

Since I have been asked to reply to his article briefly, I can only attempt to clarify my previous statement. The root of the trouble, as I now see it, is my failure to point out the necessary distinction between Rowley's dating of the Exodus and Conquest and the elaborate theory of which this dating is only a part. We do not have to accept or reject any scholar's views *in toto*. In saying that Rowley's dating "has all the difficulties of Albright's view" I did not mean that Rowley has no answers to the questions involved, but that the answers required by his chronology are not satisfactory.

A fuller explanation than I can make here would show that on many points I agree with Rowley. Much of what he says in reply to my comments on his theory is quite in accord with my own position.<sup>2</sup> At the same time his theory involves also several propositions which I cannot accept, and on the whole it seems to me too complicated to be convincing. I admit, however, as stated on the same page of my book that carries the observations to which Rowley takes exception, that the facts were undoubtedly more complex than our records seem to indicate. Every theory encounters difficulties and requires questionable assumptions: on that we all agree.

Perhaps some day, in a happier world, Professor Rowley and the rest of us may find places at the table near Moses and ask him when these things took place. I fear, however, that his reply may be something like this: "I really don't remember just what the date was; in fact, I'm not sure I knew it at the time. Does it matter?"

#### NOTE ON THE WORD *ḥupšu* AT NUZI

E. R. LACHEMAN

In BULLETIN No. 83, pp. 36-39, I. Mendelsohn has presented an interesting study of *The Canaanite Term for "Free Proletarian."* He states that "the term *ḥupšu* is found in the Amarna Letters, in the Assyrian law-code, in Late-Assyrian texts, in an Ugaritic text, and in the Old Testament."

The term *ḥupšu* is also found three times in unpublished Nuzi documents: SMN 694: 13 *naphar 17 amēlāti ušparāti (UŠ.BAR)* 14 Lo. B. *ḥu-up-še*. SMN 1170: 15 *naphar 25 amēlāti ušparāti wardāti ekalli. . . .* 24 16 *amēlāti ušparāti ḥu-up-šu* 2 *naphar 41 amēlāti ušparāti* 20 *ša gāt ma-ri-ip-ḥur-ra* (This tablet is sealed with the seal of Tehip-Tilla, son of Puhi-šenni). SMN 1444 (the obverse of which is destroyed): 1 Rev. *naphar 17 amēlāti ušparāti ḥu-up-šu* 2 *naphar naphar 44 amēlāti ušparāti* (follows a list of garments made by women; the document is sealed with the seal of Tarmiya, a contemporary of Tehip-Tilla).

As can be seen the term is used only of *ušparāti*, 'weavers.' Weavers are designated as *etēnu*: SMN 3512: 3: *mPu-ḥi-ia amēlu ušparu e-te-nu*

as *šubarū*: SMN 839: 9-10: *naphar 13 šu-ḥa-ru-ū an-nu-tu, ušparātu*

SMN 3324: 32: *10 šu-ḥa-ru-ū ša uš-pār-ru-ti*

SMN 593: 13: *naphar 24 amēlāti an-nu-tu, ušparāti* (includes the name of Zigi, son of Šurki-Tilla, grandson of Tehip-Tilla and 2 *šu-ḥa-ru-ū ša Na-aš-wa-na*

as *ardāti ekalli* (SMN 1170: 15, quoted above)

as *ḥupšu*.

Therefore the *ḥupšu* was a weaver belonging to a special class differentiated from

<sup>2</sup> For a summary of my conclusions see *What Mean These Stones?*, pp. 271-4.

the palace-slave. It is interesting to note that in Nuzi, so far as evidence shows, only weavers were called *ḥupšu*. Since they were not 'palace-slaves,' nor 'young slaves,' yet "under the hand of" a master (SMN 1170: 26) they were not quite free, neither were they *coloni* in the Latin sense of the word.<sup>1</sup>

#### NOTES AND NEWS

The spring meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Schools was held on April 8th, 1942, at Andover Hall, Harvard Divinity School, in connection with the centennial meeting of the American Oriental Society. The following were present: President Burrows; Messrs. Albright, Bull, Morgenstern, Moulton, Scott, Sellers and Wilson of the Trustees; Messrs. Ingholt, Kraeling and Stinespring of the Associate Trustees; Mr. Goetze of the Committee on the Baghdad School; Mr. Gehman of the Corporation's Committee on Evaluation; Mr. Engberg as Director of the School in Jerusalem and acting Field Secretary.

Aside from questions of administrative routine, a number of important matters of direct scholarly significance were considered and several decisions were reached. All our readers will be intensely interested in the appointment of Professor Nelson Glueck of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati as Field Director of the Jerusalem and Baghdad Schools. Dr. Glueck is expected to leave this country soon in order to return to the archaeological exploration of the regions east of Palestine, where he has made so many important discoveries. It is a matter for deep satisfaction that the Schools can continue these epoch-making explorations, now in cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution, which has made a generous grant for the purpose.

News-letter No. 8, circulated among supporters and associate members of the Schools, contains substantial extracts from a recent letter of Mrs. Pommerantz, now business manager of the School in Jerusalem. This letter, dated Jan. 10th, contains very interesting information about conditions in the School, which are extremely favorable so far. The photograph which appears on the front page was sent by Mrs. Pommerantz; it suggests Scandinavia rather than the Holy Land.

#### A NEW WALL-MAP OF PALESTINE

A former member of the School in Jerusalem, Rev. Dr. G. Frederick Owen, has just published a very remarkable wall-map of Palestine in colors: *Palestine in Third Dimension* (Beacon Hill Press, 2923 Troost Avenue, Kansas City, Mo., price \$4.00, including *Mileage Chart*). By the skilful use of seven colors Dr. Owen has successfully achieved the effect of relief, making the main physical elements of the Holy Land and Southern Syria stand out with extraordinary vividness. At a distance of

<sup>1</sup> [Dr. Lacheman's note is extremely valuable for the light which it throws on the usage of the Amarna Tablets, only a few decades later, as well as on that of the Ugaritic texts, which were probably composed about the same time (late fifteenth century) in their extant form. The interpretation of the word as meaning "semi-free," approximately like Accadian *muškēnu* in the eighteenth century B. C., is strongly supported by the new evidence.—W. F. A.]