

here is to Professor Symeonoglou's failure to mention Dr. Spyropoulos' work. Other scholars have been more scrupulous in this respect: Professor Buck in his *A History of Boeotia*, does not accept Dr. Spyropoulos' conclusions but he refers to them and gives full references to Spyropoulos' works in his bibliography.⁴ Professor Symeonoglou's omission, like Professors Dow and Chadwick's failure to mention Professor Gordon's work on Linear A in their chapter of the *Cambridge Ancient History* on "The Linear Scripts," shows an intolerance for contrary opinions that should have no place in academic life.⁵

MARTIN BERNAL

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

⁴ *A History of Boeotia*. Calgary: University of Alberta, 1979, p. 43.

⁵ *Cambridge Ancient History II/1; History of the Middle East and the Aegean Region c. 1800-1380 B.C.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973, pp. 582-626 and 801-5. Chadwick also fails to mention Gordon's work in his authoritative *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975. For a discussion of the general atmosphere of racism and anti-Semitism in which the tradition of categorical denial of Levantine influences on early Greece grew up, see this reviewer's "Black Athena denied: the tyranny of Germany over Greece and the rejection of the Afroasiatic roots of Europe: 1780-1980" *Comparative Criticism* 8: 3-69.1986.

The Sheep of His Pasture: A Study of the Hebrew Noun ʿAm(m) and Its Semitic Cognates. By ROBERT MCCLIVE GOOD. (Harvard Semitic Monographs, 29.) Pp. xv + 198. Chico, CA: SCHOLARS PRESS, 1983. \$15.00.

The book under review is a revised version of the author's 1980 doctoral dissertation prepared under the direction of Marvin H. Pope at Yale University. In the sense that it brings together much information concerning the Hebrew word ʿam(m) "people," it is a useful volume. But the book has several failings, mainly of omission, hence its usefulness is somewhat diminished.

Good's thesis is highly original, "that the noun ʿam(m) represents the sound made by caprine beasts and originally signified 'flock'" (p. 2). The best evidences for this theory are 1) the Arabic words ʿīma "choice animal from the flock," ʿaymān "man deprived of flocks," ʿamiya "animal from the flock without milk," and ʿāma "to thirst for milk"; and 2) such tantalizing biblical passages as Psa 95:7 and Zech 9:16,

especially in conjunction with Prov 30:24-26 where ʿam refers to animal groups and not people.

Apart from these items, however, there is little to commend the theory and few will be convinced of Good's suggestion. In fairness to the author, he readily admits that "absolute proof is unattainable" (p. 1), but this leads one to wonder why the thought was not relegated to a tangential remark or footnote instead of setting the tenor for an entire monograph.

The aforementioned failings of the book, however, lie elsewhere. The following comments are in no particular order of importance and are offered to increase the book's usefulness.

In his discussion of Semitic cognates to Hebrew ʿam(m), Good opts to exclude the modern dialects. Accordingly, note the following: Neo-Aramaic ʿamma "people," Modern South Arabian ʿōm (< ʿōm) "grandfather, ancestor," Gurage (Selṭi-Wolane) umi "maternal uncle," Argobba amme "paternal uncle." W. Leslau, *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic)*, Vol. III (Wiesbaden, 1979), p. 42, suggests that the Ethiopian terms may be borrowed from Arabic. Beyond Semitic, note that ʿam "uncle" also appears in Berber, where it is definitely a loanword from Arabic.

Attention to the modern dialects can often be instructive and an interesting semantic parallel between the two well-known connotations of "people" and "kinsman" in Semitic ʿm may be forthcoming in Modern South Arabian. The Mehri word for "people, folk" is ḥā-bū which conceivably could derive from "the fathers" (see T. M. Johnstone, *Harsūsi Lexicon* [London, 1977], p. 1).

In the realm of semantic development, the classic work of C. D. Buck, *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages* (Chicago, 1949), might have been consulted. Although most words for "people" derive from roots meaning "fill, fullness, multitude, crowd, birth, world, men, strength, etc.," it is of interest to note Welsh *gwerin* "people" among whose cognates is Sanskrit *vr̥nda* "crowd, herd, swarm" (ibid., pp. 1313-1316, especially 1314). I do not think that one such word-pair among the dozens of Indo-European languages further bolsters Good's thesis, but a reference to it would have been of interest.

Any treatment of Hebrew ʿam(m) must also discuss Egyptian ʿ3m "das asiatische Nachbarvolk der Ägypter," a term used from the Old Kingdom onward (see A. Erman and H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, Vol. I [Leipzig, 1926], p. 167). The word clearly must have been borrowed from Semitic ʿm and a Canaanite source in the 3rd millennium would seem most likely.

Two important studies by Israeli scholars should be added to the bibliography: J. Liver, "ʿam," *Ensiqlpediya Miqraʿit*, Vol. VI, pp. 235-39; and Y. M. Grintz, "Munaḥim qedumim be-torat kohanim, III," *Leshonenu* 40 (1974-75), 20-25, with discussion of ʿam "kinsman" and the phrase ʿam ḥāʾāreš

“people of the land.” Another lacuna is the 1980 New York University doctoral dissertation of Laurence Kutler, “Social Terminology in Phoenician, Biblical Hebrew, and Ugaritic.” Good cannot be expected to have used this work in his original dissertation, but the published version of 1983 should have incorporated Kutler’s material.

Good’s acceptance of the exilic date for “P” presents many problems, particularly in his discussion of the phrases *neʿšap ʿel ʿammā(y)w* “to be gathered to one’s people/kinsman” and *nīkrētā hannepēš hahīʾ mēʿammēhā* “that soul is to be cut off from its people/kinsman.” See especially the aforementioned article by Grintz. Also, see now Avi Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* (Paris, 1982), pp. 67–71. Of related interest, see Hurvitz’s discussion of *ʿamūt* “fellow” (*ibid.*, pp. 74–78).

Good resists using the expression *ʿam sēgullā* “treasured people,” especially if compared with Akkadian *sugullu* “herd,” to support his thesis on the caprine origin of *ʿam(m)*. But he does believe that the connection between the two terms “remains probable” (p. 171, n. 58), despite the convincing argument of M. Greenberg, *JAOS* 71 (1951), 172–74, to relate Hebrew *sēgullā* and Akkadian *sikiltu* “earnings, possessions.” To all that Greenberg has forwarded, note as well the Egyptian evidence, where *sḏ3wt* means “precious things, treasures,” and *sḏ3wtjw* means “treasurers” (see Erman-Grapow, *Wörterbuch*, Vol. V [1931], 636–38, where however the hieroglyphs are described as “unlesbares”;

accordingly see also R. O. Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* [Oxford, 1976], p. 258). The fiscal connotation of these words assures the equation made by Greenberg. (The correspondences of Egyptian *s* = Hebrew *s* and Egyptian *3* = Hebrew *l* are well known. Since the equation of Egyptian *d* and Hebrew *g* is less widely recognized, note the following cognates: *mḏ3t* “papyrus-roll, book” = *mēgillā*, *sḏd* “relate, recount” = *higgīd*, as well as *ḏnh* “wing” = Arabic *ḡanāḥ*.)

Good speaks of the linguistic situation of the Nabateans as diglossia (p. 26), but he intends bilingualism. The former refers to two varieties, a literary and a colloquial, of the same language (the best example being Arabic). The latter refers to the use of two distinct languages, which was obviously the case among the Nabateans where both Aramaic and Arabic were used.

To sum up, it is convenient to have many important ideas about Hebrew *ʿam(m)* gathered between the covers of one book. Scholars seeking information not only on *ʿam(m)* but on such phrases as *ʿam qēšēh ʿōrep* “a stiff-necked people,” *ʿam yhw* “Yahweh’s people,” the several mentioned above, and still others, will want to refer to Good’s study. But additional material along the lines presented here would have enhanced the volume greatly.

GARY A. RENDSBURG

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
