to be made in his so-called 'Israel stele',[25] was mainly intended to quell or suppress the peasants' revolt which was, of course, counter to Egyptian interests as well. In central Palestine, for which, as is well known, there is no 'settlement' tradition,[26] Mendenhall supposes the revolt to have occurred without any very significant military events. Since, however, the kings of Aphek, Hepher, Tappuah and Tirzah appear in the list in Josh. 12,[27] it can be assumed that the defeat of the ruling classes in this area was relatively quickly successful and led to the same result as east of the Jordan and in what later became Benjaminite territory.[28] The victorious population of Hepher and Tirzah then appear, appropriately, among the Manasseh clans.[29]

RHPhR 35, 1955, 44. To make the point doubly certain one might point out that the place name *maʿyan mē neptōaḥ* Josh. 15.9; 18.15, even if it really goes back to the name Merenptah (so F. Calice, *OLZ* 6, 1903, 224) offers no proof of a campaign on the part of the Pharaoh: such well stations were usually named after the ruler under whom they were opened up; cf., e.g., the dedicatory inscription of *kanāʾis* B 6 (S. Schott, *Kanais: Der Tempel Sethos' I. im Wâdi Mia*, NAG 1961: 6, 143 and plate 19) and Schott, *loc. cit.*, 134f. Cf. generally W. Spiegelberg, *ZÄS* 65, 1930, 57f.

[25] See above ch. I n. 6.

[26] But see Albright's view above pp. 51f. and ch. II 2 n. 31.

[27] Josh. 12.17f., 24.

[28] Mendenhall (*op. cit.*, 83) leaves open the solution of the problems of the conquest of Jericho and Ai which is reported in the Benjaminite settlement tradition.

[29] See above pp. 19f. and ch. II 1 n. 45.

III

TOPICS IN THE DEBATE

1. ʿ*APIRU* AND HEBREWS

1. Mendenhall's bold counter-suggestion to the prevailing settlement theories (II 3) hangs, on closer inspection, by a slender thread, namely his identification, taken by him as self-evident and basically presupposed, of the '*ḫab/piru*' attested in ancient Near Eastern texts since the days of the old Assyrian trading colonies in Asia Minor[1] with the biblical 'Hebrews' (*ʿibrīm*) who, for their part, are equated just as questionably with the 'Israelites' (*bᵉnē yiśrāʾēl*). If Mendenhall's sociologically based equation is correct, then we need concern ourselves no further with the question whether the 'Israelites' before the settlement in Palestine were 'nomads' or 'semi-nomads'. This question would be answered in the negative, for the '*ḫab/piru*', according to the unanimous testimony of all the texts in which they appear, were not a population group of a 'nomadic' or 'semi-nomadic' type.[2] For the time being, therefore, the nomad question can be completely excluded from our discussion. Much more important is the question whether too much is not being demanded of the equation '*ḫab/piru*' = '*ibrīm* (achieved, in my opinion, primarily on linguistic[3] or even emotive[4]

[1] In what follows the texts relating to the *ḫab/piru* are cited by their number in the collection by J. Bottéro, *Le problème des Ḫabiru à la 4ᵉ Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Cahiers de la Société Asiatique 12, Paris 1954) (abbrev. Bott.). The Ur-III-texts which mention a noun LÚ SA.GAZ and a verb SA.GAZ (Bott. 1–4) are not relevant to the *ḫab/piru* problem. The earliest definite references are then to be found in the text of Bott. 5 from Alişar.

[2] This has, however, recently been maintained by M. Astour, 'Les étrangers à Ugarit et le statut juridique des Ḫabiru', *RA* 53, 1959, 75f., without, however, as he himself admits, being able to provide any definite evidence. Similarly for Mari A. Finet, *Syria* 41, 1964, 140–42.

[3] See below pp. 74–82.

[4] The Anglo-Saxon habit of saying 'Hebrews' for 'Israelites' (on this cf. J. Lewy, *HUCA* 28, 1957, 1f.) certainly plays an unconscious role in the identifications of Albright (see above pp. 51f.) and Mendenhall.

grounds) if it is required to bear the weight of a detailed hypothesis of the Israelite settlement as a great, victorious peasants' revolt against the feudal system of the ruling classes of the cities. In criticizing Mendenhall's hypotheses, therefore, we must give a definition of the term '*ḫab/piru*' which is faithful to the textual material available, then compare this term with that of 'Hebrew' (*'ibrī*) in the Old Testament and discuss the evidence, both of linguistic usage and of the content of the terms, for and against their identification.

2. This problem has kept scholarship busy ever since the discovery of the *ḫa*-BI-*ru* in the letters of king ÌR-Ḫeba of Jerusalem[5] in the Amarna archives. In this connection we can refrain from examining individually all the theses and opinions produced since 1888[6] since the discoveries of the last decades have made many of the older positions no longer tenable. With the publication and uncovering of the rich finds of clay tablets from the ruins of the Hittite capital Ḫattuša (modern Boğazköy) the proof was produced, in the twenties, for Winckler's supposition[7] that the Sumeriogram SA.GAZ which, according to the lexicographical lists,[8] has the reading *ḫabbātu(m)* 'robbers' (and 'itinerant workers'), is to be read in the Akkadian (and Hittite) texts of the Hittite and Syro-Palestinian state offices usually, even if not exclusively, *ḫab/piru*. In the year 1939 it became clear beyond all doubt that the consonantal element of the word *ḫa*-BI-*ru*, which could not be unambiguously determined from the cuneiform script, had to be established as *'-p-r*,[9] whereby at least all etymologies dependent on the root *ḪBR[10] were excluded, and corresponding attempts with *'BR and the *'ibrīm*[11] became dubious. In what follows, therefore,

[5] Bott. 142–6 (VAB II 286–90).
The correct reading of the logographically written element of the king's name cannot be determined with any certainty; I therefore prefer to leave the Sumeriogram. For the reading *'*Abdi-Ḫeba*, see F. Thureau-Dangin, 'Le nom du prince de Jérusalem au temps d'El-Amarna', *Cinquantenaire de l'École Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem (15 novembre 1890–15 novembre 1940): Mémorial Lagrange* (Paris 1940), 27f.

[6] A detailed, if incomplete review of the history of research is offered by Bottéro, *op. cit.*, v–xxxii.

[7] H. Winckler, *Geschichte Israels* I (Leipzig 1895), 18f.; *Altorientalische Forschungen* III (Leipzig 1901), 90–94.

[8] Bott. 177–9. [9] See above ch. I n. 4.

[10] Cf. Bottéro, *op. cit.*, vi, viii, xiii, xxf., xxiif.

[11] In the first instance, amongst others, H. Zimmern, *ZDPV* 13, 1890, 137 n. 5; C. R. Conder, *PEFQS* 1890, 327. Cf. further Bottéro, *op. cit.*, vi, viii, x,

we can always take as our basis the form *'*apiru*[12] and examine the meaning of the word unencumbered by hypotheses which have been superseded because they are linguistically impossible.

3. It is nowadays fairly generally recognized that the '*apiru* who appear in numerous places from Mesopotamia to Egypt via Asia Minor, Syria and Palestine in the period between approximately 2000 and 1200 BC are not a 'people',[13] that is a relatively unified entity with much in common linguistically, sociologically and culturally, but an 'international' class of men, a social stratum[14] which, in the stratified society of the Middle and Late Bronze Age, plays anything but a leading role.[15] I have already indicated above, in my exposition of Mendenhall's theory of the settlement, that the word '*apiru* is best rendered by 'outlaw'. In our context the term[16] is to be taken primarily in a sociological sense, implying also, of course, legal distinctions. Applied to the '*apiru* class, it designates, with a kind of loose dependence on the etymology of the English word, a person who, for some reason or another, stands outside the acknowledged social system and thereby dispenses with the legal protection which the community guarantees to all its members. This definition of the term '*apiru* occasionally appeared in earlier discussions in one form or another,[17] and it is to the credit of

xi, xiv–xvi, xxi–xxviii; W. F. Albright, 'Abram the Hebrew: A New Archaeological Interpretation', *BASOR* 163, 1961, 36–54; N. A. van Uchelen, *Abraham de Hebreeër: Een literair- en historisch-kritische studie naar aanleidning van Genesis 14:13* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 5, Assen 1964). Sharply opposed to this R. Borger, 'Das Problem der 'apīru ("Ḫabiru")', *ZDPV* 74, 1958, 121–32. Cf. also generally F. M. Th. de Liagre Böhl, 'Babel und Bibel II', *JEOL* 17, 1963 (1964), 137–40.

[12] On the vowel quantities see below p. 81.

[13] So A. Jirku, starting with *Die Wanderungen der Hebräer im 3. und 2. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend* (AO 24.2, Leipzig 1924), and most recently in *Geschichte Palästina-Syriens im orientalischen Altertum* (Aalen 1963), 96f.; A. Pohl, 'Einige Gedanken zur Ḫabiru-Frage', *WZKM* 54, 1957, 157–60.

[14] So explicitly in the first instance J. Lewy, 'Ḫabiru und Hebräer', *OLZ* 30, 1927, 738–46, 825–33; then especially B. Landsberger, 'Ḫabiru und Lulaḫḫu', *KlF* I, 1930, 321–34; also E. Chiera, 'Ḫabiru and Hebrews', *AJSL* 49, 1933, 115–24; M. Noth, 'Erwägungen zur Hebräerfrage', *Festschrift Otto Procksch zum 60. Geburtstag* (Leipzig 1934), 99–112; J. Lewy, 'Ḫâbirû and Hebrews', *HUCA* 14, 1939, 587–623. A compromise position in A. Jepsen, 'Die Hebräer und ihr Recht', *AfO* 15, 1951, 54–68.

[15] It is sufficient to refer to the ritual against '(evil) tongues', many of whose details are still obscure but in which the *lulaḫḫiēš* and the *ḫapiriēš* refer to the lower strata of Hittite society (Bott. 91; cf. A. Goetze in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 80).

[16] See above p. 58 and ch. II 3 n. 11.

[17] Cf., e.g., Landsberger, Chiera, *opp. cit.* (above n. 14) and now also E. F.

Mendenhall[18] that he has defined it in this way within the context of his treatment of the Israelite settlement. In order to fit in with his conversion hypothesis, however, Mendenhall is obliged to lay too great an emphasis on the voluntary nature of the existence of the *ʿapiru*. It seems to me that entry into this category of classless individuals must normally, as the texts seem to indicate between the lines, have been experienced as a misfortune, just as in the few cases in which we can observe the process of exclusion from 'middle-class society' external pressure is the cause, not free choice. Thus, the later king Idrimi of Alalaḫ[19] is forced by a revolt on the part of the inhabitants of his father's royal city of Aleppo to leave the city along with his brothers and lead a wandering life among the bedouin (*sutû*)[20] and in the cities of Emar[21] and Ammiya.[22] In Ammiya 'in the land of Canaan' there gather about him people from his home states (Aleppo, Mugis,[23] ʿAma'u[24]), and with them

Campbell, Jr., *BA* 25, 1960, 15; M. B. Rowton, 'The Topological Factor in the *Ḫapiru* Problem', *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on his Seventy-fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965* (AssSt 16, 1965), 375–87.

[18] 'The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine', *BA* 25, 1962, 71.

[19] S. Smith, *The Statue of Idri-mi* (Occasional Publications of the British School of Archaeology in Ankara 1, London 1949), 14–17.

[20] On the *sutû* (old form *su-ti-um*^{KI}) cf. W. F. Albright, *JBL* 63, 1944, 220 n.89; *BASOR* 118, 1950, 16 n.18; F. M. Th. Böhl, *BO* 8, 1951, 54 n.29; Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 41, n.1; É. Dhorme in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 114 and n.2; *ARMT* XV, 133 *s.v.* Sutû; D. O. Edzard, *Die 'zweite Zwischenzeit' Babyloniens* (Wiesbaden 1957), 32, 108, 155; J.-R. Kupper, *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 142, Paris 1957), 83–145; J. M. Grintz, *'Ereṣ hā-ʿivrīm ('Oz lᵉ-Dāwīd: Qoveṣ meḥqārīm bi-TNK mugaš lᵉ-Dāwīd ben-Guryōn bi-mlōt lō šivʿīm wᵉ-ševaʿ šānīm [Pirsūmē ha-ḥevrā lᵉ-ḥēqer ha-miqrāʾ bᵉ-yiśrāʾēl* 15, Jerusalem 1964], 92–102).

[21] Cf. especially A. Goetze, 'The Syrian Town of Emar', *BASOR* 147, 1957, 22–27; J.-R. Kupper, 'Notes géographiques: 2. Sur un passage mentionnant Emâr', *RA* 52, 1958, 37; W. W. Hallo, 'The Road to Emar', *JCS* 18, 1964, 77, 81; A. Goetze, 'Remarks on the Old Babylonian Itinerary', *ibid.*, 115f., 119.

[22] Cf. S. Smith, *op. cit.*, 73.

[23] *Mugiš(ḫe)*, Ug. *mgšḫ*, is the Hurrian form of the name of the state of Alalaḫ; cf. M. Liverani, *Storia di Ugarit nell'età degli archivi politici* (Studi Semitici 6, Rome 1962), 39 n.50; M. Weippert, *GGA* 216, 1964, 185 n.18; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *WO* 3.3, 1966, 213f.; R. Degen, *WO* 4.1, 1967, 55 and n.29. The original place name *Mugiš* belongs to the non-Semitic and non-Hurrian group of toponyms in *-iš* such as *Karkamiš*, *Lākīš* etc. Against my supposition, *loc. cit.*, the sibilant is **š*, not **ṯ*. On the history of the state of Mugiš-Alalaḫ cf. now H. Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v.u.Z.: I. Nordsyrien* (VIO 40, 1965), 203–57.

[24] Cf. W. F. Albright, 'Some Important Recent Discoveries: Alphabetic Origins and the Idrimi Statue', *BASOR* 118, 1950, 15f., n.13.

he prepares his return to power. Before the description of the mobilization of his expeditionary force he summarizes, in his autobiography, the preceding period of flight[25] as follows: *a-na li-bi* ERÍN.MEŠ LÚSA.GAZ *a-na* MU.7.KÁM.MEŠ *aš-ba-ku* 'amongst the *ʿapiru*-people[26] I remained for seven years', i.e., 'for seven years I was an *ʿapiru*'. That he was not an *ʿapiru* of his own free will is self-evident. Similarly a slave who, in spite of his position at the bottom end of the class system of the Late Bronze Age, is still endowed with certain rights, can break away from ties which he finds unbearable and seek his fortune as an *ʿapiru* (*a-na lìb-bi* LÚSA.GAZ *ir-ru-ub*),[27] at least in theory; for it is this very possibility which the ruling classes are trying to exclude by international treaty: LUGAL GAL *ú-ul a-la-qí-šu a-na* LUGAL KUR *ú-ga-ri-it ú-tá-ar-šu* 'I, the great king, will not take him in, but will send him back to the land of Ugarit'.[28] Now it is already clear that the basic position of the *ʿapiru* as an outlaw makes the securing of his life his most pressing problem. He can seek his livelihood outside and in opposition to the 'civic' order as a freebooter and highwayman[29] with all the risks involved in this way of life, or else he can endeavour to associate himself with the class system in a suitable fashion, that is, he can legally enter into the service of recognized members of this system. Thus we find *ʿapiru* in the service of kings,[30] private individuals[31] and perhaps even

[25] Text: S. Smith, *op. cit.*, 16:27f.; Bott. 37. Without at the moment being able to provide definite proof, I believe that the passage quoted sums up lines 3–26. The following description of the oracle which is linguistically difficult and is probably corrupt, perhaps introduces the narrative of the return (lines 30ff.) and at least describes the end of the hero's seven-year period of *ʿapiru* existence but not his activity during that period.

[26] For this interpretation of ERÍN.MEŠ = *ṣābū* see B. Landsberger in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 201; R. Borger, *Babylonisch-assyrische Lesestücke* (Rome 1963), LXXVIII^{b}; *CAD* 16/Ṣ, 46ff. *s.v. ṣābu;* P. Artzi, *RA* 58, 1964, 163 n.4.

[27] RS 17.238, 11–19, the quotation line 16 (*PRU* IV, 108); Bott. 161.

[28] *Loc. cit.*, lines 17–19. The extradition of refugees is usually agreed upon in state treaties of this kind; cf. V. Korošec, *Hethitische Staatsverträge. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristischen Würdigung* (LRS 60, 1931), 80f. (to be amplified in certain details on the basis of recent discoveries, especially those from Ugarit).

[29] Bott. 6, 8; guerilla warfare Bott. 20, 25, 26 (?), 27 (?), 28, 36(?), 162. On the Amarna texts which are usually included here too see below pp. 71–4.

[30] Bott. 5, 18, 29, 64, 161. The distribution of rations, which is done by the state (supplied from crown property), probably belongs here: Bott. 9–16, 35, 48(?), 67–69; E. Cassin, 'Nouveaux documents sur les Ḫabiru', *JA* 246, 1958, 226–9 nos. 1–6 (Nuzu). Clothes: Cassin, *op. cit.*, 228f. nos. 7, 8.

[31] Attested only in Nuzu: Bott. 49–66.

temples.[32] The kings usually seem to have demanded military service of them, perhaps giving them positions to some extent as military colonists,[33] evidence for which exists in the cases of Larsa,[34] Mari,[35] Nuzu(?),[36] Ḫattuša[37] and Alalaḫ,[38] and particularly clearly in a letter of king Biriyawaza[39] of Upe (a state of Damascus) from the Amarna archives:[40] *a-nu-ma a-na-ku qa-du* ERÍN.MEŠ-*ya ù* GIŠGIGIR.MEŠ-*ya ù qa-du* ŠEŠ.MEŠ-*ya ù qa-du* LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ-*ya ù qa-du* LÚ.MEŠ *su-te-ya a-na pa-ni* ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭá-te a-di a-šar yi-qa-bu* LUGAL EN-*ya* '. . . I shall (be) there with my infantry and chariot troops and with my brothers and with my *ʿapiru*-people and with my bedouin (*sutû*) at the head of the archers where the king, my lord, commands (me).' We see here that among the conscripted troops with which a fairly important Syrian vassal promises to join his overlord's army, the bedouin (*sutû*) and the *ʿapiru* are listed alongside Egyptian (ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-te*)[41] and native troops. We do not know whether the *ʿapiru* made themselves available for such service in every case of their own free will. The indication given by Itūr-Asdu in a letter to his lord Zimri-Lim of Mari, that he had 'brought together' or 'organized' the *ʿapiru* (LÚ.MEŠ *ḫa-pí-ri a-ka-ṣa-a*[*r* . . .)[42] and the existence of the office of an UGULA

[32] In a fragmentary context Bott. 74:
600 LÚSA.GAZ *ša* DINGIR É[
600 LÚSA.GAZ *ša* MIN *ša*[

[33] Thus, e.g., in the lists from Alalaḫ Bott. 38, 40–42 where ERÍN.MEŠ LÚSA.GAZ EN TUKUL.MEŠ/GIŠTUKUL 'ʿ*apiru*-people who own weapons' are listed along with the places where they live.

[34] Bott. 16: AGA.ÚS.MEŠ(*rēdû*) LÚ*ḫa-pí-ri*. On the position of the *rēdû* cf. G. Evans, 'An Old Babylonian Soldier: Notes on the Archive of Ubarrum', *JCS* 14, 1960, 34–42.

[35] Bott. 18, 21, 22, 24.

[36] Cassin, *op. cit.*, 229 no. 9 (HSS XV 62, 1–4) where the statement LÚ*ḫa-apí-ra-tu*$_4$ *ša la e-man-tuḫ*^{1}-*lu*^{1} presupposes the fact that *ʿapiru* could also hold the office of *emantuḫlu* (= *rab ešri*) which was apparently a military rank in Nuzu; cf. E. A. Speiser, *JAOS* 59, 1939, 310f.; H. Lewy, *Or* NS 10, 1941, 202f.; E. Cassin, *op. cit.*, 234f. n.11; *JESHO* 5, 1962, 130 n. 2; *AHw* 211^{a}; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *WO* 3.3, 1966, 189 n.4.

[37] Bott. 72, 72′ (if the fragmentary context is correctly interpreted in Bottéro); *KUB* XXXVI 106 (H. Otten, *ZA* 52, 1957, 217–20).

[38] Bott. 38, 40–43, 46.

[39] Read instead of 'Namiawaza' by F. Thureau-Dangin, *RA* 37, 1940, 171.

[40] VAB II 195.24–32 (Bott. 132).

[41] ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-te* corresponds to Eg. *pḏ.tyw*; cf. W. F. Albright and W. L. Moran, *JCS* 2, 1948, 246 n.16. In this case it is a question of a (probably small) Egyptian garrison probably in the royal city of Biriyawaza.

[42] Bott. 24.

(*wakil*) LÚSA.GAZ.MEŠ under the first dynasty of Babylon[43] both suggest that the kings who, understandably, had an interest in keeping a fairly strict control over this restless and always suspicious element, actively pursued a policy of 'barracking' the *ʿapiru*.[44] Only from Nuzu do we know of cases where *ʿapiru*-people of both sexes, in fixed contractual terms, give themselves 'of their own free will' (*ramān-šu* or *pī-šu u lišān-šu*), in so far as one can talk of 'freedom of will' at all under the given circumstances, into service as slaves (*ana wardūti*/*amūti*)[45] of a private individual, thus achieving legal protection as well as their livelihood. From these contracts it has often been wrongly concluded that the enslaving of themselves was the only characteristic of the *ʿapiru*.[46] It is, rather, one means among others by which he sought to ensure his life and his survival. The fact that he is outside the law emerges from the fact that the conditions of these contracts are scarcely favourable to him.[47] In many cases they seem to have been foreigners at Nuzu; at any rate, from time to time, there are mentioned *ʿapiru*-people from Asshur (LÚ*ḫapiru ša* KUR *aš-šu-ur*)[48] and from Akkad (LÚ*ḫ. ša* KUR *ak-ka*$_4$*-di*/*dì*)[49] and in one document the assertion is made about the people in question that they had 'arrived this year from Akkad' (*i-na* MU *an-ni-ti i-na*/*iš-tu* KUR *ak-ka*$_4$*-di a-li-ka*$_4$).[50] Similarly, at Mari, there appear *ʿapiru*-people from Jamudbal (LÚ.MEŠ *ya-mu-ud-ba-la-yú ḫa-pi-ru*).[51] On the other hand,

[43] Bott. 17.

[44] Nevertheless, we have from Boğazköy in the text Bo. 298/n = 756/f (*KBo* IX 73) the fragment of a treaty between a Hittite king and *ʿapiru*-people; cf. H. Otten, *ZA* 52, 1957, 220–23. The date formula in Bott. 36 from Alalaḫ is explained analogously by Otten, *op. cit.*, 223. According to the collation by M. Dietrich and O. Loretz (see *Theologische Revue* 65, 1969, 365), it does not contain the element ERÍN.MEŠ *ḫa-ʾ-pí-ru*, but, rather, ERÍN.MEŠ KI^{1}-GA^{1}-RU should be read.

[45] Cf. above n.31. Once (Bott. 54), instead of this, there occurs [*a-na*(?) *kè*-] *el-lu*$^{?}$/*zu*$^{?1}$-*uḫ-lu-ti*; cf. J. Lewy, *HUCA* 14, 1939, 600f. n.74. W. v. Soden, in *AHw* 284^{b} *s.v. gelduḫlu*/*gelzuḫlu*, reconstructs our passage as follows: LÚ*ḫa-pí-ru* [*ša*$^{?}$ *ge*$^{?}$-] *el-zu*$^{1?}$-*uḫ-lu-ti*. According to this, the *ʿapiru* would be more accurately described by the vocational (?) description *kelzuḫlūtu*, but this does not correspond to the formula of the group of texts. Cf. also Dietrich-Loretz, *op. cit.*, 200.

[46] E. Chiera, 'Ḫabiru and Hebrews', *AJSL* 49, 1933, 115–24.

[47] Cf. E. Cassin in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 65–69; Bottéro, *ibid.*, 70.

[48] Bott. 49, 50.

[49] Bott. 56, 63, 67.

[50] Bott. 56.

[51] Bott. 19. On Jamudbal/Emudbal cf. D. O. Edzard, *Die 'zweite Zwischenzeit' Babyloniens* (Wiesbaden 1957), 105f.; J.-R. Kupper, *Les nomades en*

another text from Mari speaks of 'indigenous '*apiru*-people' (*ṣa-bi-im ḫa-pí-ri* [gen.] *ša ma-a-tim*).[52] There is thus explicit confirmation in these passages of the point of view which is won from a thorough examination of a group of people scattered from Mesopotamia to Egypt, that there can be no question of an ethnic unity such as a 'nation' of '*apiru*. This, in turn, explains why, in the Hittite state treaties, the 'gods of the '*apiru*'[53] (along with the 'gods of the Lulaḫḫu')[54] are always mentioned in this summary form as the protective gods of the treaties alongside gods who are men-

Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 142, Paris 1957), *passim* (see Index pp. 271[b], 274[a], *s.vv.* Emutbal, Iamutbal, Iamutbaléens); W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 163, 1961, 49f. n. 67.

[52] Bott. 18. The interpretation of the expression *ša mātim* according to B. Landsberger in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 204; *WO* 3.3, 1966, 260 n. 56. Otherwise L. Oppenheim, *JNES* 11, 1953, 133: *mātum* = 'steppe'.

[53] Bott. 75–86 (Bott. 89, 90 are linguistically obscure). The question whether we are dealing with a god called 'Ḫabiru' with a plural determinative (*DINGIR.MEŠ*ḫa*-BI-*ru*: A. Jirku, 'Neues keilinschriftliches Material zum Alten Testament', *ZAW* 39, 1921, 156–8; *Die Wanderungen der Hebräer im dritten und zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend* (1924), 18f.; 'GötterḪabiru oder Götter der Ḫabiru?', *ZAW* 44, 1926, 237–42) or 'gods of the "Ḫabiru"' (A. Gustavs, 'Der Gott Ḫabiru', *ZAW* 40, 1922, 314; 'Was heisst ilâni Ḫabiri?', *ZAW* 44, 1926, 25–38) is to be resolved along the lines of Gustavs: In two duplicates of the treaty between the Hittite king Šuppiluliuma and KURtiwaza (the exact reading of the name is not known: Mattiwaza? Šattiwaza? Kurtiwaza?) of Mitanni there correspond the forms DINGIR.MEŠ *nu*[1]*-ú*[1]*-aḫ-ḫi* (ú seems to me to be an error for LA) DINGIR.MEŠ *ša* LÚSA.GAZ (*KBo* I 2, v°. 27; Bott. 75; cf. *KBo* I 3+, v°. 4f.; Bott. 76) and DINGIR.MEŠ *lu-la-ḫi-i* DINGIR.MEŠ SA.GAZ (*KBo* I 1, v°. 50; Bott. 75). From this it is clear that in the Akkadian texts from Boğazköy **ilāni ša ḫapirī* or **ilāni ḫapirī* is to be read, and the form **ḫapirī* is to be understood as the plural of the oblique case (cf. Gustavs, *ZAW* 44, 28). The corresponding form in the Hittite texts is the gen.pl. *ḫapiriaš* in DINGIR.MEŠ *ḫa-pí-ri-ya-aš* (Bott. 82, 83; *ḫa-pí-ra-aš* Bott. 81). The variant form of this, *ḫapiriēš*, in DINGIR.MEŠ *ḫa-pí-ri-e-eš* (Bott. 84, 85?, 86), which is a nom.pl., is probably to be regarded with Gustavs (*op. cit.*, 31) and G. Neumann (letter of 4 June 1965) as an adjectival attribute (nom.pl. of **ḫapiriya-*) and the expression therefore to be translated as 'the 'apirite gods'. The replacement of the genitive by an adjective of belonging is not unknown elsewhere in the languages of ancient Asia Minor. The god ^{D}*ḫa*-BI-*ru* in the 'directory of gods' from Asshur (*KAV* 42 II 9; Bott. 167; R. Frankena, *Tākultu: De sacrale maaltijd in het Assyrische ritueel, met een overzicht over de in Assur vereerde goden*, Commentationes Orientales 2, Leiden 1954, 124: 60) which is hotly disputed in the discussion between Jirku and Gustavs, has been convincingly separated by W. v. Soden in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 135, from the '*apiru* problems and explained as a neo-Assyrian form of the Bab. ^{D}*ḫāweru* ('spouse'; cf. *AHw* 338[b]).

[54] Literature on the *Lulaḫḫu* in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 83 n. 1.

tioned by name. It is, if the comparison may be allowed in respect of time and place, a question of a precautionary measure analogous to that of the Athenians who, in certain cases, dedicated altars ἀγνώστων θεῶν.[55] For the 'gods of the '*apiru*' are not a firmly defined group the members of which were known by name, not a definite pantheon, but the constantly changing totality of all deities of the most diverse origins who were worshipped by the individual members of the '*apiru* class. Each one of these gods whatever his name or wherever his home is to watch over the clauses of the treaty and, in a certain fashion, also guarantee the safety of the partners of the treaty from any possible intrigues on the part of his worshippers.

4. From the results achieved hitherto, it seems to me possible to determine also the character and the role of the '*apiru* mentioned in the Amarna letters[56] better than has generally been done till now. Mendenhall[57] is certainly right when he rejects the concept of a great '*apiru* invasion of Palestine and Syria in the Amarna period. The texts clearly state that city kings,[58] princes,[59] countries,[60] 'mayors' (*ḫazannūtu*),[61] cities (communities of citizens),[62]

[55] Cf. Pausanias I 1.4; V 14.8; Philostrat, *vita Apollonii*, 6.3; A. Deissmann, *Paulus: Eine kultur- and religionsgeschichtliche Skizze* (Tübingen 1911), 178–81; ET of 2nd ed., *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History* (London 1926), 287–91; A. v. Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (TuU 45 = III 15, [2]1924), 2 top; E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Darmstadt [4]1956), 41ff., 117ff. However, for the ultimate background of the expression ἀγνώστος θεός cf. the name *kuišḫamaššani-* 'a certain (= anyone you like?) goddess' of a Luwian deity (Bo. 2311.8 in Liane Rost, *MIO* 8, 1961, 168) and on this G. Neumann, *MSS* 16, 1964, 51.

[56] Bott. 93–153.

[57] *Op. cit.*, 72f.

[58] VAB II 148.41–43 (Bott. 127); 185.9ff. (Bott. 129); 186.12ff. (Bott. 130); 254.32–35 (Bott. 138).

[59] VAB II 298.22–27 (Bott. 147).

[60] Mostly in the formula 'every country has joined the '*apiru*' (*ti-ni-pu-šu* or the like *ka-li* KUR.MEŠ *a-na* LÚ(.MEŠ)SA.GAZ): VAB II 73.32f. (Bott. 96); 74.35f. (Bott. 97); 76.34–37 (Bott. 99); 79.19f., 25f. (Bott. 101); 85.72f. (Bott. 105); 88.32–34 (Bott. 107); 89.31f. (Bott. 108); 111.19–21 (Bott. 114); 117.57f. (Bott. 118); 148.45 (Bott. 127); 272.14–17 (Bott. 139); 273.11–14 (Bott. 140); 290.12f., 23f. (Bott. 146).

[61] VAB II 73.28–30 (Bott. 96).

[62] VAB II 74.19–21 (Bott. 97); 76.34–37 (Bott. 99); 81.12f. (Bott. 102); 104.51–54 (Bott. 111); 116.37f. (Bott. 117); 127.20f. (Bott. 128); 207.19–21 (Bott. 134); 215.13–15 (Bott. 135). In the last two passages *ḫalāqu* + *ina* LÚGAZ.MEŠ/LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ^{KI} must be interpreted as 'revolt among the '*apiru*'.

ḫupšu[63] belong to the *ʿapiru* or join up with them (*epēšu* N + *ana ḫapirī*).[64] The tenor of all the references – with the exception of three which will be discussed shortly – indicates that the writers of the letters, who remained faithful to the Egyptian crown or at least wished to appear faithful in their letters to the Pharaoh or to high officials, mean by *ʿapiru*, amongst whom they classify many of their colleagues (mostly their personal enemies), simply rebels against Egyptian sovereignty and are able, at the same time, to give to the term an additional pejorative sense similar to the way in which Rib-Hadda of Byblos calls SA.GAZ-people 'dogs' (UR.KU = *kalbu*, a singular in apposition to a plural noun)[65] or even a 'runaway dog' (UR *ḫal-qú*).[66] The rebel who rises against the Pharaoh and thereby attacks his sovereign's property, his lands and cities, is branded as a 'robber'; in actual fact, the scribes of the loyal or apparently loyal city kings also seem to have had this meaning in mind (and sometimes also the reading *ḫabbātu*?)[67] when they made use of the Sumeriogram SA.GAZ for *ʿapiru*. In this connection, one has of course to make exception of the text VAB II 195.24–32

[63] VAB II 118.37 (Bott. 119). On the class of *ḫupšu* cf. W. F. Albright, 'Canaanite Ḥofšî, "Free", in the Amarna Tablets', *JPOS* 4, 1924, 169f.; J. Pedersen, 'Note on Hebrew Ḥofšî', *JPOS* 6, 1926, 103–5; W. F. Albright, 'Canaanite Ḫapši and Hebrew Ḥofšî Again', *ibid.*, 106–8; 'The North Canaanite Poems of Al'êyân Baʿal and the "Gracious Gods"', *JPOS* 14, 1934, 131 n. 162; A. Alt, 'Eine syrische Bevölkerungsklasse im ramessidischen Ägypten', *ZÄS* 75, 1939, 16–20; I. Mendelsohn, 'The Canaanite Term for "Free Proletarian"', *BASOR* 83, 1941, 36–39; E. R. Lacheman, 'Note on the Word Ḫupšu at Nuzi', *BASOR* 86, 1942, 36f.; R. T. O'Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim: A Contribution to the History of Upper Mesopotamia in the Second Millennium* B.C. (AnOr 26, 1948), 67 and n. 2; J. Gray, 'Feudalism in Ugarit and Early Israel', *ZAW* 64, 1952, 52–55; I. Mendelsohn, 'New Light on the Ḫupšu', *BASOR* 139, 1955, 9–11; H. J. Stoebe, 'Die Goliathperikope 1. Sam. XVII 1–XVIII 5 und die Textform der Septuaginta', *VT* 6, 1956, 403f.; P. Grelot, 'Ḥofšī (Ps. LXXXVIII 6)', *VT* 14, 1964, 256–63; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *WO* 5.1, 1969, 57–93.

[64] Cf. *AHw* 229ᵃ *s.v. epēšu* N 12; E. F. Campbell, Jr., 'The Amarna Letters and The Amarna Period', *BA* 23, 1960, 15; *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters with Special Reference to the Hypothetical Co-regency of Amenophis III and Akhenaten* (Baltimore 1964), 86 n. 48. Cf. above n. 60.

[65] VAB II 91.5 (Bott. 110): LÚGAZ.ME[Š] UR.KU.

[66] VAB II 67.16 (Bott. 93).

[67] Cf. the logographic form LÚSA.GAZ.MEŠ^{tu}$_4$, whose phonetic complement -*tu*$_4$ (TUM) fits only *ḫabbātu(m)* but not *ḫapiru*, in VAB II 299.26 (Bott. 148) and the wordplay (?) LÚ.MEŠ *ḫa-pí-ru ḫa-bat gáb-bi* KUR.HÁ LUGAL VAB II 286.56 (Bott. 142). Rowton, *op. cit.* (above n. 17), 386 n. 69, suggests with some justification that SA.GAZ/*ḫabbātu* perhaps not only meant 'bandit' but was also the correct Babylonian equivalent for the West Semitic *ʿapiru*.

(Bott. 132) which we have discussed above; it is in accordance with the tone of other archives when it speaks of the *ʿapiru* as a population group some of whose members were in military service. When Abimilku of Tyre reports to the Pharaoh that 'the king of Hazor has left his city and has joined the *ʿapiru*' (LUGAL URU*ḫa-ṣu-ra i-te-zi-ib* URU?-*šu ù it-ta-ṣ* [*a*] -*ab it-ti* LÚSA.GAZ),[68] one might at first think that the ruler of this important Galilean city had abandoned his seat of government and gone over to the *ʿapiru* who were in control of the lowlands. Yet what must be intended here too is that, perhaps along with the population of the city (*i-pu-uš* KUR LUGAL *a-na* LÚSA.GAZ),[69] he has joined the movement of rebellion against Egyptian supremacy. Thus, there remains finally the text VAB II 318.10–15 (Bott. 152) in which a king by the name of Dagan-takala, whose place of residence is unknown, asks the Pharaoh 'to rescue' him 'from the hand of the *ʿapiru*-people, the robbers and the bedouin' (*iš-tu* ŠU^{qa-ti} LÚ.MEŠ SA.GA. A[Z.M]EŠ LU.MEŠ *ḫa-ba-ti ù* LÚ.MEŠ *šu-ti-i ù še-zi-ba-an-* [*ni*][70] LUGAL GAL *be-li-y*[*a*]). Yet here too one can explain, even if not with absolute certainty, the *ʿapiru* as rebels against the ruling power and its representatives in the country and the *ḫabbātū* as normal robbers of whom, in such uncertain times, there may well have been a greater number than usual.[71] The development in meaning to 'traitors' which is attested for *ʿapiru* in the Amarna letters can easily be derived from the definition of the term given above as 'outlaw', in so far as the rebel, although of course of his own free

[68] VAB II 148.41–43 (Bott. 127).

[69] *Ibid.*, 45.

[70] The form expressed here as *u šēzibanni* is usually explained as imp.sing. with 1st sing. suffix (E. Ebeling, *Das Verbum der El-Amarna-Briefe*, BAss 8.2, 1910, 64; Knudtzon, translation of the passage) like *še-zi-ba-an-ni* VAB II 318.8, 14, or, with 1st plur. suffix, *še-ez-zi-bá-an-na-ši-* 62.30. This is not certain since the conjunction *u* before the word is difficult; it could at the most be explained as a so-called 'pleonastic waw' or 'waw apodoseos' (on this cf. A. Finet, *RA* 46, 1952, 23f.). Perhaps however the form is to be taken as *ušēzibanni* (*ù-še-zi-ba-an-ni*) and interpreted as a precative wrongly formed (correctly: **lu-še-zi-ba-an-ni* = *lūšēzibanni*) and wrongly written (one would rather see, if anything, **ú-še-zi-ba-an-ni*) whose form has been influenced by that of the North-west Semitic jussive. Cf. the preterite forms *ú-šeₓ*(ŠI)-*zu-bu-ni* and *ú-še-zi-ba-an-ni* 3rd masc. sing. preterite subj. with 1st sing. suffix VAB II 74.33, 44.

[71] The *ḫabzū* of the bedouin is also favoured by the weakness of the central power. Cf. the complaint – the details are obscure – of King Japaḫu (**yapaʿu*) of Gezer about attacks by [L]Ú.MEŠ KUR$_s$[*u*?]-*te*MEŠ VAB II 297.11–16 (on this and the parallel passage 292., 44–8 see *CAD* 6/Ḫ, 214 *s.v. ḫubbulu* B).

will and with hostile intent, stands outside the legitimate, existing political order.[72]

5. Even if Mendenhall is right so far, yet our observation of the fact that local kings and their followers took part in the rebellion, shows us beyond all shadow of a doubt that the *ʿapiru* revolt in the Amarna period was not an uprising on the part of the oppressed population of the plains against the ruling feudal classes of the cities and is certainly not to be understood on the basis of a comparison with the great German Peasants' Revolt of 1525/26. It now seems justified to ask at this point in what measure the other parts of Mendenhall's historical reconstruction of the Israelite settlement are tenable. In this respect we must first of all submit to examination the identification that is maintained of *ʿapiru*-people with the 'Hebrews' (*ʿibrīm*). I have already drawn attention to the fact that the establishment of the precise phonetic structure of the word *ḫa*-BI-*ru* as *ʿapiru* gives rise to doubts as to the connection with the Hebrew word *ʿibrī*. In answer to this it is usually asserted[73] that examples are known in other cases of a change between *b* and *p* within the Semitic languages.[74] The additional

[72] The statements of P. Artzi, ' "Vox Populi" in the el-Amarna Tablets', *RA* 58, 1964, 165f., which became available to me after I had concluded this section, agree in many points with my own on the meaning of the term *ʿapiru* in the Amarna letters; cf. also E. F. Campbell Jr., *op. cit.* (above n. 64).

[73] On this question cf. on the one hand R. Borger, *op. cit.*, 126–8 who, correctly, warns against a naïve adoption of the identification *ʿapiru*/Hebrews, even if I cannot share his strongly negative position (*op. cit.*, 132), as I show above, and on the other hand A. Jirku, *Geschichte Palästina-Syriens im orientalischen Altertum* (Aalen 1963), 96 n. 125: 'The change between *b* and *p* in the various written forms of the name Habiru cannot fail to provide difficulties for those who are unaware to what extent we can establish again and again the same phenomenon in the writing of proper names in Syria-Palestine.' One must emphasize, however, that the impression of the lack of orthographic (and phonetic?) rules in the treatment of the voiced stop/voiceless stop opposition in the Akkadian cuneiform texts from the area of Asia Minor-Syria-Palestine rests on two factors: (1) the lack of knowledge of the standard Babylonian orthography on the part of the Hittite and Syrian scribes and (2) unsatisfactory methods of transcription particularly on the part of older Assyriologists who were unable to do justice to texts in 'barbarized Akkadian' since they hesitated to accept unusual values (which resulted partly from [1]) and for the most part inserted the most frequent. In alphabetic systems of writing which are able to differentiate clearly and unambiguously between voiced and voiceless stops the apparently regular change can be observed only in a few cases where usually a phonetic reason (substitution of phonemes or graphemes in foreign words and names) can be given for it.

[74] Cf. generally C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* I (Berlin 1908, reprint Hildesheim 1961), 154 §54eζ, 157

argument[75] that we actually have three Middle Babylonian examples of the word where the spelling – *ḫa*-BIR-*a-a*[76] in Middle Babylonian can be read only as *ḫa-bir-a-a* and not as **ḫa-pìr-a-a*[77] – clearly testifies to the pronunciation with *-b-* and where, moreover, the word reveals the ending corresponding to the *nisba* ending of Hebrew *ʿibrī*, has been convincingly refuted by R. Borger[78] who explains the questionable word *ḫabirāy-* as the gentilic of the city of *ḫa-bi-ri*^{KI}[79] and correctly rejects any connection with the *ʿapiru* in the case both of the name of the city and of the adjective derived from it. It cannot, however, be denied that the Semitic languages know, to a limited extent, the sound shift *b*/*p*. In the following table I give a few examples which are certain and which could be supplemented by others of variable worth.[80]

§55f, 161 §58bγδ, 164 §58gβ, hη, 166 §§58iζ, 59aα, 169 §59eαγ, 170 §59fγ; *GAG* §27d; J. Aistleitner, *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Ugaritischen* (BSA 100.6, 1954) 11f., §§11, 12; P. Fronzaroli, *La fonetica ugaritica* (Sussidi eruditi 7, Rome 1955), 50f. §33d, 52 §35ab, 53f. §36; C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Manual* (AnOr 35, 1955), 28 §5, 25; G. Garbini, *Il semitico di nord-ovest* (Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli, Quaderni della sezione linguistica degli annali, 1, Naples 1960), 19–26 *passim*; M. Dahood, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (SPIB 113, 1963), 10f., 20, 24, 32f., 43 and n. 1. A considerable proportion of the examples cited there must be regarded as uncertain or unfounded. Cf. also the criticism of Garbini in E. Y. Kutscher, 'Contemporary Studies in North-Western Semitic', *JSS* 10, 1965, 22–24.

[75] Cf. B. Landsberger, *ZA* 35, 1924, 213f. n. 1.

[76] Bott. 165, 165′, 166.

[77] W. v. Soden, *Das akkadische Syllabar* (AnOr 27, 1948), 73 no. 237; Borger, *op. cit.*, 126. For this reason the form '*ḫāpiraja*' (with BIR = *pìr*) in *CAD* 6/Ḫ,84[a] is, to say the least, precipitate. At this point Rowton, *op. cit.* (above n. 17), 384 n. 61 turns against Borger.

[78] *Op. cit.*, 126. On the divine name ^{D}*ḫa*-BI-*ru* KAV 42 II 9, which, according to the rules of neo-Assyrian orthography, should very probably not be read as *^{D}*ḫa-pi-ru*, see above n. 53.

[79] Bott. 35 (Susa): *ḫa*-BI-*ri*^{KI} among nothing but place names.

[80] The reference to the Semitic word for 'iron' where the shift *b*/*p* appears in initial position (Garbini, *op. cit.*, 21): Ug. *brdl*, Hebr. *barzel*: Akk. *parzillu*, Aram. *przl*(ʾ), OSArab. *frzn*, Arab. *firzilun* is also, of course, of no value, for this is a foreign word of unknown origin and uncertain phonetic structure, so that we cannot say for which foreign phoneme Sem. *b* or *p* has been substituted. The word could even come from a language which knew no difference between *b* and *p*. The Hittite word for 'iron' '*barzillu*' which is pursued by L. Köhler, *JSS* 1, 1956, 7, and again by R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik, I. Einleitung, Schrift- und Lautlehre* (Sammlung Göschen 763/763ab, Berlin [3]1966), 106 §24.4, does not exist; 'iron' is rather *ḫapalki-* (E. Laroche, *RHA* 15, fasc. 60, 1957, 9–15). Cf. also M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the Old Testament, their Origin and Etymology* (London 1962), 52f.; L. Deroy, 'L'expansion préhistorique du fer et les noms de ce métal en grec ancien et en

Forms with *b*	Forms with *p*
(*a*) *BḎR 'scatter' Hebr. *bẓr* G 'scatter' (Dan. 11.24), D 'scatter' (Ps. 68.31); Aram. *bdr* (Chr.Pal. G and D, Bibl., Jewish,[81] Syr. D) 'scatter'; Arab. *bḏr* G 'sow, disseminate', D 'squander'.	Hebr. *pẓr* D 'scatter, spread, disseminate' (N pass.); Jewish Aram. *pẓr* (probably a Hebraism).
(*b*) *BQʿ 'split' Hebr., Jewish Aram. *bqʿ* 'split' and derivatives; Moab. *bqʿ hšḥrt* 'daybreak'.	Syr. *pqʿ* and derivatives, Mand. *fīqa* 'cleft'.
(*c*) BṮN Akk. *bašmu*, Ug. *bṯn*, Arab. *baṭanun* a type of snake.	Aram. *pitnā*, *patnā* (Syr.), Hebr. *peten* (Aramaism)[82] a type of snake.
(*d*) *DBŠ 'honey' Ug. *dbš*, Hebr. *dᵉbaš*, Aram. *dᵉbaš* (Bibl.), *debšā* (Syr.), *dwbšʾ* (Jewish), OSArab. *dbś*, Arab. *dibsun*, Eth. *debsä* (Gafat), *dims* (<**dibs*; Argobba), *dūs* (<**dbs*; Harari)[83] 'honey'.	Akk. *dišpu* (<**dipšu*) 'honey'.

latin', *Anadolu Araştirmalari* 2.1/2, 1965, 184–6. The Ugaritic word *prṭl* (*PRU* II, 1957, 1.7.19) associated with it by Ch. Virolleaud, *GLECS* 6, 1951–1954, 17f.; *PRU* II, 6 (cf. Garbini, *op. cit.*, 21) is of unknown meaning and has nothing to do with it.

[81] Also *bẓr*, probably a Hebraism. Cf. also M. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch* (BZAW 96, 1966), 33 no. 37.

[82] Cf. G. Garbini, 'Considerazioni sulla parola ebraica peten', *RivBibl* 6, 1958, 263–5; *Il semitico di nord-ovest*, 23, 33f.; Wagner, *op. cit.*, 97 no. 242a.

[83] See W. Leslau, *Ethiopic and South-Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon* (UCP 20, 1958), 16.

Forms with *b*	Forms with *p*
(*e*) *HB/PK 'turn' Akk. *abāku* 'bring away, lead away'.	Ug. *hpk* 'overthrow'; Hebr. *hpk*, Aram. *hpk*, *ʾpk* 'turn, overthrow'; Arab. *ʾfk* 'turn back, tell lies'.
(*f*) *KBŠ 'tread'[84] Amarna Akk. *kabāšu* (West Semitism), Hebr. *kbš* 'tread'; Aram. *kbš* 'tread down, force'; Chr.Pal. *kbš* D 'force'; Syr. *kbš* G and D 'oppress' (A caus.); Arab. *kbs* 'press down, fill up, attack'.	Hebr. *kpš* H 'press down' (Lam. 3.16); PBH *kpš* D *ibid.*, cf. PBH *kāpūš* 'turned in'.
(*g*) LBŠ 'be clothed' Akk. *labāšu*, Ug., Hebr., Aram. *lbš*, Arab. *lbs* 'be clothed' and derivatives (e.g. Ug. *lbš* 'garment').[85]	Ug. *lpš* (alongside *lbš*) 'garment'.
(*h*) *NBK 'well up'[86] Ug. *mbk nhrm*, Hebr. *nibkē yām* (Job 38.16, pausal form), *nibkē mayim* (Prov. 8.24), **mabbᵉkē mayim* (Job 28.18),[88]	Ug. *npk* 'spring' (‖*mqr*)[87]

[84] To what extent *KBS (Akk. *kabāsu*, Hebr. *kbs* 'to full') is to be linked with this must remain open; Arab. *kbs* could also belong to *KBS.

[85] On the basis of Akk. *libšu(m)*/*lubšu*, *lpš* is certainly to be regarded as a 'segholate'; in the case of *lbš* one might ask whether **lubūš-*, analogous to Akk. *lubūšu*, does not lie behind Hebr. *lᵉbūš*.

[86] On nn. 87–89 cf. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore 1953), 194f. n. III 7; G. M. Landes, *BASOR* 144, 1956, 30–37.

[87] Probably **napk-* or **nipk-*; cf. Hebr. **nēbek* in *nibkē yām* (pausal form).

[88] Prov. 8.24 M *maʿyānōt nikbaddē māyim* (pausal form) 'springs heavy with water' does not make much sense; on the basis of Ug. *npk* 'spring', cf. Job. 28.11 (; 38.16), it is better to read as proposed above. In G (πρὸ τοῦ προελθεῖν τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων) *nikbaddē* is certainly not envisaged. The text in Job 28.11a is difficult. In view of Ug. *mbk* (in *mbk nhrm* = **mabbikī naharēmi*) one should vocalize **mabbᵉkē nᵉhārōt*; what ḤBŠ D (no other occurrence of it with *min*) means in this context I do not know; perhaps the conjecture *ḤPŚ (cf. G) should be adopted so that it can be translated: 'the sources of the rivers he

Forms with *b*	Forms with *p*
Aram. *nbg*, Arab. *nbj* and derivatives.[89]	
(*i*) *NPŠ 'throat' Old Aram., Phoen. (both Zincirli), Hebr. (Arad)[90] *nbš* 'soul'.[91]	Akk. *napištu(m)*, Ug. *npš*, Hebr. *nepeš*, Aram. *napšā*, Phoen. *npš*, OSArab. *nfś*, Eth. *nafs*, Arab. *nafsun* 'throat, soul'.
(*k*) *NŠP 'blow' (trans. and intrans.) Hebr. (G; H caus.), Chr.Pal. (G; A caus.), Syr. (G and D) *nšb* 'blow' (intrans.) and derivatives.	Akk. *našāpu* (G and D; N pass.) 'blow away'; Hebr. *nšp* G 'blow' (trans.); Chr.Pal. *nšp* 'blow' (intrans.); Arab. *nsf* 'blow away, scatter'; cf. Syr. *na/ušpā* 'serpent'.
(*l*) *ʿRP[92] Hebr. *rōkēb bā-ʿarābōt* (Ps. 68.5) 'he who rides upon the clouds' (divine epithet)[93]	Akk. *erēpu* 'cover oneself with clouds' (*erpu* 'clouded'),

seeks out' (I should not like, on this evidence alone, to accept the shift *b/p* in ḤBŠ/ḤPŚ). Cf. also J. A. Montgomery, *JAOS* 53, 1933, 111; G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Old Testament Studies 3, Edinburgh 1956), 162[a] and n. 11 (the derivation from *BūK seems to me to be unfounded).

[89] Cf. GesB[17], 480[b] *s.v.* **nēbek*. The Aramaic and Arabic forms show partial regressive assimilation of the *k* to the *b* (>*g*).

[90] Ostrakon Arad 6005/1 v°. line 7 *bnbškm* for **bᵉnapšᵉkem* or *bᵉnapšēkem*; see Y. Aharoni, *EI* 9, 1969, 10f. The same ostrakon also has *whbqydm* for **wᵉhipqīdām* v°. lines 3f.

[91] Cf. Z. S. Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects* (AOS 16, 1939), 71; J. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik* (AnOr 32, 1951), 18 n. 2, 37 n. 2, 155; G. Garbini, 'Note aramaiche, 1. p>b in ya'udico', *Antonianum* 31, 1956, 310f.; 'Note aramaiche, 2. Una nuova iscrizione di Bar-Rkb', *Antonianum* 32, 1957, 427f.; 'Nuovo materiale per la grammatica del aramaico antico', *RSO* 34, 1959, 43f.; *Il semitico di nord-ovest*, 24f.

[92] Against the general consensus of opinion, Hebr. *ʿarāpel*, Aram. *ʿrpyl'* do not belong here since ʿ in these words goes back to **ġ*, as Ug. *ġrpl* shows; on *ġrpl* cf. Ch. Virolleaud, *GLECS* 9, 1960–3, 51; O. Eissfeldt, 'Neue keilalphabetische Texte aus Ras Shamra-Ugarit', *SAB* 1965:6, 1965, 47.

[93] The pioneers of Hebrew lexicography followed Ibn Ezra in associating *ʿarābōt* with *ʿarābā* 'steppe' (cf., e.g., H. Opitz, *Novum Lexicon hebraeo-chaldaeo-biblicum*, Leipzig and Frankfurt [2]1705, 257[a]) with the delightful justification: '*nubes*, vel *coelum*, ob similitudinem, quae intercedit inter campestres terrae

Forms with *b*	Forms with *p*
	erpetu 'clouds'; Ug. *rkb ʿrpt* 'he who rides upon the clouds' (divine epithet).
(*m*) *PʿL 'do, make' Ug. *bʿl* 'do, make'.[94]	Hebr., Old Aram., Phoen, *pʿl*, OSArab., Arab. *fʿl* 'do, make' and derivatives, e.g. Syr. *pʿālā* 'work'.
(*n*) *PRGḪṮ 'flea' Arab. *burgḫūṯun* 'flea'.	Akk. *pu/irša'u*, *pur'usu*,[95] Ug. *prġt* (PN), Hebr. *parʿōš* (also PN), Syr. *purtaʿnā* 'flea'.
(*o*) *ŠPḤ Ug. *šbḥ* (= *špḥ*) 'posterity' (or the like).[96]	Ug. *špḥ* (= *šbḥ*) 'posterity'; Hebr. *mišpāḥā*, Phoen. *špḥ* 'family'.

locos, & inter amplissimam coeli planitiem, quam deus pro lubitu quasi permeat' (Ch. Stockius, *Clavis linguae sanctae Veteris Testamenti*, Leipzig [6]1753, 847). In BHK[3], *ad loc.*, the conjecture **beʿābōt* is proposed. Borger, *op. cit.*, 128, wishes to emend on the basis of Ug. to **baʿarāpōt*, supposing that the two expressions are at all comparable. J. A. Montgomery's scepticism at the interpretation of *rkb ʿrpt* as 'rider on the clouds' (*JAOS* 53, 1933, 118f.; 54, 1934, 60f.) has scarcely any justification, for *ʿrpt* = 'hall of pillars' on the basis of Phoen. *ʿrpt* (*DISO* 222, 16–18) does not fit the Ugaritic context. Garbini, *Il semitico di nord-ovest*, 23, also compares Hebr. *ʿarīpīm* (Isa. 5.30; meaning unknown).

[94] According to M. Dahood, *Bibl* 44, 1963, 303; *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology*, 10, BʿL 'do, make' also occurs in Hebrew as a dialect variant of PʿL; of his examples, however, only Eccles 8.8 is, in the long run, relevant, where *wᵉlō yᵉmallēṭ rešaʿ 'et-bʿlyw* could be translated 'and wickedness will not deliver him who does it' (reading **bōʿalō*). F. Ellermeier (oral communication) would not, however, regard this suggested translation as of any worth.

[95] Cf. B. Landsberger, *Die Fauna des alten Mesopotamien nach der 14. Tafel der Serie ḪAR.RA = ḫubullu* (Leipzig 1934), 126. In Old Akkadian, *B/Pirḫašum* (written BIR$_5$-*ḫa-šum/sum/šu-um*, BI-*ir-ḫa-šum*[1]; see I. J. Gelb, *Glossary of Old Akkadian* [MAD III, 1957], 217 *s.v.* PR'$_5$Š) is attested as a proper name where the reading with *b-* is possible as well as that with *p-* (on the treatment of the plosives in the cuneiform orthography of the Old Akkadian period cf. I. J. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar* [MAD II, 1952], 19, 37f., 41f.); probably what is intended is **pir'āšum* (i.e. *pir*$_6$- . . . /*pi-ir*- . . .).

[96] *špḥ* and *šbḥ* alternate in parallel passages (*CTA* 14, 144 : 290). Cf. accordingly above n. 85.

It is not possible to determine a generally valid rule for this sound shift. It occurs in the initial position in our examples five times (*a*, *b*, *c*, *m*, *n*), in final position once or twice (*k*; perhaps *l*),[97] in an internal position between vowels two or three times (*e*, *f*; perhaps *l*), in an internal position as the middle consonant of a triliteral 'segholate' five times (*d*, *g*, *h*, *i*, *o*) and not exclusively in contact with *š*. This argues against the suggestion which is occasionally made in connection with the last mentioned group that the appearance of *p* instead of *b* is to be attributed to the partial assimilation of the voiced labial *b* to the voiceless *š*;[98] other voiceless consonants also enter into consideration (the voiceless pharyngal spirant *ḥ* in [*h*], the voiceless palatal plosive *ḳ* in [*h*]. In actual fact it is not at all possible to speak of such a partial assimilation of the voiced consonant to the following voiceless consonant, for two groups among our examples are in contrast to each other in that in their case the process has occurred in opposite directions: *b* > *p* in (*d*), (*g*), (*h*): *p* > *b* in (*i*), (*o*). One can, therefore, only speak of an *oscillation* of the labial plosive before the following voiceless consonant.[99] This oscillation will have found expression in variations of the (quasi-phonetic) writing which have in turn become orthographically fixed, if at all, in different ways in individual languages, possibly by analogy with corresponding phonetic developments. If this hypothesis is approximately correct, then we have a possible analogous explanation of the change of the *p* of *ʿapiru* to the *b* of the sehgolate derivative *ʿibrī*. In this case we must, of course, notice that this can be only a possibility to prove which brings one close to a vicious circle and which must, therefore, be regarded with a corresponding caution. As has been affirmed several times above, we know that the consonantal component of the word *ḫa*-BI-*ru*, which turns out to be not an Akkadian but a

[97] The singular forms of Ug. *ʿrpt* and Hebr. *ʿarābōt* cannot be determined with any certainty. On the basis of Akk. *erpetu* one would envisage a feminine 'segholate'. Accordingly the Ugaritic word could have been **ʿarpatu* (or **ʿara/iptu*?), the Hebrew one **ʿarbā* or **ʿerbā*. However, a feminine without the feminine termination could also be possible, **ʿarpu* in Ugaritic, **ʿereb* or **ʿēreb* in Hebrew. The exact classification of the sound shift *b/p* here must therefore remain open.

[98] *GAG* §27d; A. Herdner, *Syria* 23, 1942/43, 136; Fronzaroli, *op. cit.*, 52 §35a.

[99] A personal experiment can show that usually an intermediate sound occurs which can be treated as either a voiceless or a voiced stop.

West Semitic word,[100] is *ʿ-p-r*[101] and that the vowels are *-a-* and *-i-* (possibly **-e-*). We do not, however, know the vowel quantities. With the exception of a single case from Nuzu, which is hardly of any great importance,[102] the Akkadian occurrences never give any indication of the length of the vowels in the form of so-called '*plene*-writing'; that is, there are no forms such as *ḫa-a-pí-ru*, **ḫa-pí-i-ru* or **ḫa-a-pí-i-ru*.[103] That does not automatically mean that both vowels must therefore be regarded as short; rather, we can say only that the vowel quantities cannot with any certainty be determined from the orthography.[104] It comes, therefore, as no surprise that **ʿāb/piru*[105] and **ʿapīru*[106] and **ʿapiru*[107] have all been suggested. A decision on the question would perhaps be possible if a convincing etymology for *ʿapiru* could be found, but all the suggestions proposed so far seem to me to be unsatisfactory. This is also true of the suggestion made most recently by Borger (it has been proposed before) that the word is to be connected with Semitic **ʿPR* = 'dust' and to be explained as an adjective of the form **faʿīl*, whence **ʿapīru* = 'dust covered'.[108] But this meaning cannot be incorporated in any very obvious way into the semantic range which we have already established for the word. If, however, as Borger suggests, the word is in fact originally an adjective – and Akkadian usage in some cases would lend complete support to

[100] Cf. W. v. Soden in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 157–9; B. Landsberger, *ibid.*, 160; A. Goetze, *ibid.*, 162; J. Lewy, *ibid.*, 163; Borger, *op. cit.*, 130.

[101] See above ch. I n. 4.

[102] HSS XV 62. 3 (cf. E. Cassin, *JA* 246, 1958, 229 n. 9): LÚ *ḫa-a-pí-ra-tu*$_4$ nom. pl. (*ḫa/āpirātu*). On the plural form cf. *GAG* §61n.

[103] The Hittite forms *ḫa-a-pí-ri-ya-aš HT* 6 v. 18 (cf. Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 151 §Be) and *ḫa-a-pí-ri-an* Bott. 92b, f. prove nothing at all with regard to the arbitrary use of '*scriptio plena*' by the Hittites. The isolated form LÚ *ḫa-a-pí-ra-tu*$_4$ in Nuzu (see n. 102) must be judged similarly.

[104] On the indication of long vowels in medial position by '*scriptio plena*' see *GAG* §7e.

[105] B. Landsberger, *KlF* I (1930), 328f. (**ʿābiru*); *CAD* 6/Ḫ, 84f. *s.vv. ḫāpirāja*, *ḫāpiru;* J. Lewy, most recently *HUCA* 28, 1957, 8f. n. 13 (**ʿābiru*); M. P. Gray, *HUCA* 29, 1958, 170–3 (**ʿābiru*).

[106] R. Borger, *ZDPV* 74, 1958, 131f.; A. Alt and S. Moscati, *RGG*³ III (1959), 105 *s.v. Hebräer* (following Borger).

[107] A. Goetze in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 163; W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 163, 1961, 53f. and nn. 77 and 78; *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra* (Harper Torchbook 102, New York and Evanston 1963), 5, 98 n. 17.

[108] Borger, *op. cit.*, 130f., with reference to R. de Langhe, *Les textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et leurs rapports avec le milieu biblique de l'Ancien Testament* II (Gembloux and Paris 1945), 465; É. Dhorme, *RevHist* 211, 1954, 261; with reservations also Albright, *Biblical Period* (*op. cit.*), 5.

this suggestion[109] – then one could establish, irrespective of possible etymologies, the form **ʿapiru* (type **faʿil*). This is the only one of the possible nominal forms from which one can establish a connection with Hebrew *ʿibrī*. Nominal forms of the **faʿil* type have a tendency in the Semitic languages to develop into 'segholates' of the type **faʿl* and **fiʿl*.[110] In Akkadian this is quite normal,[111] but examples can also be found in the North-west Semitic languages[112] which are primarily involved here. We would, then, have the form **ʿapr-/ʿipr-* which can be lengthened by the *nisba*-ending *-ay-*, giving the form **ʿa/ipray*. According to the rule (?) of the oscillation of the labial which we suggested above we can add the form **ʿa/ibray* as a further development in the process. But this form in Massoretic Hebrew would be *ʿibrī*. In other words, the equation *ʿapiru* = Hebrews can certainly be substantiated with linguistic proofs. That in Hebrew the word has taken on the *nisba*-ending should no longer astonish us, for that ending serves not only for the formation of gentilic forms in the narrower sense, that is of designations of belonging to a people, tribe, clan, place or country, but also for the expression of belonging to all types of concrete and abstract classes.[113] There is, moreover, an exactly parallel form in the word *ḫopšī* as the Hebrew equivalent of the Akkadian *ḫupšu*.[114]

6. It is, of course, true that purely linguistic proofs are not sufficient to set this identification free of all doubt. So long as one

[109] Cf. B. Landsberger in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 200. The possibility must also be admitted that *ḫapirū* in expressions such as *awīlū* (/LÚ.MEŠ) *ḫapirū* (/SA.GAZ) is a substantive in apposition (cf. *GAG* §134b) to *awīlū*.

[110] On this cf. C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss* I, 73 §42d, 337 §119d n., 339 §123a, 340 §124a; R. Körbert, *Or* NS 34, 1965, 42. On the change **faʿl-/*fiʿl-* cf. also Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, 148 §52g. An example: **malik-* > Akk. *malku* 'prince', Hebr. *melek* (< **malk-*) 'king', but Old Can. *milk-* (in proper names; cf., e.g., ᵈDINGIR-*mil-ku* RS 19.70, 8 (*PRU* IV, 294) = **Ilu-milku*; ᵐᵢNIN-*mi-i*[*l-ki*] RS 17.35, 7 (*PRU* IV, 123) = **Aḫāt-milki*); against this Arab. *malikun* 'king'. The situation is now complicated by the fact that for Ugaritic the vocalization **malk-* has been verified by *ma-al-ku, Ugaritica* V 1 130 III 13′; 137 II 32′. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *Theologische Revue* 65, 1969, 365 also point to the personal name *bi-it-ta-ma-al-ki* Alalaḫ 94, 18 (variant: *bi-it-ta*-LUGAL *ibid.*, 12).

[111] Cf. *GAG* §§12b, 55f.

[112] Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, 337 §§119a n., 119b.

[113] G. Beer-R.Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik* I (Sammlung Göschen 763/763a, Berlin ²1952), 110, §41, 4. Parallels to the formation *ʿibrī* in W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore 1953), 205 n. IV 43.

[114] See above n. 63.

argues along purely linguistic lines the danger is ever present of succumbing to the suggestion of the similarity in sound.[115] Rather, the equation can be regarded as sufficiently proved only when parallelism with regard to content appears probable. This of course at once raises a methodological problem.[116] If, leaving the *ʿapiru* aside, we look at the occurrences of *ʿibrīm* in the Old Testament, then we can safely say that the word *ʿibrī* is another designation for 'Israelite' and is to be treated as an ethnic term.[117] If, however, we take the *ʿapiru* into consideration, then in certain places there arise points of contact or, at least, possibilities of comparison, so that behind the immediate sense of the term *ʿibrī*, which in the last resort can be attributed to editorial modifications of the tradition which have occurred in the course of its history,[118] we seem to come upon an older, more original conception which would appear to bring us closer to historical reality. The unavoidable decision between the two methods of assessment is difficult to make. For if, with the intention of reaching as objective a judgment as possible, one that is free from preconceived ideas concerning identity or difference, we take into consideration only the Old Testament material, then we are in danger of making a wrong judgment, one that has been subjectively conditioned because we have not evaluated all the possible sources at our disposal. If, however, in our investigation, we take *ʿapiru* and *ʿibrīm* together, then this pre-judgment on our part very much influences our results from the outset. In what follows, therefore, the way of compromise can be followed only to the extent that, in following the second of these two possibilities, we are constantly aware of its limitations and of the one-sidedness of our assessment.[119] Finally,

[115] Cf. B. Landsberger, *ZA* 35, 1924, 213f.; in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 161.

[116] Cf. M. P. Gray, 'The Ḫâbirū-Hebrew Problem in the Light of the Source Material Available at Present', *HUCA* 29, 1958, 136.

[117] This of course corresponds to the usage in the post-Old Testament period; cf. H. Parzen, 'The Problem of the Ibrim ("Hebrews") in the Bible', *AJSL* 49, 1933, 256f.; M. P. Gray, *op. cit.*, 188–93.

[118] If our explanation given above is correct, then it is obvious that in the law about the *ʿebed ʿibrī* in the 'Book of the Covenant' reference is to an *ʿapiru* in a situation such as we are familiar with from the Nuzu contracts (Ex. 21.2–6) while the deuteronomic development with its phrase 'your brother, the Hebrew' (Deut. 15.12; cf. Jer. 34.14) is referring to an Israelite who has sold himself into 'slavery' (*kī yimmākēr*). In Jer. 34.9 the 'brother' who is originally referred to as a 'Hebrew' (*hāʿibrī*) is specified as Judaean (*yᵉhūdī*) (see below p. 85 and n. 123).

[119] The vulnerability of the procedure must be particularly stressed *vis-à-*

it should not be forgotten that the whole *ʿapiru*-Hebrews problem arose from a misunderstanding of the role of the former in the Amarna letters.[120]

7. The term *ʿibrī(m)* is used thirty-three times in the Hebrew Old Testament; thirty-two of these references are laid out here in a systematic way:[121]

(*a*) *Laws* (see § 8)	
Book of the Covenant	Ex. 21.2
Deuteronomy (dependent on B)	Deut. 15.12 (two instances)
Reference	Jer. 34.14, cf. 34.9
(*b*) *Exodus Narratives* (see § 10)	
Story of Moses' birth	J Ex. 2.6, 7
	? Ex. 1.15, 16, 19
Emergence of Moses	J Ex. 2.11, 13
Plagues	J Ex. 3.18; 5.3; 7.16; 9.1, 13; 10.3
(*c*) *Joseph Story* (see § 10)	
J ? Gen. 39.14, 17; 43.32	
E ? Gen. 40.15; 41.12	
(*d*) *Philistine Wars in the Time of Samuel and Saul and the Rise of David* (see § 9)	
I Sam. 4.6, 9; 13.3, 19; 14.11, 21; 29.3	
(*e*) *Unclassifiable* (*Late Texts*) (see § 11)	
Gen. 14.13; Jonah 1.9	

In five places *ʿibrī* is found as a designation of 'Israelites' in the mouth of Egyptians (Gen. 39.14, 17; 41.12; Ex. 1.16; 2.6), in six places in the mouth of Philistines (I Sam. 4.6, 9; 13.3, 19; 14.11; 29.3). The expression is used by 'Israelites' to describe themselves *vis-à-vis* Egyptians once in the Joseph story (Gen. 40.15), eight times in the exodus narratives (Ex. 1.19; 2.7; 3.18; 5.3; 7.16; 9.1,

vis M. P. Gray (*op. cit.*, 183) since the authoress considers that the separate examination of the terms *ʿapiru* and *ʿibrī* is 'unscientific' and recommends as objective and as a 'full investigation of the data' the method selected by us here only with reservation.

[120] A comparison was made between the activities of the *ʿapiru* of the Amarna letters and those of Joshua in Josh. 1–12; cf. Bottéro, *op. cit.*, VI.

[121] The corrupt passage I Sam. 13.7 is excluded here (cf. BHK³ *ad loc.*).

13; 10.3) and once by the 'prophet' Jonah in his pathetic confession to the 'heathen' sailors (1.9). In narrative contexts the word occurs mostly in the same way in which it does in direct speech (Gen. 43.32; Ex. 1.15; 2.11, 13; I Sam. 14.21). Gen. 14.13, on the other hand, is an isolated case.

8. In the legal text of the 'Book of the Covenant' in Ex. 21.2–6 there is, at first glance, nothing which positively demands that the *ʿebed ʿibrī* (21.2) should refer to an 'Israelite slave'. In support of such an assertion one cannot, of course, adduce the fact that the enslavement of Israelites by Israelites was totally prohibited by Lev. 25.35–43[122] for we do not know whether both laws were ever valid simultaneously (if at all). In addition, the deuteronomic development of this law (Deut. 15. 12ff.), which must be discussed at the same time, as well as the reference to it in Jer. 34.9, 14 show that, at least at the time of the deuteronomic reformation, the reference was, and had to be, exclusively to Israelite (or, to be more precise, Judaean)[123] slaves. The possibility cannot, therefore, be excluded that Israelites too came under this law concerning the *ʿebed ʿibrī*. That, however, still does not mean that *ʿibrī* must be understood as an ethnic term with the sense of 'Israelite'. Rather do the various clauses of the text, as has been worked out especially by J. Lewy,[124] reveal such close points of contact with the conditions of the contracts from Nuzu, which have been dealt with above, between private individuals and the *ʿapiru*-people that the

[122] Against A. Jirku, ' "Hebräische" and "israelitische" Sklaven', *OLZ* 21, 1918, 81–83; M. P. Gray, *op. cit.*, 185.

[123] I see no reason for denying to Jeremiah the prophetic word (vv. 13ff.) in the somewhat difficult pericope Jer. 34.8–22. In v. 14, in the quotation, significantly, from the deuteronomic law, the 'Hebrew' is described as the 'brother' of those being addressed – in the circumstances of the time 'Judaeans'. This is clarified correctly in v. 9 by means of the later and not very well integrated gloss *bīhūdī ʾᵃḥīhū* on *bām* (referred to *ʾeṯ-ʿabdō wᵉ- . . . ʾeṯ-šipḥātō hāʿibrī wᵉhāʿibrīyā*); after deletion of the addition one ought to have the original text which, however, in the form *lᵉbiltī ʿᵃbod-bām ʾīš* is as awkwardly phrased as the corresponding formula *lᵉbiltī ʿᵃbod-bām ʿōd* in v. 10. It should also be noted that the difficulty of the words *miqqēṣ šebaʿ šānīm* in v. 14 arises from the fact that there the introduction to the *šᵉmiṭṭā*-law of Deut. 15 is briefly summarized along with an epitome of the law about the *ʿebed ʿibrī*. It seems that Jeremiah connected the practice of freeing slaves with the *šᵉmiṭṭā*. In literary-critical terms this observation means that the prophet had in front of him Deut. 15.1–18 essentially in its present form and sequence. Cf. also A. Weiser, *Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia* (ATD 20/21, ⁴1960), 321f.

[124] 'Ḫābirū and Hebrews', *HUCA* 14, 1939, 587–623; 'A New Parallel between Ḫâbirū and Hebrews', *HUCA* 15, 1940, 47–58 (on this however see below n. 132); cf. M. P. Gray, *op. cit.*, 182–5.

conclusion suggests itself that in both instances the same group of people are being dealt with. In the first instance, the limiting of the period of 'slavery' to six years indicates that the *'ebed 'ibrī* does not have the status of a proper slave, a slave for life (*'ebed 'ōlām*, 21.5) but has bound himself, perhaps by a contract, for this period. This, of course, presupposes that the status was entered into voluntarily. Its 'voluntary nature' becomes obvious when the short-term slave can decide at the end of his six years whether he will become a slave for life or will go free. In the Nuzu contracts the voluntary aspect was always stated explicitly since it determined the legal status of the *'apiru*.[125] There, of course, no fixed period of service was laid down,[126] but the *wardūtu* could be dissolved by the short-term slave by means of a substitute or by payment of a certain sum of money.[127] There is no difference in principle between the Mitannian and the Israelite dissolution. If the *'ebed 'ibrī* opts for his freedom on the expiry of the six-year period, he leaves his master on the same personal terms as those in which he entered his service. That he receives no wages shows that he was forced by his previous situation to engage himself in less favourable conditions than someone who could become a 'hired servant' (*śākīr*).[128] This situation becomes understandable in the light of the definition of *'apiru* existence given above[129] as a condition of outlawry which made security of life necessary at any price. What he possessed beforehand he is allowed to take away with him. This applied to his wife whom he had brought into servitude with him. A wife who had been given to him by his master[130] remained the property of the master. Here, in any case,

[125] See above p. 69.

[126] The opinion of J. Lewy, *HUCA* 14, 609f.; M. P. Gray, *op. cit.*, 184, that the Nuzu contracts also presupposed a fixed period of service whose length was generally known and is therefore not specified, is not based on the texts and has arisen only from the tendency to make the regulations in Nuzu and in Israel appear as parallel as possible.

[127] On this cf. E. Cassin in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 66–68.

[128] Cf. Deut. 15.18 where the difference from the point of view of the master is clearly brought out: 'It shall not seem hard to you, when you let him go free from you; for at half the cost of a hired servant he has served you six years.'

[129] See above pp. 65–7.

[130] The *wardūtu*-contracts from Nuzu (e.g. JEN 610, 611) adduced by J. Lewy, *HUCA* 15, 1940, 49, 52f., 56, as parallels do not refer, according to E. Cassin in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 68, to *'apiru*-people and are to be explained along different lines. M. P. Gray's comparison of Ex. 12.4 and Bott. 63 (*op. cit.*, 184 and n. 356) is equally uncertain.

it was a question of a woman who was a slave for life and was the master's property. If the *'ebed 'ibrī* wanted to keep her, then he had to take on her social standing and himself become a slave for life. In this case, the equation of the terms *'apiru* and *'ibrī* with regard to their content could be accepted. It is, of course, otherwise in the later development of the law in Deut. 15.12–18. Here the 'Hebrew' is described as the 'brother' of the person addressed in the legal text and is, therefore, defined as an Israelite. If he is allowed to go free, he receives, as a consequence, a certain payment, the amount of which is left to the discretion of his master (15.13f.). He too has the possibility of becoming a slave for life out of 'love' for his master. This new interpretation of the law is presupposed in Jer. 34.9f., 14. There appears here the sense of *'ibrī* which is attested later in Jonah 1.9 and which is predominant in texts later than the Old Testament[131] and which rests on the fact that at a certain period – probably at the beginning of the first century – the word *'apiru* is replaced by the words *gēr* and *tōšāb*.[132] This, of course, has no bearing on Ex. 21.2–6.

9. In the narratives about the Philistine wars, the expression occurs, as a rule, in the mouths of the Philistines as a designation, with a somewhat contemptible ring, of their opponents (I Sam. 4.6, 9; 13.3, 19; 14.11). One might ask why the Philistines could not equally well have talked about 'Israelites' if they wanted to use their enemies' name. Those who regard *'ibrī* as an ethnic term[133] are unable to offer a suitable explanation of this. Yet this element of contempt which we have just noted and which is particularly clear in 14.11 perhaps provides a clue when we remember the way in which Rib-Hadda of Byblos described the *'apiru* of his time, the anti-Egyptian rebels, as 'dogs'.[134] In fact, there could, in the texts from Samuel, be a reflection of the meaning established by us for the *'apiru* of the Amarna letters, namely 'rebels against

[131] See above n. 117.

[132] From this there follows the parallelism of the terms noted by J. Lewy, *HUCA* 28, 1957, 11f. and R. Borger, *ZDPV* 74, 1958, 128–30. The social changes which are, in the long run, reflected in this, have still to be investigated. Cf. also similarly S. Yeivin, 'The Origin and the Disappearance of the *Khab/piru*', *Trudy dvadcat' pjatogo meždunarodnogo kongressa vostokovednov Moskva 9–16 avgusta 1960* I (Moscow 1962), 439–41.

[133] Cf., e.g., A. Jirku, *Die Wanderungen der Hebräer im dritten und zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend* (AO 24.2, Leipzig 1924), 7f.

[134] See above p. 72.

the lawful ruling power'.[135] If Alt[136] is right with his supposition that after the final collapse of Egyptian rule in Palestine the Philistines regarded themselves as the rightful successors of the Pharaoh, the parallelism in the linguistic usage is not surprising, since the Philistines would regard any resistance to their expansion as rebellion against their right to rule. The case of 14.21 and 29.3 is, of course, different. In 14.21 the narrator speaks of *'ibrīm* who had hitherto been with the Philistines and who had gone over to the 'Israelites' after Saul's victory at Michmash. Since, here, the 'Hebrews' are clearly differentiated from the 'Israelites', there could lie behind this usage the original designation of *'apiru* as a particular social class; we have encountered *'apiru*-people in military service often enough.[137] It is more difficult to see what is meant in the case of 29.3, for David and his men, both in the wilderness of Judah and in Ziklag, were, in the second millennium sense of the word, *'apiru*-people who earned their living as highway robbers[138] and mercenaries,[139] and perhaps the term *'ibrīm* is meant in this sense here. But they were also 'Israelites', David a runaway 'servant of Saul'[140] suspected, not without reason, of collaboration with those who were 'rebelling' against the leadership of his former master. One could, therefore, think of this meaning of *'apiru* as well.

10. More difficult to evaluate are those passages in the Old Testament which designate the 'Israelites' in Egypt, both individuals such as Joseph and the totality of the 'descendants of Jacob', as *'ibrīm*. In this connection the Egyptian references to *'pr.w*[141] are usually cited, and we must, therefore, include a brief discussion of these at this point. We encounter *'pr.w* in the already familiar role of robbers and highwaymen in the 'smaller' stele of king Sethos I

[135] See above pp. 72f.

[136] 'Ägyptische Tempel in Palästina und die Landnahme der Philister' (1944), *Kl.Schr.* I, 229f.

[137] See above p. 68 with n. 33–40, 42f. According to B. Mazar, *The Philistines and the Rise of Israel and Tyre* (The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings, 1.7, Jerusalem 1964), 10 they are in fact 'auxiliary units from the native population'.

[138] See above p. 67 and n. 29.

[139] See above n. 137.

[140] I Sam. 29.3f., 10.

[141] Cf. J. A. Wilson, 'The 'Eperu of the Egyptian Inscriptions', *AJSL* 49, 1933, 275–80; G. Posener in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 165–75 (Bott. 181–93); W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (ÄgA 5, 1962), 526–31.

from Beth-shan (*tell el-ḥuṣn*) in the neighbourhood of that city (Bott. 184);[142] they are the object of an Egyptian punitive expedition. In this context they need occupy us no longer. In the *novelle*-type narrative of the siege of the city of Joppa (*yāfā*) by the historically well-known general of Tuthmosis III, *Ḏḥwty*, an *'pr* appears in a very obscure context (Bott. 185).[143] It is generally accepted that what is meant is a potential horse-thief[144] about whom the Maryannu (*mryn*)[145] are being warned, but it seems to me to be more correct, on the basis of the restoration of the fragment *mr*[most recently proposed by Helck,[146] namely *mr*['] 'groom'[147] (instead of *mr*[*yn*]), to see in the *'pr* a member of the *'apiru* class in the position of a slave either to the Egyptian general or to the prince of Joppa. This interpretation, too, fits well into the picture obtained so far from the various roles played by the *'apiru* and has no connection with the 'Israelites' or 'Hebrews' in Egypt. But how did the *'pr.w*, who, in all the Egyptian examples, prove to be Asiatics,[148] come to Egypt? The answer is given in the 'lists of booty' of the Asiatic campaign in the ninth year of Amenophis II on two duplicate steles of the king found in *mīt rahīne* (Memphis) and *karnak* (Thebes) respectively.[149] In the

[142] Publication: A. Rowe, *The Topography and History of Beth-Shan* (PPS 1, 1930), 29f. and plates 42–45. 1; cf. B. Grdseloff, *Une stèle scythopolitaine du roi Séthos Ier* (Études égyptiennes 2, Cairo, 1949); W. F. Albright, 'The Smaller Beth-Shan Stele of Sethos I', *BASOR* 125, 1952, 24–31; E. Edel in K. Galling, *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels* (Tübingen 1950), 30 no. 14B. The reading of the place of residence of the *'pr.w* is partly uncertain, but *yr*[*dn*] (or rather with Grdseloff and Albright: *yr*[*mt*]) seems to me to be scarcely possible.

[143] Pap. Harris 500, v°. x + 1. 4f. (A. H. Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 1, Brussels 1932, 82: 6f.).

[144] Grdseloff, *op. cit.*, 25f.: 'sinon un *'pr* passera [près d'eux (*scil.* the horses) et] les [volera]'; cf. also the translation of Posener in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 168 (Bott. 185); Helck, *op. cit.*, 526.

[145] Since H. Winckler, *OLZ* 13, 1910, 291, this is almost generally explained as a Hurrianized 'Aryan' word (cf. Sanskrit *márya-*); cf., e.g., W. F. Albright, 'Mitannian maryannu, "chariot warrior", and the Canaanite and Egyptian Equivalents', *AfO* 6, 1930/31, 217–21. Against this already A. Gustavs, *ZA* 36, 1925, 301f., and now, especially, A. Kammenhuber, *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient* (Heidelberg 1968), 220–23.

[146] *Op. cit.*, 523.

[147] On *m*( )-*rú-'ù* (*mr'*) 'groom' cf. A. Alt, *ZAW* 58, 1940/1, 279; Helck, *op. cit.*, 560 n. 95.

[148] Cf. G. Posener in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 175.

[149] On the stele from *karnak* see E. Edel, 'Die Stelen Amenophis' II aus Karnak und Memphis mit dem Bericht über die asiatischen Feldzüge des Königs', *ZDPV* 69, 1953, 98–113, where the earlier copies and discussions

Memphis version of the text, between '127 princes of *rṯnw*; 179 brothers of princes' and '15200 Bedouin (*šꜣs.w*); 36300 Asiatics (*ḫꜣr.w*); 15070 Nuḫašše(*ngs*)-people', there are mentioned, as prisoners of war, 3600 *ʿpr* (Bott. 183).[150] *ʿpr.w* as prisoners of war probably occur also in the *novelle*-like narrative of a campaign of Tuthmosis III in Asia which is found in Pap. Turin 1941, x+1.9 (Bott. 186), but the context is much too fragmentary for any very precise statements to be made on this basis. In this way, too, the *ʿpr.w* directly attested for Egypt in other places must have arrived in the land of the Nile where they were employed as agricultural labourers (Bott. 181, 182),[151] as members of an expedition of Rameses IV to the *wādī ḥammāmāt*, as quarry workers (and/) or soldiers (Bott. 190) and on building work of Rameses III (Bott. 187, 188). The *ʿpr.w* assigned by Rameses III to the temple of Atum at Heliopolis (the mention of them along with 'princes' and Maryannu would suggest that here too we are dealing with

are listed; restored text *ibid.*, plate 7. The stele from *mīt rahīne* is published in A. M. Badawy, 'Die neue historische Stele Amenophis' II', *ASAE* 42, 1943, 1–23; copy *ibid.*, plate 1; photographs in Edel, *op. cit.*, plates 3–5. A synoptic transcription and translation of both steles in Edel, *op. cit.*, 113–36.

[150] On the character of the lists of booty on both steles see Edel, *op. cit.*, 167–73. It is clear that the list of booty discussed here and belonging to the campaign of year 9 on the stele of *mīt rahīne* (lines 29–32; Edel, *op. cit.*, 123, 124, 135f.) does not belong to the campaign to which it is ascribed. Amenophis II did not go further than Galilee in his ninth year; the mention of people from Nuḫašše as prisoners from this limited campaign would therefore be very surprising. Moreover, we do not, of course, know how this list is to be classified historically. The large numbers of persons which exceed the figures of contingents of prisoners brought to Egypt at other times are explained by J. J. Janssen, 'Eine Beuteliste von Amenophis II. und das Problem der Sklaverei im alten Ägypten', *JEOL* 17, 1963 (1964), 141–7, by accepting that this is a census list, used secondarily, of Asiatic territories ruled by Egypt. But it seems to me that the figures are again too low for this. If we leave open the question as to when and in what circumstances these prisoners came into Pharaoh's hands, one could accept that they were, at least in part, requisitioned in Syria-Palestine itself for work on the royal domains (on this cf. Helck, *op. cit.*, 261f.) while only a small 'élite' were deported to Egypt.

[151] T. Säve-Söderbergh, 'The *ʿprw* as Vintagers in Egypt', *Orientalia Suecana* 1, 1952, 5–14. The reservations raised by G. Posener in Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 166f., especially on the basis of the writing of the word *ʿpr.w* with the sign *ʿpr* (Aa 20 in A. H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, London ³1957, 542) in tomb 39, against the citing of the Theban tomb inscriptions (cf. similarly also Helck, *op. cit.*, 527) are not convincing, for we are sufficiently familiar with 'frivolous' ways in which the Egyptians wrote Asiatic foreign words which have a connection with Egyptian words of related or even very remote meaning. In this case the puzzle anyhow is fairly obvious. Cf. similarly Säve-Söderbergh, *op. cit.*, 6f. and n.4.

prisoners of war) were probably utilized for similar tasks (Bott. 189). From these passages it is clear that the *ʿpr.w* represent a group of men who have been brought by the Egyptians from Asia and have been called by their native Asiatic, i.e. North-west Semitic, designation. The class of *ʿapiru* is fundamentally foreign to the Egyptian social organization. If, therefore, one regards the Old Testament *ʿibrīm* who live in Egypt as *ʿapiru* and considers that the description in this sense is completely authentic, then one must accept that the 'Israelites' described in this way already belonged to the *ʿapiru* in their own land and have arrived in Egypt, in 'the house of bondage',[152] as the Pharaoh's prisoners of war or at any rate by means of force. This contradicts the narrative of the voluntary migration of Jacob and his sons to Egypt as this exists within the framework of the Joseph story (Gen. 46; 47.1–12), a narrative which describes the migrants as breeders of small cattle and 'semi-nomads'.[153] Even if one accepts that the present form of the Joseph story (which can scarcely be utilized as the historical event immediately preceding Ex. 1ff. and which is, in any case, of late date)[154] has suppressed older and perhaps deviant traditions about the immigration (?) of 'Israelites' into Egypt, one cannot positively assume that these lost traditions had presented the ancestors of the exodus generation as prisoners of war. This is in fact contradicted by the older formulations of the elements of tradition concerning the descent of the Jacob family to Egypt,[155] and the texts in Ex. 1ff. clearly show the aversion felt

[152] Cf. Ex. 20.2; Deut. 5.6.

[153] Cf. Gen. 46.32–34; 47.3–6.

[154] On this cf. from the traditio-historical aspect M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Darmstadt ²1960), 226–32 and, from the aspect of history of subject-matter and of philology, J. Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte: Genèse chap. 37–50 à la lumière des études égyptologiques récentes* (Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia 3, Louvain 1959), 203–13 (at least for the 'editorial modernization' of the narrative; the hypothesis of the Mosaic origin of the original need not be discussed here); D. B. Redford, *VT* 15, 1965, 532 and n.3 (see also below n.162). One can – even against the most recent excellent treatment of the theme by L. Ruppert, *Die Josepherzählung der Genesis: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Pentateuchquellen* (StANT 11, 1965), 23f. and 29ff. *passim* – justifiably still ask the question whether the Joseph-*novelle* ever belonged within the context of the 'Pentateuchal sources' J and E or JE and whether it is not rather an originally independent even if stratified composition.

[155] Cf. G. v. Rad, 'Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch' (1938), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (ThB 8, 1958), 11ff. (ET 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, Edinburgh and London 1966, pp.3ff.); Noth, *op. cit.*, 227.

by the 'semi-nomads' towards the forced labour[156] to which they had been compelled by the Egyptians and which they regarded as 'slavery'. One may always suppose that from the Egyptian point of view the distinction between labouring 'semi-nomads' (who, earlier, had always been referred to as *šꜣśꜣ.w*) and *ʿpr.w* as state or temple slaves had become blurred; but these are *ad hoc* speculations completely without significance for the historical appraisal of our material. The fact that, according to the Old Testament, the work done by the 'Hebrews' in Egypt coincides, in part, with that of the *ʿpr.w*[157] is no proof of the identity of the two groups; identical operations are also carried on by other peoples in cases where there is not the slightest question of identification with the *ʿapiru*/ Hebrews. Consequently, even the two passages in letters from the time of Rameses III,[158] which are frequently compared with Ex. 1.11 (where we should note that it is 'Israelites' who are mentioned), can prove nothing. In this connection, too, explicit denial must be made of any connection[159] between the *ʾelōhē hāʿibrīm*, at whose command Moses appears before the Pharaoh in the plague narratives (Ex. 3.18; 5.3; 7.16; 9.1, 13; 10.3J) and the 'gods of the *ʿapiru*' of the Hittite treaties. On the basis of the explanation which we have given above of the expression *ilāni* (*ša*) *ḫapirī*,[160] such a connection is impossible, the more so since what is certainly meant by the 'God of the Hebrews' is *YHWH ʾelōhē yiśrāʾēl*[161] and since the term *ʿibrīm* is used here in accordance with Yahwistic usage in the rest of these narratives. The same is surely true of the description of Joseph as an *ʿibrī* 'stolen' (Gen. 40.15) from the 'land of the Hebrews' (*ʾereṣ hāʿibrīm*), a description which says nothing about his social status as *ʿebed* (39.17, 19; 41.12) but which, in accordance with later usage, apparently represents a pure ethnic form. This is quite unobjectionable if in the Joseph story we have

[156] See also below p. 121 and ch. III 2 n. 82 on *ARM* III, 38.19–22.

[157] Cf. M. P. Gray, *HUCA* 29, 1958, 177–80.

[158] Sample letter (school text): Pap. Leiden 348, v°. 6.6; E. Edel in K. Galling, *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels* (Tübingen 1950), 30 no. 14D; Bott. 187. Identical formulation in Pap. Leiden 349 b 7; Bott. 188, which is a genuine letter in the view of J. Černý as reported by Posener on Bott. 188.

[159] Gray, *op. cit.*, 152f., 178. On Jirku's views see the literature cited in n. 53 above.

[160] See above p. 70 and n. 53.

[161] Cf. the formulation *YHWH ʾelōhē hāʿibrīm* in all the relevant passages except Ex. 5.3 and the contrast between Ex. 3.15 (directed at 'Israelites') and 3.18 (directed at Pharaoh).

to do, as we have supposed above, with a unit of a relatively late date and originally independent of the 'Pentateuchal sources' J and E.[162] We can sum up by stating that we can indicate no definitely convincing reason for the description of the 'Israelites' in Egypt as 'Hebrews' in certain parts of the Joseph story and of the exodus narratives. It may be, however, that the Yahwist already regarded the expression as an archaic ethnic term for his people.[163]

11. The last reference to *ʿibrī* which will be discussed here is Gen. 14.13. It cannot be the aim of this examination to discuss *in extenso* Gen. 14,[164] a chapter which has been much discussed and

[162] Cf. above p. 91 and n. 154.

On the expression *ʾereṣ hāʿibrīm* cf. most recently D. B. Redford, 'The "Land of the Hebrews" in Gen. xl 15', *VT* 15, 1965, 529–32, who believes that he has found a corresponding Egyptian expression in the demotic papyrus D 6278–89 + 6698 + 10111 in the papyrus collection of the Austrian national library in Vienna (R. A. Parker, *A Vienna Demotic Papyrus on Eclipse- and Lunar-Omina*, Brown Egyptological Studies 2, Providence 1959). In text A of this papyrus which comes from the Roman period but which, according to Parker, goes back to an original probably from the Persian period, specific months, hours and sections of the sky are drawn up for, besides *kmy* = Egypt, the four countries *iśwr* (*pꜣ tꜣ/tš pꜣ iśwr* IIIb; IV 28 as well as *iśwr* III 6 and *pꜣ tš iśwr* IV 15) = Asshur = Mesopotamia, *ʿybr* (III 5, II 22 probably needs to be supplemented thus; variants: *ʿbr* II 27; *y[b]r* IV 9) = Hebr. *ʿēber* = Palestine, *pꜣ ʿymr* (II 30; IV 9, 17) = Amurru ('instead of i is unobjectionable in demotic orthogrpahy) = Syria and *grṭy* (II 29, 30; III 3; *pꜣ grṭy* IV 29; *nꜣ grṭy* II 26) = Crete (cf. Parker, *op. cit.*, 6f.). According to Redford, the name *ʿybr* corresponds to the Hebrew expression *ʾereṣ hāʿibrīm* Gen. 40.15 and is an indication of the late composition of the Joseph-*novelle*. If, in the interests of a more exact analogy, one were to read rather in the demotic text **pꜣ tꜣ/tš pꜣ/nꜣ ʿybr* or the like, then Redford's argument is completely tenable – but not his dating of the original form of the papyrus in the Saite period (*op. cit.*, 531) which cannot simply be deduced from the occurrence of the expressions *pꜣ nsw* 'the king' or *pꜣ nsw kmy* 'the king of Egypt' since these could be the transposing into Egyptian of the Akk. *šarru* (or LUGAL) from a possible Babylonian original – and would be additional support for our interpretation of *ʿibrī(m)* in the Joseph-*novelle*. The identification proposed by R. J. Williams, *JNES* 25, 1966, 69 n. 1, of *ʿybr* with Akk. *eber* (*nāri*) cannot be excluded but is not very likely since *ʿybr* would then be in too close a geographical proximity to *ʿymr*.

[163] It is questionable whether the Yahwist could still have understood the class term *ʿibrī*/*ʿapiru*, which he must have found to hand, in a sociological sense. See also above p. 87 and n. 132 on *gēr*.

[164] From the enormous literature I select what is not exclusively concerned with the so-called 'Melchizedek episode': W. F. Albright, 'A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology', *JPOS* 1, 1921, 68–79; 'Shinar-Šanğar and its Monarch Amraphel', *AJSL* 40, 1923, 125–33; 'The Jordan Valley in the Bronze Age', *AASOR* 6, 1926, 62–66; 'The Historical Background of Gen. XIV', *JSOR* 10, 1926, 231–69; 'A Third Revision of the Early Chronology of Western Asia', *BASOR* 88, 1942, 33–36; 'Abram the Hebrew: A New

debated and which still remains enigmatic. A few remarks are, however, necessary since for Albright,[165] for example, this chapter is central to his discussion both of the 'patriarch' Abraham and of the '*apiru*-people of the second millennium. It is well known that Gen. 14 cannot be attributed to any of the sources of the 'Pentateuch'. It stands like an outcrop of rock in the middle of the Abraham narratives with which it has, of course, certain features in common, but, on the whole, it depicts the 'patriarch' differently from the main line of the traditions. Opinions concerning the character and age of the chapter are, therefore, understandably varied. According to Eissfeldt,[166] it presupposes 'the already complete compilation L+J+E+B+D+H+P' since it is not only dependent on the 'L' narrative of Lot and Abraham (Gen. 12.6–8 +

Archaeological Interpretation', *BASOR* 163, 1961, 36–54; H. Asmussen, 'Genesis 14, ein politisches Flugblatt', *ZAW* 34, 1914, 36–41; I. Benzinger, 'Zur Quellenscheidung in Gen. 14', *Vom Alten Testament: Karl Marti zum 70. Geburtstage gewidmet* (BZAW 41, 1925), 21–27; F. M. Th. (de Liagre) Böhl, 'Die Könige von Genesis 14', *ZAW* 36, 1916, 65–73; 'Tud'alia I, Zeitgenosse Abrahams, um 1650 v.Chr.', *ZAW* 42, 1924, 148–53; 'Das Zeitalter Abrahams' (1930; ²1931), *Opera Minora* (Groningen and Djakarta 1953), 43–48; 'King Ḫammurabi of Babylon in the Setting of his Time' (1946), *Opera Minora* (1953), 353f.; *RGG*³ I (1957), 332f. *s.v.* Amraphel; E. Burrows, 'Notes on Hurrian', *JRAS* 1925, 283f.; F. Cornelius, 'Genesis XIV', *ZAW* 72, 1960, 1–7; C. H. Cornill, 'Genesis 14', *ZAW* 34, 1914, 150f.; A. Deimel, 'Amraphel, Rex Senaar . . . Thadal, Rex Gentium', *Bibl* 8, 1927, 350–57; É.Dhorme, 'Ḫammourabi-Amraphel', *RB* NS 5, 1908, 205–26; 'Abraham dans le cadre de l'histoire', *RB* 37, 1928, 367–85, 481–511; 40, 1931, 364–74, 503–18; J. C. L. Gibson, *JSS* 9, 1964, 362f. and n. 10; N. Glueck, *The Other Side of the Jordan* (New Haven 1940), 114; F. Hommel, 'Zu Gen. 14 und insbesondere zu Arioch von Ellasar', *BZ* 15, 1920, 213–18; K. Jaritz, 'Wer ist Amrafel in Gen. 14?', *ZAW* 70, 1958, 255f.; P. Jensen, 'Genesis 14 und ein Ausschnitt aus den Res gestae des Aššur-bān-apli', *ZA* 42, 1934, 232–5; A. Jirku, 'Neues keilinschriftliches Material zum Alten Testament', *ZAW* 39, 1921, 152–6; 'Zum historischen Stil von Gen. 14', *ibid.*, 313f.; J. H. Kroeze, *Genesis Veertien. Een exegetisch-historische studie* (Hilversum 1937); J. Meinhold, *1. Mose 14* (BZAW 22, 1911); M. Noth, 'Arioch-Arriwuk', *VT* 1, 1951, 136–40; A. Parrot, *Abraham et son temps* (Cahiers d'Archéologie Biblique 14, Neuchâtel 1962), 76–86; W. T. Pilter, 'The Amorite Personal Names in Genesis 14', *PSBA* 35, 1913, 205–26; 36, 1914, 125–42; N. A. van Uchelen, *Abraham de Hebreeër. Een literair- en historisch-kritische studie naar aanleiding van Genesis 14:13* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 5, Assen 1964); R. de Vaux, 'Les patriarches hébreux et les découvertes modernes', *RB* 55, 1948, 326–37; S. Yeivin, *Bᵉʾēr-ševaʿ ʿīr hāʾāvōt* (*Meḥqārīm bᵉ-tōlᵉdōt yiśrāʾēl wᵉ-ʾarṣō*, Tel-Aviv 1959), 56–58.

[165] *BASOR* 163, 1961, 49–54.

[166] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen ²1956), 251f.; (Tübingen ³1964), 280f. (ET *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, Oxford 1965, 211f.).

13.2, 5, 7–11a, 12bb–18) and of Sodom (Gen. 18f.) but also has all manner of linguistic peculiarities in common with P; on these grounds it is, therefore, a very late and certainly post-exilic section into which have been worked 'some information about warlike events in the remote past and perhaps a tradition concerning the pre-Israelite priesthood of Jerusalem'. According to Albright the contents of the section are very old, and the text is, in addition, 'strewn with indications of a very archaic verse tradition underlying its transmitted prose form';[167] he would like to date the events in the nineteenth century BC or a little later,[168] even if our knowledge does not (yet) extend to a more exact historical classification. Now, it cannot be doubted that the names of the protagonists have a Middle and Late Bronze Age colouring. It has often been pointed out that *tidʿal melek gōyīm* has the name of the Hittite king *Tudḫaliya*.[169] The name of Arioch (*ʾaryōk*) of Ellasar is encountered in the form *ar-ri-yú-uk* in the Mari texts (ARM II 63.3; 64.3)[170] and in Nuzu as ᴵ*a-ri-ú-uk-ki*.[171] Chedorlaomer (*kᵉdorlāʿōmer*) is a

[167] *Op. cit.*, 49. [168] *Op. cit.*, 49f.

[169] Recognized by A. H. Sayce, *ExpT* 19, 1908, 283; *OLZ* 13, 1910, 489–91; cf. F. M. Th. Böhl, *ZAW* 36, 1916, 68f.; 42, 1924, 148–53. In the Ugaritic alphabetic script the name appears as *ttġl*, *PRU* II 69. 4; the word *tdġl*, *PRU* II 34. 9; 39. 21, hitherto associated with *ttġl* as a variant, whose written form would correspond better to Hebr. *tdʿl*, has been recognized correctly by M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *WO* 3.3, 1966, 201, as a vocational description of Hurrian origin (unexplained, with formative element *-uḫli/ḫuli-*, perhaps in Nuzu as ᴸᵁ*tiʾ*ᴵ (ᴴᴵ)-*du-uḫ-l*[*i*] *RA* 56, 1962, 77 line 21). The correspondence Hitt-Hurr. *ḫ*: Ug. *ġ*: Hebr. ʿ is regular.

What *melek gōyīm* means I do not know. The association of the expression by F. Cornelius, *ZAW* 72, 1960, 3f., with Thieme's disputed interpretation of the 'Aryans' as the 'foreigners' (P. Thieme, *Der Fremdling im Ṛgveda*, AKM 23.2, 1938), and with the *ḥqꜣ.w ḫꜣś.wt* ('Hyksos'), along with the historical consequences deduced from this, is unfounded. The association with the *ummān manda* (A. H. Sayce, *JTVI* 29, 1897, 90) is old and rests primarily on the supposed correspondence in meaning of *ummānu* 'army, troop, people' and *gōyīm*.

[170] *Ar-ri*-ᴰᴵ-*uk* is probably to be read thus and not as *ar-ri-wu-uk*; only in this way can the Hebrew form be easily explained. The equation first of all in F. M. Th. Böhl, *JEOL* 2, 1945, 66; cf. R. de Vaux, *RB* 55, 1948, 333; Ch. F. Jean, *Studia Mariana* (DMOA 4, 1950), 98; H. Schmökel, *ThLZ* 75, 1950, 689; M. Noth, *VT* 1, 1951, 136–40; F. Cornelius, *ZAW* 72, 1960, 2. The old equation with a hypothetical name *ᴵÈᴿᴵ-*aku* (after ᴵÈᴿᴵ-ᴰÉ-*a-ku* of the 'Spartoli texts') (cf. E. Schrader, *SAB* 1894, 279ff.) was already dismissed by F. M. Th. Böhl, *ZAW* 36, 1916, 67 and n. 4; his interpretation of the name at that time as **āryaka*-'Aryan, worthy of an Aryan' (*op. cit.*, 70 n. 1) was from the very beginning scarcely probable.

[171] I. J. Gelb, P. M. Purves and A. A. MacRae, *Nuzi Personal Names* (OIP 57, 1943), 30ᵃ.

good Elamite name (**Kuder-Lagamar*)[172] which suits a 'king of Elam', even if it has not hitherto been attested as the name either of a king or of a private individual. Finally, the name Amraphel (*'amrāpel*; G *Αμαρφαλ*), borne by the 'king of Shinar',[173] has a completely Mesopotamian ring, but cannot be connected with the name of the great Hammurapi[174] or with that of

[172] This identification is old and surely also correct; cf., e.g., P. Dhorme, *RB* NS 5, 1908, 209f.; F. M. Th. Böhl, *ZAW* 36, 1916, 67; *Opera Minora* (Groningen and Djakarta 1953), 46f. and 478 n.39; W. Hinz, *Das Reich Elam* (UB 82, 1964), 9. The element *kdr-* corresponds to Elam. *kud.e.r* 'protector he/protectress she' (written *ku-te-er, ku-ti-ir, ku-ter*) in proper names such as ^{I}*kuder-*^{D}*humban,* ^{I}*kuder-*^{D}*nahhunde EKI*, 199. Since G has *Χοδολλογομορ* (variant *Χοδολλαγομορ*) it may be assumed that Hebr. *k^{e}dor-* goes back to **kodor-* and the latter to **kudur-*, with which may be compared Assyrian forms of the name Kuder-Nahhunde: ^{I}NÌ.KU(*kudur*)-^{D}*na-ḫu-un-du* Sennacherib V 1, 12 (*BAL*, 75); ^{I}*ku-dúr-na-an-ḫu-un-di* Assurbanipal Ann. 5 vs. 12. Both the Elamite and the Assyrian forms are surely attempts to reproduce what was pronounced as /**kudər*/ or /**kudr*/ (W. Hinz orally). In the case of the name of the goddess Lagamar (^{D}*la-ga₅-ma-ar*) one would have to establish the pronunciation /**laǧamar*/ with dull a-vowels in order to arrive at the Hebr. *lāʿōmer* (theoretically *lāʿōmer* could be traced back to **laǧumr*). Another possibility would be to derive *lāʿōmer* from the name of the god Nahhunde. In this case **lāʿōmed*[1] (error *d/r*) would have to be read and it would have to be assumed that initial *n* had become *l-*, that Hebr. -ʿ- went back to -**ǧ-* standing for Elam. *-hh-* and that the nasal *-n-* had become *-m-* before *-d*. The vowels of the Hebrew form agree perfectly with the Elamite ones (*-e-* a parasitic vowel) and one acquires, in addition, the name of a king that is frequently attested (O. Rössler orally). This at first sight illuminating hypothesis, to which I refer with the friendly permission of Prof. Rössler, nevertheless has against it insuperable difficulties of the phonetic law: the shift *n/l*, as opposed to the shift *r/l* – cf. ^{D}*ruhurater EKI* 6h, 4; 7 IIb. 2, 3, 4; 11 C. 4, 5; 86.14, 16; VAB I, 180: 3,9 (in the proper name *tan-*^{D}*r.*) with ^{D}*luhurater* in the proper name ^{I}*kuk-*^{D}*l.* DP XXIII 318 vs. 5, 7 and ^{D}*lahuratel CT* XXV 11, 37; Šurpu II 162 or ^{D}*lagamar EKI* 34.6; 48.199; 69.28, 29 with ^{D}*lagamal EKI* 30.3 and R. Labat, *CILUP* 10, 1950/51, 28 §5 – is not attested in Elamite and the *ḫ* of the Elamite cuneiform texts (such as in Assyrian attempts at writing Elamite words and names) does not transcribe a velar spirant but rather a weak pharyngal spirant comparable to our *h* (cf. Labat, *op. cit.*, 28 §3) which cannot therefore be reproduced by Sem. **ǧ* > Hebr. ʿ.

[173] *Šinʿār* is usually identified with *šanḫar(a)*. On this cf. W. F. Albright, 'Shinar-Šanǧar and its Monarch Amraphel', *AJSL* 40, 1923/24, 125–33.

[174] The equation already in E. Schrader, *SAB* 1887, 600f.; cf. Dhorme, *op. cit.*, 205–26; W. T. Pilter, *PSBA* 35, 1913, 171–86, 244f. It is, however, phonetically impossible since we would expect a Hebrew form corresponding to Ugaritic *ʿmrpi* (Ch. Virolleaud, *JA* 243, 1955, 133f.). The more recent attempt by Cornelius, *ZAW* 72, 1960, 2 and n.4, to support the equation on grounds of historical 'probability' is linguistically and factually untenable. For to call the deified Ḫammurapi **ʿammu-rāpiʾ-ʾil(u)* (= *ʾamrāpel*!) would be odd, nor can it be supported by Babylonian proper names whose theophorous element is the name of a ruler – e.g. ^{D}*bur-*^{D}SUEN-*i-lí* BIN VII 59.11; 60.12, 17;

Amud-pî-el[175] of Qatna or even with the country of Jamudbal/Emudbal.[176] Even the names of the Palestinian opponents of the coalition are, as Albright[177] has shown, to be attributed, from the point of view of their type, to the second millennium and, in spite of apparent textual corruption (or deliberate alteration?), can be associated with the group of so-called 'Amorite' names.[178] Is, then, the mention of 'Abraham the Hebrew' to be looked at in the light of the archaic use of names in this narrative? Albright answers this question in a positive way and sees, therefore, in Abraham an

215 (seal); ^{D}*ri-im-*^{D}SUEN-*i-lí* YOS VIII 118.16; *ḫa-am-mu-ra-pí-i-lí* J. J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung* (MVAeG 44, 1939), 372. Against the equation also Böhl, *ZAW* 36, 66f.; *Opera Minora*, 354.

[175] Böhl, *Opera Minora*, 353f.; on the contrary *ibid.*, 478 n.34; cf. K. Jaritz, *ZAW* 70, 1958, 255f. Other proposals by Böhl, which admittedly are not very illuminating, can be found in *ZAW* 36, 69 and n.5; *Opera Minora*, 45.

[176] W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 163, 1961, 49. I would prefer to think of an Akkadian or 'Amorite' proper name whose first part cannot in the meantime be exactly determined; *-pel* could be *-pī-el*. Along the same lines cf. van Uchelen, *op. cit.*, 62. A 'purely linguistic' connection (if one can have such a thing) with the name *amud-pî-el* would be possible if one conjectured *ʾmd*[1]*pl* in Gen. 14 (cf. Albright, *op. cit.*, 49f., n.67).

[177] *Op. cit.*, 52.

[178] I use this description in a somewhat conventional manner without being able to provide a convincing justification for it. One can, however, cite in its favour the fact that many bearers of such names are actually introduced by the description MAR.TU = *amurrûm*; cf. I. J. Gelb, *La lingua degli Amoriti* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, rendiconti, VIII 13, Rome 1958), 145. I believe, however, that it is entirely possible that it will turn out that Th. Bauer, following B. Landsberger, was on the right road with his description 'east Canaanites'; cf. Th. Bauer, *Die Ostkanaanäer: Eine philologisch-historische Untersuchung über die Wanderschicht der sogenannten 'Amoriter' in Babylonien* (Leipzig 1926); 'Eine Überprüfung der "Amoriter"-Frage', *ZA* 38, 1929, 153–60. The description 'Canaanites' in D. O. Edzard, *Die 'zweite Zwischenzeit' Babyloniens* (Wiesbaden 1957), 30 n.127 and *passim*, is too general; W. v. Soden, *WO* 3.3, 1966, 178 n.1, now says 'early Canaanites'. One must always keep in mind the fact that both 'Amorite' and '(east-/early-) Canaanite' as descriptions of languages are artificial creations (analogous to 'Semitic'). The classification proposed by M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (BWANT III 10, 1928), 44–55; 'Zum Problem der "Ostkanaanäer"', *ZA* 39, 1930, 221f.; 'Mari und Israel, eine Personennamenstudie', *Geschichte und Altes Testament* (BHTh 16, 1953), 152; *Die Ursprünge des alten Israel im Lichte neuer Quellen* (Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Geisteswissenschaften, 94, Cologne and Opladen 1961), 29–33, 'proto-Aramaic' is incorrect and should be avoided since it does not correspond to the linguistic character of the names and does not even fit the appellatives cited by Noth from the Mari texts; on this cf. aptly D. O. Edzard, 'Mari und Aramäer?', *ZA* 56, 1964, 142–9.

'*apiru* of the nineteenth century BC, a 'caravaneer' who carried on the trade of donkey caravaneering which flourished at that time.[179] Even apart from doubts as to this interpretation of the term '*apiru*, one must, of course, question whether the archaic traits of Gen. 14 which seem to indicate the Middle and Late Bronze Age really rest on authentic historical tradition. They could equally well be attributed to intentional archaizing in a late text[180] which has thus acquired the appearance of great antiquity. Eissfeldt[181] has already pointed out that the narrative betrays a certain affinity with the book of Judith or, to be more precise, with the historical exposition in Judith 1.1–16. There we find, in a literary work of the second century BC,[182] in the attempt to describe a fictitious event in the period of the restoration of the cult of the Jerusalem temple, that is in the late sixth century, that the protagonists are provided with very ancient names but are set in a framework abounding in historical incongruities. Thus 'Nebuchadnezzar',[183] 'who ruled

[179] *Op. cit.*, 40–54. My criticism of Albright's interpretation of the term '*apiru* is not directed against his reconstruction of caravaneering in the second millennium (*op. cit.*, 40–43) for which the researches of H. Lewy, 'The Assload, the Sack and Other Measures of Capacity', *RSO* 39, 1964, 181–97, may well prove fruitful.

[180] In this context there should be recalled the so-called 'cruciform monument of Maništušu' (*CT* XXXII 1–4) which purports to be an inscription of king Maništušu, son of Sargon I, but which, according to I. J. Gelb, 'The Date of the Cruciform Monument of Maništušu', *JNES* 8, 1949, 346–8; *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar* (MAD 2, 1952), 11, is a forgery of the Old Babylonian period in favour of the É.BABBAR temple of Sippar, and, according to E. Sollberger, *JEOL* 7.20, 1967/68, 50–70, even comes from the neo-Babylonian period.

[181] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen ²1956), 726; (*ibid.* ³1964), 795; ET *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Oxford 1965), 586.

[182] This is the usual position. J. M. Grintz, *Sēfer yᵉhūdīt: Taḥzoret ha-nosaḥ ha-mᵉqōrī bᵉ-ṣērūf māvō', pērūšīm ū-maftēḥōt* (Jerusalem 1957), 15–17 would rather date the book in the later part of the Achaemenian period (Artaxerxes II, fourth century). The geographical horizon of the book may well be late Achaemenian (see below n. 186), but this does not mean that it was necessarily also written in that period.

[183] After what has been said above, it is pointless to inquire after the identity of this 'Nebuchadnezzar'. Even the revival of the hypothesis that he is the Armenian Araḫa, son of Haldita, who in the confusion at the accession of Darius I after the failure of Nidintu-Bēl ('Nebuchadnezzar III') set himself up as Babylonian king with the name 'Nebuchadnezzar (IV) son of Nabonidus' (G. Brunner, *Der Nabuchodonosor des Buches Judith: Beitrag zur Geschichte Israels nach dem Exil und des ersten Regierungsjahres Darius' I.*, Berlin ²1959) by C. Schedl, 'Nabuchodonosor, Arpakšad und Darius: Untersuchungen zum Buch Judith', *ZDMG* 115, 1965, 242–54, must be regarded as a failure. For this 'Nebuchadnezzar IV' was, in spite of all the efforts of Brunner and Schedl,

over the Assyrians in the great city of Nineveh' (Judith 1.1) fights against 'Arphaxad' (*Αρφαξαδ*) 'who ruled over the Medes in Ecbatana' (*ibid.*). The alleged king of the Medes is also encountered in the biblical tables of nations under the name '*arpakšad* (G. *Αρφαξαδ*)[184] probably as a Mesopotamian people or city (Gen. 10.22, 24; 11.10–13; I Chron. 1.17f., 24). A similar case is that of the field of battle where the two 'kings' fight. The region of Ragau (*Ραγαυ*), where the 'great plain' lies (Judith 1.5) and where 'Arphaxad' is eventually killed by 'Nebuchadnezzar' (1.15), is perhaps a distant reflection of the name of one of the Median capitals, *Ragā* (*Ραγαι* or *Ραγοι*),[185] but is more probably to be connected with the *rᵉʿū* (G *Ραγαυ*) of the Priestly table of nations in Gen. 11.18–21 (I Chron. 1.25). The tables of nations could also be used in order to explain the curious pseudo-geography of the book.[186] In view of all this, it is not very surprising if, in Judith 1.6, there appears

an ephemeral figure who did not have the power to make a military attack against the Iranian uplands or Palestine. Since he was able to survive for only four months, only his first year is recorded in the sources: A. Goetze, 'Additions to Parker and Dubberstein's Babylonian Chronology', *JNES* 3, 1944, 45; R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.–A.D. 75* (Brown University Studies 19, Providence ²1956), 16. In the original records there is not a single reference to the practice assumed by Schedl, *op. cit.*, 246–8, that the usurper counted the years of his reign from the end of the rule of Nabonidus his supposed father. In Judith 1.1, 13; 2.1 the reference cannot be to the twelfth, seventeenth and eighteenth years of this 'Nebuchadnezzar IV' who was defeated, captured and killed in the first year of his reign by Darius (*bisūtūn* inscription Pers. III 76–IV 2 [VAB III, 54–57 §§49–51]; cf. IV 28–30 [*ibid.* 60f. §52]). On this cf. also W. Hinz, 'Das erste Jahr des Grosskönigs Darius', *ZDMG* 92, 1938, 161f.; A. Poebel, 'Chronology of Darius' First Year of Reign', *AJSL* 55, 1938, 289–91, 302f.; A. T. Olmstead, 'Darius and his Behistun Inscription', *ibid.*, 402f.; A. Poebel, 'The Duration of the Reign of Smerdis, the Magian, and the Reigns of Nebuchadnezzar III and Nebuchadnezzar IV', *AJSL* 56, 1939, 131–44; also K. Galling, 'Politische Wandlungen zwischen Nabonid und Darius' (1953/54), *Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen 1964), 50f.

[184] The name has not yet been identified; I cannot accept what W. Brandenstein, *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung: Festschrift A. Debrunner* (Berne 1954), 59f., says on this.

[185] Old Persian *ragā*, Elamite *rag-ga₅-*, Akkadian *ra-ga-a'*: *bisūtūn* inscription Pers. II 71f. = Elam. II 54 = Bab. II 59 (VAB III, 38f. §32); Pers. III 2f. = Elam. II 73 (*ibid.*, 42 §36); additional references in Grintz, *op. cit.*, 72, on Judith 1.8; cf. also F. Stummer, *Geographie des Buches Judith* (Bibelwissenschaftliche Reihe 3, Stuttgart 1947), 22.

[186] The author of the book of Judith has very nebulous conceptions of the 'wider world', and these presuppose the Achaemenian empire; the impression made by his Palestinian geography is to say the least conflicting.

as 'king of the Elymaeans', that is of the Elamites, a certain 'Arioch' (*Αριωχ*) who probably owes his existence to a confusion between our Chedorlaomer of Elam and Arioch of Ellasar. Here, therefore, we can see how such ancient names were felt to be 'exotic' and found their way into and through later literary works. Another Arioch appears in Dan. 2.14f., 24f. as an official (*rab ṭabbāḥayyā'*) of king 'Nebuchadnezzar' in Babylon. Thus, the name appears to have enjoyed a certain vogue among the pseudepigrapha in the Persian-Hellenistic period. In the case of Gen. 14 this means at least that we cannot deduce from the ancient personal names an equal antiquity for the tradition as a whole. The description of Abraham as *hā'ibrī* could, therefore, equally well be authentic or archaistic fiction. In the same place, however, Gen. 14.13, there is mentioned, alongside Abraham, Mamre, apparently a personification[187] of the traditional dwelling-place of Abraham at Hebron and certainly not a historical personage. He is here, and only here, described as 'the Amorite' (*hā'emōrī*). The parallelism in the introduction of these two personages is certainly not accidental. It would lead us to suppose that when the author of our text wished to associate his fictitious ('Amorite')[188] 'country-dweller' 'Mamre' with the 'father of the Israelites', he went back to the description of the Israelites as 'Hebrews', a description which had for long been and in his own time certainly was ar-

[187] For Abraham's residence near Hebron J uses *'ēlōnē mamrē'* (Gen. 13.18; 18.1), P only *mamrē'* (sometimes as a definition of the site of the 'ancestral grave of the patriarchs': Gen. 23.17, 19; 25.9; 35.27; 49.30; 50.13). The fact that in Gen. 14.13, 24 we probably have personifications of places round Hebron also emerges from the fact that 'Eshcol', the 'brother' of 'Mamre', can scarcely be separated from the 'valley of grapes' (*naḥal 'eškōl* Num. 13.23f.; cf. 32.9; Deut. 1.24) which must be located in the Negeb also in the neighbourhood of Hebron. A similar situation must be envisaged for 'Aner' although no comparable place name can be suggested in the region; the Levitical city of Aner (*'ānēr*) in the tribe of Manasseh (I Chron. 6.55) which proves the use of the name as a toponym, probably owes its existence to a textual corruption (Josh. 21.25 has 'Taanach'). One should also note that in Gen. 14.13 with *be'ēlōnē mamrē'* the linguistic usage of J is adopted while what follows has no parallels in the rest of the tradition. There is general agreement that Mamre is to be located on the site of the *ḥaram* of *rāmet el-ḫalīl* about 3 km. (2 miles) north of the old city of Hebron (*el-ḫalīl*) (cf. *BRL* 275–9 *s.v.* Hebron).

[188] On the designation of the pre-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine as 'Amorites' (*'emōrī*) cf. M. Noth, 'Num. 21 als Glied der "Hexateuch"-Erzählung', *ZAW* 58, 1940/41, 182–9. With regard to the two passages in Gen. 14, Noth, *op. cit.*, 185 assumes that *'emōrī* serves as a general name for 'pre-Israelites' similar to the linguistic usage of the E-source.

chaistic. Here, then, *'ibrī* is understood in accordance with normal post-biblical linguistic usage as an ethnic term and says nothing either about the nineteenth century BC in general or about Abraham and the relationship of his descendants to the *'apiru*. At any rate, such a far-reaching hypothesis as that of Albright's cannot be built on such a precarious foundation.

12. With regard to the question of the identity of the *'apiru*-people of the ancient Near Eastern texts of the second millennium with the biblical Hebrews, there emerges from our discussion of the two terms the following:

(*a*) On the presupposition that *'apiru* is formed on the basis of the noun form **fa'il-*, the etymological relationship of the word with the Hebrew *'ibrī* can be established.[189]

(*b*) The situation of the *'ebed 'ibrī* of the 'Book of the Covenant' (Ex. 21.2–6) can be compared with that of the *'apiru*-people of the *wardūtu*-contracts from Nuzu.[190]

(*c*) The description as *'ibrīm* of the Israelites who were resisting Philistine claims to supremacy can perhaps be explained as analogous to the name *'apiru* which was given in the Amarna letters to those elements of the population of Syria-Palestine who were rebelling against Egyptian rule.[191]

(*d*) The passages in the Joseph story and the exodus narratives, as well as the examples from late Old Testament and subsequent writings, seem to understand the word *'ibrī* as an archaic way of describing the 'Israelite' nation.[192] The connection with the *'apiru* is extremely indirect.[193]

The picture which we have to sketch is much more complex than Albright, Mendenhall and others supposed. It now seems out of the question to regard without closer examination the terms 'Hebrews' and 'Israelites' as synonyms and to lump the 'Israelites'/'Hebrews' together with the *'apiru*-people. Finally, the fact that the word *'ibrī* appears only in certain clearly defined groups of texts cautions us against the idea that the terms 'Hebrew' and

[189] See above pp. 74–82.
[190] See above pp. 85–7.
[191] See above pp. 87f.
[192] See above pp. 88–93.
[193] If the suggestion made under (*c*) is right, the description of the 'Israelites' in Egypt as 'Hebrews' could be explained as a retrogressive transposition of the description used by the Philistines into the Egyptian period which was understood as the pre-history of the settlement in Palestine.

'Israelite' are interchangeable at will. At the same time, it is not possible either to regard the *bᵉnē yiśrā'ēl*[194] of the Old Testament settlement narratives simply as *'ibrīm* and *'apiru*-people. Since, in addition, the *'apiru* of the Amarna letters, as we have shown,[195] do not fill the role which Mendenhall ascribes to them, his hypothesis of the Israelite settlement must be rejected as being without sufficient foundation.[196]

2. NOMADS OF THE SECOND MILLENNIUM

1. The thesis that the Israelite settlement was essentially a social upheaval within Canaanite society at the end of the Bronze Age with no statistically significant immigration from outside overlooks the fact that at all periods Israel was vitally conscious of not being autochthonous in Canaan. The fact that this awareness usually finds expression in the sources at our disposal in kerygmatic formulations[1] is no reason for denying it historical relevance. This is all the less permissible since the Old Testament itself, as we have seen, has retained indications that the 'Israelites' who entered the cultivated land came from the context of life in the steppe and were originally not agriculturalists but breeders of small cattle.[2] In his attempted reconstruction of the settlement Mendenhall has also

[194] On the basis of the theories of Alt and Noth presented above, the names of individual tribes will have stood in the place of 'Israelites' in a stage of the tradition which is preserved now only in fragments.

[195] See above pp. 71–4.

[196] Cf. also the criticism in J. A. Soggin, 'La conquista israelitica della Palestina nei sec. XIII e XII e le scoperte archeologiche', *Protestantesimo* 17, 1962, 208 (*appendice*), which agrees on the whole with the objections raised here.

[1] It is unnecessary to provide detailed references for this assertion since the concept is present everywhere in the older parts of the Old Testament down to Deuteronomy. I refer only to the particularly fine expression of it in Deut. 6.10–12. Cf. also G. v. Rad, 'Es ist noch eine Ruhe vorhanden dem Volke Gottes. Eine biblische Begriffsuntersuchung' (1933), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (ThB 8, 1958), 101–108 (ET 'There remains still a rest for the people of God: An investigation of a biblical conception' in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, Edinburgh and London 1965, 94–102); 'Verheissenes Land und Jahwehs Land im Hexateuch' (1943), *ibid.*, 87–100 (ET 'The Promised Land and Yahweh's Land in the Hexateuch', *ibid.*, 79–93).

[2] See above pp. 5f. and cf. also Num. 32.16, 24, 36, where it is stated with regard to the tribes of Reuben and Gad that the first measures taken by them after the occupation of their territory was the building of *gidrōt ṣōn* 'sheep-folds' and *'ārīm* 'cities', i.e. permanent settlements (see below pp. 115–20 on *ḥaṣirātum* and *ālānû* in the Mari texts).

not noticed that of the lines of tradition which have been woven together in the present historical picture of Israel it is not the 'exodus-Sinai' traditions but the traditions of the 'fathers' which serve as the ideological basis for the occupation of the agricultural land east and west of the Jordan.[3] According to the general consensus of opinion, however, these traditions reflect conditions in the (Middle and) Late Bronze Age in the steppe region[4] which stretched between the thickly populated areas of southern Mesopotamia ('Sumer and Akkad') and Phoenicia-Palestine, a region whose inhabitants were, for the most part, breeders of sheep and therefore necessarily mobile and whom we have described hitherto in this work in the usual terms of 'semi-nomads' or 'nomads with small cattle'. In this respect one must remember that the 'fathers' to whom the divine promise of land is addressed are described against an Aramaean background.[5] This may be anachronistic, and that would fit the description of them as a 'people', since the Aramaeans are known, at the earliest,[6] from the time of Tiglath-pileser I;[7] but it does prove that the Israelites were completely aware of their ancestors' connections with the territories on the

[3] On the promise of land to the 'fathers' cf. A. Alt, 'Der Gott der Väter' (1929), *Kl.Schr.* I, 65f. (ET 'The God of the Fathers' in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, Oxford 1966, 64f.); G. v. Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose, Genesis* (ATD 2–4, ⁴1956), 14f. (ET *Genesis*, London ²1963, 20ff.). J. Hoftijzer, *Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter* (Leiden 1956), seems to me to confuse the actual circumstances when he assumes that 'a tradition of promise (*scil.* of land) first arose after the connection between the patriarchal period and the exodus period had already occurred both from the religious and from the traditio-historical point of view' (*op. cit.*, 98), that is 'first in the period when the existence of the nation was seriously threatened or perhaps first during the exile' (*ibid.*, 99).

[4] On the definition of this steppe region see R. de Vaux, *RB* 56, 1949, 12–14 with map p. 13.

[5] Cf. Gen. 22.20f.; 28.5 (; 29.4, 14); 31.20, 24, 47 etc. and J. C. L. Gibson, 'Light from Mari on the Patriarchs', *JSS* 7, 1962, 53f. It is not quite clear whether the expression *'ᵃrammī* (*'ōbēd*) in Deut. 26.5 has the ethnic meaning 'Aramaean' or the sociological meaning 'bedouin' (cf. the secondary use in Akkadian of the original tribal names *tid(a)num*, MAR.TU = *amurrû, sutû*, ḪA.NA = *ḫanû, aḫlamû*).

[6] See Preface.

[7] *aḫ-la-mi/mì-i* KUR*ar-ma-(a-)ya*ᴹᴱŠ Prism V 46f. (*AKA* 73); KUR*aḫ-la-me-e* (KUR)*ar-ma-a-ya*ᴹᴱŠ *KAH* II 63 III 4f.; 71, 19; *aḫ-la-mì-i* [KUR*a*]*r-ma-a-ya*ᴹᴱŠ Weidner I, 29f. (*AfO* 18, 1957/58, 344); (KUR)*aḫ-la-me-e* KUR*ar-ma-a-ya*ᴹᴱŠ Weidner II, 34 (*ibid.*, 350); cf. J.-R. Kupper, *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari* (1957), 111 and n. 1. The description 'Aramaean *Aḫlamû*' presumably means Aramaean bedouin and not that the *Aḫlamū* people of the older sources were 'Aramaean'. On the *Aḫlamû* cf. Kupper, *op. cit.*, 104–15,

upper Euphrates and with the nomadic area of *jebel bišrī* and of the fact that they formed part of the population of that area, who were breeders of small cattle.[8] In this connection we must single out the concept of the 'God of the fathers' which Albrecht Alt[9] has convincingly explained on the basis of the circumstances of non-sedentary or semi-sedentary life. Even if modifications of Alt's thesis are necessary in detail,[10] one cannot deny that the concept of 'gods of the way'[11] can be explained only with difficulty from

132–8; P. Sacchi, 'Per una storia di Aram. II. Gli Aḫlamu nel sec. XI a.C.', *PP* 14, fasc. 65, 1959, 131–4; S. Moscati, 'The "Aramaean Ahlamu" ', *JSS* 4, 1959, 303–7; S. Yeivin, 'The 'Amu', *'Atiqot* 2, 1959, 163f. The alleged 'Aramaean' passages cited by N. Schneider, 'Aram und Aramäer in der Ur III-Zeit', *Bibl* 30, 1949, 109–11; S. Moscati, 'Sugli origini degli Aramei', *RSO* 26, 1951, 16–22; A. Dupont-Sommer, 'Sur les débuts de l'histoire araméenne', *SVT* 1, 1953, 40–49 must be deleted from the discussion since in every case the connection of the place name or personal name in question with the Aramaeans of the later second and first millennia is very unlikely. On this see Kupper, *op. cit.*, 112–14; I. J. Gelb, *JCS* 15, 1961, 28 n. 5; on the Ugaritic personal name *army* (*WUS* 408) = *ʿar-me-ya* RS 15.37, 13 (*PRU* III, 35) or *a-ri-mu-ya* Alalaḫ 148, 57, also M. Liverani, *Storia di Ugarit nell'età degli archivi politici* (Studi Semitici 6, Rome 1962), 153f.; R. A. Uyechi, *A Study of Ugaritic Alphabetic Personal Names* (Thesis Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass., 1961, typewritten), 64. Moscati's criticism (*JSS* 4, 304 n. 3) does not convince me.

[8] On the meaning of *jebel bišrī* cf. J. Lewy, *ZA* 40, 1929, 270; B. Maisler, *JPOS* 17, 1937, 139; D. O. Edzard, *Die 'zweite Zwischenzeit' Babyloniens*, Wiesbaden 1957, 34–36; H. Klengel, *Benjaminiten und Hanäer zur Zeit der Könige von Mari* (Diss. phil. Berlin 1958), 55; Kupper, *op. cit.*, 136, 149f.; Gelb, *op. cit.*, 30, 31f.

[9] 'Der Gott der Väter' (1929), *Kl.Schr.* I, 1–78 (ET 'The God of the Fathers' in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, Oxford 1966, 3–77).

[10] Cf. J. Hoftijzer, *Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter* (Leiden 1957); L. Rost, 'Die Gottesverehrung der Patriarchen im Lichte der Pentateuchquellen', *SVT* 7, 1960, 346–59; F. M. Cross Jr., 'Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs', *HThR* 55, 1962, 225–59. Complete rejection by S. Mowinckel, *Palestina før Israel* (Oslo 1965), 131. The Old Assyrian material on the 'personal God' ('protector God'; on this cf. also H. Hirsch, *Untersuchungen zur altassyrischen Religion, AfO* Bh. 13/14, 1961, 35–45) cited by J. Lewy, 'Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament', *RHR* 110, 1934, 50–56, must be taken into account in any new treatment of the problem alongside the much later inscriptional material gathered by Alt (*op. cit.*, 68–77; ET, 67–76) (otherwise Alt, *op. cit.*, 31 addition to n. 1; ET, 32 addition to n. 77). The solution, however, would be quite different from that of Hoftijzer. The most recent contribution by H. Hirsch, 'Gott der Väter', *AfO* 21, 1966, 56–58 does not come to terms sufficiently with the problems raised by the scholarly debate and therefore takes us no further.

[11] The difference between the 'religion of the way' and the 'religion of the place' I owe to J. Hempel, who has expounded it at several points in his lecture 'Das Alte Testament im Rahmen der allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte'

the situation of agricultural populations. In the Old Testament itself there are still traces of a time when the 'Gods of the fathers' had not yet been identified with Yahweh.[12] Yahweh, the God of Israel 'from Egypt onwards' belongs, from the point of view both of the history of tradition and of the history of religion, in another context, and I do not hesitate to regard the 'day of Shechem', the event which lies behind Josh. 24, as the day when this God was accepted by those tribes already in the land and to interpret it as the day when the Israelite Yahweh-amphictyony was founded.[13] The significance of this event is difficult to evaluate correctly. It meant no less than that the Israelite tribes, in their transition to sedentary life, were prevented from becoming assimilated, in the way that their kinsmen in Mesopotamia and Syria had become, to the social conditions of the agricultural land and from becoming absorbed into the resident population and its culture. The religious conflicts of the tenth–eighth centuries in the northern kingdom of Israel show how protracted the conflict concerning assimilation or 'apartheid' was, and we can not conceive how it would have ended if the brutal assault of Assyrian power in the eighth century had not radically altered the situation. Yahweh was not a God of the agricultural land, a God of Canaan, either; he, too, came from the steppe or even from the desert and from a nomadic context, but, as far as we can ascertain, he was, at the end of the second millennium and the beginning of the first, not a 'God of the way' but a 'God of the place' who had his dwelling and also a cultic centre, or cultic centres, in the mountains of Seir, in Edom, in Sinai.[14] The worship offered to him in the circle of the Israelite

which I heard in Göttingen in the summer semester of 1959. The idea comes from E. Lehmann, *Stället och vägen: Ett religionshistorisk perspektiv* (Stockholm 1917).

[12] This is clear in Gen. 31.53a where the 'god of Nahor' (*ʾelōhē nāḥōr*) and the 'god of Abraham' (*ʾelōhē ʾabrāhām*) are set side by side in such a way that it is impossible to think of Yahweh in connection with the latter. A correct recollection from the point of view of the history of religion has also been preserved in Josh. 24.2.

[13] See above p. 40 and cf. also R. Smend, *Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund: Erwägungen zur ältesten Geschichte Israels* (FRLANT 84, 1963), 77f.

[14] The so-called 'Kenite hypothesis', which cannot be definitely proved but which is nevertheless probable, is presupposed here. Broadly speaking it states that Yahweh, the God of Israel, was originally a God who dwelt in the Edomite mountains (*har śeʿīr*) or in Sinai, the God of the nomads of the Negeb and of Edom, of the Kenites and/or the Midianites, and