

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*.

Thus the conclusion forced upon me, that the Jebusites themselves made a pool south of Gihon, is most welcome, inasmuch as, by providing a pool in the Kidron, it exactly meets the obvious requirements of Neh. iii, 16; and so another difficulty of long standing entirely vanishes.

So confident am I that this theory is not a mare's-nest that below I request the Executive Committee to undertake an excavation in the Kidron ravine, in order to test and (I doubt not) also to prove the correctness of my conclusion.

It seems to me, however, that one may safely go still further. Stanley ("Palestine," 513) gives the Hebrew word for *pool* as meaning an *artificial tank*. I believe this opinion is correct.

As then every pool had, of course, to be made, it is most extraordinary that one should be described merely as "the pool that was made," without any addition whatever as to *when*, or *where*, or *by whom*, &c., it was made; some such explanation seems absolutely necessary. Now, Isaiah (xxii, 9, 11) says to the people of Jerusalem, "Ye gathered together [or *drew in, withdrew*, i.e., into the city] the waters of the lower pool. . . . Ye made also a reservoir [R.V.] between the two walls for the water of the old pool." This lower pool seems to me to be the King's Pool named in Neh. ii, 14, and to be identical in position with the present lower Pool of Siloam; while the reservoir seems to be the pool which (2 Kings xx, 20) Hezekiah made in the Tyropeon, close to Ain Silwân, at the southern end of his rock-tunnel through Ophel. The result of this tunnel or aqueduct being made would be (1) that the waters of Gihon, being thus diverted, would no longer, by means of Schick's aqueduct, supply the lower or King's Pool; and (2) that Hezekiah's pool or reservoir (A.V., "ditch") would receive the waters of (the Jebusite pool, i.e.) the pool that was made; by this I mean the waters which, but for the diversion, would have flowed into that pool. Be it observed, however, that Isaiah speaks of the reservoir receiving the waters of (i.e., which used to flow into) the *old* pool. The Jebusite pool would, indeed, be pre-eminently *the old pool*. Hence I conclude without hesitation that "the pool that was made" (Neh. iii) was identical with the old pool (Isaiah xxii).

Further, as the words "that was made," without any addition, appear to me (as stated above) to form an unmeaning description, I strongly suspect that through some defect in the manuscript the Hebrew word for *old* (*שנה עשויה*) has been misread into "that was made".

I may add that the three pools (the King's Pool, the Pool of Siloah, and the pool that was made) in Neh. ii, iii, seem to me to be necessarily *three different pools*, being mentioned by one writer in one story, but I do not see any impropriety in Isaiah's subsequently describing one of them (the King's Pool) as the lower pool.

It remains to consider the approximate position of the Jebusite, i.e., "old," pool, mis-entitled "that was made." (1878, 187, 5.)

Mr. Schick's excavations, narrated in *Quarterly Statement*, 1886, p. 198, seem to supply a clue to the right answer. In his first shaft, A, in the

Kidron Valley, 350 feet south of the Virgin's Fountain, he says, "We struck a bottom of very hard concrete a few inches thick, consisting of lime and small stone chippings, with pounded bricks in it. Under it there was dry mud, like the deposit in a well or a pool. . . . Has the valley really been so deep here, or have I come into an old pool? I cannot tell." Let excavation decide the question. I would, however, observe that the Jebusite pool would need a concrete flooring, and this is exactly what has been found, while the non-discovery of broken pottery below the concrete seems to suggest that the latter was put down in very early times. By excavation it might easily be ascertained whether this concrete is a part merely of a small cistern or of an actual pool.

If the concrete should be found to extend westwards to the Ophel hill and to end at a point where the rock is perpendicular or scarped, so as to present a steep face, and if remains of an old wall should be found at the top of this steep rock, or even if the rock at the top be found to be such that it is suited for the foundation of a wall, then I am ready stoutly to maintain that the concrete really marks the site of the pool that was made.

Neh. iii, 16, distinctly says that the wall was repaired *to* this pool, and the Hebrew word (**לְ**) used for *to* or *unto* (R.V.) in this chapter seems to me to mean in this description *right up to* or *close to* (see iii, 20, 21, 24). But the wall, so far as I can see, could only come *close to* the pool, not by the wall descending into the valley, which seems out of the question, but by the pool itself reaching to the foot of the rock on which the wall stood; and this would apparently be effected by the rock being cut down so as to present a vertical face, and cut to such a depth that the water would reach the foot of the scarp.

Should excavation happily show the existence of a pool at the shaft A, then the limits within which the sepulchres of David are to be found, become greatly reduced. For then this pool, instead of the Virgin's Fountain, would be the most northerly limit possible. Further, if those sepulchres had been close to the pool, it would hardly have been worth mentioning them as a landmark. I think, then, we might safely strike off quite 200 feet from the end at Siloam, and measure off nearly as many from the southern end of the Jebusite pool. This would leave us a distance about 100 yards long, north and south, within which it is exceedingly probable, if not absolutely certain, that the sepulchres of David are situated. The breath of the area need not now be calculated. This discovery (that is to be, so to say) of the pool that was made, of course, requires the city of David to be extended further south than I have placed it on my plan (1886, 34; 1889, opp. 36), and the position of David's tomb probably must go with it. I cannot help this; but I stated (1886, 34) that "How far the city of David extended *southwards* is open to question," and that "the approximate position of the sepulchres of David is a still more difficult question." I earnestly hope that here once more the Executive Committee will decide that the spade shall certainly follow the pen.