

A Structural Semantic Approach to Israelite Communal Terminology

LAURENCE KUTLER
San Diego City College

It is our intention to investigate Hebrew communal terminology, in the Massoretic Text, more specifically, the lexemes 'îš, "man," and 'am, "people," as distinct from, and in relation to, the 'ādām, "commoner" and the gôy, "nation."¹ We will treat these lexemes in a closed system, define them in opposition to each other, and by their functions with respect to each other.² The advantage of this method is that we can define our lexemes in an organized system which allows us to stress the relationship of the vocables to each other.

We will also address ourselves to the following questions: What is the relationship between the 'îš and the 'am in the MT? How does this relationship differ from the connection between the 'ādām and the gôy? Another aspect of this study will focus on the etymons of these vocables in the northwest Semitic dialects, where we will investigate similar semantic change within these dialects and determine the interdialectal distribution of these etymons.

The 'îš is employed as a referent for soldier in the Bible. The ancient poem Exod. 15 contains a reference to 'îš in vs. 3, where the Divine Warrior is an 'îš *milhāmā*. The martial aspect of the 'îš cannot be overstressed, for it is this ingredient which distinguishes the 'îš from the 'ādām and aligns the 'îš with the 'am. The 'îš, as has long been recognized, is a soldier or fighting man throughout the Old Testament, e.g., Josh. 8:12; 10:24; Isa. 3:2; Ezek. 39:20, etc. Three vocables that fall within the semantic range of 'îš "fighting man" are *bāḥûr*, *gibbôr* and *na'ar*. In I Sam. 26:2 'îš forms a parataxis with *bāḥûr*, "elite soldier."³ *Gibbôr* is within this semantic field in Ezek. 39:20 and Isa. 3:2. The *na'ar* is a

1 This study is an outgrowth of my dissertation: "Social Terminology in Phoenician, Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic," submitted to New York University, 1980. I would like to extend my gratitude to the advisors B. A. Levine and L. H. Schiffman who gave unstintingly of their time, and to the readers F. M. Peters and D. Sperling who made many valuable suggestions.

2 For this methodology see U. Weinreich, "Is a Structural Dialectology Possible?," *Word* 10 (1954), 388-400.

3 An etymon with approximately the same meaning is the Akkadian lexeme *bēru* "picked soldier," see CAD, B, 207. The Mari evidence for this term has been gathered by J. M. Sasson in *The Military Establishments at Mari* (Rome, 1969), 22. In contrast to the CAD, Sasson remarks, "Far from being selected for a choice position, the *bērum* was simply drafted." He goes on to quote from ARM vi:40: "Yasarti-El a man from Ḫiṣamta was recruited by his *moqtar* as a *bērum*-soldier. But Yasim-Sumū seized him and said: It is written in the records of the palace that he is a palace slave, let him return to the palace. But if he is a freeman, let him be recruited as a *bērum* soldier." This hardly sounds like an elite soldier.

soldier in Judg. 8:20; 9:54; 2 Sam. 20:11; Isa. 40:30, etc. and can be placed with *bāhūr* inasmuch as both words share a common semantic overlap with regard to "youth."⁴

Three northwest Semitic dialects contain military connotations in connection with "man." In Moabite (*KAI* 181:20) we find *'qh mm'b m'tn 'š kl ršh w'š'h byhš 'hzh*, "and I took from Moab 200 fighting men, every captain,⁵ and I led it up against *yhš* and captured it." In the Amarna tablets the native Canaanite of the scribes emerges with regard to the referent *amēlu*. The Canaanite scribes do not employ the word as "freeman" but instead the Akkadian *amēlu* carries the significance of Canaanite *'š* and is employed as a referent for fighting man. Thus *EA* 106:41–45, a letter from Rib Addi to the King has: *šanitam litriš ana bēliya u luwaššira 20 tapal ša damqu sisi ana ardišu mādu amēlūtū itiya aššumma alākiya ana nukurtū šarri bēliya*, "further, may it seem right to my lord to send 20 pairs of fine horses to his servant, the fighting men with me are great in number—that I may be able to march against the enemies of the King my lord."⁶

The *amēlu* at Amarna carries an additional meaning. In *EA* 73:27, Abdi-Aširta writes to the *LÚ.MEŠ (amēlūt) āl Ammia* "people of the city of Ammia," saying: *dākūmi bēlakūna* "kill your lord." These "people" were apparently in a high political position and could effectively carry out the assassination. In *EA* 149:59, we read of the military pact between Zimrida of Sidon and Azira, the *amēl arni šarri*, "enemy of the king" and the *LÚ.MEŠ amēlūt āl Arwada*, "people of the city of Arwada." These confederates have assembled ships, chariots and infantry in order to subjugate Tyre. Of importance to us, is the *a priori* assumption that these "people" could negotiate a military pact with chieftains as equal partners. We can conclude from this that these "people" wielded considerable political clout, perhaps as members of a council.⁷ We would then posit the following semantic development for Amarna *amēlu*: *amēlu* "freeman" in standard Babylonian ♦ "men (with political clout)" and "soldier" in Amarna.

Ugaritic does not employ either the referent *iš* or *it* for 'man, soldier'. Instead the terms *mt* and *g̃zr* are employed to encompass the semantic range of biblical Hebrew *'iš*.⁸ *mt*

4 Both terms have a similar semantic extension, i.e., the meaning "young man" extends to "soldier." The process of analogy may have been at work here, but it is hardly possible to determine which vocable is dependent on the other. See the remarks of J. McDonald, "The Status and Role of the Na'ar in Israelite Society," *JNES* 35 (1976), 147–70.

5 For the possible meaning "its divisions" for *ršh* compare Isa. 11:11; 13:17. See J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1971), I: 81, cf. *KAI*, II: 168–79.

6 *EA* 74:30–53, the famous address of Abdi Ashirta to the warriors (*šābu*), is illustrative since the component of the *šābu* is the *amēlu* "soldier." A similar relationship may have existed between the *šābu* and the *amēlu* at Amarna as between the *'am* and *'iš* in biblical Hebrew. It is of interest to note that the *šābu* can either be a "people" or an "army." See *CAD*, S 46–54.

7 References to this governmental body can be found in Byblos, *EA* 138:49, *LÚ.MEŠ = amēlūt bēl āli*, "lords of the city," in Šumur, *EA* 118:51–52, *LÚ.MEŠ = amēlūt rābišū ša Šumu[ra]*, "chief men of Šumur." Rib Addi refers to this group as "the city" *ālu* in *EA* 89:40–41. Ezekiel mentions a similar governmental body in 26:16, viz. *nēši' ē hayyām*, "princes of the sea," and perhaps it is alluded to in Isa. 23:8 *šārīm* "officials." For the historical background as well as a cogent review of this material see H. J. Katzenstein, *The History of Tyre* (Jerusalem, 1973), 28–45, especially 30–31.

8 For a study of the vocable *mt*, see Z. Zevit's unpublished dissertation ("Studies in Biblical Poetry in their Northwestern Setting") submitted to the University of California at Berkeley (1973).

is employed in Ugaritic as 'man,⁹ mortal,¹⁰ a gentilic preceding a place name,¹¹ and husband¹² but not 'soldier'.¹³ Instead we find the lexeme *g̃zr*¹⁴ as 'man, youth and soldier', which is in consonance with biblical Hebrew *'iṣ*. Illustrative of the martial nuance of Ugaritic *g̃zr* is Anat II:20–24, where *g̃zr* parallels *mhr* and *šbim*.¹⁵ The text reads: *tt'r ksat lmr t'r¹⁶ ṭlḥnt lšbim hdm lēzrm*, "She casts chairs on warriors, she casts tables on troops, footstools upon soldiers." *g̃zr* is employed as the referent "man" in 119:16, 18, 19, 20, 23; 124:7; 2081:1. etc.¹⁷

The *'iṣ* is the component of the Israelite *'am*. E. A. Speiser indicated this in 1959 but failed to develop the military nature of either the *'iṣ* or the *'am*.¹⁸ It is not our intention to provide an exhaustive study of the lexeme *'am*,¹⁹ but rather to adumbrate the special martial character of the *'am* with regard to the *'iṣ*.

Evidence for the martial character of the *'am* is abundant in biblical narrative and poetry and it is this factor which distinguishes the *'am* from the *gōy*.²⁰ In the archaic poetry of the Bible the *'am* is employed as a referent for "troops", e.g., the Song of Deborah²¹ Judg. 5:11 *'āz yārēdū lašē'ārīm 'am YHWH*, "Then did the troops of the YHWH march down to the gates." See also vv. 13 and 14. The oracles of Balaam offer an interesting

9 124:607. References to Ugaritic are taken from C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome, 1965).

10 2 Aqht VI: 35–36.

11 E. g. *dnīl mt rpi*, "Daniel man of rpi," and *g̃zr mt hrnmy*, "Ghazir man of hrnmy." See 1 Aqht I:20, 36, 47; 2 Aqht I:18; II:28; V:4, 14, 33; etc., Cf. W. F. Albright, "The Traditional Home of the Syrian Daniel," *BASOR* 130 (1953), 26–27.

12 52:40, 46 has: *hm aṭtm tšḥny mt mt*, "Behold the two women cry, O husband, husband."

13 The Ugaritic lexicon is specific with regard to its military nomenclature. A. F. Rainey in his article "The Military Personnel of Ugarit," *JNES* 21 (1961), 17–27, describes the military stratification at Ugarit. See also J. McDonald and B. Cutler, "The Unique Ugaritic Text UT 113 and the Question of the Guilds," *UF* 9 (1977), 13–30.

14 2 Aqht VI:20; 119:3, 10, 19, 20; 125:46, 83, 95; etc.

15 See Rainey's remarks concerning this word in his article "The Military Personnel of Ugarit," loc. cit.

16 For the sequence imperfect-perfect in Ugaritic see M. Held, "The YQTL-QTL (QTL-YQTL) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic," A. A. Neuman *Festschrift*, (Leiden, 1962), 281–90.

17 A parallel development can be found in the biblical Hebrew polyseme *na'ar*, see J. MacDonald, "The Status and Role of the Na'ar in Israelite Society," *JNES* 35 (1976), 147–70.

18 See his seminal remarks in "People and Nation of Israel," *JBL* 59 (1959), 167–73.

19 N. K. Gottwald in *The Tribes of Yahweh* (New York, 1979), 509–11 has examined the "specialized social-organizational meaning of *'am*." Among these meanings he finds that "the delegation" is the appropriate English vocable for *ha'am* in Judg. 3:18. The *'am* here is, in our opinion, nothing more than "arms bearing males" sent by Ehud to Eglon, King of Moab. This tendency to specialize Hebrew lexemes without resort to semantic data is a drawback in his book, cf. his treatment of *yōšēb*, 511ff.

20 For the clear distinctions see Speiser, op. cit. and L. Rost, "Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk im Alten Testament." *Otto Procksch Festschrift* (Leipzig, 1913), 122–44.

We do not wish to suggest that *gōy* lacks the meaning "troops." This would be misleading. One need only consult Josh. 10:13; Deut. 28:49; Jer. 5:15; 50:3; Joel 1:6; Amos 6:14; Mic. 4:3; Hab. 1:6 to see that *gōy* denotes a martial unit albeit mostly in poetic or prophetic texts with the exception of Deut. 28:49 which emphasizes the geographical locale of the *gōy*. Our study of *'am* has demonstrated that it is employed more frequently and more consistently as a martial term than *gōy*. Unfortunately, space precludes a complete citation of the readily available evidence.

21 For the date of this poem see D. N. Freedman, "Divine Names and Titles of Early Hebrew Poetry," *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. E. Wright* (N. Y., 1976), 55–107 and W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (N. Y., 1968), 20–22.

simile, Numb. 23:24, *hen 'ām kēlābī' yāqūm wēka'ārī yitnaššā' lō' yiškab 'ad yō'kal terep wēdam ḥālālīm yište*, "Lo troops that rise like a lion, leap up like the king of beasts, rest not until it has feasted on prey and drunk the blood of the slain."²² The 'am in this verse clearly is a referent to the arms-bearing males of the Israelite tribe. It is not unusual to find animal imagery employed to describe military prowess in the Bible and especially archaic poetry, e.g., Gen. 49:9; Deut. 33:17, 20, etc.²³ The Divine Warrior is pictured marching at the head of the troops ('am) in Ps. 68:8,²⁴ *'ēlōhīm bēšē'tēkā lipnē 'ammekā bēša'adēkā bišmōn selā*, "O God when you went at the head of your troops, when you marched through the desert, selah."

We are not limited to archaic poetry in our identification of 'am as a martial term, Josh. 6:10, *wē'et hā'ām šiwwā yēhōšū'ā lē'mōr lō' tārti'ū wēlō' tašmī'ū 'et qōlkem wēlō' yēšē' mippikem dābār 'ad yōm 'omrī 'ālēkem hārī'ū waharī'ōtem*, "But Joshua's orders to the troops were: Do not shout, do not let your voices be heard, and do not let a sound issue from your lips until the moment that I command you, 'Shout!' Then you shall shout." See also the prose texts in Josh. 8:10, 11, 13, 14; Judg. 9:29, 43; 20:2, 8; I Sam. 6:19; 11:7, 14; 12:20; I Kgs. 8:33; etc. In non-prose texts we find for example Prov. 11:14 where 'am can best be understood in a military ambiance: *bē'en taḥbulōt yippol 'am ūtēšū'ā bērōb yō'ēš*, "Where no planning is, troops fall; but in the multiple of counselors there is victory." See also Hab. 3:16; Joel 2:5; Ps. 144:2; etc. In addition the phrase 'am ḥaššābā' in Num. 31:32 is employed in the priestly writings to signify army.²⁵

Phoenician and Ugaritic 'm do not semantically agree with biblical Hebrew 'm in regard to the referent "troops" or "army." In Phoenician, 'm denotes a people. This might appear congruent with biblical Hebrew usage, where 'm is a consanguineous term, but there is no hint of a blood relationship in the Phoenician term 'm. We will cite a few examples both from Phoenicia proper, i.e., the Palestinian-Syrian coastal region and from countries that employed Phoenician in their inscriptions.

In the ninth century Phoenician inscription from Karatepe the word 'm is employed as a referent for a city population. Azitawadda implores *b'l-krntryš* his god to grant prosperity for himself and his citizens.²⁶ *KAI 26A:7-9: wkn hqrt z b'lt šb' wtrš w'm z 'š yšb bn ykl b'l'lpn wb'l š'n wb'l šb' wtrš*, "And may this city possess grain and wine and may the citizens that dwell in it possess oxen and small cattle and grain and wine!"²⁷ There is no

22 W. F. Albright in "The Oracles of Balaam," *JBL* 63 (1944), 207-33 would insert *gōy* or another synonym of 'am for the sake of parallelism after *yitnaššā'*. Note also the Samaritan offers 'ryh for Massoretic 'ry.

23 See the study by P. D. Miller, Jr., "Animal Names as Designations in Ugaritic and Hebrew," *UF* 2 (1970), 177-86.

24 For the date and analysis of this poem see W. F. Albright, "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm 68)," *HUCA* 23 (1950-51), 1-39. See also P. D. Miller, Jr., *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* (Cambridge, 1975), 102-13.

25 The Deuteronomist employed the terms 'anšē hammilḥāmā or 'am hammilḥāmā (Josh. 5:4, 6). Cf. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford, 1972), 48. More recent scholarship suggests that these terms are employed as stylistic devices and not derived from different editorial sources. On the whole problem see R. Rendtorff, *Das Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*, BZAW 147 (Berlin/New York, 1977).

26 We are employing the word "citizen" here with the basic meaning of city dweller. Note Old French *citēain* and *citē*.

27 Our translation relies on H. L. Ginsberg "Ugaritico-Phoenicia," *JANES* 5 (1973), 131-49.

hint of a consanguineous nuance of the word 'm here or in the Yehawmilk inscription (KAI 10:10) from Byblos, dating from the 5th–4th centuries. There we find the phrase 'm 'rš, "people of the country."²⁸ The Pireaus inscription offers very little in the way of blood relationship. KAI 60:1 has *bšt 14 l'm šdn*, "In the 14th year of the people of Sidon." We are fortunate to possess a bi-lingual Greek inscription which renders the Phoenician 'm into Greek, where we obtain *koinon* "community," "populace." In Phoenician we do not find either a consanguineous nuance or a military nuance in 'm; in fact a constant of 'm in Phoenician is its affinity for a geographical location.

Ugaritic 'm as a consanguineous or even as a communal term is at best problematic, and as a military term, non-existent. Most commentators regard this lexeme as a preposition.²⁹ There are two passages in the Ugaritic corpus that are mentioned in connection to this referent *UT 49:1:22, dq anm lyrz 'm b'l ly'db mrh 'm bn dgn ktmism*, which Aistleitner renders: "The one who is weak in power, he will not subdue Ba'al's tribe; He will not use the staff of the tribe of Dagan's son in authority."³⁰ The other example is found in 2 Aqht 1:19–34. This is the pericope of the ideal son: *nšb skn ilibh bqđš ztr 'my*, Ginsberg renders, "who sets up the stelae of his ancestral spirits, In the holy place the protectors of his clan."³¹ One should be cautious before accepting these meanings in Ugaritic.

M. Birot tentatively suggested a noun *ḥimmu* "group," or "list of men," in the Mari documents.³² *ARM 14:70:3–5* (reverse) contains: *ina tuppi tebibti ḥalšim ša ana šer bēliya ušabillam ḥimmu šater*, "Sur la tablette de recensement du district que j'ai fait porter a mon seigneur, un *Ḥimmu* est inscrit." Again we urge prudence before assigning this referent an entry into the lexicons.

Until now we have demonstrated the componential quality of 'iš as part of the 'am in military nomenclature; what then is the relationship between the 'ādām and the gôy? Speiser³³ had concluded that 'ādām was the component of the gôy "nation." My study has reinforced this conclusion and added several salient points worthy of attention. 'iš and

28 Note that the term *bn 'dm* "people" occurs in place of 'm 'rš in the supplication formula from Egypt 2nd-1st century B.C.E. *KAI 48:4: wytn lm hn whym l'n 'lnm wbn 'dm*, "and may she grant him favor and life in the eyes of the gods and the people." The Yehawmilk formula contains: *hn l'n 'lnm wl'n 'm 'rš*, "favor in the eyes of the gods and in the eyes of the people of this country."

29 See for example D. Pardee, "The Preposition in Ugaritic," *UF 7* (1975), 362 and *UF 8* (1976), 260 and K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen AOAT 21* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974).

30 J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1963), #2537 contra M. Deitrich and O. Loretz, "Ein Spottleid auf Attr," *UF 9* (1977), 331 and J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu* AOAT 16 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1971), 203. Aistleitner is probably wrong here. We prefer the more sober translation offered by Ginsberg in *ANET*, 137, "Too weakly. He can't race with Baal, and throw javelin with Dagon's son."

31 H. L. Ginsberg, *ANET*, 150. See also M. Pope, "Notes on the Ugaritic Rephaim Texts," *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein* (Hamden, 1977), 163–82; Y. Avishur, "The Incense and the Sweet Scent: The Commandments of the Ideal Son in Aqhat and Idol Worship in Ez. 8," *Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm* (Jerusalem, 1978), 1–15 [in Hebrew].

32 M. Birot *ARM 14*, 231. I would like to thank R. M. Good for the reference. For the lexeme 'm in Ugaritic, see his unpublished dissertation "The Sheep in His Pasture: A Study of the Hebrew Noun 'am(m) and its Semitic Cognates," submitted to Yale University, 1980.

33 E. A. Speiser, see. n. 18.

'*ādām* are close but not identical synonyms.³⁴ These two terms appear idiosyncratically several times in the Old Testament.³⁵ Indeed these two terms are frequently employed in stereotyped expressions, but this does not imply that no distinction exists. Each verse must be scrutinized on its own merit.

'*īš* as we have demonstrated is a military term, both in prose and poetry, '*ādām* is not. In the entire Bible we have but two occurrences of '*ādām* in a martial ambiance and these are in poetic texts.³⁶ '*ādām* is employed as a referent for "commoner" in the poetry and prose sections of the Bible, a social designation absent in the '*īš*. Ps. 82:7, an archaic Psalm, poses the merismus *šar* "ruler" and '*ādām* "commoner": '*ākēn kē'ādām tēmūtūn ūkē'ahad haššārīm tippōlū*, "Indeed like a commoner you will die, and as a ruler you will fall." The two social positions ruler and commoner are polar devices employed here in a rhetorical fashion.³⁷ Judg. 16:17 contrasts the '*ādām* "commoner" with the *nēzīr 'ēlōhīm*, "God's nazirite." *kī nēzīr 'ēlōhīm 'ānī mibbeṭen 'immī 'im gullaḥtī wēšār mimmennī kōḥī wēḥālītī wēḥayītī kēkol hā'ādām*, "for I have been God's nazirite from my mother's womb; if I be shaven, then my strength will depart, and I will become weak, and be like any other commoner." The religious elitism inherent in the concept behind the referent *nāzīr* allows it to be contrasted with '*ādām*. Again in Prov. 18:16 the '*ādām* is employed as the antithesis of *gēdōlīm* "great ones." *mattān 'ādām yarḥīb lō wēlipnē gēdōlīm yanḥennū*, "a commoner's gift makes room for him and brings him before great ones." It has not been our intention to derive a new meaning for '*ādām* but to stress the low social status of the '*ādām* in prose and poetry. Further, '*ādām* and '*īš* respectively, focus on different aspects of an individual's place in Hebrew society.

Phoenician also employs the etymon '*dm* with approximately the same meaning as the Hebrew referent "commoner." The Eshmunazor inscription dating from the 5–4 centuries (KAI 14:4) supplies us with valuable semantic data concerning the referent '*dm*. In this inscription we find the merismus *mmlkt* and '*dm*: '*t kl mmlkt wkl 'dm*, "any ruler or any commoner."³⁸ This usage is not only found in the mainland or in the "late" inscriptions. Indeed we find an example of the social order from Karatepe dating from the 9th to the 8th centuries. In this inscription KAI 26:III:12–13: *w'm mlk bmlkm wrzn brznm 'm 'dm 'š 'dm šm ymh šm 'ztwd*, "If there be a king among kings or a prince among princes (or officials) or a man who is called a man (i.e., a commoner) who will wipe out the name of

34 See the remarks of S. Talmon in "Synonymous Readings in the Old Testament," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 18 (Jerusalem, 1961), 335–83 who has attempted to reduce these terms into a vague stereotyped expression without regard to differences in meaning.

35 Archaic poetry contains the following example: Num. 23:19; pre-exilic and exilic works include 2 Kgs. 7:10; Jer. 2:6; Isa. 9:5, 15; 44:13; and poetic material encompasses: Ps. 39:12; 49:3; 62:10; 140:2; Prov. 6:12; 12:14; 20:6; 30:2; etc.

36 Isa. 22:6; 31:8; note also the extra biblical evidence from Lachish KAI 194: 5–6 by analogy with '*īš*.

37 Ps. 82:7 may reflect an earlier Canaanite model or mythological motif, where the death of a god is mentioned. See also Isa. 14:12–21 and Ezek. 28:1–10. Cf. P. Grelot, "Isaie 14:12–15 et son assiere plan mythologique," *RHR* 149 (1956), 18–48 and J. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan* Suppl. to VT 5 (Leiden, 1957), 288.

38 This expression is also employed in lines 6–7 and 10 of the same inscription. Note also KAI 10:11: *kl mmlkt wkl 'dm* "any ruler or any commoner."

Azitawadda.”³⁹ Ugaritic does not employ the substantive *adm* for “commoner” rather the term *blmlk* is used in poetic texts to render this social position: *UT* 51:VII:42–44: *yṯb b’l lbhth umlk ublmlk arš drkt yštkn*, “Baal dwells in his house. Neither king nor commoner will establish a land of authority,”⁴⁰ and perhaps *mt* in 2 *Aqht* 6:35–36: *mt uḥryt mh yqh*, “Further life—how can a commoner attain it?”

The term *adm* has two usages in the Ugaritic texts, the first as part of an epithet of El (*Krt* 36–37): *wbḥlmh il yrd bḡhrth ab adm*, “and in his dream El descends, in a vision the father of men.” The title *ab adm* is found only in the *Krt* epic occurring here six times.⁴¹ The word *adm* together with its synonym *lim* appear in *Anat* II:7–8, *tmḥš lim ḥp (ym) tšmt adm šat špš*, “She strikes the people of the West, she shatters the men of the East.”⁴² Both here and in the formula *ab adm* the referent *adm* signifies a collective for humanity. Synonyms of *adm* in Ugaritic include *lim*, which is a poetic term used in the Ugaritic mythological texts. 67:VI:24, *nšm Anat* 3:35; 9:3, 15, etc., *bnš* vocalized *bu-nu-šu* by the quadrilingual vocabulary list 2038, 2040, 1040, etc., and *npš* 2106:1; 1142:1–7, etc.

Because of the nature of the terms *’ādām* and *gōy* we will limit our investigation to semantics. It is not our intention to examine all the nuances of the word *gōy*; rather we simply propose to seek out the nature of the term with regard to *’ādām*. The word *gōy* in biblical Hebrew refers to a people bound together to form a nation; and is distinguished from the rest of Hebrew communal terminology by its stress on nationhood and its affinity to a geographical location.⁴³ The latter point is predicated on the principle that *gōy* possesses an established territory where it can implement its kingdom (Heb. *mamlākā*).

The *gōy*, as a term for nation, is deduced from its affinity to a geographical location. An examination of the terms that surround the *gōy* reveals not only *mamlākā* (Jer. 18:7; 2 Chr. 32:15) but *melek* (Jer. 50:41; 1 Sam. 8:6; etc.). 1 Sam. 8:5–6 is particularly instructive since the elders of Israel request a king from Samuel in order to rule them as all

39 The social scale wherein the highest official is mentioned first and the least prominent figure is last is common in Phoenician inscriptions. Note Ahiiram *KAI* 1:2. A. Demsky has indicated Akkadian parallels to this practice in “Mesopotamian and Canaanite Literary Traditions in the Ahiiram Curse Formula,” *EI* 14 (1978), 7–12 [in Hebrew]. The Larnex-Tes-Lapethos inscription from the 3rd–2nd centuries fits into this category stylistically. In *KAI* 43:11: *’l ḥyy w’l ḥy zr’y ym md ym wḥsmḥ šdq w’l štw w’l dmy*, “For my life and for the life of my descendants, day by day, and to the legitimate progeny and for the women and commoners.” Compare the remarks of H. L. Ginsberg in *Ugaritico-Phoenicia*, loc. cit. There is a problem associated with this translation, viz., the *waw* after *w’l štw* which we view as a scribal error (dittography) for the *waw* of *w’l dmy*. Both women and men here were commoners without titles. Yatonba’al the governor of the district was concerned with himself, his immediate descendants and continued in delineated order until he arrived at the bottom of the social ladder, i.e., the commoners. Donner and Röllig attempt to connect *’dm* with *dm* “blood,” the *aleph* being prosthetic (*KAI*, II:61). Cooke in *NSI* has refrained from commenting on this passage.

40 See Gordon *UT*, 372. The interdialectal distribution for “commoner” is biblical Hebrew *’ādām*, Phoenician *’dm*, and Ugaritic *blmlk* / *mt*.

41 *Krt* I:37; III:136, 151; V:259; VI:278, 297.

42 This parallel has been noted by several scholars including C. Virolleaud, “La déesse ‘Anat Poème de Ras Shamra,” *Syria* 18 (1837), 85–102 and U. Cassuto, *The Goddess Anath* (Jerusalem, 1971), 86–87. The two synonyms *lim* and *adm* may also be rendered as martial terms, i.e., soldiers, warriors.

43 Rost in *Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk*, 112–44 has noted this geographical affinity “Das Volk ist ohne Land nicht denkbar.” He draws our attention to Ezek. 35:10; 37:22, etc.

the other nations, Heb. *gôyîm*. It is this relation, vis., between the *melek*, "king" and the *gôy* "nation" that distinguishes the *gôy* from the '*am*, "people."⁴⁴ Further, the '*ādām* "commoner" is a member of the society with the *melek* as its titular head.⁴⁵

Ancillary evidence is provided by Job 34:29 which contains: "When he gives quietness who can condemn? And when he hides his face who can see him? whether it be done to a *gôy* (nation), or to an '*ādām* (commoner)."⁴⁶ This verse clearly indicates that the '*ādām* is in fact the component of the *gôy*. This interpretation is valid when the author of a verse or pericope conceives of a nation either governed by a king, or of a people with aspirations to this type of rule (*vide supra*).

It is difficult to ascertain the relationship of the *gw* in Phoenician to the '*dm*. The only evidence we have comes from the Pireaus inscription which is late (it dates from ca. 96 B.C.E.; KAI 60). Further the etymon *gw* is not a clear semantic equivalent to biblical Hebrew *gôy*. The Phoenician term is a referent to a small self-contained community of Phoenicians living outside of their homeland. Indeed it is a body of people that have as their head a *nš'* and not a *melek*. This is a significant statement with regard to the political differences between these two groups separated both by time and location. In spite of these vast differences in social structure and geographical location it is interesting to note that the component '*dm* is employed here: (KAI 60:7): *k yd' hgw lšlm hlp' yt' dmm 'š p'l mšrt pn gw*, "for the community knows to compensate the men who have performed service for the benefit of the community." Despite this similarity the differences predominate. These '*dmm* may have been ordinary workers hired to set up a portico for the *gw* and not members of the *gw* per se. Indeed the *gw* may have been composed of a republic which admitted only male members with property.⁴⁷ In short, this inscription raises more questions than it solves.

The lexeme *ga'ûm* "gang (of workmen)" is a west Semitic word found in the Mari dialect.⁴⁸ A. Falkenstein and A. Malamat⁴⁹ see in ARM 6 28:7ff. a reference to a martial

44 See the remarks of A. Cody in "When is the Chosen People Called a Goy," VT 14 (1964), 1-6. Note however the use of *melek* with '*am* in 2 Sam. 8:15; Ezek. 30:10-11; Ps. 105:13; Prov. 14:28; Esther 4:11.

45 Indeed the rulership of Yahweh was threatened in Isa. 8:6 because the *zignê yišrâ'êl* requested a *melek* and not a *nāšî'*, which would have left the kingship of Yahweh intact. See the remarks of B. A. Levine and W. W. Hallo in "Offerings to the Temple Gates at Ur," HUCA 38 (1967), 17-38 and E. A. Speiser, "The Biblical *nāšî'*," CBQ 25 (1963), 111-17. W. Zimmerli missed this point in *Ezekiel 1-24 Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1955), 178.

46 We cannot press this translation too much since '*ādām* may be employed here in the general sense of man without regard to social position, e.g. Ps. 22:7. However our translation adds impetus to verse 52, "the godless commoner reign not . . ." Indeed the least fit to rule would be a man who was a commoner.

47 See the remarks of N. Slouschz, in general in "Government among the Hebrew and Phoenicians," JQR 4 (1914), 303-10. The dialectal distribution of the referent community can be rendered into Phoenician as *gw*, biblical Hebrew *qāhāl* and Ugaritic *qbš*. The last example is based on the reading of *qbš* in UT 144:7. Note also Krt III:14-15, *btk rpi arš bphr qbš dtn* "In the midst of the *rpi arš* in the congregation of the community (?) of *dtn*." D. Sperling in EJ 14 (1971), 79-80 connects *dtn* with Amarna *damu* (143:40). "Although *datnu* is problematic, it is equated in an Akkadian lexical text with *dapnu*, 'heroic, martial, ferocious,' and *qarradu*, 'hero, warrior.'" The word *hbr*, if it does not denote the name of a city, is a candidate for "community." See UT, 400; 128:IV:8, 19, etc.

48 On *ga'ûm* see CAD, G, 59a, von Soden, AHw., 284 and M. Held, "Philological Notes on the Mari Covenant Rituals," BASOR 200 (1970), 34.

49 A. Falkenstein, "Mesopotamia-Assyriologie," BiOr 13 (1956), 31, and A. Malamat, "Mari and the Bible: Some Aspects of Tribal Societies in Mari and Israel," Les Congres et Colloques de l'Universite de Leige, 42

unit restoring *ga-iu-um a-na ga-ii-im ip-pa-qi-id* "each gang (= military unit) will be inspected." If the term *ga'ûm* can be associated with the military in Amorite then a semantic connection with Hebrew *'am* would not be improbable in prose texts. Since most attestations of Hebrew *gôy* in military pericopes and verses are poetic, some hesitation need be utilized in comparing *ga'ûm* with its Hebrew etymon.

In this study we have attempted to demonstrate the relationship between the *'îš* and the *'am*. We have followed Speiser in treating the *'am* as a consanguineous unit, the *'îš* as its component. Both terms were transferred over to martial vocabulary, and as such attracted to themselves the specialized meaning of "fighting man, or soldier" and "troops" respectively.

This relationship differed considerably from the bond that connected the *'ādām* and the *gôy*. These terms were employed in an environment that demanded structural differentiation.⁵⁰ In this environment the *'ādām* served aside from the more general meaning "man" as a "commoner." The matrix out of which the vocable *'ādām* developed was the *gôy*, i.e., a nation. The polar terms within this closed system were the *melek* "king," occupying the highest social position and the *'ādām* "commoner" holding the lowest position (aside from the bondsman or slave.)

An interdialectal distribution of the data that we have just presented can be expressed in paradigmatic form in the following manner: biblical Hebrew *'îš* "man" underwent a semantic specialization at an undetermined point resulting in the additional meaning of "soldier." This process was shared by Moabite *'š*, Ugaritic *ğzr* and the *amēlu* of the Akkadian of Amarna; Phoenician *'š* and Ugaritic *mt* did not develop in this manner.

Biblical Hebrew *'ādām* "man" came to mean, again at an undetermined point in time, "commoner." This was expressed in a poetic text in Ugaritic as *blmlk* and in Phoenician as *'dm*.

Biblical Hebrew *'am* "people" is a consanguineous term; Ugaritic *'m* is problematic. The etymon *'m* in Phoenician is not a kinship term, and Akkadian, to my knowledge, lacks this nuance in its communal terminology. The term *'am* in biblical Hebrew extends to include the meaning of "troops," or "army." Ugaritic has a specialized vocabulary and the Akkadian of Amarna employs *LÚ.MEŠ*, Akkadian *amēlūtu*.

Gôy in biblical Hebrew denotes a nation bound to a geographical area which is expressed in Phoenician as *'m*.

42 (1967), 129–38. J. R. Kupper in *ARM* 6, 28:7 translated *ga'ûm* as "territoire", a position that both *CAD* and *AHW* reject.

The exact status of Amorite *ga'ûm* is not without difficulties. M. Held, op. cit., connects *ga'ûm* with Akkadian *gābu*. This would cover the semantic range of both lexemes if *ga'ûm* and *gābu* could be rendered into English as "group" and "military unit." The problem with *ga'ûm* at Mari centers on whether it is a martial term. Since the supposed referent rests on a restoration, scholars should be cautious.

50 The Phoenician lexeme *'dm* may have served as a model for the Israelite referent. Biblical Hebrew already employed the term *'ādām* as "man", "men", etc. and through the process of semantic specialization employed *'ādām* as "commoner". This meaning is demonstrable in peripheral Phoenician (Karatepe) from the ninth century (most of these occurrences are from the fifth century). It is not impossible that the Hebrews looked toward Phoenicia for suitable terminology. This is an oversimplification of what must have been a complex interplay between these two peoples. The linguistic term loan translation is too strong a description of this phenomenon; rather Phoenician influence at best might be found here. In any case semantic distribution and diffusion among the Northwest Semitic dialects is still in need of close study.