

the neighbourhood of the village of Rammûn there are cliffs sufficiently high to be called Shukf (especially that now called Shukf Dâûd). According to Gesenius the root *Se'la* means "elevated," but not necessarily precipitous.

6. Migron was apparently farther north than Wâdy Suweinit, and near Ai (Isaiah x. 28).

7. Josephus places the site of Saul's camp at a place called Aroura (Ant. vi. 12. 4), and it is remarkable that he translates the expression "under the tree" (1 Sam. xxxi. 13), in another passage, by the same word Aroura (Ant. vi. 14. 8). He probably follows a Targum rendering of the Hebrew *Ashal*. There is a village 'Arûra north of Bethel, but this could scarcely have been in the district of Gibeah.

C. R. C.

### THE NAMELESS CITY.

[See *Quarterly Statement*, July, 1879, page 130.]

THE position of the city—called Ramah by Josephus—where Saul and Samuel first met (1 Sam. ix. 6; Ant. vi. 4. 1) is a *crux interpretum*, and one of the most difficult questions of the Old Testament topography. I have enumerated in a former paper the arguments in favour of a position near Soba, where Robinson endeavoured to fix Ramathaim Zophim, the main objection to which is the mention of Rachel's tomb on the line of Saul's return journey.

There are two indications which seem to point to the identity of the nameless city with Bethlehem. First, the fact that it was in the "land of Zuph," by which we may perhaps understand the country of Zuph, Samuel's ancestor, to be intended, who was an Ephrathite, or inhabitant of Bethlehem (1 Sam. i. 1). Second, the connection between Ramah and Bethlehem implied in the New Testament (Matt. ii. 18). The term Ramah, or "hill," would apply to the situation of Bethlehem on a well-defined spur.

It seems to me that we should be cautious in introducing any element of pure conjecture into such a question. Ramah was a common name for towns in Palestine, and Ramath Lehi was apparently on the border between Judah and Philistia, below the rock Etam (Beit 'Atâb), and thus not near Bethlehem.

Dr. Robinson was equally unsuccessful in attempting to identify the city with Ramah on Mouut Ephraim, and the attempt to identify several Ramahs on one site resembles that of Jerome to combine various Gibeahs and different Rimmons, which has caused endless confusion.

Mr. Birch supports a view which has often been put forward before, that the "hill of God" (Gibeah ha Elohim) to which Saul returned from the land of Zuph was Jerusalem. The objection to such a view appears to be that Jerusalem was at that time held by the Jebusites, whereas the "hill of God" was a garrison of the Philistines. Geba of Benjamin

standing in Saul's native district, Gibeah is more probably the place intended, for we know that it remained a garrison of the Philistines until one year after the accession of Saul (1 Sam. xiii. 3).

The name Gibeah is nowhere connected with Jerusalem. Gabbatha, or "the pavement," which Mr. Birch connects with it, is derived from a different root, without any guttural, and applies to the Court of Antonia.

Mr. Birch further remarks, "the high place of Samuel might doubtless have been seen any day down to the ill-fated 24th October, 1874, when (*infandum!*) these memorable ruins were converted into Salami's Cairn.

The cairn in question (now known as Rujm el Kabtân) was built of scattered stones. It stands in a modern ruined hamlet, with a Kubbeh of Neby Daniâl, which I visited at least three times before the cairn was built, and examined carefully without finding any traces of antiquity.

C. R. C.

### THE TOMB OF DAVID.

JEREMIAH bought his cousin's field at Anathoth, though the Chaldeans were besieging Jerusalem. Will any one buy the ground overlying David's Tomb (the plot is not large) while the Turks are in the Holy City? Few would care to dispute the right of redemption with one patriarch on our Committee.

It would be money well spent to buy the field of "—," which *is* before Jerusalem, "the field, and the cave which is therein, and all the trees that are in the field, that are in all the borders round about" (Gen. xxiii. 17); "to gather out the stones thereof; to plant it with the choicest vine and fig trees, so that even Rehoboam could recognise the sepulchre of his fathers.

Who is to "step in and rob our Society of the fruits of our long toils in the past" (*Quarterly Statement*, Report, 1869, p. 49) through discovering the actual tomb of David by means of excavations judiciously made on reliable *data* obtained by the Fund?

Owing to Moslem jealousy, the Fund *may not* dig in the Haram Area, so as to settle the debatable points about the Temple; owing to the great expense, it *cannot* dig among the buildings of the city, so as to recover *the second wall*, which may fatally affect the claims of the Holy Sepulchre; but it *may* and *can* (if funds are forthcoming) dig on the south side of Jerusalem, on Ophel (so called), in search of David's Tomb.

Nine years ago Mr. Grove said, "I think that at present the object we should have in view and keep steadily before us is Jerusalem—the exploration of Jerusalem itself. . . . We do not intend to let the exploration of Jerusalem slip or go to the wall at all."

The survey is secured. Not so the spoils of Jerusalem. Why not