intrusion into the amphictyonic structures appears to be more congruent with R. Smend's view that in Israel the military organization and the amphictyonic organization developed along entirely separate lines that conjoined only at a relatively late premonarchic date. Even at that, the feudal and imperial elements in Thessaly's career find no counterparts in Smend's reconstruction of early Israel. Boling, however, seems to think of the Thessalian sociopolitical and religious-amphictyonic developments as relatively homogeneous and thus a rebuttal of Smend's hypothesis (cf. *Judges*, p. 21, note 29). Methodologically, the one merit in Boling's proposal is that at last a biblical scholar has widened the comparative Greek data to include political-military as well as religious associations. Unfortunately, his attempted analogy between the Thessalian League and the Israelite "amphictyony" is unsustained either in micro- or macrosociological terms. For details of the Thessalian League, see M. Cary, *CAH*, vol. 3, reprinted with corrections, 1929, pp. 598–606, and more fully, J. A. O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and History*, 1968, pp. 12–26.

285. J. A. O. Larsen, *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, 1955, chap. 2; *Greek Federal States*, 1968, part I, chap. 1.

286. Noth's comprehensive cross-cultural vision and methodological clarity account for the extraordinary tenacity of his amphictyony theory. By comparison, his critics have tended to look parochial and methodologically feeble. Even though they have convincingly rebutted, or at least thrown grave doubt on, Noth's reasoning at point after point, they have failed to propose a comprehensive alternative model of early Israelite society and in fact have shown little interest in societal models, either structural-functional or comparative. This situation is well illustrated by the widely cited anti-amphictyony studies of H. Orlinsky, "The Tribal System of Israel and Related Groups in the Period of the Judges," *OA* 1 (1962) 11–20 =*Studies and Essays in Honor of A. Neuman*, 1962, pp. 375–387, and of G. Fohrer, "Altes Testament—'Amphiktyonie' und 'Bund'?," *TLZ* 91 (1966), cols. 801–816, 893–904. Among the many critics of the amphictyonic scheme, it seems to me that only R. Smend, "Zur Frage der altisraelitischen Amphiktyonie," *EvT* 31 (1971) 623–630, has shown sufficient sensitivity to the necessity of formulating an alternative all-Israelite socioreligious design if the amphictyonic model is rejected as improbable. Because he cannot think of an explanatory alternative (except to show holy war and amphictyony as two separately developing institutions, the former older than the latter, which only merged shortly before the rise of the monarchy, cf. *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation*, 1963 [Eng. trans. 1970]), Smend still adheres cautiously to the amphictyonic model, remarking: "[the thesis of an old Israelite amphictyony] furnishes the most important historical contribution toward an answer to the question of why precisely this Israel was the people of Yahweh, and that in itself is no inconsequential fact" (p. 630). See also the brief update of the discussion in M. C. Astour, "Amphictyony," IDBSV, 1976, pp. 23–25.

287. Indicative of the value of macrosociological control on cross-cultural analysis is the brief but highly penetrating treatment of Greece and Israel as "two seed-bed societies" by T. Parsons, *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives*, 1966, pp. 95–109. Although lacking the literary and historical tools of Noth or of a classical scholar, Parsons skillfully subjects the results of biblical and classical scholarship in broad outline to structural-functional and diachronic-developmental analyses that permit the identification of cross-cultural similarity and differentiation without getting locked into simple either/or choices on single cultural items of the sort that have bedeviled the debate in biblical scholarship over the presence or absence of an Israelite "amphictyony."

NOTES TO PART VIII

288. J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* (with commentary by O. Weber and glossary by E. Ebeling), 2 vols., 1907/1915 (reprinted 1964); A. F. Rainey, *El Amarna Tablets* 359–379, 1970; 2nd ed. rev., 1978.

289. C. F. A. Schaeffer, *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, 5 vols., 1955–1965; A. F. Rainey, "The Social Stratification of Ugarit" (Ph.D. thesis, Brandeis University, 1962); A. F. Rainey, "Family Relationships in Ugarit," *Or* 34 (1965) 10–22, J. Gray, "Feudalism in Ugarit and Early Israel," *ZAW* 64 (1952) 49–55; C. C. Libolt, "The *mudû sarris/sarrati* Texts from Ugarit: An Aspect of Social Structure and Social Process in Ancient Agrarian Society" (Paper presented to the Social World of Ancient Israel Group at the annual meeting of AAR-SBL, San Francisco, December 30, 1977).

290. D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 2), 1953, and additional texts in *JCS* 8 (1954) 1–30; 12 (1958) 124–129; 13 (1959) 19–33, 50–62. Also, notes on the last two sets of texts by A. Goetze, *JCS* 13 (1959) 34–38, 63–64.

291. *ANET*, 18–22; Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography*, 1962 (Eng. trans. 1967), pp. 130–131.

292. *ANET*, 328–329; Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, pp. 131–134.

293. J. Prawar and S. N. Eisenstadt, "Feudalism," *IESS*, vol. 3, 1969, pp. 393–403; see also essays on feudalism in ancient Mesopotamia by B. C. Brundage and in ancient Egypt by W. F. Edgerton in *Feudalism in History* (ed. R. Coulborn), 1956, pp. 93–132. See qualifications and reservations on the use of a "feudal" analysis for Canaan in note 299 below.

294. G. R. H. Wright, "Tell el-Yēhudīyah and the Glacis," *ZDPV* 84 (1968) 1–17; P. J. Parr, "The Origin of the Rampart Fortifications of Middle Bronze Age Palestine and Syria," *ZDPV* 84 (1968) 18–45.

295. On the conciliar principle of political organization in the ancient Near East, rather misleadingly dubbed "primitive democracy," see, with respect to Syria-Palestine: J. A. Wilson, "The Assembly of a Phoenician City," *JNES* 4 (1945) 245; H. Reviv, "On Urban Representative Institutions and Self-Government in Syria-Palestine in the Second Half of the Second Millennium B.C.," *JESHO* 12 (1969) 283–297, and with respect to Mesopotamia: T. Jacobsen, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," *JNES* 2 (1943) 159–172, and "Early Political Development in Mesopotamia," *ZA* 18 (1957) 91–140; G. Evans, "Ancient Mesopotamian Assemblies," *JAOS* 78 (1958) 1–11; A. L. Oppenheim, "A New Look at the Structure of Mesopotamian Society," *JESHO* 19 (1967) 1–16. I. M. Diakonoff in *Ancient Mesopotamia: Socio-Economic History*, 1969 (article orig. pub. 1957), pp. 182–185, 187–188, 191–193, 200–202, has wisely cautioned in the case of the Mesopotamian Council of Elders and Assembly of Citizens (also the City Ward Assembly) that these institutions should not be simplistically read as broadly democratic, either in their social composition or in the class interests they advocated. Diakonoff claims that the council was the aristocratic organ of an oligarchic ruling class that more or less moderated royal leadership. The councils grew weaker over time, by the reign of Hammurabi serving merely as organs of local administration. On the other hand, the assembly of citizens represented a wider body of freemen sometimes employed by the king as leverage against the more aristocratic interests of the council of elders, who tended to threaten royal dominance of the state. The council in turn struggled to control the popular assembly for its own interests. The kings were able to consolidate their power by using the assemblies against the councils, but, once they were entrenched, kings delivered few benefits to the full body of free citizens, preferring rather

to draw closer once again to the aristocratic elements with whom they worked out mutually supportive alliances. The kings neutralized conciliar oligarchic political power while assuring the basic socioeconomic gains of the upper class under a state-centered mercantile policy, and at the same time they encouraged limited assembly-based "democratic" political power that signally failed to secure socioeconomic protection for weaker and poorer sectors of the free citizenry whose interests were repeatedly sacrificed to mercantile and big land-owning interests. In short," . . . the establishment of the new power [centralized monarchic rule] proved in fact to be beneficial to only quite a small part of the commoners—to those who got promoted in the army or the administration, or to those who were connected with trade, . . . " (pp. 192–193). Accordingly, judgments about the survival of forms of self-government in Palestine during the Amarna period must be based on a diachronic and dialectical social-structural analysis of Syro-Palestine before these nonroyal political organs can be seen as major limitations on monarchic or oligarchic rule, in the rather too facile manner, for example, of H. Reviv in *JESHO* 12 (1969) 283–297.

296. W. F. Albright, "Mitannian Maryannu, 'Chariot Warrior,' and the Canaanite and Egyptian Equivalents," *AFO* 6 (1930/31) 217–221; R. T. O'Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim: A Contribution to the History of Upper Mesopotamia in the Second Millennium B.C.*, 1948, pp. 64–68; W. Helck, *Der Einfluss der Militärführer in der 18. ägyptischen Dynastie* (Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens, 14), 1939; and *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (AAb, 5), 1962, pp. 515–526. H. Reviv, "Some Comments on the Maryannu," *IEJ* 22 (1972) 218–228, traces an increasing disintegration of the cohesiveness of the old *maryannu* military aristocracy during the period 1500–1200 B.C. Dynasts, fearful of a concentration of power in the hands of a military caste, began to appoint *maryannu* aristocrats to civilian posts and to draw lower-class elements into the charioteer ranks, a move that tended to sever military performance from the independent wealth formerly necessary to provide and maintain military equipment. M. Heltzer, "Problems of the Social History of Syria in the Late Bronze Age," *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo* (ed. M. Liverani), 1969, p. 42, adamantly rejects the prevailing view that the *maryannu* were "a privileged aristocratic class of the population in the states of Syria, Palestine and Mitanni in the Late Bronze Age." He insists that in Ugarit *maryannu* owed service duties to the king like all the other royal servants, lived on royal land on conditional holding, and received all their arms and equipment from royal stores. Since Heltzer concedes that royal institutions were probably more highly centralized in Ugarit than elsewhere in Syria, it is not clear how far he would generalize his results about the *maryannu* beyond Ugarit. He rests the problem with the judgment that "a complete reexamination of the *maryannu*-question is urgent" (p. 45).

297. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien*, 1962, pp. 92–108; P. Labib, *Die Herrschaft der Hyksos in Ägypten und ihr Sturz*, 1936; R. Engberg, *The Hyksos Reconsidered*, 1939; J. Van Seters, *The Hyksos: A New Investigation*, 1966; D. B. Redford, "The Hyksos Invasion in History and Tradition," *Or* 39 (1970) 1–51.

298. For a lucid account of Syria-Palestine as a cultural link in the ancient Near East, early sea trade in the region, and the role of chariotry in the age of international relations, see W. S. Smith, *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East: A Study of the Relations Between the Arts of Egypt, the Aegean, and Western Asia*, 1965, pp. 3–37.

299. A vigorous debate among Soviet Assyriologists as to whether the ancient Near East was a feudal society or a slave society has been largely resolved in favor of the latter since the work of V.V. Struve in 1933 (printed in abridged form in I. M. Diakonoff, ed., *Ancient Mesopotamia: Socio-Economic History*, 1969, pp. 17–70). Diakonoff correctly points out, however, that much of the disagreement over "ancient oriental feudalism" has to do with different criteria of feudalism, whether "referring to a socio-economic structure based on the exploitation of peasants personally dependent on their lord but owning the means of production" or to "a state with a hierarchic structure" (*Ancient Mesopotamia*, p. 202, note 17). If the looser political sense of feudalism is invoked (analogous to S. N. Eisenstadt's "centralized bureaucratic empire"; cf. *The Political Systems of Empires*, 1963 [reprint with new preface 1969]), there can be little doubt that Syro-Palestine was "feudal" in the Amarna Age. If the more technical socioeconomic sense of feudalism is employed, however, the crucial socioeconomic data are much sketchier than we should like, leading to rather different conceptions, for example, of the status of Canaanite peasants, whether as medieval European-type "serfs" or as Roman-like "coloni" (cf. discussion in text under VIII.41.3 and notes 405 through 408). It may be that a more appropriate model than feudalism for understanding pre-Israelite Canaanite society is Marx's analytic concept of "the Asiatic mode of production" as refined and nuanced by recent ethnological and early historical data (see, e.g., E. Mandel, "The Asiatic Mode of Production and the Historical Pre-Conditions for the Rise of Capital," in *The Formation of the Economic Thought of Karl Marx*, 1971, pp. 116–139). I have made some very provisional suggestions as to how this model might apply to ancient Canaan in "Early Israel and 'the Asiatic Mode of Production' in Canaan," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*, 1976, pp. 145–154, but my probes of the concept's applicability to Canaan are not yet sufficiently developed or tested to justify complete discard of the admittedly nebulous notion of Canaanite "feudalism."

300. N. K. Gottwald, *All the Kingdoms of the Earth: Israelite Prophecy and International Relations in the Ancient Near East*, 1964, pp. 12–18; G. Steindorff and K. C. Seele, *When Egypt Ruled the East*, 2nd ed., 1956, especially chaps. 3 and 10.

301. M. B. Rowton, "The Topological Factor in the *Ḫapiru* Problem," *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger* (Assyriological Studies of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 16), 1965, pp. 375–387.

302. The above typology of Egyptian imperial and Canaanite feudal sociopolitical symbiosis is particularly indebted to M. A. K. Mohammad, "The Administration of Syro-Palestine during the New Kingdom," *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* [Cairo] 56 (1959) 105–137, and to W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien*, 1962, pp. 256–257, 515–535. D. Lorton, *The Juridical Terminology of International Relations in Egyptian Texts through Dynasty XVIII*, 1975, isolates technical juridical terminology from Amarna letters and royal inscriptions of the New Kingdom in order to illuminate the Egyptian view of international law. A pertinent comparative analytic study is S. N. Eisenstadt, *The Political Systems of Empires*, 1963 (reprint with new preface 1969), who reports and synthesizes the results of an ambitious team research project in which pre-modern centralized bureaucratic empires were studied in an effort to identify their basic characteristics as a system type and the social conditions conducive to their development, continuity, and decline. Eisenstadt includes the ancient Egyptian empire in his inventory of empires for which he collects data, the others being: Incas; Aztecs; Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine Empires; Persia; China and India: Abbasside, Fatimite, and Ottoman Empires; and European absolutist states. The volume is awash with bibliography and brimming with highly compact codified information to support structural and developmental propositions about bureaucratic empires. Eisenstadt's study is of little use for direct historical study of a particular empire, but of great analytic value in proposing the fundamental socioeconomic, political, and ideological conjunctions that tend to occur in such empires. As such, Eisenstadt's work is suggestive of heuristic perspectives and research strategies appropriate to discerning the bureaucratic imperial system of ancient Egyptian dominion over Canaan.

303. M. W. Several, "Reconsidering the Egyptian Empire in Palestine during the Amarna Period," *PEQ* 104 (1972) 123–133, contends that the Amarna letters do not

document Egyptian imperial decline but rather point up certain abiding imperial problems: inter-city conflict; *'apiru* disturbances; disruptions of trade and communication; disregard of imperial orders; bureaucratic incompetence and corruption. Precisely these same problems had existed earlier and continued thereafter. The fuller Amarna references to disruption of trade result from better organization and regularization of trade to replace previous dependence on raids for booty. The Amarna letters give an unrepresentative picture of disorder since normal conditions are less fully reported. As a whole, there is a stable and secure Amarna political environment and a rich material culture, divide-and-conquer tactics work well, Egyptian rule possesses a high degree of legitimacy (its orders were generally followed), envoys are able to deliver diplomatic letters, vassal duties are usually carried out, there is a strong expectation that Egypt will comply with requests for help, and there are fewer destructions of cities in this period than before or after (he does not adequately document this claim). Marvin Chaney points out that the conditions of declining Egyptian rule in Canaan about 1100 B.C. are treated by H. Goedicke, *The Report of Wenamun,* 1975.

Several allows, however, that while the *content* of the Amarna letters does not demonstrate a declining Egyptian empire, the greater *infrequency* of letters from Palestinian vassals (compared with Syrian vassals) in the latter part of the Amarna age may attest Egyptian imperial decline.

At times Several seems to argue toward opposite conclusions from the same data (did trade decline or not?), and he fails adequately to evaluate the total impact over time of the accumulating problems that he treats separately. Nevertheless, I found his approach of value since it challenges accepted conclusions and demands re-evaluation of the evidence. The cautious case I make for a progressive structural weakening of imperialism and feudalism in Canaan is not undermined by Several's overstated broadside, since it is precisely the sort of caveats he tends to exaggerate that I have tried to take into account in describing a very long trajectory of decline over at least two centuries.

304. G. E. Mendenhall, "The Message of Abdi-Ashirta to the Warriors," *JNES* 6 (1947) 123–124. The references to the El Amarna letters hereafter (e.g., EA 74) follow the numbering system of Knudtzon and Rainey in their authoritative editions listed in note 288.

305. I do not share the assurance of P. Artzi, " 'Vox Populi' in the el-Amarna Tablets," *RAAO* 58 (1964) 159–166, that Abdi-Ashirta's speech is straight-out evidence for a full-bodied anti-feudal movement; cf. also M. Liverani, "Implicazioni sociali nella politica di Abdi-Ashirta di Amurru," *RSO* 40 (1965) 367–377.

306. There are considerable variations in the way scholars transliterate the names of the Amarna rulers. I have chosen to follow the transliterations of M. Greenberg, while noting here some of the more common variants: *Abdi-Ashirta* = Abdu-Ashirta = 'Abdu-Ashirta; *ÈR-Ḫeba* = Abdi-Heba = Abdi-Hepa = 'Abdu-Ḫeba = 'Abdu-Ḫepa; *Labaya* = Lab'aya = Lab'ayu; *Rib-addi* = Rib-adda; *Tagi* = Tagu.

307. *ANET,* 529.

308. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien,* pp. 519–520.

309. E. A. Campbell, Jr., "The Amarna Letters and the Amarna Period," *BAR* 3 (1970) 68 = *BA* 23 (1960) 16; H. Klengel, "Aziru von Amurru und seine Rolle in der Geshichte der Amarnazeit," *MIO* 19 (1964) 65–75.

310. See the review and summary of evidence for the linguistic equation *'apiru* = Hebrew(s) in M. Weippert, *The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes* (SBT, Second Series, 21), 1967 (Eng. trans. 1971), pp. 74–82.

311. Cf. the assembled texts on the *'apiru* in translation in J. Bottéro, *Le problème des Ḫabiru a la 4e Recontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Cahiers de la Société Asiatique, 12), 1954, and in M. Greenberg, *The Ḫabiru* (AOS, 39), 1955. For summaries and interpretation of the data, see T. J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins,* rev. ed., 1950, pp. 18–48, and M. P. Gray, "The Hâbirū-Ḥebrew Problem," *HUCA* 29 (1958) 135–202, and for more up-to-date reflections, R. de Vaux, "Le problème des Ḫapiru après quinze années," *JNES* 27 (1968) 221–228, and *Histoire ancienne d'Israël: Des Origines à l'Installation en Canaan,* 1971, pp. 106–112, 202–208. De Vaux's personal conclusion that *'apiru* was, after all, an ethnic designation is scarcely any longer tenable.

312. Possibly a more accurate way of making this point is to say that fundamental economic tendencies in the ancient Near East toward the pauperization of many social sectors led to the peculiar sociopolitical status of *'apiru* as one among several responses to pauperization, including the more vulnerable fates of debt servitude and slavery. N. B. Jankowska, "Extended Family Commune and Civil Self-Government in Arrapḫa in the Fifteenth-Fourteenth Centuries B.C.," *Ancient Mesopotamia* (ed. I. M. Diakonoff), 1969 (Eng. summary of papers orig. pub. 1957–1960), pp. 235–252, links the rise of the *'apiru* as a supplementary labor force at Nuzi to the decline of the economic function of the extended family in the face of the upsurge of specialized production (e.g., fruits and vegetables in agriculture and handicrafts for trade). She concludes " . . . while the 'in-kind' economy predominated, the process of separation of individual households from the family commune was invariably accompanied by growth of credit-and-loan relations. . . . a characteristic feature attesting to an irrevocable disintegration of the earlier ownership conditions: the creditor's rights were recognized by the state as prevailing over the claims of heirs by kin. . . . All known archives in the Near East of the second millennium B.C. provide information on economical shifts of status in the population and on redistribution of ownership rights to real estate, particularly on the loss of property by a high percentage of community members; in our opinion it was this process that gave rise to the multi-tribal crowd of outlaw wanderers from the settled regions . . . [*'apiru*] . . . who got hired as soldiers, were employed by the large estates, got settled on state land, or simply lived by robbery" (pp. 248, 251). Jankowska's account of the *'apiru* at Nuzi should be read in the context of the wide-ranging reconstruction of socioeconomic history in Mesopotamia by V. V. Struve, "The Problem of the Genesis, Development and Disintegration of the Slave Societies in the Ancient Orient," *Ancient Mesopotamia* (ed. I. M. Diakonoff), 1969 (abridgment of article orig. pub. 1933), pp. 17–70, and I. M. Diakonoff, "The Rise of the Despotic State in Ancient Mesopotamia," ibid., 1969 (orig. pub. 1957), pp. 173–203. The above-translated anthology of work by Soviet Assyriologists deliberately omitted any of their contributions to the socioeconomic history of Syria and Palestine; some of the latter is available, however, in *World History* (Academy of Science of the USSR), vol. 1, 1955 (Russ. orig. with subsequent German trans.). Also of interest is the work of the East German scholar B. Brentjes, "Zur socialen Funktion der Kultur im alten Orient unter Berücksichtigung der Lehre W. I. Lenins über die 'Zwei Kulturen,' " *WZMLU* 20 (1971) 29–59.

313. D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets,* 1953, pp. 12, 71–72.

314. *ANET,* 247; Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien,* pp. 528–533.

315. It is now virtually universally agreed that the Sumerian ideogram SA.GAZ (or GAZ) is coextensive and interchangeable with the Akkadian *'apiru.* M. Greenberg, *The Ḫabiru,* 1955, pp. 88–90, suggests that SA.GAZ was a "pseudo-ideogram" for Akkadian *sāggāšu,* influenced by the connotations of West Semitic *šgš,* with the meaning of "disturber" or "one who is restive."

316. EA 87:20–24, as translated by M. Greenberg, *Ḫabiru,* p. 37.

317. EA 197:2–5, 7–12, 26–34, as translated by M. Greenberg, *Ḫab/piru,* pp. 43–44.

318. AT = Alalakh Tablet, with numbers supplied according to the enumeration in the official publication of D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets,* 1953, pp. 11–12, 71–72, 79.

319. EA 286:18–20, as translated by Greenberg, *Ḫab/piru,* p. 47.

320. EA 271:13–21, as translated by Greenberg, *Ḫab/piru,* p. 46

321. EA 288:43–44, as translated by Greenberg, *Ḫab/piru,* p. 48.

322. EA 287:29–31, as translated by Greenberg, *Ḫab/piru,* p. 48.

323. EA 289:5–8, as translated by Greenberg, *Ḫab/piru,* p. 48.

324. Greenberg, *Ḫab/piru,* p. 48.

325. *ANET,* 255; W. F. Albright, "The Smaller Beth-shan Stele of Sethos I (1309–1290 B.C.)," *BASOR* 125 (1952) 24–32, and Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography,* 1962 (Eng. trans. 1967), pp. 168–169.

326. G. E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," *BAR* 3 (1970) 105–107 = *BA* 25 (1962) 71–73, and *The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition,* 1973, chap. 5. Mendenhall's sketchy characterization of "withdrawal" from Canaanite society needs to be filled out more discriminatingly by data and categories of the sort initially explored by M. B. Rowton in his analysis of ancient Near Eastern "dimorphic society," under the title of "The Physical Environment and the Problem of the Nomads," *La civilisation de Mari* (ed. J. R. Kupper), 1967, pp. 110–121.

327. E. Hobsbawm, *Bandits,* 1969, first pointed out to me by Marvin W. Chaney.

328. W. F. Albright, "Syria, the Philistines and Phoenicia," *CAH,* rev. ed., 1966, fascicle 51; A. Alt, "Ägyptische Tempel in Palästina und die Landnahme der Philister," *KS,* I, 1953 (orig. pub. 1944), pp. 216–230; J. Bérard, "Philistins et Prehellenes," *RA* 37 (1951) 129–142; G. Bonfante, "Who Were the Philistines?" *AJA* 50 (1946) 251–262; T. Dothan, "Archaeological Reflections on the Philistine Problem," *AS* 2 (1957) 151–164; T. Dothan, *The Philistines and Their Material Culture,* 1967 (Heb. with Eng. summary); R. Hestrin, *The Philistines and Other Sea Peoples* (Israel Museum exhibition catalogue, Heb.-Eng.), 1970; B. Mazar, "The Philistines and the Rise of Israel and Tyre," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences* I.7 (1964), pp. 1–15; B. Mazar, "The Philistines and Their Wars with Israel," *WHJP,* 1st series, vol. 3, 1971, pp. 164–179; J. B. Pritchard, "New Evidence on the Role of the Sea Peoples," *The Role of the Phoenicians in the Interaction of Mediterranean Civilizations* (ed. W. A. Ward), 1968, pp. 99–112; G. A. Wainwright, "Caphtor-Cappadocia," *VT* 6 (1956) 199–210; G. A. Wainwright, "Some Early Philistine History," *VT* 9 (1959) 73–84; F. Willesen, "The Philistine Corps of the Scimitar from Gath," *JSS* 3 (1958) 327–335; G. E. Wright, "Philistine Coffins and Mercenaries," *BA* 22 (1959) 53–66; G. E. Wright, " Fresh Evidence for the Philistine Story," *BA* 29 (1966) 70–86.

329. A. Alt, "Ägyptische Tempel in Palästina und die Landnahme der Philister," *KS,* I, 1953 (orig. pub. 1944), p. 228.

330. There is now a strong inclination to locate Ekron at Khirbet el-Muqanna'. A surface survey of potsherds at the site favors the identification, but no excavation has been undertaken, cf. J. Naveh, "Khirbet el-Muqanna'—Ekron," *IEJ* 8 (1958) 87–100, 165–170. For Gath, a succession of sites has been proposed: Tell Sheikh el-'Areini, Tell en-Nejileh, Tell el-Ḥesi, and Tell es-Ṣafi. Occupational and pottery evidence from excavations at the first three sites militates against the identification of Gath with any of them, and the last-named site has yet to be excavated. It is also possible that some of the biblical references to Gath are to another city altogether, as has been argued by B. Mazar, "Gath and Gittaim," *IEJ* 4 (1954) 227–235, but rebutted by H. Kassis (see note 332).

331. On the derivation of *seren/sārān* (?) from Greek *tyrannos,* a Lydian, Phrygian, or Etruscan loan word, cf. H. E. Kassis, *JBL* 84 (1965) 264, nt. 36, and F. Bork, *AFO* 13 (1940) 338; see also entry on *tyrannos* in H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon,* rev. ed., 1940, p. 1836. For the evidence that Philistines and Etruscans were closely related culturally, cf. H. Hencken, *Tarquinia, Villanovans and Early Etruscans,* 1968, p. 146.

332. H. E. Kassis, "Gath and the Structure of the 'Philistine' Society," *JBL* 84 (1965) 259–271.

333. Ibid., p. 268, note 53.

334. For summations on Philistine arms and military organization, cf. Y. Margowsky, "War and Warfare," *EJ,* vol. 16, 1971, col. 271, and Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands,* vol. 2, 1963, pp. 248–253, 336–345, 354–355; see also titles listed in note 328.

335. The sources I have consulted are not entirely consistent as to the reasons for the technical difficulties in working iron. They cite a number of factors: high or constantly maintained temperature for melting or smelting (the two processes require very different temperatures), adequate draft by bellows, proper amount of carbon to combine with the iron, flux to facilitate smelting, heavy tools to separate out slag from the mass of iron, correct reheating and quenching of the iron in order to harden it, etc. T. T. Read, "Metallurgical Fallacies in Archaeological Literature," *AJA* 38 (1934) 382–389, gives the clearest description for novices, summarizing as follows: " . . . the production of iron from its ores is easy and must have been accomplished very early, but the production of iron of *usable quality* from ores is quite difficult and was not accomplished until long after the art of producing copper and copper alloys was well developed . . . The history of iron is the story of the continuous endeavor of metallurgists to attain a practical mastery over the carbon content of the iron, without knowing that it contained any carbon, or what the effects of carbon are. This concise attempt to explain them is somewhat confusing, because of the simultaneous effect of carbon content, produced by heating, and of hardening, produced by heating and chilling. It is easy to imagine how difficult it must have been to learn how to do it through experiment without understanding the factors in the process, . . . " (p. 387). R. J. Forbes sums up the peculiar challenge of iron-working by stressing the necessity for a happy conjunction of complex technical processes: "The Iron Age is a new metallurgical stage, a technical world of its own. In the Copper Age the stress lies on the *composition* of alloy (or impurities in the metal) but in the Iron Age the properties of the iron are much less determined by its carbon content or accidental or natural impurities, but far more by its *handling,* by the temperature at which it has been heated, by the way and speed of quenching, the time and temperature of tempering or annealing. It is the true age of the smith!" (*Studies in Ancient Technology,* vol. 8, 1964, p. 136; also by Forbes: *Studies in Ancient Technology,* vol. 9, 1964, pp. 175–276; "The Coming of Iron," *Ex Oriente Lux* 9 [1944] 6–14; and *Metallurgy in Antiquity: A Notebook for Archaeologists and Technologists,* 1950. The latter work is reviewed, with enriching bibliographical references and observations, by R. North, "Metallurgy in the Ancient Near East," Or 24 [1953] 78–88.) Other works of merit: O. Johannsen, *Geschichte des Eisens,* 3rd ed., 1953; H. Maryon, "Metal Working in the Ancient World," *AJA* 53 (1949) 93–125 (mainly on metal bowls); M. Narkiss, *Metal Crafts in Ancient Palestine,* 1937, pp. 113–125; A. W. Persson, *Eisen und Eisenarbeitung in ältester Zeit,* 1933; T. A. Rickard, "The Primitive Smelting of Iron," *AJA* 43 (1939) 85–101; U. S. Würzburger, "Metals and Mining: Iron," *EJ,* vol. 11, 1971, cols. 1432–1433.

336. Y. Margowsky, "War and Warfare," *EJ,* vol. 16, 1971, cols. 268–269; Y. Yadin, "Chariotry," *EM,* vol. 5, 1968, cols. 462–472 (Heb.); Y. Yadin, "Warfare in the Second Millennium B.C.E.," *WHJP,* 1st series, vol. 2, 1970, pp. 127–159. On the composite bow in particular: W. F. Albright and G. E. Mendenhall, "The Creation of the Composite Bow in Canaanite Mythology," *JNES* 1 (1942) 227–229; Y. Yadin (Sukenik), "The Composite Bow of the Canaanite Goddess Anath," *BASOR* 107 (1947) 11–15.

337. M. B. Rowton, *Studies in Honor of B. Landsberger,* 1965, p. 382.

338. B. Mazar in *WHJP,* 1st series, vol. 3, 1971, pp. 174–175.

339. The excavators of Gibeah (Tell el-Fûl) in 1922–23 and 1933 (W. F. Albright, *AASOR* 4 [1924] 1–160; *BASOR* 52 [1933] 6–12) and in 1964 (P. W. Lapp, *BA* 28 [1965] 2–10) believed that Saul himself built the fortified structure. However, A. Alt, *PJ* 30 (1934) 8–9; *KS,* II, p. 31; III, p. 259, B. Mazar, *EM,* vol. 2, 1954, cols. 412–416 (Heb.), and L.A. Sinclair, *BA* 27 (1964) 52–64, were of the opinion that the Philistines first fortified the site and that Saul made re-use of their fort after driving out the Philistines. The direct archaeological evidence is inconclusive in settling this difference of historical judgment.

340. J. Bright, *A History of Israel,* 2nd ed., 1972, p. 180; W. F. Albright, "Syria, the Philistines and Phoenicia," *CAH,* rev. ed., 1966, p. 32, remarks: "The conquest of Israel by the Philistines about the middle of the 11th century was perhaps dictated mainly by the increasing need of protection for caravans from the desert." In this connection, the close temporal association of the Philistine and Ammonite attacks on Israel (emphasized by M. Noth, *The History of Israel,* pp. 164–178), may well indicate that Philistia and Ammon had converging trading interests, if not an actual alliance, which prompted them to go to war against Israel and perhaps even to collaborate strategically and tactically.

341. A. Alt, "The Formation of the Israelite State," *EOTHR,* 1966 (orig. pub. 1930), p. 235.

342. On Shamgar ben Anath as a non-Semitic name, with varying views as to whether he was an Israelite and concerning his historical locus, see: W. F. Albright, "A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology," *JPOS* 1 (1921) 55–62; E. Danelius, "Shamgar Ben 'Anath," *JNES* 22 (1963) 191–193; F. C. Fensham, "Shamgar ben 'Anath," *JNES* 20 (1961) 197–198; B. Mazar (Maisler), "Shamgar ben 'Anath," *PEQ* (1934) 192–194; M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen,* 1928, pp. 122–123; A. van Selms, "Judge Shamgar," *VT* 14 (1964) 294–309.

343. H. W. Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel* (OTL), 2nd rev. ed., 1960 (Eng. trans. 1964), p. 101; see also comments of S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel,* 1890, pp. 75–76.

344. RSV and NEB so translate I Samuel 13:7.

345. Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel,* p. 101.

346. J. P. Overholzer, "The *'ibrīm* in I Samuel," *Studies in the Book of Samuel (DOTWSA,* 3rd meeting), 1960, p. 54.

347. H. P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC), 1899, pp. 91–92.

348. Cf. the summary and bibliography on archaeological work in Transjordan by N. Glueck, "Transjordan," *Archaeology and Old Testament Study* (ed. D. Winton Thomas), 1967, pp. 429–453.

349. On Transjordan as a whole: J. A. Thompson, "The Economic Significance of Transjordan in Old Testament Times," *ABR* 6 (1958) 143–168.

On the Ammonites: W. F. Albright, "Some Notes on Ammonite History," *Miscellanea Biblica B. Ubach,* 1954, pp. 131–136; E. F. Campbell, Jr., and G. E. Wright, "Tribal League Shrines in Amman and Shechem," *BA* 32 (1969) 104–116; F. M. Cross, "Epigraphic Notes on the Amman Citadel Inscription," *BASOR* 193 (1969) 13–19; G. Garbini, "Ammonite Inscriptions," *JSS* 19 (1974) 159–168; S. H. Horn, "The Amman Citadel Inscription," *BASOR* 193 (1969) 2–13; S. H. Horn, "Ammon; Ammonites," IDBSV, 1976, p. 20; G. M. Landes, *A History of the Ammonites* (Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1956); G. M. Landes, "The Material Civilization of the Ammonites," *BA* 24 (1961) 66–86; G. M. Landes, "Ammon," IDB, vol. 1, 1962, pp. 108–114; B. Oded, "Ammon," *EM,* vol. 6, 1970, cols. 266–271 (Heb.); B. Oded, "Ammon, Ammonites," *EJ,* vol. 2, 1971, cols. 853–855; H. O. Thompson, "The Biblical Ammonites," *AJBA* 2 (1973) 31–38; H. O. Thompson and F. Zayadine, "The Works of Amminadab," *BA* 37 (1974) 2–19.

On the Moabites: W. F. Albright, "The Oracles of Balaam," *JBL* 63 (1944) 227–230; A. Alt, "Emiter und Moabiter," *KS,* I, 1953 (orig. pub. 1940), pp. 203–215; J. R. Bartlett, "The Moabites and the Edomites," in *Peoples of Old Testatment Times* (ed. D. J. Wiseman), 1973, pp. 229–258; E. D. Grohman, "Moab," IDB vol. 3, 1962, pp. 409–419; J. Liver, "Moab," *EM,* vol. 4, 1962, cols. 707–723 (Heb.); B. Oded, "Moab," *EJ,* vol. 12, 1971, cols, 190–194; W. L. Reed, "The Archaeological History of Elealeh in Moab," *Studies on the Ancient Palestinian World* (ed. J. Wevers and D. Redford), 1972, pp. 18–28; A. H. Van Zyl, *The Moabites* (Pretoria Oriental Series, 3), 1960.

On the Edomites: I. Avishur, "Edom," *EJ,* vol. 6, 1971, cols. 369–372; J. R. Bartlett (see title above under Moabites); J. R. Bartlett, "The Rise and Fall of the Kingdom of Edom," *PEQ* 104 (1972) 26–37; C.-M. Bennett, "An Archaeological Survey of Biblical Edom," *Perspective* 12 (1971) 35–44; C.-M. Bennett, "Edom," IDBSV, 1976, pp. 251–252; F. Buhl, *Geschichte der Edomiter,* 1893; S. Cohen, "Edom," IDB, vol. 2, 1962, pp. 24–26; N. Glueck, "The Civiliztion of the Edomites," *BA* 10 (1974) 77–84 = *Bar* 2 (1964) 51–58; N. Glueck, "Edom," *EM,* vol. 1, 1955, cols. 91–98 (Heb.).

350. A. Alt, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine," *EOTHR,* 1966 (orig. pub. 1925), pp. 205–206.

351. A. Alt, "The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine," *EOTHR,* 1966 (orig. pub. 1930), pp. 259–261.

352. Ibid., pp. 261–263.

353. Ibid., p. 262; on the Edomite king lists, see also J. R. Barlett, "The Edomite King-List of Genesis 36:31–39 and I Chron. 1:43–50," *JTS* 16 (1965) 301–314; J. R. Bartlett, "The Rise and Fall of the Kingdom of Edom," *PEQ* 104 (1972) 26–27; and G. Buccellati, *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria: An Essay on Political Institutions with Special Reference to the Israelite Kingdoms* (SS, 26), 1967, pp. 125–127.

354. G. E. Mendenhall, *BAR* 3 (1970) 114–115 = *BA* 25 (1962) 81–83.

355. O. Eissfeldt, "Protektorat der Midianiter über ihre Nachbarn im letzten Viertel des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr.," *JBL* 87 (1968) 383–393; W. F. Albright, "Midianite Donkey Caravans," in *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament* (ed. H. Frank and W. Reed), 1970, pp. 197–205; W. J. Dumbrell, "The Midianites and Their Transjordanian Successors: Studies in the History, Social Structure and Political Influence of Related Transjordanian Groupings" (Th. D. diss., Harvard University, 1970), cf. *VT* 25 (1975) 323–337.

356. G. E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation,* 1973, chap. 6.

357. E. F. Campbell, Jr., and G. E. Wright, "Tribal League Shrines in Amman and Shechem," *BA* 32 (1969) 104–116. Two large cultic structures, rather similar in design, one in northern Israel and one among the Ammonites, are claimed to have been amphictyonic centers for intertribal worship, but it seems to me that the authors' conclusions follow largely from the dubious assumptions of Noth's amphictyonic model (cf. my critique in Part VII). The shrines may or may not have been centers of worship for intertribal associations. Admittedly, the apparent similarity of the structures is a datum calling for further investigation, but a strictly amphictyonic, or even an intertribal, explanation is by no means the only possible one. This is also the view of G. R. H. Wright, "Shechem and League Shrines," *VT* 21 (1971) 572–603, who, in a thorough review of the archaeological evidence on Canaanite-Israelite temples, concludes that neither the free-standing stone pillar nor the courtyard arrangement distinguishes these temples as "amphictyonic."

358. G. E. Mendenhall, *BAR* 3 (1970) 101–105 = *BA* 25 (1962) 67–71, and *The Tenth Generation,* 1973, esp. chaps. 1, 5, and 7.

359. J. T. Luke, *Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period: A Re-Examination of the Character and Political Significance of the Major West Semitic Tribal Groups in the Middle Euphrates* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms), 1965; see also J. T. Luke, "Observations on ARMT XIII 39," *JCS* 24 (1971) 20–23.

360. L. Krader, "Ecology of Central Asian Pastoralism," *SJA* 11 (1955) 301–326.

361. L. Krader, "Pastoralism," *IESS,* vol. 11, 1968, p. 458.

362. E. E. Bacon, "Types of Nomadism in Central and Southwest Asia," *SJA* 10 (1954) 44–68; J. I. Clarke, "Studies of Semi-Nomadism in North Africa," *EG* 35 (1959) 95–108; see also the interesting attempt to draw together the evidence on pastoral nomadism in these regions and to propose a more refined classificatory typology by D. L. Johnson, *The Nature of Nomadism,* 1969.

363. H. Charles, *Tribus moutonnières du Moyen-Euphrate* (Documents d'Etudes Orientales de L'Institut Français de Damas, 8), 1939.

364. F. S. Frick, "The Rechabites Reconsidered," *JBL* 90 (1971) 279–287; on the social location of metallurgists, see R. J. Forbes, "The Evolution of the Smith, His Social and Sacred Status," *Studies in Ancient Technology,* vol. 8, 1964, pp. 52–102.

365. A. Haldar, *Who Were the Amorites?* (MANE, 1), 1971, pp. 51–52.

366. A regrettable example of the almost complete neglect of an adequate historical and cultural framework for viewing ancient Near Eastern pastoral nomadism in relation to biblical Israel is M. S. Seale, *The Desert Bible: Nomadic Tribal Culture and Old Testament Interpretation,* 1974. After a cursory and superficial methodological overview, which merely assumes what it purports to demonstrate, Seale treats atomistically a series of biblical texts from the perspective of pre-Islamic Arab texts. As for Seale's competence in rendering and interpreting the Arab texts, I am unable to pass judgment. As for interpretive insight, the book can be read with profit, for many of the exegetical and cultural observations are acute and at times persuasive, but not for the reason Seale thinks, namely, that premonarchic Israel was pastoral nomadic like the pre-Islamic Arabs. In my judgment, the great majority of his "parallels" are in no way premised intrinsically or exclusively on pastoral nomadism, but are indicative of a broad tribal organizational pattern common to early Israel and to some of the pre-Islamic Arabs, and to many sedentary tribes as well. Mention should also be made of J. Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition,* 1975, pp. 13–38. After initially offering some sound and promising observations on nomadism, including a clarification of the distinction between population migration and socioeconomic nomadism, the author unaccountably fails to apply them with consistency in his subsequent analysis of the historical groups in the ancient Near East. More satisfactory is the approach of H. N. Schneidau in *Sacred Discontent: The Bible and Western Tradition,* 1977, pp. 104–172: "The Hebrews against the High Cultures: Pastoral Motifs." Although he vacillates in his definition of nomadism, Schneidau recognizes that the social facts about village agriculture and pastoralism have been greatly transformed into literary motifs and religious types about the true Israelite as "wanderer" and "shepherd."

367. R. J. Braidwood, *Prehistoric Men,* 7th ed., 1967, pp. 81–153; on the physical conditions disposing the neolithic revolution to occur where it did in the ancient Near East, see K. W. Butzer, *CAH,* vol. 1, pt. 1, 1970, pp. 35–62.

368. J. T. Luke, *Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period,* pp. 23–24, referring to the studies of Braidwood and Howe in Iraqi Kurdistan (see note 369).

369. C. A. Reed in *Prehistoric Investigations in Iraqi Kurdistan* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 31; ed. R. J. Braidwood and B. Howe), 1960, pp. 129–138; see also comments of editors on "The General Problem," pp. 1–8. On the other hand, J. Mellaart, *CAH,* vol. 1, pt. 1, 1970, pp. 248–254, claims that domestication of animals, beginning with sheep by 9000 B.C., preceded domestication of plants by perhaps two millennia, but he views the domestication of animals as already occurring in settled communities and does not propose a stage of pastoral nomadism prior to the agricultural village. Some of the discrepancy in judgment among prehistorians on this point seems to hinge on differences of opinion over criteria for determining whether animal remains are those of wild or domesticated specimens. L. Braidwood and R. Braidwood, "Current Thoughts on the Beginnings of Food-Production in Southwestern Asia," *MUSJ* 45 (1969) 145–155, observe that it is no longer possible to make a sharp distinction between a food-collecting period and the beginning of domestication and cultivation in prehistoric Palestine, for there is evidence of complete domestication of food plants at points all over the ancient Near East by plus or minus 7000 B.C. The writers view domestication of animals as a part of the same general horizon as the domestication of plants. R. Braidwood, "The Early Village in Southwestern Asia," *JNES* 32 (1973) 34–39, synthesizes the most recent evidence into a fascinating cross-section of early village life throughout the prehistoric Near East.

370. S. Moscati, *The Semites in Ancient History: An Inquiry into the Settlement of the Bedouin and Their Political Establishment,* 1959, p. 29.

371. J. T. Luke, *Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period,* p. 24.

372. A. Haldar, *Who Were the Amorites?,* 1971.

373. L. Krader, "Pastoralism," *IESS,* vol. 11, 1968, p. 457.

374. C. D. Forde, *Habitat, Economy and Society: A Geographical Introduction to Ethnology,* 5th ed., 1963, p. 396.

375. Ibid., pp. 287–307.

376. G. Sjoberg, *The Preindustrial City: Past and Present,* 1960, esp. chaps. 2, 5, and 7–8.

377. M. B. Rowton, *Studies in Honor of B. Landsberger,* 1965, pp. 375–387.

378. The Mari Yaminites are so interpreted by J. T. Luke, *Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period,* pp. 84–85, 272.

379. D. H. K. Amiran and Y. Ben-Arieh, "Sedentarization of Bedouin in Israel," *IEJ* 13 (1963) 163.

380. F. S. Bodenheimer, "Fauna," IDB, vol. 2, 1962, p. 249; F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal Life in Palestine,* 1935, p. 118; E. Bilik, "Cattle," *EM,* vol. 2, 1954, cols. 312–316 (Heb.); J. Feliks, "Cattle," *EJ,* vol. 5, 1971, cols. 256–257.

381. Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible,* pp. 178–184.

382. J. L. Mihelic, "Manna," IDB, vol. 3, 1962, p. 260; see also S. E. Loewenstamm, "*Mān,*" *EM,* vol. 5, 1968, cols. 7–10 (Heb.).

383. R. Giveon, *Les bédouins Shosou des documents égyptiens* (DMOA, 18), 1971.

384. Papyrus Anastasi VI; *ANET,* p. 259 (Shosu translated "Bedouin").

385. Giveon, *Les bédouins Shosou,* pp. 240–241.

386. Ibid., pp. 255–257.

387. M. D. Sahlins, *Tribesmen,* 1968, pp. 28–47.

388. Papyrus Anastasi I, xix–xx, xxiii; *ANET,* p. 477 (Shosu translated "Bedouin").

389. Giveon, *Les bédouins Shosou,* pp. 261–264.

390. See note 388 and Amarna letter 318.12 in J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln,* 1915, vol. 1, pp. 924–925.

391. *ANET,* p. 247 (Shosu transliterated as "Shasu").

392. Giveon, *Les bédouins Shosou,* pp. 267–271.

393. S. Schwertner, "Das 'Verheissene Land': Bedeutung und Verständnis des Landes nach den frühen Zeugnissen des Alten Testament" (doctoral diss. Heidelberg, 1966)

includes to my knowledge the most thorough and disciplined attempt to date to examine the evidence for pastoral nomadism in the patriarchal, exodus, and settlement traditions. Schwertner's work is well informed by current ethnological studies on nomadism (cf., e.g., "Exkurs: Die Entstehung des Nomadentums," pp. 58–62), including the important distinction between "transmigration" and "transhumance." Schwertner concludes that:(1) there was transmigration and transhumance in the patriarchal groups, although he grants that some or all of the transhumant groups may have been former settled peoples driven into pastoral nomadism, and he is further compelled to regard a number of references to patriarchal land cultivation (such as I have noted in the text above) as later textual intrusions;(2) there was only transmigration and no transhumance in the exodus group, which was an eclectic formation of peoples with a complicated prehistory of underclass incorporation into Egyptian society, and with evidences of many socioeconomic ingredient elements, among which pastoral nomadism is *not* represented;(3) the settlement traditions tell both of transhumant groups (mainly Leah tribes) and of settled agricultural groups (mainly Rachel tribes). It seems to me that Schwertner somewhat overstates the extent of pastoral nomadism in the patriarchal and settlement traditions, since he sometimes aligns biblical texts with transhumance which I read as testimony to transmigration alone. Nonetheless, we agree on many points. In particular, we share the view that the intertribal league of Israel was an eclectic formation of many types of socioeconomic producers. Incidentally, Schwertner refers only once to Mendenhall's revolt model, briefly summarizing it without evaluation and without making any further use of it (p. 132, note 98). The major question with which this incisive analysis leaves me is simply this: What was the objective basis (both in motivation and in socioeconomic conditions) for such diverse socioeconomic groups to cooperate in a single comprehensive socioreligious formation? Unquestionably, Schwertner's thesis deserves publication. I am indebted to the author and to his mentor, Prof. Rolf Rendtorff of the University of Heidelberg, for their initiative in sending me a copy of the dissertation, which would otherwise have escaped my attention, especially since the title unfortunately fails to communicate the significant sociological interest and method that permeate the work.

394. M. Weber, *Ancient Judaism,* 1921 (Eng. trans. 1952), pp. 14–15, 19–21, 56–57, 69–70, argues unpersuasively that in Israelite cities from the beginning there was a military patriciate which lorded it over the rural plebeians, for the evidence he cites is consistently drawn from monarchic times. On the other hand, Weber's argument is not consistently maintained, for elsewhere he notes that the urban military patricians of the coast and plains were the enemies of Israel's peasants and herdsmen (*Ancient Judaism,* p. 54, quoted by Frank S. Frick, "The City in the Old Testament," Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1970, p. 222). Cf. S. A. Baron, *The Jewish Community,* 1942, vol. 3, pp. 8–9, who criticizes Weber's thesis of an oligarchy of big landowners in early Israel on the grounds of general Palestinian conditions, but Baron himself misses the revolutionary clash between the Israelite tribal system and the Canaanite city-state system.

395. H. Charles, *Tribus moutonnières du Moyen-Euphrate,* 1939, p. 149, quoted by J. T. Luke in *Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period,* p. 29 (translation mine).

396. M. B. Rowton, "The Physical Environment and the Problem of the Nomads," *La Civilization de Mari* (ed. J.-R. Kupper), 1967, p. 116.

397. Rowton has begun to rectify his initially somewhat stereotyped outlook on nomadism by a projected ten-part analysis of pastoral nomadism in the ancient Near East, of which two parts have so far appeared (see my comments in X.51.2 and citations in note 575).

398. J. T. Luke, *Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period,* p. 37; M. Liverani, "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts," *Or* 42 (1973) 178–194, points out the contrast between city and village as a major set of polar categories in ancient Near Eastern historical texts (see especially pp. 190–191).

399. G. Sjoberg, *The Preindustrial City: Past and Present,* 1960, p. 110.

400. M. D. Sahlins, *Tribesmen,* 1968, pp. 39–40.

401. M. H. Fried, *The Evolution of Political Society: An Essay in Political Anthropology,* 1967, pp. 170–174.

402. W. Helck, "Die Bedrohung Palästinas durch einwandernde Gruppen am Ende der 18. und am Anfang der 19. Dynastie," *VT* 18 (1968) 472–480.

403. Ibid., p. 476.

404. *ANET,* p. 247; and cf. translation and comments by W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.,* 1962, p. 528.

405. D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets,* p. 10; I. Mendelsohn, *BASOR* 139 (1955) 10; and see the extensive discussion in M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Die soziale Struktur von Alalaḫ und Ugarit (II): Die sozialen Gruppen *ḫupše-namê, ḫaniaḫḫe-ekû, eḫele-sūzubu* und *marjanne* nach Texten aus Alalaḫ IV," *WO* 5 (1969) 57–93.

406. W. F. Albright, "Canaanite *ḫapši* and Hebrew *ḥofši,*" *JPOS* 6 (1926) 107, and "New Canaanite Historical and Mythological Data," *BASOR* 63 (1936) 29.

407. I. Mendelsohn, "The Canaanite Term for 'Free Proletarian,' " *BASOR* 83 (1941) 36–39, and "New Light on the *Ḫupšu,*" *BASOR* 139 (1955) 9–11. On the Roman *colonus* or "tied tenant farmer," see A. H. M. Jones, "The Roman Colonate," *Studies in Ancient Society* (ed. M. Finley), 1974, pp. 288–303. To imply that the model alternatives for understanding the Canaanite *ḫupshu* are solely "serf " or "tied tenant farmer" is of course grossly simplistic. Not only does it ignore the different forms and ranks of serfs and *coloni* at various times and places, but it overlooks additional forms of "dependent or involuntary labor," such as debt-bondsman, helot, and client, as discussed in the sophisticated analysis and interpretation of socioeconomic structure in the Roman Empire by M. I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy,* 1973 (see index under "tenant farmers"). Finley also cautions that the legal status of debt serfdom and tenant farmer in the Roman Empire was more confused and blurred than we, who look at the data through European feudal eyes, tend to recognize.

408. N. P. Lemche, "The 'Hebrew Slave': Comments on the Slave Law of Ex. 21:2–11," *VT* (1975) 140–142, 144, appropriating studies by M. Heltzer and H. Klengel, contends that *ḫupshu* were a group in collective clientage to private persons or kings (generally the latter, called *bnŝ mlk,* "royal men," along with many other occupational groupings who owed *pilku,* "service duties," to the king), and who served a mainly military function (though some were engaged in crafts or professions). In his view this disallows that the *ḫupshu* were free proletarian peasants (contra Knudtzon and Mendelsohn). M. Heltzer, who has written on the subject almost entirely in Russian, speaks but briefly to the point in his one article available to me, "Problems of the Social History of Syria in the Late Bronze Age," *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo* (ed. M. Liverani), 1969, pp. 34–35: ". . .the texts of Ugarit tell us about some military service-men of some lower category, *ḫupšu,* but we know very little about them from the sources. However, the data from Alalakh and Byblos tell us more and we can better define their role as royal military men of a lower category. . . .so we must refuse of [sic] the explanation of that term as a 'free proletarian'." Nor have I had access to H. Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend,* Teil I, 1965; II, 1969; III, 1970 (in his abbreviated "Probleme einer politischen Geschichte des spätbronzezeitlichen Syrien," *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo* [ed. M. Liverani], 1969, pp. 15–30, Klengel does not treat the *ḫupshu*

problem). From what I can make of the remarks of Lemche and Heltzer, it appears that their main stress is on denying that the *ḫupšu* were free proletarians rather than on denying that they were peasants. They were bound to do royal service and were entrusted with plots and provisions by the crown (although Heltzer denies that European-type feudalism held sway in Syria, p. 39). It is less clear that they are denying that *ḫupšu* worked the land, although this might be taken as the implication of some of their comments about "royal men" doing military or other service. But since the texts seem only to speak of a periodic impressment or call-up to military duty, I see no basis for excluding that between battles the *ḫupšu* worked their holdings. In the Alalakh Tablets, the *ḫupšu* are by far the largest enumerated element in the populace, so that if they were not agriculturalists it is by no means clear who did the cultivation of the land. Evidently, the references to the *ḫupšu* require a complete restudy with a view to more closely determining their identity. To this point, however, I see no compelling reason to modify the hitherto prevailing view that, whatever their degree of personal freedom, the *ḫupšu* were peasants. It should be noted that the two essays mentioned above by Klengel and Heltzer on the political and social history of Late Bronze Syria provide commendably full and well-annotated bibliographies up to 1969.

409. Commentators on the biblical *ḥopshī* have noticed that in most of its occurrences it indicates deliverance from a former status of slavery, cf. R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel,* 1961, p. 88; S. Loewenstamm, "*Ḥopshī,*" *EM,* vol. 3, 1958, cols. 256–257 (Heb.); S. Loewenstamm, "Notes on the Alalakh Tablets," *IEJ* 6 (1956) 217–225; E. A. Speiser, in a review of Wiseman's edition of the Alalakh Tablets, in *JAOS* 74 (1954) esp. pp. 20–21. A. E. Glock, "Early Israel as the Kingdom of Yahweh," *CTM* 41 (1970) 577, describes early Israel "as a dissenting and disinherited community of *hopshi* (emancipated slaves) and *habirū* (social outcasts)." [These two transliterations with a single diacritical mark are as in Glock.] Possibly the strong connotation of emancipation in Hebrew *ḥopshī,* which is not so markedly present in *ḫupšu,* derives from the early Israelite success in shattering the Canaanite latifundia system and in freeing *ḫupšu,* who became members of autonomous extended families in the new Israelite tribal system.

410. E. Marmorstein, "The Origin of Agricultural Feudalism in the Holy Land," *PEQ* 85 (1953) 111–117, describes the *métayage* system in which land is cultivated for a proprietor by an agricultural worker who receives a share of the produce and is extremely vulnerable to debt enslavement and expulsion from the land. This is a useful account of the dynamics of the *métayage* system; it errs historically, however, in viewing the conquest of the land as the imposition of a new Israelite landowning class on indigenous serfs who had formerly served Canaanite masters. Like Weber before him, Marmorstein failed to observe the distinction between premonarchic and monarchic texts. In this respect, E. Neufeld, "The Emergence of a Royal-Urban Society in Ancient Israel," *HUCA* 31 (1960) 31–53, is a far more sociohistorically perceptive account than Marmorstein's. Neufeld focuses on debtor and creditor, town-country enmity, unemployment, and poverty and corruption as evidences of the evolution of striking economic differences stimulated by royal-urban sociopolitical organization.

411. A. F. Rainey, *El Amarna Tablets 359–379,* 1970, pp. 25–27. In my interpretation of the text and its application to Israelite history, I follow A. Alt, "Neues über Palästina aus dem Archiv Amenophis' IV," *KS,* III, 1953 (orig. pub. 1924), pp. 169–174; see also M. Noth, *The History of Israel,* 2nd ed., 1954 (Eng. trans. 1960), pp. 78–79, 81.

NOTES TO PART IX

412. In transcending the *'apiru* status as a social totality, Israel appears nonetheless to have retained a place for the *'apiru* status in at least one of its many forms. N. P. Lemche, "The 'Hebrew Slave': Comments on the Slave Law of Ex. 21:2–11," *VT* 25 (1975) 129–144, building on the views of A. Alt and J. Lewy, has convincingly argued that *'ivrī* in the "slave" law of Exodus 21:2–11 refers to a form of individual service under contract to a master which is formally analogous to the service contracts of *'apiru* at Nuzi in fifteenth- and fourteenth-century Mesopotamia. Whereas the *'apiru* contract at Nuzi was unlimited, except as the *'apiru* found a substitute or was able to pay off the remaining service, the *'ivrī*-contract in Israel was for a stated period of six years. Since *'ivrī* is an appellative for "a person who sells himself as a slave for debt" (p. 138), Lemche concludes that "the thought that the Hebrew [=*'ivrī*] of Ex. 21:2 was necessarily an Israelite must be ruled out, but this does not exclude the possibility that he might have been" (p. 144). Lemche's argument that the *ḥopshī* (= Akkadian *ḫupšu*) status to which the *'ivrī* is released after six years is that of a somewhat less onerous form of clientage, rather than to full freedom is a much more disputable contention (pp. 138–142, 144).

413. *ANET,* p. 255; cf. Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible,* 1962 (Eng. trans. 1967), pp. 168–169; W. F. Albright, "The Smaller Beth-shan Stele of Sethos I (1309–1290 B.C.)," *BASOR* 125 (1952) 24–32.

414. J. Dus, "Das Sesshaftswerden der nachmaligen Israeliten im Land Kanaan," *CV* 6 (1963) 263–275.

415. R. H. Smith, "Abram and Melchizedek (Gen. 14:18–20)," *ZAW* 77 (1965) 129–153. Smith's rendering is closely related to W. F. Albright's interpretation in *BASOR* 163 (1961) 52: "Melchizedek, his [Abraham's] allied king." Subsequently, on the basis of a proposal by M. Haran, Albright offered the translation: "Melchizedek, king <of Jerusalem, the king> who was <his> [Abraham's] ally" (*Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan,* 1968, p. 231; the words enclosed by < > are restorations of terms Albright believes were lost from the text by simple haplographies). Incidentally, Albright's ingenious thesis that the *'apiru*-Hebrews were "donkey caravaneers" (ibid., pp. 56–79) seems to me unsubstantiated for three reasons: (1) he did not advance a single text which unambiguously identifies *'apiru* as caravaneers; (2) a caravaneer status for *'apiru* does not adequately explain their militarization to the extent that they were armed auxiliaries in Amarna Canaan; and (3) even if the still contested meaning of "dusty-(footed)" for *'apiru* is accepted, it does not follow that caravaneering would be the only occupation meriting that description. It seems to me that, at most, Albright may possibly have identified another occupational function for some *'apiru*-Hebrews, but hardly for a majority, much less for all. Albright's endeavor is astutely motivated, however, by the perception that "the semi-nomadic hypothesis was correct in some ways, but it failed to solve the problem of how the Patriarchs made their living and what their mode of life was" (ibid., p. 57).

416. R. Clements, *Abraham and David: Genesis 15 and Its Meaning for Israelite Tradition* (SBT, 2nd series, 5), 1967, especially chap. 5.

417. W. F. Albright, "The Names 'Israel' and 'Judah,'" *JBL* 46 (1927) 151–185; W. Caspari, "Die sprächliche und religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Namens Israel," *ZS* 3 (1924) 194–211; R. Coote, "The Meaning of the Name Israel," *HTR* 65 (1972) 137–142; G. A. Danell, *Studies in the Name of Israel in the Old Testament,* 1946; R. Marcus, "The Hebrew Sibilant ŚIN and the Name of YIŚRA'EL," *JBL* 60 (1941) 141–150; M. Noth, *Die israelitische*

Personennamen, 1928, pp. 207–210; E. Sachsse, *Die Bedeutung des Namens Israel,* I, 1910; II, 1922.

418. A contrary view is advanced by A. Lemaire, "Asriel, šr'l, Israël et l'origine de la confédération israélite," *VT* 23 (1973) 239–243, who argues on linguistic grounds that *Asriel,* a clan in Manasseh near Tappuah on the border with Ephraim (*šr'l* in Samarian Ostraca), and *Israel* are two forms of the same name, the initial "demi-consonants" being prosthetic and interchangeable. Lemaire further hypothesizes that the clan gave its name to the confederate entity of greater Israel, in analogy with the canton Schwys that contributed its name to the Swiss confederation and with the small region of Gaul called Franc that gave its name to the nation of France. In spite of the suggestiveness of his observations, several problems are untreated in Lemaire's brief study: (1) Why does MT use two different forms of the name for the clan and for the confederacy? Was this an attempt to hide the derivation of the confederate name from a clan name, and if so, why? Or was it simply a later standardization device to avoid confusing clan and confederacy?; (2) Why was the name for the confederacy drawn from a clan rather than from a tribe? Does this suggest that the first confederating entities were clans rather than tribes?; (3) Why should a clan lacking a major cult center or any known leader of stature have given its name to the confederacy? Lemaire tries to make good this deficiency by suggesting that Shiloh, several miles to the southeast, may have been in the territory of Asriel, but the evidence he offers is weak.

419. M. Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels,* 1930, pp. 75–80.

420. "El, the God of Israel," Gen. 33:20. After the proper name Yahweh became the primary designation for deity in Israel, "Yahweh" replaced "El" in the formulary "Yahweh/El, the God of Israel" (e.g., Ex. 5:1; 32:27; Josh. 8:30; 9:18–19; 24:1,23; Judg. 5:3,5). The independent form "the God of Israel" (e.g., Ex. 24:10; Num. 16:9; Josh. 22:16) indicates that the appositional phrase could qualify more than one name for deity (as borne out by Gen. 33:20), and it is likely that Exodus 24:10 points to the older and fuller form "El, the God of Israel." (Cf. B. W. Anderson, "God, Names of," IDB, vol. 2, 1962, p. 413, and M. D. Cassuto, "*'Ēl'ᵉlōhē yisrā'ēl,*" *EM,* vol. 1, 1955, cols. 284–285 [Heb.]). I find the view that El Elohe Israel means "El, god of (the patriarch) Israel," which in turn is equivalent to "El, god of your father" (Gen. 46:3), to be highly dubious, since the transfer of the proper name Israel to the patriarch Jacob gives every evidence of being a late secondary phenomenon (contra F. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic,* 1973, p. 46, note 13).

421. J. Bright, *A History of Israel,* 2nd ed., 1972, p. 132; E. Nielsen, *Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation,* 1955, pp. 282–283; S. Lehming, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Gen. 34," *ZAW* 70 (1958) 228–250; A. de Pury, "Genèse XXXIV et l'histoire," *RB* 71 (1969) 5–49. For further exploration of the complex historical and social horizons of Genesis 34, see the discussions in VI.30.3 and VII.32.3 and, in particular, note 213.

422. *ANET,* 376–378; J. Bright, *A History of Israel,* 2nd ed., 1972, pp. 112–113.

423. B. Maisler (Mazar), "Canaan and the Canaanites," *BASOR* 102 (1946) 7–12; A. van Selms, "The Canaanites in the Book of Genesis," *OTS* 12 (1958) 182–213; I. J. Gelb, "The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples," *JCS* 15 (1961) 27–47; J. C. Gibson, "Observations on Some Important Ethnic Terms in the Pentateuch," *JNES* 20 (1961) 217–228.

424. B. Maisler (Mazar), *BASOR* 102 (1946) 7–8; P. Artzi, "Canaan, Canaanite," *EM,* vol. 4, 1962, cols. 196–202 (Heb.); J. Liver, "Canaan in the Bible," *EM,* vol. 4, 1962, cols. 202–204 (Heb.); B. Oded, "Canaan, Land of," *EJ,* vol. 5, 1971, cols. 98–101; R. de Vaux, "Le pays de Canaan," *JAOS* 88 (1968) 23–30.

425. Following E. A. Speiser, "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C.," *AASOR* 13 (1933) 26–31; "Hivite," IDB, vol. 2, 1962, p. 615, and "Horite," IDB, vol. 2, 1962, p. 645; "*Ḥorī, Ḥōrīm,*" *EM,* vol. 3, 1958, cols. 57–61 (Heb.). See also S. E. Loewenstamm, "*Ḥivvī,*" *EM,* vol. 3, 1958, cols. 45–47 (Heb.); R. de Vaux, "Les Hurrites de l'histoire et les Horites de la Bible," *RB* 74 (1967) 481–503; and J. Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament,* 1959, pp. 42–44.

426. N. K. Gottwald, "Amorites," *EJ,* vol. 2, 1971, cols. 877–878; see also Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible,* pp. 59–60, 137, 158–159, 187, who rejects the suggestion of B. Mazar (in "Land of Israel," *EM,* vol. 1, 1955, cols. 694–695 [Heb.]) that the Amorite kingdom of Sihon was colonized by people from Amurru in league with Hittites after the Battle of Kadesh and prefers instead to explain the application of the name "Amorite" to the Transjordanian kingdoms along the line of a progressively southward-shifting geographical restriction of the term Amurru as follows: in Akkadian times for Syria-Palestine as a whole; in the Hyksos era for southern Palestine-Syria; in the Amarna Age for the small kingdom of Amurru in Lebanon; in biblical usage for residents of the mountains and interior regions, virtually coextensive with Canaan.

427. First proposed by B. Maisler (Mazar), "Beth-She 'arim, Gaba, and Harosheth of the Peoples," *HUCA* 24 (1952/53) 81–84, and in *EM,* vol. 3, 1958, cols. 309–310 (Heb.). This view is accepted by Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible,* pp. 201, 203, contra W. F. Albright, "Some Additional Notes on the Song of Deborah," *JPOS* 2 (1922) 284–285.

428. D. Winton Thomas, *SVT* 4 (1958) 8–16; *CBQ* 24 (1962) 154; P. Calderone, *CBQ* 23 (1961) 451–460. My interpretation of Judges 5 is greatly indebted to M. L. Chaney's full-orbed exegetical, historical, and sociological analysis and reconstruction, starting from the philological data, as presented in his unpublished paper "ḤDL-II in I Sam. 2:5; Judg. 5:7; and Deut. 15:11," delivered at the Annual Meeting of the AAR-SBL in Washington, D.C., on October 24, 1974. I have also had the opportunity of reading early drafts of parts of Chaney's Ph.D. dissertation, which treats the same data more exhaustively and with full notes: "ḤDL-II and the 'Song of Deborah': Textual, Philological, and Sociological Studies in Judges 5, with Special Reference to the Verbal Occurrences of ḤDL in Biblical Hebrew" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1976).

429. W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 163 (1961) 40–43; W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.,* 1962, pp. 461–465; A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization,* 1964, pp. 64, 93, 118–120.

430. F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," *JNES* 14 (1955) 237–250.

431. Ibid., p. 239.

432. E. A. Speiser, " 'People' and 'Nation' of Israel," *JBL* 79 (1960) 157–163; see also L. Rost, "Die Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk im Alten Testament," *Festschrift Otto Procksch,* 1934, pp. 125–148.

433. Speiser, " 'People' and 'Nation,' " p. 158.

434. F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament,* 1906, p. 766 (entries 2 c. and d.).

435. A. Alt, "Meros," *KS,* I, 1953 (orig. pub. 1941), p. 196.

436. E. Täubler, *Biblische Studien: Die Epoche der Richter,* 1958, p. 196.

437. F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," *JNES* 14 (1955) 248–249.

438. Ibid., p. 249. A further instance of *yōshēv* as "ruler(s)" is pointed out by W. G. E. Watson, "David Ousts the City Ruler of Jebus," *VT* 20 (1970) 501–502, who recognizes that *hayᵉvusī yōshēv hā'ārets* in II Samuel 5:6 does not mean "the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land" (as misconstrued by I Chronicles 11:4–5), but "the Jebusite ruler of the city" (*'erets* employed sociopolitically for "city" or "city-state"; cf. p. 502, notes 2 and 3). This rendering