

south) it passed "over against the sepulchres of David," and went on to "the pool that was made," i.e., the present Pool of Siloam. This sweep to the south seems improbable, until we consider (1) that the object was to rebuild the wall of Jerusalem (ii. 17), and not simply to make a fortification; and (2) that the wall here, like that from the dung gate, probably needed but few repairs. After turning north, the wall was continued apparently on the line of Manasseh's *outer wall* "without the city of David on the west side of 'Gihon' in the valley" (nachal) 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14 (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, 182).

That this later wall was the one repaired by Nehemiah seems to be the true explanation of the strange fact that the wall now rebuilt, instead of embracing as part of itself such points as "the armoury" (iii. 19); "the turning of the wall and the tower," &c. (25); "the water gate and tower" (26); "the great tower" (27) only passes "over against," i.e., "opposite to" them. This expression "over against" is used ten times in Nehemiah iii.; eight or nine times it obviously and necessarily refers to objects *within* the wall. One seems forced therefore to admit that in the remaining cases or case (iii. 15) it has the same reference, and therefore "over against the sepulchres of David" means that they were *within* the wall (see below).

26. As the "gutter" (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, 184) may have been made when the stronghold of Zion was constructed, the water gate need not have been near the Virgin's Fountain, as stated in *Quarterly Statement*, 1877, 202.

27. Here we seem to join the wall of Ophel (? = the swelling) near K, which word seems to denote that part of the hill where the narrow ridge (of Zion) swells out to the east as we approach the Haram Area.

28. The horse gate probably was near the south-east corner of the latter (Jer. xxxi. 40, corner).

29-31. The wall may have gone north *exactly* on the present line. The massive wall, however, mentioned in Jerus. Rec., pp. 156-7, offers a suitable course, bending west to the sheep gate, to complete the circuit.

31. The place of the Nethinims (Νηθιναιιμ) is perhaps referred to in 1 Macc. xii. 37. "The wall toward the brook on the east side was fallen down, and they repaired that which was called Caphenatha" (? corrupted from Cephar Annathinim = village of the Nethinims). The gate Miphkad (i.e., of the appointed place) was evidently on the east of the temple, and near it "the bullock of the sin-offering was burnt in the appointed place (Miphkad) of the house, without the sanctuary" (Ez. xliii. 21).

W. F. BIRCH.

NOTE ON THE TWO POOLS.

A. The Virgin's Fountain is certainly Solomon's Pool (Jos. W., v. 4. 2), and so may well be the King's pool (Neh. ii. 14). As the valley here is narrow, it is not strange that Nehemiah could not go up on his beast

through the ruins, by *the brook* (Nachal), since at this point the fields of the Kedron cease and *the brook* begins (Jer. xxxi. 40). It is unsatisfactory for the same pool to be called by two names in Neh. ii., iii., so we must consider that the Virgin's Fountain—i.e., *the King's pool*—was not the pool that was made.

B. The channel to the present Pool of Siloam must have been undertaken by Hezekiah; but Shiloah is mentioned earlier. Therefore *the waters of Shiloah* (Isa. viii. 6) did not mean the waters at "Siloam." As the fountain flowing from the city of David would better represent the royal line of David than would water from an aqueduct or pool elsewhere in Jerusalem, it would seem that *the Virgin's Fountain* must have been intended by *Shiloah*.

C. Adonijah feasted at Enrogel (the Virgin's Fountain)=Gihon, in the valley (Nachal, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14), so that Solomon must have been anointed at *some other Gihon* (?=stream or spring), obviously in a higher position, and so mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxii. 30. "The same Hezekiah also stopped the upper watercourse of Gihon" (= rather "*the springhead of the upper Gihon*") "and brought it down to the west side of the city of David."

This passage seems (to me) not to allude to the channel from the Virgin's fount, but rather to that under Robinson's arch, conveying water to (1) some pool in the Valley of Hinnom (i.e., Tyropœon), due west of Zion, and not to (2) the Pool of Siloam (so called) *hardly west at all*.

To (1) and not to (2) I would also refer the following passages:—

(a) "Hezekiah made a *pool* and a conduit, and brought water into the city" (2 Kings xx. 20).

(b) "Hezekiah fortified his city and brought in *water*" (Thrupp reads Γῶν for Γῶν=upper Gihon) "into *the midst* thereof: he digged the hard rock with iron and made wells for waters" (Eccles. xlviii. 17).

Now we have to place in the Tyropœon Valley both *the Pool of Siloah* and *the pool that was made* (Neh. iii. 15, 16), since it was not the King's pool (see A). The two Pools of Siloam (so called) cannot be the two wanted, since it would have been labour lost (for Hezekiah apparently) to have made the upper one if the lower already existed. We have therefore to seek for a pool higher up the Tyropœon, and we seem to have one above in (1, a, b). Was this then (x) *the Pool of Siloah* or (y) *the pool that was made*? As the wall ran from (x) to, and not to near or opposite to (y), we conclude that (1) above was the Pool of Siloah, and (2) the pool that was made, since the wall could run to (2) from (1), but not from (2) to (1), situated in the *deep bed* of the Tyropœon.

The Mishna says, "Now *Siloam* was in the *midst* of the city," and Lightfoot that Shiloah and Siloah are not the same. (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, 188.) Isa. xxii. 9, 11, and "the two walls" (2 Kings xxv. 4), also bear on this question, but *the point* of them is not to me satisfactorily clear.

W. F. B.