Muḥīṭ *Kitāb al-Majmūᶜ fiʾl-Muḥīṭ biʾl-Taklīf*. Vol. 1. Edited by J. J. Houben. Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1965.
Sharḥ *Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Khamsa*. Edited by ᶜAbd al-Karīm ᶜUthmān. Cairo: Maktabat Wahba, 1965.

Ashᶜarī, Abuʾl-Ḥasan (d. A.D. 935):
Lumaᶜ *The Theology of al-Ashᶜarī*. Edited and translated by R. J. McCarthy. Beirut: Librairie Orientale, 1953.
Istiḥsān Ibid.
Maqālāt *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*. Edited by Muḥammad M. ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd. Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍa, 1969–70.

Baghdādī, ᶜAbd al-Qāhir (d. A.D. 1037):
Farq *Kitāb al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*. Edited by M. M. ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd. Cairo: M. A. Ṣabīḥ, n.d.
Uṣūl *Kitāb Uṣūl al-Dīn*. Istanbul: Maṭbaᶜat al-Dawla, A.H. 1346/A.D. 1928.

Bāqillānī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad, al-Qāḍī (d. A.D. 1013):
Bayān *Kitāb al-Bayān ᶜan al-Farq bayn al-Muᶜjizāt waʾl-Karāmāt*. Edited by R. J. McCarthy. Beirut: Librairie Orientale, 1958
Tamhīd *Kitāb al-Tamhīd fiʾl-Radd*. Edited by R. J. McCarthy. Beirut: Librairie Orientale, 1957.

Juwaynī, Imām al-Ḥaramayn (d. A.D. 1086):
Shāmil *Kitāb al-Shāmil fī Uṣūl al-Dīn*. Edited by Dr. ᶜA. S. Nashshār. Alexandria: Al-Maaref, 1969.

Khayyāṭ, Abuʾl-Ḥasan ᶜAbdarraḥmān (d. ca. A.D. 912):
Intiṣār *Kitāb al-Intiṣār*. Edited by H. S. Nyberg. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub, 1925.

Māturīdī, Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad (d. A.D. 944):
Tawḥīd *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*. Edited by Dr. Fatḥallāh Khulayf. Beirut: Dār al-Mashriq, 1970.

Maqdisī, al-Muṭahhar ibn Ṭāhir (fl. ca. A.D. 966):
Badʾ *Kitāb al-Badʾ waʾl-Taʾrīkh*. Edited and translated by Clement Huart. 6 vols. Paris: E. Leroux, 1899–1919.

Maqrīzī, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad (d. A.D. 1442):
Khiṭaṭ *Kitāb al-Khiṭaṭ al-Maqrīziyya*. 4 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Malījī al-Kutubī, A.H. 1324–26 (ca. A.D. 1906–08.)

Nāshiʾ, ᶜAbdallāh ibn Muḥammad (d. A.D. 906):
Awsaṭ *Kitāb Masāʾil al-Imāma wa muqtaṭafāt min al-Kitāb al-Awsaṭ fiʾl-Maqālāt*. Edited by J. Van Ess. Beirut and Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1971.

Shahrastānī, ᶜAbd al-Karīm (d. A.D. 1153):
Nihāya *Kitāb Nihāyat al-Iqdām fī ᶜIlm al-Kalām*. Edited by Alfred Guillaume. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.

DIMORPHIC STRUCTURE AND THE PROBLEM OF THE *ᶜAPIRÛ-ᶜIBRÎM**

MICHAEL B. ROWTON, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago

THE present article is the twelfth in a series of articles concerning the role of dimorphic structure and topology in the history of Western Asia. Only the bearing which dimorphic structure has on the problem of the *ᶜapirû-ᶜibrîm* will be discussed here. Topology, that is, the role of the physical environment, is discussed elsewhere, and I shall be reverting to it also in subsequent articles.[1]

Problems of etymology will be relegated to another article, as well as material of dubious date and origin, such as the Bne ᶜEber passages, Abraham the *ᶜibrî* in Gen. 14, and the term *ereṣ hāᶜibrîm* in Gen. 40:15. Etymology will be treated there as a matter of minor importance. The debate on the *ᶜapirû-ᶜibrîm* has been going on now for the better part of a century, ever since the discovery of the Amarna archive.[2] It therefore goes back to a period when etymology was still thought to be an argument which carried great weight. As a result, the problem of the *ᶜapirû-ᶜibrîm* has continued to be plagued and distorted by etymology down to the present, leading to a variety of misconceptions.

*This article is based on a paper given at the meeting of the Mid-West Branch of the American Oriental Society, Madison, Wisconsin, in October 1974. A preliminary point to note is that in this article terms which, at one time or another, had an ethnic connotation will be rendered in modern form, as commonly used in English. The terms in question are: Amorite, Kazak, Kurd, Lullean, Lur, Mawali, Sutean, and Turk. This homogenizing is necessary because of variant spellings and variant phonetic forms. "Lullean," for instance, stems from an original **Lulluwa*, later *Lullû*, *Lullebu*, *Lullumu*, and *Lulaḫḫi*.

A few special abbreviations are used:
Histoire R. de Vaux, *Histoire ancienne d'Israël* (Paris, 1971).
Kumidi D. O. Edzard et al., eds., *Kamid el-Lōz/Kumidi* (Bonn, 1970) (Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 7).
Landnahme M. Weippert, *Die Landnahme der israelitischen Stämme* (Göttingen, 1967).
Nomades J.-R. Kupper, *Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari* (Paris, 1957).
Pastoralism J. T. Luke, "Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1965).
Problème J. Bottéro, *Le Problème des Ḫabiru à la 4e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, Cahiers de la Société Asiatique no. 12 (Paris, 1954).
PKB J. A. Brinkman, *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia*, AnOr 43 (Rome, 1968).

[*JNES* 35 no. 1 (1976)]
© 1976 by the University of Chicago.
All rights reserved.

[1] For a list of the articles already or about to be published see *OrAn* 15 (1976). The *ᶜapirû*, though not the *ᶜibrîm*, have already been discussed in one of these articles, *AS* 16 (1965): 375–87, in connection with topology.

[2] The three most important contributions are: (1) J. Bottéro, *Problème* (1954); (2) M. Greenberg, *The Ḫab/piru* (1955); (3) Bottéro, *RlA* 4 (1972): 14–27; (1) and (2) have a full bibliography up to 1953; for subsequent publication during the years 1954–66 Bottéro refers, in (3) above, to M. Weippert, *Landnahme* (1967), pp. 66–102. Further contributions, after 1966, include the following: Djakonoff, *MIO* 12 (1967): 363–65; Bruce in D. Winton Thomas, ed., *Archaeology and Old Testament Study* (1967), pp. 3–20; W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (1968), pp. 64–79; de Vaux, *JNES* 27 (1968): 221–28; Helck, *VT* 18 (1968), 472–80; Koch, *VT* 19 (1969): 62–78; Edzard, *Kumidi* (1970), pp. 55–59, 88–91; Weippert, *Biblica* 52 (1971): 407–32; de Vaux, *Histoire* (1971), pp. 106–12, 202–8; Cazelles in D. J. Wiseman, ed., *Peoples of Old Testament Times* (1973), pp. 1–28. New texts mentioning the *ᶜapirû*, not included in (1) and (2) above, are listed by Bottéro in *RlA* 4 (1972): 15 ff. These are: nos. 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 29, 30. 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 102–5, 127, 128, 131′, 204, 205, 209, 216, 217; some, however, concern the *ḫabbātu* rather than the *ᶜapirû* and some are personal names. For discussion of the more important among these new texts see Otten, *ZA* 52 (1957): 216–23; Cassin, *JA* 246 (1958): 225–36; Edzard, *Kumidi* (1970), pp. 52–62; see also n. 30 below for the new Posener text. For the most recent etymological theories see Albright (1968) and Cazelles (1973); also Loretz, *UF* 6 (1974): 486.

The objective here is to try a new approach to the problem, based on tribal society instead of etymology. Dimorphic social and political structure, or dimorphic structure for short, has been discussed in four of the preceding articles.[3] It is rooted in close interaction between nomad and sedentary, between tribe and town. In discussing it the term "urban society" is used as a synonym of "non-tribal society," to include villages as well as towns, in the general sense of a society based on urban rather than tribal institutions.[4]

Now, in Western Asia tribal society and urban society have coexisted side by side for several millennia. History is replete with the story of economic, social, and political disintegration in urban society. But I have not been able to find even one short article on the subject of tribal disintegration. The suggestion here is that this explains why the problem of the *ʿibrîm* has so long eluded solution; the clue is to be sought in the process of tribal disintegration.

Where a nomadic tribe is in close contact with the sedentary, as is usually the case in dimorphic society, there tends to be a continuous seepage from the tribe. This seepage comes mainly from the poorest tribal element, those whose livestock diminishes to the point at which it is no longer sufficient to sustain a family.[5] These destitute or near destitute tribesmen frequently leave the tribe to seek a living in urban society, very often entering military service. Some of them may form into more or less predatory bands, which urban society views as little better than gangs of bandits. For these the Sumerian term was *sagaz*, Akkadian *ḫabbātu*, meaning "robber, bandit, raider." And here it is that we have our first link with the *ʿapirû*. For the logogram which the scribes used to denote the *ʿapirû* derives from this Sumerian term, *sagaz*.[6]

Thus on the margin of tribal and urban society one can discern a social element consisting of detribalized labor, mercenaries, predatory bands, and tribal splinter groups, all impelled from tribal society into urban society by lack of food, sometimes amounting to genuine famine, and also by intertribal warfare and disputes.[7] These people were outcasts from tribal society. But in dimorphic society, characterized as it is by close interaction between tribe and town, one could expect to find that this tribal element would be joined by similar outcasts from urban society. For urban society, too, would be spewing out its own crop of uprooted and destitute social elements. This in turn means that in dimorphic society one has to reckon with a social element intermediate between established tribal society and established urban society, not belonging fully either to one or the other. It is important to note that this intermediate element commonly took the form of tribal splinter groups. The evidence for this will be discussed in a later article in conjunction with the problem of tribal disintegration.

In our texts an ill-defined social element of this kind would be somewhat elusive. We

[3] *Or.* 42 (1973): 247–58; *JNES* 32 (1973): 201–15; *JESHO* 17 (1974): 1–30; the fourth is to appear in *Studia Instituti Anthropos* 30 (1976).

[4] Thus reflecting Akkadian usage where *ālu* denotes anything from a settlement to a city.

[5] F. Barth, *Nomads of South Persia* (1961), pp. 101–28; Barth in R. Firth and B. S. Young, eds., *Capital, Saving and Credit in Peasant Societies* (1963), pp. 69–81, esp. pp. 77 ff.; Stauffer, *MEJ* 19 (1965): 284–302, esp. pp. 292 ff.

[6] For use of the logogram SA.GAZ (and variants) for *ḫabbātu* and *ḫapiru* see *CAD* 6 (1956), pp. 13 f. and 84 f. There is reason to believe that the term *ḫabbātu* may represent the original Akkadian term for the social element known also as the *ʿapirû*; see Rowton, *AS* 16 (1965): 386, with n. 69; Weippert, *Landnahme* (1967), p. 75, n. 4. When the logogram is used it is often difficult to tell which term is intended, especially in military contexts; e.g., *RlA* 4 nos. 18–25, 27, 28.

[7] On the relation between predatory raiding by nomadic elements and lack of food see Brinkman, *PKB* (1968), pp. 387–89. This subject will be discussed in a subsequent article dealing with tribal disintegration.

might have a name for it, but the precise social content of the term might be difficult to prove. Or else a specific name might be lacking, since sometimes this kind of social element would have shared a name with the tribal people from which it was in the main derived. Since one could expect a term of this sort to gravitate between the ethnic-gentilic and the social, for want of a better term we will call a name of that type a "social ethnonym."

Take the term "Turk," as used by the Turks themselves. At first an ethnic tribal term, it then veered to the social, only to veer back to the ethnic in the context of rising nationalism during the past century. But as late as the first half of that century, it still denoted the uncouth population of the countryside: peasants, nomads, bandits, even such diverse elements as gypsies and camel drivers. Thus when a certain Halet Efendi was sent to Paris as Turkish ambassador in 1802, he was shocked to hear the ignorant Europeans call him the "Turkish" ambassador.[8]

Similarly, the term "Kurd" began as an ethnic tribal name, then veered to the social, and by now has gradually reverted to the ethnic. As a social ethnonym it denoted any mountain nomad of Persia, whether Kurd, Lur, or Arab, even Daylamites of the Caspian region and Qufs of the Kirman region, the latter speaking a Sindi dialect. Since the Daylamites were not nomads but were notorious raiders, whereas the Qufs, though partly nomadic, were even better known as raiders, one suspects that the term "kurd," when used as a social ethnonym, had as much the connotation "raider" as "nomad." There is perhaps some confirmation of this in another peripheral region, the Caucasus. For in Georgian the term "kurd" did in fact come to mean "robber." Another indication is that an eleventh century writer could muse on the happy state of the world, when rid of "Kurds, Lurs, highwaymen and robbers."[9]

Next the term "Goran." Throughout it has remained the name of a large, fully sedentary tribe. Yet at the same time, among the Kurds, it is used to denote detribalized peasantry and bandits.[10]

Tribesmen may even use the name of the tribal people to which they themselves belong for the purpose of emphasizing social stratification. Thus Feilberg found that among the Papi, a Lur tribe, the term "Lur" included only the average uncouth tribesmen, not the tribal elite.[11] Exactly the opposite is attested among the Muntafiq, who, speaking among themselves, used the term "Muntafiq" only when referring to the tribal elite.[12]

All the terms hitherto mentioned veered from the tribal ethnic to the social. But the opposite is also attested. Three examples will be quoted here: kazak, mawali, and, probably, *ʿibrî*.

Originally in use among the tribal nomads of Central Asia, the term "kazak" first served to denote a nearly destitute element, forced out into the poorest grazing land and hence highly predatory. In time it emerges in Central Asia as the name of one of the most

[8] B. Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 2d ed. (1968), p. 333, also pp. 1 f. The term used for a member of established society was "Osmanlı." For the transition from "Osmanlı" to "Turk" see also Jäschke, *Welt des Islam* 21 (1939): 85 ff.

[9] Minorsky, *Actes du Congrès International des Orientalistes* 20 (1940): 144; for the more restricted meaning "Iranian Nomads of Western Persia" see Minorsky, *BSOAS* 11 (1943–46): 75 and see p. 78, n. 5 for the meaning "robber" in Georgian. For the philosophical aside, the last passage mentioned, see Minorsky, *Iranica* (1964), p. 163.

[10] Minorsky, *BSOAS* 11 (1943–46): 78. Note also that the term "Goran" could be used in a pejorative sense; see E. Nolde, *Reise nach Innerarabien, Kurdistan und Armenien* (1898), pp. 228 f., n. 10.

[11] C. G. Feilberg, *Les Papis* (1952), p. 39.

[12] *The Muntafik*, Arab Bureau (1917), p. 2.

important tribal confederations and also, quite independently, as the name of a semi-ethnic element in the population of Russia, the famous Cossacks. The way this happened was that the Turkmen fugitives kept infiltrating the steppes of the Ukraine, where they were joined by fugitive Russian peasants fleeing serfdom. There, in the Ukraine and the regions adjacent to it, the term "kazak" acquired the meanings "free man, freebooter, rebel, adventurer." Later the Poles and the Russians began forming this uprooted, predatory element into an auxiliary military force.[13]

Among the bedouin the term "mawali" originally denoted an inferior social category. These mawali consisted of men who left their tribe and sought the protection of an influential tribesman elsewhere, of manumitted slaves who remained in the service of their masters, and of others who did not belong either within the category of slave or within established tribal society. In the Middle Ages the term "mawali" became the name of the most powerful tribal confederation in the Syrian Desert and the Jazirah. The original nucleus of the tribe consisted of the retainers and followers of a prominent Ṭay family, the Abu Reshe. They had been recruited by the Abu Reshe among manumitted slaves, and also from a nomadic group in the Syrian Desert which included fugitives from urban society, perhaps predominantly fugitive slaves. Even in recent times the tribe remained highly heterogenous; it even included deserters from the Turkish army.[14]

Turning now to ancient Western Asia, we will begin with the term "Sutean." In the Old Babylonian period "Sutean" was still, in Mari at least, an ethnic term.[15] Subsequently there can be little doubt that it evolved into a social ethnonym, though more evidence is needed before we can be certain just what its semantic content was in different periods and different regions. Among the Hittites it seems to have acquired the meaning "tribe, tribesman";[16] it is used in approximately the same sense in the Amarna archive. In Babylonia, in the first millennium B.C., it seems to have denoted a detribalized element, usually predatory and verging on the earlier usage of *sagaz*, *ḫabbātu*, *ʿapirû*. This may be significant because "Sutean," in that usage, appears at about the time when the term *ʿapirû* goes out of use.[17]

"Amorite" and "Lullean" are two other ethnic names which evolved into social ethnonyms. But both involve far more than the problem under discussion here, hence both will be dealt with in a subsequent article. The social ethnonym "Lullean" leads directly to the problem of the *ʿapirû*, for the two terms are used among the Hittites in the same

[13] V. V. Radlov, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk Dialecte*, vol. 2 (1899), p. 364, under *qazaq*, where the range of meaning includes "vagabond, wanderer, robber"; L. Cahun, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Asie* (1896), pp. 48 ff., who points out that the term originally denoted an animal which had strayed from the herd, or a man who had left his tribe; V. V. Barthold, *Zwölf Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens* (1935), pp. 195, 215, 235, and 243, with the meanings "nomad," as well as "whole bodies of people who had separated from their . . . kinsmen," i.e., tribal splinter groups; see also Barthold, *EI* 2 (1927), p. 836; for the fugitive peasant element of Slav origin see *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 6 (1963), p. 588 and the literature quoted there. Note especially L. Krader, *Peoples of Central Asia* (1966), pp. 64 ff.; speaking of the Kazakh tribe in Central Asia, he says (p. 66): "Kazakh designated first a social estate, then a political union, finally a people unified politically."

[14] M. von Oppenheim, *Die Beduinen*, vol. 1 (1939), pp. 305–21

[15] J.-R. Kupper, *Nomades* (1957), pp. 83–96; J. T. Luke, *Pastoralism* (1965), pp. 105–38.

[16] At least as a logogram; cf. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 (1956): 67, lines 16 and 18 where reference is to twelve Gašgean tribes (written ŠU.TI) and also to tribal troops (EREN.MEŠ ŠU.TI). See also E. von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer* (1965), pp. 71 and 74; Arnaud, *RA* 61 (1967): 88.

[17] See J. A. Brinkman, *PKB* (1968), pp. 285 ff. and 277 f., n. 1799, for Sutean activity in that period and for their close connection with the Arameans. Since at that time Aramean tribes are often mentioned, but Sutean tribes never, the tentative conclusion seems justified that the elements called "Sutean" represent detribalized Arameans, mostly in the form of predatory tribal groups, some still nomadic. See n. 24 below.

context and in much the same sense.[18] The difference is that, on the evidence at present available, the term *ʿapirû* never had anything of the ethnic.[19]

Opinion is virtually unanimous among Assyriologists that the *ʿapirû* represent a social element. They are scattered far and wide among the peoples of Western Asia. There is no single country that can be regarded as their original home, no language we can regard as theirs. The logogram which is used for them in cuneiform elsewhere denotes bandits or predatory nomadic bands.

As a result, about half a century ago an Assyriologist of the caliber of Landsberger concluded that the *ʿapirû* can only represent a social element. Some twenty years ago Bottéro and Greenberg independently and simultaneously reinvestigated the problem in the light of well over 200 data.[20] They both reached the conclusion that Landsberger was right. Every new passage which has come to light since then fits Landsberger's solution without the slightest difficulty.[21] The conclusion here is that, so long as this continues to be the case, further discussion of the rival, ethnic solution is a waste of time.

However, at least one essential question remains: do the *ʿapirû* include an element of tribal origin? Inasmuch as the *ʿapirû* are included in the discussion of nomads and tribes, the Mari experts implicitly affirm that they do; Dossin even goes so far as to view the *ʿapirû* as the counterpart of the modern bedouin.[22] It has to be admitted that this view does not seem to have carried much conviction, the rather obvious reason being that no explanation is offered as to how the *ʿapirû* are to be fitted into the tribal picture.

The suggestion here is that this crucial link in the chain of evidence is weak only because the process of tribal disintegration has not been taken into consideration. In a subsequent article evidence will be discussed which points to tribal disintegration on a considerable scale in the so-called Upper Country of the Mari region. And if that be correct, the proportions of the problem are as follows: the term *ʿapirû* is of West Semitic origin, and it first appears in Mesopotamian urban society at a time when that society was being penetrated by Amorites.[23] This suggests that it was brought in by the Amorites and that it originally denoted some aspect of tribal society. Now, if in urban society it denotes the economically and socially uprooted, there is a reasonably good chance that it had much the same connotation in tribal society. Hence in tribal society *ʿapirû*

[18] For the use of the term *ʿapirû* among the Hittites see Bottéro, *Problème*, pp. 71–84; Otten, *ZA* 52 (1957): 216–23; Weippert, *Biblica* 52 (1971): 414. I shall be reverting to this subject in a subsequent article in conjunction with the *lulaḫḫi*, "Lulleans."

[19] For the opposite view see R. de Vaux, *Histoire* (1971), pp. 106–12, esp. p. 111. Comparing the terms *ʿapirû* and Sutean, de Vaux argues that both terms occur in similar context. That is perfectly true. But the fact that "Sutean" started as a tribal ethnic term is no proof that the term *ʿapirû* did.

[20] Landsberger, *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1 (1930): 321–34; Bottéro, *Problème*; Greenberg, *The Hab/piru*; for the most recent total see Bottéro, *RlA* 4 (1972): 14 ff. The total there is 249, but this includes some personal names and some passages where the reading of the logogram is *ḫabbātu*, rather than *ḫapiru*.

[21] For these new texts see n. 2 above.

[22] J.-R. Kupper, *Nomades* (1957), pp. 249–59; *CAH* 2 (1973), pp. 27 f.; Dossin in F. Gabrieli, ed., *L'Antica Società Beduina* (1959), pp. 35–51; Finet, *Syria* 41 (1964): 138–42; whereas Luke, *Pastoralism* (1965), pp. 272–75 and Bottéro, *RlA* 4 (1972): 23 ff. seem less inclined to accept this view. Note however that the latter (p. 27) concedes that among the *ʿapirû* we have to allow for an element of steppe origin and recruited from among the nomads of Upper Mesopotamia. In fact, his statement (p. 26) that, unlike other nomads, the *ʿapirû* have no sheikhs or tribal institutions (literally "autorités tribales") strongly suggests that he is thinking in terms of a detribalized element, without explicitly saying so. I shall be reverting to the *ʿapirû* in a subsequent article on social stratification in a dimorphic society.

[23] At present the earliest occurrence of the term is in Cappadocia, not long after the time when, in Babylonia, the Amorites began gaining the upper hand; see I. J. Gelb, *OIP* 27 (1935), pp. 24 ff., discussed also in Bottéro, *Problème* (1954): 8 ff.

probably denoted the detribalized, since in tribal society it is they who primarily constitute the economically and socially uprooted.[24]

The evidence from the Old Babylonian period agrees well with this conclusion. At present, the Upper Country of the Mari archives is the only region in the whole of Western Asia where at that time we have evidence for a significant degree of tribal disintegration. Is it then likely to be a coincidence that, in the Old Babylonian period, it is also the region in Western Asia where we have most of the evidence for the *ʿapirû*?

Turning now to the term *ʿibrî*, we have to start at a point which the discussion had reached nearly half a century ago. Parzen, comparing the terms Israelite and *ʿibrî*, was able to show that the latter had a derogatory connotation.[25] The potential significance of this observation is obvious, in view of the tendency there is for tribesmen to view the detribalized with a certain contempt. It means that in discussing the term *ʿibrî*, the term Israelite also has to be taken into consideration.

The patriarch, Israel, and his twelve sons represent, of course, the tribal confederation of Israel and its component tribes. And there, crucial to the whole problem, is the fact that these symbols appear in the tribal tradition before, and not after, the sojourn in Egypt. The significance of this is that, by all the norms of tribal tradition, it should mean that Israel was already a tribal group before the sojourn in Egypt. If so, only some of these tribesmen can have been in Egypt, since there is no evidence, and no probability, that a whole tribal confederation would have been allowed to enter Egypt and remain there, in New Kingdom times, at the height of Egyptian power. In fact, the view that emergence of Israel as a tribal group precedes the sojourn in Egypt, and that only some among the Israelites were present there, is nowadays gaining acceptance in quarters usually regarded as conservative.[26]

Now this conclusion has to be taken in conjunction with the conclusion that the *ʿapirû* included the detribalized, those who leave tribal society and migrate to urban society, with famine symbolic of the economic pressures, commonly the cause of this kind of tribal seepage. For if these two basic premises are correct, then the Israelites who were in Egypt obviously represent a detribalized element of that kind, and they are rather consistently called *ʿibrîm*.

But this in turn would make it very difficult to believe that the terms *ʿapirû* and *ʿibrî* do not denote essentially the same social element. For the logical proportions of the problem are such that otherwise it would be difficult to avoid stumbling over an awkward conclusion. It is this. The *ʿapirû* represent one of the most conspicuous features of dimorphic society in the second millennium B.C. Yet of them there would be no trace in

[24] Thus if, by the time Aramean tribes had appeared in Mesopotamia, the term "Sutean" had replaced *ʿapirû* as a designation of detribalized, predatory, and in part nomadic bands essentially of Aramean origin, one would expect to find close affinity between Arameans and Suteans. That is in fact the case, as pointed out by Brinkman, *PKB* (1968), pp. 285 f. See n. 17 above.

[25] Parzen, *AJSL* 49 (1933): 254–61, especially p. 258: "Originally. . . Ibri was a degrading, derogatory appellation . . . ."

[26] For instance, among Jewish scholars Liver, among Roman Catholic scholars de Vaux. Discussing tribal structure in Israel, Liver has this to say in B. Mazar, ed., *The History of the Jewish People*, vol. 3 (1971), p. 196: "Thus Israel's name is linked with the formation of the tribal league which originated neither at Kadesh-barnea, nor at the revelation at Mount Sinai, nor in the Israelite wanderings in the wilderness, but at another, apparently earlier, stage in the history of the tribes described in the Book of Genesis in the migration of Jacob and his sons from the region of the Euphrates to Caanaan (Gen. 32:25–31)." De Vaux's view is that some of the Joseph group were in Egypt, primarily Machir, whereas the Lea group contributed elements from the tribes of Simeon, Levi, and Juda; see *Histoire* (1971), pp. 302 f., with n. 121. For Protestant opinion, on the whole much less conservative, see, for instance, T. J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, rev. ed. (1950), pp. 30 f., with n. 97.

the Old Testament if we view the *ʿibrîm* as a purely ethnic element. On the other hand a tribal people would be present, the *ʿibrîm*, which no other source knows anything about.

Arrayed against this inherently improbable conclusion are the three groups into which fall most of the Old Testament passages on the *ʿibrîm*. First, the famous law on the *ʿibrî* slave in Exod. 21, together with the later passages depending on it.[27] We are dealing with the case of an Israelite tribesman, presumably destitute or debt-ridden, who temporarily becomes the house slave of another Israelite. Now nothing is more fundamental in tribal society than the concept of the tribesman as a free man. Hence a slave of this kind would automatically cease to be regarded as a tribesman; in other words he would, temporarily at least, have joined the ranks of the detribalized. Here, then, we have a man uprooted from tribal society, called an *ʿibrî*, whereas in Nuzi, in virtually identical circumstances, we have the uprooted from urban society called *ʿapirû*.[28]

Second, the passages relating to the situation in Egypt.[29] The Egyptian sources speak of *ʿapirû*, the Old Testament speaks of *ʿibrîm*. In fact, we now have a new Ramesside text which speaks of *ʿapirû* labor employed in connection with building operations, just as are the *ʿibrîm* in the Old Testament, also in the Ramesside period.[30]

Third, the oft discussed *ʿibrîm* passages in Samuel, representing a typically *ʿapirû* situation, with renegade Israelites in Philistine paramilitary service.[31]

Thus, if we accept the solution suggested here, the terms *ʿapirû* and *ʿibrî* denote approximately—but not quite—the same thing. The term *ʿapirû* denotes the uprooted, the social outcast, whether from tribal society or from urban society. The term *ʿibrî* is confined to the uprooted from tribal society, and therein only to the detribalized from one tribal people, Israel.

True, objections have been raised against any solution that would see in the *ʿibrîm* a social element. Two of these objections deserve serious consideration.

First, the Philistines never use the term "Israelite," only *ʿibrî*, and this certainly does suggest an ethnic content for that term. But, based on the solution suggested here, the answer is, of course, that *ʿibrî* is a social ethnonym. Like kazak and mawali, it originally denoted a social element and gradually acquired an ethnic connotation; the same is obviously true of the tribal name Issachar. Nor is it in any way surprising that this should have taken place initially outside Israel, in the maritime plain. For the population there was in day-to-day contact not with the intact tribes of Israel but with Israel's detribalized. These were men in paramilitary service among the Philistines or recruited as labor by the Canaanites and Phoenicians, men who had left their tribe for work in the fields, the harbors, and with the ship crews of the coastal cities.[32]

[27] Exod. 21:2; Deut. 15:12; Jer. 34:8–14, the latter at a time when many Judeans would have been destitute and uprooted.

[28] See Weippert, *Landnahme* (1967), pp. 86 f. and the literature quoted there; further bibliography de Vaux, *Histoire* (1971), p. 201, n. 160. Add the important contribution by S. M. Paul, *Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law* (1970), pp. 45–52 (*VTS* 18).

[29] Gen. 39:14, 17; 40:15; 41:12; 43:32; Exod. 1:15, 16, 19, 22 (Sam.); 2:6, 7, 11, 13; also the passages quoted in n. 33 below.

[30] Quoted, together with hieroglyphic text, Cazelles (1973), p. 15, fig. 1; see n. 2 above. The text is an ostracon to be published by Posener. The *ʿapirû* there are working stone, very probably, of course, in connection with building operations, just as the *ʿibrîm* in the Old Testament are making brick, both in the Ramesside period.

[31] 1 Sam. 4:6, 9; 13:3, 19; 14:11, 21; 29:3. For literature see de Vaux, *Histoire* (1971), p. 204, n. 158.

[32] So Jonah, the *ʿibrî*; cf. Jonah 1:9; for the Danites see Judges 5:17. The suggestion by Yadin, *The Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 1 (1968): 9–23, that the tribe of Dan is descended from one of the Sea Peoples, the Danuna, is too difficult to reconcile with the biblical tradition. Labor from the tribes of Asher, Issachar, and Zebulon is discussed most recently by de Vaux, *Histoire* (1971), pp. 606 f. The term "Issachar" represents a minor social ethnonym, first "hireling," then the name of a tribe.

It is the other alleged difficulty, however, which goes to the core of the matter. For there can be little doubt that the main objection to *ʿibrî* as a social term stems from the passages in which "Jahwe, God of the *ʿibrîm*,"[33] alternates with "Jahwe, God of Israel." But there the crucial factor is this: these detribalized Israelites who, to an Egyptain or or a Philistine, amounted to little more than tribal scum and renegades, would have been viewed in Israelite tradition as tribal expatriates. Hence from this view, "God of the *ʿibrîm*" is simply equivalent to "God of the tribal expatriates," meaning, of course, in the context in which it occurs, Israel's expatriates. And could it be seriously suggested that Jahwe would not have been credited with the power to protect an Israelite living among foreigners?

As formulated in this article, the solution rests primarily on the social ethnonym and, related to it, the existence in ancient Western Asia of a social stratum intermediate between tribal society and urban society. But this in turn involves the problem of tribal disintegration, and there a word of caution is necessary.

Among the detribalized, only the more prominent and powerful have left their imprint in the historical record, particularly those who have caused a great deal of trouble. But the amorphous mass of the detribalized is poorly visible. Either absorbed into urban society or reabsorbed into tribal society, of them we get only an occasional glimpse. Thus the detailed statistical evidence which would amount to proof is simply not available. We are left with a widespread pattern of fragmentary evidence covering several regions and several millennia. This aspect of the problem, to be discussed at length elsewhere, remains therefore a matter of probability; it does not amount to conclusive proof.

The solution suggested here, however, does not rely only on the evidence for tribal disintegration; another very significant factor has not been included here, namely, the role of the physical environment. This factor, topology, has already been discussed in connection with the *ʿapirû*.[34] I shall be returning to it in a later study in connection with the *ʿibrîm*.

[33] Exod. 3:18; 5:3; 7:16; 9:1, 13; 10:3.

[34] See n. 1 above.

PHOENICIAN DEMONS

WILLIAM CULICAN, University of Melbourne

BETWEEN the Mesopotamian Humbaba and Pazuzu demons and the world of Greek gorgons, satyrs, and silenoi, grotesque figures are relatively scarce in Levantine art. True, the Egyptian god Bes was widely borrowed and his role as a bringer of luck and protector against evil widely recognized. There are, however, a few hints that before the widespread adoption of Bes, who reached his greatest popularity in Achaemenian times in the Levant,[1] the Phoenicians had a demonic imagery of their own—a horned and bearded fellow with a coarse wrinkled face, broad nose, animal ears and horns. As such he appears in closely similar amulets of various materials at Byblos,[2] Amathus[3] (fig. 1b), and at the West Phoenician sites of Carthage[4] and Tharros[5] (fig. 1f). His face is not Bes-like and he wears a flattened disc between his horns, quite unlike anything worn by Bes. Though strictly undated, the Byblos example comes from the Iron Age II surface material, while the white glazed paste amulet from Amathus was found in a tomb dated to the seventh century B.C. The graves at Carthage from which these amulets come—the Tharros context is quite unknown—are all part of the seventh century B.C. Dermech graveyard, which contained an abundance of egyptianizing amulets including examples of Bes in his canonical Egyptian forms. There is scarcely a possibility that the horned demons are copied directly from either Egyptian or Mesopotamian sources: they are Phoenician in their own right.[6]

The same is true of the closely related silver amulet from a sixth century grave at Marion-Arisnoë, Cyprus, illustrated by Gjerstad in *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition* vol. 4/2 (1948), p. 158, fig. 31 (after Ohnefalsch-Richter, *Kypros*, pl. 67a, p. 215; see fig. 1c above). The earlier history of the imagery is to be found in a bone amulet from a grave at Tell Fara (Beth Pelet) (fig. 1a) dated to the Twenty-second Dynasty and again

[1] For Achaemenian seals see D. J. Wiseman, *Cylinder Seals of Western Asia* (1962), pp. 103, 106 among many examples; for jewelry, O. M. Dalton, *Treasure of the Oxus* (1926), nos. 7, 32; E. Coche de la Ferté, *Les bijoux antiques* (1956), pl. 5. 4.

[2] M. Dunand, *Fouilles de Byblos* (1937), vol. 1, p. 175, pl. 72, bronze amulets nos. 2553–54 found in a deposit of what appears to be mid-first millennium B.C. material.

[3] A. S. Murray et al., *Excavations in Cyprus* (1900), p. 120, tomb 88. This tomb contained terra cottas and jewelry of types which appear to be of the fifth century B.C., though some may be of fourth century date, e.g., ibid., pl. 14, 22. It must be added that the purity of the Amathus tomb groups is questionable (see below n. 14). Some of the terra cottas compare with those from Amathus tomb. 9; E. Gjerstad, ed., *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition*, vol. 2, (1935), pp. 55 ff. of the Cypro-Archaic II period.

[4] P. Gaukler, *Nécropoles puniques de Carthage*, vol. 1 (1915), p. 4, tomb 16; p. 8, tomb 26; p. 18, tomb 58; p. 21, tomb 66; pl. 118 bottom row; pl. 126, tomb 78; pl. 168, bottom row; pl. 126, tombs 16 and 20; and pl. 177, tomb 53.

[5] Museo Nazionale, Cagliari. There are further examples from sixth-seventh century B.C. West Phoenician contexts recently published: M. Ponsich, *Recherches archéologiques à Tanger* (Paris, 1970), p. 147, pl. 49 and P. Bartolini, "Gli amuleti punici del tophet di Sulcis" *Revista di Studi Fenici* 1 (1973): catalog nos. 39–41, 45, 47, pl. 58, 10–14.

[6] Some of them are discussed by P. Cintas, *Amulettes puniques* (Tunis, 1946), pp. 56–60, but I disagree that they are closely related either to Bes faces or to Punic terra-cotta masks, as Cintas argues. J. Vercoutter, *Les objets égyptiens et égyptisants du mobilier funéraire carthaginois*, (1945), p. 277 confirms that to his knowledge the "personnage barbu et cornu" is unknown in Egypt (fig. 907). This type must be kept quite separate from a Naucratite comparison, W. M. F. Petrie, *Naukratis*, vol. 1 (1885), pl. 38, no. 11 (quoted by Vercoutter p. 277, n. 9) which is not horned and belongs to a group confined to Naucratis.

[*JNES* 35 no. 1 (1976)]
© 1976 by the University of Chicago.
All rights reserved.