

"ZION, THE CITY OF DAVID."

In the last *Statement* (p. 35) Mrs. Finn writes: "In the outbreak of 1834 the Fellahheen actually got possession of Jerusalem for a while. They entered by the sewer, from the south-east, and thus got (after some little difficulty in enlarging a passage for exit) into the Armenian quarter."

It has been noted as a remarkable coincidence that Jerusalem has thus twice been entered by a hostile force in identically the same way—viz., *through a subterranean passage*—on the first occasion by Joab, through the Gutter (or Tziinnor), on the last through the sewer as described above.

Historically it would be interesting to get a conviction against Araunah for treachery. The evidence may be thus summed up:—

1. Some one must have betrayed Jebus.
2. He would without doubt be liberally rewarded for his services, in addition to the preservation of his household.
3. It is certain that no other quarter would be given, for David was provoked (2 Sam. v. 8), and was not mild at such times (1 Sam. xxv. 13, &c.). The matter also fell into the hands of Joab, who, if less impetuous, was not less thorough in his work (1 Kings xi. 16).
4. Araunah is found in possession of exceedingly valuable land, in an advantageous position connecting him with the city, and requiring an explanation why an alien should be allowed to own it.

5. Josephus says "he was a wealthy man among the Jebusites, but was not slain by David in the siege of Jerusalem because of the goodwill he bore to the Hebrews, and a particular benignity and affection which he had to the king himself" (*Whiston*).

I do not think that any jury of honest or dishonest Jebusites would hesitate to identify the traitor who would be spared and enriched, with the very man who bore goodwill to the Jews and was very intimate with David, and who sold him for 600 shekels of gold (more than Omri paid for the hill of Samaria) the dry rock of Moriah, doubtless foreseen by one speculator at the capture of Jebus as certain afterwards to fetch a fabulous price for building purposes. Therefore, verdict "Guilty."

ERRATA.—1878, p. 133, line 17. After "above" read "though Michmash was . . . between them" (line 18).

P. 182, line 11. After "east" read or south-east.

P. 185, line 36. For "eastern" read western.

P. 186, line 25. For "Acre" read Acra.

P. 187 (5). For "or at any rate," &c., read unless this be one just below the fountain, in the Nachal.

It is remarkable that Jerome mentions the valley of Hinnom, but never the Tyropæon.

W. F. BIRCH.