The habiru as the 'ibrim of I Samuel and the implications for the 'new chronology'

by

Peter van der Veen

Introduction

In this article I am responding to Phillip Clapham's critiques [1] recently uttered against my hypothesis on the equation of the literary use of *habiru* in the el-Amarna Letters and of *'ibrim* in I Samuel.

At the time of writing Phillip disagreed with the general outline of the 'new chronology' (henceforth NC) although I have now been informed that he now finds its present form of development more acceptable. Rather than returning to the conventional chronology, Phillip sought to develop a scheme which allowed for some modest revision which he thought would nevertheless resolve all major obstacles faced both by the orthodox scheme and by the revisionists.

Starting off with the simple conviction that the NC could not be right because it allows too little time for the Third Intermediate Period in Egypt and that it could never come to terms with the Assyrian and Babylonian chronologies (these convictions have been recently expressed more precisely by Phillip in *Workshop* [2]), he naturally was very suspicious about any of our deduced synchronisms.

One of these is undoubtedly my own equation of the term *habiru* in the el-Amarna Letters with the appellation *'ibrim* in I Samuel [3]. As I shall re-state below, many eminent scholars have indicated the striking analogy between these terms and the sets of documents describe historical conditions in Palestine normally thought to be some 350 years apart. The equation is the very heart of my thesis and the parallel between the two terms produces (for orthodox scholars) a '*habiru*-problem'. The reader has a choice: accept the equation or explain the *habiru*-problem.

Instead of evaluating the *'ibrim*-problem in I Samuel in the light of the literary usage of *habiru* in the el-Amarna Letters (as I have done), Phillip's criticism centres on the date which I believed marked the disappearance of the appellation *habiru* from the documents, i.e. by the end of LB II, or in terms of the conventional chronology, c.1200-1150 BC. I had used this date of support the revision of Old World chronology by stating that if the *habiru* are still found in I Samuel how can we say they had already disappeared from the literary scene some 150 years earlier?

Phillip instead believes the reign of David to have been the time during which 'all diverse elements including Canaanites and the *'ibrim/habiru*' were reabsorbed into general society. The reign of David would thus become the *terminus ad quem* for the *habiru* phenomenon in Syro--Palestine. If his deduction were correct we would have a problem for the NC in which, if we are correct in assuming that the *habiru* did indeed disappear by the end of LB II, the *habiru* are still believed to have been around until the second half of the 9th century BC, for this is where we would date the LB II through Iron I transition.

The question to be examined here is whether Phillip's deduction about the reign of David as the *terminus ad quem* of the *habiru* phenomenon is really justified. In answering this, I shall summarise what I consider the core of my thesis on the literary use of *habiru* and *'ibrim* in the relevant documents and will examine who the *'ibrim* in I Samuel really were. I shall evaluate the time of absorption of the *habiru* elements into the Israelite kingdoms: would David have been sufficiently able to meet the needs of all the low-class people who had felt socially and politically oppressed during the preceding centuries, and would they no longer have felt obliged to migrate elsewhere to find a better living?

Finally, I decided to include a section on Assyro-Hittite synchronisms in the light of the NC. Phillip has argued [4] that we have not been able to come to terms with the Assyrian and Babylonian chronologies in as far as they relate to our revised dates for the New Kingdom in Egypt. I believe the absence of articles on this subject in *Review* and *Workshop* is due more to lack of time than inability to deal successfully with the problems of the subject matter.

1. The Habiru-'Ibrim Problem

1.1 The El Amarna Letters and I Samuel

It was very surprising that Phillip Clapham never said a word about what I consider to be the main argument of my thesis, i.e. the striking literary analogy between the El Amarna *habiru* and the *'ibrim* of I Samuel. Phillip instead criticised my thesis by asking the question as to when the

---

Peter van der Veen is the author of 'I Samuel and the Habiru-Problem', a thesis which helped him obtain the degree of Licentiate in Theology at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit of Louvain, Belgium, in 1989. A leading advocate of the 'new chronology', he is currently working as a missionary in Mondou, Chad.

term *habiru* disappeared finally from literary usage. Even if I have argued, as several distinguished scholars do also, that the *habiru* must have been widely reintegrated into the cosmopolitan LB II society from which they had originally separated themselves (i.e. at the very end of that period) and therefore they disappeared from the documents some 100-150 years before we find them again in the book of I Samuel, the anomaly is by far inferior to the literary link of the *habiru/'ibrim* in the aforementioned documents.

I was by no means the first to point out this most remarkable link. Rather a great number of Old Testament and Amarna scholars have pointed us the way over many years, starting with the eminent scholar Julius Lewy [5]. Their arguments feature strongly in my thesis and I shall review some of them here - so as to do justice to the case for redating the Amarna period to the days of the early Israelite monarchy. At no other time in history do we find the same two-fold literary usage of the appellative *habiru/'ibrim* as in these two documents, which in terms of the conventional scheme are some 350 years apart. Several scholars have in fact argued before me that in both documents the term is applied to

i). the traditional socio-political grouping of migrants both times organised as mercenary bands fighting in the armies of the Canaanite/Indo-European feudal lords, and

ii). as a pejorative used to denigrate all rebels who have risen in revolt against the ruling class in Syro-Palestine.

As this literary extension of the traditional appellative remains absent from the extensive list of references to the *habiru* which post-date the Amarna Letters (including references from Egypt, Ugarit, Hatti and Assyria), it is difficult to believe as Gottwald, Weippert and Na'aman have it that this use of the term was passed on from the Egyptians to the Philistines who, according to Albrecht Alt [6], inherited the former's hegemony over Palestine, and hence it would not be surprising to find the Philistines apply the same term to the Israelite rebels in the interior during the 11th century BC.

Although this is theoretically possible, my own research of the relevant textual evidence has led me to conclude that there exists a direct (rather than an indirect) literary link between the El Amarna usage and that of I Samuel. Such has nevertheless been underscored by Nadav Na'aman who also claims that the author of I Samuel was aware of the twofold application of the term by the Amarna scribes and hence he may even have been an eye-witness of the events that he describes. Consequently for Na'aman, the historical narrative of I Samuel is the oldest narrative section of the Old Testament set down in writing, as other books (such as Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, etc) apply the term *'ibri/'ibrim* firstly as a 'social ethnicon' (a term invented by M. B. Rowton [7]) and later as a full gentilic determinable by the *nisbe* ending which is clearly visible in the singular *'ibri*. That is why Na'aman considers the book of Samuel to be 'the best source for a historical study of the problem of the hebrews, much better than all other biblical sources' [8].

Manfred Weippert also, after having carefully examined all references to *'ibrim* in the Old Testament, concludes that the use of *'ibrim* in I Samuel is reminiscent of that in the Amarna Letters in the the Philistines apply *'ibrim* as a pejorative - to denigrate the Israelites who have risen in revolt against them - and that the narrator is aware of the existence of real *habiru* bands fighting in the professional armies of both Saul and his Philistine enemies [9]. But as the documents are separated by at least 3 centuries Weippert only hesitantly points at this striking analogy:

> In der Tat konnte in den Texten aus dem Samuelisbuch die von uns fur die 'apiru der Amarna-Briefe nachgewiesene Bedeutung 'Rebellen gegen die legitime Herrschaft' reflektiert sein [10]

and further:

> Die Bedeutung der dem Oberhoheitsanspruch der Philister Widerstand leistenden Israeliten als 'ibrim kann vielleicht analog zu der Bennenung der gegen die agyptische Herrschaft rebellierenden Beolkerungsteile Syrien-Palastinas also *'apiru in den Amarna-Briefen erklart werden.* [11 - emphasis added]

In the light of the 'new chronology', however, this striking analogy becomes historical reality.

1.2 Who were the *'ibrim* in I Samuel?

It is clear from reading Phillip Clapham's remarks about the *'ibrim* in I Samuel that he has not really studied a). the *habiru*-problem in general and b). what the book of I Samuel says about them.

Clapham fails to make the distinction between the two groups of *'ibrim* in the book, i.e., the *habiru*-mercenaries and the rebel masses joining the overall revolt movement. Rather he sees all *'ibrim* in I Samuel as one distinct group of *hupsu*-peasants, who according to him had invaded the country from the south and who were by all means distinct from the tribal confederates of Saul, 'mercenaries employed by Israelites and Philistines alike'. Please let me put a few things straight here. A careful reading of the passages in I Samuel referring to *'ibrim* shows that everywhere where the term *'ibrim* is used by the Philistines of their eastern neighbours in the hill country the narrator makes it plain that the Israelites are the only ones implied (cf. I Samuel 4:9, 13:9, 14:11). I do not know of any commentator who has understood these passages differently!

Even the *habiru* auxiliary bands were partly made up of Israelite tribal outcasts and political dissidents. David himself is a good example: he had fled the royal court as a political dissident and had no claims to the Jesse family's inheritance as the youngest son of the family. Further, we find Israelite tribals listed among other indigenous elements among David's band of soldiers of fortune in the extensive lists of names found in II Samuel 23:8-39 and I Chronicles 11:12-22. Note that this band is clearly called *'ibrim* in I Samuel 29:3.

It was then in the course of battle against the Philistine lords of the country that the Israelite tribes swore allegiance to these turbulent groups who had already set in motion a revolt movement which was to free all the oppressed from the yoke that had been put on their shoulders by only a small class of aristocrats, the lords of the Philistine Pentapolis. Although the Philistines applied to them the very same appellative which was commonly known only for the restless groups who had broken their loyalty with the authorities of the established feudal estate [12], in reality we must add here that these tribal people were more commonly known (e.g., in the Amarna Letters and Egyptian military annals) as Shutu (in Akkadian) and Shosu (in Egyptian) [13].

We may note that the Shutu (= tribesman, pastoralist) of the city state of Gezer are also simply denigrated as 'habiru' (compare Yapuhu's free use of these two terms in EAs 297:24-29 and 299:17-26). At other times they were more clearly distinguished as in EA 246:6-7 where we read that the *habiru* (auxiliaries) served alongside these tribal elements ('Shutu') in the army of the sons of Labayu (note that this is exactly what we would expect if Labayu was King Saul,

and if his sons are to be identified with Ish-baal in the north and David in the south). In the records of Seti I the Shosu seem to be pharaoh's main enemies in southern Palestine, whereas a *habiru*-band is specifically mentioned in the smaller Beth-Shean stela in relation to a battle fought by the Egyptians in the vicinity of Beth-Shean.

Admittedly the study of the *habiru* in the EAs on the one hand and of the *'ibrim* in I Samuel on the other is very complex, as the traditional appellative has been carried far beyond its original meaning. However, once this has been understood, and once other yet more important arguments will substantiate the dating of the Amarna period to the time of the early Israelite monarchy, we can only appreciate the remarkable similarity between the use of these terms in both sets of documents.

1.3 When did the habiru disappear from literary use?

Phillip has argued that we cannot really determine from the documents when the appellative disappeared. I think that he is right to some extent. For even from the second phase of LB II we do not always have sufficient evidence about these groups in all of the regions where we had found them previously. For instance, in Palestine we no longer hear about them after the single reference to them in the second Beth-Shean stela of Seti I. Perhaps this may be taken to imply that the *habiru* in Palestine were reintegrated into society this early. However, we do have positive evidence from the Hittite documents, as well as from Ugarit and Assyria, that such a process took place toward the end of the Late Bronze Age.

During the 13th century (conventional chronology) the Hittite monarch Hatusillis III recognised the *habiru* living in the Hatti lands as a legitimate element in everyday society. These *habiru* had rights equal to all other citizens and full protection from the royal house. Their gods were listed as accepted deities of the Empire and are mentioned on a series of treaties between the Hittite suzerain and his vassals.

In the Ugaritic documents we read about the town Halbi (Aleppo?) of the *habiru*, one of the five major towns of the kingdom, and which enjoyed a status equal to the other four. Consequently Michael C. Astour concludes that:

> The Hapiru are no longer mentioned after 1200-1150 because by that time their turbulence was spent.... they ended by settling down. [14]

Even if the evidence seems somewhat lacking for Palestine, Nadav Na'aman still feels that something similar must have occurred there as well, for he says:

> Thus it seems that the Habiru were part of the society of Canaan in the Late Bronze Age, appearing because of certain political, social and economical conditions *and then becoming reabsorbed and assimilated into the same society* [15 - italics mine].

Furthermore, it can be inferred from three middle Babylonian references to individuals specified as 'habiraya' (12th-11th century, conventional dating) that the old appellative *habiru* had by this time developed into a sort of pseudo-gentilic. *The Assyrian Dictionary* (*CAD*) translates this term with 'one belonging to the class of habiru' but others such as Mary P. Gray prefer to translate it with 'Habirean', or even better, 'descendant of a Habiru' [16].

Similarly, in the biblical tradition post-dating the early monarch (and therefore I and II Samuel), the word *'ibrim* also developed into a pseudo-gentilic (as is plain from the *nisbe*-ending), first indicating descent from a group of people once known as *habiru* in the strict sense of the word, though later it was to become a full gentilic denoting the national status of an Israelite or Jew. In the NC both literary developments, i.e., 'habiraya' and 'ibr(iyy)im' would post-date the early monarchy period as seems in both instances necessitated by the literary evidence.

1.4 Did David's kingdom absorb the *habiru* elements?

In my Introduction I have already noted that Phillip's argument (that the *habiru* disappeared from literary usage during the reign of King David) really cannot be supported by biblical evidence. There is good evidence that it didn't, nor did the *habiru* phenomenon in general. For, in the narrative of II Samuel 16-21 we find it clearly stated that David was not able to satisfy the needs of all his subjects. The previously so-popular warrior king was faced with lots of opposition even from his own family and friends during the second half of his reign. Despite his great abilities as a war leader it is reasonable to assume that 'he may have been incompetent in managing the day-to-day affairs of government' [17], as we gather from the story of Absalom's rebellion. This revolt was subdued mainly by what was known as David's personal bodyguard (including non-Israelite mercenaries specifically called *'ibrim* in I Samuel 29:3).

The discontent problem was by no means settled in the period thereafter and we read in II Samuel 20:4-22 that the Ephraimite commander Sheba conspired against the crown with the help of a reasonable standing army recruited from amongst a group called *kl hbrym* in the Massoretic Text and *kl h'rym* in the LXX and Samaritan versions. Na'aman carefully emends this otherwise enigmatic name and reads it as *'ibrim* and infers that 'Sheba was a refugee who stayed with his band of "Hebrews" in the inaccessible area of Mount Ephraim' [18].

Nor did the reigns of David and Solomon resolve the *habiru* phenomenon by absorbing these elements into their kingdom. Parasocial leaders such as Rezon the son of El-Yaha with his band of 'outlaws' at Damascus continued to be a source of constant danger to both David and Solomon throughout their lifetimes (cf I Kings II:24).

2. Assyro-Hittite Synchronisms in the Light of the New Chronology

To date little has been done to accommodate Assyrian and Babylonian history with the revised dates of the NC. So far no attempt has been successful in bringing down Assur-nadin-ahhe, Assuruballit, Kurigalzu, Kadashman-Enlil and Burnaburiash of the king lists to the time of the early Israelite monarchy. It is to be hoped that progress will be made in this field and that some satisfying solution can be arrived at.

On the other hand, as far as the well known Assyrian-Hittite synchronisms (conventionally dated to the 13th century BC) are concerned, it can be shown that the NC scheme offers a new set of parallels between Assyria and Hatti (and indirectly with Egypt) without having to alter any known data of the Assyrian Kinglist. For if we use the new dates of Ramesses II, i.e. *c.*932-867 BC [19], as a starting point, we arrive at the conclusion that the names of the Assyrian 'Great Kings' mentioned in the International Correspondence with the Hittites can all be identified with neo-Assyrian kings whose names are found in the Assyrian eponym lists.

After having listed a whole set of generally assumed synchronisms between Assyria and Hatti, Peter James wrote:

> Taken together the evidence of letters (e) [= KUB III 74] and (f) [= KUB XXVI 70] provides a reasonable synchronism between an Assyrian king named Tukulti-Ninurta and the Hittite king Tudhaliya IV [20].

I agree with Peter James that only few Letters from the International Correspondence between Hatti and Assyria can be shown to be helpful in providing chronological links between Hittite and Assyrian kings from the royal king lists. Following here a rather recent list of presumed parallels [21], only KBo XVIII 25 and KUB III 74 can be taken to establish a firm parallel between Tudhaliya IV and a king Tukulti-Ninurta. All we can say about KUB XXVI 70 (to which James also refers) is that it was equally written to a Tukulti-Ninurta by one of Urhi-Teshub's successors. It is therefore generally assumed on the basis of the above mentioned synchronisms to have been written by Tudhaliya IV as well [22].

I would like to suggest here that the Tukulti-Ninurta to whom both letters appear to be addressed was not the Tukulti-Ninurta 'I' of the king list but instead Tukulti-Ninurta 'II'. For if we follow the chronology proposed by Albertine Hagenbuchner for the reign of Tudhaliya IV (i.e., that she argues that in relation to Egyptian chronology Tudhaliya IV must have come to the throne in *c.* year 42 of Ramesses II [23], or in terms of the NC, *c.*890 BC), we readily find that Tukulti-Ninurta II succeeded his father Adad-Nirari II on the throne of Assyria in 891 BC, i.e., at about the same time as Tudhaliya IV became king of Hatti.

On the other hand, on other occasions the Hittite-Assyrian Letters often lack either the name of author or addressee, and hence a link may only be tentatively established on the basis of context. For instance, KBo I 20 (which actually does not belong to the official Hittite-Assyrian correspondence) refers to an Assyrian king Adad-Nirari in relation to a war which the latter is supposed to have fought against Hanigalbat. Though the author's name is actually lost, the letter has been attributed to Hattusilis III on the basis of content [24]. Even if the identification rests on a mere guess, the NC scheme also dates the reign of Hattusilis III (*c.*915-892/890 BC) to exactly the time when Adad-Nirari 'II' sat on the throne of Assyria. His dates are 912-891 BC. There may then be a good reason to assume that the dating of the letter to the reign of Hattusilis III is in fact correct, as is also suggested in the conventional scheme.

A further Letter, namely KUB XXIII 88 [25], whose Hittite author is also unknown, was written to a king of Assyria whose name has been restored to read [Shalman]-asher-[i]-d, i.e., 'Shalmaneser' [26]. In terms of the reconstruction of later Hittite chronology presented here, we note that the only Assyrian king we know who bore this name was the well known expansionist king Shalmaneser III. I would then suggest that it is he to whom KUB XXIII 88 was written. It was this king who claims to have fought against a Sapalulme of Hattina in his year 1, i.e. in 859/8 BC [27]. Although the context of KUB XXIII 88 might perhaps present a peaceful relationship between Assyria and Hatti (though it must be kept in mind that the text is fragmentary and that not too much sense can be made of its content anyhow), Otten argues that other documents from precisely this period portrary an entirely different situation:

> Von den grossen politschen Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Hatti under Assur, wovon die assyrischen Inschriften berichten, wie sie aber auch Tuthalijas Vertrag mit Sausga-muwa von Amurru und die Urkunden aus Ugarit wiederspiedgeln, und wie sie deutlich ihren Ausdruck finden in dem Anspruch der Seigellegende "Tuthaliia sarru rabu sar kissati" - von all dem ist der Korrespondenz nichts zu entnehmen [28].

Even if the Assyrian inscriptions Otten refers to are unmistakably those from the Assyrian kings who are conventionally dated to the 13th century BC, and thus not from those kings whom we now wish to identify with the Assyrian kings mentioned in the Boghazkoy correspondence, all the other documents undoubtedly speak of a worsened political relationship between Hatti and Assyria at this time. Therefore nothing appears to hinder us from identifying the 'Shalmaneser' of KUB XXIII 88 with the neo-Assyrian king Shalmaneser III, even if the content of this letter remains silent about any political frictions that might have existed between Assyria and Hatti.

Otten, in fact, adds that some time during the reign of Tudhaliya IV (i.e., NC date *c.*892-865? BC) these frictions must have left a final breach between the two empires. And this, he claims, can be deduced from documents dating to the reign of Suppiluliumas II, son of Tudhaliya IV, who came to the throne after the short reign of Arnuwandas III [29]. May we be right in assuming, then, that the anonymous author of KUB XXIII 88 was either Arnuwandas III or indeed Suppiluliumas II, whom we believe was none other than the Sapalulme of Hattina of the royal inscriptions of Shalmaneser III?

There is further evidence which, in my view, strengthens the hypothesis that kings Hattusilis III through to Suppiluliumas II belonged to the end of the 10th to the mid-9th centuries BC. We already stated that Shalmaneser III claims to have defeated a Sapalulme of Hattina (whom we identified as Suppiluliumas II, son of Tudhaliya IV) in his year 1. Shalmaneser claims to have approached Alimush, the fortress town of Sapalulme of Hattina whereupon the latter called on his confederates from [Beth-]Adini, Carchemish, Sama'l, Que, Hilluka, Iasbuq and perhaps from a rebel prince of Assyria (Ada[...] ... Assyria ....?) [30].

Where the actual military confrontation took place we cannot tell with certainty. At any rate, Sapalulme of Hattina was defeated and eventually lost control over a good part of northern Syria: it no doubt was the end of a long era of Hittite supremacy over that region. What became of Sapalulme/Suppiluliumas II we are not told. It is reasonable to assume he was pushed back into mainland Anatolia in fearful expectancy of an Assyrian invasion of the heartland of his kingdom. For in one text (which is believed to have

	Egypt	Hatti	Assyria
-950			
	Seti I		
			Assur-dan II
	Ramesses II	Muwatallis	
-925		Urhi-Teshub	
		Hattusilis III	Assur-nirari II
-900		Tudhaliyas IV	Tukulti-Ninurta II
			Assur-nasir-pal II
-875		Arnuwandas III	
	Merenptah		Shalmaneser III
		Suppiluliumas II	
	Ramesses III	Kalparuda ?	
-850			

Aproximate chronological chart for 'new chronology'

been written by Suppiluliumas II [31]), the Hittite monarch lists various events which had radically brought to an end the glories of Hatti. Vassals had been imprisoned, others had defected to the side of the enemy. The king accuses others of not having joined him in battle when he had gone up to Nihirya (probably a loose term at this stage in history for the area between eastern Anatolia and northern Mesopotamia). The enemy had laid claim to Hatti's eastern concessions and in the end the king was left all alone in the city of Alatarma.

Even if we cannot know how accurately this text refers to the military clashes between Suppiluliumas II and Shalmaneser III, there are certainly tight affinities between them. What is more, Suppiluliumas II argues in KBo IV 14, II:66, he was in a state of war with the king of Assyria - and though he tried hard to oppose him he expected his land to be imminently invaded [32].

If we are right about the dates we have attributed to the later Hittite kings and if indeed their correspondents were the neo-Assyrian kings known from the eponym lists, then we may attempt to reconstruct what eventually happened to Suppiluliumas II and his shrunken Hittite kingdom. As Shalmaneser III received tribute from certain Kalparuda from Hattina in his year 6, we may be correct in assuming that the fears of Suppiluliumas had come true and that the heartland of Hatti had been invaded by the Assyrians, that concurrently the king had died, or had been killed, or had been replaced by a relative who had been forced into vassalage to Assyria [33].

Without wishing to oversimplify the complexity of the information about the latter years of Hittite history and how to interpret it, I do think that much of it could well fit with our new dates for the NC, i.e., with dates for Ramesses II of 932-867 BC. Apart from the fact that there are still many problems to be solved, especially in terms of the Assyrian and Babylonian chronologies, I hope to have shown here that some reasonable sense can be made of the existing parallels between Hatti and Assyria within the context of our alternative scheme.

Notes and References

1. Phillip Clapham: letter in *C & C Review* XIII [1991], p. 50
2. P. Clapham, letter 'New Chronology Problems' in *C & C Workshop* 1991:2, p. 36
3. See P. J. van der Veen: *I Samuel and the Habiru Problem* (Louvain, 1989) and idem: 'The El-Amarna Habiru and the Early Monarchy in Israel', *JACF* 3, pp. 72-78
4. Clapham: *op. cit.* [2]; a similar complaint has also appeared in a letter from Jeremy Goldberg (personal communication, 1992).
5. J. Lewy: 'Origin and Significance of the Biblical Term "Hebrew"', *Hebrew Union College Annual* 28 (1957), pp. 1-13
6. A. Alt: *Agyptische Tempel in Palastina und die Landnahme der Philister, Kleine Schriften I* (1953), p. 228. For the application of this theory and its importance in the study of the habiru problem see N. Na'aman: 'Habiru and Hebrews: the Transfer of a Social Term to the Literary Sphere', *JNES* 45:4 (1986), p. 285.
N. K. Gottwald: *The Tribes of Yahweh, A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE* (London/New York, SCM Press Ltd, 1979), p. 422; M. Wieppert: *Die Landnahme der israelitischen Stamme in der neueren wissenschaftlichen Diskussion* (Gottingen, Van den Hoeck und Ruprecht, 1967), p. 89
7. M. B. Rowton: 'Dimorphic Structure and the problem of the 'APIRU-IBRIM', *JNES* 35:1 (1976), p. 19
8. Na'aman: *op. cit.* [6], p. 279
9. Wieppert: *op. cit.* [6], pp. 88-89 and 101; see also J. Weingreen: 'Saul and the Habiru' *IVth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Papers I* (Jerusalem, World Union of Jewish Studies, 1967), pp. 63-66; J. P. Oberholzer: 'The 'Ibrim in I Samuel' in *Studies on the Book of Samuel* (Pretoria, Die Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika, 1960), p. 54
10. Weippert: *op. cit.* [6], p. 89
11. *Idem*, p. 101
12. For a good discussion of how the term *habiru* came to be applied to other low-class elements as well see G. E. Mendenhall: *The Tenth Generation, The Origins of the Biblical Tradition* (Baltimore/London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), especially p. 126
13. On the derogatory usage of *habiru*, used to denigrate the Shutu tribesmen see N. Na'aman: 'The Town Ibirta and the Relation of the 'Apiru and the Shosu', *Gottinger Miszellen* 57 (1982), pp. 29-30
14. M. C. Astour: 'Habiru', *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, supplementary volume, p. 385
15. Na'aman: *op. cit.* [6], p. 278
16. I. J. Gelb *et al.* (eds.): *The Assyrian Dictionary* (The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1964), 'hapiraja'; M. P. Gray: 'The Habiru-Hebrew Problem in the Light of the Source Material Available at Present', *HUCA* 29 (1958), p. 165
17. P. K. McCarter: 'The Historical David', *Interpretation* 40 (1986), p. 128
18. Na'aman: *op. cit.* [6], p. 284
19. D. M. Rohl: 'The Early Third Intermediate Period: Some Chronological Considerations', *JACF* 3 (1989-90), p. 61, table 5
20. P. J. James: 'Mespotamian Chronology: An Independent Control?', in *Bronze to Iron Age Chronology in the Old World: Time for a Reassessment?*, section 12, *JACF* 1 (1987), p. 70
21. A. Hagenbuchner: *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter, 1Teil:* 'Die Briefs unter ihren kulturellen, sprachlichen und thematischen Gesischtspunkten' (Heidelberg, 1989), p. 158.
22. H. Otten: 'Korrespondenz mit Tukulti-Ninurta I. aus Bogazkoy' in E. Weidner: 'Die Inschriften Tikulti-Ninurta's und seine Nachfolger', *Archiv fur Orientforschung* 12 (Graz, 1959), pp. 64, 67-68; see also Hagenbuchner: *op. cit.* [21], p. 164
23. Hagenbuchner: *op. cit.* [21], p. 162, n. 20
24. James: *op. cit.* [20], p. 70; Otten: *op. cit.* [22], p. 64
25. Otten: *op. cit.* [22], p. 65
26. *Ibid*, p. 66. Perhaps it should be said, however, that Hagenbuchner (*op. cit.* [21], p. 159, n. 10) questions the classification of this letter with the International Correspondence. She suggests instead that the letter could have been written from one official to another in the land of Hatti. However, I agree with Peter James that usually (not always!) 'Ses-ya' (i.e., 'my brother') is utilised between Great Kings, cf. James: *op. cit.* [20], p. 70.
27. J. B. Pritchard (ed): *The Ancient Near East, vol. I: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures*, p. 189
28. Otten: *op. cit.* [22], p. 68
29. *Ibid*, p. 68, n. 26; H. Otten: 'Die Hethitische historischen Quellen und die altorientalische Chronologie', in G. Walser (ed.): *Neure Nethiter Forschung*, (Weisbaden, 1964), pp. 102-103, 121; see also P. Garelli: *Le Proche-Orient Asiatique, des origines aux invasions des peuples de le mer*, (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1969), p. 219
30. Pritchard: *op. cit.* [27], p. 189; cf. Y. Aharoni and M. Avi-Yonah: *The MacMillan Bible Atlas*, (revised edition, London, 1977), p. 93, map 146
31. N. K. Sandars: *The Sea Peoples: Warriors of the Ancient Mediterranean 1250-1150 BC* (London, 1978), p. 140
32. Otten: *op. cit.* [22], p. 68, n. 26
33. Pritchard: *op. cit.* [27], p. 190

Anomalous Occurrence of Crocodilia in Eocene Polar Forests (Johnson), concluded:

113. *Ibid*, pp. 105, 106
114. Grzimek: *op. cit.* [104], pp. 143, 144. See also Guggisberg: *op. cit.* [98], pp. 107, 108
115. Minelli: *op. cit.* [96], p. 28
116. Ross: *op. cit.* [100], p. 48
117. *Ibid*, p. 49
118. *Ibid*, p. 24
119. *Ibid*, p. 50
120. Ditmars: *op. cit.* [99], p. 14
121. Guggisberg: *op. cit.* [98], p. 42
122. Wilfred T. Neill: *The Last of the Ruling Reptiles: Alligators, Crocodiles and Their Kin* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), p. 330
123. Neill: *op. cit.*, p. 193

The Origins of the Latin God Mars (Cochrane), concluded:

60. *Ibid*, p. 114
61. *Ibid*, p. 129
62. Roscher: *op. cit.* [1], p. 88
63. *Lykophron* 937
64. Hirpus is the Samnite word for wolf - see Rosivach: *op. cit.* [14], p. 520
65. Gossman: *op. cit.* [58], p. 65