

1. It is reasonable to apply Shiloah, Siloah, and Siloam to one spot, *i.e.*, the part of the Tyropœon near 'Ain Silwân, and not to different places.

2. The waters of Shiloah must, somehow or other, have come from the Virgin's Fount.

3. But they could only be brought down by some aqueduct to the southern end of the Tyropœon.

4. They could not have flowed down the Siloam Tunnel, as the date of that seems (to me) to have been the time of Hezekiah, and the waters of Shiloah are named previously in the time of Ahaz.

5. Therefore the only explanation available is that there was an aqueduct from the Virgin's Fountain along the eastern side of Ophel to the mouth of the Tyropœon.

6. If the aqueduct was made with but little fall, the waters would go or flow *softly*.

7. If it is urged that there may have been an aqueduct down the Tyropœon, one would reply, Where would a better source of water than the Virgin's Fount be found? and next, the fall down the Tyropœon would be such that the waters could hardly be said to go *softly*, but rather *swiftly*.

8. I believe the aqueduct supposed to exist in (5) was made by Solomon to irrigate the lower part of the Tyropœon (south of the 'Ain Silwân), *i.e.*, the King's gardens. It seems to me reasonable to think he would make some such use of the superfluous waters of the Virgin's Fount, instead of letting them run to waste through the soil of the Kedron Valley.

I would therefore put before the Executive Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund a proposal that search should be made for this aqueduct.

Its discovery would result in clearing up certain points.

(a) It would be a point gained to know that such an aqueduct existed.

(b) What is meant by the waters of Shiloah would be clear.

(c) There would not any longer be any room whatever for two opinions about the date of the Siloam Tunnel.

(d) I would add, from my own point of view, that a stimulus would be given to making further excavations at Jerusalem.

I trust, therefore, that the Committee will not put this question aside as an unlearned, or at any rate groundless, speculation.

W. F. BIRCH.

*Manchester,*

*November 5th, 1883.*

---

## THE CITY OF DAVID AND JOSEPHUS.

SOME of Captain Conder's remarks on p. 194 call for notice.

*The Garrison.*—As he objects to my words on this subject, I would add that Patrick, on Judges ix, 6, observes: "And after all it must be confessed

that the *Hebrew* word *Matzab* doth not certainly signify a *pillar*, for I cannot find it so used in any other place of Scripture." How then am I wrong in saying that *Matzab* never means a *pillar*, and that it is an entire mistake to say it is rendered *pillar* in other passages? Judges ix, 6, is one; but where is the second passage? His favourite authority on 1 Samuel xiii, 3, mentions a garrison, not a *pillar*, so that it is *my* turn now to ask, "Is this another false statement of Josephus?"

The fact is, Josephus is a most uncertain foundation on which to build. Even in cases where he can say *quorum pars magna fui* he sometimes is *startling* rather than *accurate*. Who would not like to see the stone that at Jotapata knocked off a man's head and sent it *three furlongs*? The Jews might indeed have called that a *sacred* stone. The proposal to convert the *two* garrisons which, according to the Bible and Josephus, Jonathan smote into *one* and the same sacred *stone*, upset first at Geba and then on Bozez, I still claim to describe fairly as "an *idol* fancy." Jonathan commanded a division and was no contemptible (2 Sam. i, 21) foe. Would Captain Conder, with a thousand men, himself prefer shattering a *stone* column of the enemy to a living one? Why then make a warrior like Jonathan into an iconoclast? On page 150 *seven* should be *six*.

*The Nameless City*.—I regret that Captain Conder and others should be in doubt as to what I think the true site. See, however, *Quarterly Statement*, 1883, page 49, line 7, and page 51, line 38.

*The Tomb of the Kings*.—I need hardly repeat that Captain Conder said "it is a *fact*" (not a conjecture of his) that the tomb of Nicodemus is this tomb. He says of me that I have been "equally confident" that I knew "the exact place of the tombs of the Kings, on more than one occasion, but in very different situations." Can he point out the passages in these pages on which he grounds this statement? Is *equal confidence* shown by the *if* in *Quarterly Statement*, 1877, page 200, line 42, or by the *seven points* distinctly said to be *assumed* in 1881, page 97, 99, or in the position given in 1883, page 155, "an area of 450 feet long by 50 feet broad?" And is this description, or even *the less than forty yards* of 1880, page 170, at all to be compared to the precision of Captain Conder's site, viz., *the tomb of Nicodemus*?

I only refer to this point because I hope the Committee will be led to excavate specially for the Tomb of David. But how can this be until a site has been named of reasonable area, which can both stand against all adverse criticism and also have reasonable probability in its favour?

For Captain Conder, and others who have sought after Zion, to rally me on my failures or attempts is rash, as I can easily retort with crushing effect as follows.

True, I have been groping for six years on Ophel, so called—"an area of 10 or 15 acres"—for the entrance to the Tomb of David, *i.e.*, for a hole about 2 feet square, and buried some feet under the surface.

But others have also for years been running all about Jerusalem and looking everywhere for Zion except in the right place: one put the City of David on the Upper Hill, another at Antonia, another near the Holy

Sepulchre, another just east of it, another of larger ideas thought that the whole of Jerusalem formed the City of David. They have been wandering all over the 300 acres, minus my 15, and you have not yet found, and never will find, in all that area, either the door of David's tomb or the famous City of David, an object a few ten thousand times larger than what I have been seeking for.

*Ophel (so called).*—On page 194, 1883, Captain Conder speaks of this as “a hill which was only walled in by later kings;” but six lines after he finds fault with me for speaking wrongly of the same spot as “the hill” on the south of the Temple. I suppose he must have changed his mind in six lines. In exposing what I consider his radical errors about Jerusalem, I pointed out (1881, p. 97) what was apparently the position of Ophel. I can hardly blame him for not answering in detail the arguments given in *Quarterly Statement*, 1881, pp. 94–97, and 1883, pp. 152–154, as they are simply unanswerable. I hope, however, that he or any one else who dissents from my view will try to answer them.

*The old wall.*—Captain Conder, after observing that Josephus says, “The old wall built by David and Solomon began on the north at Hippicus,” asks, “Is this another false statement?” I am not aware of having alluded to this statement, yet I think Josephus is very near the truth. I would observe, however, that Josephus goes on to add that the same old wall passing above Siloam reached as far as Ophel, where it was joined to the eastern cloister of the Temple. Captain Conder will, I suppose, admit that the part of the wall from Siloam to this south-east corner was on Ophel so called, and his favourite authority further gives it as part of *the old wall*. And yet (*mirabile dictu*) only two lines after, Captain Conder describes the very site of this part of the wall as “a hill which was only walled in by later kings.” Thus he himself actually rejects the very description of Josephus about which two lines before he asked me, “Is this another false statement?” He says, “We” (*I decline to be among the we*) “are obliged to rely mainly on Josephus,” and accordingly he will not allow me (if I wished) to say that the *beginning* of a statement of Josephus is false, while he himself, by his own *ipse dixit*, rejects the *end* of it as false.

*The area of the City of David.*—When I speak about *Zion, the City of David*, Captain Conder appals me with the area of *Jerusalem*. But the size of the former had no more to do with that of the latter, than the area of the Tower of London with that of the City of London. I have again and again shown that *Jerusalem* and *the City of David (i.e., Zion)* are not in the historical passages of the Bible identical. (See 1878, p. 183; 1880, p. 167; 1881, p. 97.)

Josephus, I am well aware, makes them the same, but the Bible does not; and who that cares for accuracy will believe what Josephus says, when he does not agree with the Bible? In this book of truth the line of distinction between Jerusalem and the City of David is sharply drawn. Of one or another king it is said quite twenty times, in the Kings and Chronicles, that he reigned in Jerusalem and was buried in the City of David. Surely

if the two terms meant just the same thing we should have had some instance of a king *reigning in the City of David*. Of Amaziah it is written (2 Kings xiv, 20), "He was buried at *Jerusalem* with his fathers in the *City of David*." Why add the latter words if the two places were identical?

And now, having disposed of all objections, let me loose a Parthian shaft. I have given arguments for the Valley of Hinnom, Zion, and Acra, which none can answer, and (if they are discreet) will not try to answer.

For five years I have been urging that the Tyropeon was (part of) the Valley of Hinnom, and that the City of David was solely on Ophel so called.

Enough for me now (further success I leave to others) to have got the thin end of the wedge into the Jerusalem error. That it is being driven home can hardly be denied, when while Captain Conder, on page 194, seeks to scare me with terrible conclusions that do not follow from my premises, independent critics are found maintaining the view I hold.

On pp. 213, 215, Professor Sayce says: "The key to the whole position is the *fact* that the south-eastern hill, the so-called Ophel, represents Zion, the City of David. This *fact* once granted—and it is now no longer possible to deny it—&c."

Again, Professor Robertson Smith, in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," on Jerusalem, observes: "A third view places the City of David on the southern part of the Temple-hill, and this opinion is not only confirmed by the oldest post-Biblical traditions, but is the only view that does justice to the language of the Old Testament." I commend these two statements to Captain Conder's calm consideration.

Therefore to Zion's enemies, whose name is *legion*, I shout, Come on! You cannot get over the Biblical evidence. If I never strike another blow, the two Professors will "hold the bridge," and save the City of David from desolation.

I heartily agree with these two on the two points discussed, though I cannot at present go with them in the opinion that the Upper City of Josephus never formed part of fortified Jerusalem till after the time of Nehemiah. If I leave their theory in peace, a slow pen and doubtful leisure must bear the blame. I must make the same plea if I do not try to show in these pages that—

- (1) Gibeah of Saul was at Kh. Adasah.
- (2) The Cave of Adullam is the Cave of Khureitun.
- (3) The perpendicular shaft at the Virgin's Fountain is "the Gutter" of 2 Samuel v, 8, though attributed to Hezekiah by all, I believe, except myself (1878, p. 184).
- (4) The Tomb of David (so far as I can discover) was in the position given in *Quarterly Statement*, 1883, p. 155.

I am glad to see an anonymous critic in *The Builder* (p. 545) coming to the aid of Captain Conder. This knight of the paper visor charges down upon my theory, confident of its destruction, and hopeful that the Fund will bury it by henceforth excluding from its pages "old unlearned speculations."

I pause not to discuss whether my theory is *old* or not, for I would rather at once cut his girth, and let him topple over.

This writer has a profound contempt of what I advance as "my arguments" for the true position of *Zion*. Accordingly, instead of labouring to meet them, he prefers re-echoing Captain Conder's declamation about the acres of *Jerusalem*.

"Great is Josephus!" cries the one; "Great is Josephus!" answers the other, and, as this historian says David called Jerusalem the City of David, it is vain for me, in a feeble tone, to interpose again and again that the City of David was only part of Jerusalem. I have doubted Josephus (a thing which Captain Conder does whenever it suits him). Therefore, I am to be overwhelmed with alternative billows of indignation and pity, on the ungrounded charge of having made Jerusalem no bigger than a hamlet. In vain from time to time I have taken pains to explain that the City of David stood only on Ophel (so called), and that Jerusalem and the City of David are not convertible terms (1883, p. 154). But what do these two writers? Instead of trying to show that the places were one and the same, Captain Conder begins by speaking of the City of David, and then, with charming simplicity (I should say *adroitness*, only I think he is unconscious of his own *legerdemain*), he slips in (p. 195) *Jerusalem*, instead of the City of David, in the words, "But Mr. Birch's *Jerusalem*, or City of David, is only 10 or 15 acres in area." After this, and tossing in *Moriah* (!) with a sort of *væ victis*, Captain Conder triumphantly shows that my statement, as doctored by him, is wrong; while the other returns after him only to spoil, and finds out that the Jews would have to occupy just one square yard apiece.

In 1878, p. 180, I made the following suggestion:—"Gennath = (?) Gehennath Gate = Gate of the Valley of Hinnom = Valley Gate (2 Chron. xxvi, 9; Neh. ii, 13; iii, 13)." Captain Conder borrowed this conjecture from me (I am not aware that I borrowed it from any one), and further, he did me the honour of putting it both in his plan and on p. 349 in the "Handbook" (1879), and there it remains to this day. Again, in 1879, I occupied three pages in tracing the general outline of Nehemiah's Jerusalem, referring to (if not inserting) his plan of 1877, and actually making my Jerusalem *larger* than his within the first and second walls of Josephus.

But now (oddy enough), in 1883, Captain Conder has quite forgotten his debt to me, and mine to him. He even ignores his own "Handbook," whose pages witness that my Jerusalem was no "hamlet" of "10 or 15 acres;" but occupied as great an area as his own.

Surely when the builder-on-sand critic tries to entice the Committee to cast me out, I may claim, by my appeal to the "Handbook," to have unhorsed Don Quixote. Why ever will some persons persist in advocating a *lost* cause?

I have to thank Mr. Besant for an admirable illustration, which I doubt not will make more converts than can pages of the closest argument. He says, "Did you ever see Old Sarum? It contained a cathedral with a

monastery, a castle, and a town ; all within a space large enough for a London square garden." The fortress of the Jebusites, *i.e.*, Zion, or the City of David, was just a place of this kind.

The cathedral answers to the tent pitched for the Ark.

„ monastery	„	houses for Obed-edom, &c.
„ castle	„	David's house.
„ rest of the town	„	the quarters of the <i>Gibborim</i> and other dwellings.
„ churchyard	„	the Sepulchres of David.

That "a city" was not necessarily a large place seems clear from 2 Kings x, 25, where "the city of the house of Baal" appears to describe the dwelling-place of Baal's priests.

W. F. BIRCH.

November 2nd, 1883.

## HEBREW INSCRIPTIONS.

IN connection with the article on Hebrew inscriptions, which I have read with deep interest in the *Quarterly Statement* of last October, may I hope that you will allow me to throw out a suggestion concerning another matter which I believe to be of great importance? In Jewish books we often meet with a contraction of the two letters  $\aleph$ , thus  $\aleph$ , which is not used in printing the Bible. The origin of this contraction has, so far as I know, never been investigated. Yet it is easily seen that if it was used by copyists of the Bible in early times, it was likely to have been a fruitful cause of very great mistakes. Hence, whilst students and explorers have their attention directed to the alphabets, I think it a good opportunity that they be requested, in the interest of textual criticism, as well as for other important purposes, to see also how far back they can discover this contraction to have existed. I believe I can see traces of it in the Septuagint in the following names:—

(1)  $\text{I}\epsilon\mu\omicron\eta\lambda$  for  $\text{חמול}$  (Hamuel), Genesis xlii, 12, and 1 Chronicles ii, 5. Anyone studying the names of the Septuagint will know that  $\eta\lambda$ , with another vowel before it at the end of a word, stands always for the Hebrew  $\aleph$ . See  $\text{I}\sigma\tau\eta\lambda$ ,  $\Sigma\alpha\mu\omicron\eta\lambda$ ,  $\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\eta\lambda$ , for  $\text{ישראל}$ ,  $\text{שמואל}$ ,  $\text{פנואל}$ . If there is no vowel before  $\eta\lambda$ , it may represent only a  $\aleph$  with the vowel *Tsere* before it, as  $\text{E}\sigma\eta\lambda$  for  $\text{אצל}$ ,  $\Gamma\alpha\delta\eta\lambda$  for  $\text{גדל}$ . If, then, we have here this termination standing for a  $\aleph$  only, what more likely than that the Seventy read the abbreviation  $\aleph$ , instead of the  $\aleph$ , especially as the name  $\text{חמול}$  (Hamuel) also exists in 1 Chronicles iv, 26, and is rendered  $\text{A}\mu\omicron\eta\lambda$ ?