

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

greater even than justice. The merciful man is God-like, for mercy is the highest attribute of Deity. Mercy must never be subordinated to such things as the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin (Lk 6³⁶). On one occasion when teaching in the Temple, Jesus enforced the lesson of mercy in a startlingly dramatic fashion (Jn 8³), when the chivalry of Jesus shamed the scribes and Pharisees. 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.' And one by one, conscience-stricken, they slunk away as from the judgment-seat.

3. But more even than mercy is expected from citizens of the Kingdom. Love is expected, *brotherly love*. There is singular pathos in our Lord's use of the words 'thy brother' (Mt 5²⁴ 18¹⁵). Fraternal love is the distinctive note of the Kingdom, and Jesus gives it the highest place in His social gospel. His law of love is not a code but a spirit, not a set of rigid rules but a controlling principle. Love is central and all-prevailing in His teaching. So clearly is this the case that ninety-nine people out of every hundred if asked what the message of Jesus is would answer unhesitatingly 'a message of love.' Love breathes from His personality, burns in His parables, emanates from every word He uttered, even the

sternest, for we feel that behind His sternness there throbs eternal love. Love explains Divine Fatherhood. Love explains the Incarnation and the Divine sacrifice on Calvary.

4. And, further, the love that Jesus asks is *love in action*, love expressed in *sacrifice* and *service*. The 'service of man' is a modern phrase, but the truth underlying it was a commonplace in our Lord's teaching. For next to His great Law of Love comes His great Law of Service, and the second is a corollary of the first. Love for Him meant no mere sentiment of transient emotion, but an energy of soul expressing itself in active ministry, doing good, practical helpfulness. Love proved itself by golden deeds.

On four occasions at least Jesus dwelt impressively upon the Law of Service: first, when He rebuked the desire for precedence and taught that greatness was measured by Service (Mt 20²⁶); second, when He showed by washing His disciples' feet that the lowliest service might be the divinest (Jn 13⁹); third, when He spoke the great parable of the Good Samaritan and censured dehumanized religious officialism (Lk 10³⁰); and, finally, when He indicated that at the last the crown of welcome would be for those who had performed deeds of love (Mt 25⁴⁰).¹

¹ D. Watson, *The Social Expression of Christianity*.

The Habiru and the Hebrews.

NEW MATERIAL IN THE PROBLEM.

By S. H. LANGDON, M.A., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

I NEED not enter into a detailed examination of the difficult question of the identification of the *amēli* *Ha-bi-ru* in the Canaanish correspondence of Amenhotep III. and IV. with the Hebrew people of the Old Testament.² There is, however, some extremely important material published more recently than any accessible discussion, and to make

² The most recent and thorough examination of the literature on this subject is by Professor Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, 66-81, and the same scholar's edition of *Judges*, pp. lxxiii-lxxxiv. In this very able review of the sources, Professor Burney inclines to accept the identification, and he rightly in that case regards the description of the Habiru in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries as revealed by the Amarna Letters as applicable to westward migrations of the Hebrews between the age of Abraham and the Exodus of the early thirteenth century.

this new evidence intelligible I begin with a brief résumé. Abdi-Heba, governor of Jerusalem, makes frequent mention of the *Habiru* (genitive-accusative *Habiri*),³ who plunder the lands of the Egyptian king's Palestinian provinces. In one instance the genitive form *Habiri-(ki)* occurs, that is, the name is followed by the geographical determinative for 'political state,' and hence the *Habiru* were a people and connected more or less vaguely with some province. It is possible to say 'the *Habiru-Habiri* man, or men.' The word is employed only in the singular, and is a diptote, that is, it is inflected in

³ The letters of Abdi-Heba are edited in Knudtzon, *El-Amarna-Tafeln*, Nos. 285-290. On the possible reading of this name as Mittanni or Hittite, see Knudtzon, p. 1333, and Gustav in *Orientalische Literatur-Zeitung*, 1911, 341.

the genitive and accusative by the same inflectional ending *î*. For example, the Jerusalem scribe writes, 'You love the *amêlu Habiri*,' i.e. 'the *Habiru*-man,' an example of the collective singular accusative.¹ And another passage has *amêlu Habiru habat*, 'The *Habiru*-men plunder,'² where the plural is employed as a grammatical singular in the nominative case, the verb being in the singular. On the other hand, the scribe writes, *tilikiu amêlu Habiru*, 'The *Habiru* men take,' where *Habiru* is employed as a nominative plural.³ An example of the genitive is *ana amêlu Habiri-ki*, 'To the *Habiru*-men.'⁴ Since gentilic formations in Assyrian drop the plural ending before adding the gentilic suffix (*âia*), (*îi*),⁵ it seems probable that *Habiru*, *Habiri* are for *Habirû*, *Habiri*, that is, the *Habirite*. The strictly philological side of this problem has never been emphasized, and even the statements on the gentilic endings in the Assyrian grammars have not been made thoroughly scientific.⁶ The old Babylonian (Assyrian so far as this northern people adopted it) generic ending is *îi*, as in Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic. The Babylonians inflected this ending, nominative *îiu* > *û*, genitive *îii* > *î*, accusative *îia* > *â*, which seems to have disappeared in favour of the genitive *î*, leaving the gentilic noun a diptote.⁷ So, for example, the Babylonian word for Amorite would be declined :

N.	<i>amurrû</i> ,	sing.	and plural.
G.	<i>amurri</i> ,	"	"
A.	<i>amurrâ</i> ,	"	"

So we have already in the classical period the

¹ Knudtzon, 286, 19.

² *Ibid.* 286, 56.

³ *Ibid.* 288, 38.

⁴ *Ibid.* 299, 24.

⁵ That is the ordinary rule in Arabic also, see Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, § 254, and Brockelman, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, i. § 220.

⁶ Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*², p. 184; Meissner, *Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 24; Ungnad, *Babylonisch Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 28. None of these writers help the student in the least regarding the syntax and declension of gentilics; Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*, does not mention gentilics at all; and Ebeling's monograph on the grammar of the Amarna Letters is confined to the verb, see *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. viii. part 2, 39-79.

⁷ By analogy with plural diptote ending *û*, *î*.

⁸ See Schorr, *Altbabylonische Rechtsurkunden*, No. 269, 1 and 21.

⁹ The only accusative gentilic form known to me is *amuru-am* in Thureau-Dangin, *Recueil de Tablettes Chaldéennes*, No. 85, and 124 Rev. 4 (cited by Ungnad, *Materialien zur Akkadischen Sprache*, 92).

shortened gentilic in *amêlu Ba-ab-bi-li*, 'the Babylonians';¹⁰ *ina alâni šumeri(m)*, 'from the Sumerian cities.'¹¹ The feminine form *îitu* becomes *îtu*, *Amurrîtu*, *Babilîtu*, regularly inflected, *îtu*, *îti*, *îta*, the singular supposedly replacing the plural. (No plural examples.) Now if, as seems probable, *Habiru* and *Habiri* are really shortened gentilic formations, supposedly of the Arabic-Babylonian type, are there parallel examples to prove that this is a gentilic, and, if so, a gentilic of true Babylonian-Aramaic-Canaanitish type as over against the Aramaic-Assyrian gentilic ending *âia*, *â-a*, or (with endings *u*, *i*), *û*, *î* (*ê*)? We have for the formation *îiu*, regularly, *šarru Kaššû*, 'the Cassite king,' *amêlu Kaššû*, 'the Cassite,' gen. *Kaššî* (*Kaššê* by obscuring *î* > *ê*). But Nebuchadnezzar calls himself *ikkaru babbilu*, 'the Babylonian husbandman,'¹² and the ending is omitted altogether in *mâti šumer u akkadim*, 'in the Sumerian and Akkadian land.'¹³ The Babylonians formed the gentilic for Egyptian *Miṣrû* (no examples), *Miṣri* (often *Miṣri*), where the Assyrians employ the Aramaic form *Miṣrâ*, *Miṣrâi*. The Aramaic ending is the one usually employed in late Babylonian. Note, for example, that the Babylonians wrote *amêlu A-ra-mu*, 'the Aramean,'¹⁴ and this form with short *u* is common in Assyria,¹⁵ genitive *Arimi*, *Arime*.¹⁶ These gentilic case-endings are employed with great irregularity in late Assyrian, as were also the ordinary case-endings. The point is that the gentilic ending *îiu*, *îii* > *û*, *î* was shortened to *u*, *i* in many cases. Hence we find *Miṣrû* and *Miṣri* employed indifferently in the Amarna Letters.

Now the ending *âia* > *âi*¹⁷ does not appear in Babylonian until Aramaic influence becomes manifest in the Cassite period. The Assyrians appear to have adopted it first, and it is, in fact, not improbable that the Assyrians were themselves of Aramaic stock. At any rate, the Assyrians at first added case-endings to *âia*, obtaining *âia-û* > *û* and

¹⁰ An accusative (Ungnad, *Babylonische Briefe*, No. 81, 15. 17). Ungnad regards it as a nominative here. The passage is broken.

¹¹ Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 34, col. 17, 22.

¹² Langdon, *Neubabylonische Königsinschriften*, 104. 19.

¹³ *Ibid.* 92. 16.

¹⁴ L. W. King, *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, ii. 81; cf. the full form *Aramâ*, 59. 8.

¹⁵ I. Rawlinson, 37. 37.

¹⁶ See Schiffer, *Die Aramäer*, 8-9, and p. 157, *et passim*.

¹⁷ Written *a-a*.

āi-a > *āi* > *ē* (genitive-accusative). So we have *Aḫlamū*, 'the Ahlamite,'¹ and the uncontracted form *amēlu Aḫ-la-ma-u* (= *Aḫlamāja-u*) in the Amarna Letters. The genitive-accusative is regularly *Aḫlamē*, but *Aḫ-la-ma-i* occurs. When we find a gentilic like *Aššurū* it is impossible to classify the form until the genitive or the feminine is discovered. The genitive of the *īi* formation would be *Aššurī*, and the feminine *Aššuritu*.² Now these are the gentilic forms of the word for 'Assyrian,' and it consequently belongs to the older group. But the same word also appears as *Aššurāi-u*, a gentilic of the younger group.³ The feminine of the second group ends in *āi-a-tu* > *ā'itu*, *e'itu*, and is a sure indication of class. So, for example, we have *Arkū*, 'the man of Erech,' and *Arkāiitu*, 'the woman of Erech'; *Armāi*, the Aramean,⁴ and *Ar-me-i-tu*, 'the Aramean woman.' Unfortunately no feminine of *Ḫabiru* is known. A pure Aramaic formation without Babylonian case-ending occurs, as is well known, in the Cassite period, or about the same time as the Amarna Letters. A Cassite king of about 1450 B.C. writes to an Assyrian usurper (?)⁵ and accuses him of intrigue with a Cassite *Ḫarbišipak Ḫa-bir-āi*, 'Harbishipak the Habirite.'⁶ 'Habirite' means 'mercenary' here. Again the Babylonian king Marduk-aḫ-erba (1080 *circa*) has left a memorial deed by which he bestowed an estate upon one Kudurra, son of — *-ušsuru* the *Ḫa-bir-āi*.⁷ There is no reason to suppose that this favourite of the Babylonian king who lived in the perilous days of the *Sutū* aggressions was a Cassite. The name was common in Semitic Babylonia. Marduk-aḫ-erba's predecessor Adad-apal-iddin was an Aramaic usurper.⁸ Babylonian kings of this troubled period made a habit of bestowing estates upon able soldiers, and Kudurra the Habirite was no exception. Here, again, the term seems to indicate a mercenary soldier.

Winckler has given a preliminary account of

the extraordinary treaties made by the kings of Ḫatti with Mittanni, Nuḫašše, and Kizzuwadni. In the oaths of these treaties a large number of Hittite, Mittanni, and related deities are invoked, among them the *ilāni ḫa-bi-ri*, 'Habirite gods.' The treaty between Tette, king of Nuḫašše, and Šubbiluliuma, king of Ḫatti (Hittites), invokes a list of over fifty gods. Near the end occurs this passage, 'The goddess Nindububna of Ḳadeš, the Lebanon Mountains, Mount Šarijana, Mount Bišaita, the gods of Lulāḫḫi,⁹ the gods of Ḫabiri, the goddess Ereškigal.'¹⁰ On the other hand, the treaty between Šubbiluliuma and Mattiuāza of Mittanni has in an equally long list of gods the following passage: 'The god Maniawanniš of the city Landa, the gods of Lulāḫi,¹¹ the gods *SA-GAZ*.'¹² A variant copy has *ilāni šiluhḫi ilāni ša amēl SA-GAZ*, gods of *šiluhḫi*,¹³ gods of the *SA-GAZ* men.¹⁴ This leaves no longer any doubt about the meaning of the Sumerian word *SA-GAZ*, it does mean the Habirite and cannot be rendered in any other way here. Why should the Hittite kings include the gods of this roving people in their pantheon? Can it be for any other reason than that these adventurers were now in the Hittite army as mercenary soldiers, precisely as they appear to have been associated with the Cassite military a half-century earlier?¹⁵

When did the Ḫabirites obtain this reputation as warriors, roving soldiers of fortune, mercenary fighting men in the employ of various military powers of Western Asia? They are ordinarily designated by the Sumerian word *sagaz* = Semitic *ḫabbatu*, 'warrior, plunderer.' Now the verb *ḫabātu* means originally 'smite with violence,' rob, plunder. The idea of doing personal violence is fundamental in this root. It is employed in § 196 of the Code of Hammurabi in *lex talionis*: 'If a freeman destroy the eye of a freeman, they shall destroy his eye.' The verb has almost ex-

¹ *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, by Figulla and Weidner, vol. i. p. 39-37.

² King, *Annals of the Kings of Assyria*, 62. 36.

³ *Amarna Letters*, Knudtzon, No. 8, 31; *Boghazköi*, *ibid.* i. p. 3. 50.

⁴ Klauber, *Politisch-Religiöse Texte*, No. 25, Rev. 10.

⁵ So Winckler, *Allorientalische Forschungen*, i. 389-396.

⁶ IV. Rawlinson, 34, No. 2, 5.

⁷ Hilprecht, *Old Babylonian Inscriptions*, No. 149. Obv. 22. See also Hinke, *A New Boundary Stone*, 190-5.

⁸ King, *Chronicles*, vol. ii. 59.

⁹ An unknown people; *ilāni lu-la-aḫ-ḫi* is a generic construction.

¹⁰ Figulla-Weidner, *Boghazköi*, i. p. 21, 27-29.

¹¹ *ilāni-lu-la-ḫi-i*. Note the unshortened gentilic, proving *lulāḫḫi* and *ḫabiri* to be gentilics.

¹² (*ilāni SA-GAZ*). Figulla-Weidner, i. p. 7, 50.

¹³ For this variant of Lulāḫḫi another Šubbiluliuma-Mattiuāza treaty has *ilāni-ša nu-la-aḫ-ḫi ilāni ša amēl SA-GAZ*, *ibid.* p. 14, 4-5.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 11, 27, *ilāni ša amēl SA-GAZ*.

¹⁵ Šubbiluliuma may be dated 1400-1350 (*circa*).

clusively a military signification in Assyrian texts, and especially in the Amarna Letters, and the new texts of the Hittite archives. Asiatic armies always associated war with plunder, and invariably say that they 'plundered' a land when they captured it; *ḥabbatu* is, then, a word for 'fighting man,' and it was translated into Sumerian correctly *sa-gaz* = *sag-gaz*, 'to smite the head,' to slay. An ancient Sumerian incantation describes the *gallū* demon as the *sa-gaz šu-nu-gi*, 'the smiter who is not turned back.'¹ Even Tetti, king of the north Syrian Hittite tribe of Nuḥašše, is called an *amel sa-gaz*.² The Babylonians invariably translated titles into Sumerian. Names of professions, religious and secular, in Babylonia, are either of Sumerian origin or translated into that official language. If the Ḥabirite became a professional soldier, and was known as a mercenary fighting man, his profession would have been translated into Sumerian by force of custom. The very fact that the Habirite has a Sumerian title proves that he held a legal status as a professional soldier. And his title *sag-gaz* > *sa-gaz* is the natural translation of *ḥabbatu*, 'soldier.'

Now it is obvious that a *sa-gaz* or 'fighting man' might be of any nationality. It is commonly associated with the Habirites, but it may have been used of any race or of any one who had an official status in some military power. The translation 'free booter,' 'roving soldier,' will not do. *Sagaz* implies a legal military profession, and in the Amarna Letters it almost certainly refers to mercenary soldiers in the Hittite army. Beyond doubt the Habirites so lent themselves to this service that the generic term 'Habirite' became technically and legally a word for 'mercenary soldier'; when the governors of Palestinian cities write to the king of Egypt and mention the *sagaz*, whereas the king of Jerusalem mentions only the Habirites, they all refer to mercenary soldiers of the Hittite army. The *Sutu* who appear in the Amarna period in much the same rôle as the Ḥabiru are expressly distinguished from the *sagaz-men*.³ The governor of Gazri (Gezer) makes frequent⁴ complaint about the *sa-gaz*, as does his

neighbour about the Ḥabiru. The same complaint comes from the city Ḥazi⁵ concerning the invading *sa-gaz*.⁶ Similar complaints come from Kadeš in Syria on the Orontes⁷ and Gebal on the coast north of Beirut,⁸ whose governor infers that the *sagaz* were in employ of the Amorite army.⁹ From the letters of Rib-Addi of Gebal it seems that the mercenary army of the *sagaz* held possession of all the coast land between the Orontes and Beirut at the close of the fifteenth century, undoubtedly with the connivance of the Hittites, who were in alliance with the Amorites against Egypt. Also the region of Sidon and Tyre in north Palestine fell to the *sagaz* troops.¹⁰

The possibility of identifying *ḥabiru* with the Hebrew עֲבָרִי is philologically unquestionable. Objection to this was raised by Professor Luckenbill in the *American Journal of Theology*, vol. xxii. p. 37, because Winckler and Böhl had given out a preliminary report concerning the Hittite treaty with Tetti, in which the reading *ilāni ḥa-ab-bi-ri* was said to exist.¹¹ This statement was repeated by Professor J. Powis Smith in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxxv. p. 230, in a review of Dr. Burney's *Judges*. The objection was made that *Ḥabiru* is really a *kattil* formation, and consequently the identification with 'ibri would be impossible. But the cuneiform text now published by Figulla and Weidner has *ilāni ḥa-bi-ri*.¹² Certainly we must assume that these two careful editors, whose copies were collated by Hrozný, have given the true reading.

But the Habirites were already professional soldiers in the army of Rim-Sin, king of Larsa (2155-2095), contemporary of Hammurabi, king of Babylon (2123-2080), who also employed them. The evidence is as follows:—Shortly before the War a large number of tablets of this period were sold in Europe and America from clandestine digging of Arabs on the site of ancient Larsa, modern Senkereh. In 1915 Père Scheil dis-

⁵ Usually located in north Palestine in the region of Tyre.

⁶ Knudtzon, Nos. 185-186.

⁷ *Ibid.* 189.

⁸ *Ibid.* 68.

⁹ *Ibid.* No. 71, 21.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* Nos. 144-149.

¹¹ See Böhl, *Kanaanäer und Hebräer*, p. 87. Böhl repeated this reading as a note signed W(inckler) in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1916, p. 184.

¹² This genitive-accusative form is employed in the nominative case in the Hittite text. That need cause no surprise, for case-endings are employed loosely at this time even in Assyrian.

¹ Lutz, *Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts*, No. 127, Obv. i. 7.

² Hrozný, *Hethitische Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, vol. i. 136, 137.

³ Knudtzon, No. 318, 13. Letter from Dagantakala in south Palestine. See also 195, 27-29.

⁴ *Ibid.* 298, 27; 299, 18, 24.

covered on a small Larsa record of the military archives of Rim-Sin this important record: 'Four founced cloaks for the sergeants of the *amel Ħa-bi-ri*, received from Ibni-Adad the master workman. They are in the reckoning of the temple of Shamash. [Delivered by] the hand of Ili-ippalzam. Month of Nisan, 11th day, year when Rim-Sin became king.'¹ The *ħabiri* in this Sumerian record are obviously private soldiers, for they are under the supervision of the *uku-uš*, Semitic *ridū*, a military officer of low rank. A large number of these Larsa records were sold to the Babylonian Collection of Yale University, and 253 of them have been neatly and accurately published by Miss E. M. Grice in *Records from Ur and Larsa, dated in the Larsa Dynasty*. In several of these texts *amelsa-gaz* occurs; it is obviously a variant of *ħabiru*. I give a résumé of each of the Sumerian records of Larsa which refer to the *lū sa-gaz* or 'fighting man.'

- A. Grice, No. 33. Eighteen sheep levied² for the *lū sa-gaz*, from two shepherds. Seals of the overseers. 11th month, 21st day. Year when the great court of Shamash was built. Reign of Warad-Sin.
- B. Grice, No. 47. Thirty-four sheep levied for the *lū sa-gaz*, from a shepherd. Seals of the overseers. 10th month. Same year as A.
- C. Grice, No. 50. Seventeen sheep *lū sa-gaz-šū*, 'for the fighting men,' brought by Ibašši-ili. Taken in charge by Ibni-Ea. Seals of the overseers. Ninth month. Year when Kazallu was destroyed. Unknown date. Either Warad-Sin or one of his immediate predecessors.
- D. Grice, No. 46. Sheep 'for the fighting (*sagaz*) men,' brought by Taribum. Taken in charge by Abu-ġabum. Seals of the overseers. Ninth month. Same year as C.

¹ *Revue d'Assyriologie*, 12, 115. The word rendered 'cloak' was erroneously copied by Scheil. He should have copied *gu* not *kar* in line 1, as the ordinary ideogram *gu-en* = *mahlaptu* (Brünnow, 3293) shows. *Gú-en*, *gú-an* passed into Semitic as *guanakku* and into Greek as *καυνάκη*, *kaunakes*. The same group of Larsa texts at Yale University have the same ideogram copied by Miss Grice, *Letters from Ur and Larsa*, No. 165.

² *mai-gid-a*, a term in the contracts of Larsa meaning literally 'kid seized (as revenue),' and corresponding to the term *su-gid* in the Drehem tablets. See Legrain, *Le Temps des Rois d'UR*, p. 29.

- E. Grice, No. 51. Eighteen sheep, food for the fighting men (*sagaz*), brought by Imgur-Sin. Seals of the witnesses. Seventh month. Same year as C.
- F. Grice, No. 52. Thirty-five sheep, food for the fighting men (*sagaz*), brought by Sin-idinnam. Seals of the overseers. Ninth month. Same year as C.
- G. Grice, No. 53. Fourteen sheep, food for the fighting men (*sagaz*), brought by Abi-ġabum. Seals of the witnesses. Same month and year as C.

The Habirites or *sagaz* men thus appear in history first as mercenaries in the service of Warad-Sin (2167-2155), son of Kudurmabuk the Elamite, and again in the first year of his more famous brother Rim-Sin. For this reason Scheil regards them as an Elamitic, a Cassite, or lower Mesopotamian people. If we maintain the historicity of Genesis 14, and see in Ariok of Ellasar, Warad-Sin of Larsa, in Kedorlā'omer of Elam, Kudurmabuk the Elamite, father of Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin, and in Amraphel Hammurabi of Babylon, then it is probable that these Habirites served in the armies of Larsa and Babylon when they invaded Syria and Palestine in the age of Abraham the Hebrew. That is the conclusion to which Scheil adheres. I quite agree, however, with Dr. Burney³ on this question. There is no reason for assuming that the Habirites at Larsa were not a west Semitic people. In fact, the new Larsa tablets at Yale University identify them with the *sagaz* who were also Habirites in the service of Hittites and Amorites of the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries.

They served also in the armies of Hammurabi, as we know from the following letter published by the late Professor L. W. King:⁴ 'To Sin-idinnam say, thus writes Hammurabi: "When thou seest this tablet send to me Ili-tukulti the baker who is in the service Apil-Shamash, and who is now resident with Anu-pi-Sin the captain of the *amel sa-gaz pl.*"'

The evidence, then, is conclusive for the identification of the *ħabiru* at Babylon and Larsa in the twenty-second to the twenty-first centuries with the *ħabiru* in Syria, and Palestine six centuries later. They could have received the name *sagaz* only

³ *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, p. 78.

⁴ *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, No. 35. See also Ungnad, *Babylonische Briefe*, No. 26.

from the Sumerians or Babylonians, most certainly the latter, because they had a legal status as a class of people in the service of the State.

The Habirites appear, therefore, to have been a wandering people precisely as Hebrew tradition describes the *Ibrim*, the Israelites, and the sons of Jacob. Were their heroic deeds in the services of Larsa, Babylon, and the Hittites also written in the Book of Jashar? When I first came upon the Larsa texts and discovered the undoubted identity of the Habiru of the twenty-second century with those of the Amarna period, their identity with the Hebrews of Old Testament tradition seemed impossible.¹ The implications were so large as to be overpowering. But with what other important people can we identify them, even if we deny the perfect philological evidence? The Hittite treaty

¹ That has been the opinion consistently advocated by Sayce.

speaks of their gods, and that need not surprise us. Only the branch of their people led by Abraham and descended through the line of Jacob received the revelation of monotheism. Were the Old Testament mere profane history few would refuse to grant historicity to its traditions. Why should we not see in this Canaanitish people an ancient race who wandered into the civilized land of Sumer and Akkad along with the western Semites of Maer and Amurru in the twenty-fourth century and founded the dynasties of Isin (2356) and Babylon (2224)? The subject is one which invites endless conjecture. Volumes of doubtful value may be written from this inspiring theme and the whole structure overthrown by the publication of a single cuneiform tablet. I venture at any rate in the direction of accepting the historicity of the traditions of Genesis as controlled by external sources.

Contributions and Comments.

The Name Achikar.

IN 1898 Messrs. Conybeare and R. Harris with Mrs. A. S. Lewis published some Syriac, Armenian, Greek, and Arabic texts containing the story of Achikar, and in 1911 E. Sachau published an Aramaic copy of the same work, ostensibly belonging to a Jewish community which flourished at Elephantine in the fifth century B.C. The Syriac form of the name is ܐܚܝܩܪ, and this is also found in the Aramaic text. It admits of a Hebrew etymology, 'Precious brother,' to be pronounced *akh yaqar*.

Now this personage figures in the Book of Tobit, which in 11¹ mentions a place called *Καοσαρείαν* in the Sinaitic text, *Καισαρείαν* in another. The latter name (Cæsarea) would fix the date of the work well within the time of the Roman Empire; but the former, which is also Latin, being derived from *Castrum* or *Castra*, would indicate a date but little earlier. Hence the evidence of the Book of Tobit for the true name of Achikar is of importance; as, if this form be a corruption which can be traced within the MSS. of Tobit, it follows that the Aramaic Achikar is not a work of the fifth century B.C., but of the twentieth A.D.

Now it may be assumed that the best text of Tobit is that to which the editors Fritzsche and Swete give the priority, viz. that of Codex B; the next best that to which they assign the second place, viz. the Sinaitic. The first of these has regularly the form *Ἀχειάχαρος* or *Ἀχιάχαρος*; the second varies between *Ἀχείχαρος*, *Ἀχειάχαρος*, *Ἀχεικάρ*, *Ἀχείκαρος*, *Ἀχίχαρος*.

Now the Greek χ is used to transliterate the Hebrew ܟ and ܩ, the Greek κ for ρ. It is most unlikely that when ܩ and ρ occurred in the same word, they would both be transliterated by χ. On the other hand, there is a rule of Greek euphony (Kühner, *Ausf. Grammatik*, i. § 67), which forbids the recurrence of an aspirate in successive syllables; hence *ἐκεχειρία* is written for *ἐχεχειρία*, *Καλχηδών* or *Χαλκηδών*, etc. There is then a sufficient reason for the alteration of *Ἀχείχαρος* to *Ἀχείκαρος*, but not for the contrary alteration.

Now *Ἀχειάχαρος* stands for ܐܚܝܩܪ, which may be compared with ܐܚܩܪ (according to Gesenius for ܐܚܩܪ) of 1 Ch 8¹. This name means 'my brother left behind,' and appears to be translated in 1²² ἦν δὲ ἐξάδελφός μου, which means 'he was my brother's son.' A man's posterity is called his ܐܚܩܪ, of which this verb is a denominative.