



---

"The Men of Judah" in the El-Amarna Tablets

Author(s): Morris Jastrow, Jr.

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (1893), pp. 61-72

Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3259118>

Accessed: 12/03/2010 14:05

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## “The Men of Judah” in the El-Amarna Tablets.

PROFESSOR MORRIS JASTROW, JR.,  
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PENN.

AT the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in December, 1891, I had the pleasure of reading a paper on “Egypt and Palestine, 1400 B.C.”<sup>1</sup> The basis of the paper was the official correspondence that passed between the Egyptian ruler and his governors and officials stationed in various parts of Palestine and along the Phœnician coast, during the fifteenth century before the common era. Attention was particularly directed to a number of letters among these now famous El-Amarna tablets which were addressed by Abdi-ḥeba, the *ḥazâṣ*, or governor, of Jerusalem, to Amenophis IV.; and one of the chief points raised in the discussion of the letters was whether in the “Ḥabiri men” and in the “sons of Milkil,” who are among the most active opponents of Abdi-ḥeba, we may not recognize the Hebrew clans of **הַבְּרִי** and **מִלְכִּיאֵל**, which in no less than three passages of the Old Testament occur in juxtaposition as subdivisions of the tribe of Asher (Gen. xlvi. 17; Num. xxvi. 45; and 1 Chron. vii. 31).<sup>2</sup> A third identification was proposed, though with greater reserve, between Labâ’, who also appears with a following among Abdi-ḥeba’s enemies, and the Hebrew clan **לָבִי**; distinct, as a matter of course, from the clan in its later religious rôle. Assuming as a point of departure the correctness, or, better, the possibility, of these identifications, we may properly continue our investigations by seeking in the El-Amarna correspondence for further traces of clans that at a later period formed part of the confederacy of the Bene Israel. Such a trace is to be found, I believe, in the curious mention of *amelûti Ia-u-du*, “Judæan men,” and *amelûti šabe Ia-u-du*,

<sup>1</sup> Published in the JOURNAL, Vol. XI. 95-124.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Zimmern in a private communication (Aug. 19, 1892) calls attention to Judges iv. 11, where **הַבְּרִי הַלָּבִי** is mentioned.

“Judæan soldiers, or soldiery,” in letter No. 39 of the Berlin collection (Winckler and Abel, Vol. II. p. 46). Credit is due to Pater Scheil for having been the first to direct attention to these passages.<sup>3</sup> Scheil, after offering a translation of the passages involved, contents himself with the remark that the name Ia-u-du is spelled here in precisely the same way as in the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings, — a point which materially strengthens the argument for identifying Ia-u-du with Judah. In reply to Scheil’s suggestion, Delattre, on the other hand,<sup>4</sup> not only questions the identification, but proposes an entirely different interpretation for *ya-u-du* (as he reads), which according to him is the third person plural preterite of a verb 𐤎𐤍, meaning “they have witnessed.” In the third place, Sayce,<sup>5</sup> while apparently accepting Scheil’s interpretation, finds it “difficult to account for the presence of Jews” so far to the north of Palestine as Tunip.

The importance of the point involved is a sufficient warrant, in view of the radical differences existing between Scheil and Delattre, for a renewed study of the tablet. The letter is unfortunately not well preserved, and just at the place where the debatable term occurs is in a lamentable condition; which accounts for the fact that both Delattre and Halévy in their translations<sup>6</sup> failed to recognize the word. The writer of the letter is a certain Aziru,<sup>7</sup> and before offering a translation it will be well to summarize what we know of this Aziru and his doings from the El-Amarna archives. We have in all no less than twelve letters written by him, eleven in the Berlin collection (Vol. II. Nos. 31–40), and one in the British Museum (No. 35 of Bezold’s edition). Of these, seven (Berlin, Nos. 33,<sup>8</sup> 34, 34<sup>a</sup>, 35, 36, 37; London, No. 35) are addressed to the king of Egypt; four (Berlin, Nos. 32,<sup>9</sup> 38, 39, 40) to a high Egyptian official, Dudu, whom Aziru in complimentary fashion

<sup>3</sup> *Journal Asiatique*, 8<sup>ème</sup> série, tome XVIII. 347–349.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal Asiatique*, tome XX. 286–291.

<sup>5</sup> *Records of the Past*, New Series, Vol. V. p. vi–vii.

<sup>6</sup> The former, *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, 1891, p. 215; the latter, *Journal Asiatique*, 8<sup>ème</sup> série, tome XVIII. 235.

<sup>7</sup> Stem 𐤎𐤍, from which we have such a variety of names in Hebrew; cf. Budge-Bezold, *Introduction to Tell-el-Amarna Tablets*, p. lxiv. Note the reading A-za-ru in letter No. 45<sup>ab</sup>, Berlin.

<sup>8</sup> Halévy (*J. A.*, XVIII. 221) places No. 33 among those addressed to H̄ai; but both the context and the occasional address *šarrubelia* leave no doubt as to its belonging to those written to the king.

<sup>9</sup> At the beginning of lines 7 and 28 traces of Dudu are distinctly to be seen.

addresses as "my father";<sup>10</sup> and one to another official, Hai (Berlin, No. 31), whose lower rank is indicated by the title of "brother" which Aziru applies to him. Besides, there are numerous references to Aziru in other letters of the collection, especially in those of Rib-addi, the governor of Byblos. The scene of Aziru's operations lies in the north of Palestine, or more properly speaking, in Syria. The district over which he exercises control is included in the land (or lands) of Amurri.<sup>11</sup> In his own letters he is chiefly concerned with maintaining possession of the city of Šumurra, the Simir of the Assyrian inscriptions,<sup>12</sup> and in warding off the attacks of the Hittite and Nuḥašše kings. His official position, though he never calls himself a *ḥazān*, is the same as that of other *ḥazianūtu*; and like the latter he sends gifts and tribute to Amenophis, whose faithful servant he declares himself to be. A different tale in regard to his doings is told by Rib-addi of Gubla, by Abi-milki of Tyre, by Akizzi of Ḳatna, and other officials who speak of him in their communications. According to these, Aziru, as well as his father Abd-aširta, are rebels who have formed a strong combination against the Egyptian authority in Palestine. So far from opposing the Hittites, Aziru and his associates are declared to be in league with them; and the main purpose of Rib-addi's numerous letters to Amenophis is to set the conduct of Abd-aširta and his son in its true light.

Turning now to the letter itself, it reads in transliteration as follows, — the restored passages and my conjectural readings being placed in brackets :

<sup>10</sup> Aziru's father, as we know from other letters, was Abd-aširtu (or, -ašratu).

<sup>11</sup> Delattre's proposition (*P. S. B. A.*, 1891, p. 233-234) to read the name for Palestine in the Assyrian inscriptions, *a-mur-ri*, instead of *aḥarri* as heretofore, appears to have met with general acceptance (see Sayce, *Records of Past*, V. 95, 98; Budge-Bezold, p. xlvi). The ideographic writing MAR-TU or MAR ("the West-land") for Palestine, would accordingly be a mere play upon the name Amorite. It is worthy of note in this connection that in Gen. xv. 16, מְאֻרִי is used as coextensive with Palestine; and the question may be raised whether *mat-Ḥumri* (or, *bit-Ḥumri*), the common name for the kingdom of Israel in the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings, may not be due to some association with *Amurri*, the similarity between the latter and the name of king *Ḥumri* (Omri) leading to a confusion of the two.

<sup>12</sup> The position of Sumurru, which is also mentioned in Egyptian inscriptions (Rawlinson, *History of Egypt*, Vol. II. 238), warrants its identification with מְאֻרִי, Gen. x. 18. See Budge-Bezold, p. xlvi. note 3.

1. [A-na Dûdu bêli-ia a-bi-ia
2. um-ma A-zi-ru mar-ka arad-ka
3. ana šêpâ a-bi-ia am-ḫut
4. anaku eli a-bi-ia lu]<sup>13</sup> šul mu
5. . . . . u-a-nu
6. [anaku (amelu) arad kitti ša šarri (?)] bêli
7. [a-na pa-ni-ka-ma a-]dag(?)-gal
8. [at]-ta tu-[bal]-la-ḫa-an-ni
9. [û] at-ta tu-uš-mi-it-an-ni
10. a-na pa-ni-ka-ma a-dag(?)-gal
11. û at-ta-ma bêli-ia
12. û bêli-ia li iš-me
13. a-ma-te<sup>14</sup> ardi-šu A-zi-ru (amelu) arad-tum
14. i-na aš-ran-u la tu-ma-aḫ-[ḫi(?)]-ir-šu
15. ar-ḫi-iš uš-še-ra-aš-šu
16. û mââtî ša šarri bêli li-na-aš-ṣur
17. ša-ni-tu a-na Du-u(d)-du bêli-ia
18. ši-me a-ma-te šarrani mât Nu-ḫa-aš-še
19. a-na ia-ši ik-bu-nim
20. a-bu-ka-mi i-na ḫurase
21. [iš-]ta-ab-[ru]-šu
22. [iš-]tu šar mât Mi-iš-ri
23. û . . . . mi u-ma-šar-šu
24. iš-tu mât Mi-iš-ri
25. û kap-pa mââtî u kap-pa
26. amelûti šabê Ia-u-du
27. [a-na ia-ši(?)] ik-bu-nim
28. [liptur?]<sup>15</sup> mi
29. A-zi-ru iš-tu mât Mi-iš-ri
30. û i-na-an-na amelûti Ia-u-du
31. iš-tu mât [bêli(?)]<sup>16</sup> pa-aḫ(?)<sup>17</sup>-ru . . .
32. û [uš(?)]-ta-ba-li . . . du . . .
33. ana eli-ia [il-li]-ka û

<sup>13</sup> Restored from opening phrases of No. 40. Cf. No. 98, 12-13.

<sup>14</sup> So with Delattre, instead of *a-na NIT* of Winckler and Abel's text, which is clearly in error here.

<sup>15</sup> Delattre, *J. A.*, XX. 289, proposes to fill out the line by reading *iḫtur-mi*; in that case we should have to supply in line 26, *ana kaši*, or *ana šarri bêli-ia*.

<sup>16</sup> Sayce and Delattre read [*Tu*]-*ni-pa*; but the city never, so far as I can see, appears spelled in this fashion in the El-Amarna tablets, but always Tu-ni-ib.

<sup>17</sup> Text *ab*.

34. ũ [i-n]a mât Mi-[iṣ]-ri a-ši-ib  
 35. [bêli] . . . [tu(?)uṣ ší ni ta<sup>18</sup> . . .  
 36. [li-iš-ta-ab]-ba-ru-(?) šu-nu u šulmu(?)  
 37. [a-na Du-u-du] be-li-ia A-zi-ru  
 38. [arad-ka iš-pu] ra-am  
 39. [ũ i-na-an-na amelúti(?)] šabê  
 40. [Ia-u-du u sarrani(??)] mât Nu-ḥa-aš-še.

I translate as follows :

1. To Dudu, my lord, my father,
2. as follows (speaks) Aziru, thy son, thy servant.
3. At the feet of my father I fall down ;
4. I to my father (send) greeting.
5. . . . . there is not.
6. I am the faithful servant of the king, my lord (?) ;
7. to thy face I look up ;
8. thou givest me life,
9. and thou canst put me to death :<sup>19</sup>
10. to thy countenance I look up,
11. and it is thou (who art) my lord.
12. And may my lord hearken
13. to the words of his servant, Aziru, the official.
14. Inasmuch as thou hast not forwarded him,<sup>20</sup>
15. quickly send him,
16. so that he may protect the lands of the king, my lord.
17. Again, to Dudu, my lord :
18. Hear the words of the kings of Nuḥašše ;
19. unto me they spoke,
20. (to) thy father a talent of gold
21. they have sent him
22. from the king of Egypt,
23. and . . . deserts him
24. from Egypt.
25. And all the lands and all
26. the soldiery of Ia-u-du,
27. to me they spoke,
28. Let . . . [rebel?]
29. Aziru against Egypt.

<sup>18</sup> Or does the text perhaps read *Abd-a-ši-ir-ta* ?

<sup>19</sup> An interesting parallel to the Biblical phrase, מַמְלִיחַ וְיָמְחָהּ.

<sup>20</sup> I take this as a reference to a *mar šipri* (messenger) mentioned in No. 36<sub>34</sub>.

30. And now the men of Ia-u-du
31. against the country [of my lord they rebel?]
32. and bring (?) . . .
33. against me he comes and . . .
34. dwells in the land of Egypt . . .
35. my lord . . . . .
36. [may they send them?] and peace
37. to Dudu my lord, Aziru,
38. thy servant, sends
39. [and now] the soldiery
40. [of Ia-u-du and the kings of] the land of Nuḥašše.

Whatever may be our interpretation of this interesting letter, it seems to me that there is no reason for questioning the correctness of the view which regards Ia-u-du in the two passages as a proper name, either of a place or of a clan. In addition to the objections that may be urged against a verbal form like *ya-u-du*, it is to be noted that the stem 𐎶𐎺 is of rather rare occurrence, and is never found, to my knowledge, in Assyrian in the sense of 'witness.' (See Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Wörterbuch*, s.v.) Unless we assume that Aziru has deliberately inserted not merely a Hebrew form, but also a Hebrew word into his letter, Delattre's proposition cannot be entertained. Moreover, while in the first passage (l. 26) it is possible that a verb should have followed upon *šabê*, it is more likely that *ikbunim*, l. 27, is the verb belonging to *šabê*. In this way we obtain a construction parallel to l. 18-19. "Hear," says Aziru to Dudu, "the words of the Nuḥašše kings"; whereupon he proceeds to tell what they spoke unto him; and after finishing with this, passes on to tell what others said to him. Again, *šabê* appears to be used in the El-Amarna letters as a determinative, followed, as in Berlin, 3143, by *bitati*, the name of a division of troops, or, as in our case, by a proper name. However this may be, in the second passage (l. 30) a verb is out of the question, for *amelūti*, which precedes *ia-u-du*, is not used by itself in the sense of "men" or "officials," as Delattre would have it, but always followed by some noun, to which it belongs either as a determinative or as a qualifying epithet. Ia-u-du being a proper name, the question arises, Who, or what, is meant by the term? Before proceeding to discuss this, let me indicate my interpretation of the letter.

The document, so far as preserved, is divided by the scribe into three paragraphs. The first (l. 1-4) consists of the customary intro-

ductory phrases. The second begins with a protestation of Aziru's fidelity to the king and his dependence upon the latter and Dudu. Aziru asks Dudu to hearken unto him, and inasmuch as he has not yet acceded to some request — apparently for a messenger — previously made, Aziru asks him to do so at once. From the last line of this paragraph (l. 14) it would appear that this envoy, or whoever it may be that Aziru has in mind, was also to bring reinforcements with him in order to aid Aziru in protecting the district under his control. The main purport of the third paragraph, as I take it, is to lay before Dudu the attempts that have been made to wean Aziru from his attachment to the cause of Egypt. The land of Nuḥašše appears in the letters of Aziru's opponents (see especially London, 37) among the districts which are declared to be faithful to Egypt; hence it is Aziru's object to hold the chiefs of Nuḥašše up before Amenophis in the light of enemies to the latter. In some way or other it is suggested to Aziru to play false to Egypt; whether it be that Aziru is asked to intercept the messenger who is bringing gold to Abd-aširta or that he should desert his father and in this way take sides against Egypt. By way of emphasizing this conspiracy, Aziru furthermore declares that the whole country, including the Iaudu soldiery, is trying to bribe him into assuming a hostile attitude towards Egypt; but, he adds, with a show of virtuous indignation, it is the Iaudu men who have now fallen away from Amenophis. As for the remainder of the tablet, its broken condition does not permit one to speak definitely; so much only seems clear, that Aziru continues his charges. At the close of line 32 stood the name of some person or group,<sup>21</sup> of whom he declares that he or it is marching against him; and again at the close of l. 33 some one — an ally of Aziru — was mentioned who is said to be in Egypt, and therefore of no use unless the king will send him with (reinforcements and?) assurance of good-will towards Aziru. All this, however, from line 32 on, must be considered as doubtful; though a re-examination of the letter may succeed in solving the difficulties that the published text presents.<sup>22</sup> One is strongly tempted to supply *Ia-u-du u šarrani* at the beginning of line 40, and thus obtain another reference to the combination of forces arrayed against Aziru. At least three lines of the Reverse are entirely missing.

<sup>21</sup> Perhaps *Ia-u-du*? The *du* is certain, and traces of what may be *ia* are to be seen.

<sup>22</sup> I have written to Dr. Abel, asking him to be kind enough to re-examine the tablet at certain points.



So much for the interpretation. Coming now to the question as to the Ia-u-du, it is to be noted in the first place that the reference is to a group or clan, rather than to a place or an individual. In the case of a place or an individual the determinative, 'country, land,' or the vertical stroke is never omitted in the El-Amarna tablets, unless by an error of the scribe; whereas in the case of clans, as *e.g.* Ḥabiri (Berlin, 102<sub>19</sub> <sup>56</sup> 103<sub>31</sub> etc.), Kaši (103<sub>33</sub>), *marāni Labā'* (105<sub>6</sub>), *marāni Arza'* (105<sub>7</sub>), the omission of a determinative is the rule. Secondly, as the name of a group, though perhaps derived from a place, it is certainly remarkable, to say the least, that the word is written in our two passages with precisely the same signs as are found in the inscriptions of Sargon, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon, when the country and kingdom of Judah are spoken of (see the passages in Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O. T.*, s.v. יהודה). The conclusion appears, accordingly, to be forced upon us that we have a mention of an Ia-u-du, or Judæan, group in Aziru's letter, and that this group is to be sought somewhere in Palestine. The question, however, whether these Judæans are identical with the tribe of Judah as we find it in the days of the Israelitish confederacy is by no means answered through the admission of the identity of the names; and Delattre is right in warning against rash conclusions on this point. The fact must not be overlooked that Ia-u-du in the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings is the name of the *country* and not of the people, the name of the latter invariably appearing with the patronymic ending *i* in the form *Ia-u-da-ai'*; and since the scribes of the El-Amarna tablets also employ the patronymic ending, as in Ḥabiri, Kaši, Mišri, etc., its omission in the case of Ia-u-du is not without importance. Ia-u-du is, in fact, the equivalent of יהודה, the form under which the name of Judæa appears in the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (Dan. ii. 25; v. 13; vi. 14; Ezra v. 1, 8; vii. 14); but the very form יהודה suggests the possibility of an original distinction between it and יהודה. The tradition which makes of the latter the name of an individual is perfectly trustworthy; and with the concordant testimony of the El-Amarna tablets, where, as *e.g.* in the case of Milkil and the *mare* (sons of) *Milkil*, we find the custom vouched for of naming the group after its leader, there is no reason to question the derivation of the clan of Judah from the individual; but it does not follow that יהודה and יהודה are identical. It cannot be claimed that יהודה is the Aramaic form of יהודה, for there is no other instance, so far as I know, of a proper name being curtailed

in this fashion in passing from Hebrew to Aramaic. Moreover, besides a district יְהוּדָה, we find a town of that name, and that not in Aramaic, but in Hebrew. In Jos. xix. 45 a *J<sup>h</sup>ūd* appears among the towns of the district assigned to the clan of Dan. The situation of this יְהוּדָה—generally identified with the modern el-Jahûdîje, not far from Lydda—is in itself an indication that the term יְהוּדָה was not confined to the district of Judah; and so again the proper names אֲבִיהוּדָה (1 Chron. viii. 3) and עַמֵּי יְהוּדָה (Num. i. 10; ii. 18, etc.), where יְהוּדָה seems to me to be the second element,<sup>23</sup> point towards the existence of a יְהוּדָה independent of יְהוּדָה. From the etymological side also, the distinction between the two names may be maintained. Of the two explanations of יְהוּדָה offered by the Old Testament tradition, Gen. xlix. 8 and xxix. 35, the latter, which sees in the name a compound of יְהוּ (or יְהוּ) and a form of the verb וָדָה (or יָדָה), is the more acceptable, and so far as the first element is concerned appears to be unquestionably 'correct.'<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, יְהוּדָה finds a satisfactory explanation if regarded as a קָטִיל form from יָדָה. The thought that suggests itself is that the two names, originally distinct, have come in time to be confused; and this appears the more natural if it be borne in mind that the patronymic form of both would be יְהוּדָה.<sup>25</sup> It follows that the "men of Judah" referred to by Aziru need not necessarily be identical with the Judæan group of Hebrew tradition. But even if the distinction above suggested be not admitted, we have the testimony of Genesis to the fact that the clan name יְהוּדָה or יְהוּדָה is older than the Judah of Hebrew history, for among the wives of Esau (Gen. xxvi. 34) mention is made of a J<sup>h</sup>ūdîth; and the same passage also proves that the designation was not confined to the descendants of the son of Jacob, since this J<sup>h</sup>ūdîth is expressly stated to be the daughter of a Hittite. Indeed, this latter statement is a most valuable indication in accounting for the presence of Ia-u-du men in the north of Palestine, for it will be remembered that it is with the Hittites that Aziru in great measure deals. Parallel to the northern and southern Hittites—as early

<sup>23</sup> Compare names like אֲבִיהוּדָה from אָב (or אָבִי) and יָדָה (or אָבִי) and יָדָה; and אֲבִיהוּדָה, which similarly I would take as a compound of אָב and יָדָה.

<sup>24</sup> יְהוּדָה might be a contraction of יְהוּ and יָדָה, as יְהוּבָל arises from יְהוּ and יָבָל (Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*<sup>11</sup>); or the element יָדָה may stand for אֲדָה, cf. אֲדָה.

<sup>25</sup> יְהוּדָה from יְהוּדָה, like תְּמָנִי from תְּמָנָה.

as the days of Abraham — we should accordingly have Judæans both in the north and south; and the question as to the relation between these two groups may yet turn out to hinge upon the question as to the relation between the two divisions of Hittites. In both cases a similarity of names may have led to a complete confusion of the two in the dimmed traditions of the early history of Palestine. At the same time, while arguing for a distinction between יהוּרִי and יהוּדָה, and assigning the *amelūti Iaudu* to the former category, I would not be understood as denying the possibility of a close ethnic relation between the two; and there are at least two circumstances which lead me to believe that the similarity of the two terms is paralleled by an actual connection between the two groups, and perhaps not altogether independent of this connection; in other words, that the confusion rests upon an ultimate fusion. The expression *amelūti Ia-u-du* is the exact equivalent of the Hebrew אֲנָשֵׁי יְהוּדָה (1 Sam. xvii. 52; 2 Sam. ii. 4; xxxi. 7; 1 Kings i. 9), in which phrase אֲנָשֵׁי does not apply to all the inhabitants, but only to the fighting force.<sup>26</sup> Secondly, it is well known that of all the Hebrew tribes, none contained such large admixtures of various Canaanitish elements as that of Judah.<sup>27</sup> The national tradition as recorded in the 38th chapter of Genesis furnishes unmistakable proof of the correctness of this view. According to this chapter, Judah separates himself from his brethren and marries a בַּת אִשׁ כְּנַעֲנִי — a Canaanitish woman — and many of the names of the subdivisions of the Judæans which tradition enumerates as children and grandchildren of Judah are unmistakably “Arabic and Edomitic.”<sup>28</sup> Taking this in connection with the fact to which attention was called above that יהוּדִית occurs prior to the rise of the southern Judæan clan as the name of a Hittite woman, the supposition that there must be some connection between the אֲנָשֵׁי יְהוּדָה and the

<sup>26</sup> Only in Ezra x. 9 is the expression applied to the people of Judæa in general. In the same way as אֲנָשֵׁי יְהוּדָה so אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל is generally used for the soldiery of Israel (e.g. 1 Sam. vii. 11; xi. 15; xxxi. 1; 2 Sam. ii. 17) in contradistinction to אֲנָשֵׁי עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל, בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, or כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל, for the entire nation and population.

<sup>27</sup> See Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. I. 157 f.; W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2d ed., p. 179. Stade, l.c., p. 157, goes so far as to attribute to these foreign elements in Judah the dualism of Hebrew history, which, he says, begins earlier than the revolt against the Davidic dynasty.

<sup>28</sup> See Wellhausen, *De gentibus et familiis Judæorum* (Goettingen, 1870); W. R. Smith, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2d ed., p. 179.

*amelūti Ia-u-du*<sup>29</sup> need not, and, indeed, should not, be lightly dismissed. But whether we accept the ultimate unity of J<sup>h</sup>ūd and J<sup>h</sup>ūdā as branches of the same larger group, or content ourselves with recognizing a distinction between the two in a historical period leading to an ultimate confusion of the two, the presence of Ia-u-du men at the side of Hittites in northern Palestine and Syria is not any more surprising than the presence of Hittites in the south of Palestine within the district occupied by the clan of Judah. Leaving the question as to the ultimate relation between these northern and southern Judæans aside, as not admitting of a definite conclusion, it seems to me that we are justified in maintaining:—

1. The correctness of the interpretation in the letter of Aziru which makes Ia-u-du refer to a group or clan.

2. That the group name Ia-u-du is the equivalent of the Hebrew יהוד.

3. That יהוד and יהודה being similar but not necessarily identical, there may have existed both in the north and south of Palestine clans bearing these names as early as 1400 B.C., which, whether closely related or not, were both fused and confused at a subsequent time, so that all distinctions between יהוד and יהודה as between individual, group, and name of district were wiped out, and the two terms used interchangeably.

4. The parallelism between *amelūti Ia-u-du* and אנשי יהודה, and the large admixture of 'foreign' elements in the tribe of Judah as set forth in the Old Testament tradition and genealogical lists, point in the direction of a direct identification at the time of the El-Amarna correspondence between Ia-u-du and the tribe of Judah.

5. Lastly, taking the facts and arguments above adduced in connection with the propositions maintained in my previous paper on "Egypt and Palestine" as to the identity of the Ḥabiri and sons of Milkil with the Hebrew clans of חֶבֶר and מִלְכִּיאֵל, the presence in the El-Amarna tablets of another group, which (or a branch of which) reappears in later Hebrew history, though in an entirely different *rôle*, becomes a plausible hypothesis. If correct, a further justification would be found for the proposition that, among other valuable data, the El-Amarna tablets contain records of some of the very clans or branches of the clans that afterwards entered as com-

<sup>29</sup> *Amelūti Ia-u-du* and *amelūti šabē Ia-u-du* are identical, only that in the former *amelūti* is a qualifying element to the name, whereas in the latter it is a determinative to *šabē*, the equation being *amelūti Ia-u-du* = *šabē Ia-u-du*.

ponent parts in the confederacy of the Benê Israel; and this being admitted, it will be seen that the importance as well as interest of the letters is considerably enhanced through the light that they may be expected to throw on the composition and origin of the Hebrew clans. With regard to the vexed question of Israel's sojourn in Egypt,<sup>80</sup> also, the thought suggests itself that on the basis of such identifications as have above been proposed, a criterion may be found for differentiating the various strata of traditions which the formation of the Israelitish confederacy threw together. It was a natural consequence of the union among a number of clans originally distinct that the history and traditions of some should become the common possession of all.

<sup>80</sup> For the present state of the problems involved Prof. Toy's admirable article in the *New World*, Vol. II. p. 121-140, may be consulted.