

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,

revealed the full reason. As some one in the city must have helped Joab to ascend a practically inaccessible shaft, I was driven to search for a traitor.

At this point I find Josephus dragging in Araunah, as not slain with the rest because of his good-will to Israel and special affection for David, while the extraordinary generosity shown to Araunah in his being permitted to possess the hill just above the City of David, indicates that the Jewish king was deeply indebted to him. If Mr. St. Clair, however, cares to argue that it was Araunah's *grandmother* who was the traitor I shall be glad to answer him. My theory is no guess, no product of a vivid imagination—the constant bane of topographical research.

Josephus, in rendering *tzinnor* by *ὑποκειμένων φαράγγων*, is no opponent of mine, since Kennicott says this means “subterraneous cavities.” The *plural* here is of importance; for surely it would not be necessary for the assailant to cross more than one valley or ditch in order to take Zion. Most interpreters agree (1878, 184) in making the word signify something *hollow* and in applying it to water. Those who render the word *watercourse* (R.V., Sp. Comm.) are practically in agreement with me, since the first length of 70 feet from Gihon (Virgin's Fount) into Zion is actually an *aqueduct*. A watercourse, according as it is (practically) horizontal, oblique, or perpendicular, forms an *aqueduct*, as at Gihon; or a *cataract* (as claimed by some for Psalm xlii, 7); or a *waterfall*, as interpreted by Ewald, and urged by Professor Sayce; only unfortunately on Ophel (at Gihon) the water is at the bottom when we first find it, and so both the proposed cataract and waterfall would have to do without water at the top—a most awkward arrangement.

Mr. St. Clair says my theory (or explanation) is “only a guess unsupported by any coincidence with any description in the Bible or elsewhere.” Let me show how it is supported by coincidences with both the Bible and “The Recovery of Jerusalem,” and also with Palestine topography and history in general.

The account in 2 Sam. v, 8 is certainly concise and obscure, if not elliptical; but 1 Chron. xi, 6, supplies what is wanting (1885, 64). Two words, however, in the Hebrew give us all we need; they are **בצור** **ריגע**. Professor Theodores renders them “reaching as far as the aqueduct.” The extreme difficulty of discerning what was meant has produced a variety of interpretations. Bochart, Ewald, &c., from the verb **רגע** appear to have got the idea of hurling persons down the waterfall (or that down which the water fell, *i.e.*, the cliff).

To me, in the verse quoted, **רגע** seems connected with the verb **יגע** (indeed the LETTERS are identically the same), which means to *labour*, to *exert oneself*, particularly to *make strenuous exertions*. I conclude, therefore, that he who was going to smite the Jebusites had before him a task demanding almost superhuman exertions; he would have to make strenuous exertions (literally) *in the gutter*.

Even getting along the watercourse in this luxurious age (when, as Mr. St. Clair tells us, the water flows at a lower level than formerly)

proved a dangerous matter, when Captain Warren was attempting to get up the vertical shaft. He states ("Recovery of Jerusalem," 245), "Once, while the fellahin were bringing in some frames, the spring suddenly rose, and they were awkwardly placed for a few minutes, being nearly suffocated." How would they have fared if the water, instead of flowing through the tunnel, could only have overflowed into the Kidron? Surely Joab essayed an enterprise hazardous enough in the first 70 feet, and there were worse perils beyond, viz., the Thebez stoue, and the Jebusite sword, and possibly the deep pit.

I have ventured to take גג (2 Sam. v, 8) as referring to *exertion* in the gutter; but as there is apparently something wrong with the passage, I must decline to deal with it grammatically. Certainly Hebrew is a charmingly elastic and reversible language if this one word equally well describes Joab's slowly going *up* (R.V. "Let him get *up* to the watercourse") and the Jebusites' quickly coming *down* (Ewald, "Let him *hurl down* the waterfall the lame, etc.). Therefore waiving this diplomatic word, let me show how the other word *tzinnor* of itself establishes my theory.

I have to prove—

- (1.) That the fortress Joab took was immediately west of Gihon.
- (2.) That the *tzinnor* meant the passage from Gihon leading to Ophel.
- (3.) That it was practically inaccessible.
- (4.) That, therefore, there must have been a traitor.
- (5.) That Araunah was that traitor, being spared and enriched.

Now as to these several points,

(1.) Has been proved in these pages (1878, 180; 1885, 104; 1888, 46), and he that will dare to attack my arguments must be more venturesome than even Joab.

(2.) Was settled years ago by Kennicott, before the secret passage on Ophel was ever thought of. As Gihon was the only spring hereabouts, so this, consequently, was the only passage that could possibly be alluded to. Let me add, however, that the *tzinnor* at Jerusalem is no solitary instance of this kind of contrivance. The one at Rabboth Ammon mentioned by Polybius, and perhaps as old as Joab's time (1878, 190; Jos. Ant. vii, vii, 8) gave Kennicott the clue to the truth. Another at Gibeon is described and pictured on page 23. I believe there was another at Samaria, and I am satisfied there was another at Bethel. The proximity of the spring and the words in Judges, i, 24, 25, "the entrance into the city" (see also Jos. Ant. v, 2, 6) forbid my doubting it. At the castle of Subeihah there is also a passage, said (but vainly, I believe) to reach to the spring at Banias. After such instances as these it is rather for my opponents to prove that *tzinnor* does not mean the secret passage at Gihon, and to show why the Castle of Zion was ever built on Ophel, except for the purpose of obtaining water by such a contrivance.

(3.) Is proved by the difficulty named above, and by Sir C. Warren's account of his ascent in 1867 (Recovery of Jerusalem, 245).

(4.) Naturally follows from (3). But here again I may add, that as Bethel fared, so afterwards did Zion. From Bethel to Khartoum treachery has always been a common and often the easiest way of taking a fortress. Let the founder of the Hittite Luz witness this, or the *Callidus emptor Olynthi* and his gold-laden ass, or Demosthenes (De Coronâ, page 324) with his long list of traitors, or the Jotapata deserter (Wars, iii, 7, 33) who might have told us something interesting about Josephus himself. In short, history and the east (if not the west) have always swarmed with traitors.

(5.) David was exasperated,<sup>1</sup> and Joab never scrupled to shed blood. To think that the Jebusites would receive any quarter is absurd. If the Bethelites in the north of Benjamin were put to the sword, why should mercy be shown to an *insolent* enemy in the south? Certainly the Bible does not say that Araunah was spared at the capture of Jerusalem; but all statements in profane historians are *not necessarily untrue*; and Josephus twice distinctly asserts that Araunah, for special reasons, was spared, when the city was taken; and from the Bible we further gather that he was rich, receiving from David 600 shekels of gold. Josephus, I admit, does not positively say that Araunah was guilty of treachery; but it seems to me that either from tradition or his own common-sense he knew this was the case, and that he *meant* his readers to see it too. Traitors, it must be remembered, do not like to be *called* traitors, and after a certain shady transaction and suspicious-looking prediction connected with Jotapata some years before, Josephus probably concluded on reflection that it was coming too near home for *him* openly to brand Araunah as the betrayer of Zion (Ant. vii, 3, 3; 13, 4).

I claim, therefore, on the testimony of one Hebrew word, and of Sir Charles Warren, &c., that my "Gutter" theory, so far from being *only a guess*, is amply corroborated by "coincidence with the description in the Bible and elsewhere."

Further, Joab's exploit seems to be alluded to in Prov. xxi, 22: "A wise (lit. *crafty*) man scaleth the city of the mighty (*gibborim* in Hebrew) and casteth down the strength of the confidence thereof." Joab was *crafty* enough, the Jebusites *confident* enough (2 Sam. v, 6), while Zion, when it became the City of David, was garrisoned by men *mighty* enough (his *gibborim*); though four centuries of successful resistance might well have entitled the Jebusites to the same distinction.

It is open to question how much of the underground passage (from Gihon to the surface of Ophel) traversed by Captain Warren was covered by the term "Gutter;" certainly the first 70 feet; probably the shaft 40 or 50 feet high; possibly from this point Joab may have advanced by the south-west limb of the cave now partly filled (1867,

<sup>1</sup> "*Hated of David's Soul*," 2 Sam. v, 8. Both here and in 1 Chron. xi, 6, *smiteth* occurs. Nabal barely escaped with his life; the Amalekites were *all* slain (1 Sam. xxvii, 9); the Ammonites were tortured to death (2 Sam. xii, 31). Surely at Jebus *all* would be slain, except *the traitor* and, it may be, his family.

Letters, 39) with dry walls and (I conjecture) connected with "the passage) apparently "blocked up" in the chamber at the bottom of the chasm.

Posthumous fame is so greedily sought after, that (I think) it is quite possible that somewhere in the "Gutter" Joab had an inscription cut commemorative of his daring feat. Some day it may be found and read.

W. F. BIRCH.

---

### THE POOL THAT WAS MADE.

WE learn from Nehemiah iii, 15, 16, that the wall of Jerusalem, in its course from near the Pool of Siloah to the pool that was made, passed over against the sepulchres of David.

It is certain (*Quarterly Statement*, 1879, 177; 1889, 209) that the course described above was on Ophel (so-called), and enclosed the sepulchres of David, leaving them on the left hand (1879, 179), and that the Pool of Siloah was in the Tyropœon Valley, at the southern end of Ophel. Mr. Schick's discovery of the old Shiloah aqueduct has entirely removed (*Quarterly Statement*, 1889, p. 37) the great difficulty noticed by Thrupp in regard to Siloam.

If, now, the position of the pool that was made could only be satisfactorily defined, we should be a step nearer, and possibly very near indeed, to finding the sepulchres of David.

Recently, in a totally unexpected manner, fresh light has fallen upon the position of this pool. In *Quarterly Statement*, 1889, p. 51, I proved, at least to my own satisfaction, that the Jebusites, for the sake of obtaining water, hewed the mysterious rock-staircases north of Joab's Well. But if there was any need for this work, and otherwise it would not have been made, they surely would never have allowed the waters from Gihon (Virgin's Fountain) to run to waste, but rather have carefully stored them in some pool. Such a pool must necessarily have been in the Kidron Valley, south of Gihon, unless we suppose that Schick's aqueduct (*Quarterly Statement*, 1889, p. 51) was made by them, and not by Solomon. This seems to me most improbable.

Thus at last we gain a glimpse of a very *old* pool existing at Jerusalem in the Kidron, south of Gihon, even as far back as the time of Joshua. Curiosity eagerly asks, "Is it noticed in the Bible? What was its name? What was its approximate position?"

For twelve years I have been probing this question of the site of the pool that was made, and from time to time have supported or suggested five different positions (*Quarterly Statement*, 1877, pp. 202, 204; 1879, 180; 1883, 107, 155) for it between Siloam and the Virgin's Fountain; indeed, wherever within these limits I could find a pool existing or devise a supply of water to fill one. This troublesome search became necessary (as I stated in *Quarterly Statement*, 1877, 202) "in default of any evidence of a pool situated further south (*i.e.*, than the Virgin's Fountain) in the valley of the Kedron," to represent *the pool that was made*.