form of the dual was probably וַיְ—, e. g.

עפרון (בת) 2 Chron. xiii 19 Εφρων B

עפרין (קר) „ Εφραιμ John xi 54

צמרים 2 Chron. xiii 4 Σομορων (or Σομορων) B.]

The two forms, שִׁלְתָּ and שִׁלְתֶּם, continued in use side by side: e. g. Neh. iii 15 MT בִּרְכַת הַשִּׁלְתָּ, if this is for הַשִּׁלְתֶּם (but LXX as MT): Josephus, Σιλωά, Σιλωᾶς, and Σιλωάμ: NT Σιλωάμ Luke xiii 4: John ix 7 (interpreted as שִׁלְתָּ): Jerome, *Siloe*.

H. W. SHEPPARD.

EVST. 234

(Scrivener: 227.)

THIS beautiful MS of xii-xiii cent. was given to Sion College, London, by Mr Edward Payne, but nothing is known of its previous history or place of origin. It consists of 247 leaves of vellum of varying thickness, $10\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, 2 columns, 19 lines of about 12-14 letters each; two or more leaves are missing, of two only the corners are left, in some places the leaves are mended and the missing words supplied in a late hand, two leaves (241 and 242) are in later (Scrivener: xvi cent.) writing, several leaves are displaced in binding.

The writing is large and very clear, in brownish ink, titles and musical notes in red, fair illuminations in gold at the beginning of each section, a few corrections (probably p.m.), a few marginal notes in black ink by a late scribe, complete system of accentuation, but some mistakes, also mistakes in aspiration (e. g. both ἀβραάμ and ἀβραάμ), no iota subscript or ascript, Ν ἐφέλλκ. always before vowels, often before consonants, comma rarely used, the punctum between the ῥήματα altered into a + (red ink) by the scribe who added the musical notes, signs of interrogation very rare.