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INTRODUCTION

At the outset it was a primary purpose of this study to present the available sources relevant to the ha-BI-ru problem. But when the compilations of Bottéro and Greenberg appeared, the present writer's efforts were directed exclusively to the formulation of an interpretation of the texts.

The central problem is the identification of those denominated ha-BI-ru. What is the specific quality which distinguishes them among the manifold elements of ancient Near Eastern life? Is their identifying trait ethnic or social or professional?

Of outstanding concern to the student of the Old Testament has always been the question—what is the relation of the ha-BI-ru to the Hebrews? An interest in that question has determined the structure of the present treatment but within this framework the attempt is made to deal distinctly and thoroughly with the central issue of the identification of the ha-BI-ru themselves.
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THE PHONETIC EQUATION
I THE PHONETIC EQUATION

A. CONSONANTS

The common cuneiform spelling of the name is **ha-BI-ru**, the final **u** being according to the usual assumption the nominative case ending, which yields as the grammatical relations require to other case or gentilic endings. In this cuneiform rendering the identity of the first two radicals is ambiguous. The initial consonant is ambiguous because Accadian **n** may represent other letters than Hebrew **n** among them, Hebrew **v**. The second is ambiguous because **BI** represents among other values that of **p** as well as that of **b** in all periods of the cuneiform literature.

Further evidence is available, however, for in some cases other signs of the cuneiform syllabary are used to write this name and, moreover, the name has appeared in other systems of writing, syllabic and alphabetic. From Ras Shamra comes the form **cprw** written in the alphabetic cuneiform common in texts from that site, in which the **Ayin** is distinct from other gutturals and the **b** is distinct from **p**. This form is, therefore, unambiguous. But the question has been raised whether this form, in particular the second consonant, is original or secondary. If the phonetic equivalence of **cprw** and **Ibrim** were to be maintained, the primacy of the **p** would still be favored by the fact that Ugaritic often preserves a more primitive Semitic form than does the Hebrew. On the other hand there is evidence of an original **b** becoming **p** in Ugaritic.

In Egyptian hieroglyphics appears the form **cprw** which is also without
ambiguity. But here again the question arises as to whether the p is primary or secondary. It can be shown that Egyptian p may represent foreign, including Semitic, especially when the b is immediately preceded or followed by l or r. Such, however, is not the rule and, as Kraeling observes, in the case of the cbrw, a people present in Egypt itself, it is difficult to assume an error of hearing on the part of the scribe.

The spelling ha-BIR-a-a is found twice in Babylonian documents of the 12th and 11th Centuries B.C. Commenting on this form B. Landsberger observes that "b nicht p als mittlerer Radikal steht durch die Schreibung ha-bir-a-a (IV R 34 Mr. 2, 5) fest." In signs, however, of the variety of consonant-vowel-consonant there is not only vocalic variability but flexibility of both consonants within the limits of their type.

By way of conclusion, there can be no doubt that the Ugaritic and Egyptian forms of the name definitely require that the consonant represented in the cuneiform syllable ha is Ca'yin. They also strongly support an original p. While there is a possibility that cbr is primary, it is highly probable that cbr is the original form. In fact, unless it can be shown that ha-BI-ru is to be equated with the Biblical cbr, there is no unquestionable evidence for cbr as even a secondary form.

B. VOWEIS

That the first vowel is A-type and the second is I-type is obvious from the cuneiform, ha-BI-ru; but it is more difficult to determine the length of these vowels. This question requires examination before one attempts to draw conclusions concerning the possibilities of phonetic equation with cbr.
1. THE A-VOWEL: According to Gustav, the form ha-AB-BI-ri shows that the a is short. He explains the doubling of the middle radical on the ground that consonants in Akkadian are often doubled after an accented short vowel. This possibility, however, rests on the doubtful opinion that the following I-vowel is short, for otherwise the penult would receive the accent. Another possible explanation of the doubling of the middle radical, although the phenomenon is rare and late, is that it indicates that the preceding vowel is long.

Other unusual forms have appeared which suggest that the A-vowel is long. One is ha-a-BI-ri-ia-an. Another is ha-a-BI-ri-ia-an. (cf. ha-a-BI-ri-ia-an). Finally, from Alalah comes the form ha-a3-BI-ru.

2. THE I-VOWEL: Inasmuch as short unaccented vowels between single consonants often drop out and the name ha-BI-ru is never formed without the i, it would seem that this i is long.

Further support for this is found in the spelling ha-BI-i-ra used for the Nuzu personal name (assuming this name may be identified with our ha-BI-ru). There are also the forms noted above: ha-a-BI-i-ri-ia-an and ha-a-BI-i-ri-ia-an.

CONCLUSION: The vocalization is largely a question of how much weight to attach to the exceptional spellings. Quite possibly they require two long vowels, producing the (apparently non-Semitic) form, apir. Perhaps only one vowel is long. It would be precarious, however, to assume that every indication of a long vowel is misleading and to adopt the form apir - or still less likely abir.

C. THE HEBREW EQUIVALENT

The difference in middle radicals between ha-BI-ru (read as
ha-pi-ru) and cIbr] would not be an insuperable obstacle for the phonetic
equation of the two. There are a few examples of a shift in Hebrew from
p to b. Nevertheless, this shift is not the rule and the difference
in labials must be regarded as a serious difficulty in the case for
equation.

If for the moment we allow the consonantal equation and examine the
vowels it will be found that the difficulties increase and the equation
can be regarded as at best a bare possibility. The following is a list
of the possible vowel combinations of ha-BI-ru (reading bi for the moment)
arranged with the most probable combinations first, along with their normal
Hebrew equivalents:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
{\text{cabir}} & \text{אַבִּיר} \\
{\text{cabir}} & \text{אָבִיר} \\
{\text{cabir}} & \text{אָבִיר} \\
{\text{cabir}} & \text{אָבָיר} \\
{\text{cabir}} & \text{אָבָיר} \\
{\text{cabir}} & \text{אָבָיר} \\
\end{array}
\]

Attempts have been made, however, to derive cIbr] from one or other
of these vowel combinations. The most plausible efforts are those which
assume two short vowels, cabir. Speiser suggests that "the form qitl
may go back to an older qatil" with the restriction that such forms derive
from stative, not transitive, verbs. In line with this, attention has
been called to the derivation of late Canaanite milk, "king", from older
malik, "prince." Stronger support for such an approach is found in the
alternation of ma-ši-ri and mi-ši-ri in the Ugaritic texts. Whatever
validity there may be in the theory of a qatil to qitl shift, it must
be remembered that such is not the dominant tendency. Moreover, the degree
of plausibility in applying such a principle in the present case is greatly
diminished by the following considerations: a) The combination of two short vowels (Cabir) is one of the less likely possibilities. b) The supposed shift from Cabir to Cibr did not occur according to our evidence in extra-biblical documents either earlier than or contemporary with the appearances of Cibr in the Bible. It is necessary to assume that the shift took place first and only with the Hebrew authors. And if we may not assume that the Hebrew form is based on a previous shift to Cibr elsewhere, then proof is required within the Hebrew language itself, and not merely, e.g., from inner-Canaanite developments, of a shift from qatil to qitl.33

CONCLUSION: The complete phonetic equation of ha-BI-ru and Cibr is at most a remote possibility. If a difference in morphology may be allowed while identity of denotation is also assumed (which is less plausible in the case of a proper noun than an appellative) the differences in the vowels could be readily accounted for and only the labial problem would remain as a phonetic obstacle in the way of the thesis of common derivation. The degree of probability for such an approach depends upon the question of the semantic equation (i.e., similarity in significance would lend plausibility to it, especially so if ha-BI-ru were not an ethnic term and if traces of Cibr as an appellative with the same meaning as ha-BI-ru were to be found in the Old Testament). This matter of semantics may best be considered in relation to the larger issue of the roles of the ha-BI-ru and the Hebrews in the social-historical structure of the ancient Near East.
SOCIAL STATUS
II SOCIAL STATUS

Beyond the possibilities of the phonetic equation of ha-BI-ru and ciart is the larger semantic question. The meaning of these terms may be sought through examination of the terms themselves and by a study of the groups they designate. It is time, however, to subordinate the word to the thing. Our subject, therefore, may now be formulated as the social status of the CApiru and the Hebrews, which we shall seek to trace through the meaning of the terms themselves and the data in their contexts. The main issues are: Are the CApiru an ethnic unit or perhaps a distinct tribal entity though not necessarily without racial mixture? Or are they a particular socio-economic class or professional guild, whether these be inter-ethnic (i.e., within several ethnic groups as e.g., hupšu, fugitives, dependents, or mercenaries) or super-ethnic (i.e., composed of several ethnic units as e.g., the general category of nomadic tribes)? And is ciart always ethnic in meaning, or are there at least traces of an appella­tive usage in the Old Testament?

A. THE CAPIRU

1) THE SIGNIFICATION OF HA-BI-RU

There are three avenues by which the meaning of the term ha-BI-ru may be approached: its etymology, its ideographic equivalent, and its morphology.

a) Etymology of ha-BI-ru: Before the evidence accumulated for CAyin as the first radical, many advocated a root hbr; and especially since
the identity of the guttural has become certain, many have favored the root $c\text{br}$ either in the sense of "passing (from place to place)" or "being a nomad," or in the sense of "crossing (the frontier)," i.e., a foreigner. A meaning similar to those arrived at by the verb $c\text{br}$, namely, "one from the other side (of the river)," is obtained if the derivation is traced directly to the preposition $c\text{br}$. Since the evidence has appeared for $p$ as the second radical, the suggestion has been made that the root is $c\text{par}$, "dust," yielding the derived meaning of "man of the steppe land" or "dusty (traveller)." The semantic association on either alternative is dubious, however. Goeze has suggested a hypothetical Semitic $c\text{pr}$, noting the Akkadian $ep\text{aru}$, "to provide," from which he would derive a verbal-adjective, $spirum$, "one provided with food." The further possibility remains that the root is non-Semitic. That it is not Akkadian has been maintained on the grounds that it begins with an Ayin, there are no Akkadian roots (either $b\text{pr}$ or $b\text{br}$) that yield a suitable sense, and the word is preceded in one Amarna letter by the diagonal mark used there to designate glosses and non-Akkadian words. That it is not West Semitic has been argued on the grounds that no West Semitic root $c\text{pr}$ provides a plausible meaning (which of course assumes that the reading of the surd is assured) and that the verb $hab/p\text{aru}$ (regarded as a denominative from $hab/p\text{iru}$) is found at Kültepe where a loan from West Semitic was not possible. Landsberger now holds that the word is Hurrian or some other substratum of the Semitic dialects of our documents. Agreeable to the Hurrian derivation are the Nuzu personal names $ba-BI-ra$ and $ba-BI-ir-til-la$, if these represent the same word as our $ba-BI-ru$ and if Purves is correct in his assumption of a Hurrian
base (hapir) for them. As for meaning, Landsberger says it is a synonym of munnabtu and that he was thus correct in his early article, "Habiru et Lulahhu," (1928), in suggesting the sense "étranger ayant traversé la frontière." Albright has cited the possibility of derivation from the Egyptian ḫpr, "to equip." 49

b) The Ideogram SA-GAZ: In some passages SA-GAZ is to be read habbātum, 50 but that this ideogram is frequently to be read as ha-BI-ru is no longer seriously questioned. 51 If then ha-BI-ru is a proper name, its ideographic equivalent, SA-GAZ, will provide a significant characterization of that people—or possibly a calumnious caricature, i.e., if it was originally applied to them by enemies. If ha-BI-ru is an appellative, it might, but not necessarily, be equivalent in meaning to SA-GAZ.

The Sumerian SA means "cord, tendon," and GAZ means "strike, kill;" therefore, the meaning "strangler" or "murderer" suggests itself for the combination SA-GAZ. 52 Or if SA is a variant here for SAG the meaning will be "strike the head" or more simply "smite." 53

Further light may be sought from habbātum, the other equivalent of SA-GAZ. The qattal form from the root habatu, "plunder," would mean "robber." 54 The possibility may not be overlooked, however, that another meaning also attached to habbātum, for the idea of being tax-free is found in certain other derivatives of habatu. 55 Although the meaning "plunderer" lends itself readily to certain unfavorable estimates of the general role of the CAbiru, the privilege of exemption from taxation would be more compatible with the respectable status they clearly enjoy in some circumstances and, indeed, it would not be incompatible with the role of the CAbiru as mercenaries or even as servants at Nuzu or slaves in Egypt. In addition, there are homonyms of the root habatu which require attention. 56 One is habatu
meaning "obtain, receive." Goetze suggests for the nomen professionis of this root the meaning "one who obtains his livelihood from somebody else, works for his livelihood, i.e., without wages, merely for board and keep." A second homonym means "experience, encounter," apparently with evil connotation. The gattal of this root might mean "victim" or the like.

The further possibility exists that SA-GAZ is a pseudo-ideogram. Such was formerly the position of Landsberger who said it was formed from Akkadian šaggâšu as RA-GAZ is from rakkâbum. It has been argued that the variant spellings like SA-GA-ÀZ and, especially, SAG-GAZ confirm this view, while the objection has been leveled against it that the Amarna spelling of GAZ by itself would then be inexplicable. If SA-GAZ is a pseudo-ideogram formed from šaggâšu, its meaning might, indeed, be "murderer." But another possibility lies in the fact that in the Gilgamesh Epic šaggâšum is used for Enkidu, describing him as an uncivilized native of the wild steppe-lands. It has also been suggested that šaggâšu may have been colored with the connotation of West Semitic *šs* and so meant "disturber" or "one who is restive." As to how SA-GAZ and ha-BI-ru became interchangeable, the possibilities may be indicated here although any decision will depend in part on the still to be considered question of whether ha-BI-ru is a proper name. The simplest explanation, if both terms are not proper nouns, would lie in a semantic equation of the two. Such would be the case if, for example, SA-GAZ signified habbâtu in the sense of "one who receives support" and ha-BI-ru meant "one provided for." A less direct semantic relation might also account for the interchange. An example of this would be SA-GAZ understood as "murderer" or "thug" and ha-BI-ru as "nomad." Or, the usage might be explained on historical grounds quite apart from semantic considerations.
For example, if it be supposed that the **SA-GAZ** were of every, or at least mixed, race but were predominantly *C*Apiru, the secondary equivalence, **SA-GAZ-ha-BI-ru**, might arise. 66 Or, if the *C*Apiru were generally disliked, they might have received as a name of opprobrium, **SA-GAZ, "thugs."** 67

c) Morphology: 68 The spelling **ha-BI-ru** could be the gentilic shortened from **ii-um** to **i**. 69 But the fact that the feminine is found at Nuzu as **ha-BI-ra-tu** 70 rather than the feminine gentilic **ha-BI-ri-i-tu** would suggest that the ambiguous **ha-BI-ru** is also non-gentilic. The situation is, however, complicated by several instances of both earlier and later varieties of the gentilic forms, i.e., **ha-BI-ru-u** 71 and **ha-BI-ru-a** 72 respectively. The form **ha-BI-ru-u** seems to be a stereotyped gentilic, for it is used as masculine and feminine and in the singular and plural of each gender. 73

Moreover, the awfl bābili type of gentilic formation is found in awālat **ha-BI-ri** 74 and awāl **ha-BI-ri**. 75

This variety of forms is paralleled in the forms used, for example, in the Old Testament for "Israelite." In addition to the rare gentilic **יִשִּׂרְאֵלֵי**, the common **יִשְׂרֵאֵל** 76 and **יִשְׂרָאֵל**. 77 the simple **יִשְׂרָאֵל** may be used with the meaning "Israelite(s)." 76 It would seem possible then that the simple form **ha-BI-ru** (or for the feminine, **ha-BI-ra-tu**) is used interchangeably with the gentilic **ha-BI-ru-u** in an ethnic sense. 77

There is thus an adequate explanation of the variety of forms, i.e., if they are all understood as denoting an ethnic group. But it is difficult to account for all the facts on the assumption that we are dealing with an appellative. While it is true that the gentilic is simply the adjectivalized form of the noun and is not necessarily ethnic, the gentilic forms of **ha-BI-ru** can hardly be disposed of with that observation. For the question would remain as to why, if **ha-BI-ru** were already an aptly descriptive
appellative, it would ever have been adjectivalized. Moreover, the \text{ha-BIR-a-a} type formation is used to adjectivalize the names of nations only.

2) CONTEXTUAL EVIDENCE

Throughout a millennium of Near Eastern history persists a specific something called the \text{Apiru}. What is the identifying mark of this long continuing entity? Conceivably it might be national, racial or ethnic unity. But if the common denominator lies elsewhere, what is it? This is a crux and, indeed, the crux of the whole complex inquiry into the identity of the \text{Apiru}. The problem then becomes that of discovering the fundamental trait which is inclusive enough to comprehend all the \text{Apiru}, but is sufficiently exclusive to be characteristic of the \text{Apiru} alone.

a) CRITICAL SURVEY OF VIEWS

Among the earlier suggestions were the views that the \text{Apiru} were prisoners of war or foreign-enemies or bound exiles. The failure of these concepts to do justice to the rapidly accumulating texts was soon recognized.

(1) NOMADISM

Another view, also early proposed but more popular and still advocated, seeks to define the \text{Apiru} in terms of nomadism. Usually this identifying feature has been somehow qualified, as by Noth who believed \text{ha-BJ-ru} to be the self-designation of nomads who had entered a settled area and tented there without property rights. Still further removed from the idea of pure desert nomadism was the view of Speiser that the \text{Apiru} were nomads not in the same sense as the Bedouin, but in so far as they were not settled permanently in any definite locality; as such they
were naturally foreigners to all with whom they came in contact so that the name would come to denote both nomads and foreigners of a certain type.\textsuperscript{85}

This interpretation of the ḪApiru was suggested by such data as their wide dispersal, the impression in the Mari texts of their being roving raiders,\textsuperscript{86} the migration of individual ḪApiru to Nuzu,\textsuperscript{87} their "cruising habit" seen in the Amarna letters (or even their large-scale invasion of or migration into Canaan and vicinity according to certain current interpretations of those letters), the occasional reference to them in texts in association with the nomadic Sutu,\textsuperscript{88} and the still-supported assumption of the root Ḫbr for Ḫa-BI-ru.

Offsetting such an impression of the ḪApiru as a variety of semi-nomads is the evidence that identifies them either as to present residence or origin with particular localities and depicts them as an integrated element in settled communities, both on the western and eastern ends of the Crescent.

From Ras Shamra comes the text of a 13th century Hittite-Ugaritic treaty\textsuperscript{89} which reveals the presence of a specific SA-GAZ territory in the realm of the Hittite king. Agreeably, a Hittite text\textsuperscript{90} dealing with a temple and its property refers to a particular Ḫa-BI-ri settlement. In the tax-lists of Niqmad II, king of Ugarit in the 14th century, there is mentioned the town, Halab of the SA-GAZ\textsuperscript{91} (written Ḫlb Ḫprm in alphabetic texts),\textsuperscript{92} or perhaps the quarter of Halab belonging to the SA-GAZ.\textsuperscript{93} Further evidence of ḪApiru settlements in Palestine-Syria is found in the 15th century Idri-mi inscription,\textsuperscript{94} which seems to be correctly interpreted by S. Smith when he says that the ḪApiru are here pictured as a tribal unit (rather than slaves or prisoners or any general social type) holding open country near the town of Ammia.\textsuperscript{95} Indeed the SA-GAZ texts generally from Alalah's 15th century level identify the SA-GAZ with permanent
settlements in localities all about Alalah. Possibly it is in terms of these Capiru settlements in Syria on the eve of the Amarna letter period that the Amarna forms LÚ.MES KI97 and LÚ.MES KI98 are to be understood.

Meanwhile from the eastern arm of the Fertile Crescent comes evidence of settled Capiru there. The 15th century Nuzu documents identify various Capiru with particular lands and cities: "from Ashur," #from Akkad#101 and "from Zarimena."102 And, of course, the servant status of the Capiru in the Nuzu area was far from nomadic.103 Earlier, in the Mari age, the Capiru mode of life seems similar to their status in Amarna age Palestine. But some Mari texts possibly reflect a more permanent association of the Capiru with certain towns than that of temporary military quarters;104 as in the cases, for example, of thirty Yamutbalite Capiru105 and the Capiru man from Eshnunna.106 Additionally, it is probable that when the Capiru were engaged as auxiliary troops by Hammurapi107 and earlier, in the Larsa dynasty, they had their own settlements. Relevant here is an economic text109 from Susa during the first dynasty of Babylon which mentions as one of the localities, apparently on the Elamite-Babylonian boundaries, where Amorite troops (ERIM MAR.TU) were quartered, a place called ha-BI-ri. Complete certainty on the relation of the Capiru to this place is not possible. Perhaps Capiru had founded the village or were at this time quartered there.

(2) DEPENDENCY

The accumulation of such evidence has led to the judgment that we see the Capiru in our texts evolving from a semi-nomadic life into a settled state.110 Indeed, Greenberg in his comprehensive study of the question has gone far beyond that and presents the thesis "that the
were an element of the settled rather than of the desert or nomadic population." They "appear usually as a recognized societal element. With few exceptions they are dependents—of states, cities, or individuals." And that, according to Greenberg, is the identifying trait: "capiru is the appellation of a population element composed of diverse ethnic elements, having in common only a generally inferior social status." The majority of them were of urban origin, their dependent status being due to the fact that they were as a rule foreigners in the towns where they are found, plus the fact that there were among them vagrant elements. As for the term, he believes the only explanation that does justice to this socially dependent status is Goetze's derivation from Semitic *CPR, with verbal adjective capir meaning, "one provided for" (cf. habbatu in the meaning "one who receives"). And just as the socio-legal classifications hupšu and muškēnu became international currency for similar classes in distinct cultures, so, apparently, was the case of ūaggāšu/capiru.

In giving due attention to the often neglected evidence for the settled status of many capiru, Greenberg performs a service. But the question is whether he has over-vaulted in his reaction to nomadic theories and more precisely in his identifying inferior, dependent, urbanite status as the common denominator of the capiru. Admittedly, social inferiority is the capiru lot in some situations, as witness the Nuzu servant contracts, the texts describing capiru in Egypt, a Hittite ritual which delineates the Hittite social scale, and, indeed, the mass of evidence which has produced the impression that semi-nomadism was the characteristic capiru mode of life. But while it is apparent that so vague a common denominator as generally inferior social status has the convenient advantage of spaciousness for purposes of enfolding all the capiru data, it is equally apparent
that it has the fatal disadvantage of characterizing numerous other groups quite as well as and even more successfully than it does the cApiru.

Greenberg, therefore, refines this definition by inserting into it the element of dependency. Now undeniably there are times when dependency characterizes the cApiru, as witness, e.g., the Old Babylonian administrative texts and some more recently noticed Nuzu ration lists. Nevertheless, it appears that this common denominator is inadequate for there are numerous instances of cApiru, both individually and collectively, who were not in a dependent status or even a socially inferior status.

For the Syrian area there are several witnesses. A 14th century record of Mursilis III's arbitration of a dispute between his vassal cities of Barga and Carchemish discloses that a SA-GAZ named Tette is the head of Barga (as well as of Nuhassi) and that the city of Iyaruwatas had been given to his grandfather by the Hurrian king. At Ugarit certain Akkadian texts reveal the SA-GAZ men apparently in the role of government officials. Among other privileges a grantee receives immunity from serving as royal messenger and from having either an ubru or SA-GAZ-ZA enter his house.

J. Lewy observes that the word ubru is used in the Kültepe texts in the sense of a "stranger" or "guest" and concludes that the parallelism here of ubrum and SA-GAZ is evidence "that ḫabiru denotes a particular class of aliens." In another of the Ugaritic texts, however, immunity from the entry of the ubru into the house is connected with the declaration that the grantee's possessions will not enter the palace. The ubru, therefore, would seem to be a government collector while the SA-GAZ found in the text in association with the ubru would also seem to be an agent of the government. His function (to judge especially from the Alalah texts) was probably that of conscripting men and matériel for military enterprises. This
conclusion is confirmed by a fragmentary Alalah name list which indicates the professional positions of those listed. One such position is described as ha-BI-ri. That it was a government office of some eminence follows from the fact that two persons thus designated appear between an awîl biti, "officer of the palace" and a mār šar-ru, "prince." Among the positions held by individual SA-GAZ in the Alalah sphere were those of the hazannu official, the bāru-priest and the chariot-owning maryannu.

Other instances of individual cApiru enjoying some measure of social eminence are found in the earliest and latest strata of the extant cApiru register. The cApiru we see in the 19th century B. C. Asia Minor are free men of wealth capable of paying a high ransom and operating in the service of a prince. In the 12th century B. C. there is Harbisipak, the cApiru, influential in the court of Mutakkil-Musku of Assyria, and in fact, the power behind the throne according to the remarks of Ninurta-nadin-sumati of the second dynasty of Isin. And in the 11th century B. C. there is Kudurra, the cApiru, friend of the Babylonian king Marduk-ehhe-eriba from whom he receives a royal grant of land.

There are also those general historical situations where the cApiru collectively are found operating as independently organized bodies. According to the Mari texts the cApiru at times conducted independent razzias in the region of Upper Mesopotamia in the manner of nomads and semi-nomads. That their autonomous activities were not confined to this area in the 18th century appears from the date formula on an Alalah document reading, "the year king Irkabtum made peace with Shemuba and the cApiru warriors. Peace treaties are not formulated between kings and dependent social classes. A similar role is played by the cApiru in Palestine in the Amarna age, for
their service, whether in the employ of native chieftains or of the Egyptians, was also on a free-booting basis. Moreover, if the SA-GAZ of the Akkadian omen texts may be equated with cApiru groups, the cApiru were notorious for their incursions into settled communities. For the standard prognostication attending unfavorable omens is "the SA-GAZ will appear in the land."131

A concluding evaluation may now be offered for the theories that the cApiru common denominator (and the appellative significance of ba-BI-ru) may be expressed in terms of either (semi-)nomadism or urbanite dependent status. As for the question of semi-nomadic or settled state, due attention to all the evidence compels the conclusion that it is not a matter of either/or but both/and. The cApiru are found in both states according to the molding influence of historical circumstances. The significance of this for the term ba-BI-ru is that it renders unconvincing an appellative meaning founded on either of these opposite aspects of their chequered career. Moreover, such appellative ideas would be too general to be distinctive of only those known as cApiru. All the desert roamers along the fringe of the Fertile Crescent had the same type of relationship with the inhabitants of the Sown as the cApiru in their semi-nomadic moments;132 and surely the settled cApiru held no monopoly on that condition.

Much the same criticism applies mutatis mutandis to Greenberg's emphasis on dependency. Numerous instances have been cited where the idea of dependency is altogether inappropriate, and there are others where dependent status, though not awkward, is not the compelling significance of the ba-BI-ru or SA-GAZ designation. Greenberg is aware of these but is able to regard them as "few exceptions" and not characteristic of "the core of the SA-GAZ/3."133 We cannot agree that it does justice to all these data to dismiss them as
a-typical. What forbids one's regarding the free-booting phases as the
typical and the instances of dependency as the a-typical? And whichever
way the scale might tilt on this, it will be a case of both/and even if it
is a case of more/less. And again the effect of this is to make precar­
ious if not impossible the view that the term ha-BI-ru is an appellative
with a meaning descriptive of dependent status—or of its opposite. More­
over, even if it could more successfully be shown that the cApiru were
classically dependent it could not be shown that all dependents
were cApiru or, in other words, that ha-BI-ru was an appellative signifying
dependent status applicable to any and all who were in such a status.

The identifying trait of the cApiru would still be elusive.

(3) FOREIGNNESS

A characteristic which would be compatible with any of the contrast­
ing theories already surveyed and was, indeed, explicitly mentioned as a
subordinate element by some of their advocates, is that of foreignness.
By itself, however, foreignness is too broad a characteristic to provide
the solution to our common denominator riddle. No matter how successfully
it might be shown that all the cApiru were foreigners where they are found,
it could always be shown that there were in those same places other
foreigners, not identified with the cApiru. But what if the concept of
foreignness be more specifically circumscribed; might it not then have the
qualities of comprehensiveness and specificity both of which are necessary
for an appellative? There are enough scholars who believe it might, to make
this approach in one variety or another the most popular answer abroad today
for the ha-BI-ru question.

The position of J. Lewy has consistently been that the cApiru were
immigrant foreigners or resident aliens, who having left their native lands.
found their living elsewhere in the service of governments or, less frequently, in the service of private citizens. Dhorme now believes that the Apis were emigrants who fled to a strange country for one reason or another; in short, displaced persons. A. Alt has long held that the Apis were a congeries of rootless characters whose former fortunes and social position had suffered shipwreck in the turmoil of changing orders and who thus torn loose from former tribal connections found themselves without standing, means, or rights in a new order. B. Landsberger even earlier presented and still maintains a similar view: the Apis are ethnically mixed bands of family-less, tribe-less, isolated fugitives in foreign lands. J. Bottero, finally, aligns himself with the Lewy-Landsberger-Alt approaches which he deems complementary and, taken together, a comprehensive enough framework for all the ha-BI-ru texts. In developing this, Bottero’s chief emphasis falls on flight from original environment as the common denominator.

In these variations of the view that the Apis are those who have crossed the boundaries into foreign territory there are two elements: the present condition of the one who has crossed the frontier and the past cause that led him to do so (or the manner in which he did so). It will be our first concern to indicate that those varieties of this approach which emphasize the fugitive’s present condition are unsuccessful in their effort to discover the definitive feature of the Apis.

Lewy emphasizes the resident, servile character of the "hapiru" immigrant. In that respect his position is about identical with Greenberg’s definition in terms of settled, dependent status and it is open to the same criticisms. Even if Lewy’s definition were more adequately comprehensive it would not be sufficiently specific. For example, the Apis do appear to be alien
servants as they are seen in the realm of the Hittites but what then is the distinction between the Āpiru and the Lulahhu, who were also foreign servants there? Or did not the Sutu play the same role of foreign mercenaries in Amarna age Palestine as did the Āpiru from whom they are nevertheless distinguished\(^{144}\) as they are also in the Idri-mi inscription?\(^{145}\) And while at Nuzu the Āpiru were new arrivals in the Mitannian area and servants to the state and to private individuals, other foreign servants not identifiable as Āpiru worked side by side with them there.\(^{146}\)

Landsberger, Alt and Dhorme accent the negative in describing the condition of the Āpiru subsequent to his crossing the frontier of his native land. He is family-less, tribeless, property-less, right-less, rootless. The individuals, according to Landsberger, give their name to the bands in which they organized themselves. The relation of these to the more settled population blocks depended on the condition of the latter. If the local authority was stable and strong the Āpiru were content to be dependents in the state employ; if things were anarchic, the Āpiru played the independent opportunists.

This evaluation of the Āpiru does not, however, satisfy all the evidence. It has been observed above that Lewy insists, and correctly, that the Nuzu texts refute Landsberger's repeated assertion that the Āpiru were "heimatlos" and without "Familienzugehörigkeit."\(^{147}\) And it is quite impossible to take account of the status of the Āpiru in Syria from about the 13th to 15th centuries B.C. (and possibly for a considerable while earlier) as revealed in the Ugarit and Alalah material and to conclude that it was of the essence of the Āpiru status to be property-less, right-less and rootless. For in that situation is found a large Āpiru population with its own property holdings and cattle, with its share of government
officials, aristocracy, military officers, and cultic functionaries, along with its contributions to the lower ranks of wardum and shepherd. Neither does it appear that there is any solid basis for Alt's evaluation of the Apiru of the Amarna letters as being a social class in revolt.

Bottero has benefited from witnessing so intimately the Paris conflict of the savants on this problem, for he recognizes the partial validity of their various mutually contradictory theories and he is impressed with the fact that each cancels out its opposite as a candidate for the sine qua non of "Apiru-ness." He believes, however, that all the antinomies can be resolved by the supposition that the Apiru were refugees, men who had fled their native lands. This would explain why they appear as strangers, why they are found well-nigh everywhere, and why they have such a variety of names. It would account for the fact that some settled down in assigned places subject to the local authorities, while others organized into independent, outlaw bands. It would account, too, for the fact that while some may have been absorbed into the new culture, others preserved some of their native traditions and thus are found, for example, to have their own gods. It would also explain why the term ha-BI-ru sometimes denotes a social class (i.e., fugitives) and yet is used as the equivalent of an ethnic term (i.e., they were all men of foreign origin who had renounced their place of origin). What fortune, from kingship to slavery, might not befall the fugitive Apiru?

In support of this Apiru-fugitive equation, Bottero appeals to the general fact that flight into strange countries was a common phenomenon in the Near East, especially in the 2nd millennium B.C. He appeals also to certain specific items in Apiru texts: in a treaty of Hattusilis III
with the king of Ugarit, the Hittite monarch pledges himself to the extra-
dition of all subjects of the Ugaritic king, whether of high or low social
status, who revolt against their king and flee into the territory of the
SA-GAZ of the Hittite king. \footnote{156}{That SA-GAZ is here to be read ha-BI-ru
and not habbâitu is clear from the fact that ordinary robbers would not be
so available to the control of the Hittite king that he could engage him-
sel£ to return refugees hiding among them. From the fact observable here
that the territory of the °Apiru among the Hittites was the natural haven
for political refugees or runaway slaves heading in that direction from
Ugarit, Bottero would draw the conclusion that the °Apiru were those who
had escaped from some former social environment into a new country. \footnote{157}{While the just-mentioned treaty appears to Bottero the only text
that offers the elements for a definition, he finds that other texts confirm
that definition. A Cappadocian text dealing with one Shupiahshu who
leaves Kanish for the country of Ziluna in order to escape from his creditors,
describes this action by means of the verbal form ha-BI-ar-ma. \footnote{158}{According
to Landsberger, this verb, "hapârum," is a denominative from "hapiru";\footnote{159}{according to J. Lewy, it is an Akkadianized form corresponding to West
Semitic °br, "pass over," and ha-BI-ru is derived from it. \footnote{160}{In either
case, if there is any etymological connection one way or another between
this verb and ha-BI-ru, the meaning of the latter would be "fugitive" or
"one who crosses over the frontier." But it is uncertain whether or not
that is a condition which is contrary to fact.

In a letter written by Iasim-El to the court at Mari, the author
mentions an °Apiru who had fled from Eshunna and in search of whom he is
engaged, perhaps for purposes of extradition. \footnote{161}{Idri-mi, when he had to flee from Aleppo and failed to find satisfactory
asylum elsewhere, came and abode among the "Apiru warriors during the seven years of his political exile before his restoration to his throne.162

Similar is the experience in Canaan of the king of Hazor who left his city and went over to the SA-GAZ.163 So also did Amanhatbi, a lord of Hazi, when loyalist forces brought pressure to bear on him.164 And Iapahi of Gezer laments that his younger brother having revolted against him had departed and given over his two hands to the SA-GAZ.165

Finally, Bottéro suggests with less force that the Nuzu contracts give the impression of dealing with fugitives in the case of the "Apiru who are from Assyria or Akkad and who in some cases have arrived within the year.166 Even less cogently he appeals to the "Apiru of the Alishar text who are held for ransom.

In this connection may be recalled the observation of Landsberger that peoples who used Akkadian or "Accadogrammes" and in whose language munnabtu is frequent do not employ the word "npiru" and vice versa.167

This formulation of Bottéro then is not committed to any specific traits as essential to the condition of an "Apiru-immigrant in his new environment (other than the foreignness involved in his being an immigrant) but would rather discover the mark of the "Apiru in the circumstances of his emigration. His view is, therefore, not as vulnerable as the others to direct contradiction by specific documentary evidence; for though there is considerable information concerning the area where Bottéro is non-committal, the reconstruction of the phase of the "Apiru career which he singles out as their hallmark is much more a matter of deduction from scattered hints. At the same time such an approach places the burden of proof heavily on Bottéro's position and it is exceedingly doubtful that the supporting data are adequate to sustain the load. The argument for the meaning of "fugitive" from the term ha-BI-ru itself hangs from a thread. The one "Apiru fugitive hounded
by Iasim-El is after all the lone CApiru of all our documents caught in the act of flight. And while there is a strong case for the fact that an CApiru camp or settlement was, in some areas at least, about as good a place as any for a fugitive to find concealment or refuge beyond the reach of authorities, whether nearby or remote, that is certainly not proof that all or even a large percentage of the CApiru were themselves fugitives. Other explanations of the phenomenon are ready at hand. In the instances from the Amarna letters, for example, it is clearly a case of native leaders seeking refuge among independent bands of mercenary troops. Among the Hittites, the SA-GAZ were a foreign settlement and as such a more logical goal for a fugitive than a native Hittite center where extradition laws could be more readily enforced. Moreover it is most unlikely that an appellative that designated a man as having been a fugitive or even as the descendant of one who had been a fugitive would persist as the identifying epithet of men long after they or even their fathers had become an integrated and respected element in a given social structure. Such appears to have been the case with the CApiru at least in and around Alalah. 168

b) ETHNIC UNITY

Up to this point in our probe for the CApiru denominator the popular current assumption has been allowed that the CApiru possessed no national, racial, or ethnic unity. That assumption is not altogether unchallenged in recent studies. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the possibility of some sort of ethnic unity, especially in view of the unsatisfactory nature, as the present writer sees it, of the efforts to identify the specific trait of the CApiru in terms of some social class.

Several matters require attention in this examination: the CApiru names, their wide dispersal, their gods, and the problems of accretions to
their ranks and of their relationships with other groups, social and ethnic.

(1) Names: The onomastic evidence is often urged in support of a non-ethnic view of the cApiru for the names they bear range inside and outside the Semitic sphere. "The Analyzable Old Babylonian names are Akkadian; those from Alalah are, with few exceptions, non-Semitic; one of the two from Anatolia is non-Semitic; from Babylon and Ashshur of the Middle period-Kassite. At Nuzi H. names, mostly Akkadian, differ in a marked degree from those of the local (in this case, Hurrian) population."\(^{169}\) Caution, however, is required in drawing ethnic conclusions from onomastic data. A migratory group, even if ethnically self-conscious, will adopt names current in the lands they visit, for imitation of the higher social strata of the environment is a common human foible.\(^{170}\) Certainly that was the practice of the Israelites and the cApiru (whatever else they were not) were equally human. While, therefore, the onomastic data is obviously compatible with a non-ethnic view it is explicable on an ethnic view. On the latter view, the cApiru will everywhere have assimilated their names to the indigenous population except, as far as the evidence goes, at Nuzu where they were apparently recently arrived from a Semitic area and even there the process of assimilation to Hurrian names may be seen to have begun.

(2) Wide Dispersal: The wide geographical as well as chronological distribution of the cApiru has earned for them in modern studies the epithet, "ubiquitous." And this wide dispersal throughout the Fertile Crescent and adjacent areas has been judged to be a difficulty for an ethnic interpretation of them. Nevertheless, this feature is not decisive in favor of a non-ethnic view, for it would be explicable on the assumption that islands of cApiru population were left in the wake of large scale and long range tribal migration.\(^{171}\) It is true that the notion of a general
westward movement of the cApiru from Babylonia about the Fertile Crescent is too much dependent on the accident of archival discovery and is not suggested by the fact that, even according to present evidence, the cApiru are found from Sumer to Alalah and Alishar by the 19th and 18th centuries. If, therefore, the cApiru are an ethnic element, their wide dispersal might better be envisaged as so many deposits of a large ethnic wave that washed over the Fertile Crescent before even our earliest extant mention of the cApiru in Babylonia. If so, there then arises the question of whether their ultimate origins were from the desert enclosed by the Crescent or from the tracts beyond.

We may conclude then that the broad geographical distribution of the cApiru, while it is agreeable to other theories of the specific unity of the cApiru, does not make impossible the theory of ethnic unity. And it would help to explain, on an ethnic basis, the apparent lack of national consciousness among the scattered cApiru and their failure to make a concerted effort to achieve some common destiny and renown.

(3) Gods: The references to the "gods of the cApiru" in the Hittite treaties come as no surprise on the assumption that the cApiru were an ethnic or tribal group. It would not be as common for inter-ethnic professional groups to have guild deities and it is unlikely that a general social class had its own gods.

Also to be accounted for is the appearance of the god dša-BI-ru in an Assyrian "Götteradressbuch" and in Hittite rituals. Jirku concluded that dša-BI-ru was the "Stammesgott" of the cApiru (cf. Ashur). If that is so, this dša-BI-ru would be one of the unnamed "gods of the cApiru" in view in the Hittite treaties. It is possible that the similarity of dša-BI-ru and Lúša-BI-ru is accidental, but otherwise there could be
here evidence of the tribal character of the CApiru in the appearance of their eponymous tribal god.\textsuperscript{179}

(4) Accretions: In opposing the view that the CApiru were an ethnic or tribal unit Greenberg appeals to what he believes to be evidence in the Amarna letters for accretions to the CApiru ranks.\textsuperscript{180} Thus, Abdi-Ashirta is called the GAZ-man.\textsuperscript{181} Again, "the townsmen of Lachish, after committing an offense against the king, are said to 'have become Ḫ.'"\textsuperscript{182} There is also Amanhatbi who "fled to the SA-GAZ men."\textsuperscript{183}

Incidentally, these texts are on Greenberg's own interpretation of them singularly ill-chosen proof texts for his thesis that dependent status was the CApiru hallmark. For on his interpretation certain non-CApiru became CApiru by the act of revolting from dependence under certain authorities in order to engage in independent enterprise. Actually, it is far more plausible to interpret the texts in question to mean simply that certain villagers and leaders of Canaan in rebelling against Pharaoh and his loyalists were identifying themselves with the efforts of the guerrilla bands of CApiru, who, though they might hire out to Pharaoh's agents if it were convenient, were chiefly notorious for their defiance of Egyptian authority and interests in Canaan. In so doing, these Canaanites became "like GAZ-men\textsuperscript{184} but did not actually become SA-GAZ.

(5) Relationships of the CApiru with Other Groups: In various texts the CApiru appear in lists as one of several itemized groups. By observing the character of the groups with which the CApiru are compared and contrasted something may be learned of their nature.

In a Hittite ritual designed to counteract "quarrel" the CApiru (LÚ.MEŠ₂₃₂₃₂BI-ri-ia-aš) appear in a list of social classes.\textsuperscript{185} The first part of this list deals with the upper and the second with the lower strata
Heading the second part of the list are the paired Lulahhu and cApiru, who are thus intermediate between the freeborn citizens and the slaves. This pairing of the Lulahhu and the cApiru is common in Hittite rituals and treaties. The Lulahhu are the people of Lullu and it would thus appear that the cApiru were also an ethnic group and that when these two ethnic groups appear together in a list of Hittite social classes, they represent the social class of foreigners or "barbarians" among the Hittites.

Several of the Egyptian cApiru texts belong in this category. In the Memphis Stele of Amenophis II, 3,600 "cpr" are cited among the captives carried off by the Pharaoh on his second Asiatic campaign. They are preceded by 127 (or 217 or 144) princes of "Rtuw" (a designation of Syro-Palestine) and 179 brothers of princes, and they are followed by three terms which are geographical in connotation: 15,200 "S36w" (Bedouin, especially to the south of Palestine), 36,300 "Fr.w" (the settled population of Palestine and Syria, the term itself corresponding to Hurri), and 15,070 "Ngs" (people of Nuhassi). The intermediate position of the cApiru, in the order of the list and numerically, between the aristocracy and the ethnic terms makes it difficult to determine whether the cApiru were a social class or ethnic group. Their place in the arrangement would indicate, however, that if they were non-ethnic they were in the eyes of the Egyptians an important, perhaps, semi-aristocratic group.

Ramses III left a kind of testamentary enactment stating the properties accumulated by the temples of Thebes, Heliopolis, and Memphis through his benefactions. In the Heliopolitan section the serfs of the temple are listed as follows: "warriors, sons of (foreign) princes, maryannu, cpr-w, and the settlers who are in this place: 2,093 persons. Altogether a
total of 12,364 persons were added to the Heliopolitan estates.

In the Wadi Hammamat there is a stele erected in the third year of Ramses IV by a large expedition of 8,362 men (not counting some 900 who perished on the desert journey and in the quarry labors) sent to procure monumental blocks of stone.\(^{192}\) The personnel are recorded in full. Heading the list is the high priest of Amon. Then follow 9 civil and military officers of rank (Nos. 2-10), 412 subordinate officers (Nos. 11-16, 18, 21, 22), 5,000 infantry (No. 17), 800 \(\text{Cpr(w)}\) of the bowmen of \(\text{Cnt}\) (or \(\text{Cnr}\)) (No. 19), 2,000 slaves (No. 20), 130 quarrymen and stone-cutters (No. 25), and 10 trained artificers and artists (Nos. 23, 24, 26, 27).

Similarly, two hieratic papyri\(^{193}\) from Memphis dated to the reign of Ramses II depict \(\text{Cpr-w}\) working alongside men of the army and dragging apparently large blocks of stone on wheelless sledges for work on a royal building or temple. Even though these texts, which are in the form of instructions to a scribe to issue grain to the workers, may be model letters to teach the art of writing, they envisage real situations.\(^{194}\)

From these texts it appears that the \(\text{C}^\text{Apiru}\) were in the eyes of the Egyptians a clearly distinguishable and countable group, distinct from the Bedouin and from the general population of Syro-Palestine. That does not favor the theory that the \(\text{C}^\text{Apiru}\) were an indistinct social class such as dependents or fugitives or nomads.\(^{195}\) Of course in Egypt itself they are prisoners of war and often, therefore, slaves; but this social status is local and secondary. More precisely, to the Egyptians the \(\text{C}^\text{Apiru}\) were a military corps from Syro-Palestine which was somehow but clearly distinct from other such military forces both general (e.g., the \(\text{Hr-w}\)) and elite (e.g., \(\text{Mryn-w}\)), and which as observed, ranked above the ordinary population. Egyptian evidence does not locate the \(\text{C}^\text{Apiru}\) in any specific geographic area.\(^{196}\)
nor in itself clearly suggest or forbid that they were an ethnic unit. 197

At times ha-BI-ru is used as at least the equivalent of an ethnic term. For example, one Mari text records that "the men of Talhaya and the oApiru have raided Luhaya."198 This type of coordination with an ethnic term, however, does not prove that the oApiru were necessarily an ethnic group but only that they possessed some common feature which served as effectively as ethnic unity to distinguish them from others. It does suggest though that the oApiru stood in ethnic detachment from the rest of the community where they are found. On the other hand the possibility of the oApiru constituting an ethnic unity is not disproved by texts which specify a certain town, country or area as their place of immediate origin. 199 Such texts might also be interpreted as being concerned with a somehow distinct and detached population element (possibly even an intrusive ethnic stock) not indigenous to and perhaps only temporarily located in the place in question.

The major considerations bearing on the possibility of oApiru ethnic unity have now been surveyed. It should also be mentioned in this connection, however, that there are indications of family relationships200 and self-contained communities or tribal organization201 in the oApiru pattern of life. The evidence of morphology, it may also be recalled, seemed to be most reasonably interpreted as pointing to an ethnic group. The conclusion indicated is that it is easiest to account for all the facts on the assumption that at least the core of the oApiru constituted an ethnic unity.

c) ETHNO-PROFESSIONAL STATUS

The foregoing conclusion need not mean that ethnic unity and identity was the only or even the dominant element in the conception and reality
denoted by the term ha-BI-ru. As a matter of fact it is their professional character which frequently is in the foreground as the term ha-BI-ru appears in the record of their life and exploits. And that professional role is military. If nothing else is obvious about the CApiru, and apparently nothing else is, nevertheless that they are almost everywhere and always engaged as fighting men is obvious. They are repeatedly found functioning as mercenaries manning state garrisons—as at Ur, Larsa, Babylon, Susa and in Anatolia—or conducting razzias along the Euphrates and throughout Palestine and Syria or enduring the fate of military captives in Egypt.

It is not maintained here that ha-BI-ru is in our documents an appellative which denotes some type of military activity. Ha-BI-ru is rather a proper name the etymology of which, even if known to the authors of these documents, was not their conscious concern in employing it. The denotation of ha-BI-ru is a twin thing, the correlative elements of which are a particular ethnic character and a particular military function. As a proper noun it does, locally at least, develop a specialized significance. Thus there is the LU ha-BI-ri officer of Alalah, (cf. SA-GAZ officer of Ugarit) and in some areas it is quite likely that only the military connotation of the term was in the user's mind even when he used it (not of an individual officer but) of members of the group generally. Such seems to be the case in the Old Babylonian and Egyptian texts. In the Alalah material (which is more fully examined immediately below), and in that of Ras Shamra and Amarna the ethnic connotation is apparently adjectival and the military substantival.

Of outstanding importance at this point is the Alalah evidence. Here the term ha-BI-ru (or SA-GAZ) is clearly employed to denote the members of a particular military corps. The theory that the CApiru were everywhere
some specific kind of social class as were the ḫupšu is directly contradicted by the details provided concerning the constituency of the ĈApiru corps of Alalah. The Hurrianized society of Alalah was divided into distinct social classes.206 The top rung was occupied by the maryannu. Then followed a free class of tradesmen, the ehešena. Next came the rural dwellers called ṣâbeh namê,207 subdivided into the ḫupšu and haniahu. There were also, as always, the poor (the muškenu), and the slaves. Now the significant thing is that the membership of the ĈApiru corps cut across these recognized social classes.208 For it comprised ehešena,209 muškenu,210 slave,211 and even the maryannu (according to the probable implications of the charioteers in the ĈApiru corps212 and according to the most probable interpretation of the list of family chiefs, AT. 198, especially line 42).

Alongside the ĈApiru as a second distinct military body at Alalah is the ṣanannu corps.213 The two groups have much in common. Like the ĈApiru, the ṣanannu corps is composed of members of the various social categories.214 Both groups are composed in part of charioteers. The members of both groups come from various towns around Alalah215 and farther afield.216 While the ĈApiru and ṣanannu are not coordinated with social classes they are both coordinated with towns as such. Thus in a cattle census217 the totals are given in terms of the sheep, rams, and asses belonging to four groups: Alalah, Mukish,218 the SA–GAZ, and the ṣanannu. The ṣanannu total of this list is found itemized elsewhere219 in terms of sixteen towns around Alalah.

What then is the distinction between the ĈApiru and the ṣanannu corps? One possibility would be that it was (at least on the ĈApiru side) ethnic, as in the case of David's Palethites and Cherethites. Or the distinction
might lie in the area of military specialization. Albright, relating the šanənnu of Alalah to the šnn of the Ugaritic texts, compares Akkadian šanənu and suggests šnn, "to strive," as the common stem; he translates šanənu as "archers," but it is uncertain. Even if that translation be accepted it would be precarious to suppose the distinction in question was that only the šanənnu corps possessed archers, especially in view of the reference to the ³Apıru of the bowmen of ḫ-(?) in the Wadi Hammamat inscription.

It may help to bring the ³Apıru into clearer focus to observe that comparable to their dual character as an ethnic-military group is the two-sided maryannu status. For the maryannu on the professional side were the experts in chariots, while on the ethnic side the characteristic core and bulk of them belonged to the Indo-Aryan stock, which constituted the ruling and patrician class in the unusual symbiosis of Mitannian society. Caution is necessary in extending the parallel since, as has been noted, the Alalah ³Apıru corps cuts across the other social categories and includes maryannu. A specifically social connotation did not attach to ḫa-BI-ru as aristocratic standing was implicit in "maryannu." The ³Apıru and maryannu classifications are not, therefore, completely coordinate. Nevertheless, the maryannu do offer a social phenomenon in the immediate historical context of the ³Apıru which is comparable to that offered here as an interpretation of the ³Apıru, particularly with respect to the essential point of the correlativity of ethnic and professional character in one group. And if we may regard the ³Apıru and maryannu as kindred phenomena, the ³Apıru will have been, within the Mitannian orbit at least, a kind of guild. Moreover, this compatibility of the ³Apıru phenomenon with the pattern of Hurrianized society might well be regarded as an indication that
the ultimate geographical-cultural origins of the CApiru and the several elements in the migratory intrusion that resulted in Mitanni were associated.

Such an approach has the advantage of being based upon that which is known and pervasive in the texts as over against Bottero's view, the foundation of which is in the shadowy area of scattered hints. At the same time this approach has the chief virtue of Bottero's view, which is its ability to account for the antinomies in the CApiru characteristics. As for the usage of the term ha-BI-ru, partly ethnic, partly professional (or perhaps originally ethnic, later and/or locally professional) it is not without parallel. Another example of such a development is the use of "Chaldean" for a particular religious caste even while the term was being used to denote a dominant ethnic group.

Ordinarily it would be contradictory to hold that a distinctive ethnic character was essential to the nature of a group and simultaneously to allow the validity of evidence for their ethnic diversity. Now in the examination of this question above it was concluded that none of the evidence demonstrated conclusively that the CApiru were racially mixed. But if an opposite conclusion were adopted it would be compatible with our dual interpretation of the CApiru, for it might well have been that added to the characteristic core stock were accretions to the military organization from various other ethnic stocks. Precisely that situation obtained in the case of the maryammu who were characteristically but not exclusively Indo-Aryan.

Also adjustable as concomitant traits on our view of the CApiru are their settled and free-booting phases. The latter isolated from the former has led to the theory that the CApiru were a 2nd millennium B.C. counterpart to the condottieri of the late Middle Ages, (i.e., bands of men, with their families, giving themselves to banitry when they could not
This theory properly recognizes the family structure and fighting profession of the ³Apiru but is one-sided in that it does not do justice to the other phase of their history which finds them an integral, respected and long since settled element in a highly developed cultural complex. Both phases find room, however, within the historical vicissitudes of an ethnic but far-flung group, in the shaping of whose history the dominant factor was a committal to the military profession. The pursuit of happiness for them would often become the pursuit of trouble—and a hectic chase it led the ³Apiru in some parts of the Fertile Crescent in the 2nd millennium B.C. But militarists who identify themselves permanently with a particular political-cultural movement can there achieve a deep-rooted and influential status. Indeed, the warriors along with the priests generally constituted the two highest social classes. Such an exchange of loyalty and recognition marks the status of the ³Apiru within the Mitannian hegemony, especially in the Alalah-Ugarit sector. And the explanation of this points again to the probability of a prior kinship of some sort between the parties in this alliance.

Within this framework there is room for periods of more peaceful pursuits either on the part of segments of the ³Apiru ethnic whole who did not participate in the ³Apiru military guild (if, indeed, there were such) or even on the part of ³Apiru militarists who found themselves in situations where their professional services were not desired, while their families still required support. Indeed, the answer to the problem of why the ³Apiru at Nuzu felt compelled to give up a measure of their freedom for a measure of security, as they did in accepting the terms of their servant contracts, might simply be that as professional militarists they were not sufficiently adept at peaceful occupations to support themselves.
successfully by such means, especially in an area where they were recently arrived. Moreover, if it be asked why they did not resort to the razzia as they did elsewhere or why they did not remain in areas where they might serve as mercenaries, these very questions point us once more to the likelihood that more than anywhere else in the Fertile Crescent the ĉApiru belonged in the Hurrian or Mitannian orbit. They apparently shared common traditions, culture or even race with one or more elements of the Mitannian symbiosis. In Egypt, Asia Minor and elsewhere the ĉApiru might be foreigners and their settlement a refuge for fugitives but in Mitanni they seem somewhat more "at home."

In other words, we cannot ask simply, What?—but must also ask, When and Where? For it is impossible to establish the existence of any one common trait which is so absolutely pervasive that it would support the theory that ha-BI-ru is used in our texts as an appellative. The ĉApiru refuse to be contained by one nice social category. Socially, they are one thing here and the opposite there. These opposites it has been necessary to explain as secondary and adjectival, while that which was primary and substantival has been found in a broader ethno-professional concept. Even then it has been necessary to reckon with the varying relations of this people to other peoples. In short, it has come to appear that we cannot satisfactorily define the social status of the ĉApiru without taking account of their historical relations and so we have been transgressing on our next chapter.

B. THE ĈIBRIM

The Gentile ĈÎprî is used in the Old Testament only for Abraham and his descendants and is clearly an ethnic term. It is found almost
exclusively in a few clusters which indicates that particular circumstances account for its employment. One such group appears in the narrative of the Egyptian sojourn and bondage; a second, in the record of Israelite-Philistine relationships during the days of Samuel and Saul; and a third in a series of passages dealing with the manumission of Hebrew servants. There are in addition the isolated appearances in Genesis 14:13 and Jonah 1:9.

The great majority of these are instances of non-Israelites speaking to or about Israelites, or of Israelites speaking to foreigners or of declarations of God destined for foreigners. Where it is the Israelite author who applies the term to the Israelites he is at times adapting his terminology to the usage in the context. In several passages a contrast is drawn between Israelites and other ethnic groups.

It has been suggested that within these narrow limits of the use of הָעַרְבִּים, it uniformly possesses a peculiar connotation. According to Parzen, is everywhere a derogatory appellation; for the contexts deal with servitude, whether they be slave legislation or records of economic enslavement or political subjection. DeVaux finds the common element in the fact that the הָעַרְבִּים are strangers in the milieu. He maintains that others used it of them with "une nuance de mépris" and that the Israelites were reluctant to apply it to themselves. Kraeling, though rejecting the idea of derogatory nuance, suggest that הָעַרְבִּים is an alternative for "Israelite" in situations where the designee is not a free citizen in a free community or on free soil. He finds this to be applicable not only in all the main clusters but in the cases of Abraham (Gen. 14:13) and Jonah as well. This formulation of Kraeling seems to be successful in unravelling a strand common to all the הָעַרְבִּים contexts, but that this demonstrates that
possessed the particular nuance he suggests does not necessarily follow. It seems to be a sounder position to maintain that clbrIsrael is a plain ethnic designation without any peculiar nuance. The occurrences in Genesis will need no special explanation for at that time (before the use of the honorific "children of Israel") there was no other gentilic available. And as for the subsequent period, the choice of clbrIsrael may be adequately accounted for by the particular circumstances and purposes suggested above.239

Particular notice must now be taken of a few passages where, in the opinion of some, the term is used in a non-ethnic sense. These are:
(1) the Hebrew-servant legislation, (2) I Samuel 13 and 14, and (3) Genesis 14:13.

1) THE CEBED clbrIsrael PASSAGES

Some have held that in the legislation of Exod. 21:2 and Deut. 15:12, and the references to these laws in Jer. 34:9, 14, the term clbrIsrael is used to denote a particular variety of servanthood not the ethnic character of the servant. J. Lewy develops this theory on the basis of his opinion that the term ha-BI-ru in the Nuzu contracts is an appellative meaning "foreign-servant." He then maintains that the parallels between the status of the ha-BI-ru servants of the Nuzu area and the clbrIsrael of Exod. 21:2 and its associated passages are so close and numerous as to require that clbrIsrael have the same appellative significance of "foreign-servant."241

Lewy supports his thesis with the considerations that the ha-BI-ru are present in the Mitannian orbit in the period during which the clbrIsrael became a nation and that the whole area in question had been unified under the Hyksos with the result that the same technical terms and analogous institutions are found throughout this area. It is the opinion of Lewy that this
social-legal apppellative usage of Ħibrî represents the earliest stage but that later the term was used in an ethnic sense for the descendants of the "Hebrews par excellence."

But is the situation on the Nuzu side clearly as Lewy has reconstructed it? There are texts in which the person(s) concerned is not designated as an ha-BI-ru and yet the essential clauses of the contract are those characteristic of the contracts where the persons are labeled as ha-BI-ru. It is, therefore, difficult to insist that we are dealing with a specifically ha-BI-ru type of servanthood. It is just as plausible to theorize that the economic-political circumstances of the ha-BI-ru (conceived of ethnically or even as a social class of far broader character than Lewy's suggested "foreign-servant" variety) disposed them at this time and place to enter in large numbers into servanthood. We have, of course, advocated above a specific alternate interpretation. While, therefore, ha-BI-ru are found in the great majority of these contracts, it is not to be supposed that ha-BI-ru are necessarily involved in all of them.

Especially relevant is the figure of Attilammu the Assyrian in the servant contract JEN VI 613:2. Even when this text in abbreviated form is included in the Sammelurkunde JEN V 456 between two contracts in which the persons are specifically designated as ha-BI-ru (i.e., in a situation where there would be a tendency to uniformity), Attilammu is still not described as an ha-BI-ru. The evidence, therefore, does not allow one to assume with certainty the existence in the Nuzu area of a specifically ha-BI-ru brand of slavery.

But even if Lewy's view of the Nuzu situation were to be accepted, the Biblical evidence would contradict the notion that Ħibrî is identical in meaning with the ha-BI-ru ("foreign servant") of Nuzu. For one thing the
ceced in the phrase cebed 0Ibri (Exod. 21:2) would then be tautological. Alt feels obliged to excise it from the text. But more decisive is the fact that the Biblical legislation is patently not dealing with foreign servants. It is concerned with those who were their masters' brethren. Thus, in Deut. 15:12 the original statement of the law is expanded to read: "If thy brother, a Hebrew man, or a Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee." It is of interest that in the third verse of this same chapter a clear distinction is drawn between "the foreigner" and "thy brother" in the law of the seventh year release with respect to debt. Additional confirmation is found in Jeremiah's further expansion of the terminology when he urges "that every man should let go free his man-servant and every man his maid-servant, that is a Hebrew or Hebrewess; that none should make bondmen of them, namely, of a Jew, his brother." (34:9, cf., 14). While one may then recognize the instructive parallels in the conditions of servanthood at Nuzu and in the Biblical legislation, it is impossible to hold that 0Ibri is in this legislation a technical term for a specific type of servanthood and least of all for the idea of "foreign servant."

2) THE 0IBRIM IN I SAMUEL 13 AND 14

It has been affirmed that the 0Ibri here (cf., 13:3, 7, 19; 14:11, 21) are quite clearly non-Israelites. However, while it is freely granted that the proper interpretation of these passages is difficult, the effort to distinguish between the 0Ibri and the Israelites is at odds with the entire context.

Difficulty first appears at 13:7 where it might seem that the 0Ibri are a group distinct from the "men of Israel" in 13:6. Such an interpretation, however, would involve for the term 0Ibri a change in meaning too abrupt to be plausible. For in 13:3, 4, and 14:4 are obvious
equivalents (cf. [Hebrew text]). Moreover, in apparent reference to the hiding activity of those described as the "men of Israel" in 12:6, the Philistines say: "Behold, the ḫīprim are coming out of the holes where they had hid themselves" (14:11b). Again, this same equivalence of סבוביכו with the inhabitants and with סבוביכו is found in 13:19, 20.

The difficulty arises again at 14:21 where סבוביכו might seem to be distinguished (as a group of mercenaries in the service of the Philistines) from סבוביכו (vs. 22). However, in view of the equivalence of these terms in the whole preceding context such a distinction here is a priori extremely improbable. There is, indeed, a distinction drawn between the groups mentioned in verses 21 and 22, but the distinction is to be found in the qualifying phrases not in the terms סבוביכו and סבוביכו, which are again synonymous.

The following are three possible interpretations of these verses, any one of which has more in its favor than the effort to distinguish here between Hebrews and Israelites:

(1) Translate verses 21 and 22 thus: "And the Hebrews were with respect to the Philistines as beforetime when they went up against them in the camp round about; both they were with the Israelites who were with Saul and Jonathan, and all the men of Israel who had hid themselves in the hill-country of Ephraim, when they heard that the Philistines fled, even they also followed hard after them in the battle." According to this translation the distinction would be between (a) those (vs. 21) who had gone to the camp with Saul against the Philistines but later deserted, and (b) those (vs. 22) who had not been called to the camp with the 3000 but were sent home (13:2) and later hid themselves in caves and the like (13:6).
It is also possible that the distinction in verses 21 and 22 is based on the distinction drawn in 13:6b, 7a. If so, the following two additional interpretations suggest themselves:

(2) The distinction is between two groups of deserters from the original 3000. On this view, those sent home (13:2) do not appear in the narrative again; the מְלֹא of vss. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 15, is then to be translated "the army." Verse 21 refers to the deserters described in 13:7a as having crossed over Jordan in their flight. This requires a change from the Massoretic pointing to מְלֹא in 14:21, and this in turn would lend support to but not necessitate a change to מְלֹא in 13:7a. Verse 22 refers to a second group of deserters described in 13:6b as having hid in caves.

(3) The distinction is between two groups belonging to the multitude sent home after the selection of the 3000 (13:2). In this case the reference to their former going up to the camp (14:21) would have in view the camp at which the selection of the 3000 took place rather than the subsequent positions taken against the Philistines as in interpretations 1 and 2. Verse 21 would again correspond to 13:7a and verse 22 to 13:6b, each group now regarded as belonging to the multitude sent home.

3) ABRAHAM, אֲבָרָם (Genesis 14:13)

Is אֲבָרָם in this its earliest Biblical appearance used ethnically? This question may be dealt with in connection with an inquiry into the origin of the term אֲבָרָם. From broad contextual considerations it seems that in his use of אֲבָרָם in Genesis 14:13, the author had in mind אֵבֶר of the line of Shem (cf., Gen. 10:21, 24, 25; 11:10-17). The genealogy of Gen 11:10-26 had already traced the direct descent of Abraham from אֵבֶר. Moreover,
the departure from the stereotyped presentation of the genealogical data in Genesis 10 to describe Shem as "the father of all the children of 0Eber" (vs. 21) is most readily accounted for as an anticipation of the author's imminent (i.e., Gen. 11:27 ff.) concentration upon the Eberites par excellence, the "Hebrews," whom Yahweh chose to be his covenant people. In Gen. 14:13 then, 6Ibr would be a patronymic, applied in this isolated way to Abraham perhaps to contrast him with the members of other ethnic groups mentioned in the context.

On the other hand, many regard the usage here as appellative. This view is ancient for the LXX renders as ɗπερατής ; Aquila, περατής ; Jerome, transseuphratensis; and the prevailing view of the rabbis of a generation after Aquila was that designated Abraham as "from the other side of the River." All of these derived 6Ibr from the substantive meaning "the other side" rather than from the verb 0br. In line with this view of the etymology is the emphasis in Josh 24:2,3 on Abraham's origin "beyond the River." But these facts are far from possessing the weight of the more immediate contextual considerations noted above.

If the conclusion is correct that 6Ibr derives from the eponymous ancestor 0Eber, the term would most likely be early; and in particular, its application to Abraham need not be proleptic. It probably originated outside the line of Abraham to judge from its characteristic association with foreigners in the Biblical contexts and the avoidance of it by the Israelites. Originally it may have been of wider application than the descendants of Abraham, as is perhaps suggested by the use of "0Eber" in Num. 24:24.

The validity of conclusions based on the tradition of descent from 0Eber is challenged by DeVaux's contention that there are divergent views
within the Old Testament. He grants that the composer(s) of the Biblical genealogies derives Ḫabrî from the ancestor ḪEber, but he finds in the reference to Jacob as a "wandering Aramean," a conflicting tradition of Aramaic origin. The latter tradition DeVaux believes to be further supported by the description of Laban, grandson of Abraham's brother Nahor as an "Aramean" (Gen. 31:20). But according to the record, the term "Aramean" could have been applied to both Jacob and Laban in virtue of their long residence in Paddan-aram and so construed would have no bearing on their racial descent. DeVaux also insists, but unnecessarily, on identifying the Aram of Gen. 10:22 and the Aram of Gen. 22:21 which would then bring the two passages into hopeless confusion. Finally, DeVaux appeals to the prophetic denunciation of Jerusalem in Ezek. 16:3: "Your origin and your nativity are of the land of the Canaanite; the Amorite was your father and the Hittite your mother." But even if the reference were to racial intermixture it would not refer to Abraham's ultimate origin but to the subsequent mingling of the racial strain of his descendants with that of the inhabitants of the land of Canaan. Actually, it is apparent from the context (cf., especially, vss. 45 ff.) that Ezekiel is using a scathing figure of speech to depict Israel's inherent sinfulness, which from the first disqualified her equally as much as her despised heathen neighbors in and around Canaan from enjoying a covenantal relationship with Yahweh—the point being that the fact of her election must be attributed to the principle of divine grace.
HISTORICAL RELATIONS
III HISTORICAL RELATIONS

The conclusion one reaches concerning the phonetic and semantic relationships of *ha-BI-*ru and *CPr*\(^{\text{a}}\) and concerning the social status of the groups those terms denote will be largely determinative of his views of their historical relationships. For the present writer, who has arrived at the position that the terms in all probability cannot be equated phonetically or semantically and that ethnic unity is characteristic of both groups (even though that has been significantly qualified in the case of the *CApiru*), various theories of both racial and socio-professional kinship between *CApiru* and Hebrews are obviated. But before turning directly to the question of *CApiru*-Hebrew relationships, we must revert to the point reached in the study of the social status of the *CApiru* and pursue further the thesis that an unusual relationship of close and cordial association prevailed between the usually detached and ominous *CApiru* and the Mitannian Kingdom.

A. *CAPIRU-HURRIAN RELATIONS*

The boundaries of *CApiru* and Hurrian careers in the Near East are by and large co-terminous chronologically and geographically.\(^{268}\) The *CApiru* are discovered in the Fertile Crescent from the Ur III period and probably somewhat earlier to almost the end of the 2nd millennium B.C., although evidence of the *CApiru* in strength vanishes by the close of the 14th century. The date of the Hurrian arrival is a moot point but they too are clearly on the scene well before the Ur III period. There are even two Hurrian kings at Urkish in the Upper Khabur area as early as the 3rd millennium.\(^{269}\) The rise of the Hittite Suppiluliuma in the second quarter of the 14th century marked
the end of Mitannian strength in the west and the rise of the Assyrian Shalmaneser I a century later in the east terminated Hurrian political significance. The presence of only individual Hurrians can be traced down into the 1st millennium. Geographically, the Mitanni Kingdom extended at times from east of the Tigris to Anatolia and Apiru are found from one end of it to the other. For the rest, there are penetrations of Hurrian individuals and influence among the Hittites and into Palestine and Egypt as well as into Babylonia and this corresponds closely with the scope of Apiru activities.

In short, there is a general contemporaneity of Apiru and Hurrian careers with the importance of each declining sharply by about the end of the 14th century. Bottéro mentions the disappearance of the Apiru from history at the end of the 2nd millennium as a difficult problem, but a much more significant problem is why the evidence of Apiru engaging in community organization and collective enterprise disappears by the end of the 14th century. And it seems difficult to divorce the answer to this question from the simultaneous collapse of the Mitannian Empire.

The clue provided by Apiru-Hurrian contemporaneity is confirmed by the evidences of their cultural-political congeniality. For it is in the period and within the boundaries of Mitanni that the Apiru seem to find themselves. The evidence for this will appear more sharply if contrasted with their role and reputation elsewhere. For outside Mitanni one of the clichés among the threatenings of prophets of woe is that the Apiru are coming, and the historians in describing anarchic conditions of the past often observe that then the Apiru roamed uncontrolled on the highways. In the 18th century Apiru raiders were a plague to the Amorite authorities in Mesopotamia and in the 15th and 14th centuries Apiru incursions were a menace to the loyalist
native chiefs of Palestine. Indeed, the epithet SA-GAZ as applied to them in all probability has its strongly pejorative significance and will serve to illumine for us the hostile relationship of the Apiru infiltrating into the settled areas at the beginning of the 2nd millennium B.C. to the then dominant sedentary groups who gave the intruders this epithet. Of course a less hostile modus vivendi was worked out at times whereby the Apiru were utilized as mercenaries, as by the Larsa dynasty in Babylonia and elsewhere. But even among the Hittites, where the Apiru had their own settlement, their social status was low and they were regarded as foreigners, while in Egypt they were reduced to slavery.

The picture of the Apiru in the Hurrian sphere at Ugarit and especially at Alalah is quite different. We need not here recapitulate in detail the observations made in the study of the Apiru social status. But it was noted that in nature and function their peculiar societal species found its native habitat in the Hurrian structure of society. For in the Alalah area the Apiru were over a long period a well-integrated element in a societal complex, in which, moreover, they found organizational analogues to themselves. And this integration was on a respected social level.

Attention may now be directed to supplementary data in the sources. Among the Hittite texts is found one in Old Hittite which records a battle between the Hittites and Hurrians sometime certainly before the reign of Suppiluliuma, whether in Anatolia or Syria is not clear. The Hittite king is victorious but the interesting feature is that parallel to the boast that the leaders of the Hurrian army had fallen in battle is the claim that three thousand Apiru soldiers had been captured. Again, in Mursilis II's treaty of arbitration between Barga and Carchemish, in which Tette the SA-GAZ king appears, it is disclosed that the king of the Hurrians had taken the
city of Iyaruwatta and had given it to the grandfather of Tette. Furthermore, in connection with the familiar pairing of CaApiru and Lulahhu in Hittite texts it is perhaps significant that the Lullu and the Hurrians were both elements in the Subarian compound.

In Palestine it was the design of Mitanni to encroach on Egyptian holdings. Practically the whole CaApiru program as seen in the Amarna letters was in furtherance of that policy. In view of the contemporary position of the CaApiru in adjoining Syria the harmony of the CaApiru activity with Mitannian policy will hardly have been due to coincidence.277

As far as the evidence permits us to see, the CaApiru are found working and warring in close alliance with Mitannian agencies and interests in the west. There is, indeed, the cooperation of the CaApiru with Aziru against the loyalists in Palestine at a time when Aziru was being used as a tool by the Hittite Suppiluliuma.278 There is also the fact that Tette of Nuhassi (who may be Tette the SA-GAZ) concluded a mutual defense pact with Suppiluliuma.279 But these indirect or dubious instances of pro-Hittite sympathy do not constitute a significant exception to the CaApiru-Mitanni alliance, especially since they occur in the period of Mitannian disintegration. This collapse of Mitanni confronted the CaApiru with a difficult choice of masters. Indeed, it introduced a crisis which the CaApiru as an organized entity did not survive.

Meanwhile on the eastern extremity of Mitannian dominion CaApiru are found in a relationship to the Hurrians rather different than at Ugarit and Alalah. In our interpretation of the social status of the CaApiru in the Nuzu area the possibility was mentioned that more of the CaApiru might have been engaged for military service than the explicit terms of their contracts would suggest, but that in any case their very willingness to be bound by such contracts might well be a reflection of the difficulties professional
militarists would encounter in adapting themselves to a peace-time economy. It was observed that this was a newly organized frontier region of Mitanni and it is the difference between this situation and the mature Hurrianized social structure in Syria which is the first factor in explaining the difference of C'Apiru status in the two places. And the second explanatory fact is closely related to that, namely, that the C'Apiru were apparently recent arrivals at Nuzu (probably attracted now by the appearance there of Mitannian control) while in Syria they had had ample time to be integrated into and to develop with the community of their Hurrian confederates.

Nevertheless, even the condition of servitude which the C'Apiru were obliged to accept at Nuzu, though less attractive an arrangement than the one enjoyed by their colleagues in Syria, may in its own way serve equally well to underscore the possibility of a prior association or kinship of the C'Apiru servants and their lords. It will be recalled that Lewy equated the ha-BI-ru of the Nuzu contracts with the C'ebed C'Iprî of the Mosaic legislation, maintaining that both signified "foreign servant." While we have rejected that interpretation of the two terms, it is still possible for us to recognize the validity of Lewy's conclusion that the Nuzu contracts and Exodus 21:2 ff. (and the related passages) pertain to similar social phenomena. To the extent, however, that Lewy's thesis is valid, it will indicate to us not that the C'Apiru at Nuzu were subjected to a servant status peculiar to foreigners but, according to the plain meaning of the Biblical C'ebed C'Iprî legislation, that the Hurrians treated the C'Apiru like needy brothers. 280

Our conclusion, therefore, is that within the period of our documents the base of operations for the C'Apiru and their center of family-tribal settlement and societal integration was in the Hurrian sphere. 281 The implications of this for earlier associations of the C'Apiru and Hurrians
or Indo-Aryans before they appear on the stage of Near Eastern history are far less certain. In our present state of knowledge, however, it appears more likely that the Apiru belonged to the massive migration that brought the Hurrians into the Fertile Crescent than that the Hurrians found them a native element there.

B. ḪAPR желез RELATIONS

From the beginning of the study of the Apiru the endeavor to identify them has suffered interference from theories of ḪApiru-Hebrew equation. Though a total identification of these two groups is obviously impossible, the hypothesis is still popular that the Hebrews were one offshoot of the Apiru. This theory may start with the supposition that the Apiru were a social class or that they were an ethnic group. Either of these approaches may make the further assumption that the terms in question can be equated phonetically or at least semantically, but some form of either approach can also be developed along with a recognition that the terms have nothing to do with one another. In support of most of these varieties appeal is usually made to parallels between the careers of the Hebrews and the Apiru.

To criticize the forms of this hypothesis that interpret the Apiru as a purely social category would be to re-cover territory already sufficiently traversed. But what of the possibilities of equation if it is recognized that the Apiru were characteristically of one ethnic stock? If the terms themselves are judged to be equatable both groups will then be descended from the common ancestor, ḪEber (at least, if one considers the Biblical genealogy reliable). Those who do may then observe the ḪEber is the ancestor of many ethnic groups related to the Abrahamites, though they must also recognize that the Biblical usage reserves the term ḪPrčm exclusively for the Abrahamites—and only for the Isaac-Jacob line at that.
If the terms ha-BI-ru and CApiru are deemed unequatable, the groups themselves may on other grounds (and the burden of proof lies there) be regarded as of common descent. The resultant relationship of Hebrews and CApiru will then be of far narrower proportions and significance than the exponents of equation prefer to make it in their historical reconstructions of the period.

At this point we are again facing the question of whether the CApiru were of Semitic stock or were at least native to the Fertile Crescent and the Arabian desert or whether they were part of the ethnic amalgam that intruded itself into the Fertile Crescent from the north in the third and second millennia B.C. We have already developed our argument in favor of the latter alternative.

In a word, the Hebrews were not the CApiru or any part of them.

One question, however, remains. For the Amarna texts pose a unique problem in CApiru-Hebrew relationships. Even though the historian judges that there can be no identifying of the two groups, in Palestine of the Amarna Age he finds them at least in immediate contact with each other and must somehow integrate the two histories.

1. All attempts to identify the activity of the SA-GAZ/ha-BI-ru reported in the Amarna letters with the first phase of the Hebrew Conquest under Joshua must be given up. Quite apart from the philological problem of equating the names there are insuperable difficulties. Even in its broadest outlines the Conquest under Joshua was the opposite of the military operations of the CApiru.

   (a) The Hebrew conquerors were a people which had long been in Egypt and were newly arrived in Canaan. The Ugaritic and Alalah evidence reveals that the CApiru were in Syria for a long while before the Hebrew
Conquest (on any view of its date). Moreover, since in Syria the °Apiru had long enjoyed permanent settlements of their own in well-regulated, peace-time integration with the local population and authorities, while the Amarna letters show the °Apiru in Palestine to be on the move, quartered here and there, without absolute loyalty to any one party, it seems clear that the Amarna °Apiru are the °Apiru whose home base was to the north but who were in Canaan to exploit the anarchy there to increase their fortunes in the exercise of their military profession. At the same time, as maintained above, they were serving the political interests of Mitanni in Canaan.

(b) Also in conflict with this picture of the °Apiru operating in relatively small, detached companies and fighting as mercenaries with no apparent national aspirations of their own as °Apiru is the Biblical picture of the Hebrew Conquest as an invasion by a united multitude, advancing in their own name in a concerted effort to achieve a common national goal.

(c) The natives of Canaan were to the Israelites an enemy to be exterminated; the acceptance of them as allies would directly contravene Israel's purposes. But the °Apiru had no special antipathy for the Canaanites as such. Quite the contrary, the Canaanites were, as noted, their employers and for the most part the °Apiru are found abetting the attempts of those Canaanites who strove to gain independence from Egyptian domination. Complaints are frequently heard from the loyalists that Canaanite rebels are going over to the cause of the SA-GAZ.

(d) The goal of Israel in Canaan with respect to the land was to gain possession and agreeably their general policy in dealing with cities was to exterminate the population and seize the spoil but to refrain from destroying the cities by fire. The °Apiru, however, after conquering
and plundering frequently set the city on fire, apparently having no designs to acquire territory or to build an empire.

The difference between the two movements can also be traced in matters of detail.

(a) Names: None of the names of the Israelite leaders is found in the Amarna letters. Moreover, where the names of the rulers of specific Canaanite cities can be checked (as at Jerusalem, Lachish, Gezer, and Hazor) there is in every case disagreement between the Bible and the Amarna texts.

(b) Numbers: In the pleas of the loyalists for military assistance it appears that Egyptian support in the form of fifty or so men will be adequate to turn the tide of battle. Obviously these Canaanite kings were not confronted with an assault on the scale of Joshua's army.

(c) Places: The ʿApiru operated successfully in Phoenicia and Syria, but neither the Conquest under Joshua nor later tribal efforts penetrated that far.

(d) Military Technology: The Israelites made no use of chariots, whereas chariots were a standard division of the ʿApiru corps at Alalah and in Palestine.

2. An alternative must be found then for identifying the Biblical Conquest under Joshua with the Amarna disclosures. The procedure of the majority of scholars is to place Joshua after the Amarna events. Thus Meek, though he believes the Amarna ʿApiru and Joshua's campaign belong to one movement, specifies that "the Amarna account marks the beginning of the movement, while the Old Testament account has to do largely with its final accomplishment." An odd quirk of Meek's view is that the exodus from Egypt under Moses follows Joshua by more than a century.
Albright, though he posits an earlier, pre-Amarna exodus from Egypt and entry into Canaan on the part of the Joseph tribes and finds their presence in central Palestine before the major Hebrew arrival reflected in the Apiru of the Amarna letters, dates the (second) exodus (i.e., Moses leading out the Leah tribes) and the campaigning of Joshua in the 13th century, long after the Amarna correspondence. 297

To cite one further variety of this approach, there is Rowley's intricate reconstruction. He also espouses a theory of a two-fold entry into the land, according to which certain Hebrew groups, notably Judah, press northward from Kadesh c. 1400 B.C. (these Rowley would identify with the Apiru of the Amarna letters) while kindred tribes, including Asher, Zebulon, and Dan, exert pressure in the north (these, Rowley conjectures, are the SA-GAZ of the Amarna letters). But the exodus from Egypt under Moses and the entry of Joshua into central Palestine he dates late in the 13th century B.C. 298

It will be observed that all these efforts to locate Joshua after the Amarna episodes involve drastic recasting of the Biblical data—the rejection not merely of points of detail but of the Biblical history in its basic structure. It requires some ingenuity, indeed, to produce one of these elaborate creations by weaving together a host of miscellaneous data sublimated from their original contexts but the result is fiction not history. Under the mask of a claim of controlling the Biblical sources by means of archaeological and extra-Biblical sources an almost totally undisciplined Biblical exegesis has been introduced. But why the penchant for the hasty rejection of the Old Testament source in favor of interpretations of archaeological evidence which are themselves so uncertain and disputed at countless points?
3. The present writer would suggest another alternative for the integration of the Biblical and the Amarna histories. It proceeds on the presupposition that the former is a self-consistent narrative. My view is the reverse of those just surveyed in that it locates the Conquest under Joshua before rather than after the Amarna letters, at least before those of Abdi-Hepa and those that follow him. This is, of course, in precise agreement with the datum of I Kings 6:1, and assumes a fairly brief period for Joshua's campaigns which also agrees with the Biblical record.

Even more compatible with this view than with the identification of Joshua's campaigns and the Amarna activity are certain facts which have long constituted a popular argument in favor of the latter view. Giving it a somewhat different turn than the advocates of identification the argument is as follows: Precisely those cities which appear in the Amarna letters as under Canaanite control, whether pro-Egyptian or rebel (and, therefore, likely allied to the SA-GAZ), are those which were not permanently dispossessed either by Joshua or the early tribal efforts after the death of Joshua. The situation at Shechem is somewhat problematic. Nothing is said about an Israelite conquest of central Palestine but if the transaction of Joshua 24 implies Israelite control of Shechem, they subsequently lost their foothold for Labaya some thirty years after the Israeliite entry ruled Shechem. Similar developments at a few other cities make it apparent that Israel's permanent acquisition of territory in Canaan was a very gradual process which was more prepared for than accomplished by Joshua's campaigns.

Albright has concluded that in southern Palestine of the Amarna period the main city-states were Gezer, Lachish, Jerusalem, and Hebron-Keilah.
In the period of Joshua there are in this area five additional city-states: Jarmuth, Makkedah, Libnah, Debir, and Eglon, with still others like Jericho, Bethel and Gibeon nearby. Albright then theorizes that from c. 1375-1250 there had been a gradual reduction in the power of the city-states combined with an increase in their number, which he attributes to a settled Egyptian policy of *divide et impera*. This decrease in the power of the Canaanite city-states is then judged to have aided Israel in her Conquest. Indeed, this is seized upon as compelling evidence that the Hebrew Conquest was late.

It will be recognized that this reconstruction of the 14th century situation in southern Palestine is based in part on silences in the Amarna letters. Such a procedure is precarious, however, for the silences might readily be accounted for by the fact that the authors of the Amarna letters simply had no occasion to mention the towns in question. To the extent, however, that there may actually have been fewer city-states in the Amarna period than in Joshua's day, my thesis offers a far more plausible explanation; namely, that between Joshua and the Amarna situation the Israelites had been encroaching on the territory of the old Canaanite city-states, reducing their number by conquest.

Furthermore, the spontaneous confederation of Canaanite kings described in Joshua 10 is an exceedingly awkward development if it be supposed that Joshua's campaigns were contemporary with or subsequent to the *Apiru activity of the Amarna letters. For these letters graphically exhibit the mutual distrust and growing antagonism among the Canaanite kings during this period. Is it not apparent that neither in the midst of nor soon after such intrigues and civil strife could a king of Jerusalem so easily consolidate the surrounding city-states for a joint military venture
against a common foe? Abdi-Hepa and his futile efforts along this line in the struggle with the C_Apiru is a witness that a king of Jerusalem would find that task impossible. It is a far more natural reconstruction to suppose that the collapse of the five-city alliance against Joshua marked the end of the confederacy of southern Canaan's city-states and prepared the way for the state of affairs evident in the Amarna letters.

If Joshua is to be placed before the Amarna period, the problem still remains of synchronizing the later Israelite tribal efforts to take actual possession of their allotted inheritances (i.e., the Book of Judges) with the Amarna C_Apiru movements. The arguments already presented against the possibility of identifying the C_Apiru with the Israelites of Joshua's day, for the most part hold against any such identification at this point as well. However, in view of the known tendency of the authors of the Amarna letters to stigmatize the cause of all enemies (or at least all accused of disloyalty to Egypt) with the SA-GAZ label, we ought not to be too dogmatic in denying the possibility that some Hebrew activity might be hidden in the Amarna letters under that label. Such, however, would be exceptional and in the present connection insignificant.

But quite significant is the fact that on the chronology followed here the first oppression of Israel in Canaan falls in the late second and in the third decade of the 14th century B.C. This corresponds with part of the era of the C_Apiru in Canaan. Israel's first oppressor was "Cushan-rishathaim king of Aram Naharaim." The area designated by "Aram Naharaim" would include within its southwestern limits the region about Alalah (and probably still farther south) which was a strong C_Apiru center in the 14th century B.C.

Moreover, the name Cushan is attested in this area both as the name of
a geographical district and as a personal name. That there was a district in northern Syria in the 13th and 12th centuries B.C. called Qusana-ruma, i.e., Kūšān-rom, is known from the list of Ramses III. Still more pertinent is the 15th century tablet from Alalah which contains the personal name ku-ša-an. This tablet is a fragment of a census list of unspecified purpose, on which 43 personal names remain along with the phrase found on the left edge, "owner of a chariot." The list then might well be one of the numerous military lists and probably includes the names of several maryannu.

Though styled melek, Cushan-rishathaim need not have been more than one strong chieftain among several in Aram Naharaim. Such is the usage elsewhere in Judges. Thus Jabin of Hazor is called "king of Canaan." But while Hazor was the dominant city of northern Canaan at this time, Jabin was only one of several Canaanite kings, as appears from the parallel account in Judges 5.

These facts suggest that elements of the ʿApiru corps active in southern Canaan as the terror of the loyalist Canaanite city kings turned their attention in time to the more recently established Hebrew settlers. The Hebrews as well as the Egyptians were a threat to the Canaanite rebel chieftains whom the ʿApiru for the most part served. And it would appear that for a while under the leadership of one Cushan-rishathaim these ʿApiru proved with their characteristic raiding, plundering tactics to be exceedingly oppressive to the Hebrews—until Othniel arose to bring relief to his people.

Quite the opposite then of being identical with the Hebrews, the ʿApiru of the Amarna letters were apparently the first oppressors of the Hebrews in Canaan. And far from the Amarna letters offering a Canaanite
version of the Hebrew march of conquest, they depict the assaults of professional raiders from the north, who (according to the scriptural interpretation) were sent for a season by Israel's God against Israel as chastisement for their failure to execute the mandate of conquest.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The least likely reading for ha-BI-ru is 'abir; the correct reading is possibly ʕābir, though one of the vowels might be short. Morphologically, it is found at times at least as a gentilic. In derivation, it may well be non-Semitic.

2. Ha-BI-ru denotes an ethno-professional group of militarists with a characteristically non-Semitic core but possibly containing accretions from other ethnic stocks.

3. The ha-BI-ru were apparently part of the intrusive ethnic complex which entered the Fertile Crescent from the north towards the end of the 3rd millennium B.C. Their fundamental political commitment and most satisfactory social adjustment was within the Hurrian dominated sphere.

4. SA-GAZ, the ideographic equivalent of ha-BI-ru, probably has the pejorative meaning of its other equivalent, habbatum, and may have been applied to the infiltrating ha-BI-ru by the settled population of the Fertile Crescent.

5. The term ʕībrā in the Bible always has an ethnic meaning, denoting the descendants of Eber of the line of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

6. The phonetic equation of ha-BI-ru and ʕībrā is at most a bare possibility. Nor can any more substantial identity of the two groups be demonstrated. Different in geographical-ethnic origins, different in political allegiance and sociological type—when ha-BI-ru and Hebrews meet on the stage of history in Amarna Age Palestine, it is as enemies, the oppressor and the oppressed.
To the extent that the foregoing conclusions are valid, it would appear that the wide modern interest attracted by the ancient 𐤁𐤄𐤆𐤇𐤁 has been in considerable measure due to false pretensions imposed on them by modern scholarship. But though this thesis indicates that the subject of 𐤁𐤄𐤆𐤇𐤁-𐤁𐤇𐤓𐤃 relationships does not have the kind of significance which has been generally attributed to it, our study of this aspect of the ha-BI-ru question has not been much ado about nothing.

For history did witness an 𐤁𐤄𐤆𐤇𐤁-𐤁𐤇𐤃 encounters. And it is not difficult to surmise what verdict the Biblical historians would have left for us had they applied their theistic, covenantally complexioned philosophy of history to the interpretation of the data of the 𐤁𐤄𐤆𐤇𐤁 oppression of the theocratic people in the early 14th century and the almost total disappearance of the 𐤁𐤄𐤆𐤇𐤁 as a social-political entity by about the close of that century. Surely they would have judged that the brief Amarna Age encounter with Israel was for the 𐤁𐤄𐤆𐤇𐤁 a crucial hour of more than political or even moral decision, determinative of their historical destiny.

On the other hand, for purposes of socio-ethnic identification of the 𐤁𐤄𐤆𐤇𐤁 and interpretation of their role in the broader context of life in the Near East in the 3rd and 2nd millennia B.C., more progress may be anticipated if in the future investigators turn their attention from the 𐤁𐤄𐤆𐤇𐤁-𐤁𐤇𐤃 to the 𐤁𐤄𐤆𐤇𐤁-𐤁𐤇𐤂 question.
NOTES

1. Indeed, as A. Ungnad observes, "Bisweilen wird .apps s. gebraucht" (Grammatik des Akkadischen, 1949, p. 9).

2. In the Canaanite glosses in the Tell el Amarna tablets are found, for example: hu-ul-lu (EA 296:38) = ܢܘܠ (cf. ܢܘ); and bi-na-ia (EA 144:17) = ܒܝܢ (cf. ܢ). Cf. E. A. Speiser, Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C., 1933, p. 39.

3. Virolleaud, Syria 21, 1940, p. 132, pl. 8 and p. 134, pl. 10.

4. So Kraeling, AJSL 58, 1941, pp. 237 ff. Cf. W. F. Albright, BASOR 77, 1940, pp. 32-3; DeVaux, RB 55, 1948, p. 342, n. 3. In an effort to show that it is "quite possible that the isolated Ugaritic as well as the Egyptian <prim are secondary forms due to Hurrian influence" J. Lewy observes that "the population of Ugarit included Hurrian elements and that Hurrians, wherever they appear, are responsible for a confusion in the rendering of Semitic ܕ and ܒ because their scribes did not distinguish between voiced and voiceless stops." (HUCA 15, 1940, p. 48, n. 7). C. H. Gordon, however, informs me orally that the Ugaritic scribes who wrote the tablets bearing <prim carefully distinguish ܦ and ܒ. J. W. Jack, (PEQ, 1940, p. 101) attributes the Ugaritic spelling to Egyptian influence at Ugarit.

5. There are, e.g., the variants ܠܒܘ/லܒܘ and ܢܒܐ/ܢܝܛ. Cf. Greenberg, The Hab/piru, 1955, p. 90, n. 24. For evidence of confusion in Ugaritic between ܒ and ܦ, and that in the very name ܗܒ-ܒܝ-ܪܘ, attention has been called to the Ugaritic text 124:14, 15 (Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook, 1947). Cf. Virolleaud, Syria XV, 1934, p. 317 n., and La Légende de Keret, 1936, p. 74; and H. H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, 1950, p. 50. Actually, the text has nothing to do with the ܐApiru—or with the Hebrews (as suggested
Kraeling’s treatment (ibid.) is as follows: \textit{kksp l^cbrm zt=} "like silver is the olive tree to the c^brm"; \textit{hr^s l^cbrm k^s=}"gold is the ks’ (-tree) to the c^brm.\) The c^brm, according to Kraeling, are simply "passers-by" (cf. Ps. 129:8). C. H. Gordon (Ugaritic Literature, 1949, p. 102) reads the final two letters with the next line as he renders thus: \textit{kksp l^cbrm=}"like silver for merchants"; \textit{zt hr^s l^cbrm=}"olive-oil of gold for merchants"; k^s d pr t^bn= "like fields of fruit(?) of the table"; b^c^l b^c^l ml^m= "the daintiest of dainties(?) of kings." For the association of zt and hr^s see Zech. 4:12.

6. For the evidence see B. Gunn apud Speiser, op.cit., p. 38, n.

Cf. J. A. Wilson, AJSL XLIX, 4, pp. 275 ff. W. F. Albright (JAOS 48, 1928, pp. 183 ff.) argues that the equation of Egyptian c^spr with Ceber is difficult since Egyptian of the New Empire regularly transcribes Semitic b by Egyptian b. As for Egyptian hr^p for Can. h^r^b (Heb. h^r^eb), he says that it only shows there was the same tendency for a final vowelless sonant stop following a consonant to become voiceless that there is in the modern Arabic dialect of Egypt; but the b in Ceber is medial and cannot have been pronounced as a voiceless p. It should be noticed, however, that in some instances of the use of Egyptian p for foreign b, the b is medial: thus, \textit{l^sbr} varies with \textit{l^spr} ("whip") and Kpn (O.K., Kbn)=Can. Gbl ("Byblos").

7. Gunn (ibid.): "There are many cases (36 counted) in which a foreign b with r or l either before or after it is represented by b and not by p in the Egyptian writings." Wilson (ibid.) affirms that the most straightforward equation is c^spr= l^spr.

8. Ibid.

9. Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, IV, 34:2, 5; and Hilprecht, Old Babylonian Inscriptions, I, 2, pl. 66, no. 149, 22.


There is specific evidence that BIR was used (though not commonly) for pîr in the neo-Assyrian period and possibly (the evidence is doubtful) in the middle-Assyrian period. Cf. Von Soden, Das Akkadische Syllabar, 1948, p. 73, no. 237. Bottéro (Le Problème des Habiru, 1954, p. 132) urges against reading pîr here the absence of specific Babylonian evidence for this value to date, plus the availability of the sign UD (pîr). However, he acknowledges (p. 156) that this form is not decisive for a root cbr. It may be additionally noted that J. Lewy in defense of reading the second radical as b appeals to the occurrence of the god "dha-bi-ru" in an Assyrian text (Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenem Inhalts, no. 42), i.e., in a text in which ha-bi-ru can hardly stand for "ha-pi-ru." (HUCA 15, 1940, p. 48, n. 7). Bottéro (op. cit., p. 135) agrees on the grounds that in the neo-Assyrian era one normally used PI to signify pî. For evidence that BI-pî in all periods see Von Soden, ibid., p. 53, no. 140. Also, J. W. Jack states, "In the Hittite documents, for instance, Habiru clearly has bi" (PEQ, 1940, p. 102). E. Laroche (in Bottéro, op. cit., p. 71, n. 2) argues, "D'après le système en usage à Boghazköy, ha-bi-ri note une prononciation habiri (sonore intervocalique non gémée)." But ha-ab-bi-ri appears twice. Moreover, P. Sturtevant maintains that in cuneiform Hittite "the Akkadian distinction between...p and b did not exist," adding, "To all intents, therefore, Hittite has dispensed with the means of writing b." (Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language, 1933, p. 66). Similarly, J. Friedrich, Hethitisches Elementarbuch I, 1940, p. 6(21). Accordingly, even the form ha-ab-bi-ri (KBo V, 9, IV, 12) is quite ambiguous, as it would also be in Akkadian cuneiform where AB stands in all periods for both ap and ab.
Greenberg (op.cit., p. 90, n. 20) suggests the possibility that a Hittite scribe utilized a native convention, doubling the labial to indicate a sound heard by him as $p$. Also ambiguous is the sign BAD (bi₄ or pi) used in the Alishar text.


13. Speiser (op.cit., p. 40), writing at a time when he did not have the benefit of the Ugaritic evidence, begged the question of the phonetic equation with $Dpr$ in concluding, "The second consonant is ambiguous both in cuneiform and in Egyptian, but not so in Hebrew: since the latter has $b$, the labial must be read as voiced in cuneiform, while the voiceless correspondent in the Egyptian form of the name is to be ascribed to local developments."

14. As far as it goes the Egyptian data is compatible. Gunn (ibid.) concludes from a survey of the evidence that "we seem to have the alternatives Capar, Capir, Capur, with a possible indication in" the Beth-shan Stela of Sethos I "in favor of Capir."

15. ZAW, NF, 3, 1926, pp. 28-29.

16. KBo V, 9, IV, 12. Cf. also ha-AB-BI-ri-ia-an (KUB XXXV, 43, III, 31).


20. HT 6, 18. This text is a variant of KUB IX, 34, IV. Greenberg (op.cit.) comments, "Were this writing not unique and not in a word foreign to the Hittites it might have deserved consideration as indicative of a participial form."

21. KUB XXXII, 14 (XXXIV, 62), 10; and KUB XXXV, 49, I, 6 ff. (cf. IV, 15).
22. AT 58:29. E. A. Speiser (JAOS 74, 1954, p. 24) observes that the main purpose of this unique form may be to indicate a form like *Hābīru. He suggests that even if the sign be given its value ab₂ instead of a', the h might be a graphic device signifying a long vowel or stressed syllable. Cf. Greenberg (op. cit., p. 20): "Assuming that the scribe was West Semitic he may have noted that his alephs became long vowels in Akkadian: hence, by a sort of back analogy he may have converted what he took to be a long vowel into an aleph." Wiseman (in Bottéro, op. cit., p. 37): "The word is unusually written ha-'a-bi-ru. This may be either a case of HAR=AB₂ or, as I am inclined to think, a case of the scribe erasing by the three small horizontal strokes of the stylus."

23. Cf. Ungnad, op. cit., pp. 12, 13(5c). The possibility that the i is short but accented is obviated by the fact that were it short, the antepenult with its long ḫ (as maintained above) would receive the accent.

24. So C. H. Gordon (Orientalia 21, 1952, p. 382, n. 2): "That the i is long follows from the fact that it is not dropt to become ḫapru."

25. JEN 228:29.

26. dpr-dbr, "drive"; parzillu-◡ quân ; dišpu-שד Cf. W. F. Albright, BASOR 77, 1940, p. 33; H. H. Rowley, PEQ, 1940, p. 92; DeVaux, RB 55, p. 342. Examples can be cited of a similar shift from other stops to sonants.

27. Cf., e.g., בִּרְשָׁי , נֵיעָר , נֶאֶר , לֹאָר , יָנָר , יָוָר .

28. J. Lewy (op. cit.), assuming the form Hābīru, suggests that it "is to אָבָר and as the Akkadian proper name Zākīru(m) [for references see, e.g., A. T. Clay, Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Cassite Period (New Haven, 1912) p. 145] is to אָבָר and אָבָר (Ex. 6:21, etc.)."

There is, however, no evidence that the Hebrew form אָבָר represents the Akkadian Zākīru.

30. So, e.g., Albright, Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, 1935, p. 206, and Böhl, Kanaanäer und Hebräer, 1911, p. 85. In an earlier article (JBL 43, 1924, pp. 389 ff.), Albright stated that Hebrew Gēber for Ġibr stands by epenthesis for *Ašpir, adding that the philological process is familiar in all the Semitic languages; e.g., Arab. bi'sa from ba'īsa. In a later article (BASOR 77, 1940, p. 33), he suggests that ha-BI-ru = יַפְרֵל (Gen. 25:40), a Midianite tribe.

31. See in glossary of C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Manual, 1955. Perhaps we do not have here a direct shift from gatil to qitl but a secondary formation resulting from the cuneiform orthographic peculiarity of dropping at times a short unaccented vowel between single consonants. Thus, the i dropped leaving the a in a closed unaccented syllable, where, in Hebrew at least, there is a tendency for a to shift to i.

32. DeVaux (op.cit.) goes to the extreme of describing the passing of Ġapir into Ġipr as "normal."

33. The qatil type of noun does appear at times in Hebrew like a segholote; cf. Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar, 1910, 93 hh,ii. Most of these are of the getel-type which is usually the A-type but is sometimes the I-type (e.g., בֹּמְרָתָם, בֹּרִבְּרָתָם; but לֵבָנָה (Eccles. 5:7; Ezek. 18:18) is also found and that is clearly I-type. This phenomenon is, however, confined to the construct state. This restriction would not, of course, be significant so far as the Gentilic form יַבְרַי is concerned. It becomes significant though when account is taken of the derivation of יַבְרַי from the patronymic יָבְרָי (see below) which is found in the absolute state.
34. Luckenbill (AJSL 36, p. 244) suggested an unknown Akk. root *habâru, whence the meaning "brigand"; J. Lewy (ZA 36, p. 26, n. 4; cf. RHR 110, 1934, p. 34) suggested habâru, "invade." Many favored a West Semitic root, hbr, (cf. Hebrew, הָבַר, "bind") yielding the meaning "allies" (so e.g., Sayce, Kraeling, Dhorme) or "captives" (so e.g., Dhorme in RHR, 1938, pp. 184 ff.; for criticism, see Lewy, HUCA 14, 1939, p. 595) or "condottieri" (so e.g., Landsberger, KF 1, 1930, pp. 321 ff.; Albright, JBL 43, pp. 389 ff.; JAOS 48, 1928, pp. 183 ff.; and Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, 1932, p. 206, n. 8). Landsberger (ibid.) as a lesser possibility suggested an Akk. habâru, "be in continuous motion.


35. So e.g., Speiser, op.cit., p. 41. Albright (JAOS 48, 1928, pp. 183 ff.) held it was an intransitive participle meaning "nomad" originally, though it was later used in the sense, "mercenary." For earlier advocates of this view see Greenberg, op.cit., p. 7.

36. So Lewy, op.cit., p. 604; more precisely, "foreign (servant)," or, as more recently put (in Bottéro, op.cit., p. 163), "resident aliens."


39. E. Dhorme, RH CCXI, avril-juin, 1954, pp. 256-264. The "Apiru were "des 'poussiéreux,' autrement dit: ceux qu'on appelait jadis les 'pèlerins' et qu'on appelle aujourd'hui... les personnes 'déplacées.' C'est des émigrants que se réfugient à l'étranger." For criticism of this
approach see Greenberg, op.cit., p. 91, n. 25.

40. See Goetze's note in Bottéro, op.cit., pp. 161-163. He bases the passive sense on the fact that the Š-form of this root is passive when used with one object. Epirum, however, would not be a Š-form. It appears from Akk. ṣərû, "provide" and Eg. cpr, "equip," that cpr is Hamito-Semitic. The lack of a West Semitic equivalent need not surprise for it is not uncommon for Akkadian to stand alone among the Semitic languages in matching Egyptian.

41. So e.g., DeVaux, op.cit., p. 340, and Goetze, in Bottéro, op.cit., p. 162.


43. EA 290:24.

44. Albright (JBL 43, 1924, p. 391) held this mark labeled it as a Canaanite word.

45. Op.cit. For the text see Bottéro, op.cit., p. 10, no. 5. J. Lewy (in ibid., pp. 11, 200) maintains that this verb is not a denominative but rather corresponds to West Semitic cbr, "cross over." Von Soden states (in ibid., p. 11, n. 1) "Ich persönlich glaube nicht ganz an die Ableitung von ṣapiru."


47. Nuzu Personal Names, 1943, p. 214.

48. In Bottéro, op.cit., pp. 160-161. He defends this on the ground that "les peuples qui se servent de l'accadien ou d'accadogrammes et dans la langue desquels munnabtu est fréquent, ne connaissent pas le mot ṣapiru, et inversement." The Hittite texts are only as apparent exception for though both words appear there, SA-GAZ is confined to stereotyped expressions.

50. For the texts see Deimel, Sumerisches Lexikon II:1,260; Greenberg, op.cit., pp. 54, 55, nos. 145-154; Bottero, op.cit., nos. 157, 168-180. In the lexical texts the consistent equation with habātu is obvious, while in the omen texts the reading habātu is required by phonetic gloss (as in Bottero, ibid., nos. 173, 175) or by play on words (as in ibid., no. 168, cf. 170). Landsberger (in ibid., p. 159) states that though habātu is the proper reading in these Akkadian texts and is normally so in Sumerian legal and literary texts, everywhere SA-GAZ appears in Old Babylonian, Hittite or Syro-Palestinian texts it is to be read "habiru." This conclusion is rendered dubious by certain Amarna data: EA 318:11-13 reads LÚ.MES.SA-GA.Z MES LÚ.MES.Ba-ba-ti ū LÚ.MESŞSu-ti-û and the grammatical relation of the first two is apparently epexegetical apposition; cf. the parallel in EA 195:27. EA 299:26 reads LÚ SA-GAZ.MES.tum (cf. EA 207:21, [i-na] [I]Ú.GAZ.MES [ba ...]). The phonetic determinative, tum, almost certainly requires the reading habātu (or plural, habbatūtum). Bottero, op.cit., p. 110, n. 2, suggests the possibility of reading a plural "habirūtum" but it is most unlikely.

51. This is so even though Akkadian lexicographers, so far as known, never use ha-BI-ru as an equivalent of SA-GAZ. The equation first became apparent in the alternating use of the terms in the god lists of the Hittite treaties and in the Amarna letters. In line with it was the appearance in the administrative texts of SA-GAZ and ha-BI-ru in the same role at Larsa during the reigns of Warad-Sin and his successor Rim-Sin. More recently confirmation has been found at Ugarit in the equation of
Aball-\textit{bi} \textit{Lú.MEŠ}SA-GAZ with \textit{Hb cprm} and in the use of the phonetic determinative \textit{ru}(?) after \textit{Lú.MEŠ}SA-GAZ twice in the unpublished RS 1603 (cf. Bottéro, \textit{ibid.}, no. 158). The interchange of the terms in the Alalah tablets is further proof. Even where \textit{habbātu} is to be read, the \textit{CApiru} may be in view. This is illustrated by the appearance of "\textit{ha-bi-ri-ia-aš}" in the Hittite text, KUB VIII, 83:9. For this text is the Hittite version of an Akkadian \textit{šumma izbu} text where it is clear, as observed in the preceding note, that \textit{habbātu} is the proper rendering of SA-GAZ, and \textit{ha-bi-ri-ia-aš} occurs in precisely the place where SA-GAZ is usually found in the formula. The Hittite text, moreover, is earlier than the Akkadian omen texts. That the \textit{CApiru} are in view everywhere that SA-GAZ might be used does not follow necessarily though it may be the case in all the texts at our disposal, even the earliest Sumerian texts, but leaving out of view the lexical texts. Greenberg (\textit{op.cit.}, p. 86, n. 1) argues that the \textit{CApiru} are in view wherever SA-GAZ is used (even if \textit{habbātu} be read) but he falsely shifts the burden of proof to those who would dissociate the two. The very existence of a general term like \textit{habbātu} (whichever meaning be in view) as an alternate reading to the specific \textit{ha-BI-ru}, and especially its exclusive employment as a lexical equivalent of SA-GAZ would put the burden of proof on Greenberg's position. Beyond this the existence of homonyms of \textit{habētum}, the equivalence of SA-GAZ with more than one of these (which some dispute but Greenberg accepts), and the extreme improbability that any other reading of SA-GAZ like \textit{ha-BI-ru} (either as appellative or proper name) covered exactly the same semantic range makes it almost certain that SA-GAZ was used at times without the \textit{CApiru} being in view. It is, therefore, a question whether the SA-GAZ of a given text, like one of
the Ur III texts or the Sumerian literary and legal texts of the Isin-Larsa age, are the cApiru. That the cApiru may be in view in some or all of these is suggested by the reference to the ha-BI-ru in the 19th century Cappadocian texts. Some support could be found for reading SA-GAZ as ha-BI-ru if SA-GAZ should turn up even in Dynasty of Akkad texts since the Old Hittite translation of the Naram Sin epic may accurately reflect the original situation in its mention of cApiru either as prisoners or guards, and the proper name ha-bi-ra-am is found on a text from Tell Brak (F 1159, cf. Bottero, ibid., p. 1) contemporary with the dynasty of Akkad.

52. So Albright in JBL 43, 1924, pp. 389 ff. Commenting on the Hittite translation of the Naram-Sin inscription, he then held that SA-GAZ is the ordinary Hittite equivalent for "Semitic nomad." Ungnad (Kulturfragen, I, 1923, pp. 15 ff.) interpreted SA-GAZ as "slinger."

53. Landsberger (in Bottero, ibid., p. 160) has now adopted this view suggested long ago by Langdon (see next note). He would render it as a substantive, "frappeur de tête" and regard this as equivalent to simply "brigand." SAC-GAZ is indeed found twice at Ugarit (see Bottero, ibid., nos. 154 and 157), once certainly as the designation of the cApiru. Moreover, in an astrological omen text (ibid., no. 170) one of the woes predicted is: LÚSA-GAZ gaqqada inakkisîs, "the SA-GAZ will cut off the head." This is surely a pun, but whether on the sound or on the sense (whether partially or wholly) is the question. Landsberger's approach is uncertain for as Bottero observes (ibid., p. 148), "le SAC-GAZ qu'enregistrent les vocabulaires connus paraissant marquer d'abord un verbe mahâsu, 'frapper,' dont la spécification nous échappe." The common spelling GAZ is understandable then for GAZ-dâku which is broadly
synonymous with mahâsu = SAG-GAZ. The reading SA-GA-AZ (found, however, only once) would be problematic since it divides the essential element.

54. Such a pejorative meaning clearly attaches to SA-GAZ in the early Sumerian literary and legal texts and this is preserved in the later Akkadian omen texts, as we might expect in this conservative genre of literature. The meaning "brigand" is required in a Ras Shamra word list (Bottero, ibid., no. 157) where it appears between IM-ZU "thief" and LUGÁN.ES, "malefactor," and in the unpublished Ras Shamra 17341 (cf. Bottero, ibid., no. 162), and elsewhere. Indeed, Landsberger (in ibid., p. 199) insists that "LU(SA-GAZ) signifie partout et toujours 'Räuber.'"

S. H. Langdon (ET 31, 1919-20, pp. 326-7) reasoned that habâtu meant originally "smite with violence" (cf. Code of Hammurapi, Law 196) and was used exclusively with a military signification and, therefore, the idea of plundering was a natural nuance (since Asiatic armies customarily plundered defeated foes). Habâtu then meant "fighting man" and this was translated into Sumerian correctly as SA-GAZ=SAG-GAZ, "smite the head, slay."

It is perhaps significant that habâtu in this sense is conjoined with the Apiru in EA 286:56: 
\[ Ú.MES \text{ha-BI-ru } ba-bat \text{ gâ-bi mâtât HÀ } \text{šarri.} \]

55. Cf. Deimel, op. cit., III, 2, which cites: habâtum, "interest-free loan, loot"; and hubtu, "tax-exempt." Albright (JAOS 48, 1928, pp. 183-185) directs attention to the derivatives hubutâti (plural of hubuttu) and hubutâtu which mean respectively, "tax-free property" and "the condition of being tax-free (of property)." From these he deduced that the habâtus received hubutâti in return for their services and were thus mercenaries who were rewarded with a grant of rent-free land, i.e.,
condottieri. When the Aramean nomads, the "Ḫabiru," became known throughout Mesopotamia as such mercenaries, their name replaced the original ḫabbātu as the term for "mercenary."


57. So in Bottéro, ibid., p. 162; cf. Greenberg, op.cit., p. 89. Perhaps the nouns with the tax-free connotation derive from this ḫabātu. From this root appears to derive the ḫabbātum found in association with ag-ru, "hired laborer," and e-ĝi-du, "harvester," in the lexical occupation lists (UP V, no. 132; K 4395; cf. Bottéro, ibid., nos. 177 and 180; Greenberg, ibid., nos. 150-152). The Akkadian legal text, BIN VII, no. 93, also mentions two ha-ab-ba-ti-i who appear to be engaged in peaceful occupation.

58. The suggestion that it would mean "migrant" (so Greenberg, ibid.) is based on the appearance of the verb once in the N-stem: ana māt Tābrā ahhabitma, taken together with a lexical datum: (ha-bā-tu)ša a-la-ki, (K 2055). Lewy (in Bottéro, ibid., p. 163) identifies ḫabātu with Arabic, ḫabatā, "to wander about."


60. So Goetze, op.cit., and DeVaux, op.cit. Cf. Deimel, op.cit.,
p. 115, no. 42. In the spelling SA-GAZ-ZA (found once at Ugarit and once at Amarna) the ZA would be a sort of phonetic complement.

61. So Dhorme (RHR 118, 1938, p. 173, n. 3), while Bottéro (ibid., p. 149) says, "il faut tenir GAZ pour une licence graphique."


63. Aramaic-Syriac, šēgā; Arabic, sajjis.

64. So Greenberg, op.cit., pp. 89, 90. He accepts the view that SA-GAZ is a pseudo-ideogram for šaggāšu but finds difficulty in the translation "murderer" because it is far too strong for the normal character of the group, as well as on the grounds that there would have been no need then for the lexical gloss habbātu. On his own view of West Semitic semantic coloring, there would be need in Akkadian for an explanatory gloss. And such was habbātu, not as derived from ḫabātu, "plunder," but from one of its homonyms. One difficulty with Greenberg's view is the supposition that one ambiguous term was glossed with another term of very similar semantic range and, therefore, equally ambiguous.

65. Albright (JBL 43, 1924, pp. 389-393) supports this combination on the grounds that there was no clear distinction between bands of robbers and bands of Bedouin, the same word meaning "Bedawi" in Egyptian (šōše) and "robber" in Hebrew (šōseh). Cf. Böhl, Kanaanäer und Hebräer, 1911, p. 89, n. 2. Albright adds that the similarity in sound between ḫabbātu and ha-BI-ru as pronounced by the Akkadians likely suggested the use of SA-GAZ for ḫa-BI-ru.


67. So J. Lewy (HUCA 14, p. 605, n. 90) who argues that in the early 2nd millennium the ʿApiru "constituted troops of soldiers—comparable to the French légion étrangère—in the service of governments." Similarly,
Bottero (ibid., p. 196) maintains that some of the Apiru fugitives, organized outlaw, marauding bands and so all Apiru fugitives came to be called SA-GAZ, "brigands." Goetze (in Bottero, ibid., p. 163) cites the possibility that SA-GAZ (taken as a pseudo-ideogram for habbatum, "robber,") was extended to cover "one who works for board and keep"; adding, "It might have been difficult to distinguish between the two."

68. They miss the point who dismiss the question of whether ha-BI-ru is a proper noun or an appellative with the observation that all proper nouns were once appellative. So Jirku, ZAW, N.F. 5, 1928, p. 211; and Gustavs, TLZ 1, 1925, col. 603. For the issue here is not that of ultimate etymological origin, but of usage in the literature at our disposal. On the other hand, whether ha-BI-ru is gentilic or not is not decisive for that usage for a gentilic need not be a proper noun and a non-gentilic might be a proper noun.


70. This form is used for the masculine plural (HSS XIV 53:18 and 93:6) and the feminine plural (JEN V 453:11).


73. Cf. Chiera, op. cit. Due to the Nuzu scribes' lack of regard for case endings ha-BI-ru-u is used once for the Genitive (SMN 2145).
74. JEN V, 465:2.

75. AT 164. It occurs here twice between awil bitti and mar šarrī (given as mar šar-ru in Botteéro, ibid., no. 39). Cf. Wiseman, AT, p. 69. Possibly EA 289:24 should be read: a-na awilū𝑡i ha-BI-riKI.

76. E.g., Ex. 9:7; I Sam. 2:14; 13:20; 14:21; etc.

77. Landsberger (KAF I, 331) cites certain difficulties in the gentilic view: (1) When ideograms render gentilics they are regularly followed by the place-determinative KI. (But ethnic-gentilics usually refer to a people which may be identified with a particular place and that was not the case with the  qa-pirū. In Amarna age Palestine, the most settled situation enjoyed by the qa-pirū, there are one or two instances of SA-GAZKI: (a) a-na lu<TAB>SA-GAZKI, or perhaps, a-na awil SA-GAZKI (EA 298-27); (b) EA 215:15. Cf. ha-BI-riKI (MDP XXVIII, 51l:2; EA 289:24). KI is used also, however, with the nomadic Sutu (Idrimi Inscription, l. 15); (2) There is lack of analogy for an ideogram being equated with both an appellative and a gentilic, as would be the case if SA-GAZ-habbatu, an appellative, and SA-GAZ=ha-BI-ru, regarded as a gentilic. (But the fact is that the gentilic forms of ha-BI-ru occur at times, and one type is clearly ethnic—see below.)

78. Lewy (HUCA 14, 1939, p. 587, n. 1) suggests that at Nuzu the preference for the nisbe form may reflect the influence of the Hurrian language there, since "there was in the Hurrian languages a strong tendency to replace nouns (particularly proper names) by enlarged (adjectival) forms" of the same stem. If anything, this favors the view that ha-BI-ru is a proper name, not appellative. Moreover, it does not explain all the variants.

79. Botteéro (op.cit., p. 133) says that in this case, in order to
designate the persons as descendants of cApiru, an adjectival form was coined after the type which was ordinarily ethnic. But Greenberg (op.cit., p. 78) finds this point quite awkward and can only hope that eventually the ha-BIR-a-a forms may prove unconnected with our cApiru.

Some scholars who have held that ha-BI-ru (outside of any supposed use of the term in the O.T. for the Abrahaimites) was an appellative are: Albright, Alt, DeVaux, Dhorme, Greenberg, Lewy, Noth and Speiser. As for the supposed development of the gentilic cThri from an appellative ha-BI-ru, Albright (Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 1942, p. 109) compares it to Lewâ, "Levite," probably derived from *lawiyu, "person pledged for a debt or vow"; Qânâ, "kenite," from qānâ, "smith"; or hopshâ, "free-man," from hupshu.

80. For a discussion of the connotation of these terms see O’Callaghan, Aram Naharaim, 1948, p. 41.


83. So Winckler in 1897; Böhl, Kanaanäer und Hebräer, 1911; E. Speiser, AASOR 13, 1933, pp. 34 ff.; M. Noth, Erwägungen zur Hebräerfrage (Festschrift Procksch, 1934, pp. 99-112); A. Guillaume, PEQ, 1946, pp. 64-85; R. DeVaux, RB, 1948, pp. 338 ff.


86. E.g., ARM II, 131; 13, 14.

87. E.g., JEN 455:2, 8; 1023:3; SMN 3191:19.


89. RŠ 17238:7 (no. 161 in Bottéro, op.cit.).

91. RS 11790:7.
92. RS 10045:1; 11724 11848, l. 12.
93. Virolleaud (Syria 21, 1940, pp. 143-4) held there were five villages named Halbi. Goetze (BASOR 79, 1940, pp. 32-4) by identifying (âl) ḫal-bi ḫUR-SAG ḫa-zi with ḫlb ṣer, reduced the number to four and regarded these as four parts of one township known as Halbi, his strongest point being the complementary character of ẖal-bi GAR-RA (ḥlb krd), the citadel of Halbi, and ẖal-bi ṭa-ni (ḥlb ṭaš), the vast portion of Halbi, i.e., the part at large and unfortified. Cf. J. Friedrich, Orientalia, 12, 1943, p. 4; J. Nougayrol, in Bottéro, op.cit., p. 120, n. 1. R. DeVaux (RB 55, 1948, pp. 339, 340) rejects Goetze's view of four quarters of the same village in favor of four separate villages.
94. For the text see S. Smith, The Statue of Idri-mi, 1949, pl. 9-14; and especially 11. 26-28.
95. Ibid., p. 73. Greenberg (op.cit., p. 64, n. 16) rejects Smith's interpretation, in favor of regarding these ẖArū as an immediately urban element.
98. EA 289:24.
99. Possibly, however, the KT reflects only a temporary quartering of ẖArū troops. Other texts, e.g., EA 197, 287, 289, mention the giving of towns to the ẖArū but only to be plundered.
100. JEN V 458, 459.
101. JEN V 455; JEN 1023; HSS XIV 176.
102. SMN 152:22, 23.

103. J. Lewy (HUCA 14, 1939, p. 606) is correct in declaring that the Nuzu evidence refutes "Landsberger's repeated assertion that they were 'heimatlos.'"

104. Such temporary location seems to be in view in texts like ARM II 131 (cf. L. Oppenheim in Bottéro, op. cit., p. 190, n. 1); A 49; and A 3004. Cf. A 3056; A 1265 and A 566 which are concerned with 'Apiru attacks on towns.

105. A 2939.

106. A 2886. Cf. the messenger named 'Apirum from Eshnunna, (A 2734). There is another 'Apirum, identified as an am su-hi-im, (A 2523).

107. BM 23136.

108. See the administrative texts of Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin. Nos. 9-16 in Bottéro, op.cit.

109. MDP XXVIII, 511:2 (no. 35 in Bottéro, ibid.).


112. Ibid., p. 92.

113. Cf. ibid., p. 65.

114. Ibid., p. 91. Since Greenberg inclines to a West Semitic derivation, he finds the chief difficulty in Goetze's suggestion in the lack of evidence for a West Semitic *Cpr which could yield such a meaning.

115. KUB IX, 34 with its duplicates (no. 91 in Bottéro, op.cit.).

116. HSS XIV, 46, 53, 93, and 176. Greenberg regards as comparable the Alalah situation as indicated in AT 350:6, 7, a sheep census. (Cf. AT 292:9, a list in which the name ha-BI-ru is found for one of sixteen
persons receiving barley rations.) As for the sheep census it is
doubtful if the 240 sheep of the SA-GAZ are state rations since the same
list mentions besides these and 268 of the Yananna soldiers, 115 of
Alalah and 402 of Mukish(?). Greenberg argues (op.cit., p. 65, n. 19)
that military groups would not be "required to shepherd their rations
while they were still on the hoof." This objection, however, seems to
overlook the whole situation at Alalah and vicinity where the SA-GAZ
were an element in the normal peace time societal structure with their
own settled dwellings (whether scattered among the rest of the population
or separate and tribal) and their own shepherds (AT 198:39, 48; cf.
Wiseman in Bottéro, ibid., pp. 38, 39), and where they were regarded as
a population unit in all government administration.

117. KBo III, 3, I, ll. 6, 7 and duplicates.

118. If this Tette is the same Tette as Suppiluliuma, father of
Mursilis II, had made king of Nuhassi (cf. E. Weidner, BoSt 6, pp. 58 ff.).

16:296:53.


my attention to these texts.

122. AT 164:3-7. Possibly a third Lũba-BI-ri follows the már Šar-ru.

123. AT 182:13. According to Wiseman the heading of such a list:
šâbu MERS LũSA-GAZ, is to be translated, "The troops of the SA-GAZ-man," so that the names which follow would not necessarily be all SA-GAZ, as is the case if the rendering "SA-GAZ troops" is accepted. The evidence of a SA-GAZ/H official could be used to support Wiseman's view. The specific designation of one man in a similar list (AT 181) as LũGAZ (l. 19) might imply the others were not (SA)-GAZ. But on Wiseman's view this man
would also be a GAZ-officer and why then would he be listed among the ordinary troops? The translation "SA-GAZ troops" is favored by the parallel appearance of the šabuša-na-nu in some texts (e.g., AT 183, 226, and 350), the usage in the contemporary Idri-mi inscription, Amarna letters and elsewhere, the quantities of pasture-sheep assigned to the SA-GAZ, comparable to those for a town (AT 350), and the large number of those who have LU SA-GAZ holdings (AT 183:4-5, 1 li-im 4 ME 36 bit LU SA-GAZ, "1436 having SA-GAZ holdings"). The singular bit is a collective and corresponds to the singular found elsewhere with large groups (e.g., AT 226:7, 8; 213 bit ḥa-ni-ša-ḫu 33 bit e-ḫi-el-e) though the plural, bitatu, is also used (e.g., AT 185). This bit apparently means "property" rather than "family" (though the presence of families would be implied) for parallel with bitatuša-nikhašana and bitatuša-nikhašana is found bitatuša-narkab(ii)ša, "chariot sheds" (AT 189). Finally, the singular LU SA-GAZ may signify a plurality as in AT 184:5; [an]-nî-tum LUS A-GAZ, "these are SA-GAZ."

124. AT 180:20; 182:16.

125. AT 198: rev. 42. (See comments of Wiseman in Bottero, op.cit., pp. 38, 39.) This list mentions also an awîl gassû and a herdsman (ll. rev. 38, 39) among the SA-GAZ. It is relevant to note here the close association of the ʾApiru with the maryannu class, an aristocratic status which was hereditary but also obtainable by royal release.

Numerous charioteers (who were probably maryannu) are listed in the SA-GAZ troops of Alalah. Observe also that some ʾApiru at Nuzu are owners of horses (HSS XIV 46:18, 19: 53:17, 18; cf. 93:4-6; 176:8, 9. Cf. C. H. Gordon in Orientalia, 21, 1952, p. 380). In certain Egyptian texts the ʾApiru and maryannu are in close association also (cf. Papyrus Harris and
Papyrus Harris 500).


128. As described on a *kudurru* stele (OBI 149:20-22).

129. See A 49,109,566 (nos. 20, 25, and 28 in Bottéro, *op.cit.*).

Even in cases where the *Apiru* are seen supporting the cause of local princes (e.g., *ARM* II, 131 and A 3004, 3056; nos. 18, 19, and 21 in Bottero, *ibid.* they appear to be independent tribes voluntarily serving as mercenaries.

130. AT 58:28 ff.

131. See in Bottéro, *op.cit.*, nos. 168-174 for this formula (*LÚSA-GAZ ina māti ibreššī*) and for variants like *LÚSA-GAZ ibaššañes* and *LÚSA-GAZ innadaru*, "the *SA-GAZ* will wreak havoc."

132. As a concrete example, it is found in the Mari texts that the Beni-Iaminu and the Beni-Simal play essentially the same role as the *Apiru* along the Middle Euphrates and in northern Mesopotamia, while still other groups of similar character are active east of the Tigris and elsewhere on the Euphrates. Cf. Dossin, *Syria* 19, 1938, p. 116. Any appellative meaning suggested for the *Apiru* such as nomads or mercenaries would be equally applicable to these other groups and, therefore, cannot serve as the distinctive appellation of the *Apiru*.


134. Greenberg (*ibid.*, p. 88), for example, makes a quite unfounded assumption in suggesting that the Mari and Amarna freebooters had been
under masters but had seized an opportunity to break away.

135. For example, if the Akkadian and Alalah ration texts prove the CApiru were dependents, they equally prove to be dependents other groups mentioned in them, yet distinguished from the CApiru.

136. So, for example, Speiser (Ethnic Movements in the Near East, p. 36): "wherever they are encountered, the Habiru are evidently foreigners. In the West they are not Hittites or Canaanites, in the east they cannot be classed with the citizens of Arrapha or of Babylon." And Greenberg (op.cit., p. 88): "A contributory factor in their helplessness appears to have been their lack of rights as foreigners in the places where they lived."

137. Undeniably it is often plain that the CApiru are not part of the indigenous population. Thus in Egyptian texts the use of the throwstick determinative with ḫpr-w (and according to Albright's reading, the use of the foreign warrior determinative on the Beisan stele) shows that the CApiru are foreigners in Egypt. The practice of the CApiru in Amarna age Palestine of serving with equal enthusiasm the loyalists and the rebels reveals that it was not in the peace of this land that they looked for their peace. In Hittite texts (as Goetze points out, in Bottéro, op.cit., p. 82) the close connection of the CApiru with the Lulahhu, who are clearly foreigners, advocates a foreign (and Goetze feels eastern) origin for the CApiru. Similar evidence is available that the CApiru did not belong to the indigenous population in other regions. But, as will be maintained more fully below, the CApiru seem in at least one area to be so well and long integrated on a respectable level that it would be altogether unreasonable to suggest that their essential appellative quality in that situation was foreignness.
138. Especially HUCA 14, 1939, pp. 587-623 and in Bottéro, ibid., pp. 163-164. He normalizes ḫābiru which he identifies as "the Akkadianized form of the active participle of the West Semitic root ʿBR to the singular of which we may ascribe the meaning 'he who came over.'"

139. RH 211, avril-juin 1954, pp. 256-264. The root is West Semitic ḫpr, "dust," yielding the derived sense of "dusty (wanderers)." He had earlier regarded the ʿApīru as confederates or prisoner-deportees.

140. See his article "Erwägungen über die Landnahme der Israeliten" as brought up to date in his Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israëls, 1953, I, esp. pp. 163 ff. Alt's view is adopted as a subordinate element by Greenberg who describes the core of the ʿA-GAZ/H. as "composed of uprooted, propertyless persons" or as a group which "served as a magnet to attract all sorts of fugitive and footloose persons who were impelled by misdeed or misfortune to leave their homes," (op.cit., pp. 87, 88).


142. See now in Bottéro, op.cit., pp. 159-161. There he defends the synonymous character of "ḫaptiru" and munabtu.


144. EA 195:24 ff.; 318:10 ff.


146. Figuring in servant contracts similar to those of the ʿApīru but not labeled ḫa-BI-ru are individuals identified as "Assyrian" (JEN VI, 613:2; cf. JEN V, 456:9 ff.) and as "from the land of Izalla" (JEN V, 462:3). And there were, of course, the highly prized Lullian slaves.
147. See above note 103. Text JEN V, 464 concerns an "CApiru along with the people of his household." For family ties among the CApiru see also JEN 1023 and JEN V, 455.

148. For the evidence see the text above with the indicated notes.

149. AT 182:14.

150. AT 180:16.

151. AT 198:39.


154. Ibid., pp. 192-198.

155. Cf. ibid., p. 127, n. 5, for the frequent references to the munnaatu, "fugitive," in the legal, administrative, and historical documents of this period. A similar observation is made by Landsberger (in ibid., p. 160).

156. RŠ 17238. In Bottéro, ibid., no. 161.

157. Ibid., p. 129

158. The text is NBC 3981 (BIN VI, pl. 71, no. 226; in Bottéro, ibid., no. 5). The relevant part reads: šu-pi-a-šu a-na Zi-lu-u-na i-pa-šu-bu-li-šu Šš-Šš-ar-ma. This verb is attested only in this document.

159. In Bottéro, ibid., p. 160.

160. Ibid., p. 11.

161. A 2886; no. 30 in Bottéro, ibid.

162. Idrimi Inscription, esp. 11, 26-30.


165. EA 298:22-27.

166. JEN 458, 459, 455, 1023 (cf. 462, 446, 613); SMN 3191.


168. Compare also the prominent Harbisipak and Kudurra, the 12th-11th century ha-BIR-a-a.

169. Greenberg, op.cit., p. 87. The analyzable Old Babylonian data: 9 Akkadian and 2 possibly West Semitic (these 2 are among 4 patronymics. Cf. Finkelstein and Landsberger in Bottéro, ibid., pp. 177-181); the Alalah data: the great majority of some 80 names is non-Semitic, including many identifiably Hurrian and only 7 possibly Semitic; the Nuzu data: of some 30 analyzable names, 22 are Akkadian and almost all the rest are Hurrian. Cf. J. Halévy, RS 12, 1904, pp. 246 ff.

Discussing excavations by Sellin at Taanach, he mentions four cuneiform texts containing names, most of which he would assign to the QApiru because one is named TUR-hu-BI-ri, which he renders "fils de Habiri." He argues that there are many correspondences between these names and chiefs mentioned in the Amarna letters as friends of the QApiru.

170. While granting that this is a "proven tendency" and judging that the Hurrian names of several of the QApiru at Nuzu is evidence of the absorption of Semites into the local Hurrian population, Greenberg says that the edge of the above argument has "been dulled by frequent use" (op.cit., p. 87, n. 9). It may be the beginning of scholarship to realize that an accumulation of authorities does not validate a view, but it is a bit novel to judge that popularity invalidates a view. Bottéro (op.cit., p. 188) acknowledges that the linguistic variety of their proper names, "en soi, ne seraient pas une preuve."

171. Comparable would be the experience of the Terahites (Gen. 11:27 ff.)
who left some elements of the family in Ur when they migrated north, then left still others at Haran when Abraham continued on to Canaan.

172. Gustavs (ZAW, N.F. 3, 1926, pp. 25 ff.) disposes of the opinion of Jirku (OLZ, 1921, pp. 246 ff; 1922, p. 38; and Der Alte Orient, 1924, pp. 18 ff.) that the proper translation is "the gods Ha-BI-ru." Jirku was compelled to regard as a scribal error the combination: \textit{ilâni}MES \textit{ya} LUGA-GAZ (KBo I, 2, Rs 27; cf. I, 3, IV, 5). Nor could he explain the genitive (Akk., ha-BI-ri and Hitt., ha-BI-ri-ia-aš) which is found in all cases but one (excluding, of course, the use of the ideogram). The one exception is a Hittite nominative: [ilâni ha-BI-ri-e-eš (KBo V, 3, I, 56). Gustavs treats this adjectivally, i.e., "the Habirean gods." Might this possibly reflect the fact that what appeared like a nominative elsewhere, i.e., ha-BI-ru, was a shortened gentilic? Gustavs also demonstrates to be groundless the opinion of Jirku that the \textit{ilâni} was a plural of majesty.

173. Certain professions in India have patron gods.

174. So, e.g., Rowley, op.cit., p. 53. For a contrary opinion, see Greenberg, op.cit., p. 78; cf. pp. 80, 87, n. 9. He argues that the summary type formula points to an agglomeration of gods from diverse sources, not to a single pantheon of an ethnically unified group. On the other hand, if, as Greenberg holds, the Āpiru were a social class made up of the various ethnic groups in the area, their gods would already have been mentioned by name in the syncretistic list and the additional summary formula would lose its point.

175. KAV 42,II,9. It is part of a corpus known as the "Description of the city of Aššur" and dates from the 7th century B.C.

Gustav (ZAW 40, 1922, pp. 313, 314) observes that \textit{dha-BI-ru} is found among vegetation gods. If the nature of god and people was related, they were once quite sedentary and with this would agree the association of \textit{SA-GAZ} with agricultural pursuits in the lexical texts. Albright (BASOR 81, 1941, p. 20, n. 20) points out that this \textit{dha-BI-ru} might be foreign since included with it in the gods worshipped in this temple were the Hurrian deities (bulls of the storm god) \textit{Šerìš} and \textit{Hurriš} (i.e., \textit{Hurriš}).

W. von Soden (in Bottero, op.cit., p. 135) says this \textit{dha-BI-ru} is the Neo-Assyrian form (elsewhere attested) of the Akkadian \textit{hā'iru}, \textit{hāwiru}, "spouse."

Relevant in this connection are the personal names containing the element, \textit{hab/pir}. The personal name, \textit{ha-BI-ra-am}, occurs in Old Akkadian texts from Chagar Bazar and Tell Brak (C. J. Gadd in \textit{Iraq} IV, 1937, 178 and 185; VII, 1940, 60 ff., 66). At Nippur was found \textit{ha-BI-re/ri} (Clay, \textit{Personal Names from Inscriptions of the Cassite Period}, 1912, p. 78) and \textit{ha-[BI]-ir-di-il-la} (Pa. Univ. Museum Publications of the Babylonian Sec., II, 2, 1912, no. 89:2). From Nuzu come \textit{ha-BI-ra}, \textit{ha-BI-i-ra} and \textit{ha-BI-ir-til-la} (Gelb, Purves and MacRae, 1943, Nuzu Personal Names, pp. 55, 214). In addition, the element \textit{Cpr} occurs in Egyptian personal names from the Old Kingdom to the Ptolemaic period (See G. Posener in Bottero, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 171 ff. Cf. Greenberg, op.cit., pp. 57-58). The relation of these names to \textit{dha-BI-ru} and \textit{Lî'ha-BI-ru} is problematic. Gustav, ZAW N.F. 17, 1940, pp. 158-159 judged \textit{ha-BI-ir-til-la} to be "\textit{îš} is lord," and thus further evidence of \textit{dha-BI-ru}; \textit{ha-BI-ra} was then an abbreviated form of this. If that were so \textit{dha-BI-ri} might well be a Hurrian deity for the \textit{tilla} element is common in Hurrian
names (though also found in Elamite names; cf. I. G. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians*, 1944, p. 54, n. 37) and most of the Nuzians who bear the names ha-BI-ra and ha-BI-ir-til-la have Hurrian relatives. However, in every other case the word compounded with -tilla is verbal or adjectival and -tilla is itself a Hurrian deity or surrogate for one. Gustavs' view is then uncertain but the hab/pir element could still be related to LÚ ha-BI-ru. Less probably related to d(or LÚ)ha-BI-ru are the cpr- names in Egyptian texts, for since they go back to the Old Kingdom, this cpr is probably Egyptian (viz., cpr, "provide"); or in the case of those names where cpr is compounded with a Semitic deity (cpr-bcr and cpr-ip) it may be Semitic; e.g., ḫṣראה, "stag." See further, Greenberg, *op.cit.*, pp. 79-80.

180. Ibid., pp. 75-87.
181. EA 91:5. The form is LÚ[G]AZME[S], the plural determinative being a mistake, for the grammatically related verbs are singular.
182. Greenberg, *op.cit.*, p. 75. The text (EA 288:44) reads: 

ardūtu MEŠ ip-suma LÚ[MEŠ]a-[BR][R].

183. EA 185:63.
184. Thus in following Abdi-Ashirta the people of Ammiya "k-ba-as-su ki-ma LÚ-MEŠ GAZ" (EA 74:28-29; cf. 67:16-17).
185. KUB IX, 34 with duplicates IX, 4 and HT 6; KUB VII, 42. No. 91 in Bottero, *op.cit.*
186. See the observations of Goetze on this text in Bottero, *ibid.*, pp. 79-80.
187. E.g., KUB XXX, 34, IV, 30-35; KUB XXXV, 45, II, 2 ff. (a Luwian text).
188. Landsberger (KAF I, 1930, p. 326) opposes such a conclusion.
arguing that even *Lulahhu* is an appellative. But, cf. Goetze in Bottéro, *op.cit.*, p. 81, n. 3.

189. See the translation and remarks of J. A. Wilson in ANET, pp. 245-247.

190. Papyrus Harris I (British Museum 10053).

191. *Ibid.*, 31, 8. Wilson (ANET, p. 261, n. 7) regards all these serfs as foreign. Posener suggests the "settlers" are Egyptian.


195. G. Posener (in Bottéro, *op.cit.*, p. 175) observes that in the case of the term *çpr-w*, "Les déterminatifs les désignent simplement comme des étrangers; il ne s'ajoute aucun signe qui caractérise une classe sociale, un genre de vie ou une occupation, comme on en trouve, d'une façon régulière ou sporadique, après des appellatifs d'emprunt comme *mrî*, *mrîn*, *mâkb*, *nçru*, *kt(n)*, etc." According to Albright, the foreign warrior determinative is used on the Beisan stele.

196. Posener (*ibid.*, p. 174) says there is given only the general impression that the *çApiru* live on the margin of the regular population. The Beisan stele of Seti I attests the presence of some *çApiru* in that area near 1300 B.C. and the Papyrus Harris 500 account of the taking of Joppa locates *çApiru* there in the 15th century (though the manuscript itself is 13th century).

197. If the 12th century proper name, *p3-çpr*, "the *çpr,*" (see no. 191 in Bottéro, *op.cit.*) has anything to do with the *çApiru*, it might be an indication of their ethnic character since names of the type article plus
Substantive are often ethnic (e.g., p3-hr, "the Syrian"); but they are also professional (e.g., p3-lm-ntr, "the priest").

198. A 109 (no. 28 in Bottero, ibid.). As for other examples, in EA 195:24 ff., Biryawaza, in enumerating his forces distinguishes his SA-GAZ from his Sutu as well as from his army, chariots, and brothers. In EA 318:10 ff., Dagantakala cities as his enemies the SA-GAZ and the Sutu (cf. the Idri-mi Inscription). In EA 246:5 ff., Biridiya complains that Labaya’s sons have hired against him the SA-GAZ and the men of the land of Kashu. In the Mari texts the *Apiru are distinct from the Beni-Iaminu and the Beni-Simal. Tette, head of Barga, is described as the SA-GAZ man KBo III, 3, I, 7 and Harbisipak and Kudurra as ha-BIR-a-a. Cf. Speiser’s remark (Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C., p. 34): "Habiru comes to designate a fairly well-defined entity, which may be contrasted with such other entities as Hurrian, Hittite, or even Amorite."

199. For example, Mari text, A 2939 (no. 19 in Bottero, ibid.) mentions, (1. 13) 30 LÜ-MES-la-mu-ut-ba-la-iu ha-BI-ru, "30 Iamutbalite men, *Apiru." Bottero (ibid., 188) lists numerous similar cases and judges that in these ha-BI-ru must be primarily an appellative.

200. Thus, at Nuzu are mentioned an *Apiru man and his household (JEN V, 464; cf. 455), two *Apiru women and their kinsman (JEN 1023), and *Apiru women with their children or alone (JEN V, 452, 453, 456, 465; SMN 2145). *Apiru women are found also among the Hittites, HT 2, 4, 5 ff.

201. As in the Idri-mi inscription, at Ugarit, Alalah, and among the Hittites. Frequently also, as argued earlier, the *Apiru are found in independent raiding bands.

202. The situation at Nuzu is, in part at least, exceptional.
Certainly not all the ĈApiru of the contracts were engaged for military services; compare especially the women who appear alone or with children (but apparently as widows). Nor can they be regarded as prisoners of war (so Chiera, AJSL, 49:2). Such a supposition is contradicted by the voluntary terms of the contracts (cf. *ramanšu* and *pîšu û lišânsu*, which describe the entrance of the ĈApiru into service), and by a text like JEN V, 455, which shows that the ĈApiru, Mar-Ishtar, had his family back in Akkad and had himself come north within the year apart from any military venture. On the other hand the possibility may not be overlooked that some of the ĈApiru were being enlisted by Tehiptilla to serve in a military corps. Mitanni had only recently conquered the Nuzu area so that there might well have been special need for military strength there. Moreover, Tehiptilla was the first *halsahlu* official appointed over this administrative district and it would not be unusual (cf. J. Lewy, HUCA 14, 1939, p. 601, n. 75) if business conducted in the name of "his house" was actually official state business. But the case of those ĈApiru who were not being engaged as soldiers would simply be one where the original, or at least correlative, ethnic connotation of the term *ha-BI-ru* dominated instead of the special military connotation (as would also be the case whenever *ha-BI-ru* women were in view). While, therefore, these Nuzu contracts make it impossible to hold that *ha-BI-ru* was an appellative denoting military activity (cf. also references to ĈApiru women singers) they are not incompatible with the view being presented here. For an ethnic group peculiarly identified with the military profession might find other employment when opportunities were not available to exercise their special profession.

203. AT 164.

204. RS 15109.
205. For a refutation of Wiseman's view that the term was confined to the head of this military body see above, note 123.

206. See Wiseman, AT, pp. 10 ff.; E. A. Speiser, JAOS 74, 1954, pp. 18 ff.; I. Mendelsohn, BASOR 139, 1955, pp. 9 ff. Wiseman would equate only the hupšu with the gâbê nâmê and associates the ḭaniḫu with the ebēlu.

207. Landsberger points out (in Bottero, op.cit., p. 201) that gâbum may serve as a sort of plural for awîlum without in itself implying a military occupation. This is also to be borne in mind in the texts where ERIM or gâbum is used with ha-BI-ru (ARM II, 131, 13; AT 58:29; KBo III, 46:39) or with SA-GAZ (Statue of Idri-mi, 27; EA 68:13, 18; 74:14, 21; 75:10; 87:21), though as a matter of fact the military meaning is clear in all these cases.

208. This was recognized by O. Eissfeldt (Forschungen und Fortschritte 28:3, March 1954, pp. 80 ff.). Greenberg blurs the facts when he comments that the SA-GAZ "are grouped with a military class composed of ehele and hanvakû" (op.cit., p. 65).

209. AT 182:27; cf. 180:27.


211. AT 182:14.

212. AT 180:24; 182:19; 183:6; 226:1. In this connection the order of the listings in AT 180 and 182 is interesting: charioteers, ehele, muskennu. Note also that in AT 182:13, one of these charioteers is an ḥazannu official. Since the maryannu status was obtainable by marriage and royal grant as well as by inheritance and since this class barrier was not rigidly ethnic (cf. R. T. O'Callaghan, Aram Naharaim, 1948, p. 66) there is no difficulty in the presence of 6Apiru, regarded as substantially
an ethnic unity, among the **maryannu**.

213. See AT 183, 226 and 350. Wiseman, *op.cit.*, p. 11, is mistaken in regarding the **yanannu** as part of the forces of "the SA-GAZ man."

214. It is, therefore, uncertain whether the **a-ya-a-nu** of AT 202 are the equivalent of the **yanannu** (so Wiseman) since they are coordinated with classes like the **hupēu** and **hanäbu**.

215. For the **yanannu**, see e.g., AT 145 and 341.

216. CApiru are mentioned, for example, from Ammiya (AT 181:2).

217. AT 350. Cf. also AT 352.

218. Wiseman suggests that **Mu-ki-ya** be read for **Mu-ki-he**.

219. AT 341.

220. C. H. Gordon, *UH*, no. 2190, "yeoman," "members of a certain guild." Gordon suggests the possibility of a Hurrian root **tanu**. Cf. AT 439, described by Wiseman as a "Note in Hurrian (?)" and cited by him among the **yanannu** texts. Two men are here designated as **šušanni**.

221. Apud Wiseman, *op.cit.*, p. 11, n. 4. Cf. BASOR 139, 1955, p. 11, n. Wiseman accepted "archers" tentatively at first and later unhesitatingly. Speiser (*JAOS* 74, 1954, pp. 18 ff.) doubts that translation, but suggests that there was a **tanu-yanu** weapon which was used by the **yanannu**.

222. Or "foreign troops," however.


224. The similar notion that there was a development from an ethnic
to an appellative use of ha-BI-ru has been suggested by, e.g., Langdon, Kraeling, and Rowley. Rowley (From Joseph to Joshua, 1950, pp. 53-54) contends that an ethnic term might easily develop a non-ethnic usage, but that in the present instance at least (and having in view especially the theory that the Biblical Hebrews belong to the cApiru) the reverse would be more difficult since evidence is lacking that any ethnic unity was felt among the cApiru in the later stages. The reverse has been held by, e.g., Lewy and Speiser (op.cit., p. 37) and, as a possibility, by Greenberg (op.cit., p. 93).

225. The insistence that the appearance of the restricted meaning of "Chaldean" must follow the decline of the ethnic group (cf. Rowley, ET XXXVIII, 1926-27, pp. 423-428) is not supported by the facts. Cf. Dan. 2:2, 4, 5, etc., and Herodotus I:181, 183.


227. The passages which some have regarded as in conflict with the above statement are considered below.


230. Cf. Exod. 21:2; Deut. 15:12; Jer. 34:9, 14.


236. AJSL 49, pp. 254-261.


239. So e.g., Greenberg, op.cit., p. 92. Similarly Landsberger has suggested that כִּבְרִי is used as a gentilic substitute for the nisbe כְּבָרִי which is rare. However, since other substitutes are used for the simple gentilic כְּבָרִי such as כְּבָרִי שְׁבָיָה and even plain כְּבָרִי, it is necessary to go on to account in the particular instances for the choice of כִּבְרִי as the substitute.


241. It is necessary for him, of course, to assume the phonetic equation also.

242. Lewy makes the observation that the law is in the first paragraph of Israel’s Book of the Covenant.

243. JEN VI, 610, 611, 613 (cf. JEN V, 456:9-23); JEN V, 446, 449, 457 and 462.

244. For the as-su-ra-a-a-u of JEN VI, 613 is substituted DUB.ŠAR (tupšarru). The ʿApiru from Ashur are described as ša māt as-su-ur.

245. Cf. Lewy, HUCA XIV, p. 606, n. 99, on the absence of patronymics in connection with the majority of the proper names of the ha-EL-ru.

246. The following parallels are adduced by Lewy: a) there was a fixed terminus understood for the period of service (cf. Exod. 21:2 and JEN V, 455:1-7 and 8-16); b) there was the option of choosing to become a permanent slave (cf. Exod. 21:5-6; but see, too, Lev. 25:39-41 and JEN V, 452, 453, etc.); c) the servant who left might not take with him a wife given him by his master (cf. Exod. 21:4; but see, too, Lev. 25:41;
and JEN V, 437; cf. JEN VI, 611). Lewy's position that there was a law which automatically fixed the term of service in such contracts unless the contract itself stipulated the master's lifetime, is criticized by Greenberg (op. cit., p. 67, n. 28) on the grounds that no contracts mention such a feature. It seems, however, that the date formulae of JEN V, 455 are best accounted for on an assumption like Lewy's.

247. Cf., e.g., A. Guillaume, PEQ, 1946, p. 68.

248. The rendering of the LXX at the end of verse 3, ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου (as though the Hebrew were דַּבָּר יִשְׂרָאֵל) seems to be a conjectural emendation occasioned by the fact that דַּבָּר יִשְׂרָאֵל comes somewhat unexpectedly on the lips of Saul.

249. The problem would disappear altogether if the pointing in verse 7 were to be changed to לְבָרִי. The suggestions to emend to לִעְבֹר הַיָּד or, with LXX, to לִעְבֹר הַיָּד do not commend themselves.


251. Cf., ibid., under לָעֵב, 1c.

252. The original three Israelite positions at Bethel, Michmash, and Gibeah (13:2) actually did surround the Philistine garrison at Geba. If the Massoretic text and accentuation (דִּבְרֵיהֶם) stand, the next clause will be a pseudo-verbal construction (as translated above). The LXX and Syriac would read, כְּאַרְבּוֹאמָן, "they also turned," which provides a parallel construction to כְּאַרְבּוֹא (vs. 22).

253. Or, "adhered faithfully to them," i.e., to the Israelite army.

254. There were originally 3000 chosen by Saul to encamp with him against the Philistines (13:2), but following the approach of the Philistines in force and Samuel's delay there were only 600 left (13:11, 15; 14:2).
At least, on this approach the reference in 13:6 is to them. Cf. Judg. 7:3-7, and 7:23-24.  

This participial form would then parallel the corresponding member in vs. 22, i.e.,  

Cf. also the additional remark in 10:25.  

If a non-Hebrew source lies back of Genesis 14, this would be another example of the frequent use of  Apiru by foreigners. Cf. also, "Laban the Aramean," Gen. 31:20, etc.; "Heber the Kenite," Judg. 4:11.  

The various advocates of the Apiru-Hebrew equation would find their interpretations of Apiru reflected in the use of in Gen. 14:13. For example, Albright (JACOS 48, 1928, pp. 183 ff.) found the idea of "mercenary"; and De Vaux (EB 55, 1948, pp. 337 ff.), that of "stranger." While Kraeling (op. cit.) suggested that Apiru is used to underscore Abraham's role as a sojourner who pays tribute to Melchizedek.  

Parzen (AJSL 49, pp. 254 ff.) is mistaken in his opinion that the LXX actually found in the Hebrew text. Noth ("Erwägungen zur Hebräerfrage," Festschrift Otto Proksch, 1934, pp. 99 ff.) is probably correct in stating that the LXX translator simply regarded it as desirable at this first appearance of Apiru to indicate what was, in his opinion, its significance.  

Greenberg (op. cit., p. 5, n. 24) directs attention to the evidence for this in Bereshit Rabba 42, 8. A minority opinion of the rabbis held that Abraham was called because he was a descendant of Eber.  

This appears to be so even in the LXX, although later Patristic writings in treating the LXX rendering derived it from a verbal base (cf. Greenberg, ibid.).
Kraeling (op. cit.) offers the strange hypothesis that "Hebrews" is a secondarily personalized form of a geographical name, i.e., "Overites" from רֵבִים, adapted by the Israelites as late as the early monarchy in an attempt to orientate themselves to the world in which they had just become prominent. The usage would thus be that of the 1st millennium even where applied to the Patriarchs. H. H. Rowley counters: (a) In the early monarchy there is not apparent among the Hebrews any consciousness of being from over the Euphrates. (b) The term disappears almost completely from the O.T. with the establishment of the monarchy. (c) The Israelites would hardly adopt as a symbol of self-esteem a term "generally employed in a pejorative sense." (PEQ, 1942, pp. 41-53; From Joseph to Joshua, 1952, pp. 54-55. Cf. the criticism of O'Callaghan in Aram Naharaim, 1948, p. 216, n. 4).


266. Deut. 26:5; see on this passage D. D. Luckenbill in AJSL 36, pp. 244 ff., and Albright's criticism in JBL, 1924, p. 390, n. 65.

267. Is it not difficult to assume that even an ancient editor combining his genealogical sources would be so unobservant as to allow to pass without adjustment a contradiction as blatant as DeVaux supposes this to be?

268. Speiser, (Ethnic Movements in the Near East, pp. 34 ff.) was impressed with this similarity. He regarded the cApiru as culturally dependent on the Hurrians and identified the Hurrians and one branch of the cApiru as the main components of the Hyksos. This cApiru offshoot he equated with Abraham and his descendants. Though one is unable to accept the equation of cApiru and Hebrews, the assumption that the cApiru were involved in the Hyksos movement is most plausible in view of their military
character, their known presence in Syria before the Hyksos period and their role in Syro-Palestine after the Hyksos era.


271. The mention of the cApiru in Egyptian slave gangs is not a real exception.

272. So in the omen literature, if the cApiru may be seen in the SA-GAZ of these texts.

273. So again if SA-GAZ may be understood to refer to cApiru in the Old Babylonian literary texts. Cf. in Bottéro, op.cit., nos. 6-8.

274. The stereotyped recognition of the gods of the cApiru in Hittite treaties is no indication that the Hittites regarded the cApiru with favor. Neither is it an indication of cordial relationship that Hittite rituals (cf. Greenberg, op.cit., no. 156) mention dha-BI-ru since the goal of incantation is comprehensive coverage as a means to comprehensive control.

275. KBo III, 46 (and duplicate KBo III, 53) and a parallel version, KBo III, 54. Cf. Nos. 72 and 72' in Bottéro, op.cit.

276. Greenberg (op.cit., p. 77) regards these cApiru as part of the Hittite army. Actually, although there is the one reference to cApiru mercenaries in the Alishar letter from the Cappadocian period, none of the later Hittite documents provides evidence that the cApiru served as Hittite mercenaries.

277. For a possible indication of collaboration see the close juxtaposition of the references to GAZ troops and Mitanni in an unfortunately mutilated section of EA 90:19-25.
278. The Hittite archives preserve a treaty and pact of mutual defense between Suppiluliuma and Aziru. BoSt VIII, 4.

279. BoSt VIII, 3.

280. Even if one does not identify the Nuzu and Biblical phenomena as closely as Lewy it must be recognized that the ḪApiru at Nuzu were treated far more favorably than ordinary slaves. Such is the position of Greenberg who cites the following features (op.cit., pp. 67 ff. For details, cf. Lewy's articles in HUCA 14 and 15): (1) The ḪApiru do not sell their persons to their patrons; no price is paid as in genuine self-enslavement documents. (2) ḪApiru may terminate their service by furnishing a substitute. (3) The relationship of servant to master is at times expressed in terms reminiscent of adoption contracts. (4) Occasionally patronymics are used with the names of the ḪApiru. It appears then that there is in any case such a similarity in approach of master to servant at Nuzu and in the Hebrew servant law that a similar prior relationship between the master and the servant must have obtained in the two cases. It must be recognized that this type of arrangement was extended at Nuzu to others than ḪApiru, e.g., men from the lands of Ashur and Izalla. Is the explanation in their case that they were natives in the area controlled by Mitanni?

281. There are additional data which in themselves would not help establish our thesis but which are in line with it. Thus the major post-Mitannian evidences of the ḪApiru are in the formerly Hurrianized areas of Assyria. There we find Harbisipak influential in the court of the Assyrian king. There, too, we find the god ḫa-BI-ru in a temple along with two Hurrian deities. And the point may be recalled that if ḫa-BI-ru is the first element in the personal name Ḫapiritilla, it is
probably Hurrian.

282. Cf. Greenberg, _op.cit._, pp. 93 ff. As an illustration of what ingenuity can do he suggests that Abraham was an āApiru (=ēIrī), i.e., of a particular social class; but this epithet as applied to Abraham's descendants became an ethnicon. Later genealogists, unaware of this, invented the ancestor āEber, man of many descendants, in order to explain the known kinship of the Hebrews to other Semitic tribes and the origin of their name at one stroke.

283. For a recent popular example see H. Orlinsky, _Ancient Israel_, 1954. Cf. DeVaux, _RB_ 55, 1948, pp. 342-343; H. H. Rowley, _From Joseph to Joshua_, 1952, p. 53, n. 1. The parallels are often superficial or based on misinterpretations of the data on one side or the other. Items like the following have been or might be mentioned: (a) In each case there is a westward movement about the Fertile Crescent. (But this cannot be demonstrated for the āApiru and, in the case of the Hebrews, it applies not to the group as such but only to Abraham.) (b) The chronological span of the use of the terms ha-BI-ru and ēIrī is roughly the same. (c) Both groups move in the Hurrian cultural orbit and exhibit the influence of this fact. (d) The military activity of Abraham the Hebrew in Genesis 14 and the attack of Simeon and Levi on Shechem are comparable to āApiru razzias. (But this involves a superficial estimate of both Biblical instances.) (e) The āApiru mercenary activity is paralleled by the Hebrews in the Philistine army. (But this is a misinterpretation of the Biblical data.) (f) Both groups are in Egypt forced into the corvee. (g) The āApiru are frequently strangers in the milieu and such are the Hebrew patriarchs in Canaan. (h) Both groups deprive Egypt of its holdings in Canaan by military operations during the Amarna Age.
284. Guillaume (PEQ, 1946, pp. 86 ff.) identifies both groups as "sons of Heber" and people of the Arabian desert.

285. Attention was directed above to the wider application of "Eber in the Balaam prophecy (Num. 24:24).

286. An example of this is the view of DeVaux (RB 55, 1948, pp. 344 ff.) for although he regards the phonetic equation as possible, that opinion is not essential to his argument. His position is the following: The Hebrews and "Apiru are of common Aramean descent. The appellative terms ha-BI-ru and Ahlamu appear to be interchangeable to some extent and the latter designates desert nomads who were proto-Arameans. Certain Biblical data suggest that the patriarchs also belong to a proto-Aramean ethnic stock. By way of evaluation of DeVaux's theory—the supposed Aramean connection of the patriarchs was subjected to criticism above and the evidence offered for the "Apiru-Ahlamu relationship is bound up with a view of the "Apiru as desert nomads which is also unacceptable.

287. A strong point in favor of regarding the "Apiru as Semites would be the Susa economic text which mentions a Ha-BI-ri Ki where Amorite soldiers were quartered, if it were certain that the name of the place demonstrated that only "Apiru were quartered there. But that is by no means certain.

288. Cf. Josh. 11:19. Nothing underscores this more than the anomalous character of the Gibeonite alliance. It should not be overlooked, however, that after the days of Joshua's leadership the original determination gave way frequently to a fraternizing attitude (e.g., Judg. 3:5-6).

290. So repeatedly in EA 185.

291. Efforts to equate Joshua with Yashuia and Benjamin with Benenima (or Ben-elima) are phonetically impossible, besides which the Amarna men were pro-Egyptian.

292. Cf. Exod. 12:37; 38:26; Num. 1:46; 2:32; 26:51. At the same time it should not be overlooked that even 50 professional soldiers might provide adequate leadership to defend a walled garrison. Moreover, there are larger requests like that of Rib-Addi (EA 71:23-24) for 50 pair of horses and 200 infantry, as a merely defensive measure.

293. The way in which this argument is developed by Rowley (op.cit., pp. 42 ff.) is an illuminating exhibition of rewriting history to one's taste. He argues that the exploits of Joshua were mainly if not entirely confined to the central districts while the Apiru trouble was in the south and north and only at Shechem in the center. It will be recognized that this is the precise opposite of the prima facie Biblical account, according to which Joshua's campaigns were notably in the south (Joshua 10) and in the north (Josh. 11:1-14). Rowley rejects Joshua 10 in favor of the supposedly conflicting account in Judges 1; and Joshua 11, in favor of the supposed variant in Judges 4. According to the record itself, Judges 1 records events after the death of Joshua and the events of Judges 4 fall well over a century after those of Joshua 11.

294. Cf., e.g., Josh. 11:9.


297. BASOR 58, 1935, pp. 10 ff.

298. See Rowley, op.cit., esp. pp. 140 ff. for a survey of these various views.
299. In the background, there is the complex question of the date of the Exodus. I am aware of the apparent difficulties attending the early date view, the proper solution of which is not in every case altogether clear; but I find quite insuperable the objections to the late date view. The adequate exposition of that matter obviously lies outside the scope of this thesis and a cursory presentation could only appear to be unjustifiably dogmatic.

300. Letters written early in the reign of Amenhotep III would precede or be contemporary with the entry under Joshua.

301. Josh. 14:7 and 10 indicate that the initial phase was completed within 5 years of the entry into Canaan.

302. Cf., e.g., Olmstead, History of Palestine and Syria, 1931, pp. 196-197; Meek, op.cit., p. 20.

303. Joshua 10 and 11.

304. Judges 1. The theory that these are two variant accounts of a single episode is unconvincing to the writer. For a statement of the problem from the viewpoint accepted here see E. J. Young, Introduction to the Old Testament, 1949, pp. 166-167.

305. EA 289:22 ff. Similarly, if Albright (BASOR 87, 1942, p. 38) is correct that Deir became the seat of a local chieftain after the Amarna period, not only Joshua's raid but even Othniel's capture of that city (Josh. 15:15-17; cf. Judg. 1:11 ff.) failed to be permanently effective. Again, though Joshua's raid had depopulated Lachish and Gezer, these cities fell again into Canaanite hands according to EA 287:14-15, whether these lines mean that these cities had been assisting Pharaoh's enemies or were to provide for Pharaoh's archers.

306. This is not the impression one might receive from the Biblical
record alone but when reread in the light of other contemporary sources that record can be so understood without violence being done to sound exegetical canons.


308. Exceptional would be the argument based on the meager Egyptian forces requested by Canaanite chiefs to meet the őApiru threat. If only a single tribe of Israel were threatening, such small Egyptian assistance would make more sense.


310. Part of this era corresponds to the career of Labaya which can be dated in the second and third decades of the 14th century on either Albright’s or Knudtzon’s reading of the date on the hieratic docket on Labaya’s letter, EA 254.


313. As pointed out by Albright (Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 1942, p. 205, n. 49). He adds, “The Syrian Kushan was in the region called Naharaim (Nahrêna) by the Egyptians.”

314. Wiseman, AT 154.

315. Ibid., p. 140. 36 names end in -an (ibid., p. 10).

316. It is possible that the additional דְֶּנֶּבֶר, “double wickedness” was appended by Cushan’s victims, perhaps as a pun on דֶּנֶּבֶר. Cf. Burney, The Book of Judges, 1920, pp. 65-66.

317. Cf. O’Callaghan (op.cit., p. 123): “Nor is there any reason why we cannot see in the term melek a designation for the most powerful chieftain in a given region without thinking of a well-organized state.”

319. Especially verse 19. Whatever the literary critic thinks of the sources of the two accounts he ought to allow that the final editor was observant enough not to place in juxtaposition two accounts with conflicting viewpoints. We are on better ground if we hold that according to the author's native understanding of the *usus loquendi*, 4:2 was not in conflict with 5:19.

320. Since Othniel is associated with the south, this first oppression probably centered there.
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