

NOTE ON THE POOL THAT WAS MADE.

Further consideration satisfies me that the "concrete flooring" was part of an actual pool, and not merely of a well. If excavation should show that I am wrong in this conclusion, the precise position of the pool that was made will still be unknown; yet it is a point gained to find that it was situated in the Kidron.

On the supposition, however, that the concrete marks a pool that was made by a dam across the valley, a considerable difficulty at once probably presents itself, inasmuch as Mr. Schick failed at shaft A to find rock at 2,064 feet, although it is given on the contour plan as lying at 2,099 feet. This difference of at least 35 feet implies that our knowledge of the rock-surface at this part of Ophel is still very imperfect, and it follows that any proposed line of wall based on such imperfect knowledge, *may* easily be very far from the truth.

It may also approximate to the truth. An examination of the rock contours in the Jerusalem Portfolio leads me to the following admissions:—

1. If the Jebusite pool really reached westwards, so as to be almost beneath the wall, then the wall must practically have approached the valley to near contour 2,129. If, however, it should be found that the water of the pool could not have reached within 50 or even 80 feet of the foot of the wall, then the meaning attached above to **וַי** must be given up. Nevertheless this would really prove a great help, since the loss of verbal precision in this case would be a great topographical gain, inasmuch as in Neh. iii, *unto over against* obviously implies a greater intermediate distance than *to* or *unto*.

If, therefore, the Hebrew word for *to* should be found to apply to a distance of 50 or 80 feet, then as the wall was *over against* the sepulchres of David, it follows that they were more than that distance from the wall; and so whenever the wall is found (a comparatively easy matter) there will be no need to search the first 50 or 80 feet from the wall. It will suffice to examine the rock beyond this distance.

2. As the placing of "the pool that was made" near shaft A, apparently requires the City of David to have extended further south than is shown on my plan (*Quarterly Statement*, 1886, 34), and as the contour plan in the Portfolio gives a steep or scarped corner of rock on Ophel, 250 feet north of the Pool of Siloam, it seems to me very probable that the wall of the City of David followed the line of this scarp. Accordingly, I extend the west wall southwards 250 feet, and thence across the ridge of Ophel, until on the eastern side it reaches to contour 2,179 feet. At this point, the outer wall built by Hezekiah to defend his new reservoir, *i.e.*, the Pool of Siloam, came, I imagine, close to or joined the old wall of the City of David, though whether the point of junction was here or more to the west is open to question.

As this point of junction, an important one as a landmark, is not mentioned by Nehemiah, I can only account for its omission by supposing that the Sepulchres of David were opposite this point, or at any rate sufficiently near to render unnecessary the mention of any other landmark.

From Neh. iii, 16, it seems clear (1886, 34) that the Sepulchres of David were within Nehemiah's Wall, and I am more and more inclined to think that they were also *within* and not merely *near* the City of David. On measuring up my plan I cannot make the part of my wall to be *over against* these sepulchres, until a point is reached at least 350 feet distant from Siloam. When a further distance of 150 feet has been struck off from the wall running south from near the Jebusite Pool, there only remains a length of wall amounting to 230 feet, *over against* which the sepulchres could have been situated, while the breadth of the area available for the sepulchres of David, cannot, it would seem, exceed 130 feet. Further, this breadth, for searching purposes, may, as aforesaid, be reduced to 80 or 50 feet, in case the wall is not found to pass close to the Jebusite pool.

I do not at present see any prospect of fixing the position of the Sepulchres of David more precisely than I have attempted above, and therefore, after twelve years' hunt, I must leave to some enterprising explorer the task of bringing matters to a successful termination by actually discovering the long-lost tomb of David.

Any reader observing any defect in my theory will oblige me by pointing it out.

P.S.—The only reason I can suggest why the 148-foot tunnel (*Quarterly Statement* 1889, 48) was made almost on a level with aqueduct leading southwards from the grotto, is that the waters from that grotto, *i.e.*, from En-rogel, might thus be conducted to some point within the wall of Jerusalem. If this work had only been finished, then (1) by walling up in part the southern entrance to the grotto the waters of En-rogel could have been drawn from within the city by means of a shaft or staircase leading to the northern end of the tunnel; and (2) the tunnel would have afforded a secret way of exit from the city and so afterwards have helped Zedekiah in his flight from the Chaldæans.

W. F. B.

THE SILOAM INSCRIPTION.

THE commonly accepted version of the fifth line in the Siloam Inscription is not entirely satisfactory, inasmuch as it is inconsistent with Scriptural Hebrew usage.

It stands thus in the Jerusalem Memoirs, 347, and *Quarterly Statement*, 1883, 210: "And there flowed (5) the waters from their outlet (or the spring) to the pool for a thousand two hundred cubits." Professor Sayce gives it again, as follows, in his "Fresh Light from the Ancient Monu-