

ways, as if their kindness to her subjects in distress was taken as deeds of love to Her Majesty.—E. MORGAN.

**What wilt Thou have me to do?**—In the year 1752 Benjamin Franklin made the discovery of the identity of lightning with the electric fluid. His object was to prove that it was practicable to prevent this powerful agent from being destructive to life and property, and he was fortunate enough to invent the lightning conductor. But it is a far greater triumph for the scientists of a later age to harness the lightning in the service of mankind, so that it sends a message to the farthest ends of the globe in a few seconds. We have in this an illustration of the work of the gospel in the world. It is not enough to be able to induce the drunkard to forsake his cup, and to win the man of evil tongue from his wicked words, it is also necessary to get them to see true happiness in holy living, and in praising God both in conduct and in word.—H. C. WILLIAMS.

WHY, Lord, this twofold glory of Thy ray,  
Giving him sight whose sight it takes away?  
Paul in that night God's inner light shall find:  
That he may see the Christ his eyes are blind.  
RICHARD CRAWSHAW.

## FOR REFERENCE.

- Alford (H.), Homilies on Acts, 277.  
Barry (A.), Sermons preached at Westminster, 279.  
Benson (R. M.), The Final Passover, 656.  
Brooks (P.), The Law of Growth, 184.  
Campbell (J. M.), Bible Questions, 105.  
Coates (G.), The Morning Watch for Soldiers of the King, 259.  
Ingram (W. C.), Happiness in the Spiritual Life, 45.  
Knight (J. J.), Sermons in Brief, 56.  
Laing (F. A.), Bible Lessons for Children, 304.  
Macmillan (H.), Gleanings in Holy Fields, 101.  
Morgan (E.), Calls of God, 331.  
Morison (J.), Sheaves of Ministry, 212.  
Spurgeon (C. H.), Gospel for the People, 24.  
Stanley (A. P.), Sermons in the East, 63.  
Stier (R.), Words of the Risen Saviour, 9.  
Sturrock (J. B.), Our Present Hope and our Future Home, 32.  
Thompson (H.), Concionalia, Outlines of Sermons, vol. ii. 48.  
Thorold (A. W.), Questions of Faith and Duty, 305.  
Wells (J.), Bible Images for the Young, 47.  
Williams (H. C.), Christ the Centre, 16.

## Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.D., OXFORD.

### Were there Hittites in Southern Palestine?

THE question has again been raised as to whether the Benê-Khêth from whom Abraham bought the cave of Machpelah are to be identified with the Hittites of northern Syria. The progress of knowledge is so rapid that although my discovery of the ethnic relationship and importance of these northern Hittites and their art is hardly twenty-five years old, it is likely to be forgotten by the younger scholars of to-day, who accept the fact as self-evident, and it is still more likely to be forgotten that although historians, like Eduard Meyer, accepted the discovery at once, I had a long contest to maintain before I could get it generally admitted in this country. And yet the same principles of reasoning which led me to 'discover' the Hittites of Asia Minor and Syria led me also to the belief that the Benê-Khêth of Hebron were really a branch of the Hittite race. The question, in fact, like all other questions of Old Testament history, is one which must be settled by archæology and not by philology.

My chief reason for believing that there were Hittites in southern Palestine was the statement of Ezekiel that such was the case. According to Ezekiel (16<sup>8, 45</sup>) the founders of Jerusalem were primarily Amorites and secondarily Hittites. Long before I found the name of Urusalim, or Jerusalem, in the Tel el-Amarna tablets and pointed it out to my brother Assyriologists, I had maintained against my critical adversaries that the name of Jerusalem was older than the age of the Exodus, and that the city was already an important one in the time of Abraham. I had also prophesied that a library of clay books might be discovered there, similar to the clay libraries of Babylonia, if only we could dig deeply enough, and that, at any rate, as the city was not destroyed by the Israelites (Jos 15<sup>68</sup> and Jg 1<sup>21</sup>), its early records, written on imperishable clay, could easily have been handed down to the contemporaries of Ezekiel. I recall all this, not in order to claim superior prevision and insight, but in order to show that if we wish to search for historical truth it is better to follow the leading of archæology than of grammatical analysis. The conclusions at which I arrived might have been

arrived at, by any one else who had a smattering of archæological knowledge and a little common sense.

Now these conclusions were indissolubly bound up with the conclusion that there were Hittites in the south of Palestine. And this latter conclusion was further supported by the ethnographical lists given in the Pentateuch in which the Hittites appear among the inhabitants of Canaan. In Gn 10 Heth—not 'the Hittite,' be it observed—heads the list after Zidon, and is conjoined with 'the Jebusite.' The fact must be specially noted, as the list not only takes us back to the Tel el-Amarna age, after which 'the Arkite' and 'Zemarite' specified in it disappear from history, while Tyre and other cities or tribes take their place, but with the exception of the Jebusite and perhaps the Hittite it is confined to the states and populations of the north. 'Hivite' may be a descriptive rather than an ethnic name—at all events, it is not met with farther south than Shechem and Gibeon—and the land of the Amorites, as we learn from the Tel el-Amarna tablets, was properly immediately to the north of Palestine. But from a very early age the Babylonians had included the whole population of Canaan under the general term 'Amorite,' and in the Pentateuch the old Babylonian practice (which ceased after the beginning of the Assyrian period and the Hittite conquerors in Syria) is usually followed. So it is also by Ezekiel. The list in Gn 10 must thus have been compiled by a writer to whom the Babylonian practice and the actual geographical position occupied in the Tel el-Amarna age by the peoples he mentions must have been equally well known. The fact, therefore, that he couples the Hittites with the Jebusites of Jerusalem is at least worthy of attention.

Elsewhere (Gn 15<sup>19-21</sup>, Ex 33<sup>2</sup>, etc.) the Hittites are included among other populations of southern Palestine, their territory is promised to the descendants of Abraham, and they are to be driven out by the invading Israelites. This was never true of the northern Hittites, and no Hebrew writer could ever have supposed it to be true of them. The reference must consequently be to some other Hittites who were associated with the native tribes of the south. The biblical writers to whom the ethnographical lists are due must therefore have identified the Benê-Khêth of Hebron with the Hittites, but as the Jebusites are also mentioned in the lists, they can hardly have been

meant to be, as in Ezekiel, the Hittites who were inhabitants of Jerusalem.

The name of the Benê-Khêth cannot be separated from the Heth of Gn 10. Its substitution for the more ordinary 'Hittite' and 'Hittites' is one of those 'undesigned coincidences' which have a particular value in the eyes of the archæologist. The Hittites, we now know, deified their tribes and cities. At Boghaz Keui the goddesses wear mural crowns, and Khattu, or 'Heth,' 'the Hittite,' was not only the name of the nation, but also of the national god. Hence came the proper name Khattu-sar, 'Khattu (the Hittite) is king,' like Qau-sar, 'Quê (Cilicia) is king,' or Khilpa-sar, 'Aleppo is king.'<sup>1</sup> My decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions has added other examples to the list. Katu, for instance, was a god, as well as 'the Cataonian'; the mother of Sandes is called 'the divine daughter of Carchemish'; and, as among the Babylonians, Amurru was at once 'the Amorite' and 'the Amorite god.' Similarly Stephanus of Byzantium tells us that the cities of Adana, Ostasos, and Olymbros were Cilician deities, the offspring of Heaven and Earth. Earth, called Amma or Ammes in the Hittite texts, was itself divine, and 'the nine great gods' of one Hittite inscription became 'the nine sacred cities' in another. The chief Hittite cities, in fact, were 'sacred cities,' in each of which a triangular stone symbolized and contained the deity. It is these sacred stones, and not an image, that the Hittite priest-kings describe themselves as setting up and restoring.<sup>2</sup>

Heth, accordingly, was the deified Hittite race, whose children were the Hittites themselves. Its use in the ethnographical table of Genesis is strictly correct, and there is no need of seeing in Benê-Khêth some other and unknown name. In archæology, as in other sciences, where a known cause is available, we are not permitted to invoke an unknown one.

But archæology, like other sciences, cannot admit that a result has any scientific value unless it is established by the method of comparison. And we cannot compare a thing with itself. If we

<sup>1</sup> Here I follow the usual interpretation, but the name may just as well be read Khirpa-sar, 'Herpa is king.'

<sup>2</sup> Thus Aimgalas (Mugalla, the Greek *Μυγάλλας*), the priest-king of Tyana, states that he 'built anew the sacred stone of Sandes of the city of the Eneti as it was before,' and a king of Carchemish whose name is lost similarly says: 'Behold the sacred stone of the city as it was before [anew I set up].'

wish to attain to scientific results, we must have something else with which to compare it.

As long as the Book of Genesis stood isolated and alone, a really scientific examination of its contents was impossible. But its isolation is a thing of the past. Thanks to archæological discovery, the civilized world of Genesis is becoming fairly well known to us, and the means for testing the value and signification of its narratives are being put into our hands. We can now read the pages of the Pentateuch side by side with the cuneiform tablets of Tel el-Amarna.

The Tel el-Amarna tablets have told us a good deal about the Hittites. We can follow their movements as they poured southward in band after band through the passes of the Taurus into the Syrian province of the decaying Egyptian empire. The power of the Mitannian kingdom, which had once extended as far westward as Tunip (Tennib north-west of Aleppo), was confined to the eastern side of the Euphrates, the Egyptian garrisons were driven southwards, and a body of Hittites established themselves on the banks of the Orontes which were henceforth known as Khattinâ, 'the Hittite land.'

Here was probably the Amma, Ammiya, or Am of the Tel el-Amarna letters, which would have extended as far as the Euphrates and Sajur if we should translate 'land of the children of Ammo' in Nu 22<sup>5</sup>. The Tel el-Amarna letters, however, seem to confine it more to the westward, and the same evidence is borne by one of the Hittite texts of Hamath, which associates the land of 'Amma' or 'Ammiya' with Hamath. The name is probably preserved in the classical Imma, the Aumi of the geographical list of Thothmes III.

Subbi-luliuma, the Hittite king, did not himself take much part in the raids upon Egyptian territory, though we hear of his burning Qatna on the Khabur and carrying off the image of its sun-god. But the local Hittite chiefs carved out new principalities for themselves in the south. Foremost among them was Aita-gama, who 'at the head of the Hittite soldiers' marched into Am and Ubi or Abitu, the Aup of the Egyptian monuments. Along with him went Tassu, or Dasa, Teuwatti (Tuates, Greek Τεάττης), the prince of Lapana, and Arzawaya (also called Arzauya and Arzawâ), the prince of Rukhizi. Tassu occupied Ammâ, while Teuwatti and Arzawaya accompanied Aita-gama to the land of Kinza, which bordered on Ubi, and of which

Kadesh on the Orontes was the capital. Kadesh was captured, and the Egyptian Government was compelled to acknowledge Aita-gama as its governor, content only if, like a modern Kurdish chieftain in Turkey, he rendered a nominal obedience to the Pharaoh. As the power of Egypt declined, even this nominal obedience was withdrawn; and Kadesh was made the southern capital of the Hittite kings, from which they were able to direct operations against Pajestine.

Meanwhile, after offering his services as a leader of *condottieri* to the Pharaoh, Arzawaya died, and we next hear of his sons, no longer in northern Syria, but in the south of Palestine, where they are engaged in attacking Ebed-Kheba, the king of Jerusalem. Ebed-Kheba usually terms his enemies the Khabiri, in whom some scholars have seen the Hebrews, despite history and probability. When, however, we compare his letters together, we find that the Khabiri and the sons of Arzawaya are one and the same.

The Khabiri, we are told (WINCKLER, 180, 183, 185), had seduced Milki-il from his allegiance to Egypt, and in alliance with the sons of Lab'aya (also written Lab'awa) had overrun 'the land of the king' in southern Canaan, and were threatening Jerusalem. But in WINCKLER 182, which Knudtzon has shown to be part of WINCKLER 185, the place of the Khabiri is taken by the sons of Arzawâ, or Arzawaya. It was also the Khabiri, according to Ebed-Kheba (WINCKLER 185), by whom the alliance with Lab'aya in Mount Shechem had been made.

The fact that the Khabiri were really the Hittite *condottieri* of Arzawaya is further illustrated by a discovery to which my decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions has led. The kings of Carchemish call themselves kings of 'the country of Kas.' We find the name Kas throughout the Hittite region. Mount Kasios was in the land of the Khattinâ; there were Kases in Cappadocia and two towns called Kas-tabala, 'Kas of the Tabal,' in the territory occupied by the Tabalâ; while the Kashkash are associated by Ramses II. with the troops from Carchemish in the Hittite army, and the Kaskâ, according to Tiglath-pileser I., were 'soldiers of the Hittites.' Kasios is also the name of a man in an inscription of Tefenü.<sup>1</sup> But the name of Kas,

<sup>1</sup> Is the Cappadocian (?) land of Kus to be identified with Kas? 'Horses of Kus' were brought to Nineveh from Arpad and other north Syrian cities.

written Kasi, Ka'si and Kas'si, is also met with in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, where it has hitherto been misunderstood. In ignorance of the fact which my decipherment of the Hittite texts has now first revealed, it has been supposed to represent the Babylonians who were ruled at the time by a Kassite dynasty. Babylonia, however, is called Kar-Dunias and Sankhar or Shinar, while 'the land of Kassi' is assigned a totally different geographical position in the neighbourhood of Mitanni and the Hittites. Moreover, the references to the land of Kas, in the letters of Ebed-Kheba of Jerusalem, remain inexplicable so long as it is identified with Babylonia; once assume that it was a Hittite district and all is clear. In one passage Ebed-Kheba says: 'When a ship was on the sea (in the days of Egyptian maritime power) the arm of the mighty king occupied the lands of Naharaim and Kas, but now the Khabiri are occupying the cities of the king.' A contrast is drawn between the older days of the Egyptian empire, when Thothmes III. conquered Naharaim, and the present, when the Khabiri are conquering the Egyptian empire. Not only, therefore, must Kas have so closely adjoined Naharaim as to have been included in the conquerors of Thothmes III.—who, as we know, never made his way to Babylonia,—but the parallelism further obliges us to see in the Khabiri invaders from Naharaim and Kas. Otherwise Ebed-Kheba's reproach would have no point.

Now, consequently, we can understand two passages in another letter of Ebed-Kheba. In one of them the writer says: 'Behold, this is the deed of Milki-il and of the sons of Lab'aya, who have given the land of the king to the Khabiri; (but) behold, O king, my lord, I am righteous as regards the Ka'si.' In the other we read: 'If an evil deed has been committed against the men of the land of Kas, do not kill a good [servant] (like myself on that account). (For) the men of Kas are in my territory.'

Here (1) the Khabiri and the men of the land of Kas are identified together, and therefore (2) the men of Kas must have been Hittite followers of the sons of Arzawayā. In other words, Kas was a Hittite land.

The Egyptian Government in the Tel el-Amarna age was too dependent on its foreign mercenaries to afford to offend them. It was only too well satisfied if they accepted its pay and did not openly

deny its authority. Hence Ebed-Kheba received no support in his struggle with the *condottieri* of Arzawayā; on the contrary, he was threatened with punishment for opposing their occupation of his territory, and in one of his letters he plaintively asks the royal commissioner: 'Why do you love the Khabiri and hate the native governors?' The reason was really very clear, and Jerusalem and its cities were accordingly destined to pass into the hands of the Hittites.

It follows from all this that the Jebusites of the Old Testament must be the Khabiri of the letters of Ebed-Kheba, and that Jebus was the name given by its Hittite conquerors to Jerusalem. How Uriah came to be a Hittite by race is not explained, and the variations in the name of the Jebusite Aravnah, Aranya, or Ornan are due to its foreign origin. Aravnah and Aranya, indeed, are both possible Hittite names, Aranya being a derivative from the name of the Hittite city Arinna, and meaning 'the Arinnian,' and Aravnah being possibly for Arammunis, the name of the prince in the Hittite texts of Hamath, which is explained by the ideographs attached to it to signify 'great chief,' which is a derivative from Arammê, the name of the later king of Yaghan.<sup>1</sup>

In Khabiri—which is not Khabirâ, and therefore not a proper name—I see the Assyrian *khabiri*, 'confederates.' At all events, it was the name given by the Canaanites to the particular body of *condottieri* who followed Arzawayā, as Lupakku, 'the troop of the god Luba,' was the name of the followers of Tassu (WINCKLER 125). Arzawayā itself is a derivative from Arzawa, signifying 'the Arzawayan.'<sup>2</sup> Rukhizi, of which Arzawayā had been the chief, is the Rukhasina of the treaty between Ramses II. and the Hittites. It is there preceded by the names of Sarisu and Khirpa, which Belck is certainly right in identifying with the classical Sirisa, now Kemer, on the Upper Sarus and Herpa on the Karmalas. Rukhizi would

<sup>1</sup> Sachau has shown that Arma was a Cilician deity, and as far back as 1880 I pointed out from the occurrence of the Carchemishian proper name, Aramis-sar-ilani, 'Aramis is king of the gods,' that Aramis must be a Hittite divinity. The Cilician name Ἀραμῶας is a derivative, corresponding to a Hittite Arammuyas, as are also the Lycian Armānō-ni and Arimānu-ha. In one of the inscriptions of Carchemish, Arames is called 'the chief (*arammas*), supreme over the nine (gods).'

<sup>2</sup> Ἀρζάβιος, found in an inscription at Kastabala, in Cilicia, is the Greek form of the name.

similarly be in Komana or its vicinity, and the situation of Arzawa is accordingly approximately fixed. Arinna was another city in the same locality.

Like Arzawayā, Lab'aya, who established his headquarters at Shechem, was also a Hittite. Knudtzon has shown that one of the two Arzawa letters is addressed to him, and it is possible that he derived his name from the city of Lapana, of which Teuwatti (Tuates in the Vannic inscriptions) was chief. The suffix *-na* in Hittite signified 'belonging to the district of' and Shalmaneser II. mentions a city of Lamena midway between Tanakun (Greek Thanakê) and Tarsus.

Another Hittite leader was Biridasya, who along with Arzawayā left Aitagama, in Kadesh, and marching southward occupied Abitu, or Ubi, (WINCKLER 142). The sons of Arzawayā, however, alone of the Hittite *condottieri* made their way into the south of Palestine, and there, under the name of Khabiri and Kasi, conquered a principality for themselves. Archæology has thus vindicated the statements of the Old Testament; there were Hittites in the south of Palestine, and the Jebusites of Jerusalem were of Hittite descent.

Whether there were Hittites in southern Canaan in the Abrahamic age is another matter. Their presence there may have been thrown backward like the presence of the Philistines in Gn 26. But my own belief is that the biblical writer was better acquainted than we are with the earlier history of his country. The southern movement of the northern tribes in the Tel el-Amarna age was but a repetition of a similar movement at the beginning of the Hyksos age, and there is no reason why bodies of Hittite marauders should not have done at an earlier period what they did at a later. History repeats itself in the East. But what makes me accept the historical accuracy of the narrative in Gn 23 is that the deed of sale described in it is a Babylonian contract of the Abrahamic age. It was drawn up in the legal language and with the legal formalities of the Babylonia of Khammurabi, in striking contrast to Israelitish usage as described in Ru 4<sup>7-11</sup>. A duplicate or copy of the deed of which the technical term *ḫḫ* is used may easily have been known to the writer of Genesis. Nor should it be forgotten that Thohtmes III., in speaking of the Hittite region of Asia Minor and northern Syria, calls it 'the greater land of the Hittites,' implying that there was a lesser Hittite land, which was well

known to the Egyptians, and therefore presumably at no great distance from them.

### Note on Judges i. 8.

The statement in Jg 1<sup>8</sup> that Jerusalem had been destroyed by 'the children of Judah' is contradictory, not only to Jos 15<sup>63</sup>, but also to v. 21 in the same chapter of Judges, as well as to the fact that in the generation after the conquest, Jebus, or Jerusalem, was still 'the city of a stranger, that is, not of the children of Israel' (Jg 19<sup>10-12</sup>). It is therefore usually condemned as unhistorical, the narrative in Jos 10 being often supposed to have given occasion for its invention.

Certainly, as it stands it cannot be correct. We know from Jos 15 that it was Caleb and Othniel, the Kenizites, and not Judah, who captured Hebron and Kirjath-Sepher, and that the capture of these two cities was not preceded by the destruction of Jerusalem. Nor could Jerusalem have been 'smitten with the edge of the sword and set on fire,' in view of the passages already cited from the books of Joshua and Judges.

But the contradiction between vv. 8 and 21 of Jg 1 must have been as apparent to the writer as it is to us, and if he wrote the first verse it was only because he had—or supposed he had—a written authority for the statement contained in it. The preceding narrative describing the conquest of Adoni-bezek is one of the fragments which had come down to him of the earlier history of Israel, and according to this narrative Adoni-bezek was brought to Jerusalem and died there.

The fact does not necessarily imply that Jerusalem was in possession of Judah; indeed, if it had been destroyed Adoni-bezek could not have been brought into it at all. The children of Judah might have been living peaceably with the inhabitants of Jerusalem as they are represented in Jos 15<sup>63</sup> as doing; or they might have been acting as the hired mercenaries of the Jebusites in a war between them and Bezek, as we find from the Tel el-Amarna tablets was often the case with the Bedâwin and other foreigners encamped in Canaan in pre-Israelitish days; or the hypothesis is even possible that Judah was at the time besieging Jerusalem. On any one of these suppositions Adoni-bezek could have been carried to Jerusalem, and the statement that Jerusalem was captured and burnt would be a false inference drawn by the writer of the Book of Judges.

Now let us turn to the historical evidence. When David took Jerusalem what he captured seems to have been only the Jebusite stronghold on Mount Zion, the Ophel of later days (2 S 5<sup>6-9</sup>). Accordingly, toward the end of his reign the future Temple-hill appears to have been once an uninhabited place, exposed to the winds, outside the walls of the city, where Araunah the Jebusite was able to have his threshing-floor. We may conclude, therefore, that the Jebusite city was confined to Zion, between the valleys of the Kishon and the Tyropæon.

But it is difficult to believe that a city occupying so small an area could have been the important capital of a territory such as we learn it was in the Tel el-Amarna days. May we not conjecture that the outlying portions of it had been destroyed and the city thus reduced to 'the stronghold of Zion'? If my old translation of a passage in one of the letters of Ebed-Kheba, the king of Jerusalem, is right: 'Just now the city of the mountain of Jerusalem, whose name is Bit-Ninip, the city of the king, has revolted to the men of Keilah,' we should have evidence that a sacred city already stood on 'the mountain of Jerusalem' apart from the 'stronghold' of Jerusalem itself. Zimmern and Winckler prefer to render: 'a city of the land

of Jerusalem,' but against this is the absence of *estin* 'a,' in the original. Doubtless Ebed-Kheba did not write good Assyrian, but he wanted to make his meaning clear.

Bezek lay to the south, and not to the north of Jerusalem, and was consequently in the road of Judah when advancing 'up' *i.e.* northwards from Simeon to Jerusalem (Jg 1<sup>3, 4</sup>). The belief that it was to the north is due to 1 S 11<sup>8</sup>, where, however, the Septuagint indicates that the original reading was Bamah. But its position is fixed by the geographical lists of Ramses III. or Medinet Habu. Here it comes once between Beth-Dagon (Baita-Duguna) and Karmel of Judah, and once (with the *b* omitted by the sculptor) between Migdal and Karmel, Khibur or Hebron and its Springs being associated with it. It is also one of the Canaanitish towns which Ramses II., at the Ramesseum, says that he had captured in his eighth year, and he describes it as being 'in the territory of Baitha-Antha,' or Beth-Anoth (Jos 15<sup>59</sup>). Beth-Dagon is combined with Lachish (Tell el-Hesy) and Migdal-Gad in Jos 15<sup>41</sup>, and Beth-Anoth with Gedor and Eltekon, while the site of Karmel, a few miles south of Hebron, is well known. Where, therefore, Bezek stood, can be fixed within a few miles.

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Carob and the Locust.

THESE two things, one a vegetable and the other an animal, have been long confounded; and it is a difficult question to answer how and where the confusion arose.

The carob is the fruit of a tree, much cultivated in the East, known to botanists as *Ceratonia siliqua*. The first, or generic, name is that used by Theophrastus, but it was called *Κερατρία* by Strabo. The second, or specific, name was given by the Romans to the somewhat fleshy and sweet pods of the tree, which belongs to the Pea family. The Greek name for the fruit was *Κεράτιον*, on account of its curved or horn-like shape.

The tree is now popularly known as St. John's bread,<sup>1</sup> or locust tree. The pods are always sup-

<sup>1</sup> This name was given to the fruit by herbalists of the seventeenth century.

posed to be the same as the 'husks' mentioned in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, as the Greek word is also *κεράτιον*. Classical writers tell us that boys and pigs used to eat them, as well as the refuse, *cerevisia*, after extracting the sweet juice for making wine.

On the other hand, locusts were the insects, in Greek *ἀκρίς*, and *locusta* in Latin. It is not denied that locusts were sometimes eaten; the Parthians, it would appear, were specially addicted to them; but is it likely, *à priori*, that such food would be St. John's? A diet requires some sort of vegetable matter of a farinaceous kind; but locusts and wild honey contain none; whereas carobs, like dates, would sustain life. Even they are poor enough, and were usually accompanied with coarse bread, etc. Thus Persius (*Sat.* 3) says—

Insomnis quibus detonsa juvenus  
Invigilat, siliquis et grandi pasta polenta.