

the Siloam Tunnel, and were made by Hezekiah. Thus in self-defence I must offer the most uncompromising resistance to his *dictum*, as I had rather lose all the points named above than this last one by itself.

(a) Colonel Warren's plan (No. 18) states that the passage to the vertical shaft is in a line with that from the Virgin's Fount, while the tunnel to Siloam is marked as turning off at an angle. From this he concludes that the passage to the shaft was made before the tunnel.

(b) Mr. Sayce (p. 211) says, "This second tunnel—*i.e.*, the one to the vertical shaft (or *A*)—is in connection with the Siloam one, a perpendicular shaft (or *B*), descending to the latter below the vaulted chamber, and appears therefore to be of later origin." Here he is under some misapprehension; as *A*, which descends to the water, is *not* under the vaulted chamber, and *B*, which is so, was found partly filled up and was never explored.

Colonel Warren, however, conjectures that as the rock-cut passages and *A* would be inconvenient for drawing water, at some later date *B* was excavated to the level of the water in the Siloam Tunnel, though it does not seem actually to descend into it. *B*, no doubt, is later than either the Siloam Tunnel or *A*, but this does not at all prove that *A* is of later date than the Siloam Tunnel itself.

(c) Mr. Sayce appears to think that Solomon made the Siloam Tunnel in order that his capital might not have to depend upon rain-water in time of siege. It is, however, not complimentary to his surpassing wisdom to maintain that he executed a work of such enormous magnitude merely for such a reason, when Colonel Warren's shaft and passages would attain the same result with a mere fraction of the labour. The object of the tunnel was rather to deprive the enemy of the use of the overflow of the waters from the Virgin's Fount.

I maintain that the shaft *A* was used by the Jebusites, and (a) alone proves that it was older than the Siloam Tunnel. And even if it can be shown that the latter is of Solomonic date, it only helps to prove the point I value most.

W. F. BIRCH.

---

## THE WATERS OF SHILOAH (OR THE AQUEDUCT) THAT GO SOFTLY.

Isaiah viii, 6.

It seems to me as certain as any point not yet ascertained to be a fact can be said to be certain, that these waters flowed from the Virgin's Fount along an aqueduct (cut in the rock) on the eastern side of Ophel (so called) southward to the entrance of the Tyropœon. Little or no fall would cause the water to flow (or go) *softly*. Therefore, as the present level of the Virgin's Fountain is 2,087 feet, we may expect the waters, before the Siloam Tunnel was made, to have flowed at about the same level.

It seems probable, therefore, that if the side of Ophel was bared to the natural rock between the Virgin's Fount and the entrance to the Tyropæon valley, traces of the above-named aqueduct would be discovered at a level of about 2,087 feet, but the search ought to be extended from about 2,080 feet to 2,090 feet. Probably the aqueduct would be a narrow trench a foot or two broad, cut in the rock perhaps 3 feet deep, and covered over with slabs of stone.<sup>1</sup> As possibly the aqueduct might in some places be destroyed when it fell into disuse on the completion of the Siloam Tunnel, it is quite possible that in searching for the aqueduct, the exploring party might excavate at some of these places, so that if no result attended the first attempt, a second or even a third ought to be made at some other part of its course.

Thrupp's opinion that the waters of Shiloah represented *the line or house of David* has for five years commended itself to me.

I believe he thought that they were brought by an aqueduct from Bethlehem. When it became clear to me that the City of David was on Ophel (so called), and that the Virgin's Fount was the ancient draw-well of Zion, by means of the subterranean passage and shaft discovered by Colonel Warren, it seemed to me that the fittest explanation was that the waters from the Virgin's Fountain were the waters of Shiloah, though I did not see how, in the time of Ahaz (for I believed and believe the Siloam Tunnel was made by Hezekiah), these waters from the Virgin's Fount could have given the name of Siloah to a spot near the present 'Ain Silwân. Professor Sayce thinks that the waters from the Virgin's Fount flowing along the Siloam Tunnel thereby got the name of *Shiloah* from the *tunnel* or *aqueduct*, and so was given to the pool the name of Siloah or Siloam. Therefore, he argues, the tunnel existed in the time of Ahaz, and must have been made by Solomon as the only probable author of water-works before Hezekiah.

The discovery of another aqueduct, which it was supposed brought water *directly* to the lower Pool of Siloam, *i.e.*, without passing through the upper Pool of Siloam, suggested to me what I believe is the true explanation of the difficulty. Even if it has been proved or could be proved that this new aqueduct only led from the upper Pool of Siloam, still this circumstance would not alter my opinion as to the true explanation.

The following considerations influence me in this conclusion :—

<sup>1</sup> As the aqueduct would be made only for irrigation, not from military considerations, it is unlikely that it should have been tunnelled through the rock instead of merely a channel being cut in the rock. This latter at that time could be made with little expense and in a short time, as many could work at it together. If there were no such aqueduct as I suppose, then it seems to me inevitable that the Siloam Tunnel was made by Solomon; but this seems to me so utterly out of the question that (though I am aware it is better not to prophesy until you know) I wish to prophesy that the aqueduct will be found if looked for carefully.

1. It is reasonable to apply Shiloah, Siloah, and Siloam to one spot, *i.e.*, the part of the Tyropœon near 'Ain Silwân, and not to different places.

2. The waters of Shiloah must, somehow or other, have come from the Virgin's Fount.

3. But they could only be brought down by some aqueduct to the southern end of the Tyropœon.

4. They could not have flowed down the Siloam Tunnel, as the date of that seems (to me) to have been the time of Hezekiah, and the waters of Shiloah are named previously in the time of Ahaz.

5. Therefore the only explanation available is that there was an aqueduct from the Virgin's Fountain along the eastern side of Ophel to the mouth of the Tyropœon.

6. If the aqueduct was made with but little fall, the waters would go or flow *softly*.

7. If it is urged that there may have been an aqueduct down the Tyropœon, one would reply, Where would a better source of water than the Virgin's Fount be found? and next, the fall down the Tyropœon would be such that the waters could hardly be said to go *softly*, but rather *swiftly*.

8. I believe the aqueduct supposed to exist in (5) was made by Solomon to irrigate the lower part of the Tyropœon (south of the 'Ain Silwân), *i.e.*, the King's gardens. It seems to me reasonable to think he would make some such use of the superfluous waters of the Virgin's Fount, instead of letting them run to waste through the soil of the Kedron Valley.

I would therefore put before the Executive Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund a proposal that search should be made for this aqueduct.

Its discovery would result in clearing up certain points.

(a) It would be a point gained to know that such an aqueduct existed.

(b) What is meant by the waters of Shiloah would be clear.

(c) There would not any longer be any room whatever for two opinions about the date of the Siloam Tunnel.

(d) I would add, from my own point of view, that a stimulus would be given to making further excavations at Jerusalem.

I trust, therefore, that the Committee will not put this question aside as an unlearned, or at any rate groundless, speculation.

W. F. BIRCH.

*Manchester,*

*November 5th, 1883.*

---

## THE CITY OF DAVID AND JOSEPHUS.

SOME of Captain Conder's remarks on p. 194 call for notice.

*The Garrison.*—As he objects to my words on this subject, I would add that Patrick, on Judges ix, 6, observes: "And after all it must be confessed