

# Northwest Semitic Designations for Elective Social Affinities

M. O'CONNOR  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

## I

The soft underbelly of political and social history is the vocabulary of association and organization. The major case of this problematic is well known: to write the history of a people one must be able to find that people identified as a people in the documentary record. What constitutes such an identification? That is the question that has led to the great debates about ethnicity and race, culture and *genre de vie* in the ancient world—debates conducted, to a degree rarely acknowledged, in the distorting modern context of nationalisms and imperialisms.<sup>1</sup>

We may sidestep those debates and begin again, with association and organization. The family is the “natural” model, combining elective association, in the form of marriage, with non-elective association, in the form of childbirth.<sup>2</sup> The family is also the primary institution of association, an institution and thus not at all natural, and it furnishes the first order of the vocabulary of association. The terminology of the family ramifies from the individual members of the “nuclear” unit to include an array of relations studied under the anthropological rubric of kinship terms. The best-known order of the vocabulary of association refers to the large-scale social and political realities to which I alluded at the outset: people, nation, state, tribe; these are the functional units of geopolitical reality.<sup>3</sup> The family serves as model for this level, in

---

1 Thanks to my usual coconspirators, D. F. Graf, C. Libolt, and L. K. Obler, and to J. A. Fitzmyer, J. Greenman, and F. Rosenthal, who read an earlier draft of this paper.

Note the following language abbreviations: Akk(adian), Ar(a)b(ic), Ar(a)m(aic), B(iblical) H(ebrew), Gr(eek), J(ewish) Arm, M(ishnaic) H(ebrew), Nab(atean), Palm(yrene), Q(umranic) Arm, Ug(aritic).

2 Here and in what follows I have bastardized some basic notions of Western political thought; on this point, see, e.g., Aristotle's *Politics* I.1253–54.

3 Laurence Kutler, enlarging on a suggestion from E. A. Speiser, argues that the opposition of Heb. *‘am* and *gôy* consists in the opposition between ‘consanguineous group’, thus ‘people’ and more specially ‘troops, army’ (*‘m*; the constituent unit is *‘iš* ‘man, soldier’), and ‘geopolitical group’, thus ‘nation’ (*gwy*; the basic constituent is *‘ādām* ‘commoner’, contrasted not only to *melek* but also *šar* and *gēdōlīm* and even *nēzār* *‘ēlōhīm*). In his paper, “A Structural Semantic Approach to Israelite Communal Terminology,” *JANES* 14 (1982), 69–77, Kutler reviews not only the biblical data but also cognate usages, both linguistic and semantic, in Mari and Amarna Akkadian, Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Moabite.

“Relatively rare in scholarship is the attempt by scholars to define analogues to the term ‘state’ from ancient sources”; J. M. Lundquist, “The Legitimizing Role of the Temple in the Origin of the State,” *SBL*

ways that range from the banal link of *pater* and *patria*<sup>4</sup> to the complexities of the "fictional" kinship systems that hold together tribes and other tribally based units, the Amorite genealogies of the Old Babylonian period furnishing the most widely recognized ancient Near Eastern examples.

These two levels, familial and political, form the basis for the majority of associations among persons. There lies between them an indeterminate realm, the realm of associations outside the family but within the state or tribe. This is the field pre-eminently of elective affinities, and it is the elective quality of friendships, for example, that makes it unlikely that they would be known to the surviving records of ancient society.<sup>5</sup> Cognate affinities, less intimate, possessing less, that is, of what moderns recognize as personal involvement, but not necessarily less important, are abundantly attested in the ancient records. Documentation of them is greatest from urban sites, as the bulk of antique documents are from cities and indeed from their ruling elites,<sup>6</sup> and the documentation increases markedly after the advent of Alexander and the Hellenistic ethos, for it is only then that writing begins to be used by a broad range of people for a variety of purposes.<sup>7</sup>

These organizations, insofar as they are attested, find their bases in the whole range of human activities, the range of activities which bring together with a common purpose most often men but sometimes both women and men. The activities may be economic, professional, religious, or cultural, and the organizations devoted to burial, trade, worship, charitable goals, or having fun.<sup>8</sup> These organizations are variously

*Seminar Papers* 1982, ed. K. H. Richards (Chico, 1982), 270–97, at 272. I know of no proposed Northwest Semitic terms for 'state'.

The term *'ahābīs Qurayš* 'a class of men belonging to or linked with the tribe of) Quraysh,' though well attested in early Islamic records, remains unexplained. For a summary of the evidence, earlier proposals to render the phrase 'associates or mercenaries of the Quraysh' (among many other suggestions), and an attempt to connect *'ahābīs* with Late Bronze-Iron Age Canaanite *ḥupšu/ḥopšī*, see John Wansbrough, "Gentilics and Appellatives," *BSOAS* 49 (1986), 203–10.

4 Note, too, Arb. *'amm* 'patruus, father's brother' and *'āmm* 'public', *'amma* '(the) people', the latter two to be compared to BH. *'am* 'people'. The *patruus* sense is accorded by all scholars of Amorite to the *ḥamm-* / *amm-* formant in that language; see, e.g., I. J. Gelb et al., *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite*, *AS* 21 (Chicago, 1980), 15.

5 The language of friendship is common in treaties, and we may note a passage from the most famous of fictional Phoenicians, Vergil's Dido. After she prays that Aeneas die in battle, Dido urges enmity between her Tyrians (as she calls them) and Romans: *nullus amor populis nec foedera sunt*, "Do not let love or treaty tie our people" (4.624; so Allen Mandelbaum, *The Aeneid of Virgil* [New York, 1971]; Marlowe abridges the line: "Betwixt this land and that be never league!"; *Dido Queen of Carthage* 5.1.309). Yoël Arbeitman remarks, "It would seem reasonable that *amor et foedera* (though here broken by disjunctives) is hendyadic for 'friendship treaty, non-aggression pact' (the last word sharing the root of *pax*)."  
*Foedus* is cognate to Latin *fides*, Gr. *pistis* and thus, like Hittite *miumar*, an exception to the general rule that Indo-European treaty and oath words refer to binding (English *bind*, *bond*). I am grateful to Arbeitman for these remarks; for *miumar*, see his article cited below (n. 14).

6 Amos 6:7 suggests that the milieu need not be urban.

7 It may not be amiss to add that it is, notwithstanding these observations, unwise to speak of significant literacy in the ancient period.

8 They may be even plainer stuff. In that fine paragraph beginning, "The Nabataeans are a sensible people (*sōphrones*)," Strabo tells us, "They prepare common meals together in groups of thirteen people (*anthrōpous*, viz., both women and men?)," (16.4.26); translation cited from H. L. Jones, *Strabo*, *LCL* (Cambridge, 1930), 7:367.

called clubs, guilds, brotherhoods, fraternities, or the like, a tolerable variation in terminology, since no ancient historian puts too great an evidentiary burden on the terms.<sup>9</sup> The custom has arisen of using the Greek term *thiasos* 'company, troop' (and also 'feast, banquet') to designate a certain variety of these organizations in the ancient Levant, though ancient speakers of Semitic languages when writing Greek favored other terms in that language—*phratría*, *hetair(e)ia*, *symposion*.<sup>10</sup>

The history of this variety of organization (which is not as discrete a variety as some have suggested) and of other elective affinities would constitute a branch of what students of the modern period call institutional history, though the scattered ancient evidence scarcely warrants that fine designation. It is to the good that the evidence is scattered—it alerts us to the need to inspect, for example, architectural witnesses<sup>11</sup> as closely as religious texts—and diverse, some texts emanating from central authorities, e.g., the "guild" texts from Ugarit, some from the organizations themselves or their members. Some of the organizations were doubtless contingent on particular business possibilities, while others addressed more longstanding needs of their members.

Of the broad span of associations that belong in the realm between the family and the state, the best attested are those that belong to what I called that certain variety, a variety perhaps best defined by the qualities of independence and stability (rather than, say, hard living and hard loving). These organizations, that is, those now commonly called *thiasoi*, are assumed also to have had some non-economic basis. Certain other patterns emerge across the Northwest Semitic-speaking regions: *thiasoi* seem to have had closed memberships which regularly gathered in a fixed place to worship and feast, elect officers and keep track of members, honoring some and reproaching others.<sup>12</sup>

The subject of this essay is certain aspects of the vocabulary used in Northwest Semitic languages for *thiasoi* and other associations, most of them proper to the level of interaction I have crudely isolated between family and state/tribe.<sup>13</sup> I shall not treat

9 For cautions against misuse of the term "guild," see B. Cutler and J. Macdonald, "The Unique Ugaritic Text UT 113 and the Question of 'Guilds'," *UF* 9 (1977), 13–30.

10 As Javier Teixidor has recently noted, in "Le Thiase de Bêlastor et de Beelshamên d'après une inscription récemment découverte à Palmyre," *CRAIBL* (1981), 306–14, at 308–9.

11 On the Palmyran banqueting rooms in sacred settings, see, e.g., Iain Browning, *Palmyra* (London, 1979), 157–58, 209; J. Teixidor, *The Pagan God: Popular Religion in the Greco-Roman Near East* (Princeton, 1977), 133–35.

12 On comparable associations in the Greek-speaking sphere, see the references in the next note. The number of members also presents some patterns; favored numbers are 12 or (12 + 1 =) 13 (Teixidor contends that more than one leader was possible; "Thiase" [n. 10], 309–10) and 9 or (9 + 1 =) 10. See the discussion in J. T. Milik, *Recherches d'épigraphie proche-orientale. I. Dédicaces faites par des dieux (Palmyre, Hatra, Tyr) et des thiasos sémitiques à l'époque romaine*, *BAH* 92 (Paris, 1972), 119–21. Groups with twelve members are everywhere in the ancient Near East, from Jacob's sons (on the ancient poems about them, see M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* [Winona Lake, Indiana, 1980], 425–43), through the apostles of Christian scripture, down to the twelve city administrators of late antique Edessa; see J. B. Segal, *Edessa 'The Blessed City'* (Oxford, 1970), 126. Is the calendar a functional analogy? See also further below.

13 Greek texts regarding comparable organizations use the language of family to model group relations; on *adelphos* 'brother' and *mētēr* 'mother', see, e.g., G. H. R. Horsley, "Divergent Views on the Nature of the Greek of the Bible," *Bib.* 65 (1984), 393–403, at 398, or, more simply, Matt. 12:46–50. On such vocabulary, see also Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1977* (North Ryde, 1982), 91, and on Greek-language association texts generally, 49–50,

the most basic set of terms, those that refer to “fellow, fellow-citizen, even another person, with whom one stands in recipr[ocal] relations,” e.g., BH *rēa*<sup>c</sup>; this group of terms is most widely used in legal texts.<sup>14</sup> Nor shall I treat the rather colorless term *gw* ‘body’, used for *thiasoi* in both Phoenician and Middle Aramaic; the term is cognate to BH *gōy* ‘nation, people’.<sup>15</sup> I shall rather be concerned with the term *mrzḥ* and terms from the roots *ḥbr*<sup>16</sup> and *šrk*.<sup>17</sup> After reviewing briefly some features of the *mrzḥ*, I shall concentrate on the latter two.

## II

*Thiasoi* were common in urban Levantine civilization in late antiquity, and these well-attested *thiasoi* have an arresting prehistory and intriguing descendants. The standard West Semitic term for such a band (or, more strictly, for their gatherings) is \**marziḥ*. In the Canaanite sphere, the term is attested first at Ugarit around 1200<sup>18</sup>;

and P. M. Fraser, *Rhodian Funerary Monuments* (Oxford, 1977), 58–70. On the Matthean text and others like it, see E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her* (New York, 1983), 145–51.

On the Greek background, especially the usage in Christian scripture, see also Horsley, *New Documents . . . Published in 1976* (New Ryde, 1981), 59–61, and A. J. Dewey, “Marginal Notes on Recent Pauline Sociological Analysis,” *Proceedings Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 4 (1984), 107–19, especially 114–15.

14 The quotation is from *BDB*, 946a. For a discussion of a variety of “one . . . the other” idioms, including Targumic *gbr . . . ḥbr*, see Yoël L. Arbeitman, “The Hittite is Thy Mother: An Anatolian Approach to Genesis 23,” *Bono Homini Donum: Essays . . . J. Alexander Kerns*, ed. Arbeitman and A. R. Bomhard (Amsterdam, 1981), 889–1026, at 913–34. For an example of *gbr . . . ḥbr* where the referent is specifically members of a single, ethnic community, see the En Gedi Synagogue text (7th century); J. A. Fitzmyer and D. H. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts*, *Bib. Or.* 34 (Rome, 1978), 260. Where the Hebrew of Job 41:9, describing Leviathan’s scales, has *ṣyṣ . . . ṣhyhw*, 11Q<sup>1</sup>Job has the feminine, *ṣnth . . . ḥbrth* ‘a woman . . . her husband’; cf. *ibid.*, 44.

15 The terms are linguistically cognate, but not conceptually so; see Kutler, “Israelite Communal Terminology” (n. 3), 76, on *KAI* 60 (Phoenician); cf. Teixidor, *Pagan God*, 45, and see *DISO*, 48, for a Punic reference; for Palmyrene, see the text published by Teixidor, “Thiasē” (n. 10).

16 For a different approach to the various Semitic roots in *h/ḥbr* and BH. *ḥbr* in particular, see Henri Cazelles, *ḥāḥar, ḥāḥēr*, *TWAT* 3 (1977), cols. 721–26; cf. n. 74 below.

17 I do not wish to ignore the genuine difficulties with the study of Semitic roots as semantic entities, difficulties lately well summarized by Arthur Gibson in *Biblical Semantic Logic: A Preliminary Analysis* (New York, 1981), 176–89; but I do believe that the strictures have been overstated and that a variety of recent studies licenses some informed sense of the root as a phenomenon. The work of Ruth Berman is useful in this connection, both in historical linguistics (see Berman, “Lexical Decomposition and Lexical Unity in the Expression of Derived Verbal Categories in Modern Hebrew,” *AAL* 6 [1979], 117–42), and in developmental studies (see E. V. Clark and R. A. Berman, “Structure and Use in the Acquisition of Word Formation,” *Lang.* 60 [1984], 542–90). Another relevant psycholinguistic study is Zvia (Peres) Walden, *The Root of Roots: Children’s Construction of Word-Formation Processes in Hebrew* (Ph.D. diss.: Harvard, 1982).

18 The extensive recent discussion of the Claremont Ras Shamra *mrzḥ* text is summarized and continued in M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, “Der Vertrag eines *mrzḥ*-Klubs in Ugarit: Zum Verständnis von KTU 3.9,” *UF* 14 (1982), 71–76. On references in literary texts, see B. Margalit, “The Ugaritic Feast of the Drunken Gods: Another Look at RS 24.258 (KTU 1.114),” *Maarav* 2 (1979–1980), 65–120, at 98–105, on *qlr* ‘thiasos’ and *mrzḥ* ‘symposion’ in the text cited and *mrz*<sup>c</sup>, along with *mrzḥ*, in the Rephaim texts; on the spelling variation, see n. 22 and 79.

The two newest *mrzḥ* texts are Phoenician and Palmyrene respectively, one short and complete, the other long but severely damaged. The first text, from the fourth century B.C.E., reads *qbʿm ʾnhn || ʿrbl lmrzḥ šmš* “We two [women] offer cups to the *marziḥ* of Shamash” or, as the editors render it (taking the

later in the Hebrew Bible, between 850 and 700<sup>19</sup>; and in later Canaanite manifestations, in the Piraeus Kranz-Inscription of a Greek Sidonian community<sup>20</sup> and in the Marseilles Tariff.<sup>21</sup> The latest occurrences may be in the Neo-Punic poems inscribed on lintels from Mactar; Text A uses the spelling *mzr*<sup>2</sup> and Text B the spelling *mzrh*.<sup>22</sup> The most abundant attestations of the term \**marziḥ* come from Nabatean and especially Palmyrene texts. The intense activity of the *thiasoi* of Palmyra has been studied closely by Milik.<sup>23</sup> The Ugaritic and later evidence has been reviewed by Pope.<sup>24</sup>

The Palmyrene word for a *thiasos* or its meeting was \**marziḥ*, but the occasion of a meeting was also called <sup>3</sup>*gn* 'assembling of *thiasos*-members', from the Imperial Aramaic <sup>3</sup>*gn* 'krater', perhaps a loan from Akkadian *agannu* 'krater'. The semantics of using a drinking vessel's name to denote an occasion of its use are easily paralleled in Greek; note not only *symposion* 'a drinking together', but also *kōthōn*, both a 'Laconian drinking vessel' and a banquet at which it was used.<sup>25</sup>

number with *qb*<sup>3</sup>*m*), "Two cups we offer to the *marziḥ* of Shamash"; see N. Avigad and J. C. Greenfield, "A Bronze *Phialē* with a Phoenician Dedicatory Inscription," *IEJ* 32 (1982), 118–28, at 121.

The second text, published by Teixidor, "Thiase" (n. 10) and dating from the early first century C.E. (p. 310), contains the text of the statutes of a *thiasos* dedicated to the gods Belastor (= Bel?) and (restored) Baalshamin, the first text that refers to a thiasic liturgy for two gods. A member is called *gbr*, thus excluding women (p. 312; cf. Kutler, "Israelite Communal Terminology" [n. 3], 76; Teixidor contrasts Dura *thiasoi*; Avigad and Greenfield contend that the fact that women offered cups to the *mrzh* means they were members of it; cf. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 175–80); the *thiasos* (*gw*) had two heads, the *rb mrzh*<sup>3</sup> or president and the symposiarch, known from a Palmyrene tessera (H. Ingholt, H. Seyrig, J. Starcky, and A. Caquot, *Recueil des tessères de Palmyre*, *BAH* 58 [Paris, 1955], #39, pp. 7 and 147, plate III). The meal was called *smk* (this is the general term; the word is used in Nabatean for the *triclinium* itself) or *mšt*<sup>3</sup> (the technical term, so Teixidor) and was held in an <sup>3</sup>*drwn* (cf. Gr. *andrōn*, Starcky; JArm. <sup>3</sup>*iddrūn*, Syr. <sup>3</sup>*edrūnō*, Teixidor).

19 Amos 6:7, Jer. 16:5. I have not seen the treatment of H. M. Barstad, *The Religious Polemics of Amos*, *VTS* 34 (Leiden, 1984) (note the review by J. D. Newsome, *CBQ* 48 [1986], 709–11), nor O. Loretz on Jer. 16:5 and Amos 6:7 in *Kinder des Wortes: Beiträge zur Theologie der Propheten*. Josef Schreiner zum 60. Geburtstag, ed. L. Ruppert et al. (Würzburg, 1982) (cf. the notice by D. L. Petersen, *RSR* 10.2 [1984], 175).

20 KAI 60; see n. 15. For a reconstruction of the Greek "original" of KAI 60 based on extensive parallels in Greek documents, see H. B. Rosén's paper "Observations of *Pssēphisma Stephanōseos* of the Phoenician Community in Athens," reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften, East and West. Part One. General and Indo-European Linguistics* (Munich, 1982), 425–36.

21 KAI 69.

22 Text B is KAI 145; Text A is published in J.-G. Février and M. Fantar, "Les nouvelles inscriptions monumentales néopuniques de Mactar," *Karthago* 12 (1963–1964), 49–59. On the poetic character of the texts, see C. R. Krahmalkov, "Two Neo-Punic Poems in Rhymed Verse," *Rivista di studi fenici* 3 (1975), 169–205; cf. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 26, 142–43, 529. The term *mzr*<sup>2</sup> is used in Text A, 3.2, restored in 3.3. The *mzrh* forms probably reflect a metathesis from *mrzh*; it is possible that the *mzrh* was a distinct institution (so Avigad and Greenfield, "Phialē" [n. 18], 126, n. 39), but in light of the similarities of the Mactar clubs to other *mrzh*s this seems unlikely. For recent references to Mactar, see J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique," *Syria* 56 (1979), 353–405, at 382, 388.

23 Milik, *Dédicaces*, 107–217, 391–93; cf. Teixidor, *Pagan God*, 133–35. On *rb mrzh*<sup>2</sup> in *CIS* 2.476, see the re-study by F. Zayadine, "A Nabataean Inscription from Beida," *ADAJ* 21 (1976), 139–42.

24 Marvin H. Pope, *Song of Songs*, *AB* 7C (Garden City, NY, 1977), 210–29. Pope suggests that *marziḥ* gatherings were funerary feasts, associated with drinking and sexual activity. It will be evident that I consider the reconstruction of the *marziḥ* offered by Pope to be far too assured. In general, see J. M. Sasson, "On M. H. Pope's *Song of Songs*," *Maarav* 1 (1978–1979), 177–96, esp. 188–90, and M. H. Pope, "Response to Sasson on the Sublime Song," *Maarav* 2 (1979–1980), 207–14.

25 Milik takes Arm. <sup>3</sup>*gn* as a loan from Akkadian, but Stephen A. Kaufman argues that the evidence is indecisive: "The origin of this term is unknown, but the West Semitic and Akkadian distribution (peripheral

A *\*marziḥ* generally had under 25 members. Indeed, Milik's study of extant rosters suggests two major size patterns.<sup>26</sup> One involves nine lay members and one "priest," "president" or "symposiarch," a group size known from the Qumrān community and ancestral to the Jewish *minyān*. The other pattern is attested not only at Palmyra, but also at Dura Europos (in, among other places, the Palmyrene temple) and Petra (not only epigraphically but also in Strabo's descriptions of the Nabateans).<sup>27</sup> It includes twelve lay members and a head and is the prototype of the inner circle of twelve apostles grouped around Jesus, the thirteenth member.

### III

There is no trace of the term *\*marziḥ* at Hatra but the institution may be assumed to have existed there, given the common strains of Palmyrene, Nabatean, and Hatran religious records. Teixidor has suggested that *ḥbr* is the Hatran equivalent of *\*marziḥ* and noted that the cognate term *\*ḥbryn* is a term for 'group members, companions', usually in a text formula that refers to *PN wḥbryhy* 'PN and his companions'.<sup>28</sup> The latter term is also used by the Nabateans in the same sense and occurs once in a Palmyrene text.<sup>29</sup> In fact, in the Hatran texts *ḥbr* does not occur as a group designation; the usage is restricted to the agentive cited in the formula above.<sup>30</sup>

It is possible that *ḥbr* served as one Hatran term for *thiasos*, but there was another, as Milik has shown, in discussing a Hatran text published in a rather dismal fashion by P. Jensen in 1920.<sup>31</sup> Milik reconstructs the text as *dkyr PN<sub>1</sub> br PN<sub>2</sub> šdn<sup>2</sup> dy šrk[t]t<sup>2</sup> šrb[*m*]lkt<sup>2</sup> lt[b]* "May PN<sub>1</sub> son of PN<sub>2</sub>, custodian [cf. Arb. *sādin*, Palm. *šdn*] of the *šrkt* of Iššarbēl the Queen be remembered for good."<sup>32</sup> The term *šrkt* is an Arabic loan in Hatran, used to describe a *thiasos*. Although best known as the modern Arabic term for 'company', the loanword *šrkt* is also used in Middle Aramaic to describe an association distinct from either a *thiasos* or an economic combine.

Let us return briefly to schematic considerations before examining the other ancient attestation of *šrkt*. We began by directing our attention to a level of association "above" that of the family (more strictly, perhaps, "alongside" it) but below that of the

and late Assyrian) indicates a foreign loan [into Akkadian] from the West"; see *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, AS 19 (Chicago, 1974), 33. On BH. *ʔaggān* in the Song of Songs, see Pope, *Song*, 618, and "Response" (n. 24), 208. For further discussion of Arm. *ʔgn*, see J. Starcky, "Palmyre," *SDB* 6 (1960), cols. 1066-1103, at cols. 1100-1, and Caquot apud *Recueil* (n. 18), 143.

26 See n. 12.

27 See n. 10.

28 Teixidor, "Aramaic Inscriptions of Hatra," *Sumer* 20 (1964), 77-80; "Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique," *Syria* 44 (1967), 163-95, at 188-89. The examples are discussed in Milik, *Dédicaces*, 391-93.

29 See *DISO*, 82; Milik, *Dédicaces*, 391-93; J. T. Milik and J. Starcky, "Nabataean, Palmyrene, and Hebrew Inscriptions," in F. V. Winnett and W. L. Reed, *Ancient Records of North Arabia*, NMES 6 (Toronto, 1970), 139-63, at 154; H. Ingholt, "Palmyrene—Hatra—Nabataean," in F. Rosenthal, ed., *An Aramaic Handbook* (Wiesbaden, 1967), Part I, Nabataean text 5, line 2.

30 The formula occurs in Hatra 207, 209, 210, 213, 284, with a variant in Hatra 210, *wḥbrh* 'and his colleague'. The texts are now conveniently available in F. Vattioni, *Le iscrizioni di Hatra*, AION Supp. 28 (Naples, 1981).

31 Jensen, "Lesung und Ausbeutung der Inschriften," in W. Andrae and P. Jensen, "Aramäische Inschriften aus Assur und Hatra aus der Partherzeit," *MDOG* 60 (1920), 9; cf. 26, 32-33.

32 Milik, *Dédicaces*, 338-39.

state or tribe. Just as the family provides models for the tribe or state, so the association level provides models for the level of organization "above" the large-scale political unions: just as there are leagues of individuals, so we may speak of, say, a league of nations.<sup>33</sup>

The other Middle Aramaic use of *šrkt* involves just this fourth and highest level. It occurs in a bilingual lintel inscription from Rawwāfa, a small site in the Hījāz; the second-century C.E. inscription was first published by Milik.<sup>34</sup> The relevant portion of the text reads: *dnh nws dy bdt šrkt tmwdw qdmy šrkth* "This is the temple [Gr. *naos*] which the *šrkt* of the Thamud, [i.e.,] the elders of its *šrkt*, made." The dedicating body is an alliance of Thamudean tribes which had been pacified (*rmš*, also an Arabic loan into Aramaic) by the Roman governor of Provincia Arabia and revealed its gratitude by dedicating a temple to the good health of their overlords, the world-ruling emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. The use of *šrkt* is of interest beyond the field of ancient history, for it reveals the etymon of the Latin term *saraceni*, the source for the standard European designation of the Arabs until early in this century.<sup>35</sup>

Forms of *hbr* are used to designate a range of associations similar to that we have tied to *šrkt*. The supranational uses, which we shall consider first, are less common, as might be expected.<sup>36</sup>

The term *hbr* is plausibly restored in one of the Sefīre treaties, from the Upper Mesopotamian region; in the Sefīre text it "could easily mean . . . a 'union', or something similar, perhaps 'federation'."<sup>37</sup> There are comparable usages in Biblical Hebrew, to which we shall return. Again, perhaps the latest ancient Northwest Semitic usage is

33 In fact, the state may represent the outcome of confederations among tribes, but that is a separate issue.

34 J. T. Milik, "Inscriptions grecques et nabatéennes de Rawwafa," in P. J. Parr, G. L. Harding, and J. E. Dayton, "Preliminary Survey in N. W. Arabia, 1968," *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology, University of London* 10 (1972), 23–61, at 54–59.

For a comparison of the site with the much discussed Amman Temple Airport shrine, see Jo Ann H. Seeley, *The Amman, Jordan Structure as an Exemplar of Ancient Near Eastern Tribal League Shrines* (Brigham Young University Thesis, 1985).

35 As first pointed out in D. F. Graf and M. O'Connor, "The Origin of the Term Saracen and the Rawwāfah Inscriptions," *Byzantine Studies/Études Byzantines* 4 (1977), 52–66, which can be supplemented with O'Connor, "The Etymology of Saracen in Aramaic and Pre-Islamic Arabic Contexts," in P. Freedman and D. Kennedy, eds., *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, British Archaeological Reports 297 (Oxford, 1986), 603–32. The range of Arabic loans in Nabatean is discussed in O'Connor, "The Arabic Loanwords in Nabatean," *JNES* 45 (1986), 213–29. In the first of these papers, I also discussed *šrk* in some Pre-Islamic Arabic texts and in a variety of West Semitic names. I do not discuss the references to a *šarrakūti* tax in three Akkadian texts from Ugarit, RS 16.153, 16.244, 16.276 (all PRU III); all these are reedited in Clay Libolt, *The Land Grand Texts from Ugarit* (Michigan Ph.D. Diss., 1985).

36 J. N. Strassmaier first attempted to see a parallel development in comparing supposed Arb. *hīlm* (pl. *aḥlam*) 'friend' with Ahlamu, a term used to describe a non-sedentary people associated with the Arameans and attested in Mari, Amarna, and Neo-Assyrian texts, which he took to be "a common noun meaning 'companions, confederates'." The Arabic rather means 'friend of women, one who courts women,' and so the etymology fails; see S. Moscati, "The Aramaean Ahlamu," *JSS* 4 (1959), 303–7, though Moscati's morphological strictures cannot be endorsed.

37 J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefīre*, *Bib. Or.* 19 (Rome, 1967), 29. Note the sequences of parties bound by the treaty: RN, sons of RN, grandsons and offspring of RN, the country of RN, the lords of the country of RN; then *hb[r]* follows at the head of a list of regional designations, *rm klh* 'all

in the second Mactar Lintel poem. There the object of eulogy is praised: *šlq ʿym plytm/ wdlʿ qšb ḥbrʿrt* "He rescued him who cried out to him./ He also cut off the confederation."<sup>38</sup>

On a subnational level, *ḥbr* is more widely used. It sometimes refers to fairly extensive units. The Amorite term *\*ḥibru(m)* (*\*ḥibru*) is attested several times in the Old Babylonian texts from Mari in the Middle Euphrates Valley.<sup>39</sup> Malamat has proposed that, both at Mari and in the early Israelite period, "the *ḥibrum* was a separate union of families closely linked together within the larger unit of the clan or tribe."<sup>40</sup> He proposes that the name *ḥeber* in Judges 4 and 5 served "to personify" a social subdivision, and the term is also remade as a name in 1 Chr. 7:30–40, referring to the borderland of Ephraim and Benjamin, and probably in 1 Chr. 4:18, in a Judahite-Kenizzite genealogy.<sup>41</sup> In post-biblical Hebrew, *ḥbr yhwɔym* is inscribed on Hasmonean coins, where it refers to the adult males of the Jewish community.<sup>42</sup> The root is also used by, as it were, the competition, once in a halakhic context and once in a poetic passage. CD 12:8 notes that an exception to a rule regarding money can be made *bʿšt ḥbwr ysrʾl* 'by counsel of the congregation of Israel', presumably the entire male population of the community proper.<sup>43</sup> The poetic coda to IQS (at 11:7) relates that God has united (*ḥbr*) the assembly (*swd*) of those he has chosen (*bḥr*) with the children of heaven (*bny šmym*) for a council of community (*lʿst yḥd*).<sup>44</sup> The paronomasia here is led by *bḥr*, and the technical import of this word alone may have prompted use of *ḥbr*. In Mishnaic usage, *ḥeber ʿir* is a municipal organization.<sup>45</sup>

---

Aram', *mšr* 'Mušr', *ʿly ʿrm* 'Upper Aram', and *tḥt* 'its (Aram's) lower (part)'; the use of these terms "expresses the extent of the coalition or union which Bir-Gay'ah had set up" (Fitzmyer, 29, cf. 31). For a related Lihyanite use, see Cazelles, "*ḥbr*" (n. 16), col. 721.

38 Krahmalkov, "Mactar" (n. 22), 188–96; the *ʿayin* is a vowel letter.

39 See *AHW*, and *CAD*, s.v.

40 A. Malamat, "Mari and the Bible: Some Patterns of Tribal Organizations and Institutions," *JAOS* 82 (1962), 143–50, at 145. See also V. H. Matthews, *Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom (ca. 1830–1760 B.C.)*, *DASOR* 3 (Cambridge, 1978), 65, 90. The first-millennium *ḥibru* ('plant designation') is a mystery, as is von Soden's listing of it with the Mari term (*AHW*, 344).

41 For the Lihyanite clan name *ḥbr*, see A. Jamme, *Miscellanees d'ancien arabe VI* (Washington, 1974), 22.

42 *DISO*, 82; J. T. Milik, "Une lettre de Simeon bar Kokeba," *RB* 60 (1953), 176–94, at 283.

The usual Hasmonean coin text refers to *khn gdl* [viz., the King] *whbr hyhwɔym*. The coins of John Hyrcanus read *khn gdl rʿš ḥbr hyhwɔym*; the use of the latter form is associated with Hyrcanus' conquest of Samaria by D. Sperber, "A Note on Hasmonean Coin-Legends. Heber and Rosh Heber," *PEQ* (1965), 85–93; cf. J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique," *Syria* 44 (1967), 163–95, at 167–68. There is a variety of Hasmonean coins with the name of no Hasmonian, inscribed only *ḥbr yhwɔym* (the absence of the article reflects Mishnaic Hebrew grammar; see the reference to Sarfatti in n. 45 below), perhaps struck during the period of Alexander Jannaeus' intraregnal exile (ca. 88–82 B.C.E.; see Josephus, *J. W.*, 1.4:4–5); see D. Jeselsohn, "Hever Yehudim—A New Jewish Coin Type," *PEQ* (1980), 11–17; Jeselsohn, who first noted the type, proposes that the Pharisees issued the coins. He makes no reference to 4QpNah, a document usually associated with Jannaeus' exile.

43 S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, prolegomenon by J. A. Fitzmyer (New York, 1970; originally, 1910), 83, 107; A. M. Haberman reads *ḥbyr*; *Megillôt Midbār Yēhūdā* (Jerusalem, 1959), 8; but Fitzmyer does not list this reading among his corrections to Schechter's text.

44 Haberman, *Megillôt*, 70.

45 Milik, "Siméon" (n. 42), 283. On the absence of the article, see G. Sarfatti, "Hebrew Inscriptions of the First Temple Period," *Maarav* 3 (1982), 55–83, at 73; it is a Mishnaic feature.

Usage on a smaller scale is illustrated not only in the Nabatean and Palmyrene texts mentioned earlier, but also in the Warka cuneiform text in Imperial Aramaic<sup>46</sup> and in two Canaanite texts. The Marseilles Tariff of the third century B.C.E. refers to some priests *whbrnm* 'and their colleagues'.<sup>47</sup> Even more revealingly, one of the Neo-Punic dedicatory texts from Mactar alludes to a group of people *whbrnm hmrzh* 'and their colleagues in (?) the *marziḥ*', collocating two words tied to *thiasoi*.<sup>48</sup>

The small-scale sense of *hbr* words is also illustrated in the Aramaic Enoch texts, in which Šemīhazâ, the king of the fallen watchers, appears as head of a ten-member *thiasos*.<sup>49</sup> The cognate verb is also used in Enoch, as when Michael speaks *lšm[yhç]* *wlk[wl hbrw]hy dy ʔhbrw l[nšyʔ lʔstʔbh bhn]* "to Šemīhazâ and to all his companions who associated with women to defile themselves with them" (Enoch 10:11 = 4QEn<sup>b</sup> I, iv:9).<sup>50</sup> Elsewhere Šemīhazâ is sent *[lm]lk lkl ḥ[brwhy]* 'to rule over all his companions' (Enoch 9:7 = 4QEn<sup>a</sup> I, iv:21).<sup>51</sup> Milik's restoration of the term 'companions' is vouched for by the occurrence of *hbrwh[y]* in 4QEnGiants<sup>a</sup> Fragment 3, line 2<sup>52</sup>; it is also restored in 4QEnGiants<sup>a</sup> Fragment 8, line 5.<sup>53</sup>

The *ḥabēr* of the late Second Temple Period, described in the Mishnah and the Talmuds, was, it has recently been proposed, "a public official . . . in control of tithes . . . [and] in effect both the religious and political administrator . . . of the district . . . for which [he was] responsible"; so S. J. Spiro, "Who Was the Ḥaber?" *JSJ* 11 (1980), 186–216, at 202; the matter is controversial. Some scholars refer to *ḥābūrôt* as Pharisaic table communities, though, as one admits, "we know very little about these Pharisaic associations on the whole"; Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 115; cf. 287–88. In the period after the fall of the Second Temple, "*ḥaberim* became teachers and were henceforth associated with scholarship" (Spiro, 215); the sense of the title becomes "friend of the Rabbis" (ibid., 216). This term is loaned into Arabic as *ḥabr* (pl. *aḥbār*) and is used of Jewish leaders, along with *rabbānīyūn*, in Qurʾān Sura 5.47, 66; it occurs without the latter term in Sura 9:31, 34, where it is apparently used of Christians; it is later used of all poll-tax payers. Cf. D. J. Halperin and G. D. Newby, "Two Castrated Bulls: A Study in the Haggadah of Kaʿb al-Aḥbār," *JAOS* 102 (1982), 631–38, at 631. Halperin and Newby suggest that peninsular Judaism was different from more "orthodox" varieties, but the use of the title does not betray it as such. We may also cite the use in a text more or less contemporary with the Qurʾān, i.e., "Hekalot Rabbati [fourth-seventh centuries C.E., which] uses the terms 'fellowship' (*ḥabūrāh*) . . . and 'members of the fellowship' (*ḥabērīm*) . . . with regard to the mystical group"; see P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 1, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Garden City, 1983), 233, n. 31. For contemporary synagogal usage in Palestine, see the Beth Sheʿan Synagogue text (6th c.) and the Jericho Synagogue text (8th c.) in Fitzmyer-Harrington, *Palestinian Aramaic*, 258, 266.

On the Pharisaic *ḥābūrôt* as depicted in Tosefta Megillah, see Pinchas HaCohen Peli, "The Ḥavurot That Were in Jerusalem," *HUCA* 55 (1984), 55–74.

46 *DISO*, 82.

47 *KAI* 69:19.

48 *KAI* 159:4.

49 The texts are published in J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford, 1976). The secondary literature is enormous. On the Aramaic, see M. Sokoloff, "Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4," *Maarav* 1 (1978–1979), 197–224; and R. I. Vasholz, "An Additional Note on the 4Q Enoch Fragments and 11QtgJob," *Maarav* 3 (1982), 115–18. In general, see J. C. VanderKam, "Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of 1 Enoch," *Maarav* 3 (1982), 85–97, and his *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, *CBQMS* 16 (Washington, 1984).

50 Milik, *Enoch*, 175–76.

51 Ibid., 158.

52 Ibid., 311; Sokoloff, "Enoch" (n. 49), 210; Fitzmyer-Harrington, *Palestinian Aramaic*, 72.

53 Milik, *Enoch*, 315; Fitzmyer-Harrington, *Palestinian Aramaic*, 72.

A reading of *ḥbr* was proposed in the salutation of the Bar Kosiba letter Mur 43, *mšm<sup>c</sup>wn bn kwsbh lyš<sup>c</sup> / bn glgh wlnšy ḥbrk* "From Simeon ben Kosiba to Joshua / ben Galgula and the men of his company," by Milik in his *editio princeps*.<sup>54</sup> The last two letters of the last word cited are difficult; the *ḥ* reading, though still possible, has been questioned. Milik in his final edition of the text read *ḥbrk* 'of hab-Baruk', i.e., Kaphar hab-Baruk, a village east of Hebron, modern Bani-Na<sup>c</sup>im.<sup>55</sup> Other authorities have preferred to read *hkrk* 'the fortress'.<sup>56</sup>

Not only does *ḥbr* vocabulary show the same range that *šrkt* does at Rawwāfā and Hatra; it also shows the further semantic development of Arabic *šrkt* 'partnership, company'. Albright, in discussing the report of the Egyptian diplomat Wen-Amun on his state business in Byblos about 1070 B.C.E., demonstrates that the *ḥubūr* relation involving ships of Byblos and Smendes, Prince of Tanis, was mercantile; an early Iron Age *ḥubūr* was a trading company. "Thanks to the *khubūr* it was possible to find the necessary capital with which to build and outfit trading fleets, as well as to protect them after they were built."<sup>57</sup> A cognate phenomenon may involve the *yhb w<sup>3</sup>ḥbr* 'he bestowed and gave in partnership' formulae in real estate transactions from Palmyra, which resemble the *našû-nadānu* 'to lift-to give' formulae in the Akkadian legal texts from Ugarit.<sup>58</sup> The verb *našû* in grant texts seems to indicate a guarantee of title clearance (viz., the grantor 'lifts up' all existing obligations), and it may be that *ḥbr* similarly guarantees proper title to the property in question.

54 Milik, "Siméon" (n. 42), 277. This reading is maintained by F. M. Cross, "La Lettre de Simon bar Kosba," *RB* 63 (1956), 45–48, at 47; by D. Pardee et al., *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters, SBLBS 15* (Chico, 1982), 129–30; and by Cazelles, "ḥbr" (n. 16), col. 726.

55 J. T. Milik, "Textes hébreux et araméens," in P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les Grottes de Murabba'at*, *DJD* 2 (Oxford, 1961), 160.

56 Y. Yadin, *Bar-Kokhba* (New York, 1971), 137, with a photograph of the text; Pardee et al. regard the reading *hkrk* "as almost [as] plausible" as *ḥbrk*; *Handbook*, 130.

57 W. F. Albright, "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization," in G. E. Wright, ed., *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Garden City, 1965), 438–87 (Eisenbrauns reprint [Winona Lake, IN, 1979]), 458–59. So also B. Maisler [Mazar], "Canaan and the Canaanites," *BASOR* 102 (1946), 7–12, at 10. See also H. Goedicke, *The Report of Wenamun* (Baltimore, 1975), 66, 70–71, who draws attention to the fact that the two occurrences of *ḥbr* are spelled differently and have different determinatives, though they are only a few lines apart. The term *ḥbr* in the merchant marine sense may be behind the term *sociorum* in *garum sociorum* 'fish sauce of the associates', as suggested by V. Quittner, "The Semantic Background of 'Socii' in Lat: 'Garum Sociorum,'" *JNWSL* 6 (1978), 45–47; she refers to a Phoenician context; her treatment of the Semitic facts is otherwise garbled.

The contention that *ḥbr* in this sense occurs at Ugarit, shared by Albright and Maisler and recently affirmed by E. Linder, "Ugarit: A Canaanite Thalassocracy," in G. D. Young, ed., *Ugarit in Retrospect*, (Winona Lake, Indiana, 1981), 31–42, at 34, is dubious; see n. 60 and 77.

58 *DISO*, 81. Other Aramaic cognates of the Ugaritic formulae are discussed by J. C. Greenfield, "našû-nadānu and Its Congeners," in M. deJ. Ellis, ed., *Essays on the Ancient Near East in memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein* (Hamden, CT, 1977), 87–91. For other uses of Palm. *ḥbr*, see the texts in H. Ingholt, "Five Dated Tombs from Palmyra," *Berytus* 2 (1935), 57–120, at 76, 91, etc.; and cf. *ṛḥq*, 88, and *štp*, 94, n. 120; I have discussed these texts in "The Grammar of Finding Your Way in Palmyrene Aramaic and the Problem of Diction in Ancient West Semitic Inscriptions," in Y. L. Arbeitman, ed., *Fucus: Studia Afroasiatica et Semitica et Biblica in Memoriam Alberti Ehrman* (Amsterdam, forthcoming).

## IV

The range of uses of *hbr* in the Hebrew Bible includes not only the various specialized senses we have noted, but others which stake out the unmarked sectors of the semantic field. Thus we have a variety of inanimate uses of the verb and some derivatives, which refer to joining drapery, clothing and other material.<sup>59</sup> Other uses refer to human companionship in an extremely general sense (Eccl. 9:14), and to lifetime companionship (male in Eccl. 4:10; female in Mal. 2:14).<sup>60</sup> Similarly, *hābēr* is used of fellowship in crime in Prov. 28:24: "He who robs his parents / And says there's nothing wrong / Is companion to a thug." This usage is also reflected in Isaiah's charge that the state officials of Judah are rebels and *hābrê gannābīm* 'confederates of thieves' (Isa. 1:23).

The political specialization of the root appears in references to alliances formed by kings (Gen. 14:3<sup>61</sup>; 2 Chr. 20:35–37<sup>62</sup>; Dan. 11:6, 23; and metaphorically of the divine king in Ps. 94:20), and to unions on the supratribal level, both individual (Judg. 20:11) and tribal (Ezek. 37:16, 19). The associates of the king cited in Ps. 45:8 may be other local dynasts, including the king of Tyre, whose daughter is mentioned later in the poem. The political sense of confederation may be behind the name of the old league shrine Hebron,<sup>63</sup> and perhaps also the river name Habur<sup>64</sup> and the area terms

59 Such use is also attested in Qumrānic descriptions of the weaponry of the end-time; see IQM 5.5, 8, 12; Haberman, *Megillôt*, 99.

60 On the uses in Sirach, see Cazelles, "*hbr*" (n. 16), col. 725. For the companionship sense in Aramaic, see 11Q<sup>st</sup> Job, col. 20, line 8; Fitzmyer-Harrington, *Palestinian Aramaic*, 112. This seems to be the sense of Ug. *hbr* (UT, 394). On Ug. *hbr*, see n. 77, below. On the Ethiopic, see Cazelles, col. 722.

61 This usage is echoed in the parallel passage in 1QapGen, col. 21, lines 26, 28; col. 22, line 17; see Fitzmyer-Harrington, *Palestinian Aramaic*, 120.

62 Maisler suggests that the use here, in connection with a commercial venture, is reminiscent of Wen-Amun's *hubur*, see "Canaan" (n. 57), 10; so also Linder, "Ugarit" (n. 57), 34.

63 Y. L. Arbeitman argues that Gen. 23:2 presents a translational equivalence between Hebron (from Semitic 'friend') (cf. Cazelles, "*hbr*" [n. 16], col. 723) and (Qiryat) Arba (from Anatolian 'the friend'), an equivalence reflected in the Arabic name of the town, *ʿal-ḥalīl* 'the friend (of God, viz., Abraham); and in the other biblical name for the site, Mamre (from Anatolian *miumar* 'benignity'); see Arbeitman, "The Hittite" (n. 14), esp. 900, 903, 950–59, 998.

On the problem of translation versus adaptation of toponyms, see the valuable general remarks of Paul Wexler in his article, "Exploring the Distinctive Features of *Wandersprachen*: The Case of European Romani and Jewish Languages," *Mediterranean Language Review* 2 (1986), 7–45 at 32–35, and in his review of a book on the Balkans, in the same journal, 2 (1986), 144–47.

64 The relationship between the earthly, upper Mesopotamian river Habur and the river in the underworld, the Hubur (or Hibur, also the name of an Assyrian month, usually in the latter form), is unclear. T. Frymer-Kensky separates them completely; *The Ordeal in the Ancient Near East*, BM 27 (Malibu, forthcoming). I. J. Gelb associates at least the earthly river with Hurrian *hawur*, apud Purves in I. J. Gelb, P. M. Purves, and A. A. MacRae, *Nuzi Personal Names*, OIP 68 (Chicago, 1943), 215. Von Soden takes Hubur to be a Sumerian loan; *AHW.*, 352. Perhaps cognate to Habur are the place names attested in Old Babylonian texts, Habura (VAT 9260) and Habaratum (near Qarana; Mari texts).

There are in this world not one but two rivers Ḥabūr, the well-known one tributary to the Euphrates and another associated with the Tigris; on the latter and a Sumerian etymology of the name (*he<sub>2</sub>-bur<sub>3</sub>* 'fountain of abundance'), see M. C. Astour, "Semites and Hurrians in Northern Transjordan," in D. I. Owen

Iberia, one of which is spelled *hbr* in Hispania 14 (see below), if these are to be given Semitic etymologies—which is not certain.<sup>65</sup>

The religious associations of *hbr* in the Hebrew Bible tend to be illicit, but the one exception in Psalm 119 is clear enough to prevent us from regarding such usage as always negative. In Hos. 4:17, the prophet says that Ephraim is a *ḥābūr ʿāšabbīm* ‘a confrere of idols’ and Second Isaiah alludes to a *pesel* ‘idol’ and *ḥabērāyw* ‘its confreres’ (Isa. 44:11). The Ugaritic texts which refer to the confreres of the god Koshar are discussed by Pope.<sup>66</sup> The priestly *thiasos* (*heber kōhānīm*) of Hos. 6:9 is directly implicated in murder. Elihu rebukes Job by saying that he keeps company (*hebrā*) with idolaters (*pōʿālē ʾāwen*) (Job 34:8).<sup>67</sup> Counterbalancing the purport of these passages, the ever-lucid and modest poet of the great acrostic psalm says, “I am a confederate (*ḥābēr*) to all who fear you / To all who observe your precepts” (Ps. 119:63).

Given that Pope has suggested that the Song of Songs has a background in *\*marziḥ* observances, the two occurrences of *hbr* in the Canticles take on a special interest, though Pope does not discuss the *mrzḥ-hbr* connection. The uses frame the book: the first is in the middle of the first chapter and the second near the end of the last chapter. In the first chapter, a female speaker prays that she not be *kēʿōlyā ʿal ʿedrē ḥābērēkā* “like a veiled woman among your associates’ flocks” (1:7), and in the last she (or another female) is addressed: “O you who dwell in gardens / The confreres (*ḥābērīm*) are attentive” (8:13).<sup>68</sup>

The business sense of *hbr* appears in Job 40:30 when Yahweh, in describing Leviathan, asks Job: “Can trading partners (*ḥabbārīm*) get him on the market? / Can they split him up among merchants?” The mercantile vocabulary (*kry*, *knʿnym*) is so clear that, despite the allusion to covenanting two verses above this couplet, there can be no doubt of the business context.<sup>69</sup> The passage embodies the form of advancing counterfactuals called a pseudosorites, in the proposition: Leviathan can’t be caught, but even if he could be caught, he couldn’t be commercialized.<sup>70</sup> The uses of *hbr* in 2 Chr. 20:35–37 noted above in connection with political alliances refer to sea-going ventures, like the Wen-Amon *ḥubūr*, and presumably the partners in Job 40 are mariners, too. Milik recognizes a commercial sense in Prov. 21:9 ≡ 25:24 (see below), Hos. 6:9, and tentatively in Ps. 122:3, all rather dubious cases.<sup>71</sup>

and M. A. Morrison, eds., *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians, Volume 2* (Winona Lake, Indiana, 1987), 3–68 at 19–21; on various related regions called *Ḥabūra*, see 42–47.

65 I mean Iberia in the western Mediterranean and Iberia in the Caucasus. Another toponym that may be relevant is *Ḥabrān* in Syria, near the Strata Diocletiana; see G. Bowersock, *Roman Arabia* (Cambridge, 1983), 100 with n. 31 for references.

66 Pope, *Song*, 694.

67 The noun of the MT colors the verbal choice of 11QtgJob, col. 24, line 1, which says that Job *mḥbr lʿbdy šqr* “(is) associated with workers of deception”; see Fitzmyer-Harrington, *Palestinian Aramaic*, 30.

68 Pope, *Song*, 330–31, 694, seems not to mention this framing effect.

69 The other vocabulary also rules out J. J. Finkelstein’s proposal that “charmners” are meant; “Hebrew *ḤBR* and Semitic *ḤBR*,” *JBL* 75 (1956), 328–31, at 331, n. 11.

70 See F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Hosea*, AB 24 (Garden City, New York, 1980), 496–99; O’Connor, “The Pseudosorites in Hebrew Verse,” in F. W. Conrad and E. Newing, eds., *Essays in Honor of F. I. Andersen* (Winona Lake, Indiana, 1987); O’Connor, “The Pseudosorites: A Type of Paradox in Hebrew Verse,” in E. R. Follis, ed., *Directions in Hebrew Poetry* (Sheffield, 1987).

71 Milik, “Siméon” (n. 42), 283. On *garum sociorum*, the fish sauce favored of Phoenician sailors, see Quittner’s paper, cited in n. 57.

## V

The root *hbr* 'to associate' is, as J. J. Finkelstein first noted, distinct from a Hebrew root derived from the Proto-Semitic etymon which yields Akk. *habāru* 'to be noisy',<sup>72</sup> and Ar. *hbr* 'to inform (II, IV)'.<sup>73</sup> To this root belong the noise and magic senses of BH. *hbr* (Job 16:4) and *heber* (Deut. 18:11, Ps. 58:6, Isa. 47:9, 12 for magic spells; Prov. 21:9 ≡ 25:24, for noise in general).<sup>74</sup> The word *hbr* 'charm' is used apropos of reptiles in IQH 11:8.<sup>75</sup>

In addition to *hbr* 'noise' and *hbr* 'associate', we must distinguish a third root, *hbr* 'skin marking',<sup>76</sup> whence come the rare Akk. *ebēru* 'to paint the face', *eburu* 'painted' (both only in lexical lists), BH. *habbûrâ* 'stripe' (as of a wound; in prose: Exod. 21:25 bis; in verse, with *peša*<sup>c</sup> 'bruise', Gen. 4:23; Isa. 1:6; Prov. 20:30; in verse otherwise, Isa. 53:5, Ps. 38:6)<sup>77</sup> and *hābarburâ* 'stripe (of a *nāmēr*)' (hapax in Jer. 13:23), MH. *hābarbar* 'to darken,' '(a lizard which hides in the dark)', Arb. *ha/ibār* 'mark, trace (especially of blows), welt, wale', *habira* 'wound', perhaps *hibir* 'yellowness (of teeth)', *hibr* 'complexion, beauty mark', *hbr* II 'to embellish', less likely *hibr* 'ink', *miḥbara*

72 And various derivatives, *habru* 'noisy,' *habarratu/habarattu* 'uproar,' *hubūru* 'noise,' *habbiru* '(the creaky part of a loom,) wool stretcher'. For details, see the dictionaries, s.vv. Finkelstein reports that Akkadian "*ebērum* (stem \**hbr*) . . . is well documented, having virtually the same range of usage as its Hebrew cognate," "Hebrew" (n. 69), 329; but this is a lapse. Akk. *ebēru* 'to cross water, extend beyond' is cognate to BH *ḥbr*.

73 From these forms derives the less frequent I-form *habura* 'to know,' in the sense 'to try, prove by experience', which is thus not related to *hbr* 'associate'.

74 See Finkelstein, "Hebrew" (n. 69), 331; Pope, *Job*<sup>3</sup>, AB 15 (Garden City, New York, 1975), 122. Cazelles contends that when *hbr* 'associate' and *hbr* 'noise' entered Hebrew, they became not homonymous roots but the same root; his treatment of the Hebrew occurrences is thus quite different from my own; see "*hbr*" (n. 16), cols. 722–24.

75 Haberman, *Megillôt*, 120, and cf. MH *hābarbar* '(a lizard)' (contra Jastrow). Note also MH *hābārâ* 'noise', *hbr* Pi<sup>c</sup>el 'to charm', *habbār* 'charmer'; Syr. *hābārâ* 'noise.' On Sirach, see again Cazelles, "*hbr*" (n. 16), col. 725. For QArm. *hbr*[w] 'binding by spell' (Enochic text), see Sokoloff, "Enoch" (n. 49), 210. For the Aramaic verb *hbr* 'to enchant', in the phrase *w<sup>2</sup>zy<I>n<sup>2</sup> whbrn<sup>2</sup> lhwn* 'I am coming and enchanting them', see C. D. Isbell, *A Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls*, SBLDS 17 (Missoula, Montana, 1975), #11, line 6; *hbryt*<sup>2</sup> is a divine epithet in the phrase *bšwm zy<sup>c</sup>s hbryt<sup>2</sup>* 'in the name of ZY<sup>c</sup>S the noisy', *ibid.*, #67, lines 5–6, pace Isbell, on whose rendering, see n. 77, below.

Hispania 14 probably does not reflect Phoen. *hbr* '(magic) spell', pace F. Vattioni and, following him, M. Dahood, *Psalms II*, AB 17 (Garden City, NY, 1968), 60, and Cazelles, "*hbr*" (n. 16), col. 722. Read there rather *štrt hbr* 'Astarte of Iberia' with C. R. Krahmalkov, "Observations on the Phoenician Inscription Hispania 14," *Oriens Antiquus* 11 (1972), 209–14, at 212–13; cf. F. M. Cross, "The Old Phoenician Inscription from Spain Dedicated to Hurrian Astarte," *HTR* 64 (1971), 189–95.

76 I think that we should distinguish the roots, even bearing in mind the (remarkable) *champs sémantique* of Gr. *kosmos* 'world, order, decoration'.

77 This is the source of Isbell's gloss of *hbryt*<sup>2</sup> as 'the wounder' (*anglice* 'bruiser'); see above, n. 75, but this sense is not otherwise warranted.

Also related to this root may be the artifact terms Arb. *habara* 'striped silken shawl', *habār* 'striped garment' (cf. English *wale*), though probably not the Akkadian basket and vat terms, *huburnu* 'small oil flask' (Mari, Nuzi; a word loaned into Hittite), *huburtu* 'beer jug', *hubūru* 'beer vat', *hiburnu* '(beer or barley) vat', some of which may be Hurrian. The term *hubūru* 'vat' appears in the Ugaritic phrase *br hbr*. See Finkelstein, "Hebrew" (n. 69), 328, n. 2 and references. The term *hbr* in Keret is another matter; cf. Kutler, "Israelite Communal Terminology" (n. 3), 76, echoing Gordon. The Akkadian terms *habburu* '(said of wine)', *habburu* 'shoot, stalk', and *huburuu* 'reed wrapper', are apparently unrelated to these roots, as is the Akkadian/Ugaritic official *huburtanuru/hbtrnr*.

'inkwell'. A fourth root, *ḥbr* 'joy' is attested only in Arb. *ḥabara* 'to gladden', *ḥabira* 'to be happy', *ḥubūr* 'joy', and Akk. *ebēru* 'joy'.<sup>78</sup>

## VI

The root *šrk* refers to people joining together in different senses: in large-scale political federation (in the Nabatean Rawwāfā text), on a smaller scale, in a *thiasos* (in the Hatran graffito), and in economic activity (in Classical and Modern Standard Arabic). The range of uses to which *šrk* is put is similar to the breadth of the root *ḥbr*, which refers to political federation (in Aramaic, Biblical and Qumrānic Hebrew, and Neo-Punic); to *thiasoi* (in Middle Aramaic, Phoenician and Biblical Hebrew); and to economic combines (in early Iron Age Canaanite and Biblical Hebrew). The core of *thiasos* vocabulary seems to be drawn from the root *ḥbr*; the Arabic *šrk* supplements that core, as does *mrzh*, which may, as the spelling variations (Ug. *mrzh*/<sup>ς</sup>, Neo-Punic *mzrh*/<sup>ς</sup>) suggest, be a loanword.<sup>79</sup> The religious use of the Arabic term *šrk* IV 'to associate (of gods), be a polytheist' seems to be isolated, an instance of durable linguistic innovation of the sort associated with the revelation of the divine name to Moses.

See Athalya Brenner, *Colour Terms in the Old Testament*, JSOTSup 21 (Sheffield, 1982) on some of the lexical problems of *ḥābarburā* 'stripe' (so tradition) or 'spot' (so apparently Brenner, 109, 232 n. 22) and *nāmēr* 'tiger' or 'leopard' (see Brenner, 170–71).

<sup>78</sup> *AHW.*, 182; only one lexical text records the word, which von Soden notes cannot be glossed with certainty. The Arabic lexicographers connect *ḥbr* 'joy' with the root for skin marking by the notion that happiness makes the face shine. *Loquitur grammaticus*.

A summary of the four roots in *ḥ/ḥbr* may be useful; the entries are samples, and loans are excluded.

|                           | Akk.           | NWS            | Arb.          |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| <i>ḥbr</i> 'associate'    |                | <i>heber</i>   |               |
| <i>ḥbr</i> 'skin marking' | <i>ebēru</i> * | <i>ḥabbūrā</i> | <i>ḥibār</i>  |
| <i>ḥbr</i> 'joy'          | <i>ebēru</i> * |                | <i>ḥabara</i> |
| <i>ḥbr</i> 'noise'        | <i>ḥabāru</i>  | <i>ḥbr</i>     | <i>ḥbr</i> IV |

\*lexical lists only

Cazelles reckons with only three roots; "*ḥbr*" (n. 16), col. 721; Arbeitman, too, differs in treating this group; "The Hittite" (n. 14), 956.

If Arb *šrk* were related by metathesis to Akk. *rakāsu* 'to bind', we would have a semantic parallel between *ḥbr* and *šrk*. On *ḥbr* 'associate' in Eblaite, see M. Dahood, "The Equivalents of EME-BAL in the Eblaite Bilinguals," *OA* 20 (1981), 191–94.

<sup>79</sup> Avigad and Greenfield, e.g., take the Ugaritic as evidence of such (but not the Neo-Punic); see "*Phialē*" (n. 18), 125, n. 32; 126, n. 39.