

GIHON.

By REV. W. F. BIRCH.

DR. CHAPLIN'S two papers in *Quarterly Statement*, 1890 (pp. 124, 331) touch on five points that require notice.

1. He is inclined to attribute "the short side tunnel and Warren's shaft" (i.e. my gutter) to Hezekiah, and refers 2 Chron. xxxii, 30, to this work.

2. While he is disposed to attribute the Siloam tunnel also to Hezekiah, he objects to its having been made "in haste."

3. He would derive the name Gihon from the word "*gahan*, to bow down," implying the crouching or grovelling position of one passing through the low passage of the Siloam tunnel.

4. He takes the mention of Gihon in 1 Kings i, 33-45, to be a prolepsis such as is repeatedly met with in the Old Testament.

I am always glad to see objections urged against my "gutter and Araunah" theory, though love for the truth brings me the trouble of exposing their hollowness.

1. Dr. Chaplin's first point, if true, would entirely sweep away my theory, for if Hezekiah made my so-called gutter, Joab could not have got up through it 300 years previously. Captain Warren (1885-64) considered that the short tunnel was *older* than that to Siloam; while Dr. Chaplin practically admits in (1) that the hill (Ophel) above Gihon (Virgin's Fount) was the site of the city of David. Now we have been repeatedly assured (1885, 107; 1887, 106) that this Ophel site is naturally so weak that it never could have been occupied by the stronghold of Zion. Yet the hard fact remains (as I have often shown) that it was actually so occupied. Accordingly, once again I ask, without any expectation of an answer, "What in the world ever led the Jebusites to make their fortress on Ophel, but the insuperable fact that by means of the gutter they would have an inexhaustible supply of water"? This obviously was the only secret of their 400 years' successful resistance, without chariots, and in the mountains. More fortunate than Zion, my theory need not fear any treacherous Araurah.

2. The fact that the tunnel was made from both ends at once, and the unfinished state at the point of junction seems to me to show that it was made "in haste," though I do not say in a short time.

Major Conder (1882, 128) says: "The two narrowest parts of the tunnel occur, one on either side of the point of junction. In fact, the excavators must be accused of scamping their work with the object of showing a greater total length than their rivals, and for this purpose they reduced the size of the excavation to a minimum in which it seems almost impossible that a man could have worked."

Of course it is possible that the excavators at the head of the tunnel

all along made it of the least width practicable, and that it was widened by others working in the rear. The above, however, is evidence enough of "haste."

3. Let it be assumed that Gihon is derived from *gahan*. Then, until the depth of the silt at the lowest parts of the Siloam tunnel has been ascertained, there is nothing to show that "bowing down" was originally more required in the Siloam tunnel than in "my gutter." As, therefore, the latter existed in David's time, so equally might the name of Gihon; and a prolepsis would be utterly unnecessary.

4. But let it be further assumed that no "bowing down" was required in my westward gutter, although Sir C. Warren stated (letters 25) that in clearing out the passage the men seldom had "much more than their heads above water." then I must expose the error in (4) above.

I stated (1890, 200) that "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." In reply to Dr. Chaplin (p. 331) let me point out that his examples (Bethel and Ebenezer) do not meet the case. Gihon is mentioned thrice in 1 Kings i. Now, if I had quoted v. 38, where *the historian* simply records an action, these examples would clearly have proved that I was wrong; for it is certain that the Bible narrative often anticipates the name by which places were called, e.g., Dan is mentioned in Gen. and Deut., before Israel crossed the Jordan, though the name was given after the crossing (Josh. xix, 47).

Accordingly, I did not refer to v. 38, but cited only 33, 45, where *David* and *Jonathan* speak, and not the historian. This alters the whole case. I shall be obliged to any one who will produce satisfactory instances from the Old Testament in which *old* speakers are really made to speak in *new* terms. The Bible contains many explanatory additions, but I cannot find an instance (that will bear investigation) of the *substitution* of one word for another, such as would support Dr. Chaplin's (331) treatment of Gihon as *proleptical*.

The following, no doubt, satisfy some, but not me:—

(a) Gen. xl, 15. "I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews." A writer in the *Guardian*, p. 721, asks: "How could Joseph be made to speak of *the land of the Hebrews* by any author before that settlement?" Patrick explained the difficulty 200 years ago. The patriarchs, though living in tents, overcame kings, made treaties, dug wells, and gained fame. Nomads still give their names to the districts they frequent, and did so of old. The land of the Hebrews meant the land frequented by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

(b) 1 Kings xiii, 32. "The saying shall surely come to pass against all the houses of the *high places which are in Samaria*." These are *apparently* the words of the old prophet uttered years before Samaria was built. This, I admit, *seems* a strong instance, and the *Bible Comment.* observes: "The writer of Kings has substituted for the term used by him that whereby the country was known in his own day."

It seems vain for me to object to this explanation without producing a better. The reader, after noting that in v. 2 the expression is simply "high places," may suspend judgment until a third instance has been examined.

(a) Judg. xxi, 19, R.V. "A feast of the Lord from year to year in Shiloh, which is on the north of Bethel, on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem and on the south of Lebonah." These, again, are *apparently* the words of the elders to the Benjamites. Now, the land of Benjamin reached to within ten miles of Shiloh. It would, therefore, be superfluous to describe so minutely to the latter the position of Shiloh. The difficulty is met in the A. V. by the insertion of the words *in a place* before *which*. This, however, is inadmissible. Obviously the details about the position of Shiloh are an *explanatory addition* appended when the glory of Shiloh was over and its very site in danger of being forgotten. The words, "which is on," &c., were *not* spoken by the elders, and similarly in (b) the words, "which are in Samaria," are a later explanatory addition, and were *not* actually spoken by the old prophet at all, so that (b) is *not* an instance of substitution. If any critic, by producing sound instances, can drive me from this position, let him do so. I shall cheerfully retire on the one point in question—"that it is *most unsatisfactory* to have to take I Kings i, 33, 45 as speaking proleptically when Gihon is named by David and Jonathan." I state this deliberately, because, curiously enough, in 41, 45, Joab and Jonathan apply to Jerusalem (or rather, I believe, to a particular part of it, *i.e.*, the city of David) the "almost solely poetical" term *Kiriah*, whilst this term is never elsewhere in the historical books so applied, except by the Samaritans and in the Persian decree in Ezra iv.

In Ps. xlvi, 2, *Kiriah* is used of the *city* of the great King, *i.e.*, the city of David (1888, 44), and in Is. xxix, 1, of "Ariel, the *city* where David encamped."

If, therefore, the prose writer has substituted Gihon for the actual name used by David and Jonathan, why has he not also substituted the ordinary word *Ir* or *Ar* (city) for the unusual word *Kiriah* used by Joab and Jonathan in the same passage?

Probably this question needs no answer, since it seems to me most likely that the short tunnel is quite as low as the Siloam one, and, therefore, on the assumption that Gihon came from *gahan*, the name may have been in use in David's time quite as easily as in Hezekiah's.

November 6th, 1890.