

THE HOME OF SAMUEL.

By PROF. LUCIEN GAUTIER, Ph.D.

DR. SCHICK'S papers are always extremely instructive ; nobody appreciates them more than I do. His long experience of the Holy Land and his technical knowledge give a special value to all his writings. His notice in the January number of the *Quarterly Statement* on "Ramathaim-Zophim" contains the most useful materials. Thankful for these precious informations, I suppose I may, nevertheless, discuss freely the exegetical basis upon which Dr. Schick builds his theory about the home of Samuel and its identification with the localities he has so thoroughly studied and described.

Elkanah, says Dr. Schick, was "the son of Zuph, an Ephratite, i.e., a Bethlehemite." Now, certainly, such is the sense of the word Ephratite in Ruth i, 2, and in 1 Sam. xvii, 12 ; but in Judges xii, 5, and in 1 Kings xi, 26, it is quite as evident that Ephratite = Ephraimite. The word has two meanings, both historically proved ; therefore it is natural to take it in 1 Sam. i, 1, in the sense which the context imperiously suggests, namely, = Ephraimite, as Elkanah is called "a man from Mount Ephraim." It follows that the home of Samuel was north and not south of Jerusalem.

But Rachel's tomb ? Dr. Schick says that, having formerly advocated in the *Quarterly Statement* the idea that there were two monuments of Rachel, he has given it up, and believes now that Rachel's tomb has always been where it is shown now, near Bethlehem. According to that theory, which involves the rather unnatural supposition of a strip of land allotted to Benjamin within the land of Judah, Saul, returning from Samuel's home to his own village and passing near Rachel's tomb, must have started from some locality south of Bethlehem. Jeremiah, however, speaking (xxxix, 15) of the inhabitants of Jerusalem assembled at Ramah (xl, 1) and going to be brought northward to the land of the Exile, mentions, in connection with Ramah, "Rachel weeping for her children." This fact, combined with the most natural explanation of 1 Sam. ix and x, shows that in Jeremiah's time Rachel's sepulchre was still shown north of Jerusalem. Later on, and already in the time of the Evangelist St. Matthew (ii, 17-18), it was transferred south of the metropolis to the place where it is still to-day.

Dr. Schick says : "It might be that of the Ramahs so often mentioned one or more may in some passages mean quite another city, but a close study makes it probable that one and the same, viz., Samuel's home, is always meant." Of course, he does not include the different Ramahs mentioned here and there, two in Galilee (Joshua xix, 29, 36), one or two in Gilead (Joshua xiii, 26 ; 2 Kings viii, 29 ; 2 Chron. xxii, 6), one

in the Negeb (Joshua xix, 8) ; but I do not understand, if he puts Ramah the home of Samuel near Bethlehem, how his assertion can be maintained in view of such texts as Judges xix, 13 ; 1 Kings xv, 16-22. The Ramah mentioned in these two texts is generally identified with er-Râm, and it is usually acknowledged that the same place is also mentioned by Joshua xviii, 25 ; 2 Chron. xvi, 1 ; Ezra ii, 26 ; Neh. vii, 30 ; xi, 33 ; Is. x, 29 ; Hos. v, 8. But is it possible to identify this Ramah, which we may call Ramah of Benjamin, with the Ramah of Samuel ? Several of the first authorities deny it : Robinson, Furrer, Schürer, G. A. Smith, Buhl, Conder, and Séjourné. However, the great majority of the texts are not incompatible with this assimilation : 1 Sam. i, 19 ; ii, 11 ; vii, 17 ; viii, 4 ; xv, 34 ; xvi, 13 ; xix, 18-23 ; xx, 1 ; xxv, 1 ; xxviii, 3. And if the "nameless city" of 1 Sam. ix-x is the same Ramah it might also quite well be situated at er-Râm.

But there are two serious objections.

(1) Elkanah's home belongs (1 Sam. i, 1) to Mount Ephraim, and Elkanah is called an Ephratite = Ephraimite. Is that not a sufficient proof that we must look for another Ramah, er-Râm belonging to the territory of Benjamin ?

I answer that we do not know exactly what extent was given to Mount Ephraim. The Benjamite Ehud (Judges iii, 12-30), after the murder of Eglon, king of Moab, goes and blows a trumpet in Mount Ephraim (v. 27). Deborah (Judges iv, 5) "dwelt . . . between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim." The Benjamite Sheba, son of Bichri (2 Sam. xx, 1), is called (v. 21) "a man of Mount Ephraim." Zemaraim (Joshua xviii, 22) belongs to Benjamin ; but Mount Zemaraim (2 Chron. xiii, 4) belongs to Mount Ephraim. Er-Râm was in the northern kingdom (1 Kings xv, 16-22), and the terms Mount Ephraim and Ephraimite could have been extended to some localities on Benjamite soil.

(2) In the same verse (1 Sam. i, 1), Elkanah's home is called in the massorethic text, "Ramathaim-Zophim" instead of Ramah. Notwithstanding the opinion of Gesenius, and some others among the old writers, it is now generally accepted that this place is the same as Ramah of Samuel. The *hapax legomenon* Ramathaim-Zophim is explained either (a) as a second name of Ramah, the hill (Ramah, singular) having two summits (Ramathaim, dual) ; or (b) as a clerical error ; or (c) as an intentional correction ; or (d), according to Dr. Klostermann, by the clever supposition that only the vowels must be changed and that we ought to read *min-haramathim*, one of the Ramathians, *i.e.*, of the inhabitants of Ramah, that *gentilitium* being used in 1 Chron. xxvii, 27. Be it as it may be, all this does not modify our former conclusions, but the Septuagint usually transcribe Ramah by the dual form ; the First Book of Maccabees (xi, 34) mentions a village called Ramathem ; the New Testament has a town called Arimathea ; and Eusebius and Jerome say that this place, Ramathem-Arimathea, being Samuel's home, was near Lydda and in the territory of Timnah. If this can be proved, we shall have to admit two Ramahs, but if it is not proved, we may

still maintain the unity of the two Ramahs. If there had been two different places of that name, both near Jerusalem, both north of it, both important, both frequently mentioned, how could it happen that nothing ever hints at this fact, and that in the usual language both are always mentioned by the same name, a quite common name, a name which is scarcely a proper noun?

I may add that a superficial reader of Dr. Buhl's very able book, "Geographie des Alten Palaestina" (pp. 170-172), might be easily misled and brought to believe that Ramah of Samuel is always written without the Hebrew article, whereas the "other" Ramah, Ramah of Benjamin = er-Râm, is *ha-Ramah* with the article. This would be quite false; both names have systematically and equally the article.

Geneva, Switzerland.

HEBREW NAMES IN INSCRIPTIONS FROM BABYLONIA.

By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, M.R.A.S.

It is with great pleasure that I have read the note of Prof. H. V. Hilprecht in the January *Quarterly Statement*, pp. 54-55. To the American expedition to Niffer we are greatly indebted for a large number of discoveries of the greatest importance, which, under Prof. Hilprecht's able editorship, are now being given to the world.

I have long felt that there must be something in the Hebrew tradition that Niffer is the site of the ancient city of Calneh, and the presence of the Hebrew names of which Prof. Hilprecht speaks seem to give great probability to the statements of those ancient writers, who certainly were in a position—living, as they did, so much nearer the time when the city was in existence as an active and integral part of the Babylonian empire—to know better than we whereabouts the site of that ancient foundation of Nimrod lay.

With regard to the names of which he speaks, it is to be noted that they are of great value as such. Thus we have, among others, the Babylonian forms of Adoram, Haggai, Elzabad, Nathaniel, &c. Most interesting of all, however, are those ending in *āma*—Gadalyāma, Hananyāma, Igdalyāma, and Mattanyāma, which are, apparently, to be read with the final syllable transcribed as *wa*—Gadaliāwa, Hananiāwa, &c., showing the original Hebrew forms of these names (Gedaliah, Hananiah, Igdaliah, and Mattaniah), here compounded with the unpronounceable name Yāwa (Yahwah or Jahwah), later pronounced as *-iah* or *-iahu* only, and changed to Adonai when it occurred in the course of the Bible narrative as the name of God. Yahwah is, in fact, the true pronunciation of the divine name transcribed in our Bibles as Jehovah.