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TOY ΣΙΛΩΑΜ—הַגָּנָה IS. viii 6.

Σιλωάμ does not represent Heb. הַגָּנָה through confusion of מ and ט. A careful search throughout the proper names of O. T. has not produced a single instance of מ becoming -א, or, indeed, of final מ becoming -ן. הַגָּנָה would naturally be transliterated as Σιλωάς; cf. Μανως,Νως, &c. I suggest that τοῦ Σιλωάμ represents a Hebrew dual form, either as defectively written or, more probably, as compressed in pronunciation, הַגָּנָה.

The original form of the name, as Isaiah wrote it, was הַגָּנָה = 'the Out-gushing' (גנן has the same meaning)—the spring is intermittent. Isaiah’s phrase, הַגָּנָה ים, 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 SBO T. 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-Hamara’). 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 Silwan', 'Pool of Siloam'), which he made to receive it. At the same time he
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built the dam for the old pool (‘Birket el-Hamrâ’); 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. חניך 2 b.)

See Isa. xxii 9, 11; 2 Chron. xxxii 4, 30 (render ‘to the west side
of the city of David’); Ecclus. xlvii 17. In Isa. 1 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 (ἰσωτερον τῆς κολύμβηθρας τῆς ἀρχαιας).

In view of these engineering achievements, it would not be surprising
if, side by side with the old name ‘Shiloah’ (שִּלוֹאָ), a new dual form
‘Shilohâyim’, shortened into ‘Shiloâh’, 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-Hamrâ’) sank into
disrepute, and the old conduit became, in all probability, wholly for­
gotten. 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 שִׂלּוֹאָה; 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 שִׂלּוֹּאָה, through con­
fusion of ה and ב (as often).

With regard to the form שִׂלּוֹאָה as a dual. That dual forms in בּו and ל (cf. the Arabic ‘Silwân’) existed side by side with forms in בּו, ל, for the same place-names, may be seen from the following
list:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. xxxvii 17</td>
<td>אֵשָׂא ה א</td>
<td>Δωθαμμ A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. xv 5</td>
<td>חֲרָבָּה Mesh. Inscr. l. 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek. xlvii 16</td>
<td>שֵׁשָּׁרָמ B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. xxxviii 14</td>
<td>אֵשָׂא A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. xv 34</td>
<td>(Maasavi B) H'naem A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. i 15</td>
<td>אֵשָׂא B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiv 9</td>
<td>אֵשָׂא B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron. vi 58</td>
<td>(MT אֵשָו, but) אֵשָׂא B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. D.B. iii p. 213 a, footnote (Stenning).

[Another form of the dual was probably יִפְּלֶּשׁ, e.g.
2 Chron. xiii 19 אֶפְרָיו, B
2 Chron. xiii 4 סֹומְרוֹן (or סֹומְרוֹן) B.]

The two forms, יֵפְּלֶּשֶׁת and בֵּית יֵפֶלֶשֶׁת, continued in use side by side:
e.g. Neh. iii 15 MT בֵּית יֵפֶלֶשֶׁת, if this is for יֵפְּלֶּשֶׁת (but LXX as MT): Josephus, סֶלָּה, סֶלָּה, and סֶלָּה: NT סֶלָּה. Luke xiii 4: John ix 7 (interpreted as יֵפְּלֶּשֶׁת): 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, 10½ x 8₂, 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 δαβδαδµ and δαβδαδµ), no iota subscript or ascript, N εφελκ. always before vowels, often before consonants, comma rarely used, the punctum between the ρηματα altered into α + (red ink) by the scribe who added the musical notes, signs of interrogation very rare.