

must concede that Gihon in the third place (1 Kings i, 33, 38) is also the Virgin's Fountain.

I give up at once the identification of Enrogel with the Virgin's Fountain, and of Zohelath with M. Ganneau's Zahweileh. The "overwhelming evidence" (1878, 187) claimed in their favour is apparently fallacious. Three points only need be mentioned now, viz. :—

- (1) As to the *stone* of Zohelath. This stone was an *eben*, which term is never applied to a *cliff* like Zahweileh, but to a stone that might be rolled over by human strength.
- (2) As both the terms *ain* and *bor* are applied to the same spring in Genesis xxiv, 16, 20, it is quite allowable to identify Ain-Rogel either with Joab's Well or the spring which at times bursts out of the ground a little to the south of it.
- (3) Since Gihon was the Virgin's Fountain, Enrogel must be looked for elsewhere, as (a) the two names can hardly be applied to the same place in 1 Kings i; and (b) it is incredible, and not consistent with the sacred narrative, that Solomon should be crowned in full view of Adonijah and his supporters, which would be the case if the stone of Zohelath were identical with the cliff of Zahweileh.

Other interesting points of detail become now more probable if not certain, viz. :—

- (1) The two walls (2 Kings xxv, 4; Isa. xxii, 11) are those reaching one from the upper city and the other from the city of David (on Ophel) to the present upper Pool of Siloam.
- (2) This pool represents "the ditch between the two walls."
- (3) The present lower Pool of Siloam most probably is the King's Pool (Neh. ii, 14) and "the old pool" (Isa. xxii, 11).
- (4) One can hardly avoid identifying "the pool that was made" with (the pool of) the Virgin's Fountain, improbable though it may seem that the wall on the west side of Gihon in the valley (*nachal*) was built *so near* the eastern base of the Ophel ridge as to come *quite close* to the pool, as appears to be required by עַי (A.V. *to*) in Nehemiah iii, 16. Or could the chasm (Jer. Rec., 1871, 251) with water at the bottom have been "the pool that was made?" Or was a pool constructed on the south slope of Ophel, and supplied with water from the aqueduct (Jer. Rec., 105) by its being carried across the Tyropæon?

W. F. BIRCH.

THE INSCRIPTIONS AT JERĀSH.

SIR,

In the report of the Princes' visit to the Holy Land, in your last *Statement*, there is a copy of a tolerably long inscription found at Jerāsh, No. 4, which is spoken of as "newly found." If, however, you go back to your

Quarterly Statement for April, 1872, p. 70, you will find it already in print. I may add that I copied it in 1860. You printed a much longer one, which I discovered at the same time, in your *Quarterly Statement* for September, 1870. What I wish now to point out is that apparently the plinth containing the Princes' inscription, No. 4, has been snapped in two, or partly lost, since I visited the spot in 1860. It is in Homeric lines, and reads better if so printed.

..... ΟΜΟΣ ΕΙΜΙ ΑΕΦΛΟΦΟΡΟΥ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ
 ΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΣ ΑΘΑΝΑΤ (ΟΥ) ΩΚΕΑΝΟΙΟ
 ΣΩΜΑ ΓΑΡ ΕΝ ΓΑΙΗ ΨΥΧΗ Δ ΕΙΣ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΝ ΕΥΡΥΝ
 ΑΓΓΕΛΙ ΤΕΛΕΘΕΙ ΚΑ ΓΗΡΑΟΝ ΕΡΜΑ
 ΑΣΤΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΝΑ ΕΠΗΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΣΣΟΜΕΝΟΙΟ
 ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΟΝ Μ ΔΙΩΤΗΣ... ΤΙΝΑ ΚΑΝΗΛΘΕΝ
 ΤΑΥΠΕ.....

I will not guarantee the absolute accuracy of my copy, for when I made it I was young at the work; but it may help to a more accurate reading of the whole.

The inscription No. 2 I also copied in 1860; it is a fragment in Homeric lines, and may be printed thus:—

..... ΠΤΗ
 ΕΝ ΧΘΟΝΙ Κ[ΑΙ] ΠΟΝΤΩ
 ΟΥΣΑ ΧΟΡΕΙΗΣ
 ΕΡΚΟΣ..... ΟΥ ΘΥ ΘΕΜΕΛΙΩΘΗ

I do not remember the inscription No. 3. Are not any of these inscriptions in de Vogüé's work? There is great interest attached to them: first, as showing the favour with which the Homeric style and metre were regarded for the purpose of public inscription; and secondly, as showing the high position of honour which must have been given to Christians in early days. The long inscription which you printed from my copy in September, 1870, illustrates still further the marked triumph of Christianity over false religion.

Wycliffe Lodge, Oxford.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

THE BODIES OF THE PATRIARCHS.

I.

Clericus thinks that "the bodies of the patriarchs, with Jacob—if not those of Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Rebekah, and Leah—were transferred from Hebron to Shechem:" and, quietly remarking that "the fact is undoubted," adds, "See Acts vii, 15, 16." By all means.