

## IRRIGATION AND WATER SUPPLY IN PALESTINE.

MR. WILLIAM SIMPSON, in his interesting paper (p. 55 January *Quarterly Statement*), mentions the system of pits for water connected with shafts at intervals, and linked by an underground tunnel, as seen by the Rev. Mr. Harper and the Rev. J. Niel in the Vale of Siddim, also found at Surtabeh and Damascus.

Mr. Simpson found the same system in use in Persia and Afghanistan, where the pit and tunnel are called Karaize. Sir R. Burton also mentions them. The same system is still in use in Cyprus, where professional well and aqueduct makers construct them 'as in olden times, in what look like waterless districts. The word used in 2 Kings iii, 16, is גַּרְבַּי (reservoir), and also in Isaiah xxx, 14, Jeremiah xiv, 3, and again of the Siddim Vale in Ezek. xlvii, 11, where our version gives "marishes." The same word is still in use in Palestine, e.g., the well known Jebb (جَبَّ) Yussuf between Siberias and Safet.

E. A. FINN.

## THE STONE (EBEN) OF ZOHELETH.

As no one has yet produced an instance (1889, 44) from the Bible of *eben* meaning a *cliff*, it may safely be concluded that such is not to be found. Major Conder's note (*id.* 90) fails to meet the case, for he quotes Gesenius as rendering *eben rock* (Gen. xlix, 24), but the dictionary says that "some persons apply the term (*rock*) to a stone of any size, and speak of boys throwing *rocks* at each other—a supremely ridiculous expression."

In the verse above, the A.V. and R.V. render the word "the stone of Israel." The Arabic *Zehwele* (for all that I know) may come from the Hebrew *Zohelath*; but it is an utter impossibility for a solid *cliff*, however slippery, at the village of Siloam, ever to have been the moveable stone of *Zohelath*, close to Enrogel, several hundred yards distant from that village.

Several explanations have been given of the word *Zohelath*. If the expression means the stone of "moving to and fro," let me offer the conjecture that it was a *logan* (or rocking) stone which will *log* again, whenever the *débris* of centuries is thoroughly cleared away from near Enrogel.

W. F. BIRCH.

## GIHON.

ON p. 124, Dr. Chaplin thinks it not improbable that the name Gihon (Fountain of the Virgin) was derived from "*gahan*, to bow down, to prostrate oneself, and was originally applied not to the fountain, but to

the canal which brought the water from the fountain," i.e., it was applied to the Siloam tunnel.

Thus, as it would be most unsatisfactory to have to take 1 Kings i, 33, 45, as speaking proleptically, when Gihon is named by David and Jonathan, it must in this case follow that the Siloam tunnel existed in the time of David.

Surely Dr. Chaplin does not wish to maintain—

1. That the Siloam inscription in the tunnel is as old as the time of David.

2. Or else that it was cut (perhaps hundreds of) years after the tunnel was made.

3. That the tunnel, therefore, is not the work of Hezekiah referred to in 2 Chron. xxxii, 30; but was made in or before the time of David.

So critical was Hezekiah's position that there was reason in his making the tunnel. It is not easy, however, to see why either David (who fled before Absalom) or the Jebusites should ever have executed in haste such a gigantic work. Accordingly, the proposed derivation seems inadmissible.

Dr. Chaplin's paper satisfies me at last that the Pool of Siloah (the ditch, Is. xxii, 11) was actually enclosed by a wall, i.e., the outer wall of 2 Chron. xxxii, 5; and that "the two walls" (Is. *id.*, 2 Kings xxv, 4) were not a loop-wall defending the pool, but the old city wall, and the outer wall, which thus placed Siloam within the city.

W. F. BIRCH.

---

### DEFENCE OF THE GUTTER (TZINNOR).

IN *Quarterly Statement*, 1885, 62, I expressed my willingness to challenge attack on this question. Let me then try to defend my theory against the objections urged from time to time.

As the *Fund* being mutilated would end in *Fun*, so the quotation (*supra*, 39) from Ewald probably fares likewise, through Major Conder's not reaching to "the lame and the blind."

Though my interest in *Jerusalem* topography is owing to the accident of some of Warren's plans having in 1868 been sent to me through a postal error, still Mr. St. Clair wrongly attributes my theory to a guess. It is due to sheer plodding, superadded to a slight acquaintance with Hebrew characters, and to a resolute adherence to Scriptural Hebrew usage, which neither allows *emek*, *ge*, and *nachal* (1878, 180) to be interchangeable terms, nor "two hundred and a thousand" (as in the commonly accepted version of the Siloam inscription) to mean "one thousand two hundred."

The perception (1878, 182; 1882, 56) that the Tyropœon was the Valley of Hinnom forced me to place Zion (the City of David) on Ophel. The only reason discoverable for choosing such a low site was the proximity of Gihon, while Kennicott's explanation of 2 Sam. v, 8,