

architrave was carried up to a point. This must have been a striking feature in the building, and is a very peculiar formation; it may have been copied from the gate Tadi of Herod's temple, which is described as having been of this nature in the Talmud. The corner pillars of this porch or court were of the peculiar double form seen at the corners of the colonnades in the interior of all synagogues.

H. H. KITCHENER, Lieut. R.E.

## ZION, THE CITY OF DAVID.

WHERE WAS IT? HOW DID JOAB MAKE HIS WAY INTO IT? AND WHO HELPED HIM?

ARAUNAH could easily have answered these questions. Unhappily, we have not the spiritualistic power of cross-examining him. So we must be content if we can get conclusive answers by the laborious process of close investigation. The Bible, with various works on Jerusalem, and Captain Warren's remarkable discoveries, will be found to furnish sufficient materials for this end.

While the thrilling incident of the story will attract the general reader, the *savans* will require full proof of the statements advanced, so that both are given, but separately, to suit different tastes.

### THE STORY.

Ancient Jerusalem stood on a rocky plateau enclosed on three sides by two ravines; that on the west and south was called the King's Dale, that on the east the Brook Kedron. The space thus enclosed was further cleft by another ravine called the Valley of Hinnom. On the narrow ridge running between the "Brook" and "Valley," and towards its southern extremity, stood, at the beginning of Davids' reign, the hitherto impregnable fortress of Jebus. On the west side of this ridge, in the "valley," lay the rest of the city, once at least already captured by the Israelites, but occupied (perhaps at times in conjunction with them) by the Jebusites. On its east side, near the "Brook," was an intermittent fountain, or rather one of irregular flow, called then Enrogel, once Gihon in the "Brook," for a time Siloah, but now the Fountain of the Virgin.

To a stranger, this position of the fortress of Jebus or Zion would not have seemed to be well-chosen, for it was built on an inconsiderable hill, while loftier and more precipitous eminences were close at hand.

The founder, however, of this stronghold of Zion was a very subtle man. While the art of erecting and taking fortified places was then in its infancy, water was, of course, as much as ever a necessary of life. An ordinary wall of no great height was enough to baffle the most skilful general and the bravest army—always supposing the besieged kept a sharp look-out. Bethel on its low hill was a match for all the

might of Ephraim. Late in David's reign the shrewd Hushai proposed to capture a fortified city by dragging it down with ropes; and if the more practical Joab preferred raising a bank and using a primitive battering ram, still he too would have found considerable difficulty in dealing with the steep sides of Zion. Even perpendicular cliffs without water to drink would have been useless, while, after all, the height of walls was but a question of labour. Very wisely, therefore, the stronger positions on the western hill and northern part of the ridge were passed by, and the humbler slopes of the sunny Zion selected as the site of the future fortress on account of the copious fountain overflowing at its base.

It was not, however, that the damsels of Jebus might have a less distance to go for water than the stronghold was built on the hill of Zion.

The far-seeing mind of some Hittite or Amorite (perhaps of Melchizedec himself) had another project in view, which resulted in the execution of a monument destined after 3,000 years to be discovered by Captain Warren. A sketch of it is given.

It occurred to this engineer, who had never seen Woolwich, that from inside the city wall a subterraneous passage might be dug through the rock to the spring below, and so in troublous times, when the daughters of Zion could no longer venture outside the gates to draw water from the fountain, the needful supply would by this ingenious device be always obtainable, probably without the knowledge of the besiegers, and not less certainly without risk to the besieged; for what enemy would attempt the all but impossible feat of diving along a watercourse for 70 feet, and then climbing 50 feet up the smooth sides of a vertical rock-cut shaft?

This clever scheme was carried out, and though four centuries had rolled on since the conquest of Canaan, the stronghold of Zion was still unsubdued. Jericho had fallen by a miracle, Bethel by treachery, Hebron though defended by giants. In the plains alone, where war-chariots could be used, did the ancient inhabitants hold their ground against Israel. In the mountains but one invincible stronghold remained, and that was Jebus, never once taken—never, the Jebusites thought, likely to be taken; and possibly we may add, one that never would have been taken if Joab, the son of Zeruiah, and Araunah the Jebusite had not lived, and that perhaps at the same time.

The first act of David on being made king over Israel was to attack Jerusalem (*i.e.*, Jebus) with all his forces. The city in the valley fell into his hands, but the impregnable fortress on the hill above it baffled his most vigorous assaults. So secure, indeed, did its defenders deem themselves that, placing their lame and blind upon the walls, they defied David, saying, "Except thou take away the blind and the lame, thou shalt not come in hither."

Somehow David got to know how the Jebusites obtained their supply of water. There was evidently no chance of taking the stronghold by

assaulting its walls. Would any form a forlorn hope and try the desperate expedient of one by one first pushing through the horizontal water-channel, at the imminent risk of being drowned, then of scaling the perpendicular shaft, when one stone dropped from the top would probably be certain death, and afterwards of penetrating into the fortress through the narrow passage, which two or three could easily hold against a hundred?

Desperate indeed the attempt seemed, but there was no alternative plan; David therefore issued a proclamation to his army that whoever first got up the "Gutter," or Tzinnor, which was the name of this aqueduct or subterraneous passage, and smote the Jebusites, should be commander-in-chief.

Great was the reward offered, but immense was the risk. David had plenty of heroes about him, who were not easily to be deterred from venturing on the most hazardous exploits; but, eager as they were to grasp the prize, one only attempted this most daring feat. That one (and sacred history justly records his name) was Joab.

He was a man of boundless ambition, who could brook no rival. The supreme command of David's army was the object on which his heart was set. This and his life he now staked on one throw. He made the venture and won.

Sacred history relates but the simple fact that "Joab the son of Zeruiah went up first and was chief."

It might seem idle, therefore, to speculate how the deed was performed; how he drew off the water in the channel, or got through it without being drowned; how he scaled the rocky shaft without falling; how he clambered through the low passage (and perhaps at last opened the gates to his comrades); and in all this how he escaped the notice of the Jebusites.

The second Joab, an Englishman, ten years ago found it no pleasant work to follow the track of his predecessor even in time of peace. One cannot read the account of his ascent of the Tzinnor ("Jerusalem Recovered," pp. 244 to 247) without coming to the irresistible conviction that Joab never performed such a feat without aid from within—*i.e.*, that some confederate among the Jebusites helped him in what was nevertheless a dangerous exploit. That such were to be found is clear from the history of Jericho and Bethel; while, again, great as was Joab's valour, his craft was greater. Who, then, was this traitor among the Jebusites? With whom did Joab tamper about the secret surrender of the stronghold? What "bucksheesh" was given for the betrayal of the impregnable fortress?

Years after this, at the close of David's reign, we find a Jebusite (a man of rank, too, it is probable), by name Araunah, actually in possession (strange to say) of the threshing-floor just outside the city of David; nor only of the threshing-floor, which was naturally the common property of the city, but also of lands adjacent, which he sells to the king for the enormous sum of 600 shekels of gold by weight.

How any Jebusite came to be left in possession of so much valuable property in such a situation the sacred history does not tell us.

Josephus says, "Araunah was not slain by David in the siege of Jerusalem, because of the good-will he bore to the Hebrews, and a particular benignity and affection which he had to the king himself."

I have no doubt it was something particular, yet not particularly creditable to Araunah, though, fortunately for him, we have no Jebusite account, nor, indeed, any professed account at all, of the transaction, otherwise there might be a revulsion of popular feeling as to his noble character. Araunah was the (but *nil de mortuis nisi bonum*) one who lost nothing when Zion fell, neither life, nor goods, nor, so far as we know, even character.

One word in the Hebrew (Tzinnor), followed by Captain Warren's wonderful discovery of the secret passage leading from the Virgin's Fount, has enabled us to understand a most obscure and baffling passage in the Old Testament, and to follow the very track by which the adventurous Joab gained access to the stronghold of Zion.

Who will say that a great discovery is not recorded in chapter ix. of "Jerusalem Recovered"? Who will question about the Bible being the most accurate and truthful of all books?

W. F. BIRCH.

## AI.

LIEUT. KITCHENER'S suggested identification of Ai with Kh. Haiy, one mile east of Mukhamas, has much to recommend it.

1. Ai was on the east of Bethel (Josh. vii. 2) and of Abram's tent (Gen. xii. 8). As the orientals call every wind an east wind which blows from any point between east and north and east and south (Jahn, *Antiq.*, p. 17), this extensive meaning of east favours equally any position for Ai in any degree east of Bethel.

2. "The Israelites pitched on the north side of Ai; now there was a valley (Hebr. *gai*) between them and Ai. . . (13) Joshua went that night into the midst of the valley (Hebr. *emek*)" (Josh viii. 11-13).

With Ai placed at et Tell or Kh. Haiyan, Lieut. Kitchener well observes on the peculiarity of a force after approaching the city from the east crossing an almost impracticable valley, to be recrossed the next day. The valley north of et Tell might suitably be described as the *gai*, but we have also to find another wider valley answering to *emek*; for the two different words cannot here well mean exactly the same valley. The "*plain* to the north of Kh. Haiy" would, however, just suit the expression *emek*; and possibly the *gai* may be a ravine interposed between the liers in wait and Ai, unless the *gai* was the bed of a watercourse in the *emek* (see 1 Sam. xvii. 2, 3, 40).

3. As all the men of Bethel assisted Ai, it is strange that the former