LANGUAGE ABOUT SALVATION

An Analysis of Part of the Vocabulary of the Old Testament

by

John F.A. Sawyer

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Newcastle upon Tyne
1968

It may well not have been said enough that philology is autonomous;

that the meaning of a word or of a full linguistic dictum must often

...can still be conceived as the subject of a distinct consideration.

"Hoc quam non temere & cupide, sed peditentim & explorato, id quod

rei gravitas jubebat, confirmarim, uno alterove exemplo palam

facere fert animus;   ubi quod illustrius ac luculentius in medium

proferam vix habeo quam ea radix ex qua sibi Dominus, Jesu nomen

sumsit."

A. Schultens, Origines Hebraeae sive Hebraeae linguae
antiquissima natura et indoles ex Arabiae penetralibus
revocata (Lugduni Batavorum, 1761).

It may seem odd that, after many centuries of translation and exegesis, the meaning of a common Old Testament Hebrew word like HOŠIAᶜ can still be taken as the subject of a doctoral dissertation. There are several answers to this charge. First, there have, broadly speaking, been only two approaches to the problem of the meaning of HOŠIAᶜ, the one based on simple translation (e.g. 'HOŠIAᶜ means "save"'), and the other on comparative philology (e.g. 'the root of HOŠIAᶜ means "spaciousness". Cf. Arabic wasiᶜa "be spacious"'). Even without analysing the obvious inadequacy of these two methods, it is clear that there is still room for a systematic definition of the meaning of HOŠIAᶜ from within the Hebrew language. How is it distinguished, for example, from HIṢṢIL which also 'means "save"', and from HIRHIB whose root also 'means "spaciousness"'? Monolingual definition, in terms of meaning-relations contracted within the language, and semantic components identifiable in lexical groups, is, to the best of my knowledge, unknown in the field of Old Testament Hebrew lexicography.

This leads to a second, more general answer. The gap between the semantics of Biblical language and modern linguistic theory has still to be bridged. My interests in this direction began in 1961 at New College, Edinburgh, under the stimulus of Professor James Barr whose famous book on the subject was published in that year, and were further

encouraged by Professor Chaim Rabin in Jerusalem, whose course in
semantiqa miqra'it at the Hebrew University in 1962, in a way marked
the beginning of a new era for the semantics of the Hebrew language.
More recently, my participation in the activities of the Linguistic
Section of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne Philosophical Society,
and some valuable assistance from Professor John Lyons in the University
of Edinburgh, have made me aware of the immense contribution still to
be made by general linguistics to Old Testament lexicography and
interpretation.

In this short essay I have tried to work out a general semantic
theory applicable to a religious text like the Old Testament. In the
field of Biblical research, semanticists - and this includes philol-
ogists, lexicographers, exegetes and theologians - have a distinct
advantage over their colleagues in other branches of linguistic science
in having a closed literary corpus to work with. Our first step is to
define this corpus and the context or contexts in which it has meaning
(Chapter I). There are varieties of language within the corpus and
distinctions must be drawn in terms of style or literary form (Chapter
II). A third chapter presents some of the more important historical
factors operating in the associative field to which HOSIA<sup>c</sup>, HISSIL,
etc. belong; while the next chapter is a synchronic analysis of the
meaning of these terms as they are used in a selected variety of Old
Testament Hebrew, namely language addressed to God. The results of
this analysis can then be correlated, compared with the historical
data, and set forth as dictionary definitions (Chapter V). A final

chapter attempts to draw up a modest blue-print for semantic studies of Old Testament terms, based on the experience of handling the lexical material involved in the foregoing chapters.

This outline suggests a third answer to the charge that there can hardly be anything left to say on the meaning of HOŠIAᶜ : a problem like this cannot properly be studied in isolation. Questions about the context of the Old Testament, the nature of religious language, and the relation between "word-studies" and "concept-studies", on which there is still a great deal to be said, arise at every stage. Which words belong to language about salvation and which do not? What is the relation between "the meaning of HOŠIAᶜ " and "the meaning of salvation"? How is it possible to move from semantic analysis to Biblical Theology? What theological norms are there in cases of diversity of meaning? In short, there are theological and religious issues in this kind of study which point beyond the relatively circumscribed context of linguistic description. For my enthusiasm for this area of Old Testament research I am enormously indebted, like a host of other students, to my supervisor, Principal N.W. Porteous, who introduced me to the Old Testament. I am grateful to him for constantly drawing my attention to some of the theological implications of my linguistic statements. While I have limited myself here mainly to semantic theory, there are several points (especially in I. Context and III. Words) at which the study might have taken a more hermeneutical or theological direction, and to which it is hoped one day to return.

In addition to acknowledging the help and encouragement already

referred to, I want also to thank my other supervisor, Dr. J.C.L.
Gibson for his meticulous criticisms and numerous constructive com-
ments at every stage.   Finally my thanks are due to Miss Margaret Todd
of the Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue for transforming a much
worked-over manuscript into the form in which the dissertation is now
presented.

The present work includes a small amount of material which has
already been published in the articles on Mošiaᶜ (1965), root-meanings
(1967) and context of situation (1967), listed in the bibliography.

Newcastle upon Tyne, 1968.                                John F.A. Sawyer.

# CONTENTS

# I.   CONTEXT

A description of the meaning of the word YĚŠA᷄ in the context of twentieth century theological writing would no doubt include a reference to Arabic wasi᷄a "be capacious". The following quotation is typical: "all that is meant by the word YĚŠA᷄, salvation (literally, 'wideness," 'spaciousness,' i.e. favourable conditions, both in external political relationships, and in internal social, moral and religious conditions)."[1]. Thanks to so tempting an etymology this is what YĚŠA᷄ means in the context of modern lexicography and in the writings of some of the great Old Testament scholars of our time.[2] Whether or not this etymology is the correct one,[3] we must first ask what part the prehistory of a word plays in its meaning at a particular time. Are we primarily concerned with the "original" meaning of the word? It would seem that this is what Mowinckel means by "literal" meaning in the above quotation, and what is usually described as the "fundamental idea" or "root-meaning".[4] Or is it with the meaning of the word in the text of the Old Testament that we are concerned? If so, are we attempting to reconstruct the original Sitz im Leben of the text, or of passages in the text?   Or is it the

---

1. S. Mowinckel, He that cometh, p. 69.

2. e.g. KB, s.v.; TWNT, VII, pp. 973f; J. Pedersen, Israel. Its Life and Culture, I-II, pp. 330ff; S. Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 47, 69; H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, I, p. 26; E.M.B. Green, The Meaning of Salvation, p. 15.

3. For doubts concerning this popular etymology, see BDB, s.v.; J. Sawyer, "What was a Mošia᷄?" and pp. 209-12, below.

4. Cf. Barr, Semantics, p. 100; and my "Root-meanings in Hebrew."

text of the Old Testament as it has been understood in one or other of the religious communities where it has been applied that is our concern? It would be interesting to describe the meaning of YĚSAᶜ as understood by the Septuagint translators, for instance, or the New Testament writers, the Qumran exegetes or the allegorizers of the Early Church, the medieval Jewish scholars or nineteenth century Christian hymn-writers, and so on. In other words, before attempting to describe the meaning of any linguistic unit, from a single word (lexicography) to a whole passage or book (interpretation), the situational context or contexts in which it is applied must be precisely defined.

Frequently the exact history of a word is known, as in the case of neologisms like Pakistan[1] or loanwords like taboo;[2] frequently it is fascinating and at times of real value in reflecting religious or political developments, as for example Hebrew miṣwa "order" > "divine precept" > "meritorious deed."[3] But the relation of the history of a word to its meaning at a particular time, in the mouth of a particular speaker or the writings of a particular author, is seldom a simple one. It will depend on the speaker's own interest in his language, and on his skill as an etymologist; it will depend on the style of the utterance, and the kind of audience addressed; it will depend on the obtrusiveness or otherwise of each particular word's etymology.[4]

---

1. Pakistan is a twentieth century neologism made up of the "initials of Punjab, Afghan Province, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan" (ODEE, s.v.).

2. Captain Cook introduced Tongan taboo into English in 1784; cf. F. Steiner, Taboo, p. 22.

3. Jastrow, II, pp. 823f.

4. "Root-meanings in Hebrew" raised these problems: Chapters I, III and V of the present study attempt to take the debate a little farther.

Without first carefully examining these factors, no valid semantic statements can be made.

This failure to distinguish historical data from synchronic data resulted in the kind of abuses which were incisively criticised by James Barr in The Semantics of Biblical Language.[1] Barr's criticisms were timely, and it is true to say that he took the first step in the direction of "Biblical Semantics" as a scientific discipline. His book is devoted mainly to the task of exposing faulty methodology, however, and he inevitably omits some of the most important insights of modern descriptive linguistics, such as one would expect in any serious study of the Semantics of Biblical Language. Of these by far the most significant is his omission of any definition of context. While reiterating his cri-de-coeur that every word must be studied in "context", he never discusses this important term in any detail: no distinction is made, for instance, between lexical environment and context of situation;[2] or between the immediate situation and the wider situation.[3] The omission is partly rectified in a brief discussion of "situation" in Barr's more recent book Old and New in Interpretation;[4] but the implications of what he says there for Biblical semantics have nowhere been adequately examined. Symptomatic of this gap in modern research is the fact that until now no serious attempt has been made to compare Gunkel's Sitz im Leben with the "context of situation" as expounded by J.R. Firth in 1935.[5] Both are key concepts in modern

---

1.  The distinction goes back to F. de Saussure, Cours de linguistique générale, p. 117.
2.  J. Lyons, Structural Semantics, pp. 13f.
3.  J. Ellis, "On Contextual Meaning"(In Memory of J.R. Firth, pp. 79-95). D. Hill in a recent semantic study makes the distinction between the "immediate context" and the "historical context" of New Testament Greek (Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, pp. 18f). See further, pp. 239ff.
4.  pp. 25ff.      5.  See J.R. Firth, Papers in Linguistics 1934-1951, pp. 26-33.

theory, both are concerned with substantially the same problem, namely
the relation between language and its setting in life, and yet the
fruits of two parallel lines of research have never been compared.[1]
In order then to determine the exact context of Old Testament Hebrew,
we begin with a discussion of some recent theories of situation.

## 1. "Sitz im Leben" and "Context of Situation."

Gunkel's achievement was to apply to the Old Testament form-
critical methods which had already been applied in the field of German
folk-lore and to a lesser extent the classical literatures.  The decep-
tively simple thesis is that every literary form (Gattung) is appro-
priate to a particular situation in life (Sitz im Leben).[2]  From the
beginning this promised to be a fruitful line of approach for Old
Testament Hebrew for two main reasons.  In the first place there is a
peculiarly wide variety of literary forms within the Old Testament -
political speeches, letters, legal documents, love-songs, war-songs,
laments, coronation hymns, parables, and the like.  In the second place,
at the beginning of the century a vast amount of new evidence was
coming to light on almost every sphere of human activity in the ancient
near east, and Gunkel's method of classifying it by dividing it up into
identifiable situations, was a timely discovery.  His emphasis on the
close relation between language and situation and his realization that

---

1.  A fuller discussion of this problem is given in my "Context of
Situation and Sitz im Leben."

2.  H. Gunkel, "Grundprobleme der israelitischen Literaturgeschichte."
For a recent critique of form-criticism, cf. K. Koch, Was ist
Formgeschichte?  Neue Wege der Bibelexegese, especially pp. 30-41.

statements about the meaning of Old Testament Hebrew are only valid

when they are statements about the meaning of Old Testament Hebrew

"contextualized"(thirty years, incidentally, before Malinowski and

Firth) eventually became the key to modern Old Testament interpretation.

But although this form-critical approach brought a new objectivity into

Old Testament exegesis, it did not give the same boost to Semitic

linguistics as Firth's article on a similar subject gave to general

linguistics in 1935.  The reason for this is of some significance.

       While Firth's object in analysing the notion of context was to

improve semantic theory, the form-critics' interest was primarily

literary and historical, and they therefore missed the implications of

their discoveries for a study of the meaning of Hebrew.  Form-criticism

introduced a key to problems of the origin and formation of the Old

Testament:  the structure of the language of the prophets, for instance,

could now be analysed in a new way, and such processes as the

"Radikalisierung" of a traditional form detected.[1.]  The importance of

these discoveries for the history of Israel was recognised from the

first.  The question, in short, that the form-critics were asked to

answer was not 'What do these utterances, contextualized, mean?' (a

question clearly of crucial importance for any Old Testament scholar),

but rather 'What can we learn from the existence of these forms in

Israel about the cult, legal procedure, the original historical

1.  W. Zimmerli, "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel.
Ein Beitrag zum Problem an Hand von Ez. 14: 1-11."

situation, and so on?'[1]

The assumption that because a literary form is attested in Israel, therefore the situation associated with it elsewhere in the ancient near east, existed also in Israel, is by no means universally accepted.[2] But it plays an exceedingly prominent role in Old Testament scholarly debate to this day, and indicates the utterly different directions in which Gunkel's situational theory and Firth's have developed in two related disciplines. This is why Barr and other Biblical scholars[3] make no mention of Gunkel in their Biblical semantics: this is why the linguistic theorists of the beginning of the century, de Saussure, Jespersen, Bloomfield and the rest, did not notice the importance of form-criticism for semantic theory.

The situational theory put into practice by Gunkel and his followers was in at least one respect in advance of Malinowski and Firth, and indeed not precisely expressed among linguistic theorists before John Lyons, Structural Semantics (1963). "The situational context cannot simply be identified with the non-verbal matrix of the speech-event ... situations are formed as much by language as by extra-lingual features."[4] Firth was certainly aware of this and sought to avoid the

1. e.g. W. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the oldest Sinaitic Traditions, pp. 49-67; N.H. Snaith, The Jewish New Year: Festival: Its Origins and Development; B. Gemser, "The rib- or controversy-pattern in Hebrew mentality."; A. Bentzen, King and Messiah, pp. 21-34.

2. Gunkel himself saw the dangers of such an assumption: H. Gunkel -- J. Begrich, Einleitung in die Psalmen, pp. 100ff. Cf. H.- J. Kraus, Psalmen, pp. xxxvii-xli.

3. e.g. C. Rabin, "Is Biblical Semantics possible?"; D. Hill, op. cit.

4. p. 82.

"materialism" of other situational theories;  Urban's conception of the
"universe of discourse" also implies that the words spoken are them-
selves part of the situation;  and Malinowski's notion of "phatic
communion" illustrates a case where utterance and situation are so
close as to be inseparable.[1]

## 2.  "Contextualization."

At this point we are less concerned with the immediate situational
context of isolated linguistic units than with the wider social, cul-
tural and religious context of Old Testament Hebrew.  The importance
of Gunkel's approach for semantic theory cannot be overestimated.  But
there is one area in which he and many of his most distinguished succes-
sors in the field of Biblical criticism must be held responsible for a
misleading emphasis.  The original Sitz im Leben of Biblical language
is not the only context of situation in which it has meaning.  Much of
the form-critical research of Biblical scholars has been mainly con-
cerned with the original situation in which their material was uttered.
But the fact is that there are other contexts of situation of equal
importance for the meaning of Biblical Hebrew, namely the life and
liturgy of various religious communities.  The same can be said of any
bloc of literature, and one might quote the example of Professor
Halliday's description of the language of a Chinese literary work, for
which he distinguishes no fewer than eight "events in which the text

1.  J.R. Firth, op. cit., p. 192;  W.M. Urban, Language and Reality,
pp. 128ff;  B. Malinowski, "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive
Languages," p. 315.

operates."[1]. As we shall see, in the very nature of the text, this is no less true of Old Testament Hebrew. The original _Sitz im Leben_ is only one of many situations in which it is "contextualized." The application of Biblical language in situations clearly different from its original context is a vital factor, and although this will obviously increase the semanticist's terms of reference, no Biblical semantics would be complete without taking into account this wider notion of "contextualization."

The first objection to this approach is likely to be the traditional one that any study of the application of Old Testament texts in later situations is liable to be subjective. Where could one draw the line separating what a passage does mean from what it undoubtedly does not mean? Where would one fix the "limits of interpretation?"[2]. The form-critics provided a convenient answer to the problem by concentrating exclusively on the original situation and writing off all later contextualizations. Recently, however, there have been several studies of the relation between the testaments, the problems of prophecy and fulfilment, and general problems of Old Testament interpretation, in which the importance of tradition has been emphasised.[3]. This would apply particularly when the exact nature of the original context is not known, when the original context as reconstructed by the form-

1. M.A.K. Halliday, The Language of the Chinese "Secret History of the Mongols," pp. 13-24.

2. The term was introduced by N.W. Porteous in a paper read to the summer meeting of S.O.T.S. in York, 1967.

3. e.g. J. Barr, Old and New in Interpretation; B.S. Childs' review of Semantics in JBL, lxxx (1961), p. 376; G. von Rad, Genesis, pp. 72f.

critics is pre-biblical, or when there is evidence in the text for several stages in the development of a tradition.  There is a tendency, in other words, to allow for historical semantic development within the Biblical text:  the meaning of an individual word or a whole passage at the latest stage of its development (within the text) is as important an element of tradition as its meaning in its original Sitz im Leben.  The similarity of this emphasis to the crucial distinction between historical and synchronic semantics will be obvious.  One example must suffice.

In an important monograph, Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis by B.S. Childs, a historical process is analysed in which one event, which we shall never be able to reconstruct in detail, has evoked at least six distinct responses, each traceable to a particular "context": "the prophetic oracles of Isaiah, the annalistic type report, the Deuteronomic redaction of historical tradition, the legend of the righteous king, the Chronicler's midrash, and the prophetic, eschatological liturgy."[1].  It is interesting to note in passing that the term "context" introduced here in preference to Barr's "situation" is in fact the "context of situation" discussed above, in particular as characterized by a "two-way movement ... a context can be shaped by a situation, but at the same time exercise a force which affects the situation."[2].  The point at issue here, however, is the problem of whether one of these six different accounts of the Assyrian crisis

---

1.  P. 121.

2.  id., p. 122.

is more authentic than the others. Childs asserts that Biblical crit-
ics must make value judgements on varying elements in, for example,
parallel texts, although he would reject some of the usual theological
norms (historical accuracy, chronological priority within the Old
Testament), introducing instead the notion of the context of the early
church. In other words, Childs is saying that if the Biblical critic
is to evaluate diversities in the Old Testament, he is forced out of
the context of the Old Testament into a religious community in which
arbitrary decisions, like those concerning the canon of scripture, are
made for him to accept or reject. In so doing he is no longer acting
as a detached exegete, but as a committed member of a religious com-
munity.[1]

Childs is dealing with the problem of the context of a number of
utterances relating to a historical event: the same kind of conclusions
would apply to the context of smaller linguistic units, and in partic-
ular of individual words. The meaning of HOŠIAᶜ will depend on the
context of situation in which it is applied. Where Childs and the
linguistic theorists (Halliday, for instance) would part company is in
the evaluation of diversified traditions and diversified contexts of
situation. The linguists would make a distinction between, on the one
hand, the description of the meaning of an utterance in all the various
contexts in which it is applied, and on the other the evaluation of their
results on any criterion or theological norm. For example, some of the
fantastic interpretations of the early Church Fathers based on allegory

---

1. id., p. 127; cf. the distinction between "discernment situations"
and "commitment situations" (I.T. Ramsey, Religious Language, pp.
11-48).

and the like, are just as important for a complete historical descrip-
tion of the meaning of the text, as the New Testament interpretations
and those of the early Jewish rabbis. One may not agree with them;
but this is not part of linguistic description. Similarly the Qumran
sect, the Covenanters, the Seventh Day Adventists, fundamentalists,
form-critics and the present-writer all constitute contexts in which
Old Testament words and passages have meaning, and all are therefore
possible subjects for semantic description. The decision to draw a
line between those interpretations which are correct and those that are
not, is arbitrary, just as arbitrary as the Church's decisions on the
canon of scripture. "The interpreter who takes seriously the Christian
canon as his theological context"[1] has made this decision, and in so
doing has fixed limits of interpretation on external, one must say,
subjective criteria. To put it another way, the problem of the
authority of the Old Testament can only be constructively dealt with
from within one or other of the religious communities in which it is
preserved. As one Old Testament scholar has recently put it, "the
authority of the Old Testament resides in that structure of theology
which in one way or another undergirds and informs each of its parts,
and which is, in its major features, taken up and reinterpreted in the
New."[2] What Childs has shown in his monograph is that before taking
this step of commitment into any one theological position, the

1. B.S. Childs, op. cit., p. 127.
2. J. Bright, The Authority of the Old Testament, p. 161.

meaning of Old Testament traditions can be constructively and rewardingly analysed on the basis of several, at times conflicting, but always illuminating contexts in which they operate.[1]

This raises a second objection to the objective analysis of the meaning of Old Testament Hebrew in all the contexts where it is applied, namely the practical one that such a task would be too immense to be humanly possible. If to make a valid semantic statement about any given passage, the critic must take into account every context in which it is applied, he might as well abandon the task before he begins. It seems, however, that our commentaries already take into account several situational contexts, although they often make little attempt to keep them distinct. The massoretic text usually provides the starting point; the original meaning of the passage is generally assumed to be the goal; thirdly the meaning of the passage in the New Testament is often included; and fourthly its meaning for us today is interwoven with the rest. It is in fact frequently extremely difficult to find an answer to the simple question 'What does this passage mean?' Naturally subjective elements come into the discussion, and the commentator selects one or other of the meanings as the right one, or the most important or relevant or illuminating. Often this is equated with the "original meaning" in the "original context" (Sitz im Leben) and where this is not accessible to modern scholarship, the

---

1. Cf. G. von Rad, Genesis., p. 27: "no stage in this work's long period of growth is obsolete."

question of meaning is left open.

In the very nature of the case this is not good semantic method: the Old Testament has meaning in situational contexts far removed from its original context and the semanticist (and this includes the exegete or theologian or lexicographer or anyone else concerned with the meaning of Old Testament Hebrew) must make this clear in every semantic statement he makes. Each situation has its own importance for the meaning of a passage contextualized in it, and must be studied objectively, and in isolation. The question 'What does it mean?' must be modified with some clear information as to whether this refers to its meaning in its original context, or in third century B.C. Alexandria, or in first century A.D. Qumran, or in the Early Church, and so on. Each question is different and may yield a different answer: but each can be approached with the same objectivity, and each belongs to the subject matter of the semantics of Biblical Hebrew.

Gunkel's classification of contexts was on one level only, namely the level of the original Sitz im Leben of each passage. He divided up the world of the Old Testament into a number of identifiable situations each with its own language associated with it. If what has been said above about the later contextualisations of Old Testament Hebrew is correct, then beside this horizontal classification a vertical classification is required. The following scheme is a tentative suggestion of how the problem might be tackled. Four main stages can be distinguished, not only by inherent differences within the situations themselves, but also by differences in the method with which the semanticist must approach them:

(1) Original context. This is broadly speaking Gunkel's _Sitz im Leben_, but one would have at this stage to distinguish between the original context within ancient Israel, and the context as attested for similar utterances in other parts of the ancient near east. Our approach to this stage would necessarily depend on comparative study, and would inevitably be dealing as often with probabilities as with facts. It would also depend on our success in isolating the later stages which come between us and the original context, and this might be facilitated by working consistently from an unpointed text.[1] One other distinction to be carefully drawn at this stage is between the original context of the separate literary units (e.g. the Psalms), and the original context of the final form of the text (e.g. the Psalms plus their headings).[2]

(2) Pre-massoretic context. Our approach to this must also be at the level of the unpointed text. It would include the early Church, the Qumran community, the Samaritan community, Rabbinic circles, and each of these would be further subdivided into a number of isolable contexts within the broad description. Early interpretations and translations would be the main source of information for this stage.[3]

(3) Massoretic context. This is of interest as being the most

1. See below, p. 118, on "visual homonymy."

2. See Appendix A.

3. There is no lack of material for this stage: e.g. K. Elliger, _Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer_; W.A. Shotwell, _The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr_; J. Bowman, "The Exegesis of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans and the Rabbis."

influential stage for later interpretation. By fixing the vocalisation
and introducing other precise notation, the massoretes of the 10th
century A.D. aimed at crystallizing older tradition in a peculiarly
decisive and formative way, leaving no ambiguities or roughnesses.[1]
For this stage we are fortunate to possess in the Codex Leningradensis
a manuscript of the fully pointed massoretic text dating back to a time
not long after it was originally written.[2]

(4) Modern context. By this is meant all post-massoretic con-
texts: e.g. Rashi, Luther, the Authorised Version, Nineteenth Century
Zionism, Karl Barth and Dr Billy Graham. These are as a rule based on
the massoretic text, although there is a tendency in some quarters to
reject massoretic interpretations on occasion as "rabbinical conceits"
or the like.[3]

Many of these possible contexts are already incorporated into the
commentaries, but there is often no clear indication as to which meaning
is intended to be the original one, and which the modern or relevant
one. For a commentary on any Biblical utterance to conform to the most
elementary rules of modern semantic theory, it must distinguish at the
outset at least these four stages.

Naturally every Biblical utterance is not equally well attested
in all four stages, and naturally commentators have their own interests
in one or other of the contexts, a form-critic in the original one, a
Christian in the Christian ones, and a Jew in the Jewish ones. What is

---

1. See below, pp. 20f.
2. P. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, pp. 131-5.
3. C.A. Briggs, Psalms, I, p. 211.

being advocated here is certainly not that every commentary must deal with every context in which a Biblical text is applied, but that every commentary should state at the beginning what context or contexts it is concerned with, because only then will it be possible to make clear semantic statements about the texts under discussion. One of the most respected of modern critical commentaries is laid out in such a way as to indicate that it is primarily concerned with the first and fourth stages of contextualisation; but in fact, interwoven with _Ort_ (i.e. original context) and _Ziel_ (modern context) are frequent and confusing references to another two stages, namely the early church and the mas-soretic text.[1] This is even more confusing in the older, equally influential International Critical Commentary series, where reference is constantly made, often rather disparagingly, to the early versions and rabbinic interpretations. Among the pages of historical and textual information, it is often hard to find any clear statement of what the text actually means.

## 3. The "final form" of the text.

In the light of these remarks on the wider situational context of Biblical Hebrew, it will be seen that for a description of HOŠIA͗ or any other Old Testament Hebrew word to be adequate, it must be preceded by a precise account of the context or contexts in which it is being described.[2] In the present study one of these situational contexts is

1. _Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament_, ed. M. Noth (Neukirchen Vluyn).

2. Cf. J. Lyons, _op. cit._, p. 102; M.A.K. Halliday, _op. cit._, pp. 13-24; P. Ziff, _Semantic Analysis_, pp. 19-24.

selected, and all subsequent statements on the meaning of HOŠIA͑

apply only to its meaning in that context. The context selected cor-

responds to stage (3) in the classification given above, and the reasons

governing the writer in his choice, although it must be emphasised that

such a choice is in the last resort subjective, can be set forth as

follows.

(1) The importance of the final form of the text is often

neglected by modern interpreters. Martin Noth for example in his com-

mentary on Exodus, while clearly recognising the need to study the

final form, appears to be far more interested in the separate threads

(i.e. J, E, D, P) than in the finished texture.[1] Isaiah 1-39 is now

regularly printed as a separate book distinct from the rest of the book

that bears the name Isaiah, and the question of why all these writings

were included under the same title in the text frequently ignored.[2]

A recent, brief discussion of the six short prayers of Nehemiah begin-

ning "Remember, O my God ..." (Neh. 5:19, 6:14, 13:14, 22, 29, 31), notes

the interesting fact that they are in the form of Egyptian and

Babylonian building inscriptions, but makes no comment on their peculiar

appropriateness in the context of an architect's memoirs, especially

when the architect in question was so clearly conscious of the import-

ance and efficacy of good works in the eyes of God.[3]

The absence of any serious discussion of the final form is due to

---

1. P. 18.

2. e.g. C. Westermann, Jesaja 40-66, p. 11; G.F. Knight, Deutero-
Isaiah, p. 11; C.R. North, The Second Isaiah, pp. 1ff.

3. B.S. Childs, Memory and Tradition, pp. 38f. See below, p. 107.

a number of factors in modern scholarship: the continuing novelty of the discoveries of the last one hundred years which have thrown such a flood of fascinating light on the original situations (witness the steady flow of books on biblical archaeology); the subsequent reaction away from the conservative or fundamentalist approach according to which the final form of the text is given pride of place over against the separate strands of tradition; and perhaps most widespread of all, the assumption that chronological priority is the only, or at least the main theological norm.[1] Whatever the reason, the fact is that an important element of Biblical tradition is being neglected, and it is the aim of this study to prove just how important an element it is.

(2) In addition to this somewhat negative observation that not enough work has been done in modern times on the final form, there is the fact, very often overlooked in modern critical scholarship, that the finished fabric of the massoretic text is completely intelligible as it stands and, moreover, quite consistent. This point will emerge from the subsequent discussion of style in the Old Testament;[2] for the moment one example will suffice to illustrate the point.

Psalm-headings claim to give the original situation on which a number of Psalms were sung: e.g. Psalm 51 is described in the text as "a Psalm of David when Nathan the prophet came to him after he had gone in to Bathsheba"; and Psalm 127 is distinguished from all the other "Songs of Degrees" by being attributed to Solomon in its heading.

---

1. B.S. Childs (Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis, p. 124) criticizes this.
2. See below, pp. 108f. and Appendix A.

Since Ps. 51 dates "probably from the time of Jeremiah" and Ps. 127 "to the more prosperous days of the Greek period," the ICC (1907) relegates the Psalm-headings to the small print, and proceeds to discuss the Psalms without any further reference to the headings.[1] Subsequent commentators adopt a very similar attitude to the problem, quite arbitrarily rejecting the proposed situational contexts as un- historical, in favour of the settings which modern research is able to reconstruct for them.[2] The relation between the situation described in the heading and elements in the Psalm, however, while it may be unhistorical and unable to claim any chronological priority, is at least as real and as meaningful a relation as that between the modern reconstructed situations and the Psalms, and has the advantage over them of being in the text and therefore perhaps more amenable to objective analysis. Thus at the level of the final form of the text, the meaning of hara$^c$ b$^e$$^c$eyneka "that which is evil in thy sight" (Ps. 51:6) can adequately be defined in terms of David's adultery, and y$^c$dido "his beloved" (Ps. 127:2) in terms of Solomon (yedidyahu), builder of the temple. This is only one contextualization of these two Psalms, but it is a meaningful one, and one that is in the text, there- fore not one to be lightly dismissed.

The specific application of details in Psalm language to a bizarre situation, for example, in the book of Jonah is another

---

1. C.A. Briggs, Psalms, II, pp. 4, 458.
2. e.g. Kraus on Ps. 51:1f. (op. cit., p. 385), and Mowinckel on Ps. 127:1 (The Psalms in Israel's Worship, II, pp. 102f.).

illustration of the value of the textual setting as well as the original one. To take Jonah's prayer out of its setting and discuss it in terms of where it was originally sung, or where it should be contextualized, is again to reject an important and meaningful part of the data.[1.]

(3) Related to the previous point is the fact that not all of the proposed reconstructions of the original Sitz im Leben of the Psalms are generally accepted: e.g. the Covenant Festival (A. Weiser), the Enthronement Festival of Yahweh (S. Mowinckel), the plight of the falsely accused (H. Schmidt) and the like.[2.] To answer the question 'What does a particular lexical item mean?' we must first distinguish, not between the correct meaning and the wrong meaning, but between its meaning in one or other of the reconstructed "original situations," and its meaning in later contexts, massoretic tradition, for example. The relative value of these possibilities depends, in the last resort, on extratextual, theological or religious grounds, not on historical or linguistic criteria.

(4) The text in its final form is the canon of scripture accepted, understood and indeed employed as a rule of life, to a greater or lesser extent, by a number of religious communities for many centuries. To say that a particular passage or expression is "meaningless as it stands" is the ultimate absurdity of modern hypercritical

---

1. See below, p.56.
2. A. Weiser, The Psalms, pp. 35-52; S. Mowinckel, op. cit., I, pp. 106-89; H. Schmidt, Das Gebet der Angeklagten im Alten Testament.

scholarship. A study of meaninglesness as a criterion of Biblical criticism would undoubtedly produce some interesting results. Some "meaningless" passages may be due to our imperfect knowledge of the ancient world; others may be due to a conflict between what we do know and what the text says; others may be due to our inadequate knowledge of Hebrew grammar. However that may be, the fact remains that in no part of the Old Testament is there a passage or a word that has no meaning in massoretic tradition. The task of the massoretes was to hand down a meaningful text, however strained and artificial their methods may at times have been. Again it is not for the descriptive linguist to dictate what is true or false here: this would be for the theologian to decide. Both the original meaning so far as it can be rediscovered by means of textual criticisms and comparative philology, and the meaning of the Massoretic text as it stands, are capable of scientific description. After such careful description of the meaning of the text at various levels, decisions on the value or truth or relevance of particular interpretations may be made. The advantage of beginning from the massoretic text is its greater objectivity as well as the greater influence it has had on later religious communities and literatures.

One example will illustrate this. What is the meaning of salmawet? According to MT it denotes "the shadow of death " (cf. AV); according to critical scholarship, this is a folk-etymology: sal is irregular as construct of sel and in any case this would be the only example of sel in a pejorative sense; elsewhere it is a metaphor for protection and love. Moreover, compounds are very rare in Old Testament

Hebrew. The real meaning of this word is "gloom" and it should be read ṣalmut, cf. Akk. ṣalamu "grow black" and Arab. ʾaẓlama "grew dark."[1] The arbitrary rejection of what may even have been a conscious folk-etymology which has become part of the literature of many languages, is not only pedantic, but faulty linguistic method. Again the decision on which is the right meaning depends on the level at which one approaches the text. Historically one would have to discuss the etymology and grammar of the word, but synchronically, in the text as it stands, the meaning of the word is "the shadow of death."[2]

(5) The Old Testament is a religious text, "the Bible," "the Word of God," and as such is to be distinguished, in its very nature, from, for example, Sennacherib's Annals and the Codex Hammurabi. Unlike these blocs of literature, which in the same way as some parts of the Old Testament, had specific identifiable contexts of situation in the Ancient Near East, the Old Testament as a whole became a religious text, dissociated from particular situations in the Ancient Near East, and contextualized instead in an infinite number of other situations in the history of the synagogue or the church, and in the experience of individual members of such religious communities.[3]

In an important study on religious iconography, it has been observed that particularity seems to have been purposely kept to a minimum in order to make possible this kind of universal applicability, so

1. GK, p. 103, note 1; BL, p. 506; KB, s.v.
2. Cf. also MT ʾal-mawet "immortality" (Prov. 12:28); on which see GK, 479g.
3. On the "oddity" of religious language in general, see I.T. Ramsey, op. cit., pp. 37-48. Cf. also A.C. Bouquet, Sacred Books of the World, pp. 23-6.

that the content could be readily communicated to as many people in as many different situations as possible.[1] This may have been to some extent due to the requirements of liturgical re-enactments of Biblical scenes. However that may be, it has been noticed elsewhere that in the Bible there is a minimum of graphic detail: colours are rare, personal appearance is seldom described, detailed topographical descriptions are unusual, except for several conspicuous and entirely explicable exceptions such as Solomon's temple and the visions in apocalyptic literature. This means that the artist may, without doing violence to the Biblical texts, introduce contemporary details from the liturgy of his time, for example, the altar-table in the scene of the sacrifices of Abel and Melchizedek in the Church of San Vitale in Ravenna.[2] Thomas Mann is able to write a monumental epic on Joseph and His Brothers, introducing political and psychological factors out of his own and his people's experiences during the period of Nazi domination, without substantially distorting the Biblical saga.[3] The language of the Psalms, however, provides the best known example of this avoidance of particularity: situations are described in such a rich mass of formal, stereotyped expressions introducing all kinds of details concerning dogs, lions, bulls, waves, evildoers and other enemies, often at the same time, that it is out of the question to reconstruct the precise situation of the Psalmist.[4]

1. G. Stričević, "Drama as an Intermediary between Scripture and Byzantine Painting," pp. 107f.

2. Id., p. 109.

3. English translation by H.T. Lowe-Porter in four volumes (Sphere Books, London, 1968).

4. On the stereotyped character of the language of the Psalms, see G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, pp. 398ff.

It cannot be finally proved whether this process is accidental or by design; but the result is that the "actualization" of Biblical traditions or their applicability in an infinite number of situations is enormously facilitated.[1] To illuminate this point still further, one might contrast the universally familiar, formalized language of Matthew 2 or Luke 2, with the pre-Raphaelite hymn "In the bleak mid-winter," in which circumstantial details tie the event down to nine-teenth century England,[2] or Leonardo da Vinci's Adoration of the Kings in the Uffizi Gallery, which is crowded with details of the architect-ure, culture and religion of fifteenth century Florence.[3] This is a characteristic feature of the Biblical text, and is a further argument in favour of choosing the finished article as a starting point, rather than attempting to reconstruct the original situation or situations with their inevitable particularity.

(6) Finally the Massoretic text, crystallized in the tenth cen-tury A.D., represents a tradition going back many years before it was finally fixed. It was the aim of the massoretes to preserve the text in a form as close to ancient tradition as possible, and it seems that, thanks to their careful scholarship, they succeeded in this to an astonishing degree. In beginning from the final form as represented in the Massoretic text, we shall be working with far more than Biblical Hebrew contextualized in 10th century A.D. Tiberias. The Massoretic

---

1. Cf. A. Weiser, The Psalms, p. 724; G. von Rad, op. cit., p. 400; and on the term "actualization" see especially Childs' discussion in Memory and Tradition, pp. 81-9, and N.W. Porteous, "Actualization".

2. The Church Hymnary, No. 50.

3. Cf. K. Clark, Leonardo da Vinci, pp. 37-41.

text is "das Resultat einer über etwa tausend Jahre sich erstreckenden munutiösen Beschäftigung mit dem Bibeltext."[1].

For the purposes of this linguistic analysis, then, the final form of the text as preserved in the massoretic tradition has been selected. The reasons for this choice have been outlined, but it must be emphasised that the present writer is well aware that this is only one of many legitimate levels at which it is possible to conduct a semantic analysis.[2] The advantages of thus fixing exact terms of reference will become evident at every stage; but it is hoped that the precision thus achieved will not divert attention from the far larger task of which this is only a beginning.

---

1. _BL_, p. 71.

2. Attempts to discredit MT in favour of a reconstructed pre-massoretic text (e.g. P. Kahle, _The Cairo Geniza_, p. 188), are irrelevant in the present context, since they are primarily concerned with phonology and grammar rather than semantics, but also because the analysis of MT can be as scientific as that of any other text.

   It is in this awareness of the value of research at other levels that the present approach differs radically from that of the fund-amentalist, who gives divine authority to the level selected by himself or by his community.

# II.   LANGUAGE

Like any other large piece of literature or "bloc" of language,
the language of the Old Testament is not entirely homogeneous, but
contains a number of distinct "varieties", or styles or literary forms:
"colloquial style," the "Deuteronomic style," the "language of the
lawcourt," "early Hebrew poetic style," "classical Hebrew," the
"sermon," the "individual lament," the "parable" are some of the
distinctions within Old Testament Hebrew that have been discovered by
critical scholarship.

## 1.  Linguistic Variation.

The dominant method of dividing the language of the Old Testament
into literary or stylistic units is without a doubt the form-critical
method.  The injunction to study a word in context means, more than
anything else today, determining the literary form in which it appears.
But valuable though form-criticism may be, particularly where an easily
identifiable "form" can be traced, it cannot of course answer every
question.[1]  What is the relation between literary form and style, for
example, or between form-criticism and stylistics?[2]  What methods have
been evolved for classifying Old Testament Hebrew into distinct styles?
What methods are adequate in the light of modern linguistic and form-
critical theory?

Stylistics, more even than semantics, is a branch of general

---

1.  Cf. J. Muilenberg, "The gains of form-criticism in Old Testament
Studies."

2.  K. Koch devotes only two pages to this problem, but cites some
interesting stylistic studies.  See Was ist Formgeschichte? pp. 18f.

linguistics fraught with difficulties and uncertainties. A recent study which attempts to find an objective method of describing and defining style makes this abundantly clear.[1] In Old Testament research very little has been done on this subject under the name "stylistics"; but there have been plenty of attempts to divide up Hebrew into distinct literary or stylistic units. Before putting forward one more suggestion, a brief survey of some of these attempts is intended as an introduction to the main aspects of the problem.

(1) The canonical approach. The traditional Jewish classification of the Old Testament, that is to say, the tripartite division into Tora, N$^e$bi$^i$im and K$^e$tubim, involves the belief that the Torah, being written by Moses, is written in the "language of Moses," and so distinguished from other parts of the Old Testament. This is entirely arbitrary, of course, depending as it does on the decisions of a religious community at a time long after the literature itself was composed; but its effect on the meaning of Biblical Hebrew must not be overlooked.

Alongside a stylistic distinction between the Torah and the other parts of the Old Testament, there is the question of authority. It would be incorrect, for example, to attempt a semantic description of lo$^$ tirṣaḥ "thou shalt not kill" in Jewish tradition without first stating that it occurs twice in the Torah and is endowed with Mosaic authority. The application of the legal sections of the Torah in the context of everyday life naturally affects their meaning; while the

---

1. N.E. Enkvist, J. Spencer and M.J. Gregory, Linguistics and Style. Cf. S. Ullmann, Language and Style, p. 100.

greater familiarity of the Torah and the Scrolls, over against the Prophets is a similar factor in the situation. The centrality of the Torah and the popularity of the Psalms and Scrolls in the liturgical context are also important.

The translators of the Authorised Version went one stage farther, taking the whole Bible as one homogeneous unit. The doctrine of the canon of scripture meant that every word had equal authority: there were no divisions, literary, stylistic, chronological or theological, and the result was that the style of the Authorised Version is so uniform that we can speak of "Biblical English" as a distinctive style within our language today.

This approach, and ones like it, naturally depend only on external criteria, and are more concerned with the effect on the reader or listener than with the nature of the text. It is a superficial approach, stylistically, because even within the Books of Moses there are clearly many different styles which must be carefully distinguished. "Biblical English" and the "Language of Moses," just like "the style of Paul," are concepts based on personal convictions, conflicting at times with the results of a more critical approach. For an adequate semantic theory, we must find some more precise and at the same time more objective criteria for defining the various styles within the Old Testament.

(2) The chronological approach. With the advent of a more critical approach to the Old Testament, a second general method became popular.

The ultimate aim of the literary-critical method associated with the names Graf and Wellhausen was the chronological arrangement of Old Testament Hebrew, so that a word or concept or institution could at the outset be dated, and historical developments, semantic, theological and religio-historical, precisely worked out. "Documents" were isolated on linguistic (but almost wholly lexical) and religio-historical criteria, and the shortcomings of the method were soon evident, both for the linguistics of Old Testament Hebrew and the history of Old Testament religion.

But for pentateuchal studies the division into three main stages, early (JE), middle (D), and late (P), is generally accepted, with reservations (e.g. the early traditions in P), by both linguists and historians; and for Old Testament studies in general the chronological aims of the Wellhausen school have been widely accepted.

A second, and entirely different approach to the problem of dating springs from an interest in oral tradition. Our written sources, given such weight in Wellhausen's research, only provide a rather erratic spotlight on developments in ancient Israel. The method ideally suited to dating this kind of material is the form-critical approach. "The task of a word-study is to follow the development and the change of meaning, not in an artificial isolation from the life of Israel, but within the larger framework of the history of the institution."[1] We shall return to this in a moment: in the meantime it is enough to note that this is another attempt to date Old Testament material and treat the

---

1. B.S. Childs, Memory and Tradition, p. 34.

Old Testament chronologically.

A third method of distinguishing different strata of Hebrew is based on linguistic criteria alone. The grammars usually distinguish several periods within Old Testament Hebrew. Gesenius-Kautsch distinguishes two periods: the first down to the end of the Babylonian exile and the second after the exile.[1] Rabin distinguishes three periods: (A) the language of ancient poetry; (B) the language of the period of the kingdom and the exile (about 1000 to 500 B.C.); (C) the language of the second temple period (about 500 to 150 B.C.).[2] Early poetry and late historical passages can be distinguished from one another without much difficulty on grammatical, lexical and syntactical grounds, and with the intervening stratum (called "Classical Hebrew" by Rabin) provide us with a rough and ready guide to diachronic linguistics. But the possibility of conscious archaisms in Ruth (for example), and later editorial levellings of the ancient forms in the Song of Deborah, make this third chronological approach not entirely reliable. In any case, as we have argued above, we are concerned in the first instance with the "finished product," the text as it lies before us. In other words, while we may detect a late Psalm applied in the context of David's life, we still can ask what is the meaning of this passage in this context.[3] Furthermore within the various chronological strata are to be found a number of distinct styles.

---

1. GK, p. 12.
2. C. Rabin, tahbir lašon ʿibrit, p. 1.
3. See above, pp.18ff.

(3) _Literary-critical approaches_. Gunkel's contribution to Old Testament research was his emphasis on the constant relation that holds between language and situation, between _Gattung_ and _Sitz im Leben_. His criteria for distinguishing different _Gattungen_ were almost exclusively literary and his method mainly comparative. As I have shown elsewhere,[1.] the linguistic implications of Gunkel's work have been obscured by the interest of Old Testament scholars in Israel's cultic and political history, in the _Sitz im Leben_ more than in the _Gattung_. Certainly this method of classifying all the heterogeneous material in the Old Testament is of central importance and cannot be ignored by any post-Gunkel scholarship. But for several reasons it is not entirely adequate for all parts of the Old Testament.

In the first place _Gattungsgeschichtliche_ distinctions are not always stylistic distinctions. For example, the main distinction between the _Danklied_ and the _Klagelied_ is not a formal literary or linguistic one, but a thematic one; and the language of the Psalms classed as _Danklieder_, _Hymnen_ and _Königspsalmen_ exhibits some close similarities which are perhaps neglected when the differences in subject-matter are emphasised.

More important is the criticism that much of the Old Testament has not yet been fitted into the slots provided by the form-critics.[2.] This will become clear later, when we come to examine a number of passages addressed to God, which are apparently in some kind of formal

---

1. See above, pp.5ff.
2. e.g. Pss. 12, 14, 31, 36, 44, 49. See H.-J. Kraus, _Psalmen_, _ad locc._, and also pp. xl-xli.

style, but for which no Gattung has been identified. Allied to this is the fact that the system of Gattungen is alien, to a large extent, to the Old Testament material. Passages which are called "Prayers" in Old Testament Hebrew, are described as Hymnen by the form-critics.[1]

Finally, the emphasis of the form-critics on discovering the Gattung to which a passage belongs, involves undue emphasis on the original Sitz im Leben of the passage. That is to say, although we may be able to reconstruct the original context in which the prayer in Jonah 2 was applied, this tells us nothing about its application in the context of the Book of Jonah.[2] In accordance with our aim to deal with Old Testament Hebrew at the level of the finished text, we cannot be satisfied with the fragmentation of Old Testament Hebrew literature into units associated with situations which are foreign to the immediate context of the words or passages under examination.

The form-critical approach is not the only literary-critical method that has been applied to the Old Testament. There is the distinction between prose and verse. Grammarians and lexicographers have naturally made use of this, alongside chronological distinctions. Gesenius-Kautsch, for example, lists a number of characteristics of the poetic language, metrical, lexical, semantic and syntactical.[3] The problem of how poetic structure affects the semantics of Hebrew has not, to my knowledge, been examined. The parallelismus membrorum, on which Hebrew poetry depends, has obvious semantic implications:

1. See below, pp. 55 ff.
2. See below, pp. 56f.
3. GK, pp. 13-15.

the analysis of a particular semantic field, for example, would have to take into account some distinction between prose and verse, because its size and content might very well be affected by the exigencies of poetic parallelism.[1] Synonymy and opposition are affected by frequent collocation in poetic structure.[2] Visually, verse form may have played some part in the semantics of Hebrew, as has been recently suggested on the basis of Ugaritic and Greek parallels.[3] The semantics of prose, in other words, is not the same as the semantics of verse.

But, in Biblical Hebrew, for several reasons the distinction between prose and verse is not always beyond dispute.[4] Although not many nowadays would follow Sievers in considering all of Genesis as being written in verse,[5] the RSV does print a considerable number of Genesis passages in verse forms, in apparent disagreement with Massoretic tradition. We have no ancient manuscripts written in verse form.[6] Finally while the prose/verse distinction must be taken into account, even if in ancient traditions it was not such an important distinction as we make it today, it is far too broad to provide us

---

1. Cf. the notion of "synonymic attraction": S. Ullmann, op. cit., p. 75.

2. See below, p. 111.

3. See H. Kosmala, "Form and Structure in ancient Hebrew poetry." These studies demonstrate how a poetic form, for example, "pedimental" and "frieze" types, may be related to the meaning: e.g. Isa. 14:3-21; 30:29-31. Cf. also the "Technopaignia" of Simmias of Rhodes (c.300 B.C.), which include poems in the shape of wings, an axe and an egg.

4. EAT, p. 78.

5. See E. Sievers, Studien zur hebräischen Metrik, II (1904-5). Cf. J. Skinner, Genesis, pp. xviii-xx.

6. Psalms, Job and Proverbs, as well as some poetic passages (e.g. Ex. 15:1-18; Deut. 32:1-43), are written with spaces between stichs in the Hebrew MSS. See EAT, p. 77.

with more than one very general stylistic criterion. Within both prose and verse there are clearly several styles to be distinguished.

Commentators and lexicographers distinguish a number of such styles in the Old Testament. BDB identifies a "colloquial style" and quotes examples of this both from prose and from poetry, and from a wide variety of periods and traditions from the earliest stratum of Genesis to the exilic period and Wisdom literature. One would have to ask how this "style" was identified, and whether the particle -na, attached to the imperative, along with a number of other linguistic phenomena, can be considered an adequate "style-marker." Is it being suggested that "colloquial style" is a homogeneous "sub-language" cutting right across the generally accepted divisions of Old Testament Hebrew into chronological strata or literary forms?[1]

Other "languages" frequently distinguished by Old Testament scholarship include, on the one hand, what might almost be called "jargons" like the language of the lawcourt, the language of the Wisdom circles, and on the other hand the "styles" of particular authors or groups of authors like the Priestly writer(s), the Deuteronomist, the Chronicler. Let us look briefly at one of these. The language of the lawcourt, that is to say the language proper to forensic situations, does not constitute a distinct Gattung, and is found in all strata of Old Testament Hebrew. In other words this is

---

1. BDB, s.v. -na , cites a wide variety of passages as examples of "colloquial style": e.g. Gen. 12:13; Jud. 13:14; Isa. 1:18; Am. 7:2; Job 40:10.

another "style" that cuts right across the usual chronological and form-critical divisions.  Certain words have a restricted meaning when they are applied in this context:  e.g. ᶜARAK, QUM;[1] others have a definite referent in a forensic situation, the identification of which illuminates their meaning:  e.g. "on the right hand."[2]

The problem is that as yet no detailed study has been undertaken of all those passages written in "the language of the lawcourt" in an attempt to define this "style" more precisely.  The same is true of the other "languages" assumed in Old Testament commentaries and lexica.  Again in this branch of Old Testament criticism, reference is made mainly to features which may be influenced more by the subject matter than by any peculiar style.

(4.) Dialects.  Finally attempts have been made to distinguish various dialects in Old Testament Hebrew.[3]  Graphological, morphological, syntactical, lexical and contextual features have been investigated in this connexion, and it is here that we find one of the most objective approaches to the problem of dividing Old Testament Hebrew up into different kinds of language.  The difficulties involved in this approach are evident from a recent article on the language of the Book of Hosea.[4]  Again, as in the case of dating Old Testament Hebrew, we come

---

1.  See BDB, s.v. ᶜARAK, g. "set forth a legal case";  on QUM, cf. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 156.

2.  e.g. Ps. 109:31.  See R. de Vaux, loc. cit.;  H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, p. 109.

3.  e.g. BL, pp. 28-32.  Cf. also the suggestion that the Moabite inscription may be a dialect of Hebrew:  GK, para. 17w, and more recently, S. Segert, "Die Sprache der moabitischen Königsinschrift."

4.  See W. Rudolph, "Eigentümlichkeiten der Sprache Hoseas."

up against the fact that scribal levelling of things that puzzled them, and possibly inventions to indicate dialectal variations make the search for dialects in the Old Testament hazardous. Such evidence as is found, however, for a northern dialect in Deuteronomy, Hosea and some of the Psalms, and for an eastern dialect in the Book of Job, must be carefully recorded in any lexical work.[1]

## 2.  Register and style.

One method of classifying Old Testament Hebrew which has not yet been attempted, but which is normal procedure in modern linguistics, is the isolation of a particular "register."[2] A register is the variety of a language proper to a particular situation, for example, the language used by a subordinate addressing his superior in the army, or of an adult speaking to a child. Examples of written registers would include the "blurbs" on packets of soap-powder, newspaper headlines, and programme notes. Given a sufficiently representative cross-section of a language (such as the Old Testament provides), one would expect to be able to identify a number of distinct registers. There may be several styles within one register, according to a variety of factors in individual situations.[3] A study of newspaper headlines, for example, would find little difficulty in distinguishing the style employed by the Daily Mirror from that of the Times.

---

1.  E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p. 70;  H. Wolff, Hosea, p. xv.  A. Guillaume, "The Arabic background of the Book of Job," pp.108f.

2.  For a valuable discussion of register as "a variety of language distinguished according to use," see M.A.K. Halliday, A. McIntosh and P. Strevens, The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching,  pp. 87-94.

3.  "Style of discourse" is one of three dimensions according to which registers may be distinguished (id., p. 90);  for the present writer's definition of style, see below, p. 43.

The register selected here, as the context in which HOŠIAᶜ,
HIṢṢIL, etc., are applied, is the language of persons addressing their
god. To be a valid starting-point the register must fulfil certain
conditions, and to show how this one is adequate, here first is a
summary of the reasons why this particular register was thought to be
a good one.

(1)     The register must be easily identifiable. Language addressed to
God can be readily identified by an introductory formula ("he said to
the Lord"), or by the occurrence of one of the names of God in the
vocative ("my God," "O Lord"), or both ("he said to the Lord, 'O
God...'"). In spite of such seemingly foolproof criteria, there is
ambiguity in some cases. In many of the Psalms and other utterances
addressed to God, there is an abrupt change of person from 3rd to 2nd
persons or from 2nd to 3rd, which apparently breaks the continuity of
the utterance.[1] This is a feature of direct speech in Old Testament
Hebrew and other languages which warrants further discussion;[2] for
the moment such passages have been recorded as though they were
uniformly addressed to God.

(2)     There is evidence that this register contains language con-
sciously distinguished from what precedes and follows it in the text.
Some utterances addressed to God are written in a style exactly the
same as their lexical environment, but others are written in a style
which indicates that a special effort is being made on the part of

---

1.  e.g. Ps. 18:29, 30;  Isa. 26:1-6;  Jon. 2:3;  Ezr. 9:6-9.
2.  Cf. E. Ullendorff, The Challenge of Amharic, pp. 8f. See Appendix B.

the speaker, aware that he is in the presence of his God.  This is
indicated in the text in several ways:  the speaker's gestures are
recorded (e.g. "he stood before the altar in the presence of all the
assembly of Israel, and spread forth his hands toward heaven, and
said ..." I Kings 8:22);  there is an abrupt change from prose to
verse (e.g. I Sam. 2:1f., Jonah 2:1f.).  This second phenomenon must
not be neglected on the grounds that it is the compiler's work,[1]
that, in other words, the reason for the change from prose to verse
is simply that the poem has been taken from another context and
applied, arbitrarily, in prose narrative.  In some contexts the
compiler's juxtaposition of what were probably independent units has
little or no significance, as in the case of the collections of
prophetic utterances where the "catchword principle" operates.[2]  But
in contexts where language is addressed to God, it is quite clear
that the change of style is intended to indicate the need for special
language when addressing God.  The compiler wished to emphasise that
God is addressed in language proper to the occasion.  This is not to
say that such language is always in one style:  there are "prose-
prayers" as well as verse compositions.[3]  The point at issue here is
that in Old Testament Hebrew a change of style is used to indicate
that a special effort is made on the part of the speaker addressing

---

1.  See Appendix A.

2.  See, for example, C.R. North, <u>The Second Isaiah</u>, pp. 6ff.  Cf.
also R.B.Y. Scott, "The literary structure of Isaiah's oracles," pp.
183-6.

3.  See below, on "Deuteronomic prayers," pp. 56-58.

God.  In other words we are dealing with a distinct register.

It is interesting to note in passing that the RSV makes a
stylistic distinction between this register and the rest of Old
Testament Hebrew.  Language addressed to God is consistently written
with the archaic Thou-forms.  In other words, according to the RSV
there is only one style in our register, namely an elevated style
used exclusively for language addressed to God.  In fact this is mis-
leading, because, as we shall see, all utterances addressed to God
are not by any means written in the same style, and if stylistic
variation is to be attempted at all in our English versions, it will
have to be far more precise than this.

(3)    A third obvious reason for selecting this register is that the
words HOŠIA͑, HIṢṢIL, etc., occur very frequently in utterances
addressed to God.[1]  That this should be so is entirely natural, since
we would expect language addressed to God to contain numerous ref-
erences to his saving acts.

(4)    Work on prayer in the Old Testament has been confined to two
approaches:  the examination of distinct forms (e.g. Klagelieder ,
"prose prayers")[2.] and etymological studies beginning, not from the
actual utterances themselves, but from the various words for "prayer,"
and "to pray" in Old Testament Hebrew.[3.]  To my knowledge there has

---

1.    More than half the attested occurrences of HOŠIA͑, YEŠA͑, etc.,
are in the register.

2.    See especially C. Westermann, "Struktur und Geschichte der Klage
im Alten Testament";  B. Hornig, Das Prosagebet der nachexilischen
Literatur.

3.    Cf. TDNT, II, p. 785.

been no complete survey of all the language addressed to God in the Old Testament.[1]

(5)   Finally there is the subjective reason that this register is a particularly interesting one.   There is a rich variety of styles within it as we shall see in a moment.   But as well as this, the situation involved, namely, that of direct confrontation with God, has a timelessness and universality about it which are less evident in, for example, historical narrative or apocalyptic.   To put it another way, the first person (speaker) and the second person (God) are not, in the nature of things, tied down to any one situation, so that to apply the language of this register in Qumran, Gethsemane, Hippo, Erfurt, Treblinka or Aberfan required no sophisticated theological or exegetical process. In this respect it is easier to answer the question 'What does hošiᶜeni mean?' than 'What does YHWH hošiaᶜ ᵓet-šimšon mean?'[2]

For a complete analysis of the meaning of any word or group of words in the Old Testament, all occurrences in the Old Testament would have to be recorded.   But as I have been at pains to emphasise, words are used differently in different registers so that a clear, definitive distinction between these is of some importance for semantic theory.   The arbitrary selection of one of them is therefore intended to make this point clear, proving that such a method is

---

1.   E.R. Bernard's article in Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, II, pp. 39-42, limits his enquiry to petitions.   Cf. the very restricted study in EAT, pp. 21-23.

2.   See above, pp. 22f.

possible and at the same time producing a lucid set of results. The
aim is to give a maximum of clarity and objectivity, although this
must be seen as the first step towards a complete system for describ-
ing the meaning of Old Testament language.

As has been pointed out already, no completely satisfactory
method of distinguishing "styles" has yet been devised.[1] It is quite
evident, prima facie, that in Old Testament Hebrew God is addressed in
a very large number of entirely different varieties of language, from
querulous colloquialisms[2] to highly formalised hymns and prayers.[3]
The speaker may be anyone from the cultic or political leader of
Israel to a servant girl, from a lion to the crew of a ship.[4] The
location of these utterances varies from the temple in Jerusalem to
the belly of a great fish.[5] The problem of defining the differences
in these passages is very great indeed. The form-critics have divided
much of the material into literary units each exhibiting a number of
characteristics. But this is based on external criteria (parallels in
other ancient near eastern cultures, modern Gattungsgeschichtliche
methods unknown to the authors and compilers, German or English labels
attached to Old Testament literary units) which sometimes tend to

---

1. See above, p.27.

2. e.g. Gen. 18:15; Ex. 4:13.

3. e.g. Ex. 115:1-18; I Sam. 2:1-10; II Sam. 22:2-51; I Kings
8:23-53.

4. e.g. Moses (Ex. 32:11-14); Hezekiah (Isa. 38:10-20); Hagar
(Gen. 16:13); a lion (Isa. 21:8); the crew of a ship (Jon. 1:14).

5. e.g. "before the house of God" (Ezr. 9:6-15; cf. 10:1); "from
the belly of the fish" (Jon. 2:2).

obscure the actual meaning of a passage, the main concern being pre-
dominantly religio-historical rather than semantic.[1]

Meaning can be examined at various levels, and undoubtedly one
of the most fruitful is the level of the original _Sitz im Leben_ of the
words or passages in question. For reasons given in Chapter One,
however, another level, namely the level of the "final form," has been
selected as the basis of this study. It is not enough to explain
apparent inconsistencies by reference to separate sources or different
_Gattungen_; we are concerned to explain the meaning of the traditions
as they stand in the text. We must attempt to understand the finished
product as well as its complex, intriguing, and often highly obscure,
prehistory.

Turning to our register, language addressed to God, we should
expect, if the text is a valid starting-point, to be able to find an
answer to questions like 'How does the style used by Moses in addressing
God compare with Nehemiah's style?' What is the proper style for utter-
ances described (in the text) as songs, prayers, vows, oracular quest-
ions, etc.? Utterances are frequently introduced by a specific form-
ula ("they sang this song," "this is the prayer of ...," "he vowed a
vow, saying," "they inquired of the Lord, saying"), and this clas-
sification, being written into the text, introducing no external, alien
criteria whatsoever, seems to be a possible approach to the problem of
classifying the three hundred or so utterances addressed to God in the

---

1. See above, pp. 5f.

Old Testament. This is a contextual classification and as such
involves the following definition of style or one similar to it:
"the style of a text is the aggregate of the contextual probabilities
of its linguistic items"[1] – probabilities since linguistic evidence is
limited, and contextual, in accordance with our decision to begin from
the final form of the text.

The classification of utterances according to their introductory
formulae is not adequate in every case: some of the Psalms and many
prophetic utterances are not introduced by any formula, and will have
to be classified on some other principle. But for the most part this
method is adequate. Its results will be compared with the results of
other modern approaches, mainly the form-critical approach; but that
it is as objective, and at the same time as fruitful as they are,
will, I hope, emerge from its application to the material selected for
this study.

The relation of this approach to form-criticism requires a few
preliminary words of explanation. In the first place there is no need
to re-emphasise the point that we are concerned first and foremost
with the _Sitz im Leben_ as indicated in the text, which may or may not
be different from the original _Sitz im Leben_. The fact, in other
words, that Jonah's prayer belongs to the _Gattung Danklied_ with a
cultic _Sitz im Leben_ is not our concern. In the text it is presented
as a prayer in a particular crisis ("Then Jonah prayed to the Lord his
God from the belly of the fish, saying"), and this is of importance

---

1. See N.E. Enkvist, J. Spencer and M.J. Gregory, _op. cit._, p. 28.

for the meaning of the word $y^e\check{s}u^cata$, for example, in the last line. The utterance is introduced by a formula, and can conveniently be classified alongside others presented in the same way, which are frequently associated with similar situations of crisis.[1]

Secondly, while most of Gunkel's labels were supposedly based on Hebrew terminology, in fact he was applying them to utterances not necessarily described by that terminology in the text.[2] He was in reality imposing upon the text an alien system, based on external criteria, unfamiliar or at any rate unimportant to the authors and compilers. For example three utterances which are classified separately according to the form-critics as Hymnus (I Sam. 2), Danklied (Jon. 2) and Klagelied (Hab. 3), are all presented as prayers in the text.[3] Once again the distinction between two levels of activity, textual and extratextual, massoretic and modern, must be carefully made. Both are interesting and important, but neither must be assumed to be necessarily superior, or more objective than the other.[4]

Thirdly the present classification is to be considered as only

---

1. See below, pp. 55f.

2. e.g. Klagelied, based on $t^e$pilla. See H. Gunkel-J. Begrich, op. cit., pp. 258f; K. Koch, op. cit., pp. 193f. In fact, $t^e$pilla is not a technical term like Klagelied at all: it can denote "any kind of prayer even the doxologizing one Ps. 72:20" (S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, II, p. 210). Cf. the distinction between technical and non-technical terms in the present author's paper "An analysis of the context and meaning of the Psalm-headings," read to the Glasgow University Oriental Society in March, 1968.

3. e.g. wattitpallel ḥanna watto᾽mer ... (I Sam. 2:1; cf. Jon. 2:2; Hab. 3:1).

4. See above, pp. 18ff.

the first stage in a longer process. One of the dangers of the form-critical approach is that it is invested with an authority and an application far wider than Gunkel, its founder, ever intended. There has been a tendency towards literalism in some excessively form-critical works. The eagerness to relate specific lexical items to details in a reconstructed situation was condemned by Gunkel, but has been apparent in many quarters.[1] The same kind of excesses can creep into any system; but the emphasis on the Massoretic text is intended as a safeguard against these trends, and at the same time as a re-appraisal of modern critical methods.

Fourthly, for obvious reasons, the form-critics have not dealt with all the passages in our register with equal thoroughness. Poetic passages have been easier to classify into literary forms than prose; the Psalms exhibit more formal characteristics than, for example, prose prayers and are therefore a more fruitful subject for form-critical research. The proposed method of classification completely reverses the balance, since the prose passages naturally provide fuller and more precise introductory formulae. Most important of all is the fuller description of the situation in which the compiler has set the utterances, as against the obscure Sitz im Leben of some of the Gattungen.[2]

3. Language addressed to God.

The first stage is a classification according to the introductory

---

1. This tendency, associated above all with the names of Engnell, Bentzen, Mowinckel and Ahlström, was singled out as a danger to be avoided, by Gunkel himself. See H. Gunkel-J. Begrich, op. cit., pp. 100f.
2. e.g. Liturgie: see K. Koch, op. cit., pp. 28ff; kultisch-liturgische Formeln: see EAT, p. 108.

formulae. This produces fourteen groups of utterances for which we
have a precise description in the text.[1.] These will be labelled
HITPALLEL-utterances, ṢA^C AQ-utterances, QARA^ͻ-utterances, and so on,
thus avoiding the dangers of imposing modern, alien terminology on
Hebrew literary units.

The arrangement of the material in each group will be as follows:
two clearly distinct sections, (I) Description and (II) Conclusions,
are intended to bring together all the relevant information on each
passage, while at the same time carefully distinguishing between what
is in the text and what is concluded from extratextual research.
(I) begins by listing all the passages introduced by the formula.
The significant characteristics in these passages are examined under
three headings: contextual, linguistic and thematic. By "significant
characteristics" is meant features which occur repeatedly in the same
group, or features which for other reasons appear to indicate a
particular style ("style-markers").[2.] No attempt is made in this
preliminary study to offer a complete description of any one style.
In the first place detailed examination of the orthography, morphology,
syntax and vocabulary of much of the Old Testament has already been
done elsewhere, and will be exploited in (II). But, at the same time,
the purpose of these sections on style is to discover what broad

---

1. Five of these styles will not be examined since none of the words
of the HOŠIA^C-group occurs in them: HILLA ͻET-P^eNE (Ex. 32:11-13);
HITḤANNEN (Deut. 3:24f.); HITNODED (Jer. 31:18f.); ^CATAR (Jud. 13:8);
ŠIAḤ (Job 7:12-21, 10:2-22).

2. Cf. N.E. Enkvist, J. Spencer and M.J. Gregory, op. cit., pp. 34ff.

distinctions can be observed between, for example, conversational Hebrew and cultic prayers, hymns and other "set-pieces."

In (I), contextual features will be collated first, since they are the easiest to identify and at the same time the most important, being the starting-point for our stylistic distinctions. This will also make it possible for us to refer in later sections to utterances as "Solomon's prayer in the Temple," or "Jacob's vow at Bethel," rather than by chapter and verse. Contextual information includes the compositional frame of the utterance (prose or verse, historical narrative, law-code), the identity and office of the speaker or speakers, the situation in which the utterance was made, any gestures (kneeling, weeping, musical accompaniment), that might accompany it, and other data of this kind.

The second section in (I), the linguistic section, concentrates mainly on syntactical and lexical characteristics, rather than orthographic, phonetic or morphological. Since the approach to the problem of describing literary units is a new one, various linguistic phenomena turn out to be "significant characteristics" which may not have been examined in other studies. They will be set out in the following order, without headings:

the length and complexity of the utterance

the presence or absence of a vocative

the position of the vocative[1].

abrupt changes of person (especially from 2nd to 3rd and vice versa) [2].

---

1. See pp. 54, 60, 66f, 81, etc.
2. See p. 84 etc. and Appendix B.

the incidence of certain particles (e.g. -na, ʾana)

the incidence of HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc.

The third section in (I), the _thematic_ section, is intended to detect recurring features which, although not lexical parallels, none the less must be considered closely related. This will include such recurring elements as confession, declaration of faith and references to acts of divine intervention. Images and ideas which appear in several passages in different words will be listed here.

Section (II) _Conclusions_, in contrast with (I), introduces the results of modern critical scholarship (Form, _Sitz im Leben_, date, authorship), and attempts to relate this information to that contained in (I). The kind of question we might expect an answer to in this last part is whether there is such a thing as a typical "HITPALLEL-utterance." Does it correspond to any _Gattung_? Does it normally occur in any identifiable stratum of the Old Testament? The final piece of extratextual information in this section will be the present author's decision, based on (I) and (II), about the style of each utterance.

The second stage in the classification of our register is to find some criterion for classifying all those passages in which the introductory formula is the neutral "and he said."[1] The first, and simplest one is the occurrence of some cultic expressions, indicating that the speaker, the location or the mode of address is connected with cultic practice. Passages isolated on this principle can then be

---

1. See pp. 91-103.

grouped alongside the first classification. A second equally clear-cut group of ꜂AMAR-utterances can be subsumed under the title "conversational style." Right away we can distinguish a group of contexts in which God and man converse or engage in intellectual, theological or political discussion in an entirely anthropomorphic manner. There is no evidence of any special effort on the part of the speaker in the presence of God: indeed God is addressed just as though he were a member of the speaker's own social or cultural class. These are the utterances which we suggested above are wrongly translated by the RSV into an exalted style, indicated by the use of Thou-forms.[1]

A number of miscellaneous utterances have no introductory formula other than "he said," are set in a context undistinguished by cultic characteristics, and yet exhibit enough contextual, linguistic or thematic features to suggest a "set-piece style,"[2] comparable to one or other of the styles examined above. These too will be included in this second stage.

Thirdly, there are thirty-six independent units addressed to God (mostly in the Prophets), with no introductory formula, not even "and he said," and sometimes without a very clear immediate context. These are incorporated into longer utterances, and are, in effect, examples of that abrupt change of person which we have already mentioned briefly, as a characteristic of Biblical Hebrew; but whereas other utterances are apparently addressed in toto to God, in

1. See above, p. 39.
2. See pp. 107-9.

these passages only those parts composed in the second person singular
are addressed to God, the rest being specifically addressed to someone
else (an enemy, the prophet's hearers, the reader), or spoken by some-
one else.  This phenomenon is particularly frequent in prophetic pas-
sages and is explained by the method of compilation.  The utterances
as we have them before us in the text of the Old Testament, however,
are applied in an important context, albeit  different from the
original one, and again we can examine contextual, linguistic and
thematic characteristics as in the other groups.  Again they may be
relatable to the groups classified according to their introductory
formulae.

A fourth section would be devoted to the Psalms, dealt with on
their own, since they are, on the one hand, distinguished from the
first groups by having no corresponding introductory formula in many
cases, but on the other, distinguished from the independent utterances
by often having a heading in which they are described by some technical
term.  The Psalms can be classified according to their headings, be-
cause whatever mizmor, miktam, etc. meant originally, as we have them
in the Old Testament they are applied to a number of utterances, and
an examination of these will provide one definition of these perplex-
ing terms, and at the same time a valid internal principle for clas-
sifying the Psalms.[1]

The arrangement then, is as follows:

1.  This section has been omitted from the dissertation for reasons
given on p.45.  See however the paper referred to on p.44 , note 2.

(1)   Utterances introduced by precise formulae

(2)   ꜣAMAR-utterances:   A. Cultic

B. Conversational

C. Miscellaneous

(3)   Independent units

(4)   The Psalms

(1)   Utterances introduced by precise formulae.

(a)   HITPALLEL.

wayyitpallel ꜣel YHWH leꜣmor ... Deut. 9:26-9;   I Sam. 2:1-10;

II Kings 6:17, 18, 20;   II Kings 19:15-19 = Isa. 37:16-20;

II Kings 20:3 = Isa. 38:3;   Jer. 32:17-25;   Jon. 2:2-9; 4:2f;

Neh. 1:5-11.

The following are described as t͏ᶜpillot, although the formula

is not used:

II Sam. 7:18-29 = I Chron. 17:16-29;   I Kings 8:23-53 = II Chron. 6:

14-42;   Hab. 3:2-15;   Dan. 9:4-19;   Ezr. 9:6-15.

(I)   Description.

(a)   Contextual.   These utterances occur in every part of the Old

Testament, Torah, Prophets and Writings.

Three are in verse:   I Sam. 2;   Jon. 2;   Hab. 3.[1]

1.   For convenience passages will be referred to by chapter references,
detailed chapter and verse having been listed at the head of each
section.

The situational contexts within which these prayers occur, can be grouped as follows:

(1) auspicious occasions - the birth of Samuel (I Sam. 2), Nathan's prophecy concerning the future of David's dynasty (II Sam. 7) and the dedication of the temple in Jerusalem (I Kings 8).

(2) a crisis - a military crisis due to the imminence of an enemy army (II Kings 6; II Kings 19 = Isa. 37; Jer. 32; Neh. 1); a national crisis due to the people's sin (Deut. 9; Dan. 9; Ezr. 9), or some kind of personal crisis such as illness (II Kings 20 = Isa. 38), mortal danger (Jon. 2) and injured innocence (Jon. 4).

Hab. 3 bears the title ᶜal šigionot which may denote a cultic ceremony of some kind.[1]

The speakers are leaders of Israel (Moses, Ezra, Nehemiah), kings (David, Solomon, Hezekiah), prophets (Elisha, Jeremiah, Jonah, Habakkuk) and others (Hannah, Daniel). The word is not used to describe the prayers of the patriarchs. Three utterances of Moses addressing God are described in this way, but only the Deuteronomy passage gives his actual words. None of the minor characters (Abraham's servant, the sailors in Jonah I and the like) are depicted in the Old Testament as addressing God in HITPALLEL-utterances.

Three of these are uttered in the Temple itself,[2] and a cultic

1. See S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, II, p. 209; for the suggestion that ᶜal- properly goes with mᵉnasseah "the official in charge of," see the paper referred to on p. 44, note 2.

2. I Kings 8; II Kings 19 = Isa. 37; II Chron. 6.

location is indicated for the following:  Hannah's prayer at Shiloh,
David's prayer "before the Lord," Ezra's prayer "before the house of
God."[1]

The following gestures accompany HITPALLEL-utterances:
"I lay prostrate before the Lord for forty days and forty nights"
(Deut. 9;  cf. Neh. 1)
"They slew the bull ... and worshipped the Lord there" (I Sam. 1:25f.)
"... he stood before the altar ... and spread forth his hands toward
heaven" (I Kings 8)
"... he rent his clothes and covered himself with sackcloth" (II Kings
19;  cf. Dan. 9;  Ezr. 9)
"... he turned his face to the wall" (II Kings 20)[2]
"with stringed instruments" (Hab. 3).
All these are connected with cultic practice;  the only passages with-
out a clear-cut cultic situation are II Kings 6, Jer. 32 and Jon. 2,
4.
(b) Linguistic. Utterances in this group are as a rule of considerable
length.  The only exceptions are Elisha's three laconic prayers in II
Kings 6.  Hezekiah's prayer in II Kings 20 is no more than a verse
long, but has a form and a substance which distinguish it from Elisha's
prayers, and bring it into line with the longer prayers that make up
the majority of the group.

---

1.  I Sam. 2;  II Sam. 7;  Ezr. 9 (cf. 10:1).
2.  The significance of the king's gesture is not clear.  The phrase
is omitted in the LXX.  Later Jewish interpreters take it as a ref-
erence either to the king's concentration or to the "wailing wall"
(Rashi).

Imperatival sentences belong to only half of the group (Deut. 9; II Kings 6; 19; 20; Jon. 4; Neh. 1).

The vocative occurs in every case except Hannah's prayer and one of Elisha's three utterances. Medial vocative occurs in five (II Sam. 7; II Kings 19; Jer. 32; Jon. 2; Hab. 3). Otherwise it is initial.

Abrupt changes of person are frequent:

"There is none holy like the Lord, there is none besides thee; there is no rock like our God" (I Sam. 2:2; cf. I Sam. 2:1; Jon. 2:2, 7, 9; Hab. 3:3, 14)

"To the Lord our God belong mercy and forgiveness; because we have rebelled against him and have not obeyed his laws which he set before us by his servants the prophets. All Israel has transgressed thy law and turned aside, refusing to obey thy voice" (Dan. 9:9f., 14f.; cf. I Kings 8:27; Ezra 9:7-9).

The particle -na occurs in most of the prose passages (not II Sam. 7; Jer. 32; Ezr. 9). ʾana begins the following prayers: II Kings 20; Jon. 4; Dan. 9; Neh. 1.

HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc. are peculiarly well represented in this group:

HOṢIʾ (Deut. 9; I Kings 8; Jer. 32; Dan. 9)

HOŠIAᶜ (II Kings 19)

Yᵉ ŠUAᶜ (I Sam. 2; Jon. 2; Hab. 3)

HEᶜ ᵉ LA (Jon. 2)

ZAKAR (Deut. 9; II Kings 20; Hab. 3)

HIYYA (Hab. 3)

SALAḤ (I Kings 8; Dan. 9)

PADA̱ (Deut. 9; II Sam. 7)

PILLE̱T (Ezr. 9)

ŠAPAT (I Kings 8)

(c) Thematic. Two confessional elements appear very frequently,
repentance over past sins and a declaration of faith in God's power:
e.g.

"... the stubbornness of this people, or their wickedness, or their
sin" (Deut. 9:27)[1].

"Therefore thou art great, O Lord God; for there is none like thee
and there is no god besides thee..." (II Sam. 7:22).[2]

(II) Conclusions. Modern scholarship would distinguish straight-
away two types of utterance in this group:

(a) Psalms (I Sam. 2; Jon. 2; Hab. 3). They each belong to a
different Gattung: Hymn (I Sam. 2), Thanksgiving Psalm (Jon. 2) and
Individual Lament (Hab. 3).[3] We have shown how these share several
linguistic characteristics both syntactical (length, abrupt changes of
person, position of vocative) and lexical (absence of the particles
-na and ꜣana, occurrence of y$^e$šu$^c$a ); but on the other hand they all
belong to entirely different contexts of situation: rejoicing at a
sanctuary, a personal crisis far from the Temple; and a liturgical
situation not precisely defined.

---

1. Cf. I Kings 8; Jer. 32; Dan. 9; Ezr. 9; Neh. 1.
2. Cf. I Sam. 2:2; I Kings 8:23; II Kings 19:15; Jer. 32:17ff.;
   Jon. 2:9; 4:2; Hab. 3:2, 19; Dan. 9:4; Ezr. 9:14; Neh. 1:5.
3. See EAT, pp. 376, 548, 568.

The application of a hymn in the context of an act of worship
(I Sam. 2)[1] and of an Individual Lament in the Temple liturgy (Hab. 3)
needs no further comment. But the application of a Thanksgiving Psalm
in a situation so grotesque as that in which Jonah finds himself is of
semantic significance, which, to my knowledge, has not been sufficiently
emphasised in the commentaries. The conventional stereotyped images of
the Psalms need not normally have had specific referents in any identifi-
able situation; but in this context it seems that the compiler has
intentionally applied a number of these details to Jonah's situation.
Indeed one wonders whether the situation was invented just to provide
referents for details in the Psalm, (rather as some modern scholars
have built up liturgical dramas in ancient Israel to explain other
details of this elaborate language). Thus the "belly of Sheol," "the
deep," "thou didst cast," "the waters closed over me," and other
phrases, not normally taken literally in the regular liturgical use
of the Psalms, are here given exact referents, which cannot but give
the tale a jocular twist.[2]

(b) "Deuteronomic Prayers" (Deut. 9; II Sam. 7; I Kings 8; II
Kings 19; Jer. 32; Dan. 9; Ezr. 9; Neh. 1). II Kings 20:3 also
contains at least two characteristics of "Deuteronomic style."[3] This

1. Cf. 1:24-8. Whether or not an emendation is made in 28b (cf. BH,
H.W. Hertzberg, I & II Samuel, p. 27), the compiler's cultic setting
of the Psalm is plain. On the theology of the compiler, see H.W.
Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 31.

2. The whole book is possibly a parody of orthodox Jewish practice:
cf. also the ludicrous disobedience of the "son of Amittai" (1:3),
the sailors' makeshift cultic activity (1:16), and the beasts'
participation in the wearing of sackcloth (3:8). Cf. p. 58.

3. See S.R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,
p. 200, Nos. 7, 9.

nomenclature, employed by a number of scholars, implies two things:
(1) the utterances contain a number of Deuteronomic expressions, and
(2) they are not necessarily an integral part of the narrative, show-
ing signs of editorial expansion.[1] It would be safe to assume,
therefore, in agreement with these literary-critical conclusions,
that these are "set-pieces" written in a prose style, proper to lang-
uage addressed to God, irrespective of their compositional frame.

They are all (except Jer. 32) associated with cultic locations
or practices. The etymology of HITPALLEL ("to cut oneself"?) may have
nothing to do with the present meaning of the word,[2] but this does
not mean that cultic practices could not normally be associated with
it. The statement that "there is no disparity between the prayer of
the cultus and the prayer of the private individual," applied to
prayer in the Old Testament in general,[3] applies particularly well
to these Deuteronomic "set-pieces."

Notice finally how this group of HITPALLEL-utterances coincides
very closely with the modern scholars' "Deuteronomic prayers." In
other words the Hebrew text provides a title for this style of utter-
ance, and an adequate starting-point for any study of "prayer"

---

1. Cf. S.R. Driver, op. cit., p. 227; J.A. Montgomery and H.S.
Gehman, Kings I and II, p. 361; W. Rudolph, Jeremia , pp. 193f.;
N.W. Porteous, Daniel , p. 137; W. Rudolph, Esra und Nehemia, p.
13; B. Hornig, Das Prosagebet der nachexilischen Literatur.

2. Cf. TDNT, II, p. 785; KB and BDB, s.v.; on the distinction
between synchronic and diachronic semantics, see above, pp. 1-3.
Cf. also W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, I, p. 172.

3. W. Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 175.

(t<sup>e</sup>pilla ) in the Old Testament. Eissfeldt's classification of prayers into prayers of intercession, confession and thanksgiving, without regard to how they are introduced or described in the text, is a good example of the arbitrary imposition of a set of modern distinctions upon Old Testament material, even though there exists a perfectly valid approach from within the Old Testament.[1]

Jon. 4:2f. also contains a number of traditional elements and is clearly intended to be taken as a "set-piece," applied in a grotesque situation exactly in the same way as the Psalms in Jon. 2.[2]  In this case the effect is once more to focus on the ridiculous plight Jonah has got himself into, namely that of an angry I-told-you-so attitude towards his God.  The celebrated attributes of the God of Israel, mercy and steadfast love, are, as nowhere else in the Old Testament, reasons for an Israelite's fury, not a cause for thanksgiving and rejoicing.

Finally, the three short prayers of Elisha, two of them specifically introduced by our formula, are all far shorter than the rest of the group (4 words at most), contain almost none of the characteristics of the other utterances, belong to the same bizarre situation, and in all three cases the emphasis is far more on the effect of the prayer than on the prayer itself.  We are not dealing with "set-pieces" at all in this one context, but with short cries closely

---

1.  EAT, pp. 21ff.

2.  See above, p. 56, note 2.  After the declaration of faith in 2b, which is in traditional language (cf. Ex. 34:6(J)), w<sup>e</sup>ʿatta YHWH introduces a typical imperatival prayer (cf. Dan. 9:17; II Chron. 6:16, 17, 41).  The first part of the prayer, on the other hand, is noticeably unorthodox.

associated with the demonstration of God's miraculous power. In
other words, the three utterances are not typical members of their
group.

To sum up, HITPALLEL-utterances are regularly associated with
cultic locations and activities, and are often applied in contexts of
crisis, where confession of sin and a renewed declaration of faith in
the God of Israel are integral parts of the speaker's approach to God.
The intercessory element is suggested by the fact that these utter-
ances are invariably spoken by an individual, often on behalf of his
people. They are written in a conscious "set-piece" style, either
that of the Psalms, or the Deuteronomic style, even in contexts which
are written in another style altogether.

(b) QARA⁾.

wayyiqra⁾ ⁾el YHWH wayyo⁾mer ... Jud. 15:18; 16:28; I Kings 17:20,
21; Isa. 21:8; Jon. 1:14; I Chron. 4:10; II Chron. 14:10.
Four other passages (Gen. 16:13; Jer. 3:4, 19; Hos. 2:18), in which
QARA⁾ occurs in the sense of "naming", will be dealt with separately.

(I) Description.

(a) Contextual. Seven of these utterances occur in narrative, but
none in the pentateuch. The only exception is the Isaiah passage
which is "An oracle concerning the wilderness of the sea" (21:1). It
alone is in verse.

The speakers are a judge (Samson, Jud. 15, 16), a prophet
(Elijah, I Kings 17), a lion (Isa. 21), the crew of a ship (Jon. 1),
a man called Jabez mentioned in a genealogy of Judah (I Chron. 4),

and a king (Asa, II Chron. 14).

The situations are almost always peculiarly dramatic:

Samson surrounded by 3000 Philistines in their temple;

Elijah at the death-bed of a widow's child;

excitement and suspense before the destruction of Babylon;

a storm at sea;

a battle with a million enemies and 300 chariots from Ethiopia.
The other two utterances are noticeably undramatic in contrast:
Samson is thirsty (Jud. 15); and Jabez is apparently in some kind of
unspecified danger from neighbouring peoples (I Chron. 4:10).

There is normally no indication that any of these had associa-
tions either with cultic activities, or with cultic locations.
Samson's prayer, however, is associated with the founding of the
sanctuary at ᶜen haqqoreᵓ.

(b) Linguistic. All these utterances are noticeably short and direct.
The only one longer than a verse is the Isaiah passage.

Of the eight passages six contain a vocative. It is initial
vocative in every case except one (Isa. 21).[1] The only two passages
without a vocative are Samson's prayer at ᶜen haqqoreᵓ and the
isolated utterance in the Judah genealogy.

All utterances contain at least one imperative sentence, except
three. Of these, two contain an appeal in the form of a question:[2]

---

1. In Jon. 1:14 it is preceded by the particle ᵓana .

2. A sentence may be interrogative in form, but imperatival in mean-
ing: e.g. "Won't you come in?" = "Come in!" A study of lama-sentences
in Old Testament Hebrew suggests that many of them are in fact not
questions requiring an answer, but imperatival: e.g. the so-called
"cry of dereliction" (Ps. 22:2 and Mark 15:34) (D. Clines, Sheffield,
in an as yet unpublished paper). Cf. J. Lyons, Introduction to
Theoretical Linguistics, p. 309.

"O Lord my God, hast thou brought calamity even upon the widow with whom I sojourn, by slaying her son?" (I Kings 17:20; cf. also Jud. 15:18). The third exception is the unique passage in I Chron. 4, where Jabez addresses God in the form of a wish introduced by ᵓim.

The particle -na occurs four times (Jud. 16; I Kings 20; 21; Jon. 1).

ᵓANA precedes the vocative in Jonah 1:14.

ZAKAR (Jud. 16:28), Tᵉ ŠUᶜA (Jud. 15:18), and ᶜAZAR (II Chron. 14:10) are the only members of the HOŠIAᶜ -field that occur among the QARAᵓ -utterances.

(c) Thematic. A theme common to two of these passages is a short declaration of faith in God, immediately following an imperatival sentence:

"For thou art Yahweh" (Jon. 1:14);

"For we rely on thee and in thy name we have come against this multitude: Thou art the Lord our god" (II Chron. 14:10).

(II) Conclusions.

The absence of any Deuteronomic editing is noted by the commentators in four of these passages (Jud. 15; 16; I Kings 17:20, 21).[1] The others occur in later narrative (Jon. 1; I and II Chron.) and in an exilic passage (Isa. 21).

On contextual and linguistic grounds, three passages stand out

1. S.R. Driver, op. cit., pp. 167f., 194f.; EAT. pp. 346f., 389f.

from the others:

(1) Jud. 15:18. The purpose of this passage is to give a folk-etymology for the spring ᶜen haqqoreᵓ, which originally may have meant "Partridge spring".[1] The introductory formula with QARAᵓ is therefore not to be taken as having the same significance as it may have in the other utterances. It may be that the only reason why this is described in the text as a QARAᵓ-utterance is to give an aetiological explanation of the name of a spring. This conclusion is supported by the con-textual (undramatic situation) and linguistic (no vocative, no imper-ative) evidence.

(2) Isa. 21:8. This difficult passage, the only one in verse, and unique in other respects (length, medial vocative,), is corrupt accord-ing to most modern scholars, and the emendation roᵓeh ("he who saw") for ᵓarie ("lion") makes good sense.[2] The meaning was symbolic in all probability: the lion represents Judah (as in Jacob's blessing),[3] or the people of Israel (as in Balaam's blessing).[4] They are exhorted by the prophet to look out for news of their enemies' destruction (v. 6f.).[5] Whoever the speaker is, however, the utterance is unique in the Old Testament, and should perhaps be taken as the poetic

---

1. See J. Skinner, Genesis, p. 346.
2. Cf. BH; G.B. Gray, The Book of Isaiah, I-XXVII, pp. 354-7.
3. Gen. 49:9.
4. Num. 23:24. Cf. also "Ariel" as an epithet for the city of Jerusalem (Isa. 29:1).
5. This seems more correct than the more obvious assumption that the watchman is the prophet, as in Ezek. 33:7; Hab. 2:1-3 (EAT, p. 121). In v. 6 the prophet and the watchman are distinguished; while the clear correspondence between 6f. and 8f. suggests that the watchman (Israel) is carrying out (8f.) the orders of his commanding officer (the prophet) (6f.). In Ps. 130 Israel is the watchman.

reconstruction of a watchman's reports to his commanding officer:

1. he is in position (v. 8);  2. horsemen are approaching (v. 9a);

3. Babylon is fallen (v. 9b).[1]

(3) I Chron. 4:10.  The utterance attributed to the unknown figure of

Jabez is unique, not only as a member of this group on contextual and

linguistic (no vocative, no imperative) grounds, but also in several

more general respects:  1. it is the only piece of oratio recta in

eight chapters of genealogy;  2. Jabez is the only figure given no

relatives at all in the family-tree of which he is apparently a

branch;  3. this is the only context where Jabez is mentioned as a

person;[2]  4. and most significant of all, he alone of all the members

of Judah's famous family is given special honours distinguishing him

from the others.  It may be that Jabez has Kenite connexions (Kenites

dwelt in a place called Jabez);[3]  and although the exponents of the

"Kenite hypothesis" have not to my knowledge adduced this as evidence

to support their case,[4] Kenite pre-eminence in Judah at one stage in

the history could explain this isolated tradition.  At any rate the

utterance is clearly not a typical QARAᵓ-utterance.

To understand the style of the remaining five utterances, which,

as we saw, share a substantial number of characteristics, contextual,

---

1. It is not enough to identify Wächterlieder here, and leave it at
   that (EAT, 121).  See above, p.18.

2. A place called Jabez is mentioned in I Chron. 2:55.

3. See previous note.

4. Cf. H.H. Rowley, "Moses and Monotheism," where no reference to
   this remarkable passage appears.

linguistic and thematic, we must compare them with the four passages referred to at the beginning of this section, where QARAˀ is used in the sense of "naming":

> "Thou art a God of seeing" (Gen. 16:13);
> "My father, thou art the friend of my youth" (Jer. 3:4);
> "My father" (Jer. 3:19);
> "My husband ... my baal" (Hos. 2:18).

All four are pre-exilic.[1] One occurs in an Ishmaelite aetiological legend[2] and the others in prophetic utterances. All four occur in situations of crisis: Hagar confronted by the angel of the Lord in the wilderness; a time of drought in Israel; and, twice, "in that day". All four are very brief; all four give prominence to the name of God; all four contain some kind of declaration of faith in God, twice introduced by "thou art ...."[3]

One theory suggested by these obvious similarities is that the QARAˀ-utterances discussed above are extensions of a simple invocation of the deity by his name. This is further confirmed by two other facts: 1. the meaning of QARAˀ elsewhere in the Old Testament, where it regularly refers to the naming of Yahweh and summoning him in times of crisis; 2. a characteristic of prayer in the Old Testament,

---

1. Gen. 16:13 (J); Jer. 3:4 "circa 620 B.C.", Jer. 3:19 "at the beginning of Jeremiah's ministry" (W. Rudolph, Jeremia, ad locc.); Hos. 2:18 "eighth century B.C." (H.W. Wolff, Hosea, ad loc.).

2. Gen. 16:13. See J. Skinner, Genesis, pp. 284f.; G. von Rad, Genesis, p. 190.

3. Jer. 3:4, 19 are in direct speech. RSV is unclear (My Father (without inverted commas) in v. 19). See W. Rudolph, Jeremia, p. 26.

noted by Gunkel, is the closer definition (Näherbestimmung) that frequently follows the vocative (e.g. "O Lord, god of my master Abraham" (Gen. 24:12).[1]

The prominence of the vocative then, distinguishing as it does QARA<sup>ᵓ</sup>-utterances from all other groups, is to be considered the main style-marker. The absence of the note of confession and the apparent lack of connexion to the cult are further distinguishing features. But it should be noted, finally, that this type of utterance in which God is invoked by name, was considered important, and distinctive enough to warrant a special aetiology among the legends of Genesis 1-11: "At that time men began to call upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. 4:26b).[2]

(c) SA<sup>c</sup>AQ.

wayyiṣ<sup>c</sup> aq <sup>ᵓ</sup>el YHWH wayyo<sup>ᵓ</sup>mer ...(Ex. 17:14; Num. 12:13; Jud. 10:10; 10:15; I Sam. 12:10; Ezek. 11:13; Hos. 8:2).

(I) Description.

(a) Contextual. Six occur in narrative: two in the pentateuch, three in the Former Prophets, and one in Ezekiel. The last is in Hosea and is the only one in verse.

The speakers are Moses (Ex. 17:4; Num. 12:13), Ezekiel (11:13) and the people of Israel (Jud. 10; I Sam. 12; Hos. 8).

1. H. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 358.
2. Cf. H. Gunkel, op. cit., p. 54; G. von Rad, Genesis, p. 109.

The situation is invariably one of crisis:

the people threaten Moses because of a drought in the desert (Ex. 17);

Miriam has been struck with leprosy (Num. 12);

Israelite tribes are oppressed by the Ammonites (Jud. 10:10; 15; I Sam.
10);

the word of God spoken by Ezekiel causes the death of one of Israel's
leaders (Ezek. 11);

"A vulture is over the house of the Lord and the enemy is pursuing
Israel" (Hos. 8).

Another element occurs in every situation: the cause of every crisis

is the sin of the people, blasphemy (Ex. 17), criticism of Moses,

servant of the Lord (Num. 12), idolatry (Jud. 10:10, 15; I Sam. 12),

political murder (Ezek. 11) and breaking the covenant (Hos. 8).

There is no indication that any cultic activity or location is

associated with these utterances, unless the case of Miriam's leprosy

is to be considered as carrying out the regulations laid down in Lev.

14.[1]

(b) Linguistic. All the utterances are short varying from 3 words

(Hos. 8) to 12 (I Sam. 12:10). Imperatival sentences occur in Num. 12,

Jud. 10 and I Sam. 10. Interrogative sentences occur in the Ex. and

Ezek. passages.

Only three of these utterances contain a vocative, all at the

beginning (Ezek. 11; Hos. 8; and the unusual ᵓel in Num. 12).[2] The

---

1. See below, pp. 68f.
2. The vocative ᵓel occurs independently six times in the Psalms: 10:
12; 16:1; 17:6; 83:2; 139:17, 23. In view of this the emendation
ᵓal-na (cf. BH) is not necessary here.

exclamation ꜣahah "alas!" precedes the vocative in Ezek. 11.

The particle -na occurs in two passages: Num. 12:13 and Jud. 10: 15. Notice that the otherwise similar utterances in Jud. 10:15 and I Sam. 12:10 differ in this respect: -na does not appear in the I Sam. version of the story.

The following words belong to the HOSIAᶜ-field:

RAPAꜣ (Num. 12:13)

HIṢṢIL (Jud. 10:15; I Sam. 12:10).

(c) Thematic. Confession occurs initially in three passages (Jud. 10:10, 15; I Sam. 12:10). These passages are all concerned with the same kind of situation, and the sin in question is the worship of heathen gods.

The three imperatival sentences all deal with divine intervention: healing (Num. 12:13) and rescue from an enemy (Jud. 10, I Sam. 12).

(II) Conclusions.

Leaving aside for the moment the two prophetic passages, we observe that all the rest belong to an early tradition: Ex. 17:4; Num. 12:13 to the E stratum, and the Judges and I Sam. passages are certainly pre-Deuteronomic and possibly also E.[1] If the phrase hataꜣnu lᶜka or hataꜣnu lᵃYHWH is a "formula of confession particularly frequent in E,"[2] its collocation with the SAᶜAQ-formula is even more

1. EAT, pp. 349, 362.
2. G.F. Moore, Judges, p. 277.

typical of E. It appears rather more frequently in Deuteronomic language, but never in utterances introduced by ṢAᶜAQ. A comparison of the parallel passages in Num. 21:7 (E) and Deut. 1:41 makes this distinction clear: the same "confession formula" is introduced in the first by the neutral ᵓamar, but in the second, the Deuteronomic passage, by the cultic introductory formula ᶜanah wᵉᵓamar.[1]

It appears that ṢAᶜAQ-utterances are early and not intended to be in a special style. ṢAᶜAQ is frequent in Deuteronomic language, and in particular in the D-framework of the Book of Judges;[2] but the actual words addressed to God on these occasions are never given. For D, language addressed to God was presented in a special style, often introduced by a precise formula[3] and some indication of cultic activity as well, in the gestures accompanying the utterance.

The antiquity of these utterances is further exemplified by the use of El in Num. 12.[4] This passage is unusual in several respects, linguistic (vocative, double use of -na) and contextual. The injunction to shut Miriam outside the camp for seven days, suggests a possible connexion with the law for the cure of leprosy in Leviticus (14:2-9).[5] Notice how, in the text, the law is given to Moses before the incident

1. See below, pp. 70f.

2. S.R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 164.

3. See HITPALLEL-utterances (especially p. 52 ) and ᶜANA-utterances (pp. 71ff).

4. El seems to have been very ancient, later superseded by Elohim or formulae like ᵓel šaddai, ᵓel ᶜelyon. See KB, s.v.

5. LXX makes this connexion. See N.H. Snaith (ed.), *Leviticus and Numbers*, p. 236.

in the wilderness, and we would suggest that the archaic formula appropriate to the occasion has survived here, although it is not given in the law itself.[1.] Moses' reaction is to apply the correct formula in the critical situation. As in the case of hata'ti l$^{e}$ka, E does not indicate its cultic nature by using, as D does, a special introductory formula.

The Ezekiel passage confirms the view that ṢA'AQ does not by itself indicate a cultic utterance. Ezek. 11:13 is unconnected with any cultic formulation or activity, being no more than an exclamation expressing horror at the devastating power of an angry God. The prophet's agitation and torment arising from the process of call and revelation are well-known,[2.] and we should not look for any style other than that of Ezekiel.

The Hosea passage is intended to illustrate Israel's hypocrisy. The slightly peculiar language, unique in the Old Testament, once more suggests that this hypocrisy consists of the lip-service that recites the correct cultic formulae, while at the same time breaking the covenant and spurning the good.[3.] If this is the case we have a third example of the incorporation of a cultic formula into a ṢA'AQ-utterance.

The ṢA'AQ-group, then, occurs only in early strata of the Old Testament except for one passage in Ezekiel. In contrast to Deuteronomic language addressed to God, no indication is normally given that these

1. Cf. Deut. 21:7, on which see p. 72.
2. See G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, II, pp. 60ff.
3. Cf. H.W. Wolff, Hosea, p. 177.

utterances are written in a special style appropriate to the occasion. But on the other hand, five of the seven passages do seem to incorporate cultic formulations, namely, a confessional formula (Jud. 10; I Sam. 12) some kind of primitive apotropaic formula associated with the ritual for curing leprosy (Num. 12) and a simple credal formula:

"My God, we Israel know thee" (Hos. 8:2).

(d) ʿANA.

w<sup>e</sup>ʿana  w<sup>e</sup>ʾamar... Deut. 21:7f.;  26:5-10.

(I) Description.

(a) Contextual. Only two utterances introduced by this formula are addressed directly to God. Both occur among the legal formulations of the Book of Deuteronomy. There are other utterances introduced by the formula: Deut. 1:41; Jos. 7:20.

Both contain formulae prescribed for specific situations:  1. an unsolved murder case (Deut. 21);  2. an Israelite's first act of worship on settling in the promised land (Deut. 26).

The speakers in the first are the elders of the nearest city to where the corpse was found;  and in the second the Israelite worshipper.

The utterance is accompanied by ritual:  the killing of a heifer in a valley with running water, that has been neither ploughed nor sown, and notice that the priests the sons of Levi must be present too (Deut. 21);  the offering of a basket of first fruits at the sanctuary, and worshipping before the Lord (Deut. 26).

(b) <u>Linguistic.</u> The utterances are of unequal length. Imperatival
sentences occur in Deut. 21.

The vocative, Yahweh, is in both cases medial.

There is an abrupt change of person in Deut. 26:10:

"... and he brought us into this place and gave us this land...
and behold now I bring the first of the fruit of the land which thou,
O Lord, hast given me."

Three members of the HOŠIA&#770;<sup>c</sup>-field occur in this style:

<u>KIPPER L</u><sup>e</sup>  (Deut. 21:8)

<u>PADA</u>  (Deut. 21:8)

<u>HOŠI</u><sup>?</sup>  (Deut. 26:8).

(c) <u>Thematic.</u> Both utterances begin with a declaration of faith, the
first in the speaker's innocence, the second in God's power to intervene
in history. Both include a statement about the acts of God in the
history of Israel: the redemption of the people from Egypt (Deut. 21:
8; 26:8) and the occupation of the promised land (Deut. 26:9).


(II)  <u>Conclusions.</u>

Both passages contain a number of Deuteronomic features, both
occur in the Deuteronomic code of law, and are therefore not likely to be
later than the 7th century, B.C.

Modern translations of the formula are "they shall testify ..."
and "you shall make a response ..." (RSV)[1].

---

1.  On the forensic application of <sup>c</sup>ANA, see <u>BDB</u> and <u>KB</u>, s.v., and
below, p. 129.

It has been suggested that in the first passage, the magical heifer ritual of expiation, the words which follow the elders' handwashing over the heifer belong to the primitive ritual:

"Our hands did not shed this blood,
neither did our eyes see it shed."  (v. 7)

Verse 8, on the other hand, contains a new interpretation of the ritual in a prayer addressed to the God of Israel.[1] Now it is only in this second part of the utterance that there are distinctive Deuteronomic features, similar to the credal formulation in Deut. 26.  It seems highly probable, then, that in Deut. 21:7f there are in effect two types of utterance combined:  Deuteronomic cultic style (v. 8) and a pre-Deuteronomic cultic formulation (v. 7).  Notice however that, although this may be true and that "it would be impossible to consider the whole text as homogeneous from a literary point of view",[2] never-theless, from a religious and from a semantic point of view, this utterance is a precise linguistic unit applied in a specific situation, with the meaning and authority of an accepted code of law.

The cultic nature of these two <sup>c</sup>ANA -utterances is further confirmed by reference to other cultic formulations introduced by the same formula.  It is unfortunate that the RSV, while correctly observ-ing the cultic meaning of <sup>c</sup>ANA in the two <sup>c</sup>ANA -utterances addressed to God, has not indicated a similar sense in other <sup>c</sup>ANA -utterances, e.g. Deut. 1:41; Jos. 7:20.  Both of these are short confessions

---

1.  See G. von Rad, Deuteronomy, pp. 136f.
2.  G. von Rad, op. cit., pp. 157f.

beginning with the formula haṭa²ti l<sup>a</sup>YHWH.

(e) NADAR.

wayyiddor neder l<sup>a</sup>YHWH wayyo²mer ...    Gen. 28:20-22;   Num. 21:2;
                                               Jud. 11:30f;   I Sam. 1:11.

(I)   Description

(a)  Contextual.   All four vows occur in the early, pre-Davidic nar-
ratives.

       The speakers are Jacob (Gen. 28), the people of Israel (Num. 21),
Jephthah (Jud. 11) and Hannah (I Sam. 1).

       Two occur in cultic centres:  Bethel (Gen. 28) and Shiloh (I Sam.
1).

       The situation in three of them is one of crisis:  the king of Arad
and a Canaanite army have fought against Israel and taken some prisoners
(Num. 21:1);  the Ammonites have declared war on Israel (Jud. 11:4);
Hannah was deeply distressed because of her barrenness (I Sam. 1:10),
and her vow concerns the dedication of a Nazirite.

       The fourth situation is not a crisis:  on the contrary, Jacob at
Bethel has just been promised Yahweh's protection to the ends of the
earth (Gen. 28:13-15).

       The gestures accompanying these utterances are weeping and praying
in the sanctuary at Shiloh (I Sam. 1) and the setting up of a stone
pillar at Bethel (Gen. 28).

       The regulations for vows in general are given in Num. 30 and
Deut. 23:21;  and for the Nazirite vow, in Num. 6.

(b) <u>Linguistic</u>. The utterances in this group are all short, and regularly consist of the protasis, introduced by ʾim, and the apodosis with pleonastic <u>waw</u>. The protasis and apodosis consist of one or two clauses in the Numbers and Judges passages; the other two are more complex.

The vocative ("O Lord of hosts") occurs in only one passage (I Sam. 1:11). Three passages have the infinitive absolute construction (Num., Jud., I Sam.).

There is an abrupt change of person in the Gen. passage:

"If God will be with me ... then the Lord shall be my God... and of all that thou givest me, I will give the tenth to thee" (Gen. 28:22).

There are some lexical correspondences between the two passages in Num. and Jud.:

"natan bᵉyad ..." occurs in both.

Only two words belong to the HOŠIAᶜ-field:

ŠAMAR (Gen. 28:20)

ZAKAR (I Sam. 1:11).

(c) <u>Thematic</u>. The subject of the protasis of two of the passages is the defeat of the enemy in battle.

The apodosis in all four utterances is concerned with cultic activity:

the foundation of a sanctuary and tithing at Bethel (Gen. 28);
ritual destruction of the enemy in a Holy War (Num. 21);
human sacrifice (Jud. 11);
perpetual devotion of a child to the Lord as a Nazarite (I Sam. 1).

(II)  Conclusions.

Of the four vows that have come down to us in oratio recta in the Old Testament, Israel's vow during the Holy War and Jephthah's fatal vow share enough characteristics, contextual, linguistic and thematic, to suggest that they represent some kind of regular style appropriate to making a vow.  That this style or formulation was of considerable antiquity is indicated by the fact that both occur in an ancient stratum of Old Testament tradition.[1]  With them we might also compare a Ugaritic parallel in the legend of Krt.[2]

I Sam. 1:11 is our only evidence for the wording of a Nazarite vow, such as is described in Num. 6.  It differs from the others in containing a vocative, but exhibits enough similarities to the two stereotyped vows to suggest that, even if we cannot go so far as to say it is in the special style appropriate to a Nazarite vow, it is certainly intended to be written in a style typical of a NADAR-utterance.

The fourth vow is that of Jacob at Bethel, and is distinguished from the others in several respects over and above those already indicated in the contextual and linguistic description above:  the protasis is based on the promises previously made by Yahweh to Jacob in a dream, and thus removes the emphasis from Jacob's activity in making the vow, to focus more on his grasping at the promise made to him by his God.[3]  Both the content and purpose of the protasis of the

---

1.  Num. 21:2 (J); Jud. 11:30f. "early legend" (G.F. Moore, Judges, pp. 283f).

2.  C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, krt 200-6 (p. 252).

3.  Cf. G. von Rad, Genesis, p. 281.

vow are quite different from other vows.

The purpose of the three distinct parts of the apodosis is no less unique among the NADAR-utterances: the first part (J) "then the Lord shall be my God" (21b) is intended to teach that here, at Bethel, Jacob grasped the fact that Yahweh had revealed himself in a dream. The fact that by separating the sources Jacob can be relieved of "the suspicion of questioning the sincerity of an explicit divine promise",[1] is of less significance, for the present study, than the fact that apparently three originally independent units have been collocated in one remarkable utterance.

The second part of the apodosis, "and this stone ... shall be God's house" (22a) attributes the founding of Bethel to Jacob (E). The third part "and of all that thou givest me I will give the tenth to thee" (22b) attributes the institution of tithing at Bethel to the same patriarch. The abrupt change of person (v. 22b), which we have noted in a cultic utterance above,[2] the fact that tithing is only dealt with in the Deut. code of law (14:20) and is associated elsewhere with northern tradition (Amos 4:4; Bethel and Gilgal), and the length and complexity of the utterance, mark it out as distinctive among NADAR-utterances.

In other words, it would not be too much to say that here the compiler has used the vow-form, merely as a framework for aetiological teaching, which is more complex than the simple hero-legends and

1. J. Skinner, Genesis, p. 379.
2. See pp. 71f.

narratives of Israel's victories in which both it and the other vows
are placed.  The Genesis "vow" is not a typical NADAR-utterance.

(f) ŠA<sup>ɔ</sup>AL (DARAŠ).

wayyiš<sup>ɔ</sup>al b<sup>a</sup>YHWH le<sup>ɔ</sup>mor ... Jud. 1:1; 20:18;  I Sam. 10:22; 14:37; 23:2,
4; 30:8;  II.Sam. 2:1; 5:19;  I Chron. 14:10.

Three utterances are introduced by an imperatival form of DARAŠ:  I
Kings 22:6, 15 = II Chron. 18:5, 14;  II Kings 1:2; 8:8.
I Sam. 14:41 and 23:10-12, introduced by the neutral <sup>ɔ</sup>AMAR, can best be
grouped here for contextual and linguistic reasons.

(I) Description.

(a) Contextual.    All members of this group belong to the period between
the death of Joshua and the time of Elisha.  All occur in historical nar-
rative.

The speakers are the people of Israel (Jud. 1:1] 20:18, 23, 28;
I Sam. 10:22), Saul (I Sam. 14), David (I Sam. 23; II Sam. 2; 5),
Jehoshaphat (I Kings 22), Ahaziah (II Kings 1) and Ben Hadad, the
Syrian king (II Kings 8).  Notice that the king is the only individual
that makes a ŠA<sup>ɔ</sup>AL-utterance in the Old Testament.

Crisis is again the main feature of the context of situation:
political crisis following the death of a leader (Joshua in Jud. 1:1
and Saul in II Sam. 2).  These two, together with a third concern the
appointment of a new leader:  Judah (Jud. 1), Saul (I Sam. 10) and
David (II Sam. 2).

Five passages occur in military crisis, and concern the outcome
of an imminent battle:  against the Benjaminites (Jud. 20), the

Philistines (I Sam. 14; 23; II Sam. 5) and the Syrians at Ramoth
Gilead (I Kings 22).

The remainder occur in situations of illness: Ahaziah lay sick
after an accident in his palace (II Kings 1) and Ben Hadad was sick in
Damascus (II Kings 8).

There are clear indications of cultic practice in several contexts:
four are connected with sanctuaries, Bethel (Jud. 20), Mizpeh (I Sam. 10),
a makeshift altar (I Sam. 14), Ekron the city of Baalzebub (II Kings 1);
and one is addressed to God via the four hundred prophets at the royal
court in Samaria (I Kings 22). The casting of lots occurs twice with
these utterances: I Sam. 10 and 14:41. The use of the ephod (I Sam.
23:30), fasting (Jud. 20) and sacrifice (Jud. 20; I Sam. 14) also
accompany ŠA AL-utterances; and priests are mentioned with four of
them (Jud. 20; I Sam. 10; 14; 23). In all except the three pre-
monarchical contexts the king is the speaker.

Most of the passages are directed to the deity, but some are
addressed to him through an intermediary or intermediaries: the four
hundred palace prophets (I Kings 22), Micaiah ben Imlah (I Kings 22),
and Elisha (II Kings 8). Questions addressed to false prophets (I
Kings 22) or to Baalzebub (II Kings 1) receive a propitious answer
which turns out to be wrong. In the passages where God is addressed
directly, the answer is always propitious except once: the exception
is Saul's question about an imminent battle with the Philistines, to
which he receives no answer at all (I Sam. 14).

(b) Linguistic. The utterances are normally short, and consist of a

single interrogative sentence:  e.g. "Shall we go out to battle against
our brethren?" (Jud. 20:28);  "Shall I recover from this sickness?"
(II Kings 8:8).

Of the two exceptions to this, the first differs from the majority only
as containing, instead of one short question, two questions in synthetic
parallelism (I Sam. 14).  The other exception is I Sam. 23:10-11, the
only one longer than one verse.  Again there are two questions in
parallel, but these are preceded by a divine vocative and followed by
a short imperatival sentence which is unique among these utterances.

I Sam. 23:10-11 differs from the rest in another striking way.
None of the other utterances contain a vocative;  this one has two
prominently placed at the beginning of sentences:  "O Lord the God of
Israel ..."

The only significant lexical characteristics are the inter-
rogatives:  $h^{ă}$- (11x), mi (2x) and ʾim (1x).

No members of the HOŠIAᶜ-field occur here.

(c) Thematic.  Going into battle is a prominent feature of most of
these:  the words ᶜALA, HALAK, YARAD, YAŞAʾ, NIGGAŠ occur a total of
14x in all but three of them.

Recovery from illness is the subject of two passages, and the
remaining one probably concerns the appointment of the first king of
Israel.

One utterance contains two entirely new elements:  a description
of the present crisis and a prayer for divine intervention (I Sam. 23:
10-11).

(II)  Conclusions.

Of the many instances of consulting a deity in the Old Testament, only these passages give us the exact words used.  The striking similarities, contextual, linguistic, and thematic, in almost all of them make it highly probable that we are dealing with traditional formulations appropriate to the occasion.  We might almost consider them as "oracular questions."

In the first place all the passages belong to the early years of Israel's history.  Furthermore the introductory formula, ša᾽al $b^e$... is known to have the technical sense of consulting an oracle.[1]  More significant is the fact that a cultic setting is described for almost every one of these oracular questions.  This agrees entirely with the procedure set down for consulting oracles in Ex. 28:15, 30 , which, although assigned to P, clearly refers to an ancient custom of the Israelite priesthood.  It is interesting that the most interesting and detailed oracular formulation of them all, concerning the exact use of the Urim and Thummim, occurs only in the LXX version of I Sam. 14:41f, and not in MT.  The reason for the lacuna of so unusual a passage may be due, not as is suggested by many commentators to a scribal error,[2] but either to ignorance of ancient ritual, or possibly the same excessive piety that excised human sacrifice from the story of Jephthah's daughter.[3]

---

1.  Cf. KB, s.v., para. 2.

2.  S.R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, pp. 117f;  W. McKane, I & II Samuel, p. 99;  but H.W. Hertzberg prefers MT (I & II Samuel, p. 111).

3.  Cf. G.F. Moore, Judges, pp. 302, 304f.

However that may be there is enough evidence of cultic procedure
associated with these oracular questions to make it probable that some
kind of set oracular formulations were current in ancient Israel.  If
the answers came in set form ("privates Orakel"),[1.] then it seems
natural that the worshippers addressed their questions too in a style
appropriate to the occasion.  This would be even more likely, if, as
we have indicated, questions were put only by priests (including the
king).

The style exhibits two main distinguishing features:  a complete
absence of vocative which is true of no other group of utterances
addressed to God, and possibly reflects the custom of directing the
oracular question to God through an intermediary;  and, secondly, a
parallelism which occurs in our texts only three times.  It has already
been noted as a distinctive mark in the questions,[2.] and it is just
conceivable that it reflects a time when two possibilities stood before
the worshipper, represented by Urim and Thummim.

It is interesting to note that, in two respects, this group
confirms our evidence for methods of divination in the ancient near
east:  1. the main subjects for oracular decision were apparently
victory in battle and recovery from illness;   and 2. the oracle
normally gave a propitious answer even when defeat or another catastrophe

1.  See K. Koch, op. cit., p. 218;  J. Begrich, "Das priesterliche
Heilsorakel."

2.  S.R. Driver, op. cit., p. 116.

was imminent.[1]

The one exceptional passage (I Sam. 23:10ff), containing a prominent vocative and being considerably longer and more complex in structure than the others, exhibits nonetheless the same core, namely, an oracular question of the traditional type (no vocative, parallel questions):

"O Lord the god of Israel, they servant has surely heard ... Will the men of Keilah surrender me into his hand? Will Saul come down as thy servant has heard? O Lord the God of Israel, I beseech thee, tell thy servant."

It seems very probable that we have here a further example of that combination of an early cultic formula with later editorial work.[2] Here the editor has transformed, by so doing, an oracular formulation into a prayer. Notice finally that although we may have detected an oracular formulation in this utterance, the utterance itself is not typical of the group, and this is indicated within the text itself, since the ŠA'AL-formula is not actually used to describe it.

(g) ŠIR

Ex. 15:1b-18; Jud. 5:2-31a; II Sam. 2b-51 = Ps. 18:2b-51; Isa. 26: 1b-21.

(I) Description.

(a) Contextual. Only four utterances described in the Old Testament

---

1. Cf. M. Jastrow, in ERE, IV, p. 784. See also A. Jirku, "Mantik in Alter Israel."

2. Cf. p. 72 and pp. 75f.

as "songs" are addressed to God. They are all in verse. They occur in the pentateuch, historical writing and the prophets. One of them occurs also in the Book of Psalms.

Three of them are sung by more than one person: "Moses and the people of Israel" (Ex. 15:1), Deborah and Barak (Jud. 5:1), and "the land of Judah" (Isa. 26:1). David is the fourth speaker.

The situation in which these three are uttered is described by the phrase bayyom hahu² ("on that day"): the defeat of the Egyptians at the Red Sea, Deborah's victory over the Canaanites at "Taanach by the waters of Megiddo", and the resurrexion of the dead (cf. Isa. 25:8ff, 26:19).

The fourth passage, David's song, is set in two contexts, but neither context is the actual narrative of the event to which it refers, namely, the escape from the hand of Saul: 1. on the one hand it is placed among a group of various passages, pieces of poetry, lists of warriors and the like near the end of the history of David's reign (II Sam. 22, 23); 2. on the other it is included in the liturgical setting of the Book of Psalms. In both contexts however it is associated with David's escape from Saul, and being uniformly in the 1st person masc. sing., consisting mainly of references to a past event in the speaker's life, and including a meditation on the wonder of God's intervention, it is peculiarly appropriate in this situational context.

Timbrels and dancing accompany one utterance (Ex. 15:20) (cf. I Sam. 18:6-8).

Women take part in the singing of two of the passages (Ex. 15 and Jud. 5).

(b) <u>Linguistic</u>. All four utterances are of considerable length.

There is a complete absence of imperatival sentences in them all.

All of them contain several abrupt changes of person: e.g.

"Lord, when thou didst go forth from Seir ...
the mountains quaked before the Lord ..." (Jud. 5:4f).[1.]

There are also abrupt changes from 1st sing. to 1st plur.

The divine vocative occurs in all these passages, usually medially (Ex. 15:6, 11, 16f; Jud. 5:31; II Sam. 22:29, 50; Isa. 26:8, 15, 17). Initially it occurs in Jud. 5:4, and four times in Isa. 26 (vv. 11, 12, 13, 16).

The omission of the definite article in all four is of some interest (Ex. 15:17; Jud. 5:4; II Sam. 22:10, 14, 41; Isa. 26:2, 5, 15).

HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc. occur frequently in Ex. 15 and II Sam. 22:

II Sam. 22: HIGGAH, HOŠIAᶜ, HOṢIᵓ, HILLEṢ, HIṢṢIL, HIRḤIB, LAQAḤ,

MAŠAʜ, PILLEṬ, ROMEM.

Ex. 15: GAᵓAL, NIHHEL, Yᵉ ŠUAᶜ, QANAʜ.

Isa. 26: ᵓOR, Yᵉ ŠUAᶜ.

(c) <u>Thematic</u>. All four agree in describing the supernatural concomitants of divine intervention (Ex. 15:8, 12; Jud. 5:4f, 20f; II Sam. 22:8-16; Isa. 26:20ff). Two of the passages use almost identical language: Jud. 5:4f, cf. II Sam. 22:8.

Another interesting correspondence between two of these passages

---

1. Cf. v. 31; Ex. 15:17f; II Sam. 22:3, 29-30, 49; Isa. 26:3.

is the "flashback" device whereby the defeated enemy is pictured before the battle looking forward to victory and the triumphant division of the spoil:

> "The enemy said, "I will pursue, I will overtake,
> I will divide the spoil, my desire shall have its fill
> of them ..." (Ex. 15:9)[1.]

## (II) Conclusions.

Two literary forms are distinguished here: 1. "triumphal poem celebrating military victory" (Ex. 15, Jud. 5).[2.] Their original Sitz im Leben may have been "an enthronement festival". Their antiquity is proved by orthographic, morphological and syntactical features.[3.]

2. a combination of various forms: a hymn (II Sam. 22:2-3), (Isa. 26:1-6); individual (II Sam. 22) and communal (Isa. 26:7-19) thanksgivings.[4.] The date of the former is probably early monarchical period, possibly the time of David;[5.] and of the latter probably post-exilic.[6.] Although the former belongs to the Davidic Psalms and the latter appears in the "Isaianic apocalypse", they certainly share enough characteristics to suggest the continuous existence of a traditional style suitable for ŠIR-utterances, from the early period until after the exile.[7.]

---

1. Cf. Jud. 5:30.

2. W.F. Albright, Archaeology in Palestine, pp. 232f. Cf. also C. Westermann, The Praise of God in the Psalms, pp. 90-3.

3. Cf. F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, "The Song of Miriam"; J.D.W. Watts, "The Song of the Sea. Ex. XV"; A. Weiser, "Das Deboralied".

4. H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, pp. 139f; EAT, pp. 435-9.

5. F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving," pp. 16ff.

6. EAT, loc. cit.

7. The persistence of literary forms in the ancient near east is the mainspring of modern Gattungsgeschichte. See K. Koch, op. cit., p. 13, 41-44.

A liturgical setting for three of them is suggested by the fact that there is more than one speaker, the liturgical setting of one of them, and the dancing and other musical accompaniment that are associated with another. The length and the sudden break from prose to verse confirm the impression that we are dealing with set-pieces. This is not to say that Š IR was a technical term.[1]

(h) BEREK.

Gen. 49:2-27; Deut. 33:2-29.

(I) Description.

(a) Contextual. Both are described as bᵉrakot (blessings); both occur at the end of the book in which they are included. Neither is uniformly addressed to God.

The speakers are Jacob and Moses: but while the former is in the first person singular, throughout, the latter is in the first person plural.

The situation in both cases is that of a father (or a leader) of Israel at the end of his life. In the Genesis passage the recipients of the blessing are present at Jacob's bedside; there is no similar indication in Deut. 33.

There is no indication that either was a cultic situation of any kind.

(b) Linguistic. The utterances are in verse. They are of considerable

_____

1. ŠIR and ŠIRA can be distinguished from the technical terms MIZMOR, MIKTAM, etc. See paper referred to on p. 44, note 2.

length and consist of a collection of units.

There are many abrupt changes of person: only parts are addressed directly to God: e.g.

"I wait for thy salvation, O Lord" (Gen. 49:18). This is in fact the only sentence directed to God.[1]

There is apparently a further change of person within Deut. 33:3.[2]

The vocative occurs three times, never at the beginning, and always without closer definition.[3]

Imperatival sentences are frequent in both, three addressed to God:

"Hear, O Lord, the voice of Judah,
    and bring him in to his people" (Deut. 33:7a)[4]

The following belong to the HOŠIAᶜ-field:

yᵉšuᶜa (Gen. 49:18); haya ᶜezer lᵉ (Deut. 33:7); hebiʾ lᵉ (Deut. 33:7); berek (Deut. 33:10).

(c) Thematic. The subject of the two utterances is substantially the same. Notice that in both, the Joseph section is the longest.

Both contain a declaration of faith in God, which appears to be separate from the rest of the utterance:

"There is none like God, O Jeshurun,
    who rides through the heavens to your help" (Deut. 33:26).[5]

Notice that the blessing of Jacob is much more personal than that of

---

1. Cf. Deut. 33:3, 7, 8-11.
2. The awkward bᵉyadeyka is often emended (cf. BH).
3. See p. 65, note 1.
4. Cf. 7b, 8, 11.
5. Cf. Gen. 49:18.

Moses, being in the first person singular.

The past acts of God in history are referred to in both utterances: the deeds of Reuben, Simeon, Levi and Joseph (Gen. 49:4, 5ff, 23ff); the mighty theophany of God at Sinai (Deut. 33:2ff) and the deeds of God (v. 21).

## (II) Conclusions.

The two "Blessings" are generally considered among the earliest parts of the Old Testament, of unknown authorship, and not germane to their present context.[1] The short verse addressed to God in Gen. 49 is an "interpolation" or a "marginal gloss", and the abrupt changes of person are explained by reference to the original independence of the various short units, now juxtaposed.[2]

That the language of these two utterances is to be considered "set-piece" language appropriate to an occasion on which the speaker addresses God, is proved by the fact that they are in verse and contain a number of abrupt changes of person, the vocative is never initial, there are frequent imperatival sentences, and the declaration of faith in God is prominent in both. The style is typical, less of blessings, than of the formal language of prayer.[3]

## (i) MIKTAB.

Isa. 38:9-20.

---

1. EAT, pp. 303ff.

2. J. Skinner, Genesis, p. 527; G. von Rad, Genesis, p. 422.

3. See above, p. 59; and contrast other blessings (e.g. Gen. 27:27ff; 48:15f; Num. 6:24ff). Cf. A. Weiser, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 42-4.

(I)  Description.

(a) Contextual.  The only utterance described in this way occurs in the
historical section (Isa. 36-39).  It is not included in the parallel
section in II Kings 20.

   The speaker is Hezekiah, king of Judah.

   The situation "after he had been sick and had recovered from
his sickness" is apparently associated with a thanksgiving ritual:

>    "The living, the living, he thanks thee,
>       as I do this day....
>    and we will sing to stringed instruments
>       all the days of our life,
>    at the house of the Lord"   (vv. 19, 20).

(b) Linguistic.  The utterance is long.  It is in verse in contrast to
the language both preceding and following it.

   There are only two short imperatival sentences:  e.g.

>    "O restore me to health and make me live!"  (v. 16).[1]

   There is one short interrogative sentence (v. 15a).

   The vocative occurs twice, both times at the beginning of the
sentence.

   Abrupt changes of person between 2ms and 3ms are frequent:

>    "like a lion he breaks all my bones;
>       from day to night thou dost bring me to an end (?)"  (v. 13).[2]

   Members of the HOŠIAᶜ-field:

HIḤYA (v. 16);   HIḤLIM (?) (v. 16);   HOŠIAᶜ (v. 20).

---

1.  Cf. v. 14.
2.  Cf. vv. 12, 14, 19f.

(c) <u>Thematic</u>. There is some elaborate imagery: for death: e.g.

> "like a weaver he has rolled up my life;
>> he cuts me off from the loom" (v. 12b);[1]

for weeping: "like a swallow or a crane (?) I clamour,
>> I moan like a dove" (v. 14a).

There is a reference to the passing on of tradition from father to son, and also in the temple (vv. 19, 20).

(II) <u>Conclusions</u>.

The statement that this Individual Thanksgiving Psalm "has hardly anything to do with Hezekiah," obscures the fact that it is particularly appropriate in the context of recovery from illness, and moreover that its cultic context, indicated in its last two verses, agrees well with what we know of Hezekiah's religious life (Isa. 37:14; 28:2; II Kings 18:3ff). Like Jonah's Psalm, details, originally maybe applied in another context unknown to us today, are applied to specific events in the life of a man, telling of his escape from death, and ascribing this escape to God.

The proposed emendation <u>MIKTAM</u> for <u>MIKTAB</u>[2] would entirely ignore the contextual and linguistic differences between this utterance and all the <u>MIKTAM</u>-Psalms included in the Psalter. Hezekiah's Psalm is not uttered during, but after the crisis; all the <u>MIKTAM</u>-

---

1. Cf. v. 12a.
2. Cf. BH, J. Muilenberg, <u>Peake's Commentary on the Bible</u>, p. 515; J. Mauchline, <u>Isaiah 1-39</u>, p. 235.

Psalms are sung by David, most of them are applied in situations in his own life, all are Psalms of lamentation, all of them contain the vocative ʾelohim (or ʾel in one context) – none of these observations is true of Hezekiah's MIKTAB.[1]

The exact significance of this expressing, usually rendered "writing" in English, is unclear. Possibly there is some connexion with Hezekiah's action on receiving a letter from the Assyrians:

"and Hezekiah went up to the house of the Lord and spread it before the Lord: and Hezekiah prayed to the Lord..." (Isa. 37: 14f).

Was there some significance attached to the writing down of a prayer? It is also curious that both these references to the presentation of a written document in the temple, belong to the biography of Hezekiah.[2]

At any rate, the abrupt change from prose to verse, the language and form of this utterance mark it out as a "set-piece", closely related to the HITPALLEL-utterances.

(2) ʾAMAR-utterances: (a) Cultic contexts.

Up to now styles have been classified according to their introductory formula, and then defined more closely on other contextual, linguistic and thematic criteria. Utterances were in fact distinguished

---

1. Discrepancies have been noticed, however, and the emendation is not universally accepted. Cf. S. Mowinckel, *Psalms in Israel's Worship*, II, pp. 42, 209.

2. On the writing down of thanksgiving psalms on votive columns, see W.F. Albright in BASOR, lxxxvii (1942), pp. 23ff; ANET, pp. 380f; S. Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 42.

one from the other, HITPALLEL-utterances from QARA⁾-utterances, and
the like; but we come now to those utterances that are introduced by
the neutral formula wayyomer, "and he said". We must seek other
criteria for classifying these, and the first is contextual. The
following utterances form a distinct group among the ⁾AMAR-utterances
in being applied in a cultic context of situation.

Ex. 34:8-9; Num. 10:35, 36; 16:22; Deut. 26:13-15; Jos. 7:7-9; Jud.
21:3; I Sam. 3:9, 10; II Sam. 24:10,17 = I Chron. 21:8, 17; I Kings
3:6-9 = II Chron. 1:8-10; I Kings 8:13 = II Chron. 6:1; I Kings 18:
36f; Isa. 6:8, 11; 44:17; Jer. 2:27; 51:62; Joel 2:17; Lam. 3:42-
66; I Chron. 16:35 = Ps. 106:47; I Chron. 29:10-19; II Chron. 20: 6-
12.

(I) Description.

(a) Contextual. These utterances occur most often in historical or
biographical narrative. The only exceptions to this are Jer. 2:27,
27; Isa. 44:17 and Joel 2:17. These four all concern the idolatrous
state of the cult.

The speakers are Moses (Ex. 34, Num. 10), the worshipping people
of Israel (Num. 16, Deut. 26, Jud. 21, Lam. 3, Jer. 2), Joshua (Jos.
7), Samuel (I Sam. 3, II Sam. 24), David (I Ch. 29), Solomon (I Kings 3,
8), Jehoshaphat (II Ch. 20), Elijah (I Kings 18), Isaiah ( Isa. 6),
Jeremiah (Jer.51 ), craftsmen (Isa.44 ), priests (Joel 2) and musi-
cians (I Ch.29).

The location is often cultic: the ark (Num. 10, Jud. 7), the
temple (Deut. 26, I Kings 8, Isa. 6, Joel 2, I Ch. 16, II Ch. 20),

Bethel (Jud. 21), Shiloh (I Sam. 3), Gibeon (I Kings 3), Carmel (I Kings 18). To the seven utterances addressed to God in the temple we can add David's prayer at the threshing floor of Araunah, on which an altar was immediately built and which later became the site of the temple (I Ch. 29). Cultic objects are the centre of the scene: the ark (Num. 10; Jud. 7) and wooden idols (Isa. 44; Jer. 2).

A specific time is sometimes indicated, suggesting cultic activity:

"whenever the ark set out ... when it rested ..." (Num. 10);

"at the time of the offering of the oblation" (I Kings 18).[1]

"Then Jehoshaphat proclaimed a fast throughout all Judah"

(II Chron. 20).

Frequently, too, the utterance is accompanied by cultic activity:

"And Moses made haste to bow his head toward the earth and worshipped" (Ex. 34).[2]

"Then Joshua rent his clothes ..." (Jos. 7).[3]

"Let us lift up our hearts and hands to God in heaven" (Lam. 3:41).

(b) Linguistic. The length of the utterance varies from two words (Jer. 2:27) to twenty-five verses (Lam. 3:42-66).

Out of the twenty-five passages seventeen have a vocative; of

---

1. Cf. Deut. 26; Jos. 7; Jud. 21.
2. Cf. Num. 16; Jos. 7; Isa. 44; I Chron. 21.
3. Cf. Jud. 21; Joel 2; I Chron. 21.

these twelve are medial,[1.] five initial.[2.]    Closer definition occurs

in seven places:   e.g.

"O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh" (Num. 16).[3.]

Interrogative sentences occur in five of the utterances.[4.]

Imperatival sentences are much more common (fourteen of the

passages).

Abrupt changes of person occur in several passages:   e.g.

"If now I have found favour in thy sight, O Lord,

let the Lord, I pray thee, go in the midst of us" (Ex. 34:

9).[5.]

The particle -na occurs rarely (only five of the passages).[6.]

The following belong to the HOŠIAᶜ-field:

SALAH (Ex. 34:9; Lam. 3:42);   HEᶜBIR (II Sam. 24:10);   ᶜANA   (I

Kings 18); HIṢṢIL (Isa. 44; I Chron. 16);   HOŠIAᶜ (Jer. 2; I Chron.

16:35; II Chron. 20);   HUŠ (Joel 2);   ŠAPAṬ (Lam. 3:59);   QIBBEṢ

(I Chron. 16);   ŠAMAR (I Ch. 29; I Kings 3)   GAᵓAL (Lam. 3:58);

HIRHIB (?)   (Lam. 3:56).


(c) Thematic.  A confessional element is present in three contexts

(Ex. 34, II Sam. 24, Lam. 3);   but the speaker's awareness of his

---

1. Ex. 34;  Num. 10:35, 36;  Jud. 21;  I Sam. 3:9;  II Sam. 24:10;
   I Kings 3;  Isa. 6:11;  Joel 2;  Lam. 3;  I Chron. 29;  II Chron. 1.
2. Num. 16;  Jos. 7;  I Kings 18;  Jer. 51;  II Chron. 20.
3. Cf. Jud. 21;  I Kings 3:7; 18:36;  I Chron. 16:35; 29:10;  II
   Chron. 20:6.
4. Num. 16:22;  Jos. 7:7;  I Kings 8:13;  Isa. 6:11;  II Chron. 20:11.
5. Cf. Deut. 26;  I Kings 8:12f;  Lam. 3:50;  I Chron. 12:35f.
6. Ex. 34:8;  II Sam. 24:10;  I Kings 8:13;  I Chron. 21:8; 29:20.

inadequacy before God also occurs:

"But who am I and what is my people ..." (I Chron. 29).[1]

A very prominent subject in these utterances is a declaration of faith in God's power as illustrated by his various saving acts in the past:

"Bless thy people Israel and the ground which thou hast given us and as thou didst swear to our fathers, a land flowing with milk and honey" (Deut. 26).[2]

A variant of this is the declaration of faith in God as the speakers' own God or father:

"let it be known this day that thou art God of Israel" (I Kings 18:36).[3]

Astonished questions, or complaints, are addressed to God in contexts of spiritual or military crisis:

"Shall one man sin and shalt thou be angry with the whole congregation?" (Num. 16).[4]

(II) Conclusions.

These passages are distinguished by their cultic context: the speakers are often cultic officials; the time and place have cultic associations; cultic objects are addressed by idolaters, and cultic gestures accompany nearly half of the utterances. The medial vocative is most frequent, sometimes accompanied by Näherbestimmung, both

---

1. Cf. I Kings 3; II Chron. 20.
2. Cf. I Kings 3; 8; Jerm. 51; Lam. 3; I Chron. 29; II Chron. 20.
3. Cf. v. 37; Isa. 44; Jer. 2; II Chron. 20.
4. Cf. Jos. 7:7, 9; Jud. 21; II Chron. 20.

frequent characteristics of "set-piece" language;[1] while the profession of the speaker's humility and his declaration of faith are also common elements in Old Testament language of prayer.[2] There are enough indications that the speaker breaks into a different and distinctive style when he addresses his god.

The following subdivision of the group is possible, bringing these passages into line with the classification worked out above:[3]

1. HITPALLEL-utterances:  (a) Deuteronomic - I Kings 3;  Jer. 51;
                          (b) Chronicler - I Chron. 29; II Chron. 20.
                          (c) Psalms - I Chron. 16:35; I Kings 8: 12f;[4] Lam. 3.

2. ʿANA -utterances:  Deut. 26:13-15[5] (cf. Num. 10:35, 36; I Sam. 3:9, 10).

3. QARA -utterances:  Num. 16; I Kings 18; Isa. 44; Jer. 2:27a.

4. SAʿAQ-utterances:  Ex. 34; II Sam. 24:10, 17; Jer. 2:27c; Joel 2:17.

Of the two short Isaiah passages, one can be considered as conversational although addressed to God in the temple:

"Here am I, send me" (6:8).[6]

The other, "How long, O Lord?", may have been some kind of cultic formulation:  the medial vocative and its frequent occurrence in other

1. See above, pp. 64ff.

2. Cf. p. 55.

3. The common features on which this classification is based are obvious and are not listed in detail.

4. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, "Zu Ps. 19:2-7 und I K. 8:12-13".  LXX has after v. 13.

5. Cf. Num. 10:35, 36; I Sam. 3:9, 10.

6. See below.

utterances addressed to God might indicate this.[1] But here it sounds more like an early example of dialogue between the prophet and his God.[2]

Jos. 7 and Jud. 21, again in a cultic setting ("before the ark of the Lord" and "before the Lord"), do not exhibit enough stylistic features to enable us to relate them to one or other of the styles examined above. But the prominent vocative, the initial exclamations ("Alas, O Lord..." and "Why, O Lord..."), the plaintive subject of both utterances, and their early date,[3] point to some connexion with the formal language of HITPALLEL-utterances.

(b) Conversational contexts.

There is a large group of contexts in which God and man converse or engage in intellectual, theological or political discussion, in an entirely anthropomorphic manner. There is no evidence that any special effort is being made on the part of the speaker in God's presence: God is addressed as though he were a member of the speaker's own "socio-economic group".

The introductory formula is usually wayyomer ('and he said'): there is no evidence of cultic gestures accompanying the utterance, of a cultic official speaking, or a cultic location; frequently it

1. Cf. Jer. 12:4; Zech. 1:12; Pss. 6:4,; 74:10; 80:5; 82:2; 90:13; 94:3. Three times ʿad-matai stands alone as an exclamation (Isa. 6: 11; Pss. 6:4; 90:13). See H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, p. 49; K. Koch, op. cit., pp. 194ff.

2. On the intimate relationship between God and his prophets, particularly the later prophets, see p.101.

3. Both passages belong to the older material incorporated by the Deuteronomist into his work. See EAT, p. 323.

is one of a number of utterances making up a longer conversation with questions and answers between God and the speaker; there are often clear indications of anthropomorphism in the meeting of the speaker with God. Utterances addressed to an angel are included here.

Gen. 3:10, 12, 13; 4:9, 13; 15:2f, 8; 17:17, 18; 18:3-5, 9, 23-33; 19:2, 18-20; 20:4, 5; 22:1-11; 31:11; 32:26ff; 46:2; Ex. 3:11, 13; 4:1, 10, 13; 5:22f; 6:30; 19:23; 33:12f, 15f, 18; Num. 11:11-15, 21-22; 16:15; 22:10f, 34; 27:16f; Jud. 6:13, 15, 17, 22, 36f, 39; 13:11, 12, 15, 17; I Kings 19:10 = 14; Isa. 40:6; Jer. 1:6, 11, 13; 4:10; 14:13; Ezek. 21:5; 37:3; Zech. 1:9, 12, 19, 21; 2:2; 4:2f, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13; 5:2, 6, 10; 6:4; Mal. 1:2, 6, 7; 3:13; Job. 1:7, 9-11; 2:2, 4f; 42:2-6; Dan. 12:6, 8.

(I) Description.

(a) Contextual. About half of these occur in the Torah; the rest, apart from two passages in Judges, two in Job and one in Daniel, are in the narrative section of the prophets. Such utterances are more frequent in the later prophets, Jeremiah and Zechariah particularly, and are totally absent from Hosea, Amos and Micah.

The most frequent speakers are Abraham (10x), Moses (12x), Jeremiah (5x) and Zechariah (15x). Individuals who address God in this style once or at most twice are Adam, Eve, Cain, Lot, Abimelech, Balaam, Gideon, Manoah, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Satan, Job and Daniel.

The situation in every case is apparently a conversation between the speaker and God or an angel, with no indication of cultic location, time or gesture. The number of different incidents during which these

passages occur is very great, and there is no point in enumerating them here.

(b) _Linguistic._ Most of the utterances are short, and in prose. One exception is Job 42, which is slightly longer than the others and in verse.[1]

Some consist of a single exclamation:

"Alas, O Lord God, for now I have seen the angel of the Lord face to face!" (Jud. 6:22).[2]

Questions are often addressed to God: e.g.

"What shall I cry?" (Isa. 40:6);

"What are these two olive-trees on the right and the left of the lampstand?" (Zech. 4:11).[3]

Frequently the speaker answers a question addressed by God to the speaker: e.g.

"What is this that you have done?"

"The serpent beguiled me and I ate" (Gen. 3:13).[4]

There are also arguments with God, or even contradictions of what he has said: e.g.

"But behold, they will not believe me or listen to my voice, for they will say, 'The Lord did not appear to you.'" (Ex. 4:1).[5]

---

1. The passage was classified here because (1) it is part of a longer dialogue, and (2) it has none of the characteristics of "set-piece" language.

2. Cf. Jer. 1:6; 4:10; 14:13; Ezek. 21:5.

3. Cf. Gen. 32:39; Jud. 13:11, 12, 17; Zech. 1:9, 12, 19, 21; 2:2; 4:2, 4, 12; 5:6, 10; 6:4; Mal. 1:2, 6, 7; 3:13; Job 9f.

4. Cf. 3:10, 12; 4:9; 18:9; 22:1, 11; 31:11; 46:2; Ex. 3:4; Num. 22:10f; Jer. 1:11, 13; Zech. 4:5, 13; 5:2; Job 1:7; 2:2.

5. Cf. Gen. 15:2f, 8; 17:17, 18; 18:23-33; 19:18-20; 20:4f; 32:26ff; Ex. 3:11, 13; 4:1, 10, 13; 5:22; 6:30; 19:23; 33:12, 15, 18; Num. 11:11; Jud. 6:13, 15, 17, 36ff, 39; Job 1:9-11; 2:4f.

The vocative occurs no more than twenty times out of the eighty or so utterances, and of these (1) all are initial vocative,[1.] (2) three are the obscure phrase bi ʾadonai,[2.] and (3) one is simply the plural, meaning "sirs", as though the persons addressed were human beings (Gen. 19:2). Angels are addressed as "sir" (ʾadoni) (e.g. Jud. 6[13]).[3.]

The "colloquial" particle -na occurs frequently (about 20 X).

The HOŠIAᶜ-field is poorly represented:

NAŚAʾ (Gen. 18); HIHYA (Gen. 19); MILLET (Gen. 19); NIṢṢEL (32: 22f); MOŠIAᶜ (Jud. 6).

(c) Thematic. Just as it would be fruitless to quote all the various contexts of situation under (a) above, so a thematic description would be of little use in view of the very large variety of topics included in these passages.

(II) Conclusions.

All the pentateuchal passages belong to JE, except Gen. 17:17 and Ex. 6:30 (P). These two exceptions are unusual in other respects,[4.] and in any case do not invalidate the interesting observation that as

---

1. Contrast HITPALLEL-utterances, p.54.

2. Ex. 4:10, 13; Jud. 6:13 (cf. Jud. 13:8).

3. Cf. Zech. 1:9; 4:4, 5, 13, etc.

4. Abraham's laughter in conversation with God is hardly typical of P; and the preposition lipne after ʾamar is also unexpected. See BDB, s.v. ʾAMAR.

a rule the Priestly writers and the Deuteronomistic school avoid the crude anthropomorphism of man conversing with God in everyday language. The Priestly writers stress the holiness and transcendence of God, while the Deuteronomistic tradition, as well as that, had the additional object of teaching that God is addressed in a style distinguished from ordinary everyday speech.[1] In contrast the anthropomorphism of the older strands is at times so gross that the scribes went so far as to emend the text (e.g. Tikk. Soph. at Gen. 18:22f).

The prophets and Daniel exhibit a number of short utterances addressed to God on the occasion of some piece of evidence of God's intervention - a vision, miracle or the like. This is a consistent feature of Jeremiah and Zechariah, and occurs also in Daniel and Ezekiel, but is not characteristic of the early prophets, there being no instances of this before the time of Jeremiah. Over thirty occur after Jeremiah, while this kind of informal, question-answer conversation is virtually unheard of in Amos, Hosea and Isaiah.

A type of "Catechetical" dialogue, in which God is challenged by intellectual questions, is characteristic of the peculiar style of Job and of the equally distinctive style of Malachi.[2] Notice, too, how it is in Job that the only conversational utterance in verse occurs (42:2-6).

Finally, to illustrate the difference in the style of conversational language and "set-piece" language, we might contrast Abraham's

---

1. See above, pp. 55ff.

2. Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, "Die Disputationsworte im Buche Maleachi." In a brief discussion of dialogue in the Old Testament, Job and Malachi are grouped together (EAT, p. 19).

answer to God's call with that of Samuel (obeying the priest Eli's instructions):

Abraham - "Here am I." (Gen. 22:1, 11);

Samuel - "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth." (I Sam. 3:9, 10).[1]

(c) _Miscellaneous Contexts._

A small number of utterances have no special introductory formula, are set in a context undistinguished by cultic characteristics, and yet exhibit enough characteristics to suggest a special "set-piece" style which differentiates them from conversational utterances.

(a) Gen. 24:12-14; 32:9-13; Num. 14:13-19.

These passages share with the HITPALLEL-utterances the following characteristics:

they are all uttered in a context of crisis; and they are of considerable length;
the vocative is prominent;
they contain three members of the HOŠIAᶜ-field:
HIṢṢIL (Gen. 32); SALAH (Num. 14); NAŚAʾ (Num. 14).

One of them (Gen. 24) is described by Gunkel as "the classic model of Old Testament devotion."[2] There are enough stylistic indications to distinguish these three utterances from the language preceding and following them, indicating that, not only in Gen. 24, but in all three we are dealing with set-piece language, closely related to HITPALLEL-

---

1. "Eli knows what is the correct procedure to be followed" (W. McKane, _I & II Samuel_, p. 43).

2. H. Gunkel, _Genesis_, p. 358. Cf. J. Skinner, _Genesis_, p. 406.

language.

(b) Isa. 12 shares with the ŠIR-utterances, the following characteristics: the context "on that day"; the speaker is the people of Israel; it is of considerable length; in verse; the vocative is medial; an abrupt change of person (vv. 1, 2); the occurrence of y^ešuati. This is without a doubt the style either of a HITPALLEL-utterance or a ŠIR, in the context most likely the latter.

(c) There are two one word cries, "My God!" (Hos. 2:25) and "Our God!" (Hos. 14:3), which would naturally be grouped with the QARA^ɔ-utterances.

(d) Ex. 32:31f; Hos. 14:2, together with two closely related utterances (Amos 7:2, 5) have much in common with ṢA^CAQ-utterances: critical situation; very short; imperatival sentences; no vocative in two of the four passages; concerned with divine intervention, especially forgiveness; two members of the HOŠIA^C -field: NAŚA^ɔ (Ex. 32:Hos. 14); SALAH (Amos 5).

Notice how closely these correspond to, for example, Ezek. 11: 13, Hos. 8:2, which are ṢA^CAQ-utterances.

(e) Finally the defeatist prayer of Elijah (I Kings 19:4) must be grouped with part of Jonah's HITPALLEL-utterance in a similar critical situation. It consists of an exclamation, followed by the vocative, "O Lord!" and an imperatival sentence exactly parallel to Jonah's cri de coeur (4:3).

(3)  <u>Utterances with no introductory formula.</u>

Thirty-six utterances addressed to God have no introductory formula, being incorporated into longer utterances, from which they are often stylistically indistinguishable.  In other words we have in this group thirty-six examples of that abrupt change of person which we have seen to be characteristic of this register in Biblical Hebrew; but whereas other utterances containing this abrupt change of person are apparently addressed <u>in toto</u> to God, here only those parts composed in the second person singular are addressed to God, the rest being specifically addressed to someone else (an enemy in Isa. 33:1, 2; the prophet's audience in Jer. 15:13f;  the reader in Neh. 5:19) or spoken by someone else (e.g. Jer. 17:18f).

This phenomenon is particularly frequent in the prophets, and is explained by the method of compilation, a number of independent units being combined (by the prophet himself, his disciples or a later compiler) into larger units.  But notice that they are applied in a context, albeit a different one from their original one, and we must examine them in this context in accordance with our principle arrived at above.[1]

Isaiah 25:1-5; 33:2-4; 63:7-64:11;  Jer. 3:22-25; 5:3; 10:6ff, 23-5; 11:18-20; 12:1-4; 14:7-9, 19-22; 15:15-18; 16:19; 17:13-18; 18:19-23; 20:7-18;  Hos. 9:14;  Joel 1:19, 20;  Mic. 7:14-20;  Hab. 1:2-4, 12-14;  Lam. 1:9, 11, 20-22; 2:20-22; 5:1-22;  Job. 9:25-31; 13:18- 4:22; 30:20-23;  Neh. 3:36f; 5:19; 6:14; 13:14, 22, 29, 31.

---

1.  P. 17.

(I)  Description.

(a)  Contextual.  Apart from several passages in Lamentations, Job and Nehemiah, all these occur in the Prophets.

The speakers are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Joel, Habakkuk, Job, Nehemiah, and the people of Israel (10X).[1]

Except for four of Nehemiah's short utterances, all these belong to various types of crisis:  enemy invasion, Israel's wickedness, drought, personal agony.  Nehemiah's four prayers occur in the context of his self-aggrandisement as he recounts his good works.

(b)  Linguistic.  The length varies from a single verse to very long literary units.  They are almost all in verse.

The vocative occurs in every utterance except Jer. 3:22-25, Mic. 7:14-20 and the three Job passages (9, 13, 30).  It is almost invariably medial.

Imperatives occur in twenty-seven of the utterances.

Interrogative sentences in fifteen of them.

The particle -na is very rare (3x).[2]

The following belong to the HOŠIAᶜ -field:

GAᵓAL (Isa. 63); HOŠIAᶜ (Jer. 14, 17, Hab. 1); YᵉŠUᶜA (Isa. 33, Jer. 3); NOŠAᶜ (Isa. 64); HENIAH (Isa. 63); HEŠIB (Lam. 5); ZAKAR (Jer. 14, 15, 18, Neh. 5; 6; 13); KIPPER (Jer. 18); NIHHEG (Isa. 63); NIQQAÍ (Job 9); NAŠAᵓ (Mic. 7); RAPAᵓ (Jer. 17); RIB (Jer. 11, 20); ŠAPAT (Jer. 11, 12).

---

1.  Isa. 25; 33; 63; 64;  Jer. 3; 14;  Mic. 7;  Lam. 1; 2; 5.
2.  Isa. 64;  Jer. 17;  Lam. 5.

(c)  Thematic.  A declaration of faith in God's power frequently
accompanies the plea:  e.g.

>  "O Lord thou art my God" (Isa. 25:1).[1]

Confession is an important element in several utterances:  e.g.

>  "We all fade like a leaf,
>  and our iniquities like the wind take us away" (Isa. 64:6b).[2]

(II)  Conclusions.

These units correspond as a rule to literary forms analysed by
the scholars:  there are Individual Laments (Isa. 33; 63/4;  Jer. 14:
7-9, 19-22;  Mic. 7;  Hab. 1;  Lam. 1; 2; 5;  Job 13/14; 30);  Hymns
(Isa. 25;  Jer. 10:6ff);  Jeremiah's "Confessions" (Jer. 11, 12, 15,
17, 18, 20) and other "prayers" (Jer. 3, 5, 10:23-5;  Hos. 9;  Neh.
3).  Notice that intercession has always been a characteristic of the
prophet's ministry, and that therefore, even if the prayers (Individual
Laments, Hymns, etc.) were not actually composed by the prophet him-
self, their application (by his disciples or the compiler) in a
particular situation is extremely natural.  In other words the thought
is right, even if the ipsissima verba are not always there.

Of the few that do not fall naturally into the form-critical
grouping, Joel 1:19f is a typical QARA$^{\mathbin{\jmath}}$-utterance, on contextual, lin-
guistic and thematic grounds.  Job 9:25-31 is part of the dialogue
between Job and God:  its rich imagery and inevitable complaining
are typical of the style of the Book of Job in general.

---

1.  Cf. Jer. 3:22f; 106ff; 11:20; 12:3; 14:8f; 15:15f; 20:11, 13;
Mic. 7:18ff.

2.  Cf. 6a;  Jer. 3:22ff; 10:23f; 14:7-9; 19-22; etc.

The six short prayers of Nehemiah (5:19; 6:14; 13:14, 22, 29, 31) are quite independent of their immediate context. It is probable that they were uttered by Nehemiah as he wrote his memoirs, looking back at his achievements, rather than spoken at the time of the incidents described. They are in the form of Egyptian and Babylonian building inscriptions, nicely appropriate in the context of an architect's memoirs, especially when that architect was obviously so conscious of the importance and efficacy of good works in the eyes of his God.[1]

Thus these independent units, from a form-critical point of view traceable to other contexts, have been aptly applied in our texts in situations in the lives of prominent figures in Old Testament tradition. It is with their meaning in this context that we shall be concerned. The style in which they are written confirms the impression that language addressed directly to God normally demands a special effort: the use of an Individual Psalm of Lamentation, a hymn or some other readily identifiable literary form, which carefully separates it from the language preceding and following it.

### (4) "Set-piece" Language.

Reference has frequently been made during the present chapter to "set-piece" style. It remains to define this idea a little more precisely in the light of our examination of utterances addressed to God, and to indicate the terms of reference for the next stage of the

---

1. Cf. B.S. Childs, _Memory and Tradition_, pp. 38f; and see above, p.17.

analysis.

Already five styles have been excluded from the discussion on the grounds that HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, [1] etc. do not occur in any of them.[2] One more can conveniently be separated from the rest, namely, conversational style: we have listed enough distinctive stylistic features already,[3] but we may now add the other practical consideration that HOŠIAᶜ (Jud. 6:15) and HIṢṢIL (Ex. 5:23) occur only once each in this style. This leaves a number of styles with many distinctive characteristics, contextual, linguistic and thematic, which enable us to group them together as "set-piece" styles. Our initial hypothesis that persons addressing God use a distinctive style has thus been confirmed.[4] That is to say, there is evidence that a person or a group of people in the presence of God make a special effort in the way they address him.

We may assume that this remarkable consistency of style which can be described, for example, in HITPALLEL-utterances and QARAᵓ-utterances,[5] is due to the interests of the compiler(s). These are important stylistic features which cut right across traditional form-critical and chronological classifications, and which decisively vindicate our aim to study the text in its final form.

Distinctions within this "set-piece" language of prayer will be of some importance in the semantic analysis below.[6] The table which

---

1. For the terminology, see below, p.131.
2. See p. 46.
3. See pp. 97ff.
4. pp. 37f.
5. pp. 59 and 65.
6. Chapter IV, especially pp. 176f.

presents graphically the results of this stylistic analysis is therefore

designed to make these distinctions as clear as possible,  In the first

place, cultic, miscellaneous and independent utterances, and the

isolated MIKTAB (Isa. 38), are grouped as far as possible with the

styles which have introductory formulae,[1] and this brings the number

of distinct styles down to five: HITPALLEL, QARA⊃, ṢAᶜAQ, ŠIR, BEREK.

In the second place under each heading only those passages in which

HOŠIAᶜ , HIṢṢIL, etc. occur, have been inserted, a complete graphic

presentation of the stylistic variations in language addressed to God

not being required for the present semantic analysis.[2]

1.  See pp. 96, 102f, 106.
2.  See Table 1.

# III. WORDS

Structural semantics still lags behind the rest of general linguistics, but this is not to say, as some do, that there has been no adequate formulation of a general semantic theory applicable to any linguistic data.[1] There have in fact been two main approaches to the problem: broadly speaking the first consists of vocabulary-analysis, the second of context-analysis. Representative of the first is S. Ullmann, and the present chapter owes much to his Language and Style.[2] Indeed it would be true to say that the main interest in most traditional semantic theory (e.g. Kronasser, Guiraud, Struck[3]) is the lexicon rather than the text.[4] J. Lyons is representative of the second approach, and Chapter Four takes his Structural Semantics as its starting-point.[5] But the aims of the "lexis-experiment" in Edinburgh,[6] the current interest in collocability (Firth, Halliday[7]) and important definitions of situation (Urban, Ellis, Ziff[8]) are also context-based.

---

1. N. Chomsky, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, p. 52.

2. Semantics (Oxford, 1962); Language and Style (Oxford, 1964).

3. See H. Kronasser, Handbuch der Semasiologie; E. Struck, Bedeutungslehre. Grundzüge einer lateinischen und griechischen Semasiologie; P. Guiraud, La Sémantique.

4. On "componential analysis," the other main lexicon-based approach, formalized in recent years, see p. 181, note 7.

5. See below, p. 183.

6. See J. Sinclair, "Beginning the study of Lexis."

7. J.R. Firth, Papers in Linguistics 1934-1951, pp. 194-6; M.A.K. Halliday and others, The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching, pp. 33-5.

8. W.M. Urban, Language and Reality; J. Ellis, "On contextual meaning"; P. Ziff, Semantic Analysis, pp. 1-38.

This distinction is by no means a clear-cut one, and it would be misleading to suggest that semanticists fall precisely into one or other of two "schools." But from the practical point of view the distinction is important: whether one should begin from the lexicon and work from there to the text, or from the text and work towards precise lexicographical definition. On the one hand one can begin by attempting to discover in the vocabulary of a language "semantic universals,"[1] i.e. features and processes common to all languages, like the distinction between transparent and opaque words, particular and general terms, synonymy, metaphorical transfer, taboo, and linguistic borrowing. Although some of these phenomena can be described as synchronic, it is possible to consider them all as historical factors and to examine their effect on the meaning of words. It may be the historical change in meaning, for example, evident in ŠAPAṬ "judge" due to a recurring relation of synonymy with HOŠIAᶜ that is the important point, not just the synchronic fact of synonymy.[2]

The second approach to the problem of formulating a general semantic theory, the context-based approach, is in contrast with the first, definitely synchronic. Meaning-relations like synonymy, opposition, implication and reference, are entirely dependent on the context: words that are synonyms in one context may not be synonyms in another.[3] By context, here, is meant both context of situation

---

1. Cf. S. Ullmann, Language and Style, pp. 63-96, where references to similar notions in the writings of C. Chr. Reisig, M. Bréal, O. Jespersen and L. Bloomfield will be found.

2. See below, pp. 127ff.

3. J. Lyons, op. cit., pp. 74-8.

as outlined in an earlier chapter, and immediate linguistic environment;

and semantic description of a word consists primarily of a careful

analysis of the contexts in which it occurs.  The meaning of HOSĬA͂ᶜ

can be defined in terms of its almost exclusive collocation with God,

its frequent synonymous relation with HIṢṢIL, its equally frequent

opposition to ṣar, mot, etc.  The analysis of contexts along these

lines distinguishes the word from HIṢṢIL, and produces a definition

of the meaning as it is applied in the contexts available.[1]

Now this is the approach advocated by John Lyons in his

Structural Semantics.  But by confining his attention too rigidly to

the immediate lexical environment, there is a danger that historical

factors which affect the meaning of a word are ignored:  these are

factors which operate (or have already operated) outside the word's

immediate linguistic environment.[2]  It may be that the relative

importance of a word's history in its contextual meaning varies from

word to word, and from style to style.[3]  But allowance must be made

for historical factors.  The plea for "panchronic semantics"[4] does

not imply a blurring of the distinction between historical (diachronic)

and synchronic semantics.  It is intended to indicate the need for

semantic description from both points of view.  It is for this reason

---

1.  See below, pp. 205ff.

2.  This applies particularly to a written text.  Barr's Semantics
    must be criticised for an overall neglect of the positive value of
    diachronic semantics.  See below, pp. 204, 209-30.

3.  Cf. p. 2.

4.  F. de Saussure, Cours de Linguistique Générale, pp. 134f;  S.
    Ullmann, op. cit., pp. 61f.

that the detailed context-based analysis of the meaning of HOŠIAᶜ,

HIṢṢIL, etc. is preceded by an examination of that section of the Old

Testament Hebrew lexicon to which they belong.

1.  "Semantic Universals".

In all descriptive linguistics it is possible to operate at

three different levels: phonological, grammatical and lexical.[1]

It is with the third of these levels, the lexical, that we are

concerned here.[2] Words can be classified at the lexical level as

well as at the other levels. Just as HOŠIAᶜ is to be distinguished,

phonetically, from HOŠI, and grammatically (morphologically) from

HILLEṢ, so it is to be distinguished lexically (or semantically) from

GA⁾AL, PARAQ, ŠAPAT, etc. By this is meant, not of course that HOŠIAᶜ

means something different from GA⁾AL, PARAQ, ŠAPAT, etc., although

this is no doubt true. There are structural semantic distinctions,

no less precise than the phonological and morphological ones. Since

once more this approach to the Hebrew lexicon is a comparatively new

one, these "semantic universals"[3] will be introduced in the form of

general definitions, with illustrations taken mainly from the HOŠIAᶜ -

field.

(1) Semantic motivation provides a valuable criterion for

classifying vocabulary.[4] A word is said to be phonetically motivated

---

1.  Cf. J.R. Firth, Papers in Linguistics, pp. 192ff; D. Crystal,
Linguistics, Language and Religion, pp. 78f.

2.  This is another decision to narrow our terms of reference. Cf.
J. Lyons, op. cit., pp. 28f. "Root-meanings" is an example of a
semantic study taking the morpheme as basic unit.

3.  S. Ullmann, op. cit., pp. 63-96.

4.  Id., pp. 40-9; cf. "Root-meanings," pp. 38-40.

when there is a direct correspondence between the sound and the sense: e.g. English <u>bang</u>, <u>roar</u>, <u>zoom</u>; Hebrew <u>HAMA</u> "roar", <u>RA<sup>C</sup>AM</u> "thunder" (as opposed to English <u>voice</u>, Hebrew <u>QOL</u> "voice", <u>ŠIWWA</u> "shout", etc.). In the nature of the associative field under discussion here, we should not expect to find examples of this type of motivation. Morphological motivation occurs when a word is composed of independently intelligible components: e.g. <u>ash-tray</u>, <u>redhead</u>, as opposed to French <u>cendrier</u>, <u>blonde</u>. The third type of motivation occurs when a word is used in a transferred meaning, made possible by some similarity or analogy between its concrete meaning and the abstract phenomenon to which it is applied: e.g. "the <u>root</u> of evil," "the <u>fruits</u> of peace"; <u>koba<sup>C</sup> y<sup>e</sup>šu<sup>C</sup>a</u> "the helmet of salvation," <u>hebley mawet</u> "the bonds of death." The term <u>transparent</u> is applied to words motivated in any one of these three ways, over against <u>opaque</u> words, which have no motivation.

Transparency is often a historical matter: for example, English <u>lord</u> was once morphologically motivated (<u>hlaf-ward</u>), but, after phonetic developments, has become opaque; <u>HOŠIA<sup>C</sup></u> may once have been semantically motivated, if it once was related to a word meaning "be wide, spacious."[1] Since such a 'relation' no longer holds, the word is opaque.

There is furthermore a subjective element in this transparent/opaque distinction: a writer who is a linguist, or at least with a lively interest in comparative philology, may exploit an etymological

---

1. but see below, pp. 209-12.

motivation for a word, which would be unknown to most of his readers:
modern scientific terms like hypodermic and necrophile are only
transparent for someone who knows Greek. In the writings of Al
Ḥariri, to quote an example from Arabic literature, special use is
made of etymological motivation, in order to fascinate and intrigue
the informed reader.[1] Some definition of the style must therefore
precede any statements about the transparency or opaqueness of certain
words. But broadly speaking, in spite of these two provisos, the
distinction is helpful and the terminology valuable.

It has been suggested elsewhere that in Hebrew a distinctive
type of morphological motivation operates, due to the structure of
the language.[2] The relatively small number of morphological patterns,
the remarkable stability of the triconsonantal root, the consonantal
script, the frequency of folk-etymologies in Old Testament Hebrew,
have been adduced as reasons for supposing that in Hebrew we may have
to take account of a type of etymological motivation (or at any rate
"folk-etymological" motivation), more developed than in the Indo-
European languages. The "root-meaning," in other words, may produce
a kind of transparency. Words containing the same root often seem to
contain an obvious semantic element in common. An interesting example
of this is provided by three Hebrew words for "true/truth": ʾEMET,
NAKON, YAṢṢIB. The three roots involved, ʾMN, KWN and NṢB, also
appear in words for "establish" and "pillar", thus exhibiting a

1. See Anthology of Islamic Literature, ed. J. Kritzeck, p. 192.
2. "Root-meanings", pp. 39f.

recurring semantic element in all three word-groups. Naturally this too is affected by historical factors. Often the development has gone a good deal farther than this so that the semantic connexion between a word and its root has virtually snapped: this is what has happened in later Hebrew examples like $s^e$daqa "almsgiving" and nasa$^c$ "travel."[1] But this does not alter the fact that in the corpus of the Old Testament, root and meaning are on the whole more closely related, prima facie, than in for example Greek or English. There is evidence for a peculiar kind of etymological motivation in Old Testament Hebrew. Whether this means that Hebrew is to be considered a "highly motivated language" (like Sanskrit or German) depends on whether some statistical test can be devised with which to compare it with these other languages.[2]

(2) A second useful distinction is that between general and particular terms.[3] Examples are easy to find in many languages: the general term aller in French corresponds to three particular terms in German, gehen "walk," reiten "ride" and fahren "drive," and two in Modern Hebrew, namely, HALAK "go (on foot)" and NASA$^c$ "go (by car, train, etc.)." In contrast to English open which is a general term, the semantic spread of Hebrew PATAH "open" is limited by the co-presence of a number of particular terms: PAQAH "open (eyes, ears),"

1. These two words earlier denoted "righteousness" and "pull out a tent-peg," respectively.

2. Cf. S. Ullmann, op. cit., p. 68. Saussure believed that Chinese represents the extreme form of opaqueness, while Proto-Indo-European and Sanskrit tend towards the opposite pole. (Cours de Linguistique Générale, pp. 183f.)

3. S. Ullmann, op. cit., p. 71.

PAṢA "open (mouth)," PAᶜAR "open (mouth, and in Modern Hebrew, bowels)." Similarly, in contrast to the general term put on in English, the semantic spread of Hebrew LABAŠ "put on (clothes, vestments)" is limited by the co-presence of NAᶜAL "put on (sandals)," ḤAGAR "put on (a sword)," ᶜAṬA "put on (cloak, veil)," ŚIM "put on (ornaments)."

(3) Polysemy is the name given to the use of the same word in two or more distinct senses in such a way as to produce in effect two separate words.[1] It is caused by the parallel development of two applications of a word, for example, a concrete application and an abstract one, or the original one and a metaphorical one, until the connexion between the two snaps, resulting in two distinct words of identical form. The most frequently quoted examples are English pupil (of the eye) alongside pupil (at school), and French voler "fly" alongside voler "steal". In both these cases there is enough historical evidence to prove that the two pairs were originally connected.[2]

The distinction between polysemy and homonymy depends on historical factors: if it were proved that voler "fly" and voler "steal" were historically distinct, this would be an example of homonymy. Homonyms are due to phonetic developments which make two originally quite distinct lexical items converge.[3] We are not

1. Id., p. 75.
2. Id., p. 31.
3. Id., p. 78.

concerned with aural examples (e.g. French cinq, ceint, sain, sein, saint; English meat, meet; Ashkenazi Hebrew ᶜatta "now," ᵓatta "thou"), since we are dealing with written texts. The nature of the consonantal script has resulted in a peculiar kind of "visual homonymy": for example, D-B-R, unpronounced, can be dabar "word," "thing," dibber "he spoke," dubbar "it was spoken," dabber "speak!" deber "plague," dᵉbir "inner sanctuary." The semantics of unpointed Hebrew is the subject of a dissertation being written at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem,[1] and H.B. Rosén has written on the process of identifying Hebrew words in unpointed texts, for the benefit of students whose intuitive knowledge of Hebrew is as yet elementary.[2] In this paper we are concerned with the Massoretic text only, and these problems do not arise.[3]

Polysemy and homonymy inevitably produce ambiguity, and subsequent "therapeutic" processes and safeguards emerge.[4] Ortho-graphic safeguards are frequent: e.g. English draft beside draught; Hebrew QARAᵓ "read" beside QARA "meet" (the process is not complete in this example before Mishnaic Hebrew), NAŠAᵓ "beguile" beside NAŠA "lend."[5] Morphological safeguards exist too: for instance I. GAᵓAL

1. A dissertation is being written by Ronni Pines on the subject, under the supervision of C. Rabin. I am grateful to Professor Rabin for this advance information and for drawing my attention to a more complex example, namely, the Quran: in the oldest script, groups of letters like b̲, t̲, t̲ were not distinguished, leaving an immense area of ambiguity.

2. A Textbook of Israeli Hebrew, pp. 84f.

3. See above, pp. 16ff.

4. S. Ullmann, op. cit., pp. 55-7.

5. Cf. H.A. Gleason, Descriptive Linguistics, p. 436.

"to act as a kinsman" and II. GA<sup>ɔ</sup>AL "stain" are not homonyms in Biblical Hebrew, although the arrangement in BDB makes them look as if they are. In reality the two words are GA<sup>ɔ</sup>AL (Qal) "act as a kinsman" and GE<sup>ɔ</sup>AL (Piel) "stain." Similar distinctions are evident for PARAQ (Qal) "rescue" beside PEREQ (Piel) "tear apart"; and HALAS (Qal) "take off, strip" beside HILLES (Piel) "rescue." Thirdly, contextual factors cut down ambiguity still further, and it is remarkable how few examples of either polysemy or homonymy actually produce ambiguity in Old Testament Hebrew, especially when one considers the nature of the script, the phonemes that have converged in Hebrew,[1] and the relatively limited number of morphological patterns.[2]

On account of our slender evidence for the prehistory of Biblical Hebrew, it is often hard to distinguish examples of homonymy and polysemy, one from the other. The tendency in traditional Old Testament lexicography is to assume that two semantically distinct words of identical form, are homonyms, and to prove this by reference to comparative philology. This can be misleading: for instance in the two standard lexica there are four entries under the form <sup>ꞓ</sup>ANA: I. "answer, testify"; II. "be downcast"; III. "be worried"; IV. "sing".[3] The distinction between I and IV is based, on the one hand, on English translation and, on the other, on comparative etymology. But this is not supported by the evidence: (1) both occur in similar contexts,[4] (2) the translations which distinguish them most clearly

---

1. OT Hebrew z, ḥ, ṭ, ꞓ, š regularly represent the convergence of two Proto-Semitic consonants, ṣ three. There are also conditioned phonetic changes. See S. Moscati (ed.), Comparative Grammar, pp. 43f., 56–62.
2. See S. Moscati, op. cit., pp. 75–84, 122–31.   3. BDB and KB, s.vv.
4. Cultic: e.g. Deut. 21:7; 26:51 (I) and Ex. 32:18 (IV); general: e.g. Num. 11:28; Jud. 18:14 (I) and I Sam. 18:7; 21:12 (IV).

("answer" and "sing") are not adequate in every context,[1.] and (3) there is sometimes doubt as to which is meant.[2.] When we add (4) the etymological evidence of Ugaritic m⁽c⁾nh "its (liturgical) response"[3.] and Syriac ⁽c⁾ANI "sing responsively,"[4.] there hardly seems to be any good reason left for distinguishing etymologically between I. and IV. With this background for ⁽c⁾ANA in Biblical Hebrew, passages like Hosea 2:17, 24, and Jer. 25:30 are more easily understood, even although translation still remains a problem.[5.] I. ⁽c⁾ANA and IV. ⁽c⁾ANA are probably examples of polysemy, not homonymy.

(4) When an expression is taken from one sphere and applied in a totally different one because of similarities of various kinds, this process is described as metaphorical transference.[6.] It is common in many languages, and results in a number of semantically motivated words and expressions like "the brow of the hill," "family-tree," "scintillating wit," "a piercing cry," and so on.

Anthropomorphic metaphor is frequent in Hebrew as elsewhere: ro⁾š hassela⁽c⁾ "(lit.) the head of the rock," ragley harim "(lit.) the feet of the mountains," yad wašem "a monument (lit. hand) and a name." It should be noted that in theological language the term anthropo-morphism is used, in a restricted sense, for the application of human

---

1. e.g. Gen. 30:33 (I) "testify"; Jer. 25:30 (IV) "shout".
2. e.g. Hos. 2:17. Cf. W.R. Harper, Amos and Hosea, p. 240; H.W. Wolff, Hosea, p. 53. BDB translates "sing"; cf. AV. RSV has "answer"; BH and KB emend the text.
3. C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, Glossary, no. 1885.
4. Quoted by BDB under IV. ⁽c⁾ANA.
5. On the forensic application of the term, see below, p. 129.
6. S. Ullmann, op. cit., pp. 81-8.

attributes to God. In the Old Testament this varies from the crude anthropomorphism of Gen. 3 to the exalted imagery of Isaiah 40-55.[1] Most language about God is anthropomorphic: but there is one interesting peculiarity about Old Testament Hebrew which perhaps distinguishes it from other languages. Certain words are applied only to God, and never in human contexts. The best known of these is BARA⁾ "create"; HOŠIAᶜ is another similar example of a word primarily reserved for the activity of God.[2] In English create and save can be applied respectively in contexts of an artist's work and housekeeping; this is never found in Old Testament Hebrew, and indeed is specifically forbidden.[3] The phenomenon is undoubtedly due to the nature of the texts and the theological interests of the writers. Again it seems likely that if we knew more about the prehistory of BARA⁾ we should find that originally it had a wider application. But the process of "disinfecting" words to avoid any kind of anthropomorphism is complete in at least this one case, and almost complete in the case of HOŠIAᶜ.[4]

Another frequent type of metaphorical transference is from concrete to abstract: e.g. English befog, on top of the world, let down, the way of truth; Hebrew haᶜam haholᵉkim bahoŠek "the people that walk in darkness," ṣur ᶜuzzi "the rock of my strength," etc. There is a very large number of metaphorical transfers of this type in

---

1. Cf. J. Hempel, "Jahwegleichnisse der Propheten," pp. 74ff; W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, I, pp. 211f.

2. See below, pp. 209-15.

3. e.g. Jud. 7:2; II Kings 16:7. Cf. also "Root-meanings," pp. 47f.

4. Cf. pp. 100-102 . On the related process of "demythologising," cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, pp. 23ff.

the HOŠIAᶜ-field, which provide a convenient means of classifying many of the items in it. Metaphorical transference from concrete to abstract is more common than the opposite type.[1]

The theory that "if at a certain time a complex of ideas is strongly charged with feeling" this will affect various linguistic processes,[2] applies particularly to metaphorical transference: for example atomique became the colloquial French term of enthusiastic approbation at a time when atomic energy was in the news; like German and Modern Hebrew Eisenbeton when prestressed concrete was discovered. In the HOŠIAᶜ-field there is one very noticeable example of this, namely metaphorical transfer from the legal sphere: PADA, GAꞋAL, ŠAPAT, DIN, RIB, PAQAD, ṢEDEQ are some examples. Indeed it is almost true to say that there are no forensic terms which do not appear in this field. The most crucial of all is the basic metaphor for the relationship of Israel to their God, namely the legal contract image contained in the word bᶜrit "covenant".[3] The immediate importance of this observation for our analysis of the meaning of HOŠIAᶜ, is that it lends some support to the recent suggestion that it too was originally a forensic term.[4]

Finally this theory would help to explain the size of the HOŠIAᶜ-field, particularly in the register we have selected. It

1.  L. Bloomfield, Language, p. 429.

2.  S. Ullmann, (op. cit., p. 83) gives a brief account of the theory: see also H. Sperber, Einführung in die Bedeutungslehre, p. 67. Cf. pp. 148-51 below.

3.  See further "What was a mošiaᶜ?," pp. 480-6; and pp. 141-4 below.

4.  See below, pp. 212-4.

would not require much research to prove that the complex of ideas associated with the word HOŠIA͑ was "strongly charged with feeling" for Old Testament writers, and the result is metaphorical transference from almost every sphere of human experience: light, space, height, medicine, war, washing, building, leading and many others.[1]

(5) Examples of the processes of extension and restriction of meaning are frequent in Hebrew as in many other languages.[2] An interesting one is DABAR, which seems to have been limited originally to "the spoken word," and later extended, or weakened to "thing," just as Latin causa is weakened to Italian cosa "thing," and Old English thing "parliament" to Modern English thing. The effect of this on the vocabulary of the Old Testament is that an Aramaic loan-word milla came to be used for "word," except in a number of petrified phrases like d͑bar YHWH.[3] Legal terminology like GA͗AL "redeem," PADA "ransom," ŠAPAṬ "judge" and ṢEDEQ "justice" have been extended in application to non-technical contexts.[4] HOŠIA͑ may be an example of an extension of meaning so complete that traces of its original, technical application are rare in Old Testament Hebrew.[5]

Modern Greek ψωμί "bread" and ψάρι "fish" are good examples of restriction of meaning, from Classical Greek ὄψωμα "morsel, bit"

---

1. See below, pp. 155-61.

2. See S. Ullmann, op. cit., pp. 88f.

3. Cf. my review of TDNT, IV, in SJT, xxi (1968), p. 91; and J. Barr, Semantics, p. 133.

4. See p. 141f.

5. See below, pp. 212-4.

and ὀψάριον diminutive of ὄψος "anything eaten with bread."
English fowl, beef and mutton illustrate a similar process, over
against German Vogel, French boeuf and mouton. Hebrew participial
forms like ŠOMER, ḤOZE, ŠOPEṬ, MAZKIR, are to be considered as examples
of restriction of meaning from "one who keeps," "one who, sees,
judges, reminds" to a technical sense "watchman," "seer," "judge,"
"secretary."

A slightly different type of restriction has been referred to
already, namely the reservation of certain words for a specifically
theological context: BARÁ "create" (only with God as subject),
HOŠIAᶜ "save" (almost exclusively with God or his appointed servant
as subject). This apparently conscious process of disinfecting parts
of the lexicon, may be the result of careful selection (if not censor-
ship) in the formation of a religious text; but it is nonetheless an
important feature of Biblical language.[1]

(6) Lexical borrowing in the Old Testament has been dealt with
up till now mainly from the point of view of loanwords, classified as
a rule not according to the reasons for the borrowing or its signif-
icance for the Hebrew lexicon, but according to the source-language.
There have been several studies like "Hittite Words in Hebrew" (C.
Rabin)[2] and Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramäismen im
alttestamentlichen Hebräisch (M. Wagner). But there have been no

---

1. Cf. p. 121 , note 4 .
2. Cf. the same author's "Indo-European Words in Hebrew."

studies on "Loanwords as cultural and lexical symbols" (T.E. Hope) in Old Testament Hebrew. This is not the place to undertake such a task. But it would be valuable to enumerate some factors operating in lexical borrowing in Old Testament Hebrew.

The most obvious cause is a gap in the vocabulary: sus "horse" was required when Hebrew speakers came first into contact with Indo-European horse-breeders;[1] the same is true of the Greek words for musical instruments like psanter, sumponia (Dan. 3:5). In the HOŠIAᶜ-field there are two examples of borrowing from Aramaic: PARAQ "tear apart" (Hebrew), "rescue" (Aramaic); and PAṢA "open" (Hebrew), "rescue" (Aramaic). The occurrence of a parallel development like this suggests a common cause. In this case borrowing could be attributed either to the exigencies of Hebrew verse-form, which demanded many "synonymous parallels,"[2] or the lively interest of the Old Testament writers in this particular subject.[3] Incidentally it appears that semantic borrowing in this field is also frequent in other languages: cf. Aramaic ʾOŠIAᶜ "save" and South Arabian HZM "deliver" (Hebrew HIṢṢIL).[4]

A fourth factor might be the artificial introduction of an aetiological loan-word by one whose native language was not Hebrew, for exegetical purposes. One example of this seems to be the folk-

---

1. See C. Rabin, millim hodiyot ba-ᶜibrit, pp. 236f.
2. See below, pp. 184-8.
3. Cf. Sperber's theory discussed on p. 122, and also pp. 148ff.
4. See below, pp. 245f.

etymology of the name Japheth in Gen. 9:27: "God enlarge Japheth."
PETI "simple," and PITTA "deceive" occur in Hebrew, but PATI "be wide,
spacious" occurs only in Aramaic. A similar explanation for the folk-
etymology of the name Abraham (Gen. 17:5) is likely, and also of YHWH
(Ex. 3:14).[1]

Finally there is the effect of a dominating religious, cultural
or political environment. Old Testament examples of this are HEKAL
(from Sumerian E-GAL) "temple or palace," and Aramaic DAT (from Old
Persian datam) "law."

Notice how conveniently borrowing can be examined in terms of
lexical fields: changes in the size of a field, convergence and
divergence of related words, and other historical developments provide
a promising approach to the problem of defining loanwords and semantic
borrowings. Again the historical fact that a word in Old Testament
Hebrew is a loanword may have little or nothing to do with its mean-
ing, synchronically: Modern Hebrew dati "religious," for example
would best be defined without reference to its Old Persian origins.

(7) Taboo has a number of linguistic consequences which can be
observed in many languages.[2] Taboo subjects have been classified
broadly into three groups: those inspired by a religious fear
(Freud's "holy dread"), those due to a sense of delicacy, and those
due to a sense of decency. Examples of the first would include the

---

1. See M. Wagner, op. cit., p. 97; cf. also BL, p. 24, and KB, s.v.
ʾabraham.
2. See S. Ullmann, op. cit., p. 89.

well-known substitutions in Old Testament Hebrew for the names of

gods: e.g. bošet "abomination" for Baal in Ishbosheth and elsewhere;[1]

and ʾadonai "the Lord," haššem "the Name," haššamayim "Heaven" and the

like for the unpronounceable tetragrammaton YHWH. A similar develop-

ment occurs in Modern English "Heaven help us!" and "Goodness knows!"

Taboo subjects in most languages, like sex and certain parts of

the body and bodily functions, have produced euphemisms in Hebrew as

elsewhere: e.g. raglayim "private parts"; and BOʾ ʾel "come in to,"

ŠAKAB ʿIM "lie with," YADAʿ "know" are all euphemisms for sexual

intercourse. It should be noted that these are regular developments

due to taboo, and tell us nothing of the meaning of the euphemistic

terms: to argue that there is some special meaning in YADAʿ because

it is used as a euphemism for sexual intercourse,[2] is no more convinc-

ing than it would be to suggest that modern colloquial English have

has a special meaning since it is applied in a similar taboo con-

text. Euphemistic terms are selected often because they are neutral

words and of general application.[3]

(8) One of the most common linguistic phenomena adduced to

explain semantic change is analogy. At all levels, phonological,

grammatical and lexical, there is "interference" in the development of

words, due to their association with other words of related meaning.[4]

---

1. Cf. "Root-meanings," p. 42.
2. e.g. Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 232:
   "an even more intimate expression of the idea of intercourse between
   God and man is found in the term yadaʿ, i.e. to know or to have inter-
   course with ...."
3. Cf. p. 140.
4. The term "interference" is used loosely by S. Ullmann, op. cit., p.
   12. As a technical term, it would have the advantage of being transpar-
   ent enough for the non-linguist, and general enough to include under
   one heading the numerous, related developments, at all levels, in an
   associative field.

In Hebrew the form hamišša "five" is due to its close relationship with šišša "six."[1]

An important case of interference which concerns the semantic description of a number of words in the HOŠIAᶜ -field, has confused commentators and resulted in semantic and even textual fabrication. In Ps. 43:1 we have the following construction:

riba ribi miggoy loʾ ḥasid "defend my cause (lit.) from an ungodly people".

The translators have had to render the prepositional adjunct "against an ungodly people" (RSV; cf. AV), although it is understood that the phrase is really "pregnant (so as to rescue from)."[2] The difficulty can best be explained with reference to the field in which the word RIB occurs. By its regular association with HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, PADA, GAʾAL, etc., all of which are regularly followed by min-, RIB has been affected in such a way as to admit of a similar construction. ŠAPAT "judge" behaves in exactly the same way, and must be rendered in English by some kind of periphrasis: e.g. "vindicate (by rescuing) from the hand of." It occurs in contexts exactly parallel to HOŠIAᶜ.[3] Seen against the background of their associative field, these two verbs demonstrate a natural semantic development.

There is a third forensic term which has probably undergone the same development, due to its association with HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc.:

---

1. See S. Moscati (ed.), Comparative Grammar, p. 75.
2. C.A. Briggs, Psalms, I, p.374.
3. Cf. Jud. 2:16, 18 with 3:9, 15. See C.A. Burney, The Book of Judges, pp. xxxiii, 59.

> haṣṣila miḥereb napši
>
> miyyad keleb yᵉḥidati
>
> hošiᶜeni mippi ʾarie
>
> umiqqarney remim ᶜanitani    (Ps. 22:21f).

Three members of the HOŠIAᶜ -field occur in this verse and are all followed by min-. Of these, two are regularly followed by min- but the third is nowhere else accompanied by this preposition. The problem has produced two main solutions: (1) emend the text to ᶜaniyyati "my afflicted soul"[1]. (2) take umiqqarney remim with the preceding hošiᶜeni, and ᶜanitani as an independent cry concluding the Klagelied "Thou hast heard me."[2]. Seen against the background of its associative field, however, the word raises no problem (except perhaps for the translator). Like ŠAPAṬ and RIB, ᶜANA is a forensic term, "speak up as a witness," "testify"; and like these other two terms, its frequent association with HOŠIAᶜ , HIṢṢIL, etc., has affected it both semantically and syntactically: "Thou hast defended me from the horns of the wild oxen."[3].

## 2.  Field Theory.

In the last analysis a word must be studied in its context, and we have dealt at considerable length with the problem of defining the

---

1.  e.g. RSV, following LXX and Peshitta.

2.  So the AV.  Cf. A.F. Kirkpatrick, The Book of Psalms, p. 120; C.A. Briggs, Psalms, I, p. 205;  H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, p. 176.

3.  Literally, "thou hast spoken up in my defence."  See above, p. 119; and cf. also A. Weiser (Psalms, p. 218), who gives the translation "rescue", but misunderstands the forensic term.

context of Old Testament Hebrew. But one of the most illuminating discoveries of twentieth century linguistics is that a word can also be fruitfully examined against the background of its "semantic field." "Field theory," first formulated by Trier in 1931,[1] introduced an important new concept into the study and description of meaning. It was immediately seized upon by neo-Humboldtian philosophers, who attempted to derive ethnolinguistic conclusions from it; theories of the relation between language and the Weltbild were constructed upon it, and the original theory, along with its practical implications for organizing vocabulary and analysing semantic developments, brought into disrepute. Forty years of development and modification have removed some of the excessively literal interpretations of the theory, and produced a balanced approach to several of the crucial problems of semantics.[2] Since its application to Old Testament Hebrew is still in its infancy,[3] and the field to which HOŠIAᶜ belongs provides an exceptionally rich and interesting example, an examination of the field is preceded by some account of the method and its contribution to Biblical Semantics.

"Dans l'intérieur d'une même langue tous les mots qui expriment des idées voisines se limitent réciproquement: des synonymes ... n'ont

1. J. Trier, Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes.
2. See S. Oehmann, "Theories of the Linguistic Field"; N.C.W. Spence, "Linguistic Fields, Conceptual Systems and the Weltbild."
3. See for instance C. Rabin, "Is Biblical Semantics possible?", p. 22, note 24; and my "Root-meanings," pp. 43-6.

leur valeur propre que par leur opposition."[1]. Since de Saussure,
"opposition" has been an essential principle in semantic theory. The
mapping out of a word's associative field is in effect a graphic way
of putting this principle into operation. Synonymy and opposition
are not the only meaning-relations to be considered in defining a
word's meaning; but the vagueness of de Saussure's expression "des
idées voisines" makes allowance for this and is in perfect accord
with the fluidity of a field's boundaries. An "associative field"
would include all the words associated in any way with a particular
term. It has been described as "a halo which surrounds the sign and
whose outer fringes merge into their environment,"[2] and must be
distinguished from a "lexical field" or "group," which can be precisely
defined for any given corpus. While a word's associative field includes
terms related to it at all levels (for instance synonyms, opposites,
terms that rhyme with it or look like it), a lexical group consists
only of words very closely related to one another. Thus we speak of
the "HOSIA$^c$-field," which incorporates 200 or more items, while
"HOSIA$^c$, HISSIL, etc." is a much smaller lexical group (within the
associative field) consisting of no more than sixteen items.[3]
Trier's work was on the smaller groupings, which he and his followers
claim correspond to conceptual spheres. In each lexical field some

---

1. F. de Saussure, Cours de Linguistique Générale, p. 160.
2. Ch. Bally, "L'arbitraire du signe," p. 195.
3. See pp. 139ff.

sphere of reality or experience is organized in a unique way, and from a comparative study of such fields as between one language and another or between one period and another within the same language, conclusions on the way the speakers of that language think are derived. We shall return to this question later.[1] Meanwhile, the fluidity and great size of an associative field, as opposed to lexical fields, must not blind us to the essential advantages of the notion.

This is a method of organizing vocabulary which takes into account the nature of language more adequately than any other.[2] The alternative is the alphabetical lexicon, in which words are listed according to an entirely arbitrary principle. In Semitic lexicography this has been a peculiarly insidious stumbling-block. In BDB, for example, words are listed according to their roots: thus not only is the alphabetical arrangement alien to the words, but the forms listed (roots in vacuo) are not attested in Biblical Hebrew. The result is that pride of place is irreversibly given to the etymology of a word, even where the etymology is obscure. In BDB, for instance, 'ARBE "locust" comes under I. RABA "be much, many, great"; HITTA "wheat" under HANAT "spice"; 'ET "time" under I. 'ANA "answer, respond." In not every case does the lay-out of such a dictionary affect the meaning of a word, but one example of where it does is the word HOSIA'. In this case the etymology, although it is one which is not accepted

---

1. See S. Ullmann, p. 12; and below, pp. 155ff.
2. Cf. id., p. 11.

without reservation by the lexicographers,[1] has become an integral part of the meaning of the word in modern Biblical scholarship.[2] If the word was seen against the background of its associative field, instead of a hypothetical reconstruction of its prehistory, its meaning might be greatly clarified.

Another source of confusion and semantic distortion is the prominent place given to translation in traditional lexical work.[3] Here again field theory helps to avoid a common error, by dealing with the meaning of words from within the language. Naturally no two languages would be expected to have fields of exactly the same size: this is one reason why loanwords occur, to fill gaps in particular fields. This is why, for instance, Hebraisms occur in English: the HOŠIA ͨ-field in Hebrew is far larger than its equivalent in English and has accordingly produced in the Authorised Version, expressions like "thou hast enlarged me when I was in distress" (Ps. 4:2) and "the lifter up of mine head" (Ps. 3:3). The semantic spread of English _answer_ is limited by the co-presence of the word _testify_, unlike ͨANA "answer, testify," which belongs to the HOŠIA ͨ-field.[4] This makes translation difficult (although not impossible[5]), but elucidates the meaning of the word in Hebrew. Instead of defining a

---

1. Cf. BDB, s.v.; "What was a Mošia ͨ ?", p. 475, note 5; and below, pp. 209-12.

2. See above, p. 1 , note 2.

3. See below, pp. 183f; and cf. statements like " δίκαιος means 'innocent'" (D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, p. 121).

4. See below, pp. 141f.

5. Cf. J. Barr, Semantics, p. 265.

word L in terms of another language, it can be defined as associated with A, B, C (in the same language), opposed to D, influenced semantically by G because of frequent collocation with it in idiom I, and so on. This is the only reliable method of describing meaning, and must precede translation, not follow it.[1]

Finally there is the uneasy problem of concept-studies. A detailed study of the root ZKR, for example, professes also to be a study of "Gedenken im alten Orient und im alten Testament";[2] Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde[3] are in effect the main Old Testament words for sin; among the articles in Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, it is often not clear whether the author is defining the meaning of the word at the head of the article, or discussing the concept which it sometimes denotes.[4] The assumption that there is an exact one-to-one correspondence between a word and its conceptual referent (e.g. "der Begriff pašaᶜ/pešaᶜ")[5] is by no means universally accepted.[6] Until it is, a study of memory in the Old Testament must include, not just ZAKAR "remember" (still less the root in vacuo ZKR), but also ŠAKAH "forget," DIMMA "actualize" (?),[7]

1. Cf. below, p. 232 on English equivalents.
2. W. Schottroff, "Gedenken" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament. Die Wurzel zkr im Alten Testament.
3. R. Knierim, Gütersloh, 1965.
4. e.g. the sections on "The Political Concept of Freedom in the Greek World" (s.v. ἐλεύθερος , II, pp. 487ff.), "The New Testament Concept of Sacrifice and the Early Church" (s.v. θύω , III, pp. 189f.), "The Theology of Mediatorship outside the Bible" (s.v. μεσίτης , IV, pp. 603-10), "The Concept of Conversion" (s.v. νοέω , IV, pp. 1000-6). See J. Barr, Semantics, p. 229.
5. R. Knierim, op. cit., p. 113.
6. On "Words and Concepts," see S. Ullmann, op. cit., Chapter X.
7. On Ps. 48:10, see H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, p. 359. The passage,

etc. This would entail a minute description of the ZAKAR-field and the systematic classification of all the memory-contexts (instead of just those in which ZAKAR happens to occur). What is the meaning of ZAKAR in Old Testament Hebrew? and What is Old Testament teaching about memory? are different questions. To answer both of them field theory is a help, but for the second it is essential. The present study is primarily concerned with a question of the first type, What is the meaning of HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc.? but in describing the associative field to which these words belong, some steps will be taken in the direction of producing an answer to the question, What is Old Testament teaching about salvation?[1]

3. "The associative field of HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc."

In Old Testament Hebrew studies several lexical groups have already been the subject of detailed examination: e.g. words for time, geographical terminology, ceramic vocabulary.[2] Scharfstein's

which is clearly important for a study of memory in the Old Testament, is not referred to in any of the three recent studies: W. Schottroff, op. cit.,; B.S. Childs, Memory and Tradition; P.A.H. de Boer, Gedenken und Gedachtnis in der Welt des Alten Testaments.

1. On Trier's "Neo-Humboldtian" correlation of a lexical field with a "conceptual sphere," see S. Ullmann, p. 12; and also p.130 above.

2. J. Barr, Biblical Words for Time; A. Schwarzenbach, Die geographische Terminologie im Alten Testament; A.M. Honeyman, "The Pottery Vessels in the Old Testament." Cf. also J.F.A. Sawyer, "Spaciousness. An essential element in Old Testament Language about Salvation"; and see further C. Rabin, "Is Biblical Semantics possible?" p. 22.

Thesaurus groups Hebrew vocabulary in fields arranged alphabetically
under one word from each,[1] and the present study is a description
of another lexical field, namely HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc. The problem of
deciding which words belong to such a study and which do not, is not
an easy one. We have already seen how semantic developments occur as
between words within a relatively confined lexical grouping, but also
within a far wider field. Should not "Biblical Words for Time," for
instance, be extended to include such words as ᵓARAK "endure," matay
"when," lᵉpanim "before," miqqedem "of old," and so on?[2] Is not
some account of words like ŠAPAṬ, ROMEM, which we have seen are
associated with HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc., essential to a complete
description of the meaning of HOŠIAᶜ?

It is here that the wider concept of the "associative field,"
as distinct from the narrower lexical field, is valuable.[3] In the
first place many of the linguistic phenomena described above operate
not just between synonyms and the like, but also between opposites.
Various types of interference are liable to occur among words
associated by any one of the meaning-relations, not just the obvious
ones. This means that the definition of the boundaries of an
associative field will be fluid. To give an approximate idea of the
size of such a field, a French linguist showed that the associative

1. Z. Scharfstein, ᵓosar ha-millim vᵉha-nivim. See also H.L.
Strack, Hebräisches Vokabularium in grammatischer und sachlicher
Ordnung.
2. None of these is discussed in J. Barr, op. cit.
3. See above, p. 131.

field of the word chat "cat" comprises about 2000 words.[1]

The criteria for building up this far larger field are in the last resort intuitive. Attempts to formulate a complete, watertight pattern of semantic fields, including the whole lexicon of a language, have been made,[2] and naturally when dealing with a closed corpus like the Old Testament, this is theoretically straightforward. But it would not be possible, or indeed desirable, to define in exact terms the processes whereby associated lexical items, words and longer phrases, are recognised.[3]

The intuitive element in linguistic work has been questioned as to whether it can adequately be used in a scientific investigation. The first answer to this charge is that intuition, imagination and hypothesis, far from being written off as "unscientific," are acknowledged more and more as essential factors in scientific progress.[4] But more important, in linguistic research intuition can be said to play a less subjective role than it does in other disciplines, because a large proportion of the decisions made independently by millions of people every day are intuitive, but yield the same result in almost every case. Intuition in other words plays a vital

1. P. Guiraud, "Les champs morpho-sémantiques," p. 286.

2. H.L. Strack, op. cit.; H. Weinheimer, Hebräisches Wörterbuch in sachlicher Ordnung; Z. Scharfstein, op. cit.

3. On the problems of computing linguistic approximations, see J.P. Thorne, "Grammars and Machines," pp. 295f.

4. At a recent international congress of astrophysicists, the reading of science fiction was seriously recommended as an aid to solving scientific problems.

role in mutual intelligibility. People make and understand utterances they have never heard before: and in the same way the present writer's knowledge of Hebrew is an important factor in the situation (however hard to prove or define), so that a classification of Hebrew vocabulary based on it is a possible starting-point, and, what is more, one on which there would be a very large measure of agreement, one might venture to suggest, among similarly informed writers and scholars.[1]

A knowledge of Hebrew implies that I can intuitively recognise words of related meaning. It is unimportant whether such empirical observations are due to the fact that I know I can translate them into another language by the same word; or whether it is because I have noticed they occur in similar contexts regularly, or refer to identical extralingual features; or possibly it is because I have discovered that they occur within the structure of Hebrew poetry in such a way as to prove a semantic relationship between them. In fact all these factors will be examined in due course; but the first step is to build up the associative field without precise, mechanical methods. In accordance with the well-tried dictum σωζειν τά φαινόμενα , the analysis of the associative field of HOSIA̔, HIṢṢIL, etc., thus complied, can be considered an adequate and at the same time an interesting and promising starting-point.[2]

---

1. On intuition in linguistics, see J. Lyons, Structural Semantics, pp. 94-9; H.A. Gleason, An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, p. 186; P. Ziff, Semantic Analysis, pp. 9f.

2. P. Ziff's corollary to σωζειν τά φαινόμενα , namely, miracula sine doctrina nihil valent (op. cit., p. 41), nicely emphasises the fact that intuition is only a starting-point for semantic analysis, and no more.

Semantic phenomena and development within the HOŠIAᶜ -field have
already been illustrated, and since we are primarily concerned only
with the central core of the field (to which HOŠIAᶜ, and its immediate
lexical neighbours belong), what is required now is a general descrip-
tion of the wider associative field.  Some conclusions will be drawn
concerning the relative importance of each part of the field in Old
Testament language about salvation, the contexts in which it is applied
(e.g. mortal danger, illness, war, guilt, ignorance), and the concepts
or theological categories which it is used to describe.  In effect
this will be a general study of Old Testament language about salvation,
based not on traditional concordance-based studies which take one or
two "key-words," but on as many as possible of the relevant "salvation-
contexts," irrespective of the words occurring in them.  It does not
profess to present a complete picture, but may nonetheless serve to
illustrate the advantages of a more comprehensive approach to the
language of the Old Testament.

(1)  General Structure of the field. [1.]

The central core of the field consists of the following:
HOŠIAᶜ, yešaᶜ, yᵉšuᶜa, mošiaᶜ, mošaᶜot, tᵉšuᶜa;
HIṢṢIL, haṣṣala;
ᶜAZAR, ᶜezer, ᶜezra;
HILLEṢ;
MILLEṬ, HIMLIṬ;
PAṢA;
PARAQ.

1.  See Table 2.  This part of the discussion is not confined to the
register selected on p. 37.

These words make up the lexical group which is the subject of detailed analysis in Chapter IV. It comprises the minimum lexical group on which a discussion of Old Testament language about salvation can be based.[1]

It may appear strange that ᶜAZAR "help" is included in this minimal core of the field: this is because, as we shall see, HOŠIAᶜ is in some respects semantically closer to ᶜAZAR than it is to, for instance, HIṢṢIL.[2]

Associated with this central core is a large, heterogeneous stock of lexical items, designated "the HOŠIAᶜ -field." Most of these are readily grouped according to their semantic motivation, words derived from a forensic context, metaphorical transfers from the military sphere, and so on.[3] A dozen such groups can be identified within the field,[4] but this still leaves a considerable number of words like ᵓAHEB "love," YADAᶜ "know," ZAKAR "remember," BAHAR "choose," which have an obvious association with HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc., and which all have this in common, that they generally denote an attitude rather than an activity, on the part of the subject towards the object. These items are grouped in one comprehensive sector which may appropriately be headed by the neutral word YADAᶜ "know."[5]

1. See above, pp.134f.
2. Cf. Z. Scharfstein, op. cit., nos. 955, 956. See below, pp. 207f.
3. See above, pp. 122f.
4. On the problem of the relation between HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc. and terms like RAPAᵓ "heal" and SALAH "forgive," see the discussion of hyponymy, p. 188.
5. See above, p. 127.

## (2) Etymology.

One element in this field which would have relevance for a discussion of the etymology of HOŠIAᶜ is SPACIOUSNESS. A detailed study of this sector indicates its importance and rich applicability in Old Testament language about salvation.[1] What bearing does this have on the popular etymology which explains HOŠIAᶜ by reference to Arabic wasiᶜa "be spacious"?[2] It would have been very satisfying, for instance, to discover that HOŠIAᶜ was semantically closer to this sector than to any of the others. This is, however, by no means the case: indeed it occurs noticeably less often in collocation with ṣar than hiṣṣil does, and in the frequent soteriological passages where words for "spacious" or "give room to" occur, HOŠIAᶜ is conspicuous by its absence.[3]

We have already had occasion, secondly, to mention the frequency of metaphorical transference from the forensic sphere into the HOŠIAᶜ-field.[4] While GAᵓAL and PADA correspond closely both grammatically and semantically to HOŠIAᶜ, we saw how ŠAPAṬ, RIB, ᶜANA, and possibly DIN have been influenced by their proximity to HOŠIAᶜ.[5] We might add the nominal forms like GOᵓEL, ŠOPEṬ and ṢADDIQ attested in soteriolog- ical contexts, where, as in English "Redeemer," the original forensic

---

1. See the article referred to on p. 135, note 2.

2. See p. 1, note 2.

3. Cf. Ps. 4:2; 18:20; 31:9; 118:5; Job 36:16; see further the article referred to in note 1, and "What was a Mošiaᶜ?", p. 475, note 5.

4. See above, p. 123.

5. pp. 128-9.

sense of the words has virtually disappeared.[1] MOŠIA⸣ itself may be
another example of this development, and a picture of the HOŠIA⸣-field
as it was at an earlier stage in the development of the language might
have shown the LAWCOURT-sector in the centre, the more general usage
of HOŠIA⸣ not yet having been established.[2]

PAṢA "save" may be an "Aramaism,"[3] but it is important to notice
that a similar development is also attested in Old Testament Hebrew,
where terms for "open" occur in the HOŠIA⸣-field.[4] The problem of
distinguishing between true semantic borrowing and parallel develop-
ments in neighbouring languages is well-known.[5]

Several puzzles can best be explained against their background
in an associative field like that of HOŠIA⸣. We are primarily
concerned with HOŠIA⸣, and this is therefore not the place for detailed
discussions of peripheral words. A few examples, however, will be
briefly examined in order to illustrate further the value of this type
of lexical grouping.

Two forensic terms have perplexed commentators and led on
occasion to textual emendation. First, ṣiwwita in Ps. 71:3 is said to
be meaningless and a corruption of lᵉbet mᵉṣudot.[6] Seen alongside

1. On ṣaddiq, see especially p. 201.
2. "What was a Mošia⸣?", pp. 485f.
3. KB, s.v.; M. Wagner, Aramäismen, p. 94.
4. Cf. PITTEAḤ "open" (Isa. 60[11]) and "set free" (Ps. 105[20]).
5. See H. Kronasser, Handbuch der Semasiologie, p. 142; E. Haugen,
   "The analysis of linguistic borrowing," p. 228; T.E. Hope, "The
   analysis of semantic borrowing," pp. 133f.
6. H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, p. 489. Cf. BH.; A. Weiser, Psalms, p. 495.

Ps. 44:5, however, and against the background of the HOŠIAᶜ-field, ṣiwwita lᵉhošiᶜeni is undoubtedly another example of the metaphorical application of a forensic term to an act of divine intervention. The translation would be along these lines:

"Your command is my salvation."[1]

The second term is gozi in Ps. 71:6:

> 5. "For thou, O Lord, art my hope,
>     my trust, O Lord, from my youth.
>
> 6. Upon thee I have leaned from my birth;
>     thou gozi from my mother's womb."

Proposed solutions involve either emending the text[2] or taking "from my mother's womb" in a quite different sense from the two parallel expressions "from my youth" and "from my birth."[3] It is clear that in these two verses, the four terms "hope," "trust,""support"and gozi belong together, so that gozi like the other three must belong to the HOŠIAᶜ-field. Now in the lawcourt-sector of the field there are three words for "cut" used, like Latin decido and German entscheiden, in the sense "decide, decree."[4] These are HAQAQ, HATAK and GAZAR. It seems possible that in goze we have an exact parallel to one of these, namely mᵉhoqeq "commander," in which the semantic development HAQAQ "cut" HAQAQ "command" is well established. The verb GAZA "cut" does not

---

1. Cf. Ps. 106:4. Whether divine intervention in this case refers to the sending of commissioned deputies or angels (Ibn Ezra and Rashi, ad loc.) is not specified,

2. KB, BH, H.-J. Kraus, op. cit., p. 489.

3. BDB, A. Weiser, op. cit., p. 496. Cf. RSV.

4. Cf. H. Kronasser, op. cit., p. 140. On the suggestion that Semitic DYN "judge" is similarly related to Egyptian dn "cut" see W.A. Ward, "Comparative Studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic," p. 33.

occur in Old Testament Hebrew, although it is attested in Aramaic,
but the noun gazit is common enough in collocation with ʾabne, "hewn
stones". The existence of a biform of GAZAZ is entirely feasible
whether it happens to occur in Old Testament Hebrew or not. The
participle goze, then, is "the one who cuts, i.e. decrees," and we
would suggest the following translation for the verse:

"thou hast been my protector since before I was born."
Protector is an appropriate English equivalent since its technical
application, like that of gozi, belongs to the term's prehistory (that
is to say, 17th century English), while an extended, soteriological
sense is what is required by the context.[1] No claim is being made
here that this is necessarily the correct solution to the problem;
its importance for the present discussion is that it came to light as
a direct result of an examination of the relevant semantic field.

Another example concerns the relation between HENIAH "give rest
to" and NAHA/HINHA "lead". HENIAH is not easily translated "give rest
to" in several contexts, where movement is indicated: in Isa. 63:14,
for example, where it occurs in parallel to NIHAG "lead", it is
emended by some commentators,[2] and BDB suggests "give rest to, i.e.
bring to a resting place."[3] Again it seems that too great a reliance
on translation has caused this confusion, while a monolingual approach

---

1. This is how the word was understood in antiquity, apparently: cf.
LXX σκεπαστής ; Vulg. protector. See further C.A. Briggs,
Psalms, II, p. 129.
2. BH; C. Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja. Kapitel 40-66, p. 306.
3. Cf. J. Skinner, Isaiah XL-LXVI, p. 202.

to the problem provides a possible solution.[1] It will be noticed

that in the LEADING-sector of the HOSIAᶜ-field the word NEHEL occurs.

This word also requires two unexpectedly diverse translations:

(1) "lead" and (2) "give rest to, refresh."[2] In other words the

semantic range of HENIAH as described above is no wider than that of

NEHEL.[3] This leads to the further conclusion that NUAH and NAHA

are biforms like HUM/HAMA, ᶜUR/ᶜARA, ŠUAH/ŠAHA, etc., and the rather

unsatisfactory attempts that have been made to distinguish them

etymologically and semantically, are rendered unnecessary.[4]

One final example, of a different kind, is the expression

babboqer "in the morning." Two main interpretations have been

offered according to which the phrase either refers to a specific

time in a liturgical sequence,[5] or was not intended to denote any-

thing more precise than "right early."[6] A third possibility emerges

from a glance at the LIGHT-sector. Like ᵓOR, ŠEMEŠ and the others,

---

1. See pp. 249ff.

2. See BDB, s.v.; and cf. J. Skinner, Genesis, pp. 499f. KB cites
   Arabic manhal "watering-place" and resorts to the translation "get
   through with bread" for Gen. 47:17. Cf. G. von Rad, Genesis, p. 404.

3. On the differences in semantic range as between one language and
   another, see above, pp. 133f.

4. While the evidence for Proto-Semitic NWH is good (Ugaritic,
   Akkadian, Phoenician, Moabite, Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic; see KB,
   s.v.), the evidence for a separate root NHW/Y, from which Hebrew
   naha is derived, is very slender: Arabic naha "go in direction of"
   is hardly compatible with Ancient South Arabian mnhy "towards"
   (Arabic ḥ normally corresponds to Ancient South Arabian ḫ).

5. Cf. B. Duhm, Die Psalmen, p. 17.

6. J. Ziegler, "Die Hilfe Gottes 'am Morgen'," pp. 281ff. Cf. RSV.

metaphorical transference brings <u>BOQER</u> into the <u>HOŠIA</u><sup>c</sup>-field.  Thus

"in the morning," that is, like the sun, God intervenes in situations

of darkness and danger, and the wicked are dispersed like creatures

of the night:  cf. Job 38:12ff.

> "Have you commanded the morning since your days began,
>     and caused the dawn to know its place,
>     that it might take hold of the skirts of the earth,
>     and the wicked be shaken out of it?
>     It is changed like clay under the seal,
>     and it is dyed like a garment (?).
>     From the wicked their light is withheld,
>     and their uplifted arm is broken."

It is remarkable, in view of this famous passage, that the possibility

of a metaphorical use of <u>BOQER</u> has not been adduced, especially when

it does not necessarily preclude a liturgical origin for this type of

language.  To this and other problems concerning the origin of certain

lexical features of Old Testament Hebrew we shall devote the next

section.

## (3) Historical factors.

The relation between language and culture is a well worn

problem and one which this is not the place to tackle.[1] It is

obviously dangerous to base any conclusions concerning the cultural

or religious conditions of a people on the presence or absence of one

1. A recent, sympathetic reappraisal of the effects of neo-Humboldtian
   linguistics and the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis on Biblical scholarship,
   can be found in D. Hill, <u>Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings</u>, pp. 8-14;
   contrast J. Barr, <u>Semantics</u>, pp. 33-45.

word in their language,[1.] or on any isolated linguistic development.

It would be absurd, for example, to draw any conclusions about personal

hygiene in ancient Israel from the fact that there is no general word

for "dirty" in Old Testament Hebrew.[2.] Equally risky would be to

link the appearance of metallurgical terminology in the HOSIA^c -field

with the "Kenite hypothesis."[3.] On occasion some kind of correlation

can be made: the fact that SEL, unlike its English equivalents "shade,

shadow," occurs in Old Testament Hebrew only in the sense of protec-

tion (apart from its arbitrary collocation with mawet "death" in the

compound salmawet "the shadow of death"[4.]), reflects climatic

conditions in the near east: cf.

> "Give counsel, grant justice;
>     make your shade like night at the height of noon;
>         hide the outcasts, betray not the fugitive ..." (Isa. 16:3).

But this is rare and limited to rather obvious phenomena.

---

1.  "Greek thought, for instance, had no idea of the righteousness of
    God as a divine activity bringing about salvation" (D. Hill, op. cit.,
    p. 294). On this kind of statement, based on the absence of one
    phrase from the Greek language, see J. Barr, op. cit., especially
    pp. 282-7.

2.  There are two words for "dirty" applied only to water (DALAH,
    MIRPAS), three are applied only in moral and cultic contexts (GA^'AL,
    TAME', KATAM), and SIQQUS, GILLUL, PIGGUL denote the consequences of
    uncleanness rather than its nature. Later Hebrew M^cLUKLAK "dirty"
    is not attested in Old Testament Hebrew, but this may be an accident.
    Cf. p. 224, note 1.

3.  Cf. the arguments concerning the meaning of "Kenite", mining in
    the Sinai area, the Sabbath law not to light a fire, and the dark
    planet Saturn. See H.H. Rowley's article referred to on p. 63, note
    4; and cf. also R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 479.

4.  See above, p.21f.

Few would dispute the claim of the field-theorists, however, that the size and structure of a field reflect to a far greater extent the conditions of its historical context. The language of the Old Testament, as we have seen, originated in various distinct contexts, and therefore no field which takes in the whole of Old Testament Hebrew,[1] could satisfactorily be used as a guide to any one historical situation. But there are some general historical observations that can be made on the size and structure of the HOŠIAᶜ-field. They can conveniently be grouped under three headings: (i) "Sperber's law", (ii) cultic origins, and (iii) the distinctiveness of Old Testament Hebrew.

(i) Sperber's theory, that if at a certain time a complex of ideas is strongly charged with feeling, this will affect linguistic development, has already been discussed.[2] In the Old Testament, ideas connected with divine intervention are clearly a case in point, and the size and richness of the HOŠIAᶜ-field are an obvious example of the influence of thought on language. A rough comparison between the field in Old Testament Hebrew and the same field in later Hebrew[3] bears this out. It might be suggested that the size of the field in Old Testament Hebrew is simply due to the exigencies of Hebrew poetic structure,[4] were it not for three other areas of semantic development

---

1. See p. 139, note 1.

2. pp. 122f.

3. See below, Chapter V.

4. For the importance of this factor, see S. Ullmann, Language and Style, p. 75, who quotes examples from Beowulf and the twelfth century French poet Benoit de Sainte-Maure.

which must be put down to the effective operation of Sperber's law.

The first is metaphorical transference which is peculiarly frequent in the HOŠIAᶜ-field. Thus, for example, not only do the words ROMEM, HERIM, etc. "raise up" occur in a metaphorical sense, as in English exalt, uplift, etc., but so also do two terms of more restricted application, HIMŠA and DILLA "draw water from a well": e.g.

> "He reached from on high,  he took me,
>  he drew me out of many waters;
>  he delivered me from my strong enemy" (II Sam. 22:17).[1]

Secondly, there are many examples of extension of meaning in the case of words collocated with YHWH:  e.g. ZAKAR "remember", ŠAPAṬ "judge", RAPAʾ "heal", HIYYA "give life to."[2] Thirdly there are cases of linguistic borrowing that may also be the result of this consistent preoccupation of religious writers with the subject of divine intervention:  e.g. PAṢA and PARAQ in the sense of "save" are two examples of borrowing from Aramaic in the very centre of the field. ŠEMEŠ "sun", applied to God in Ps. 84:12 is probably another example.[3] All these developments, metaphorical transference, extension of meaning and semantic borrowing, naturally affect the size of the HOŠIAᶜ-field.

Not only the size of the field can be shown to have been

---

1. Cf. Ps. 30:2.

2. See above, p.123.  On ZAKAR, see literature cited on p.134, note 7;  and on RAPAʾ and HIYYA, see below, pp.159ff.

3. H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, p.586 cites a parallel from the Amarna letters.

influenced by historical factors, however; its structure shows signs of similar developments. One case of this has already been mentioned, namely the peculiar productiveness of forensic terminology in language about salvation.[1] A more precisely traceable example has been suggested in an examination of the SPACIOUSNESS-sector.[2] Almost all the passages in which language about salvation includes words for "give room to," "spacious", etc. can reasonably be dated to periods of territorial expansion in Israel. In other words, when the extension of Israel's political boundaries was "in the news," language about divine intervention on behalf of Israel, or on behalf of individuals living in Israel, developed accordingly. Thus on the one hand the language of God's ancient promise of land is coloured by details of David's spectacular territorial gains (cf. Gen. 15:18ff; Deut. 11:24; Josh. 1:4; etc.); while on the other hand the language of a Psalm of thanksgiving after an individual's escape from danger contains some impressive new imagery: e.g.

> "They came upon me in the day of my calamity;
>> but the Lord was my stay.
> He brought me forth into a broad place;
>> he delivered me, because he delighted in me" (II Sam. 22: 19f. cf. v.37).[3]

A third example of the influence of historical events on the

1. Above, pp. 122f.

2. See article referred to on p. 135, note 2.

3. On the dating of these passages, see EAT, pp. 258, 265; H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, pp. 139f.

structure of the field may be found in the LEADING-sector.  Here the
deep impression made on the language of the Old Testament by the
Exodus events is perhaps reflected in the prominence of these metaphors
of leading and guiding, not only in contexts of intellectual or moral
guidance, as in English, but also in situations of physical danger and
distress:  e.g.

> "Yea,  thou art my rock and my fortress;
> for thy name's sake lead me and guide me,
> take me out of the net which is hidden for me,
> for thou art my refuge"    (Ps. 31:3f).

The prototype of divine intervention, as recorded in ancient poetry
(e.g. Ex. 15:13)[1] and confessional formulae (e.g. Deut. 26:5-9;
Jos. 24:2ff),[2] has left its mark on the idiom of the Hebrew language.

(ii) A different explanation of the origins of Hebrew idiom
centres on the importance of the cult as a formative influence.  Expres-
sions which at a later stage of the development of Hebrew may have been
metaphorical, were originally literal references to episodes in litur-
gical ceremonies and dramas.  This theory is implied in discussions of
the spiritualizing of cultic language:[3]  two well-known examples are
the call addressed to YHWH "Arise!" and the formulae which speak of
the "face of YHWH."[4]  Another case is the spiritualized language of

---

1.  EAT, pp. 279f.
2.  Cf. G. von Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 158.
3.  Cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, pp. 368f., 395ff.
4.  See A. Weiser, The Psalms, p. 39.

the "confessions of Jeremiah," certainly related to the (cultic) Psalms of lamentation.[1]

A specific ritual act seems to lie behind several expressions which belong to the HOSIA^-field. "Thou dost hold my right hand" (Ps. 73:23) can be traced to a well-attested feature of ancient near eastern ritual, as Gressmann showed forty years ago.[2] Behind the phrase "gates of righteousness" (Ps. 18:19) probably lies a reference to the names given to the gates of the temple, as the custom was in ancient Babylon.[3] Neither expression need, however, be restricted to its literal cultic application.

More problematical are such graphic images as "he set me secure on the heights" (Ps. 18:33b) and "he will set me high upon a rock" (Ps. 27:5c). Do these have their origin in specific dramatic episodes? The cultic background of expressions like "I gave my back to the smiters and my cheeks to those who pulled out the beard" (Isa. 50:6), as attested in Akkadian ritual texts,[4] makes this a plausible hypothesis. Many other expressions can, with very little imagination, be explained in terms of elaborate representation in liturgical dramas: "lifter up of my head" (Ps. 3:3; cf. 110:7); "he will conceal me

1. Cf. B.S. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, p. 37.

2. H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, p. 509. On an important parallel in the "Cyrus Cylinder," see D.W. Thomas, Documents from Old Testament Times, p. 92.

3. H.-J. Kraus, op. cit., p. 807.

4. Cf. ANET, p. 334. See also I. Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship, pp. 35f., D.R. Jones, Isaiah, II and III, p. 525.

under the cover of his tent" (Ps. 27:5b); "the Lord my God lightens my darkness" (Ps. 18:28); "take hold of shield and buckler, and rise for my help" (Ps. 35:2).[1]

(iii) There is however a third possible explanation of the rich structure of the HOŠIAᶜ -field in Old Testament Hebrew, which has not as yet been adequately examined. This involves a distinctive combination of both the factors already discussed, not only the over-whelming preoccupation of Old Testament writers with the subject of God's intervention on behalf of his people, (cf. Sperber's theory), but also the persistent and formative influence on their language of ancient near eastern cultic practice.[2] Just how much common near eastern ritual was practised in ancient Israel at any one time is obscure,[3] but it is now certain that at any rate the language associated with it played an important role in the development of Old Testament Hebrew. Indeed it is almost true to say that all the basic literary forms and motifs can be traced back to origins among Israel's neighbours. A recent study illustrates how even Israel's presentation of historical events as divine manifestations was by no means unique in the ancient near east.[4] As the author of the monograph points

---

1. Cf. S.H. Hooke (ed.), Myth and Ritual; S. Mowinckel, Religion und Kultus.

2. Cf. A.R. Johnson's summing up of the situation in The Old Tes-tament and Modern Study, especially, p. 204: "the problem must be examined, not merely against the general background of the ritual and mythology of the ancient Near East, but also ... from the stand-point of Israelite psychology ..."

3. Cf. H. Ringgren, Israelite Religion, pp. 183f.; H.-J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, pp. 14-19.

4. B. Albrektson, History and the Gods.

out, this does not mean that there was nothing distinctive in Old Testament views of history; but the distinctiveness is a matter of degree rather than of kind.[1]

This is precisely what our examination of Old Testament language about divine intervention reveals. While Israel undoubtedly shared many beliefs and much cultic practice with their neighbours, the degree to which their language about divine intervention was developed (by metaphorical transference, extension of meaning, semantic borrowing, and the like), is a measure of the distinctiveness of the religion of Israel. It is the highly developed language in which historical events are represented as acts of divine intervention, that is distinctive, whether or not this language originally reflected cultic practice. Two examples will illustrate how it appears that language about cultic institutions can develop so elaborately that the original connexion with the cult is virtually snapped.

The first is the phrase "my cup overflows" (Ps. 23:5). There seems little doubt that this motif of the cup originated in cultic practice, probably in connexion with its use as a means of divination: the opposition between "cup of salvation" (e.g. Ps. 116:13) and "cup of wrath" (e.g. Isa. 51:17, 22; Lam. 4:21) reflects the two kinds of oracular answer possible.[2] The distinctive development here is that the auspicious possibility, "cup of salvation," has been elaborated so richly that any reference to actual divinatory procedure is obscure,

---

1.  Id., pp. 113f.
2.  H.-J. Kraus, _Psalmen_, p. 91.

and it becomes irrelevant whether lecanomancy was practised in Israel at the time or not.[1] The second example is the undoubted cultic reference in Ps. 24:3:

"Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord?
And who shall stand in his holy place?"[2]

Again we cannot claim to know much about the original cultic practice associated with this, but the gap in our knowledge appears less important when we realize that there are many phrases like "he will set me high upon a rock" (Ps. 27:5), "Lead thou me to the rock that is higher than I" (Ps. 61:3), in which we are dealing, less with references to specific ritual or historical situations, than with what may be imaginative elaborations of an original cultic scene. It is in this highly developed elaboration of the stereotyped language of the cult that we should look for Israel's distinctive contribution to ancient near eastern soteriology. It is this language, developed in situations where faith in and speculation about acts of divine intervention were lively and creative to a unique degree, that has been the basis of the theology and liturgy of all the religious communities which accept the Old Testament as their Bible, or as part of their Bible.[3]

## (4) Theological considerations.

One of the most fascinating results of the field approach to

1. Cf. Gen. 44:5. See H. Gunkel, Genesis, pp. 453f.; G. von Rad, Genesis, p. 387, and for more details, A. Jirku , "Mantik in Alt Israel," pp. 161f.

2. For ʿALA "go up" as a terminus technicus, see H.-J. Kraus, op. cit., p. 196. Cf. S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, pp. 178f.

3. On the "dynamic, continuing character of past events" in the Old Testament, see B.S. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, p. 84. Cf. also J. Bright, The Authority of the Old Testament, pp. 143f.

the study of the Old Testament, is that it provides illuminating cross-sections of Old Testament language about particular subjects, in this case, "salvation." It would be something short of the truth to claim that this is an entirely adequate method of discovering "what the Old Testament teaches" about salvation. But in comparison with other methods, as illustrated for example in <u>TDNT</u> and a number of well-respected "concept-studies", which are confined to the examination of one word and the passages in which it happens to occur,[1] it represents a considerable step forward. It would also be dangerous to claim that the <u>HOSIA<sup>c</sup></u>-field is somehow co-extensive with the "Old Testament concept of salvation."[2] The advantage of this approach is a practical one: it provides a useful, but by no means fool-proof, method of amassing and classifying all the relevant passages. The following are several illustrations of the kind of theological data obtainable from the <u>HOSIA<sup>c</sup></u>-field, data which are seldom mentioned in studies on Old Testament soteriology.[3]

One feature of the field, which has already been discussed as evidence for the distinctive prominence of ideas about salvation in the Old Testament, is its size. We need only add here that salvation

---

1. See above, pp. 134f.

2. This is the claim of Trier and his Neo-Humboldtian followers. Cf. the discussion referred to on p. 130, note 2; and the opposite view in J. Barr, <u>Semantics</u>, pp. 48-50, <u>et passim</u>.

3. See for example S.G.F. Brandon (ed.), <u>The Saviour God</u>; E.M.B. Green, <u>The Meaning of Salvation</u>; S. Porubčan, <u>Sin in the Old Testament. A Soteriological Study</u>.

from every type of danger and distress, physical, spiritual and psychological, is described in the richest language in almost every literary genre in the Old Testament.  There is a further point immediately evident from a look at the passages represented in the HOŠIA᷉ᶜ -field:  the writers almost invariably attribute their escapes and victories to divine intervention.  As we shall see in the next chapter, one of the distinctive features of the term HOŠIAᶜ itself, is that it is almost never used with a subject other than YHWH or his appointed leaders.[1]

The interpretation of historical events as acts of divine intervention leads to three developments, nicely illustrated in the HOŠIAᶜ -field.  First the language of metal-working adds an important theme to Old Testament soteriology.  Defeat, suffering and humiliation are compared to impurity in metal:  e.g.

"How the gold has grown dim,
how the pure gold has changed"  (Lam. 4:1).[2]

The reference here is to the destruction of Jerusalem.  But by an act of faith this situation can be transformed into "the furnace of affliction" (Isa. 48:10),[3] whereby Jerusalem can be purified and refined:  e.g.

1.  See pp. 193f.
2.  Cf. H.-J. Kraus, Threni, pp. 74f.
3.  See C.R. North, The Second Isaiah, p. 179.

"I will turn my hand against you
    and will smelt away your dross as with lye,
      and remove all your alloy....
   Afterward you shall be called the city of righteousness,
     the faithful city"   (Isa. 1:25f.)

The ultimate stage in this refining process may be death, and this too, in the eyes of the faithful martyrs, can be an act of salvation: e.g.

"... and some of those who are wise shall fall, to refine
   and to cleanse them and to make them white"  (Dan. 11:35).[1]

A second development is a pessimistic corollary of the first. Just as faith can transform tragedy into hope for the future, so scepticism in time of crisis can transform the utterances of faith into cynical parodies of traditional theology. A famous example is the strident "misuse" of the phrase "thou watcher of men", which usually refers to God's fatherly care and protection[2] to denote the warder of a hellish prison (Job 7:20).[3] Military imagery is used to describe moral and psychological help: e.g.

"Thou art my hiding-place and my shield;
   I hope in thy word"  (Ps. 119:114).

"His angel encamps round about them" (Ps. 34:6); but in the tortured mind of Job, defence can be a claustrophobic experience far removed from salvation: e.g.

---

1.  Cf. S.R. Driver, Daniel, pp. 190-3.
2.  e.g. Isa. 27:3;  Ps. 12:8.
3.  Cf. S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, Job, p. 74.

"His troops come together;
> they have cast up siegeworks against me,
> > and encamp round about my tent" (Job. 19:12).[1]

Related to this development are the prophets' free variations on
traditional themes.[2] Joel's parody of a "floating oracle" is well-
known (3:9); and perhaps the opening of the Book of Amos is another
example. Instead of the comforting words of the original oracle
(Isa. 2:3, Mic. 4:2), we read:

> "The Lord will roar from Zion,
> > and thunder from Jerusalem" (Am. 1:2).[3]

The last general theological observation that might be made here
concerns the application of numerous expressions for physical health
and political prosperity to moral or spiritual conditions. It would
appear that there often is in Old Testament Hebrew no clear distinction
between terms describing physical and psychological conditions:[4] for
example, KOAH, HAYIL and HOZEQ can apply equally to moral and material
strength. Words like $K^{e\,'}EB$ "pain", $RAPA^{'}$ "heal", and $^{'a}RUKA$ "the new
tissue that grows over a healed wound" primarily belong to the physical
sphere, but can be transferred to psychological contexts.[5] This has
important consequences for Old Testament translation and exegesis, and
one well-known example will make this clear. The description of the

---

1. Cf. 16:12f.

2. On the prophet's freedom, see G. von Rad, _Old Testament Theology_,
   II, pp. 70-9.

3. For the translation "thunder", cf. W.R. Harper, _Amos and Hosea_,
   p. 10; R.S. Cripps, _The Book of Amos_, p. 115.

4. For the lack of distinction in Hebrew between qualitative and
   quantitive, see C. Rabin, "Is Biblical Semantics possible?", pp. 22f.

5. e.g. Jer. 45:3; Prov. 14:13 (cf. Arabic ka'iba "be sad"); Jer. 3:
   22; 14:19; 17:14; 30:17.

"suffering servant" in Isaiah 53 is couched in the language of
physical disease and pain, but this does not preclude spiritual or
mental interpretations.  Just as Job's boils are merely a graphic,
repulsive way of describing all suffering, for the purposes of the
argument, so all suffering known to the audience of Second Isaiah,
political oppression, injustice, guilt, home-sickness, humiliation,
are involved in the suffering of the servant and therefore included
in the act of divine intervention which heals and vindicates him in
the end.[1.]  It is in translation that the problem is most acute:
translators and commentators frequently lose the effect of the metaphor
by introducing psychological terms, for example, "griefs" and "sorrows"
(Isa. 53:3),[2.] which might sound inconsistent with the rest of the
picture:  "wounded for our transgressions," "bruised for our
iniquities," "his stripes" and the general repulsive physical appear-
ance of the man.  When it realised that in presenting a consistent,
graphic picture of physical suffering, the author intended to depict,
metaphorically, the nadir of degradation and desolation, including
the plight of his audience, then translation is simpler and the mean-
ing of the song a good deal plainer.[3.]

These three observations, like the rest of this chapter, are

---

1.  Cf. D.R. Jones, Isaiah II and III, p. 525.

2.  But see J. Skinner, Isaiah XL - LXVI, p. 125;  C.R. North, The
Second Isaiah, p. 237.

3.  The identity of the servant is then less important than his
function (cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, II, pp. 258-62);
and the applicability of the poem to all suffering facilitated:
see above, pp. 22f.

intended to do no more than indicate the direction in which a study based on the HOSIA̬ᶜ-field might move.  For the present, however, we must confine ourselves to the problem we set out to deal with, and, well aware of the somewhat sketchy character of some of this chapter's conclusions, we turn now to a detailed semantic analysis of the central sector of the field.

## IV.   ANALYSIS

The reasons for selecting this particular lexical group for the investigation may be briefly set forth as follows.  It is an interesting one on several accounts:  it contains HOŠIA᷉ᶜ, by far the most frequent item in the field and one which, in contrast to other items in the same field, HIRḤIB "give room to" and SIGGEB "make high", for example, has no obvious metaphorical motivation.[1]  Modern descriptions of the word have relied almost exclusively on etymological data,[2] and a synchronic analysis from within the language would seem in this case to be especially promising.  It would also be true to say that the usual English equivalents, "save", "salvation", "saviour", have tended to obscure the meaning of HOŠIA᷉ᶜ, by their very wide application in religious contexts.  The same holds for HIṢṢIL and ᶜAZAR.  The distinction between these three and the other words in the sector has not, to my knowledge, been defined, and it is the aim of this analysis to define and distinguish these semantically related words.

Naturally the meaning of these words is familiar to a greater or lesser extent to anyone who knows Hebrew, and it may be that this analysis will discover nothing new.[3]  But in that case it is hoped that previous intuitive ideas can be given a more objective basis in

1.   See pp.113ff.
2.   See above, p. 1, note 2 for references.
3.   Cf. J. Lyons, Structural Semantics, pp. 95f.

162.

accordance with modern linguistic theory. As we shall see, the agreement between several of the results and "what is generally believed" about the words is striking: for example, the stylistic difference between HOŠIAᶜ and ᶜAZAR, the secular use of the latter, and the element of separation apparent especially in HIṢṢIL. This would suggest two possibilities: (1) there is some truth in the conclusions if they can be arrived at from two quite different angles; (2) what is true of the register in particular is also true of the whole Old Testament. This second point can be further substantiated by a less detailed survey of the rest of the Old Testament and this will be undertaken in Chapter V. But it must be emphasised that the narrow concentration on one section of Old Testament language was not intended to provide a representative cross-section of the Old Testament, although if it does incidentally this would be valuable. The selection of one register from within the Old Testament (indeed one part of that register)[1] was simply intended to cut down the relevant data to easily manageable proportions so that the main emphasis should be on the method of linguistic description, rather than on the completeness of the results.

1. Grammatical classification.

All the occurrences of HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc. in the register were noted on paper-slips, grouped in the first instance according to style.[2] As one would expect, each of the members of the lexical group

1. See pp. 107-9.
2. See Table 1.

occurs in many different forms:  for example, while the second person masculine singular forms of HOŠIA͏ᶜ are naturally most frequent in language addressed to God, passives, infinitives, imperatives and so on also occur.  There are also the nominal forms YEŠA͏ᶜ, Y͏ᵉŠU͏ᶜA  T͏ᵉŠU͏ᶜA. Now if, for convenience in classifying the data, we select the conventional third person masculine singular of the perfect as the form quoted in the analysis, we are confronted by a set of relations which require some explanation.  In dealing with the word hošiᶜeni (Jer. 17: 14), for instance, we may profitably speak of the occurrence of HOŠIA͏ᶜ in this context, and this is the generally accepted procedure;  but in so doing we are assuming a relationship between hošiᶜeni and HOŠIA͏ᶜ, which is not self-explanatory.  Is it a grammatical relation?  Or is it a semantic one, or an etymological one?  When we bring in the nominal forms YEŠA͏ᶜ, Y͏ᵉŠU͏ᶜA, etc. as well, the problem is more complicated. What is the precise relation between HOŠIA͏ᶜ and NATAN T͏ᵉŠU͏ᶜA (cf. Jud. 15:18b)?  Can it be described in the same terms as the previous example?

The most common method of describing this relation is by reference to etymology.  Words derived from a common root are related to each other like members of a family or branches of a tree.  This leads to the further assumption that words containing the same root share a common semantic element, and that therefore it is possible to extract and analyse the meaning of the root.  The dangers of etymologizing are only too well known, and there is no need to enlarge on the subject here.[1] It is enough to say that the semantic relation between a word and its

---

1.  See pp. 1f., and "Root-meanings".

root is an extremely complex one, even when, as in the case of Y̌Šᶜ,
the relation between the cognates is relatively simple. What is more,
to take a root, which is by definition divorced from any context, as
the subject of a semantic analysis, would be directly opposed to all
we have said about the importance of dealing with language in context.

The alternative which is being proposed here is based on one of
the most productive insights of modern linguistic theory, namely,
transformational grammar.[1] This is not the place for any kind of
detailed critique of Chomskian linguistics, nor is the present writer
qualified to undertake such a thing. But partly because this important
field of modern linguistic theory is comparatively little known among
Old Testament Hebrew linguists, and partly because it provides a
valuable method of analysing all the heterogeneous material involved,
the following brief introduction to that part of transformational
grammar which concerns us has been included here.

Unlike traditional grammars, which are concerned with regularities
discernible in the surface structure of a language, these new
"generative" grammars (transformational grammar in particular) describe
the rules according to which all grammatical sentences in a language
are generated from a deep structure or kernel. Chomsky himself
believes that this deep structure is a reality underlying all natural
languages, and inherent in the language faculty of the human species.[2]

1. The pioneers were Z.S. Harris and N. Chomsky (see Bibliography).
   For a useful introduction, see H.A. Gleason, Descriptive Linguistics,
   Chapter 12; cf. also J. Lyons, op. cit., pp. 14f, 106-11, 122-9.
2. "A Universal Grammar," p. 688.

Not all would agree with this; but interest in the way a perfectly
structured sentence is generated, for example, by children who have
never heard it before, is common to all generative grammars. They
are concerned "not with language, but with linguistic competence."[1]
They describe the relations between surface structure and deep
structure rather than relations between elements in the surface
structure. Thus two related sentences like John loves Mary and Mary
is loved by John are analysed in terms of one underlying structure:
$NP_1 + V + NP_2$ (where $NP_1$ = John, V = LOVE, $NP_2$ = Mary).[2] The structural
relation between A. the two sentences and B. their underlying struc-
ture is said to be a transformation, that is, a process whereby A. is
rewritten as B. or B. is rewritten as A. Transformational grammar
describes the rules involved in this kind of process.

If we now return to the question of the relation between hŏši͑eni
(word in context) in language addressed to YHWH (Jer. 17:14) and the
conventional abstraction HŎŠIA͑ (lexeme),[3] it is clear that this can
readily be described in transformational terms. There is no need to
enumerate the transformational rules involved in rewriting the under-
lying structure $NP_1 + V + NP_2$ (where $NP_1$ = YHWH, V = HŎŠIA͑, $NP_2$ =
Jeremiah) as an imperative in language addressed by Jeremiah to YHWH.

---

1. J.P. Thorne, "Grammars and machines," p. 302.

2. For all symbols and abbreviations, see p. 270. "Structure" is
   preferred to "kernel sentence" (Chomsky) since it is more general.
   "Sentence" is reserved for surface structure.

3. For the term "lexeme" (cf. phoneme, morpheme), referring to "the
   whole set of forms subsumed in a paradigm," see J. Lyons, op. cit.,
   pp. 11f.

In the simplest terms, where $\rightarrow$ means "is rewritten as" (sc. according to the appropriate transformational rules), we have:

$$\underline{\text{YHWH}} + \underline{\text{HOŠIA}^{\text{C}}} + \underline{\text{yirm}^{\text{e}}\text{yahu}}$$
$$\rightarrow \underline{\text{hoši}^{\text{C}}\text{eni}}.$$

We then have a precise grammatical relation and one which gives us a clear theoretical justification for quoting Jer. 17:14 as an occurrence of $\underline{\text{HOŠIA}^{\text{C}}}$. But more than that, the relation between $\underline{\text{HOŠIA}^{\text{C}}}$ and other terms in the same linguistic environment (e.g. $\underline{\text{RAPA}^{\text{ɔ}}}$ in Jer. 17:14), and matters concerning the term's subject and object, its transitivity, or any other lexical question are greatly clarified.

The relation between $\underline{\text{HOŠIA}^{\text{C}}}$ and the nominal forms, $\underline{\text{YEŠA}^{\text{C}}}$, $\underline{\text{Y}^{\text{e}}\text{ŠU}^{\text{C}}\text{A}}$, etc. can no less adequately be described in transformational terms. Since a nominalizing transformation is a more complex question, and one which will prove to be of considerable significance for semantic analysis, some more detailed remarks on this particular relation are necessary.

We may formalize five general transformational principles involved in the relation between the underlying structure (let us continue to use the example $\underline{\text{YHWH}} + \underline{\text{HOŠIA}^{\text{C}}} + \text{NP}_2$) and the surface structure, as we have it in the massoretic text.[1] (1) A nominalization normally involves the deletion of either the subject or the object of the verb:

---

1. These are not transformational rules proper, but some significant factors which emerged in the grammatical analysis.

$$\text{YHWH} + \underline{\overset{\vee}{\text{HOSIA}}^{\text{C}}} + \underline{\text{yi\'sra\'el}}$$

$$\rightarrow \underline{y^{e}\overset{\vee}{\text{su}}^{\text{C}}\text{at yi\'sra\'el}} \quad (\text{Ps. 14:7}) \qquad\qquad (\underline{\text{YHWH}} \rightarrow \emptyset)$$

$$\text{OR} \rightarrow \underline{y^{e}\overset{\vee}{\text{su}}^{\text{C}}\text{at YHWH}} \quad (\text{Ex. 14:13}) \qquad\qquad (\underline{\text{yi\'sra\'el}} \rightarrow \emptyset)$$

Such a deletion may result in ambiguity as in Gen. 49:18, where the
identity of the object of the nominalization $\underline{y^{e}\overset{\vee}{\text{su}}^{\text{C}}\text{atka}}$ (if there is
one) is unclear.[1] There are a few instances where both subject and
object appear to remain: e.g. $\underline{\text{mimmennu } y^{e}\overset{\vee}{\text{su}}^{\text{C}}\text{ati}}$ (Ps. 62:2). But in
fact the nominalization is $\underline{y^{e}\overset{\vee}{\text{su}}^{\text{C}}\text{ati}}$ ($\underline{\text{YHWH}} \rightarrow \emptyset$), $\underline{\text{mimmennu}}$ being the
predicate.[2] It is interesting to note that in English, nominalizations
without deletion are regular: e.g. the Lord's salvation of Israel.[3]

    (2) Secondly, when a nominalizing transformation is "embedded"[4]
in another sentence, it may require the introduction of an "empty verb"
or "function word" like $\underline{\text{PA}^{\text{C}}\text{AL}}$ or $\underline{\text{NATAN}}$.[5] The useful distinction
between "empty words" and "full words" goes back to the nineteenth
century.[6] Definition is difficult: "there is a complete intergrada-
tion from items which are almost purely structural markers, to ones
which have considerable lexical meaning."[7] It should also be noted
that this is a matter of context: $\underline{\text{NATAN}}$, for example, is virtually a

---

1. Cf. Deut. 33:7; I Sam. 2:1; II Sam. 22:42; Isa. 12:3; Jon. 2:10;
   Hab. 3:8; Lam. 5:8. Deletion of the subject occurs only in Lam. 2:22.
   On Gen. 49:18, see p. 179.
2. Cf. H.A. Gleason, Descriptive Linguistics, p. 193.
3. Cf. J. Lyons, op. cit., p. 137.
4. Cf. C.J. Fillmore, "The position of embedding transformations in a
   grammar", pp. 211ff. Other related terms are "insertion" (cf. N.
   Chomsky, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, p. 47) and "rankshift"
   (cf. M.A.K. Halliday, A. McIntosh and P. Strevens, Linguistic Sciences,
   pp. 27-9).
5. Other examples of the use of an empty verb in the register are Jud.
   15:18 and Ezr. 9:13 (NATAN). Cf. the use of PA AL in Ps. 74:12 and of
   HALAK in Ps. 80:3.
6. H. Sweet, A New English Grammar, p. 58.
7. H.A. Gleason, Descriptive Linguistics, p. 156.

function word in Jud. 15:18b, but in collocation with ʾEREṢ (e.g. Deut. 3:18) it has "considerable lexical meaning." In Jud. 15:18b the grammatical analysis would be as follows:

1. YHWH ∔ HOŠIAᶜ ∔ šimšon
2. YHWH → ʾatta
3. HOŠIAᶜ → NATAN TᵉŠUᶜA
4. ↦ → natatta TᵉŠUᶜA
5. → ʾet hattᵉšuᶜa haggᵉdola hazzot
6. šimšon → bᵉyad ᶜabdᵉka

Notice that 2, 4 and 6 are due to the embedding of the nominalization in a sentence addressed directly by Samson to YHWH, with the refinement that in 6, instead of -ni "me", the polite idiom ᶜabdᵉka "thy servant" has been preferred.[1] 3 involves the introduction of the empty verb NATAN "give", and 5 gives the reason for the nominalization, as we shall see in a moment.

A second example illustrates how, in place of an empty verb like NATAN or PAᶜAL, the nominalization may involve a verb with some appropriate meaning. In II Chron. 6:41 the corresponding verb is LABAŠ "wear vestments" which has an obvious aptness in the context:

1. YHWH ∔ HOŠIAᶜ ∔ KOHEN
2. YHWH → ∅
3. HOŠIAᶜ → NOŠAᶜ
4. → LABAŠ tᵉšuᶜa
5. → yilbᵉšu tᵉšuᶜa
6. KOHEN → kohᵃneyka

---

1. Cf. C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax, para. 22a.

The simple active-passive transformation is elaborated with poetic imagery, by the introduction in 4. of the verb LABAŠ.[1]

(3) While nominalization may be optional (as in the example just quoted), there are conditions under which it is obligatory.[2] A nominalization is required, for example, when the underlying structure is a complex one, consisting of the kernel structure (for instance, YHWH + HOŠIAᶜ + $NP_2$) plus a qualifier or a second kernel structure. Jud. 15:18b as we have seen, exemplifies the need for nominalization when a qualifier like GADOL "great" or ZE "this" comes into a relationship with the verb. In Old Testament Hebrew, as in English, an adjective cannot qualify a verb without nominalization.[3]

In Gen. 49:18, on the other hand, we must think in terms of a double underlying structure: A. YHWH + HOŠIAᶜ + $NP_2$ and B. $NP_1$ + QIWWA + 1ᵉ + YHWH. The analysis would be as follows:

A. 1. YHWH + HOŠIAᶜ + $NP_2$

2. YHWH → ka

3. HOŠIAᶜ → Yᵉ ŠUᶜA

4. → yᵉšuᶜatka

5. $NP_2$ → ∅

B. 6. $NP_1$ + QIWWA + 1ᵉ + YHWH

7. $NP_1$ + QIWWA → qiwwiti

8. YHWH → 1ᶜka

9. → lišuᶜatka

---

1. Cf. Ps. 132:9, on which see A.F. Kirkpatrick, Psalms, p. 767; A. Weiser, The Psalms, p. 781; H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, p. 877.
2. On this useful distinction, see p. 173.
3. Cf. II Sam. 22:51; Ezr. 9:13.

In this example, 2, 3 and 8 are due simply to the embedding of the transformation in direct speech addressed to YHWH.  9. illustrates how a nominalization (stage 3) combines A. and B.[1.]  Notice the deletion of the object in 5.[2.]

Another construction analysable in terms of a two-fold underlying structure is a type of construct-absolute relation to which the grammarians gave the name genetivus appositionis or genetivus epexegeticus:[3.]  e.g. musar šᵉlomenu "the chastisement that brought us weal" (Isa. 53:5).[4.]  There are many examples in the HOŠIAᶜ-field: to illustrate the transformational approach to this construction, let us take as an example the sentence ʾatta ṣur yᵉšuᶜati "Thou art the rock of my salvation" (cf. Ps. 89:27).  The parts of the two underlying structures are as follows:

A.  1.  YHWH  +  HAYA  +  ṢUR  +  $NP_2$[5.]

　　2.  YHWH  →  ʾatta

　　3.  $NP_2$  →  -i

　　4.  ṢUR  →  ṣuri　　　　　　(cf. Ps. 62:3, 7)

B.  5.  YHWH  +  HOŠIAᶜ  +  $NP_2$

　　6.  HOŠIAᶜ  →  Yᵉ ŠUᶜA　　　(YHWH  →  ∅)

　　7.  $NP_2$  →  -i

　　8.  Yᵉ ŠUᶜA  →  yᵉšuᶜati

　　9.　　　　　-  ṣur yᵉšuᶜati

---

1.  Cf. I Sam. 2:1;  Ezr. 9:8, 15.
2.  See p. 168.
3.  GK, para. 128k, p. q.
4.  Cf. Deut. 33:29b; II Sam. 22:3b, 36, 47; Isa. 12:2a, 3; Hab. 3:
18; I Chron. 16:35.
5.  HAYA is introduced since there is a slot for it in the kernel
structure.  The question of nominal sentences is not raised in
Chomsky's work.

2, 3, 4 and 7 are again simply due to the contextual fact that $NP_2$ is the speaker addressing YHWH. 8 is the nominalization required by the combination of the two parts A. and B., as we can see in stage 9. The retention of two verbal forms as in the English translation of the example from Isa. 53:5 above, makes the underlying structure plainer: thus we might have read ᵓatta haṣṣur hammošiaᶜ li "thou art the rock that saves/saved/will save me".[1] Isa. 12:2 is also to be included here:

yᵉšuᶜa yašit ḥomot waḥel

The two objects of the verb ŠIT "make a thing so and so", namely yᵉšuᶜa "salvation" and ḥomot waḥel "walls and a rampart", are in a similar relation to one another.[2] Lastly the unusual phrase markᵉboteyka yᵉšuᶜa "thy chariots of salvation" (Hab. 3:8) has parallels in the Old Testament and emendation is not necessary.[3]

(4) In nominalizations of the type just described, the tense of the underlying structure may be ambiguous. Not only may the subject or the object be deleted in a nominalizing transformation; but the morpheme indicating tense may also be deleted. This is no new problem, as we can see from the various translations of the phrase from Isa. 53 quoted above: "the chastisement designed for our peace" (future),[4] over against "the chastisement that brought us weal"

---

1. On tenses, see below.

2. The accusatives are described in traditional grammars as the object proper (ḥomot waḥel) and the "accusative of the product" (yᵉšuᶜa). Cf. A.B. Davidson. Hebrew Syntax, pp. 110f; GK, para. 117ii.

3. Cf. GK, para. 131r; C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax, para. 81c. BH emends the text; cf. F. Horst, Habakkuk, p. 182.

4. e.g. GK, 128q; J. Skinner, Isaiah XL - LXVI, p. 127; G.A.F. Knight, Deutero-Isaiah, pp. 233-5.

(past).[1] No solution is offered here; on the contrary, by rewriting these occurrences as functions of the lexeme HOŠIAᶜ, we are leaving the question of tense entirely open. It is only in connexion with the relation of consequence, that tense becomes crucial, and as we shall see, in the present analysis this relation is of minimal significance.[2] On the other hand, the practical advantages in isolating one common term underlying all the forms attested, are very great.

(5) Finally we come to the difficult question of optional transformations. The distinction already referred to between optional and obligatory was made in Syntactic Structures (1953), and although it is not kept up in Chomsky's later work, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax (1967), is nonetheless of practical value for the present study. Sometimes what may look at first sight like an optional transformation may turn out on closer examination to be nothing of the sort. In Ex. 15:2, for example, we must ask whether there is any semantic difference between the sentence wayᵉhi li lišuᶜa "(lit) and he was to me for a salvation" and wayyošaᶜ li "and he saved me" (cf. Ex. 14:30). Underlying both is the kernel structure YHWH + HOŠIAᶜ + $NP_2$; but is it possible to detect another element in the structure underlying the former? What is the semantic difference, if any, between HOŠIAᶜ + 1ᵉ and HAYA LIŠUᶜA Lᵉ? The answer seems to be that the latter lays more stress on the relationship between subject and object than the former,

1. e.g. RSV; A. Simon, A Theology of Salvation, pp. 210-14; C.R. North, The Second Isaiah, pp. 239f; C. Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja. Kapitel 40-66, p. 212.
2. Cf. J. Lyons, Structural Semantics, pp. 117f. See pp. 247f.

a relationship which is elaborated in the rest of the verse:  ze ᵓeli "this is my God".  There is in other words, a double structure underlying this nominalization too:

A.  YHWH  +  HOŠIAᶜ  +  NP$_2$

B.  YHWH  +  HAYA  +  L$^e$  +  NP$_2$

HAYA is not an empty verb;  it denotes the existence of a relationship between YHWH and NP$_2$.  The combination of A. and B. involves a nominalization, exactly as in (3) above, and we discover that this is not an optional transformation after all.[1]

A second case of an apparently optional nominalization is Jer. 3: 23:

ᵓaken baYHWH ᵓelohenu tešuᶜat yiśraᵓel

The kernel structure is again straightforward:  YHWH + HOŠIAᶜ + YIŚRAᵓEL. But what is the significance of the preposition ba in the nominalization? In a simple, optional nominalization one might expect laYHWH hayešuᶜa (cf. Ps. 3:9), with deletion of the object[2] and the introduction of the possessive la attached to the subject, just like the possessive (or subjective) suffix -ka on yešuᶜatka in direct speech.  The preposition b$^e$ on the other hand rarely indicates the agent,[3] and there is one other remarkable piece of evidence:  in the only two occurrences of baYHWH where YHWH is the subject of the underlying structure (Jer. 3: 23; Deut. 33:29), the verb involved is HOŠIAᶜ.  Elsewhere (83x) it is

1.  Other examples in the register are Isa. 12:2b; 33:2.  Cf. also Ps. 30:11, etc.

2.  See pp. 167f.

3.  GK, para. 121f.

the object of verbs like QIWWA "hope", ŚAMEAḤ "rejoice", ŠAʾAL
"consult", NIŠBAᶜ "swear" and ḤAṬAʾ "sin". This would suggest the pos-
sibility of semantic interference between HOŠIAᶜ and, let us say,
QIWWA, terms which are not infrequently related in Old Testament
Hebrew.[1] The equivalent nominal forms in English perhaps make this
point clearer: "Israel's hope is in the Lord" beside "Israel's
salvation is in the Lord." Of course, both in English and in Hebrew
the preposition could conceivably be locative (cf. Jos. 22:25, 27), or
else, in Hebrew, it might be beth essentiae (cf. Ex. 6:3).[2] But it
seems at least possible that there is an element in the meaning of
HOŠIAᶜ, arising perhaps out of its association with verbs of hoping
and trusting, which results in the curious fact that YHWH in these two
instances is both subject and object: subject of HOŠIAᶜ, and object of
an underlying verb, for example, QIWWA. Far from being an optional
nominalization, this too is a sentence generated from a double under-
lying structure.

One transformation remains to be discussed. The distinction
between YHWH lᵉ hošiᶜeni in Isa. 38:20 and YHWH hošiaᶜ li or YHWH
yošiᶜeni or the like is not clear. The suggestions "wird mich retten"
(tempus instans),[3] and "is ready to save me"[4] are little help, since
both could equally apply to the more regular yošiᶜeni. Others emend
the text.[5] For our purposes, the underlying structure YHWH + HOŠIAᶜ +

---

1. See p. 203.

2. On the various uses of this preposition in Old Testament Hebrew,
   see GK, para. 119h-q. A further possibility is suggested by Ugaritic
   b "from", on which see C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, pp. 95f;
   WUS, s.v., para. 3d.

3. C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax, para. 47.

4. GK, para. 114i. Cf. AV.

5. e.g. BH; J. Mauchline, Isaiah 1-39, p. 236.

$NP_2$ is not in doubt; and as to any other semantic element present in the sentence, we must remain agnostic for the time being.

The advantages of reducing all the occurrences of the root YŠ⁽ to a function of the verb HOŠIA⁽ are obvious, and the same is true for the other terms under discussion. But it must be stressed that this is a grammatical device, and it would be misleading to suggest that, for example, NATAN t⁽šu⁽a always means the same as HOŠIA⁽, or that LABAŠ y⁽šu⁽a is necessarily the passive of HOŠIA⁽. The transformational model implies some kind of semantic equivalence, but "congruence between grammatical and semantic 'transformational structure'" need not necessarily hold in every case.[1] The meaning of each item will be dealt with individually and in its context.

## 2. Frequency.

HOŠIA⁽ occurs 38x in the register, in contrast to HIṢṢIL, ⁽AZAR, and PILLEṬ, which each occur only 7x, and HILLEṢ and PARAQ which each occur only 1x. MILLEṬ and PAṢA do not occur at all in the register.[2] This overwhelming predominance of HOŠIA⁽ is too striking to be an accident due to the size of the sample, and is the first distinctive characteristic of the term over against the rest of the group.

Secondly, a stylistic distinction can be drawn between ⁽AZAR and the other terms. A glance at Table 1 will prove this: while HOŠIA⁽, HIṢṢIL, PILLEṬ, HILLEṢ and PARAQ occur mainly in the same four styles

---

1. Cf. J. Lyons, Structural Semantics, p. 128.
2. See Table 1.

(HITPALLEL, ṢAʿAQ, ŠĪR), ʿAZAR occurs only once in any of these styles, and that is Jud. 5:23, which is exceptional in other respects too, and most frequently in two styles in which HOŠĪAʿ is comparatively rare and the others are not attested at all (QARAʾ, BEREK). Again the consistency of this picture, even in a small sample, is remarkable, and provides us with a further distinction within the lexical group.

Finally, an interesting fact about HOŠĪAʿ is that apart from one exception,[1] it is the only member of the group that occurs in the prophets: Isaiah (8x), Jeremiah (5x), Hosea (1x), Jonah (1x) and Habakkuk (4x).

## 3. Nominalization.

Excluding the word mošiaʿ, since it may be either a noun or the participial form of the verb, no less than twenty out of the thirty-eight occurrences of HOŠĪAʿ are nominal transforms (yešaʿ, yᵉšuʿa, tᵉšuʿa).[2] This is in striking contrast to HIṢṢĪL, which occurs only in verbal forms, and this leads one to wonder whether the relative frequency of the two terms is partly a morphological matter. For instance, HIṢṢĪL is less likely to occur in the construct-absolute relation than HOŠĪAʿ, just because the corresponding nominal forms required by this construction (e.g. kobaʿ yᵉšuʿa) are not available for HIṢṢĪL. haṣṣala occurs only once in the Old Testament (Est. 4:14), and it may be plausibly suggested that yešaʿ, yᵉšuʿa, etc. on

---

1. Isa. 44:17 is an exception in other respects too, and convincingly proves the rule. See pp. 181, 193f.
2. See Table 1.

occasion serve as nominal transforms for HIṢṢIL as well as for HOŠIAᶜ. In this respect we may distinguish HIṢṢIL from ᶜAZAR and PILLEṬ as well, since they too occur frequently as nominal transforms. As distinct from HOŠIAᶜ, ᶜAZAR and PILLEṬ, the frequency of HIṢṢIL seems to be affected by the fact that it can only occur in contexts where nominalization is not required.

There is, however, another grammatical point of more direct relevance for a semantic description of these terms. Let us look again at HOŠIAᶜ. As we have seen, HOŠIAᶜ appears to be more likely to occur in collocation with metaphors like markᵉbot "chariots", magen "shield", qeren "horn" and ŠAᵓAB mayim mi-maᶜyan "draw water from a well", than HIṢṢIL. This has semantic implications: one might say, using Firth's language, that "one of the meanings" of HOŠIAᶜ is its collocability with magen "shield".[1] The collocational patterns available for HOŠIAᶜ, which has three nominal transforms, and also for ᶜAZAR and PILLEṬ, are elaborate and rich in contrast to HIṢṢIL. In other words the associative field of HOŠIAᶜ is, for purely grammatical reasons, much wider than that of HIṢṢIL.[2]

4. _Transitivity._ The next feature to be examined is transitivity, and a few preliminary remarks are necessary. Like other linguistic phenomena, transitivity is not to be considered a permanent feature of

---

1. _Papers in Linguistics. 1934-1951_, p. 196; and see below, pp. 191f.
2. See pp. 172f.

any particular lexical item: it too is bound to context. A verb may be used transitively or intransitively, as for example English stand; but this is not the same as saying that a particular verb is transitive or intransitive (sc. in every context).[1] Secondly, there is an important point about transitivity which was largely overlooked in the older text-books: some verbs are more transitive than others. It is possible to speak of degrees of transitivity. For example, build is more transitive than die, but less transitive than bring. The proof of this is a matter of probabilities: sentences like The house is building (intrans.) are less frequent than They are building the house (trans.). The words die and bring, on the other hand, represent almost total intransitivity and transitivity respectively.[2] As we shall see in a moment, HOŠIAᶜ seems to be less transitive than the other members of its lexical group; but since this is based on probabilities, the size of the sample must be borne in mind.

Only HOŠIAᶜ (9x), ᶜAZAR (1x) and PARAQ (1x) occur without an object,[3] but of these eleven cases only three can be taken as evidence for intransitive usage. Gen. 49:18 illustrates the reason for this: lišuᶜatka is a nominalization due to its combination with qiwwiti.[4] As we saw, the question of exactly what the underlying structure is cannot easily be answered. Is it YHWH HOŠIAᶜ (no object) or YHWH HOŠIA ∅ (object deleted in the transformation)? The same is

---

1. Cf. B.M.H. Strang, Modern English Structure, p. 73.
2. Cf. J. Lyons, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, p. 366.
3. See Table 3.
4. See pp. 168f.

true of HOSIA͑ in I Sam. 2:1, Isa. 12:3, Jon. 2:10, Hab. 3:8, and of ͑AZAR in Deut. 33:7. In all these cases the absence of an object may be due to a transformation rule.[1] There are also two instances of the construction ͗en + participle, in which the verbs concerned, HOSIA͑ (II Sam. 22:42) and PARAQ (Lam. 5:8), do not have an object. Again this cannot be taken as evidence for an intransitive usage, since in both cases the participles may be nouns ("but there was no Saviour"), and as such might involve the deletion of the object (like the nominalizations just discussed).[2]

HOSIA͑ , however, does occur three times in a simple verbal construction without an object: Jer. 14:9, Hab. 1:2 and II Chron. 20: 9. It is the only verb that occurs in this way, and this might suggest that in the doubtful cases quoted above HOSIA͑ in contrast to the others, is intransitive too. The greater intransitivity, then, of HOSIA͑ , is a distinguishing characteristic of this verb.[3]

5. The element of separation.

Another characteristic of all these items is their collocation, to a greater or lesser extent, with an adjunct of the form min "from" + NP. In this respect HISSIL is clearly distinguished from the others: for while min occurs only 4x with HOSIA͑ (out of 38x), and 1x with ͑AZAR and PILLET (out of 7x), it occurs almost every time with

---

1. See pp. 167f.
2. On the predominance of the verbal element in this construction, however, see GK, para. 152 o, and KB, s.v. ͗ayin, para. II.
3. Cf. BDB, s.v., where II Sam. 14:4; II Kings 6:26, etc., are quoted as examples of an intransitive usage.

HIŞŞIL.[1] The only two cases where min does not occur with HIŞŞIL
can be very satisfactorily explained as the result of interference
from HOŠIAᶜ :[2] in the first instance (Jud. 10:15) it occurs imme-
diately after, and in close relation with two occurrences of HOŠIAᶜ
(without min). When the same utterance occurs in another context (I
Sam. 12:10) in which HOŠIAᶜ does not occur, HIŞŞIL is followed imme-
diately by min (miyyad ʾoyᵉbenu "from the hand of our enemies").
The other case (Isa. 44:17) is a cultic cry addressed by an idolatrous
craftsman to his wooden image. Here the simple substitution of
haşşileni for hošiᶜeni is to avoid giving HOŠIAᶜ a subject other than
YHWH,[3] and gives an adequate explanation for the exceptional occur-
rence of HIŞŞIL without min.

HOŠIAᶜ on the other hand occurs most frequently (34x out of 38x)
without min (i.e. "absolutely"),[4] and this provides an important
semantic distinction between the two items HOŠIAᶜ and HIŞŞIL.[5] We
might speak of an "element of separation".[6] While all the items in
this lexical group contain an element of separation, this applies
above all to HIŞŞIL. HOŠIAᶜ is distinguished by the absence of this
element in most of the occurrences.[7]

These conclusions are confirmed by another piece of evidence.

---

1. See Table 4.
2. For the semi-technical term "interference", see above, pp. 127f.
3. See pp. 193f.
4. Cf. BDB, s.v.
5. The size of the register makes conclusions about the other terms
   in the group less reliable.
6. Cf. C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax, pp. 109f; and KB, s.v. min.
7. The notion of "semantic components" (or "sememes") may be relevant
   here. See especially W.H. Goodenough, "Componential analysis and the
   study of meaning"; J. Katz, "Recent issues in semantic theory." Cf.
   pp. 248f, below.

The terms which contract relations with HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc., in poetic structure, can be divided into two groups: (1) spatial, in which the element of separation is prominent; and (2) non-spatial, in which other elements, emotional, physiological, social, etc. are detectable.[1] Straightaway the distinction already detected between HOŠIAᶜ and HIṢṢIL is further clarified. Poetic structure brings the following purely spatial terms into relations with HIṢṢIL : HOṢIᵓ "bring out", ROMEM "lift up", MAŠA "draw out", LAQAH "take", QIBBEṢ "gather together". There is no instance of a non-spatial term entering into a relation with HIṢṢIL: and in every case the occurrence of min confirms the element of separation in the word.

HOŠIAᶜ, on the other hand, is related by poetic structure to eleven items, only two of which are spatial, namely, HIŠPIL "bring down" and QIBBEṢ "gather together". The other parallels present an entirely different picture: simple relations include ᶜANA "answer", ŠAMAᶜ "hear", RAPAᵓ "heal", NIDHAM "frightened", Zᶜ ROAᶜ "arm", HESED "love". Complex relations are contracted between HOŠIAᶜ and HATAᵓ "sin", QARAᵓ "call", QIWWA "hope" and SAMEAH "rejoice".[2] Among these only one is followed by min. There is thus an element in common to all the terms related to HIṢṢIL and this element is almost entirely lacking from those related to HOŠIAᶜ.[3] This distinction convincingly

1. See pp. 202f and Table 4. At this stage we are less concerned with defining the precise relations involved (pp. 186f ), than with noting their existence.

2. On the distinction between "simple" and "complex" relations, see pp. 185f.

3. This is the kind of statement involved in "componential analysis". See pp. 248f.

parallels the evidence of the incidence of the preposition min
"from".[1]

On the slender evidence afforded by the register, it would
appear that ḤILLEŠ is best grouped with HIṢṢIL at this stage, since
it is related to HOṢI᾽ "take out" and HIRḤIB "give room", both spatial
terms. ῾AZAR, with its parallels BEREK "bless" and GAʾA "triumph", on
the one hand, and HEBIʾ ᾽el ῾ammo "bring back to his people", on the
other, hardly exhibits any distinctive feature.

## 6. Meaning relations.

"The meaning of a given linguistic unit is defined to be the set
of (paradigmatic) relations that the unit contracts with other units of
the language in the context or contexts in which it occurs."[2] This
important definition has been chosen as the starting-point for the
main part of the present chapter. Now the meaning of HOŠIA῾, HIṢṢIL,
etc. is well known already to anyone with a knowledge of Hebrew; but
the precise definition of the meaning of these terms is far less
readily available. The method implied in the above definition is based
on certain relations contracted by the terms with each other and with
other terms in the same language. The term "paradigmatic" in the
definition is intended to exclude "syntagmatic" relations (i.e. those
between a term and the other items in its context), and confines the
analysis to relations between the term in question (e.g. hoši῾eni)

1. See above, pp. 180f.
2. J. Lyons, Structural Semantics, p. 59.

and all the other terms that can also occur in the same context (e.g. haṣṣileni, tᵉsaggᵉbeni, rᵉpaᵓeni). By analysing the (linguistic) contexts in terms of their underlying structure, we were able to identify paradigmatic relations involving HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc. with more precision than was evident in their surface structure; but this does not affect the nature of the relations.[1]

The phrase "of the language" in the definition immediately precludes the meaning relation most commonly used in dictionaries and commentaries, namely that between HOŠIAᶜ and "save", or between HIṢṢIL and "deliver" or between ᶜAZAR and "help". These important meaning-relations, on which the work of translation depends, are inadequate for precise description for several reasons: the cultural overlap between Hebrew and English, in particular that between Old Testament Hebrew and Modern Standard English, is too narrow to ensure any consistent one-to-one relation between items in one language and items in the other.[2] What is more, relations between terms within Hebrew are apt to be obscured in translation: e.g. that between HOŠIAᶜ "save" and tᵉšuᶜa "victory". One might add that if translation into English were an adequate method for defining the meaning of Old Testament Hebrew, the task would have been more than sufficiently completed already, and the present study rendered superfluous.

Another important relation that is commonly employed to define the meaning of an item is synonymy ("hoŠiaᶜ means the same as hiṣṣil").

---

1. See p. 176.
2. On the importance of the notion of cultural overlap for semantic theory, see J. Lyons, op. cit., p. 41.

Clearly this is not sufficiently precise for our purpose, since what we require are distinctions between such closely related words. It is only one among several meaning-relations. Widely accepted statements like "There are no real synonyms in a natural language,"[1] and confusion with "referential identity," must not be allowed to obscure the importance of synonymy. Like all meaning-relations synonymy must be bound to context[2] and this is the basis of our present analysis.

A context where meaning-relations are contracted in a peculiar way in Old Testament Hebrew, is the structure of Hebrew poetry. This represents a third, well-tried approach to the problem of defining the meaning of Old Testament Hebrew.[3] It depends on the fact that meaning-relations are contracted between lexical items in adjacent stichs or hemistichs. The term parallelismus membrorum is applied to this feature and it accounts for the majority of factors operating in Hebrew poetry.[4] A number of preliminary observations are necessary here.

In the first place a distinction must be made between simple and complex relations. In some cases the subjects of the terms in question are identical: for example, in I Chron. 16:35 the subject is YHWH throughout and the relation between the three terms HOŠIAᶜ, QIBBEṢ AND HIṢṢIL is thus a simple one. But let us look at Jer. 14:8:

---

1. e.g. E.A. Nida, Morphology, p. 151. Cf. S. Ullmann, The Principles of Semantics, pp. 96ff.

2. J. Lyons, op. cit., p. 74.

3. Both BDB and KB quote poetic parallels as aids to defining the meaning of Hebrew words.

4. See most recently, K. Koch, Was ist Formgeschichte?, pp. 101-4.

A.  miqwe yiśra'el                              "hope of Israel,

B.  mośi'o b͏ᵉ'et ṣara                          their mośia' in time of
                                                trouble."

Here the relation is between miqwe and mośi'o, but the subject of the
first is Israel (yiśra'el QIWWA b͏ᵃ YHWH), of the second YHWH (YHWH
HOSIA' yiśra'el). The relation between HOSIA' and QIWWA in this
verse is a complex one. Similarly in Isa. 64:4 there is a complex
relation between HATA' and HOSIA', since the subjects are different,
'anaḥnu for the former and YHWH for the latter.[1]

A second problem is that, while in the structure of Hebrew poetry
the existence of meaning-relations is never in doubt, the precise
nature of these relations is not dependent on the structure itself.
If, for example, synonymy were the only meaning-relation contracted in
poetic structure, semantic description would be considerably simpler.
There are however a number of different types of parallelismus
membrorum which can only be detected when the meaning of the terms
involved has already been fairly closely defined. Traditional terminol-
ogy includes alongside "synonymous parallelism", "antithetic",
"synthetic", "emblematic", "stairlike" and "introverted parallelism"
as well.[2] It is clear from this that the structure of Hebrew poetry,
while indicating that a meaning-relation exists between two or more
terms, does not provide a built-in definition of what relation it is,

1.  The meaning of the verse is obscure. Cf. C. Westermann, Das
Buch Jesaja. Kapitel 40-66, p. 310. But the relation between the
two verbs in parallel is unambiguous.

2.  See for example, S.R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of
the Old Testament, pp. 362-5; C.A. Briggs, Psalms, I pp. xxxiv-
xxxviii.

and cannot therefore be taken as a starting-point for semantic
description. It may be possible on occasion, as we have seen,[1] to
detect a common semantic element in many of the items associated by
poetic structure with a given term. But apart from this, poetic
parallels are of secondary importance for semantic description, as
confirmation, not independent definition.

Another point about poetic structure in Old Testament Hebrew
concerns the distinction, already referred to, between synonymy and
referential identity. Let us take an example of "synonymous paral-
lelism" along with an example of the modern English literary device
known as "elegant variation":

A.  "The Lord thundered from heaven,
     and the Most High uttered his voice"  (II Sam. 22:14).

B.  "The main philosophical influence was that of Immanuel
     Kant. The Koenigsberg master cannot himself be described
     as a Romantic, but was not unmoved by Rousseau."[2]

The Lord and the Most High refer to the same reality, just as Immanuel
Kant and the Koenigsberg master do; but this does not imply that they
are synonymous. It is referential identity here, rather than synonymy,
that is the basis on which the structure of the two passages depends.
The literary critical term, "synonymous parallelism", in other words
does not mean that a relation of synonymy necessarily holds between
every or any pair of terms in the two parallel members.

---

1.  See pp. 181-3.
2.  B.M.G. Reardon, Religious Thought in the Nineteenth Century
    (Cambridge, 1966), p. 5.

Another important meaning-relation, frequently occurring in so-called synonymous parallelism, is hyponymy.[1] The following is quoted as a case of synonymous parallelism:

"He has prepared his deadly weapons
  making his arrows fiery shafts" (Ps. 7:13).[2]

The relation between weapons and arrows, however, is hyponymy, not synonymy; arrow is a hyponym of weapon. Strictly speaking RAPA° "heal" is a hyponym of HOŠIA͜ᶜ, not a synonym, in a verse like Jer. 17: 14:

r°pa°eni YHWH w°erape°
hoši°eni w°°iwwaše°a.

That is to say, X RAPA° Y implies X HOŠIA͜ᶜ Y, but not conversely, since HOŠIA͜ᶜ may denote, not only physical healing, but also forgiveness and material help. The relation between HOŠIA͜ᶜ and many of the terms in its associative field can be defined as hyponymy.[3] In poetic structure, however, the problem is more complex. The example just quoted involves not only referential identity, but also a type of semantic intereference[4] whereby RAPA° takes on, in this context, a metaphorical meaning definable, after all, in terms of a synonymous relationship to HOŠIA͜ᶜ. In other words, poetic structure sometimes blurs the distinction between hyponymy and synonymy, and hinders rather than helps definition.

---

1. See J. Lyons, Structural Semantics, pp. 69-71. Scarlet is a hyponym of red, tulip a hyponym of flower, τέκτων a hyponym of δημιουργός.
2. C.A. Briggs, Psalms, I, p. xxxv.
3. See p. 140.
4. See p. 127.

Reference is the relation that holds between a lexical item
and an extra-lingual feature (referent):  for example, in Jud. 15:18,
HOŠIA<sup>c</sup> is applied by the speaker (Samson) to a recent event in his
experience, namely his victory over the Philistines, and the relation
of reference is established by the demonstrative zot "this".  Ezra
9:13 is another example in which PILLET is directly applied to a
known extralingual feature, namely, the return from exile.  The problem
of exactly what situation an utterance refers to has been dealt with at
some length in an earlier chapter.[1]  In Jon. 2, II Sam. 22 and some of
the Psalms, many of the lexical items can be partially defined in terms
of their referents in particular situations, specified in the context
of the utterance.[2]  A second problem arises from the first:  often the
speaker, beginning from his immediate situation (e.g. "the day when the
Lord delivered him from the hand of all his enemies and from the hand
of Saul" (II Sam. 22:1), meditates on the wider aspects of his expe-
rience.  This generalizing process is an important element in doxolog-
ical language, and has resulted in the almost unlimited applicability
of religious texts like the Psalms.[3]  II Sam. 22 is a good example:
in the first place vv. 26-31 are a meditation on God's protection of
those in need, which is clearly intended to be of wider application
than the incidents referred to in the introductory sentence.  But
secondly the introductory sentence itself seems to suggest that the
compiler was aware of the general applicability of this song:  the

1.  See above, pp. 18-20.
2.  See above, pp. 56, 83.
3.  See above, pp. 22f.

incident in the Song is not just David's escape from Saul, but also
his escape "from all his enemies." Thus meḥamas tošiaᶜ, for instance,
(v. 3) is applied to more than one incident in David's life.  Finally
this utterance is taken right out of its context in the narrative of
II Samuel, and included in the Book of Psalms, which in itself sug-
gests that a word like HOŠIAᶜ is applied both to an extra-lingual
feature in the immediate situation as described in the text, and in
the wider experience not only of David but also of other members of
the religious community to which he belonged.  We can thus distinguish
between direct reference, in which a unit is applied specifically by
a speaker to one identifiable extralingual feature, and indirect ref-
erence, in which a unit is applied more generally.  But it must be
remembered that in cases of indirect reference, the immediate situation
(or features in the immediate situation) may also be included in the
application.  The immediate situation, in other words, may be
considered as an example of the general statement, and as such may
provide important referents.

Examples of consequence and implication will illustrate their
use, and the terminology associated with them.  In II Sam. 22:50 the
particle ᶜal-ken "therefore" brings HIṢṢIL into a (complex) relation
of consequence with HODA "give thanks":

> me ʾiš ḥamasim taṣṣileni
> ᶜal ken ʾodka YHWH

HODA is the consequent in this relationship, and HIṢṢIL the anteced-
ent.[1]  An example of implication[2] occurs in Isa. 44:17, where the

---

1.  Cf. J. Lyons, Structural Semantics, pp. 117-9.
2.  Id., pp. 87-9.

particle ki "for" brings ʾel "god" into a (simple) relation of implication with HIṢṢIL: haṣṣileni ki ʾeli ʾatta. Both HIṢṢIL and ʾel are predicates of YHWH related to one another by the particle ki. There is no antecedent or consequent here, either in a temporal or a logical sense, and the prayer depends on the relation. In Eᴢr. 9:15 the relation is the same, but the order reversed: ṣaddiq ʾatta ki nišʾarnu pᵉleta. ṣaddiq and PILLEṬ are brought into a relation of implication by the particle ki. Both are predicates of YHWH again, they are not synonyms, and in this case PILLEṬ comes second, unlike the other example.

Collocation has been described as the "basic formal pattern into which lexical items enter,"[1] and Firth's oft-quoted statement that "one of the meanings of dark is its collocability with night"[2] has been applied in some subsequent theory as though it were the only adequate meaning-relation.[3] Collocation is, of course, a syntagmatic relation, and therefore by definition excluded from the present analysis.[4] In any case since it is entirely a matter of probabilities (e.g. "We are more likely to find HOŠIAᶜ in the same utterance as the name YHWH, than šinnayim "teeth" and ʾapa "cook"), its adequacy as a semantic principle will be minimal in a sample of the size of the one we are working with.

1. M.A.K. Halliday, A. McIntosh and P. Strevens, Linguistic Sciences, p. 33.
2. Papers in Linguistics 1934-1951, p. 196.
3. This is true of the Lexis experiment and is possibly the reason for its lack of positive results so far. See D. Crystal, Linguistics, Language and Religion, pp. 87-9; J. Sinclair, "Beginning the Study of Lexis."
4. See p. 183.

There is however one type of collocation in Old Testament Hebrew which, while it is analysable as a syntagmatic relation in the surface structure of the sentence, may be rewritten as a paradigmatic one in its underlying structure. I refer to those construct-absolute relations mentioned above, to which the grammarians apply the term genetivus epexegeticus or appositionis.[1.] In expressions like ṣur yᵉšuᶜati or qeren yᵉšuᶜa, the paradigmatic relation between HOŠIAᶜ and ṣur or qeren depends, like all metaphors, on a natural semantic connection or similarity between the two terms. But this connection is a loose one and one that scarcely assists definition. Indeed, when we have noted that HOŠIAᶜ enters more frequently into this kind of relation and has consequently a richer associative field than the other members of its group,[2.] we have virtually exhausted the information provided by collocation as a meaning-relation.

(1) Reference. In the basic sentence A HOŠIAᶜ B min C bᵉD, A, B, C and D all give the verb HOŠIAᶜ a specific context of situation, in which lexical items are related to realities identifiable from the text. In two cases the verb itself is given a specific referent by the speaker:[3.] in Jud. 15:18 ᵓet hattᵉšuᶜa hazzot is applied directly by the speaker to an identifiable event described in the preceding passage, namely, Samson's single-handed victory over the Philistines; and in Ezr. 9:13 pᵉleta kazzot is specifically applied to Israel's

---

1. See above, pp. 171f.
2. See pp. 177f.
3. See above, pp. 189f.

return from exile in the days of Ezra. Direct application by the speaker is rare, but in these two cases a clear relation of reference exists between HOŠIAᶜ and the activity of YHWH in an identifiable situation, and between PILLEṬ and the activity of YHWH in another equally identifiable situation. The relation is more frequently established, however, for the subject, object and adjuncts of the verb, and this in turn puts the verb in a situational context in terms of which its meaning can be further defined.[1]

A. Only once does HOŠIAᶜ occur with a subject other than YHWH and this is Hos. 14:4, where the idea that Assyria should be the subject of the verb is repudiated by the speaker. The utterance is a pledge to turn again to the God of Israel:

ʾaššur loʾ yošiʿenu ʿal sus loʾ nirkab.[2]

HOŠIAᶜ is never applied to the activity of anyone other than YHWH.

HISSIL , on the other hand, is found in an idolater's prayer to his wooden image in Isa. 44:17. If, as we have just suggested, HOŠIAᶜ is properly not applied to subjects other than the God of Israel, it would be natural to find examples of the intentional avoidance of the application of HOŠIAᶜ to one other than YHWH.[3] The implication of this would be that HISSIL is of more general application than HOŠIAᶜ , and this is a conclusion confirmed by the rest of the Old Testament. In language addressed to a deity, however, HISSIL

---

1. See Table 5.
2. Cf. W.R. Harper, _Amos and Hosea_, p. 412; H.W. Wolff, _Hosea_, pp. 304f.
3. See also p. 121.

is never applied to the activity of a human being.

ᶜAZAR is applied, even in language addressed to God, to human activity (Jud. 5:23). Here the subject is Meroz, one of Israel's allies. The verse indicates that it would have been right for Meroz to be the subject of ᶜAZAR , and the fact that Meroz did not do so is held up as a reproach. This distinguishes the verb from HOŠIAᶜ, a distinction forcibly confirmed by an examination of its occurrence outside the register as well.[1] The distinction may be described as a stylistic one, but it is nonetheless a real one and essential to a definition of the meaning of these words. In the register HOŠIAᶜ is reserved for the activity of the God of Israel, HIṢṢIL for divine agents in general, and ᶜAZAR is of more general application than either.

B. The other verbs occur only with God as subject. In almost every instance the object of verbs in this group is the speaker or the speaker's community. The speakers themselves are Jacob, Samson, David, Hezekiah, Jeremiah, Jonah, Habakkuk and Hannah; the community is described variously as Israel, Judah, Joseph, Jeshurun and even, on one exceptional occasion, YHWH (sc. the army of YHWH) (Jud. 5:23).[2] There are two exceptions: (1) HOŠIAᶜ is applied to officials in Israel, namely, mašiah "the anointed one" (Hab. 3:13), melek "king" (II Sam. 22:51) and kohᵃnim "priests" (II Chron. 6:41); (2) twice

---

1. See pp. 212-4.

2. Cf. J. Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, p. 291.

the object consists of a description rather than an identification: ͨam ͨani "the poor people" (as victims of injustice) (II Sam. 22:28) and goy ṣaddiq "a righteous nation" (Isa. 26:1f).

The verbs are without exception applied to the fate of the speaker, his own community or certain elements in it. Where any further definition of the object is given, it refers to the political or spiritual elite of the community.

C. As has already been demonstrated, most of these words occur at least once with min-: it remains to examine the content of these prominent items. In the table both direct and indirect referents are included, the latter in brackets. In every case the adjunct refers to the enemies or adversaries of the speaker(s). Where they are not specifically named, the reference is made clear in the introductory formula (e.g. II Sam. 22) or the immediate context (II Kings 19:19). In two cases the word ḥamas appears in collocation with HOŠIAͨ and HIṢṢIL, and here the reference is not merely a situation of danger at the hand of the enemy, but a situation of injustice.

Separation from enemies or other opponents, sometimes described as unjust, is a semantic element common to all the verbs in this group. There is no example of the converse, i.e. separation from friends or a situation of justice.

One final point in this connexion is that only HOŠIAͨ occurs with an impersonal min-adjunct, namely meḥamas (II Sam. 22:3). All the other adjuncts in the list are persons.

D.   There are a number of modifiers which have a specific referent in the situational context of the utterance.  The extralingual referents are deduced from the linguistic environment.[1]  When a temporal reference is made it is invariably to a crisis in the experience of the speaker(s).  Other references are to the scale of the action described (its impressive nature is emphasised in two cases) or to the emotions which accompany it (e.g. rejoicing).

ᶜAZAR is further distinguished from the others in its application to the activity of human warriors.  The reference in II Chron. 14: 10 is apparently to the situation of the weak confronted by a vast horde of foreign invaders.  This aspect of the battle (580,000 Israelites under Asa versus one million Ethiopians and 300 chariots) is undoubtedly highlighted, but not to the same extent as, for example, the "day of Midian", Samson's single-handed victory over the Philistines or Jerusalem's miraculous escape from Sennacherib in 701 B.C.[2]  The reference to the weak, however, agrees with the special mention of ᶜam ᶜani in II Sam. 22:28.[3]

(2) Opposition.  Opposition between lexical items, contracted either by the poetic structure of the utterance, or by some other syntactic structure in the sentence, is the simplest and most direct relation.[4]

---

1.   See above, pp. 18-20.
2.   Isa. 9:3 (referring to Jud. 7);   Jud. 15;   II Kings 19.
3.   Cf. p. 195.
4.   Cf. p. 131, note 1.

It clearly excludes from the meaning of each member of the pair certain semantic elements. The other relations, synonymy, implication, consequence and the like, are often difficult to determine, although the existence of one or other of them is, in the context in question, indisputable. For example, while it is easy to identify the opposition between HOŠIAᶜ and HIŠPIL in II Sam. 22:28, the exact nature of the relation between HOŠIAᶜ and ŠAMAᶜ "hear" in Hab. 1:2 is not so easy to define: that there is a meaning-relation there is established by the poetic structure; but is it a relation of synonymy HOŠIAᶜ means the same as ŠAMAᶜ here)? or implication ( ŠAMAᶜ implies HOŠIAᶜ )? or consequence ( HOŠIAᶜ is a result of ŠAMAᶜ)? All these are structurally possible in the context; but it is hard to define which is semantically correct. For this reason, the method adopted here is to analyse the examples of opposition first, and then to examine the other meaning-relations together in the hope of differentiating them more precisely.

The clearest example of direct opposition is the one already referred to in II Sam. 22:28:

A.  weᶜet ᶜam ᶜani tošiaᶜ

B.  wᵉᶜeneka ᶜal ramim tašpil

Just as the respective objects of A and B "the poor (i.e. innocent)"[1] and the "arrogant", are opposed to one another, the verbs can be sharply distinguished. An action described by the word HOŠIAᶜ is not

---

1.  Cf. H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, pp. 82f.

the same as one described by the word HIŠPIL . In Jud. 15:18 there is an opposition between HOŠIAᶜ and MUT "die". This is a complex relation (i.e. the subjects of the two verbs are different). The adversative use of wᵉᶜatta "but now" establishes the relation and notice how the opposition is further developed in the word NAPAL "fall":

wᵉnapalti bᵉyad haᶜarelim.

The relation between HOŠIAᶜ and nidham "frightened" in Jer. 14:9 is one of opposition as the negative particle loᵓ indicates:

A.  lamma tihye kᵉᵓiš nidham

B.  kᵉgibbor loᵓ yukal lᵉhosiaᶜ .

If X is frightened, he cannot be subject of the verb HOŠIAᶜ .

The interrogative form of Isaiah 64:4b probably establishes a relation of opposition between HOŠIAᶜ and QAṢAP "be angry":

A.  hen ᵓatta qaṣapta wannehṭaᵓ

B.  bahem ᶜolam wᵉniwwašeaᶜ.

If X is angry, how can he be subject of HOŠIAᶜ ?[1].

In Jer. 3:23 the opposition between šeqer and HOŠIAᶜ is best described in terms of the underlying structure:

A.  haggᵉbaᶜot +laššeqer

B.  YHWH+HOŠIAᶜ + ᵓet-yisraᵓel.

šeqer and HOŠIAᶜ are opposed just as YHWH and haggᵉbaᶜot (i.e. heathen high-places).[2]. A similar opposition is contracted between ᶜAZAR and

---

1.  See p.182 , note 1.

2.  The syntax is difficult, but not "unverständlich"(W. Rudolph, Jeremia, p. 26; cf. A.W. Streane, Jeremiah, p. 27). The oppositions defined here are never in doubt. On gᵉbaᶜot in contexts of heathen cultic practice, cf. Deut. 12:2; I Kings 14:23; II Kings 17:10 (BDB, s.v.).

KAHAŠ "cringe" in Deut. 33:29.

HOŠIAᶜ then, is opposed to the downfall of the arrogant, the death of Samson, the helplessness of a frightened warrior, the anger of an unsympathetic God and the deluding practices of heathen sanctuaries. These relations may be further grouped according to whether they concern the subject or the object of the verb: (1) the subject is not frightened, he is not angry, he is not a delusion; (2) the object is not thrown down, does not die, does not fall.

(3) Other meaning-relations. In Deut. 33:29a a relation of consequence is established by asyndeton between HOŠIAᶜ and ʾašre:

A.  ʾašre yiśraʾel

B.  mi kamoka ᶜam nošaᶜ bᵃ YHWH

The happiness of Israel is the consequence of the structure YHWH+ HOŠIAᶜ + ʾet +yiśraʾel.

With this can be grouped a number of other passages in which a relation of consequence exists between the terms and various related expressions describing singing and praising God: e.g.

A.  umoṣiʾi meʾoyᵉbay umiqqamay tᵉromemeni meʾiš hamasim taṣṣi leni

B.  ᶜal ken ʾodka YHWH baggoyim ulᵉᵛšimka ʾazammer (II Sam. 22:49f).

The particle ᶜal ken "therefore" identifies the relation of HOṢIʾ, ROMEM and HIṢṢIL to HODA "give thanks" and ZIMMER "sing".[1] In this respect HOŠIAᶜ and HIṢṢIL clearly agree.

A second recurring consequence is peace and security: e.g.

---

1.  Cf. Isa. 38:20; I Chron. 16:35.

A.  hinne ʾel yᵉšuᶜati

B.  ʾebṭaḥ wᵉloʾ ʾephad.  (Isa. 12:2a)

Asyndeton again indicates the relation between YHWH+HOŠIAᶜ+ li (under-

lying ʾel yᵉšuᶜati) and ʾebṭaḥ wᵉloʾ ʾephad "I will trust and not be

afraid."  A similar relation occurs in I Sam. 12:10f between HIṢṢIL

and BAṬAḤ.

These relationships, however, although they admit of fairly

precise definition, do not shed very much light on the content of the

verbs under examination.  In the first place they provide no distinc-

tions as between one verb and another:  all can be related to expres-

sions of rejoicing and security.  Secondly statements of the form "A

+ B + C result in X" actually tell us more about X than about A, B

and C.  Slightly more precise information about A, B and C can be

obtained from the examination of another meaning-relation, namely

implication.

It will be remembered that a characteristic of HITPALLEL-utterances

is the motive-clause introduced by the particle ki:  e.g.

haṣṣileni  ki  ʾeli  ʾatta  (Isa. 44:17).[1]

The efficacy of such a motive-clause depends on a relation between the

verb in the imperative and a statement about YHWH, a relation best

described as one of implication. If X is Y, then X HOŠIAᶜ, can be

expressed in the form Y implies HOŠIAᶜ.  This relation exists between

HIṢṢIL and ʾel "god" in the passage just quoted, and between HOŠIAᶜ

and ʾelohim "god" in II Kings 19:19, a fact which confirms the evidence

---

1.  See above, p. 55.

discussed above under Reference.[1.] To these two examples can be added

passages where the uniqueness of the relation is the point at issue:

    A.  <u>ʾen</u> <u>kaʾel</u> <u>yešurun</u>

    B.  <u>rokeb</u> <u>šamayim</u> <u>bᵉ ᶜezreka</u>  (Deut. 33:26).

The relation of implication is between <u>ʾen</u> <u>kaʾel</u> <u>yešurun</u> "there is

none like El, O Jeshurun" and <u>ʾel</u> + <u>ᶜAZAR</u> + <u>ka</u> (underlying <u>ᶜezreka</u>).

Deut. 33:29a provides another case of uniqueness in a relation between

YHWH and <u>HOŠIAᶜ</u>, but here the uniqueness refers, not to the subject

YHWH, but to the object Israel:[2.]

    <u>mi kamoka</u>

    <u>ᶜam nošaᶜ bᵃYHWH.</u>

Another case of implication in a motive-clause is Ezr. 9:15,

where <u>PILLET</u> is related to <u>ṣaddiq</u> "righteous". The soteriological

application of <u>sedeq</u> in Old Testament Hebrew is well-known:[3.] it is

interesting to have this confirmed here for <u>ṣaddiq</u> as well. Notice

that it is not the justice of YHWH that is related to <u>PILLET</u>: on the

contrary the prayer of Ezra makes it plain that the people have not

been dealt with according to strictly just principles. <u>ṣaddiq</u>, in

other words, has a soteriological application here and little connexion

with lawcourt justice.[4.]

---

1.  See pp. 193f.

2.  See pp. 185f on complex relations.

3.  See for example, C.R. North, <u>The Second Isaiah</u>, pp. 93, 208f; D.
Hill, <u>Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings</u>, pp. 86-92, 97f.

4.  Cf. Isa. 45:21; Ps. 116:5. On the relation between the original
meaning of a word and a new meaning, see above, p. 117; S. Ullmann,
<u>The Principles of Semantics</u>, p. 174; D. Hill, <u>loc. cit.</u>, p. 98.

Another ki-clause brings the sentence YHWH t$^c$hillati "the Lord is my praise" into a relation of implication with YHWH+HOŠIA$^c$+n+i (Jer. 17:14). The relation is a complex one: it is between HILLEL "praise" (subject speaker) and HOŠIA$^c$ (subject YHWH).[1]

The following meaning-relations are contracted by the poetic structure:

A. yiš$^c$u w$^e$$^ɔ$en mošia$^c$

B. $^ɔ$el YHWH w$^e$lo$^ɔ$ $^c$anam (II Sam. 22:42).

A. $^c$ad $^ɔ$ana$^ɔ$ YHWH šiwwa$^c$ti welo$^ɔ$ tišma$^c$

B. $^ɔ$ez$^c$aq $^ɔ$eleka ḥamas w$^e$lo$^ɔ$ tošia$^c$ (Hab. 1:2).[2]

It has already been suggested that the activity described by the word HOŠIA$^c$ is less physical than the other members of the group,[3] and that the idea of physical separation is less prominent in HOŠIA$^c$ than in the others.[4] We now have the two passages just quoted, in which HOŠIA$^c$ is related to "answer" and "hear". In II Sam. 22:36 there is another instance of this where $^c$ANA occurs in poetic parallelism with HOŠIA$^c$. These are traditionally described as relations of synonymy (synonymous parallelism), but clearly this depends on a number of imponderables: is $^c$ANA used here simply in the sense of answering? Or has it a forensic application of "testify in a court of law."?[5]

---

1. Duhm's emendation toḥalti "my hope", which fits the Lament-form better and is recommended by Rudolph (Jeremia, p. 106; cf. BH), is unnecessary. Cf. Ps. 109:1.
2. Cf. II Chron. 20:19.
3. See pp. 180f.
4. See pp. 182f.
5. On the occurrence of $^c$ANA in the HOŠIA$^c$-field, denoting "help" (literally, "testify on behalf of"), see above, p. 119. Cf. also H. W. Hertzberg, I & II Samuel, p. 390. Other suggestions are to emend the text (BH), or to take the word in the sense "dein Antworten, dein Orakel" (H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen, p. 139). On the difficulty of defining relations contracted in poetry, see pp. 186ff.

Whatever the conclusion reached on this question, there is little doubt that HOŠIAᶜ is more closely related to these words, ᶜANA, ŠAMAᶜ, etc. than any of the other words in the group.

This conclusion is further justified when we consider another word related to HOŠIAᶜ in more than one passage, but not to any of the others, namely QIWWA "hope". Jer. 14:8 is an example:

miqwe yiśra'el

mošiᶜo beᶜet ṣara.

The complex relationship between QIWWA (underlying miqwe) and HOŠIAᶜ (underlying mošiᶜo) is contracted by the poetic structure. Again, as in the case of the other parallels ᶜANA "answer" and ŠAMAᶜ "hear", mošiᶜo seems to denote not so much actual physical intervention as readiness to intervene.[1] The same is true, finally, of RAPA' "heal" beside HOŠIAᶜ in Jer. 17:14. Again the meaning-relation between the two words suggests that HOŠIAᶜ denotes general health, physical and spiritual, rather than actual separation from a particular enemy or danger.[2]

---

1. Cf. "What was a Mošiaᶜ?", p. 482.
2. See also p. 182.

# V.   DEFINITION

The principle with which we began was that the meaning of a
word varies according to who is uttering it, who is understanding it
and in what kind of situation.  A preliminary examination of the
situational context of Old Testament Hebrew showed that HOSIA͑ has
meaning in a variety of distinguishable contexts of situation.  It
was decided, in the interests of precision, to limit our terms of
reference, and select one situational context for synchronic descrip-
tion.  The ultimate justification of this approach is that it re-
presents a stage in the enquiry which must precede the historical
approach, insofar as the latter depends on the synchronic description
of each stage in the word's development.  Etymological data, in other
words, are only of value after a synchronic description has discovered
the meaning of the word in its context.  We began, therefore, with the
synchronic description of the meaning of HOSIA͑, HISSIL, etc. in one
carefully defined context.[1]

It remains to correlate the results of this, and then complete
the description with a historical analysis of the semantic development
of these words, so far as it can be traced.  In accordance with the
principle already expressed,[2] the method of description is in terms of
oppositions.

---

1.  See Chapters I and II;  for the notation "HOSIA͑, HISSIL, etc.,"
 as applied to a lexical group or field, see p. 131 .
2.  See p. 131.

1. Synchronic description.[1]

(a) HOŠIAᶜ is distinguished from HIṢṢIL in the following respects:

1. Frequency. HOŠIAᶜ is 5x more frequent than HIṢṢIL. There are indications that HOŠIAᶜ is the proper word for use in language addressed to the God of Israel: on occasion HIṢṢIL is used to avoid an improper usage. HIṢṢIL does not normally occur in the Prophets; HOŠIAᶜ on the other hand is most common there.

2. Nominalization. While there are no nominalizing transforms of HIṢṢIL in the register (and only one in Old Testament Hebrew), HOŠIAᶜ has four which occur regularly: yešaᶜ, yᵉšuᶜa, tᵉšuᶜa, mošiaᶜ. 50% of the recorded occurrences of HOŠIAᶜ are nominalizing transforms. This sets it apart from HIṢṢIL in a number of ways: (i) HOŠIAᶜ occurs very frequently in metaphorical expressions like qeren yᵉšuᶜati "the horn of my salvation", maᶜayane hayᵉšuᶜa "wells of salvation". HIṢṢIL is never found in this type of construction. The associative field of HIṢṢIL is therefore much poorer in metaphorical expressions than that of HOŠIAᶜ. (ii) A similar and related result of this phenomenon is the application of qualifiers like gadol "great" to HOŠIAᶜ, but not to HIṢṢIL. Both these observations suggest that the semantic range of HOŠIAᶜ is wider and more colourful than that of HIṢṢIL.

3. Transitivity. HOŠIAᶜ admits of an intransitive usage at least 3x in the register (8%) and possibly as many as 9x (25%); HIṢṢIL is

---

1. Percentages are approximate. References are not given since every item was discussed in detail in the previous chapter.

not found without an object. One has the impression that in a number
of contexts HOSIA᷄ᶜ is semantically closer to English intransitive
"intervene", than "save" or "help".

4. <u>Element of Separation.</u> HIṢṢIL is accompanied almost invariably
by the preposition <u>min</u>, and where it is not, there are reasons for
postulating an exceptional usage there. HOSIA᷄ᶜ, in contrast, occurs
in this kind of collocation in less than 10% of its total incidence in
the register. In other words while HIṢṢIL regularly involves the
separation of one object from another, HOSIA᷄ᶜ normally denotes an
action complete in itself, involving no idea of separation.

Separation, indicated by a following <u>min</u>, is present in all
seven verbs in this lexical group, but that it is much more prominent
in HIṢṢIL than in HOSIA᷄ᶜ is confirmed by the evidence of the items
associated with them. For example, while RAPA᷄ "heal", ᶜANA "answer,
testify", SAMA᷄ᶜ "hear", and the like are associated with HOSIA᷄ᶜ, items
associated with HIṢṢIL are commonly spatial terms like HOṢI᷄ "bring
out", ROMEM "lift up", MASA᷄ "draw out" and LAQAH "take".

5. <u>Divine application.</u> There is evidence that HOSIA᷄ᶜ is one of
that small group of "disinfected" words (cf. BARA᷄ "create"), properly
applied only in contexts where YHWH is subject, its application in any
other context being consciously avoided or explicitly condemned. One
word used to avoid an improper usage is HIṢṢIL and this provides
another distinctive feature of HOSIA᷄ over against HIṢṢIL. A relation
of implication which holds between the name of a deity and both HOSIA᷄ᶜ
and HIṢṢIL further confirms this distinction, since the deity involved

in the first case is the God of Israel, in the second a wooden idol.

(b) HOŠIAᶜ is distinguished from ᶜAZAR in the following ways:

1. Frequency. HOŠIAᶜ is 5x more frequent than ᶜAZAR. Furthermore HOŠIAᶜ and ᶜAZAR are stylistically distinct as well: while HOŠIAᶜ occurs most frequently in HITPALLEL- and ŠIR-utterances (50%), ᶜAZAR never occurs in a HITPALLEL-utterance, and only once in a ŠIR-utterance where it is exceptional in other respects. On the other hand it occurs most frequently in BEREK- and QARAᵓ-utterances, in which HOŠIAᶜ is very rare (5% and 2½% respectively).

2. Divine application. HOŠIAᶜ is applied properly only to the activity of the God of Israel; ᶜAZAR is the only member of this subgroup that occurs, even in language addressed to God, with a human subject.

(c) HOŠIAᶜ has the following features in common with ᶜAZAR against HISSIL:

1. Nominalization. ᶜAZAR has two common nominal transforms: ᶜezer and ᶜezra. More than 50% of the occurrences of ᶜAZAR in the register are nominal transforms. The expression magen ᶜezri "the shield of my help" brings ᶜAZAR and HOŠIAᶜ into a semantic association over against HISSIL, and indicate the richer associative field against which ᶜAZAR too, must be viewed.

2. Element of Separation. Unlike HISSIL, ᶜAZAR is followed only 1x (14%) by min. The possibility of semantic interference in this instance is possible: that is to say, it may be that in ᶜAZAR the

separation-component is virtually absent, and that it is only by
virtue of its association with HOSIA͜ᶜ that this component is present
to a limited degree (cf. RIB, ŠAPAT, etc.)[1]. However that may be,
in this important respect, HOSIAᶜ is closer, semantically, to ͜ᶜAZAR
than its more frequent poetic associate, HISSIL.

(d) HISSIL is distinguished from ͜ᶜAZAR in the following ways:

1. Frequency. Although both occur with the same frequency in
the register, their stylistic distribution is quite different: HISSIL
does not occur in the two styles in which ͜ᶜAZAR occurs most frequently.
The one occurrence of ͜ᶜAZAR in a style in which HISSIL also occurs is
exceptional.

2. Nominalization. HISSIL is distinguished both from ͜ᶜAZAR and
from HOSIA͜ᶜ in this respect. The result of this has already been sug-
gested, namely a certain poverty in the semantic range of HISSIL over
against the other two.

3. Element of Separation. HISSIL stands apart from both ͜ᶜAZAR
and HOSIAᶜ in its almost exclusive collocation with a min-adjunct, a
feature comparatively rare with both the other two. The element of
separation is much more prominent in HISSIL.

(e) MILLET, PILLET, HILLES, PARAQ and PASA are less frequent than the
others. PASA does not occur at all in the register, MILLET only in
conversational style. Both PILLET and PARAQ are followed by min-

---

1. See pp. 127-9.

adjuncts, proving the existence of an element of separation in both, but other than this the evidence of our register is insufficient to base any further semantic conclusions.

## 2. Historical description.

Enough has already been said on the subject of confusion as between the historical approach to linguistic description and the synchronic approach. The two levels of analysis must be kept distinct, and this has been done throughout the present work. The prehistory of a word, however, may be a valuable source of information on its meaning in a particular context; and its subsequent historical development, too, may tell us something of its meaning or help us to understand some problematical feature of its application in a particular context. Thus while the meaning of HOSIA has been scrutinised as it is applied in a particular register and in a particular context of situation, the analysis is not complete without a survey of its usage outside this one context.[1]

Three stages in the history of the word can be conveniently distinguished: 1. prehistory (including etymology); 2. Old Testament Hebrew (i.e. outside the register already examined); 3. later development (LXX, Dead Sea Scrolls, NT, Talmud, Mediaeval literature, Modern Hebrew).

(a) HOSIA .

1. Prehistory. Hebrew WS may go back to Proto-Semitic YT,

---

1. Cf. the value of "panchronic semantics", cf. pp. 112f.

YTǴ, YŠ͑, YŠǴ, WT͑, WTǴ, WŠ͑, WŠǴ.[1] These eight consonantal groups
may in any one Semitic language undergo phonetic and graphic changes
producing still further patterns:  e.g. initial W, Y > ͗ in ancient
Arabian dialects;  T > s in Ethiopic;  ͗, Ǵ > ͗ in Akkadian;  ͑ may
be represented by ḥ in cuneiform.[2] Furthermore there are, possibly
because they have not yet been sufficiently investigated, developments
that do not accord with the generally accepted laws of phonetic evolu-
tion as contained in the standard comparative grammars.[3] Finally
there is the possibility that the root is not a Semitic one, but a
borrowing from Hittite, Hurrian or some other non-Semitic language.
While these general observations by no means apply to the prehistory
of every Biblical word, HOŠIA͑ does raise a number of problems.

First, the Hiph. is peculiar to Hebrew and the language of the
Moabite stone.  South Arabian hwš͑ and Aramaic ͗ošia͑ must be consid-
ered as loanwords.[4]

Second, in spite of the numerous possible etymologies indicated
above, a look at the lexica produces surprisingly few actual possibil-
ities.  This is the reason for the popularity in modern scholarship of

---

1. On consonants, see GVGSS, I, pp. 125, 128;  S. Moscati (ed.),
Comparative Grammar, pp. 43f;  on semi-vowels w, y, see GVGSS, pp.
138f;  Moscati, pp. 45f.  For PS ay > o in certain verbal forms,
(Hiphil, Niphal) on analogy with the more frequent pe waw verbs, see
GVGSS, I, p. 604;  BL, p. 377.

2. Moscati, loc. cit.  Both h and _ in Akkadian and Amorite are
graphic developments due to the absence of ͑ and ǵ in the Sumerian
script adopted by these Semites.  Cf. Moscati, p. 41.

3. Cf. Moscati, pp. 22f.

4. K. Conti Rossini, Chrestomathia, p. 248;  J.H. Petermann, Linguae
Samaritanae Grammatica, p. 50;  Fr. Schulthess, Lexicon Syropalaestinum,
s.v.;  G. Dalman, Aramäisches Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch, s.v.
On the frequency of borrowing in this field, see p. 245.

the well-known etymology based on Arabic wasi ͨa "be spacious", cf.
wassa ͨa "make wide": hence Hebrew HOŠIA ͨ "give room to". The root
WS ͨ is attested in both Hamitic and Semitic languages,[1] and the
presence of hirḥib "give room to", rewaḥ "space, relief", etc. in the
HOŠIA ͨ-field supports the etymology. There is, however, no evidence
that there was an element of spaciousness in the meaning of the words
HOŠIA ͨ, y ͨšu ͨa, etc. in Old Testament Hebrew. In fact words containing
the root YŠ ͨ are conspicuous by their absence from soteriological con-
texts where HIRḤIB, rewaḥ, etc. occur. It is interesting, too, that
where Saadiya has Arabic wassa ͨa "give room to", it translates HIRḤIB
and its connexion with HOŠIA ͨ was apparently unknown.[2]

But the etymological evidence makes the wasi ͨa-theory even more
difficult. YT ͨ occurs in personal names in several languages,
corresponding exactly to Hebrew Isaiah, Elisha, etc.:[3] Safaitic yt ͨ;
Thamudic whbyt ͨ, myt ͨ, hmyt ͨ; Nabataean yt ͨw, tymyt ͨw;[4] and to these
examples, already noted somewhat perplexingly in BDB, we may now add
Ugaritic yt ͨd[5] and Amorite išhi- ͩaddu,[6] which would correspond nicely
to Hebrew Isaiah with Hadad for YHWH. The most remarkable feature that

---

1. Cf. Egyptian wsh "be wide, broad" (A. Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar,
   p. 562); Berber uša ͨ "be wide" (G. Mercier, Vocabulaire et Textes
   Berbères, s.v.).

2. Cf. p.141.

3. See M. Noth, Israelitische Personennamen, p. 36, where it is argued
   that in such names the first element is a verb.

4. K. Conti Rossini, op. cit., s.v. yt ͨ; A. van der Branden, Les
   Textes Thamoudéens de Philby, I, pp. 18ff; G. Cantineau, Le Nabatéen,
   II, pp. 105f.

5. C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, Glossary no. 1179. On the form, cf.
   also nqmd ≃ niq-ma- ͩad (d)u (PRU, III, pp. xxxvi, xxxvii, 252; PRU,
   IV, pp. 6-11, 248), gmrd ≃ ig-ma-ra- ͩaddu (PRU, III, p. 245), brqd
   (Glossary, no. 525), y ͨdrd (Glossary, no. 1831).

6. C.-F. Jean, Studia Mariana, IV, p. 83.

emerges from this evidence is that in every one of these languages the root YT͑ occurs only in collocation with the name of a deity: nowhere is YT͑ attested apart from theophoric names. The similarity to the situation in Old Testament Hebrew is immediately obvious, since the almost exclusively divine application of HOŠIA͑ is the verb's most distinctive feature, as opposed to HIṢṢIL, ͑AZAR, etc. In this respect the Hebrew word is semantically closer to derivatives of Proto-Semitic YT͑, in several languages both earlier and later than Old Testament Hebrew, spanning a wide geographical area, than to Arabic wasi͑a (which goes back to Proto-Semitic WŠ͑ or W̌Š͑ ).[1] In the light of such consistent evidence, the attractive wasi͑a-etymology cannot seriously be considered, except as one of the many illuminating and sophisticated modern "folk-etymologies" which it is not the present writer's task to examine at the moment.[2]

The results of this stage of the enquiry have not been entirely negative. While a precise definition of the "original meaning" of YT͑ cannot be discovered (although a forensic origin has been proposed),[3] an examination of the prehistory of HOŠIA͑ has brought to light not an explanation, but a confirmation of its most distinctive feature, namely, its almost exclusive collocation with the name of a god.

2. <u>Old Testament Hebrew</u>. An examination of the lexical environments in which HOŠIA͑ occurs, confirms the view that it is properly

---

1. The problem is noted by <u>BDB</u>, s.v., but ignored by <u>KB</u> and subsequent etymologisers. Cf. p. 1, note 2.
2. The connexion with Arabic wasi͑a is unknown to E. Castell (1669); and is first attested in A. Schultens, <u>Origines</u> (1761), p. 8.
3. "What was a Mošia͑?", pp. 483-6.

only applied in contexts of divine intervention or the activity of
divinely appointed agents, kings, judges and the like. A study of
the word mošiaᶜ "counsel for the defence, advocate" proved that it is
the justice of the agent so described, in a situation of injustice
that distinguishes the word from all other semantically related
words.[1]  hošiᶜeni is defined as "the usual legal formula",[2] and
there is considerable evidence for the thesis that HOŠIAᶜ in Old Tes-
tament Hebrew has a strong forensic character. As we have seen there
is no evidence that the word has a forensic prehistory; but the
numerous contexts in which HOŠIAᶜ appears in collocation with legal
terminology and in forensic situations, make the possibility a real
one.

We are now in a position to add the evidence of the HOŠIAᶜ-
field. In this we noted the prominence and frequency of legal terminol-
ogy: GAʾAL, PADA, ŠAPAT, RIB, SADDIQ, SEDEQ, ᶜANA, etc., are all
prominent in soteriological contexts. The evidence of personal names
in Old Testament Hebrew and elsewhere in the ancient near east, where
the name of a deity is very frequently combined with a legal term,[3]
the centrality of legal terminology in Old Testament language about
Israel's relation to God,[4] the forensic patterns detectable in the
Exodus traditions,[5] the rib-pattern in the language of the prophets

---

1. See preceding note.

2. J.A. Montgomery and H.S. Gehman, I & II Kings, p. 386. Cf. II
Kings 6:26; II Sam. 14:4.

3. e.g. Hebrew Yigael, Padaiah, Jerubbaal; Assyrian Ashurdan,
Beldan, Nergalshaphat; Ugaritic Danʾel, tptbᶜl; Phoenician Baalpadah.

4. Cf. p. 122.

5. See below, pp. 217f.

and the Psalms,[1] together with a growing body of scholarly opinion in favour of the theory in recent years,[2] all support this distinctive feature of HOŠIA͑.

From this discussion of HOŠIA͑ in the wider context of Old Testament Hebrew, we can now return to the register in which evidence for forensic elements in HOŠIA͑ was not forthcoming. The importance of this "panchronic" approach[3] becomes immediately obvious: for now, in a number of passages forensic features can be detected which would not have been evident without the historical factors. HOŠIA͑ collocates twice with ͑ANA "testify" (II Sam. 22:36, 42)[4] and appears in a somewhat similar environment in Hab. 1:2. To these we might add the blessing of Dan in Gen. 49: whatever the historical connexion between v. 18c and the rest of the passage, the possibility of a forensic link between HOŠIA͑ and the dan/yadin expressions would go some way to explain the choice of HOŠIA͑ in this passage.[5] It occurs nowhere else in Genesis.

3. *Later development.* Three aspects of the later, post-biblical development of HOŠIA͑ concern us. First its application in religious language continues in many set formulae based on or derived directly

1. Cf. E. Würthwein, "Der Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede"; B. Gemser, "The rib- or controversy-pattern in Hebrew mentality."
2. e.g. M.Z. Segal, Sifre Shmuel, ad I Sam. 25:26, 31, 33; W. McKane, Proverbs, ad Prov. 20:22.
3. See pp. 112f.
4. See p. 202.
5. The commentaries barely discuss the relation between the verse and its immediate linguistic environment. See above, p. 88.

from the Old Testament.  It is common in the language of prayer, for example, and in the context of the Feast of Booths has been applied to a number of customs associated with the ritual:  the lulab or parts of it were termed hošaʿnaʾ, and the last day of the feast is described as yom hošaʿnaʾ or hošaʿnaʾ rabba.[1]  HOSIAʿ is frequent in liturgical language, where it clearly derives from the language of the Psalms and the Prophets;[2]  and the names of two recently founded settlements in Israel, yešaʿ and yišʿi, belong to a similar religious context.[3]

On the other hand the forensic application of mošiaʿ is the only attested by Jastrow.[4]

There is very little evidence for a general, secular usage.[5] One such idiom is attested in Modern Hebrew namely, kol yišʿi wᵉkol hepṣi ki ... "it is my fervent hope and desire that ..."[6]

In the languages which have borrowed it, HOSIAʿ that is to say, Aramaic, Samaritan, Syriac and probably South Arabian,[7] this picture of an exclusively religious term, applied properly only in collocation with a deity, is also convincingly reflected.

---

1.  Jastrow, I, p. 341.
2.  See S. Singer, The Authorized Daily Prayer Book, pp. 9, 29, 38, etc.
3.  Both settlements were founded by religious communities, one from Egypt in 1957, and the other from the Yemen in 1950.
4.  Jastrow, II, p. 751.
5.  Cf. the well-known modern tale of the pedantic teacher in Israel who drowned, because when he shouted for help, he used the phrase hošiʿeni "save me" and no-one knew what he meant.
6.  Cf. C. Schechter, The New Universal Hebrew-English Dictionary, s.v. yešaʿ; Z. Scharfstein, ʾoṣar ha-millim wᵉha-nivim, s.v. hepeṣ.
7.  See below, p. 216, note 4.

(b) HIṢṢIL.

1. Prehistory. Hebrew NṢL can go back to three Proto-Semitic roots: NṢL, NṬL, NDL.[1] The existence of Aramaic haṣṣala does not preclude the second and third possibilities since, like HOŠIA͑, it may be a Hebrew loanword.[2] The generally accepted etymology for HIṢṢIL is based on the first of the three Proto-Semitic roots: cf. Arabic naṣala "be dropped", IV "take out"; Ethiopic tanaš͑la "be dropped (horseshoe)". The element of separation, already identified as a distinguishing feature of Old Testament Hebrew HIṢṢIL, is present here, and the correspondence Hebrew Hiphil : Arabic IV.Form is striking.[3]

A second suggestion was put forward by Beeston in connexion with Sabaean hẓm, in which he sees "with liquid/nasal interchange," a cognate to HIṢṢIL.[4] This presupposes PS NṬL, and produces a diachronic picture corresponding very closely to that of HOŠIA͑: (i) it occurs in South Arabian only in divine application; (ii) it occurs in Aramaic as a loanword; (iii) an Arabic etymology is precluded by a South Arabian cognate; (iv) its incidence and collocation are more important than its meaning. As regards the meaning of the Proto-Semitic root, all that can be said is that Ethiopic tanaš͑la, quoted

---

1. See GVGSS, I, pp. 128ff; Moscati, pp. 43f.
2. Cf. p. 125.
3. BDB, KB, s.v.
4. A.F.L. Beeston, Addenda to A.K. Irvine, "Homicide in pre-Islamic South Arabia," p. 292.

above, may still be related (PS $\underline{\underline{t}} > \underline{s}$ in Ethiopic)[1.] and the semantic prehistory of HIṢṢIL may remain as the two standard lexica describe it.

2. <u>Old Testament Hebrew</u>. By far the commonest occurrence of NṢL in Old Testament Hebrew is in the sense "deliver" (Hiph.) with the passive "be delivered" (Hiph.). Once the Piel occurs in the same sense (Ezek. 14:14). The noun <u>haṣṣala</u> occurs once in collocation with <u>rewaḥ</u> "relief" (Est. 4[14]).

Two other elements can be detected. First Piel, Hiphil, Hophal and Hithpael all occur in contexts of violent stripping off or spoil-ing.[2.] The element of separation, in this case violent removal, is in agreement with the sense of HIṢṢIL as already described in the reg-ister.[3.] An examination of the distinction between <u>mošia͑</u> and <u>maṣṣil</u> notes how "the idea of violent action is almost invariably stressed so that descriptions of the situation include the most violent vocabulary, and in particular the notion of spoil and plunder recurs frequently."[4.]

Second, the traces of a forensic usage are suggested by Daube in a brief comparison of the despoiling of the Egyptians in the Exodus story and the taking away of a person's property in the Jacob-Laban story.[5.] With this argument, which is hardly convincing on its own, should be compared the evidence of the forensic application of the

---

1. Moscati, p. 43.
2. e.g. Ex. 3:22; Deut. 32:39; Isa. 5:29; Hos. 5:14; Am. 4:11; Pss. 7:3, 50:22; Job. 5:4; Dan. 8:4, 7.
3. See pp. 180-3.
4. "What was a Mošia͑?", p. 479.
5. D. Daube, <u>The Exodus Pattern in the Bible</u>, pp. 67-72.

Haphel (Aphel) in an Aramaic legal document from Elephantine and the enigmatic pṣln, npṣl in the same papyri in the sense of "redeem" or "compensate".[1] Whatever the other divergences as between HOŠIAᶜ and HIṢṢIL, the possibility of interference or parallel development, particularly in this highly charged area of legal terminology, should not be missed.[2]

Finally the frequent use of HIṢṢIL with subjects other than the God of Israel confirms the suggestion, made with reference to the register, that this word is not disinfected to the same extent as HOŠIAᶜ in Old Testament Hebrew.

3. Later development. In Mishnaic Hebrew HIṢṢIL is applied in two contexts as well as the Biblical, soteriological formulae: (i) "save" in the sense of preventing a person from committing a crime (e.g. Sabb. 16.1; Sanh. 8.7); (ii) "protect" in ritual and levitical law (e.g. Chol. 5.3). Curiously enough the nouns neṣel and niṣṣolet refer normally in later Hebrew to decayed matter and offal (e.g. Gen. R.67 ad Gen. 27:36; Tos. Ter. 10.3).[3]

In Modern Hebrew, in striking contrast to HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL is productive in a number of idiomatic expressions: e.g.

hiṣṣil dabar mippi... "extract a confession from";

ʾani ʾet napši hiṣṣalti "I disclaim all responsibility."

Biblical expressions are still found, e.g. rewaḥ wᶜhaṣṣala and

---

1. See C.-F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest, pp. 185, 233.

2. Cf. p. 122.

3. Jastrow, II, pp. 907, 929.

ʾud muṣṣal meʾeš "brand plucked from the burning". NIṢṢEL "exploit", HITNAṢṢEL "apologise" complete the picture of the later history of HIṢṢIL, NIṢṢEL, etc., a picture which confirms the evidence of the register: that the two most striking features of HIṢṢIL, as against HOŠIAᶜ are its wide application in secular contexts, with subjects other than God, and the prominent element of separation. Notice also how even up to modern times nominal transforms are rare.

(c)  ᶜAZAR.

1. Prehistory. The evidence of Ugaritic, Aramaic and Early South Arabian points to Proto-Semitic ᶜDR "rescue, help".[1] In Old Testament Hebrew both ᶜadar and ᶜazar occur, the former is probably a case of lexical borrowing from Aramaic, a characteristic of the HOŠIAᶜ-field as we have seen.[2]

As regards the "original" meaning, two suggestions have been put forward: (i) "withhold" (cf. Arabic ᶜazara); but this involves an anomalous phonetic development;[3] (ii) "excuse, exculpate" (cf. Arabic ᶜadara).[4] Of these the second accords better with our present knowledge of comparative Semitic phonology, and would give good sense. On balance however it would appear from the evidence that the "original" meaning might equally well have been, as I have suggested, "rescue,

---

1. Cf. WUS, no. 2115; BDB and KB, s.v.
2. p. 125. On IV. ᶜadar in the personal name Adariel, see KB, s.v.
3. KB, s.v. But PS ḏ > Arabic ḏ (Moscati, p. 43).
4. BDB, s.v. Cf. also WUS, loc. cit.; C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Text-book, Glossary, no. 1831.

save" or indeed "help".  If the principle of reconstructing a Proto-Semitic language is accepted at all, it must apply to semantic content as well as phonology and grammar.  This reconstruction must be based on a number of occurrences throughout the Semitic languages, and not on any one.  In Arabic the sense "excuse, exculpate" looks like an instance of restriction of meaning from Proto-Semitic "help".[1]

As in the other two items already examined, however, more interesting than the precise "original" meaning, is the application of ʿDR.  In Ugaritic two personal names consist of a combination of a divine name with a form of ʿDR:  yʿdrd, bʿlmʿdr.[2]  Amorite provides further examples:  yaḥzir, yaḥzar.[3]  In both these languages, however, as well as in the other languages where it occurs, it appears consistently and frequently in secular contexts too.  The element of separation is present in a number of instances notably in Ugaritic, where Gordon translates it "rescue, save".[4]

2.  Old Testament Hebrew.  ʿAZAR outside the register presents a picture hardly distinguishable from that within it.  The element of separation is not prominent;[5]  among its subjects are false gods;[6] the result of an action so described is on occasion an evil one.[7]

---

1.  That Arabic should show more semantic change than Old Testament Hebrew, although phonetically and grammatically closer to PS, is possible historically, and is often forgotten in traditional Semitic philology.

2.  See WUS, loc. cit.;  C.H. Gordon, loc. cit.

3.  H. Bauer, Die Ostkanaanäer, p. 74.

4.  Loc. cit.

5.  It is only 4x followed by min:  Deut. 33:7; Ps. 60:13; 108:13; Ezr. 8:22.  It may not denote separation in every case.  Cf. RSV "protect against" (Ezr. 8:22).

6.  e.g. Ezek. 308; Job 9:11.

7.  e.g. I Kings 20:16; II Chron. 20:23.

One interesting link with the Ugaritic compound name quoted above, is the isolated Hiphil form ma͑zrim with the subject "the gods of the kings of Syria", who certainly included b͑l. [1]

Theophoric names containing ͑AZAR are common in Old Testament Hebrew:  Azarel, Azariah, Eliezer, Eleazar, and the hypocoristic names Ezer, Ezra and Jaazer (cf. Amorite yahzir).

  3. Later development.  There is no sign of restriction of meaning or technical application in Talmudic Hebrew. [2]

In Modern Hebrew expressions like ͑ezra risona "first aid" and hel ͑ezer "auxiliary force" further illustrate the wide, secular semantic range of ͑AZAR in contrast to HOSIA͑.  Finally it is significant that it is not attested in Old Testament Hebrew idioms still in current usage and that the only place-name in which this item has been applied in modern times is ͑ezra ubiṣṣaron "help and fortification".

(d)  PILLET, MILLET.

  1. Prehistory.  The evidence of Ugaritic plt (Piel ?) "save" and Akkadian paliṭmi "has been saved" beside balaṭu "recover, escape" suggests PS PLT "escape, survive". [3]  This appears in Hebrew PILLET "rescue, save", Phoenician plt "escape" and Aramaic p͑laṭ "escape", palleṭ "rescue". [4]  Semantically, MILLET, which occurs only in Hebrew, is indistinguishable from PILLET, and the possibility of the anomalous

---

1.  II Chron. 28:23.

2.  Jastrow, II, p. 1062.

3.  See C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, Glossary, no. 2048.  For interchange between p and b in Akkadian, see Moscati, p. 26.

4.  See KB, s.v.;  in Arabic falata  PS ṭ > Arabic t is exceptional.

sound-change $\underline{p} > \underline{m}$ cannot be discounted.[1] The most plausible explanation for this development is probably dissimilation in a very frequent Old Testament Hebrew idiom: PILLEŢ nepeš > MILLEŢ nepeš.[2]

In our most ancient sources, PLŢ is attested in causative forms in the sense of "save". An exception to this is Akkadian, where balaṭu is the regular word for "live": elsewhere its place is taken by ḤAYA "live" which is common Semitic except for Akkadian. Arabic and Phoenician, together with the one occurrence of the Qal in Old Testament Hebrew (Ezek. 7:16), might be considered as back-formations from the common causative "save".

The evidence of personal names agrees with this conclusion: Ugaritic plṭ, yplṭ; Akkadian aššur-uballiṭ; Phoenician plṭbᶜl; Hebrew Pelatiah, etc. all apparently contain the same two elements, the name of a god and a term denoting "save". PLŢ is not, however, exclusively reserved for divine intervention.

2. Old Testament Hebrew. The main distinctions evident in Old Testament Hebrew between PILLEŢ and MILLEŢ are these: (i) PILLEŢ "deliver" occurs mainly in the Psalms and with YHWH as subject, while MILLEŢ occurs seldom in the Psalms and usually with a human subject;[3] (ii) while MILLEŢ nepeš is very common, PILLEŢ only once collocates with nepeš in Old Testament Hebrew;[4] (iii) PILLEŢ has no passive,

---

1. The sound change $p > m$ is not listed in any of the grammars, but KB assumes pilleṭ > milleṭ (only in Hebrew).

2. For dissimilation at a distance, see Moscati, p. 59.

3. There is only one certain occurrence of pilleṭ outside the Psalms; and there it has a human subject (Mic. 6:14). It is attested 19x in the Psalms, with YHWH as subject in every case. Of 27 occurrences of milleṭ, only 5 are in the Psalms (3 of them in the idiom milleṭ nepeš: Pss. 33:17; 89:49; 116:4), and YHWH is subject of only five of them: Pss. 41:2; 107:20; 116:4; Jer. 39:18 (2x).

4. Ps. 17:13. Almost half the occurrences of MILLEŢ in Old Testament Hebrew (11x out of 27) are in this idiom.

NIMLAT (Niph) occurs frequently in the sense "escape";  (iv) MILLET has no nominal transforms, PILLET has three: paliṭ, pᵉleṭa, miplaṭ.[1]

On the other hand both occur in theophoric names:  Paltiel, Pelatia, Elpalet, Pilti, Japhlet, Melatiah.  One other feature which both have in common is that they also occur in Old Testament Hebrew in Hiphil forms, HIPLIT and HIMLIT, in the sense "deliver".  These exceptional cases distinguished from the more regular words only in form, may well be due to interference from the more common Hiphils HOSIA and HIṢṢIL:  in two cases HIṢṢIL occurs in the same lexical environment.[2]

Finally a comparison of this evidence with our analysis in the preceding chapter confirms the impression that, while PILLET occurred seven times in set-piece language, MILLET is attested in the register only twice, (Gen. 19:196) and never in set-piece language.[3]  While both are applied in religious contexts, MILLET is much less common there than PILLET.

3.  Later development.  In Talmudic Hebrew all three forms appear BALAT "stand forth", PALAT "vomit, escape, save", MILLET "rescue".[4]  Of these the first and the third need no comment, since they follow, both morphologically and semantically, the lines we would expect from

---

1.  These two features suggest a complementarity.  On the significance of nominal transformations, see pp.177f.

2.  Isa. 5:29; 31:5.  On interference at all levels, phonological, grammatical and semantic, see pp. 127ff.

3.  See p.176.

4.  Jastrow, I, p. 172;  II, pp. 789, 1178f.

their prehistory. But the behaviour of PILLET in post-Biblical times is surprising: (i) the Piel which was the commonest form in Old Testament Hebrew hardly occurs; (ii) the sense "vomit" for the Qal is also unexpected, although the connexion between "rescue" and "vomit" can be traced in Jon. 2:11, where the Targum has p$^e$lat for Hebrew qa$^{\flat}$a. The explanation of this development seems to be that PALAT "vomit" was a regular part of classical Hebrew vocabulary, only by chance absent from the Old Testament.[1] Outside the strictly religious contexts, and other petrified expressions like the nominal forms miplat, p$^e$leta and palit, the common medical or physiological sense of PLT made other applications difficult.[2]

In modern Hebrew NIMLAT and HIMLIT serve for "escape" and "rescue"; MILLET $^{\flat}$et napšo is derived from Old Testament Hebrew. PILLET "rescue" is also derived from Old Testament Hebrew; PALAT "vomit" is productive in a number of expressions, e.g. p$^e$litat pe "a slip of the tongue". The nominal forms are common: palit "refugee"; miplat "shelter"; $^c$ASA p$^e$leta (colloquial) "he went bankrupt".

To summarise, outside the religious context of the Old Testament, PILLET is superseded by HIMLIT in the HOSIA$^c$ -field except in nominal transformations, where Old Testament Hebrew palit, p$^e$leta, etc. continue in common usage. It is only in Old Testament Hebrew that both MILLET and PILLET co-exist, an indication of the special nature

---

1. Cf. the accident that $^c$atiša "sneezing" occurs only once in Old Testament Hebrew (Job 41:18). See further R. Lowth, Isaiah, pp. xxxix-xl; and also BL, p. 26r.
2. This is an example of the effect of polysemy on usage: see p. 118.

of the texts and the peculiar size of the HOŠIAᶜ-field.

(e) ḤILLEṢ.

1. Prehistory. PS ḤLṢ appears to have both a transitive and an intransitive sense like English withdraw:[1] evidence for the former comes from Aramaic ḥᵉlaṣ "draw off, despoil"; Phoenician ḥlṣ "rescue", and for the latter Arabic ḫalaṣa "withdraw, retire, be finished". Both senses occur in Hebrew ḤALAṢ (1) "take off (a sandal)" and (2) "withdraw".[2]

The evidence for the sense of "rescue" outside Old Testament Hebrew is slight: both Arabic ḫallaṣa "save"[3] and Punic ḥlṣbᶜl, ḥlṣ, etc. are probably due to borrowing from Hebrew.[4]

The development, still productive apparently in Old Testament Hebrew, from "despoil" to "save" is a nice parallel to the development already discussed in the prehistory of HIṢṢIL. Notice also the prominence of the element of separation in the words' prehistory.

2. Old Testament Hebrew. Apart from two passages in Old Testament Hebrew, where the sense seems to be "tear out" (Lev. 14:40, 43) and "despoil" (Ps. 7:5), the Piel ḤILLEṢ occurs always in the sense "rescue, deliver";[5] the subject is always YHWH, and it occurs

---

1. On transitivity, see p. 179. The attempt to distinguish two roots (ḤDB) is no longer accepted (KB).

2. On the change PS ḫ > Hebrew ḥ, see Moscati, p. 40.

3. Cf. muḫalliṣ "saviour" and ḫalaṣ "salvation".

4. See p. 125.

5. This is a morphological safeguard against the ambiguity in ḥalaṣ (1) "take off" (2) "withdraw". See p. 118. The passive is Niph. NEḤᵉLAṢ which occurs 4x in the sense "prepare for battle", 3x "to save".

only in poetry.[1] This corresponds with a predominantly religious application of Arabic ḥallaṣa, and Punic ḥlṣ.

The element of separation as indicated by min (Pss. 116:8; 140: 2; Prov. 11:8) and spatial parallels (Ps. 18.20) is not so evident as the word's prehistory would lead one to expect. In this respect ḤILLEṢ is to be distinguished from ḤIṢṢIL in Old Testament Hebrew, although historically they may have more in common, and compared to HOŠIAᶜ and ᶜAZAR.

One personal name, presumably a hypocoristic form, occurs in Old Testament Hebrew: Helez (ḥeleṣ).[2]

3. **Later developments.** In Talmudic Hebrew the sense "strip" becomes the predominant one, and, more precisely, (1) in the forensic context of the levirate marriage: hence the noun ḥaliṣa, and the expression ḤALAṢ bayyabama "arrange the ḥaliṣa, act as judge";[3] (2) in the sense of "strip for work", hence ḥaluṣ "strong", ḤILLEṢ "gird, arm". ḤILLEṢ "rescue" is still found as in Old Testament Hebrew.

In Modern Hebrew both these senses are attested: e.g. ḥaluṣ (a) "person who has refused to perform the levirate marriage" and (b) "pioneer" (whence ḥaluṣi "pioneering", ḥaluṣiut "pioneering work or spirit", ḥaliṣa "battle dress"). Naturally in modern Israel (b) is the more productive. ḤILLEṢ "extricate, rescue" goes back to Old

---

1. 9x in the Psalms and once in Job (36:15).
2. Cf. Punic ḥlṣ; Early South Arabian ḥlṣ.
3. Cf. Aramaic Pael ḥalleṣ in the same sense. See Jastrow, I, pp. 472f.

Testament Hebrew usage; HEḤLIṢ "strengthen" takes the place of Talmudic ḥilleṣ, except in the phrase ḤILLEṢ ʾet ʿaṣmotaw "engage in sport".

Finally there is a religious settlement, founded in 1950, whose name ḥeleṣ nicely combines the name of one of David's heroes (II Sam. 23:26) with modern ideals of ḥaluṣiut.

(f) PARAQ.

1. Prehistory. The Proto-Semitic PRQ is based on its incidence in Ugaritic, Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic.[1] As to its meaning there is evidence that a basic sense of "divide, separate" can be associated with the biradical stem p-r, a theory which undoubtedly fits the derivatives of PRQ.[2] An element of separation is prominent in all the developments attested within the Semitic group: and it is also noticeable how developments in this instance agree substantially with what we have seen in the prehistory of PILLET and ḤILLEṢ.

Two lines of development can be traced from the basic idea of separation: (1) restriction of meaning in a technical, forensic context, for example, Aramaic pᵉraq "redeem" (Targum for Old Testament Hebrew GAʾAL)[3] and Nabataean prq "buy back";[4] (2) more general application in soteriological contexts, for instance, Ethiopic faraqa "set free", Aramaic pᵉraq "rescue" (cf. purqana "redemption").

---

1. KB, s.v.; cf. WUS, s.v.
2. See Moscati, p. 73.
3. Jastrow, II, p. 1239.
4. C.-F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, op. cit., p. 237.

2.  _Old Testament Hebrew_.  The element of separation is attested
in every occurrence of _paraq_ in Old Testament Hebrew.  The only two
occurrences of this verb in soteriological contexts are late and it
is natural to suppose that here is another instance of semantic
borrowing in the HOSIAᶜ-field, this time from Aramaic into Hebrew.[1]
The Piel and Hithpael forms together with one occurrence of the Qal,
all give the sense "tear away", "tear off",[2] which is not attested
in Aramaic.

There are no personal names containing the root PRQ in Old
Testament Hebrew.

3.  _Later development_.  In Talmudic Hebrew the sense "redeem"
continues, but more significantly a new line of development appears:
PARAQ "unload", PEREQ "relieve" (cow of her milk).[3]  As in the case
of PALAT "vomit" it would appear that we have another illustration of
the accidental nature of the Old Testament Hebrew corpus.  It seems
more than probable that PARAQ "unload" was common classical Hebrew,
only by chance unattested in the Old Testament.[4]

In Modern Hebrew this sense is an important one, alongside a
further development, also traceable to Talmudic Hebrew:  namely PEREQ
"break up" (mathematics), "liquidate" (business).  The noun _pereq_
"chapter, section" possibly gave rise to this development:  hence
PEREQ (Piel) "make into p raqim".[5]  Finally an idiom like PARAQ ᶜol

---

1.  See pp. 125, 245.
2.  e.g. Ex. 32:2;  33:3.
3.  Jastrow, II, _loc. cit._
4.  Cf. _palat_, p. 224.
5.  That this verb is a back-formation from _pereq_ "chapter" is highly
    probable:  cf. Piel _miggen_ < _magen_ "shield".

"kick over the traces" is symptomatic of a development away from any religious or soteriological usage. Again the HOŠIAᶜ -field has become considerably poorer in post-Biblical times.

(g) PAŠA.

1. Prehistory. A clue to the difficulty raised by Aramaic paṣa "set free" beside Hebrew PAŠA "open" has been sought in Arabic faṣa "separate" as the "basic meaning" of the Proto-Semitic root PṢY.[1] We might add from our investigations into the HOŠIAᶜ -field, that PAŠA is not the only Old Testament Hebrew word whose semantic range covers both "save" and "open".[2] However that may be, the co-presence in Old Testament Hebrew of two semantically distinct items PAŠA "open" and PAŠA "save" is best explained as a result of semantic borrowing, a recurring feature of this particular field.[3]

PṢY occurs in the Nabataean personal names pṣyw and pṣ˒l.[4]

2. Old Testament Hebrew. PAŠA "save" occurs only 3x, and these are all in Ps. 144. The element of separation is present in each case, twice in its close collocation with HIṢṢIL min-, and once followed itself by min-.[5] The date of this Psalm used to be given as late Persian or early Greek;[6] more recently however its relationship to

1. Cf. BDB, KB.
2. pitteaḥ is another. See Table 2.
3. See pp. 125.
4. G. Cantineau, Le Nabatéen, II, p. 137.
5. Ps. 144:7, 10f.
6. Cf. C.A. Briggs, Psalms, II, p. 520. Aramaisms are of course frequently adduced as evidence of a late date.

the Karatepe inscription and its royal characteristics have led
scholars to date it certainly before the exile.[1] This view would
have interesting implications for a history of semantic borrowing
from Aramaic in Old Testament Hebrew.

3. _Later developments_. In Talmudic Aramaic paşa continues in
the sense "save", but also in the ordinary sense of "open" and "branch
off". It is the Pael and Aphel forms, however, that are more
interesting: both are applied in legal contexts in the sense
"restore".[2]

In Modern Hebrew PAŞA "open" (the mouth) goes back to Old Tes-
tament Hebrew. PIŞŞA "compensate", pişşuim "compensation" can be
traced to the Talmudic usage. It is interesting how the situation in
Modern Hebrew, i.e. Hebrew "open" alongside the Aramaic loanword
"compensate" (with a morphological safeguard against ambiguity),
broadly corresponds to the Old Testament Hebrew usage.[3]

Notice that in later Hebrew Qal PAŞA "save" is superseded, and
again the peculiarly rich Old Testament Hebrew HOŠIAʿ -field is
impoverished in the later history of the language.


3. _Lexicography_.

The problem of how to tabulate all the heterogeneous informa-
tion on each of the lexical items discussed above, is not an easy one.

---

1. H.-J. Kraus, _Psalmen_, p. 942; A. Weiser, _The Psalms_, pp. 823f.
2. Jastrow, II, p. 1204.
3. Cf. ḥalas, p. 226.

A definition must make available for the translator, the exegete and the theologian such facts about each item that he will need, without introducing unnecessary terminology or burdening him with superfluous details, however interesting they may be. There is no reason, for example, to duplicate the work of the concordance-compilers. Existing lexica already list many of the occurrences of each word in Old Testament Hebrew, grouped according to certain principles. But what is still to be done is to present the distinctive features of each item, as described earlier in this chapter along with a brief account of the historical factors in its development. If one compares the entries under Y̌Ṣ<sup>c</sup> in BDB and KB, the relation of HOŠIA<sup>c</sup> to other words of closely related meaning is entirely omitted: BDB mentions "synonyms" or other poetic parallels, KB concentrates on the number of occurrences, recent bibliography, and textual emendations. Neither includes any precise information on the distinctions between HOŠIA<sup>c</sup> and HIṢṢIL, along the lines suggested above. If there is one matter on which all modern semantic theorists are agreed, it is the centrality of the meaning-relation opposition as a means of defining lexical items.

The method tentatively suggested here, therefore, is intended to add to the information incorporated in the existing lexica this important dimension of opposition. Each entry begins with a list of all the lexical items which belong to the same lexical group as the word under discussion, so that in subsequent observations contrasts can be drawn and the distinctive features of each word defined. Under HOŠIA<sup>c</sup>, for

example, are listed the seven words identified in Chapter III: anyone
wishing a definition of HOSIA᷉ᶜ will be automatically referred to all
the words most closely associated with it in Old Testament Hebrew.
This also means that, in conjunction with a concordance, a very large
number of Old Testament soteriological contexts can be traced, not
just those in which the keyword HOSIA᷉ᶜ occurs. For convenience an
asterisk denotes the most frequent members of the group, and brackets
indicate loanwords or cases of semantic borrowing. A word's frequency
in Old Testament Hebrew is listed immediately after the lexical group.

The available semantic information is then presented as follows:
significant structural features (transitivity, nominalizations, etc.)
make up the first paragraph, contrasts and comparisons with other
members of the group being indicated in each case in brackets (X means
"contrast"). The second paragraph includes the chief applications of
the word in Old Testament Hebrew, followed by English equivalents. It
should be noted that exceptional applications are not listed here, so
that the reader may obtain an idea of the normal usage of the word.
The English equivalents are intended to correspond closely to structural
features and semantic characteristics listed already in the article:
thus "intervene" in the HOSIA᷉ᶜ -entry is intended to take up the point
made elsewhere in the article that the word admits of an intransitive
usage.

Finally, and the position of this section is not without signif-
icance, the etymology is discussed. The reconstructed Proto-Semitic
root is followed by a reconstructed meaning, where possible,[1] and this

---

1. Cf. pp. 219f.

is followed by various lines of development attested throughout the Semitic family. The practice adopted by The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology, whereby the earliest attested occurrence of each item is dated as accurately as possible to the nearest century, is followed, with the refinement (demanded by the subject matter of Old Testament Hebrew) that dates B.C. are indicated by small Roman numerals (Ugaritic xiv;  Moabite ix), while dates A.D. are indicated by capitals (Aramaic II;  Hebrew XX). Sources for the information selected for each article might be listed in a final paragraph (this section is omitted here since there is a full bibliography at the end of the dissertation).

The entry is intended thus to present a general accurate definition of each word as it is most often used in Old Testament Hebrew. Abnormal usages must be dealt with in the commentaries. These definitions are based in the first instance on details obtained from the register;  but, as we have seen, the register provides a useful cross-section of Old Testament Hebrew,[1] and information collected in the wider survey just completed has also been included. Percentages are approximations and are only quoted when they are significant. Statistics are based on Mandelkern's Concordance. The importance of nominalization is its effect on a word's associative field.[2]

---

1.  Cf. pp. 162f.
2.  See p. 178.

HOŠIA͑  cf. \*HIṢṢIL, ḤILLEṢ, \*MILLEṬ, \* ͑AZAR, (PAṢA), (PARAQ),
\*PILLEṬ.  337x (183 Hiph, 20 Niph, 134 Nom).  Nominalization
(yešā͑, yᵉšu͑a, mošā͑ot, tᵉšu͑a):  65% cf. ͑AZAR, PILLEṬ.
Transitivity:  90% X HIṢṢIL, ḤILLEṢ, etc.  Element of
separation:  10% X HIṢṢIL, cf. ͑AZAR, MILLEṬ, PILLEṬ.

(1) Religious application (Prophets, Psalms, "set-piece"
language):  95% X HIṢṢIL, MILLEṬ, ͑AZAR.  Divine subject:
100% X MILLEṬ, ͑AZAR.  "save", "intervene", "salvation".
(2) Forensic application (Deut, Jos, Jud):  5% (especially
mošia͑) cf. HIṢṢIL, (PAṢA), GAʾAL, etc.  "defend", "defence".

(PS YT͑ "save" (1) yt͑ "save": xiv.  Only in theophoric
names e.g. yt͑d (Ug. cf. Amor. iŝhi-ᵃaddu), ͑myt͑, yt͑w
(ESA).  (2) hošia͑ "save": x. Religious application (OT
Heb, Moab; loanword in Aram, ESA).  (3) YŠ͑ "be spacious":
XVIII.Folk-etymology cf. Arab. wasi͑a, Eg. wŝh.)

HIṢṢIL  cf. \*HOŠIA͑, ḤILLEṢ, \*MILLEṬ, \* ͑AZAR, (PAṢA), (PARAQ),
\*PILLEṬ.  202x (186 Hiph, 15 Niph, 1 Nom).  Transitive
X HOŠIA͑.  Element of separation:  95% X HOŠIA͑, ͑AZAR.

(1) General application:  35% X HOŠIA͑.  "rescue".
(2) Forensic application:  rare cf. HOŠIA͑, (PAṢA).
"redeem".

(PS <u>NTL</u> "be dropped" (1) <u>NSL</u> (separation "remove",
"rescue": x. general application (Heb, Aram, Arab, Eth);
vi. legal documents (Aram). (2) <u>NZL</u> "deliver" (ESA).)

<u>HILLEŞ</u>  cf. *<u>HOŠIAᶜ</u>, *<u>HIŞŞIL</u>, *<u>MILLET</u>, * <u>ᶜAZAR</u>, (<u>PAŞA</u>), (<u>PARAQ</u>),
*<u>PILLET</u>. 18x (14 Piel, 4 Niph). Transitive X <u>HOŠIAᶜ</u>.
Element of separation: 22% X <u>HIŞŞIL</u>.

(1) Religious application (Pss, Job, Prov): 85% cf.
<u>HOŠIAᶜ</u>, <u>PILLET</u>. "deliver". Divine subject: 80% cf.
<u>HOŠIAᶜ</u>, <u>PILLET</u>.
(2) General application (Lev): rare. "tear out" cf.
(<u>PARAQ</u>).

(PS <u>HLS</u> (trans/intrans) "withdraw" (1) <u>HALAŞ</u> (trans) "take
off": x. Hence "strip for battle" (Heb, Aram). (2) <u>HALAŞ</u>
(intrans) "withdraw, end": viii. (Heb, Arab). (3) <u>HILLEŞ</u>
"deliver": x. religious application (Heb; loanword in
Arab, Phoen) ).

<u>MILLET</u>  cf. *<u>HOŠIAᶜ</u>, *<u>HIŞŞIL</u>, <u>HILLEŞ</u>, * <u>ᶜAZAR</u>, (<u>PAŞA</u>), (<u>PARAQ</u>),
*<u>PILLET</u>. 93x (58 Niph, 27 Piel, 2 Hiph, 2 Hithpa).
Transitive X <u>HOŠIAᶜ</u>. Element of separation: 16% cf.
<u>HOŠIAᶜ</u>, <u>ᶜAZAR</u>, <u>PILLET</u>.

(1) General application (passim): "rescue", "escape" X PILLEṬ.

(2) MILLEṬ nepeš (passim): "save one's life".

(PS PLṬ "live" cf. PILLEṬ.)

ᶜAZAR        cf. *HOŠIAᶜ, *HIṢṢIL, HILLEṢ, *MILLEṬ, (PAṢA), (PARAQ), *PILLEṬ. 91x (86 Qal, 4 Niph, 1 Hiph, 46 Nom). Transitive X HOŠIAᶜ. Nominalization (ezer, ezra): 50% cf. HOŠIAᶜ, PILLEṬ. Element of separation: 5% cf. HOŠIAᶜ, MILLEṬ, PILLEṬ.

General application (passim): "help".

(PS ᶜDR "help" (1) ᶜdr "help": xiv. Ug, ESA. Hence ᶜadara "exculpate" (Arab). (2) ᶜadar "help": xviii. Amor, Aram; loanword in OT Heb. (3) ᶜazar "help": xii. Heb, Phoen.)

(PAṢA)        cf. *HOŠIAᶜ, *HIṢṢIL, HILLEṢ, *MILLEṬ, *ᶜAZAR, (PARAQ), *PILLEṬ. 3x (Qal). Transitive X HOŠIAᶜ. Element of separation: 100% cf. HIṢṢIL, (PARAQ).

Religious application (Ps): divine subject cf. HOŠIAᶜ "set free".

(PS P̱S̱Y̱ "separate" (1) paṣa "open": x. Heb. (2) paṣa "set free": Aram; loanword in Heb. (3) piṣṣa "compensate": II. Aram, Heb. (4) faṣa "separate" Arab.)

(PARAQ)    cf. *HOŠIAᶜ, *HIṢṢIL, HILLEṢ, *MILLEṬ, *ᶜAZAR, (PAṢA), *PILLEṬ. 4x (Qal). Transitive X HOŠIAᶜ. Element of separation: 100% cf. HIṢṢIL, PAṢA.

(1) Religious application (Ps, Lam): divine subject, with persons cf. HOŠIAᶜ. "set free".
(2) General application (Gen, Ps): with things cf. HILLEṢ "tear away".

(PS P̱ṞQ̱ "separate" (1) paraq "split": x. Heb, Aram; cf. Arab faraqa. (2) paraq "set free": v. Aram, ESA, Eth; loanword in OT Heb.)

PILLEṬ    cf. *HOŠIAᶜ, *HIṢṢIL, HILLEṢ, *MILLEṬ, *ᶜAZAR, (PAṢA), (PARAQ). 79x (24 Piel, 2 Hiph, 53 Nom). Transitive X HOŠIAᶜ. Nominalization (paliṭ, pᵉleṭa, miplaṭ): 60% cf. HOŠIAᶜ, ᶜAZAR. Element of separation: 13% cf. HOŠIAᶜ, MILLEṬ, ᶜAZAR.

(1) PILLEṬ: religious application (Pss): 93%. Divine subject cf. HOŠIAᶜ, HILLEṢ. "save", "preserve".

(2) paliṭ, pᵉleṭa: general application (passim): cf.

MILLEṬ. "survivor", "escape".

(PS PLṬ "live" (1) balaṭu "live, recover": xx. Akk.
Hence II. "stand out" (Heb, Aram). (2) palaṭ "survive":
ix. Aram, Heb, Phoen. (3) pilleṭ "save": xiv. Ug, Heb,
Aram. (4) milleṭ "rescue": x. Heb.)

## VI.    SOME GENERAL SEMANTIC PRINCIPLES.

The writer is well aware of the historical and psychological barriers that exist between theology and linguistics today.  He knows only too well that much of the terminology introduced above sounds foreign in the world of Old Testament scholarship, and that some of the methods used appear at first sight to fly in the face of well-established form-critical or philological principles.  This last chapter is intended to vindicate the approach by formulating a general semantic theory, based on the results of our research into the meaning of HOŠIA‘ , HIṢṢIL, etc., and proving that, far from ignoring or destroying traditional approaches to the same kind of problem, it actually supplements and reinforces them.  Modern general linguistic theory made us aware of five main contributions to the semantics of Old Testament Hebrew.

1.  An adequate definition of context must precede every semantic statement.  While the importance of immediate linguistic environment has been noted in previous semantic studies,[1] the question of the situation or situations in which Old Testament Hebrew is "contextualized" has not been fully discussed in any recent work on the subject. "Contextualization", although a somewhat ungainly term, nonetheless denotes a key factor in semantic description, and in particular the

---

1.  e.g. J. Barr, Semantics, p. 263;  D. Hill, op. cit., pp. 18f.

semantic description of a religious text such as the Old Testament.[1]

An examination of this problem immediately reveals that the Old Testament as a whole, and also separate units within it, are contextualized in many different situations: the form-critic contextualizes a given passage in its original Sitz im Leben (Gattungsgeschichte); the worshipper contextualizes a particular Psalm or credal formulation in his own experience at the present (actualization);[2] the religious teacher contextualizes parts of the legal codes in the life of his community (authority);[3] the preacher contextualizes prophetic passages in contemporary history (application).[4] The first step in semantic description then, must be to make clear which context of situation has been selected.

A consequence of this conclusion was to question the widespread assumption that the original contextualization is necessarily the most important. This presupposition can be traced back to the cognicio historiae which Luther saw as a necessity for Biblical exegesis but which referred only to the original context of situation.[5] Is the "original meaning" of HOSIAͨ͞ as reconstructed by nineteenth century

---

1. See Chapter I, especially, pp. 22f.

2. See especially, B.S. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, pp. 74-80; G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, II, p. 109.

3. Cf. J. Bright, op. cit., 214-8.

4. e.g. Dr. Martin Luther King's "I have a dream" speech in which he applied the language of the New Exodus (Isa. 40-48) to the hopes of his compatriots.

5. See A. Jepsen, "The Scientific Study of the Old Testament," p. 255. Cf. J. Bright, The Authority of the Old Testament, p. 169; D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, pp. 18f.

comparative philologists more important than its meaning as attested in Old Testament Hebrew?  Our standard lexica suggest that it is. But it is an essential part of semantic theory that this selection of one contextualization out of many is seen to be an arbitrary one. The Church traditionally describes the meaning of Isaiah 7:14 with reference to Jesus Christ, and the present writer believes this description to be meaningful and true.  But here the semanticist, (lexicographer, exegete, or theologian) is stepping outside his terms of reference.  He may do this for two reasons:  either for convenience, since a complete analysis of the meaning of a word or a passage in every situation in which it is contextualized would take a lifetime, or because of a particular, subjective interest in one or other of the situations.  For instance the form-critic, thanks to a mass of archaeological evidence would naturally be interested in the original situation in ancient Israel;  the New Testament scholar would be interested in the early church and the contextualization of Old Testament Hebrew in the New Testament;  the present writer, and one might suggest, any other member of the Christian Church, would have a special interest in the history of Christian tradition and the actualization of Old Testament Hebrew in the experiences of a Christian community.

The isolation of this problem of contextualization led to a further question that must be dealt with before an adequate semantic description is possible, namely the nature of the Old Testament.  As a religious text, it has a number of characteristics of importance to semantic theory:  the language is peculiarly fitted for contextualization

in a wide, one might almost say, infinite number of situations;[1.]
there are words of exclusively religious application, like BARA$^{)}$
"create" and to a lesser extent, HOŠIA$^{c}$ "save";[2.] there is a tendency
to minimize ambiguity, meaninglessness and irreverence in the text;[3.]
the size of certain lexical groups, HOŠIA$^{c}$, HISSIL, etc., for
instance, is exceptionally large in comparison with the situation in
later Hebrew;[4.] and finally the corpus is not a representative cross-
section of the Hebrew language at any one time.[5.] These contextual
factors have numerous implications for the linguist, and must be stated
at the outset.

2. Semantic statements must be primarily synchronic. By this is
meant, not that diachronic (historical) statements are invalid, but that
they are inevitably based on synchronic statements, and must therefore
only be made after adequate synchronic description has been completed.
The semanticist freezes the historical development of a word (or a pas-
sage) at a certain point and analyses it there first. This may involve
the introduction of historical information: for example, to give an
adequate description of HOŠIA$^{c}$ in Modern Hebrew, one would have to
refer to its meaning in the Old Testament. The analysis of the meaning
of HE$^{)e}$MIN in Isa. 7:9 may involve reference to the word's prehistory
(etymology).[6.] But in neither case is it conceivable that historical

---

1. See pp. 22f.
2. See p. 121.
3. See pp. 18f.
4. See pp. 148f.
5. See p. 224, note 1.
6. "Root-meanings," pp. 46-50 and see above, pp. 110-2.

statements precede synchronic description:  they are always ancillary to the semantic description of a word in its context.[1]

This implies that, for adequacy as well as convenience, a single point in the development of the language (or the interpretation of the language) is to be selected as a starting-point.  The above description of HOŠIĀ , HIŞŞIL, etc. was limited to massoretic tradition as printed in Kittel Biblia Hebraica[3].  Within it a particular register was selected rather than a particular literary form or chronological stratum, first because this seemed more in accordance with the nature of the text, and second because the register in question, language addressed to a deity, was an interesting one. Finally stylistic criteria were sought,[2] all with the object of defining the precise context in which the synchronic description of the words in question would be undertaken.

3.  Semantic universals operate in Old Testament Hebrew as actively as in any other language.  For a number of reasons, theological and cultural, scholars of previous generations had a feeling that Hebrew, and in particular Old Testament Hebrew, exhibited so many unique features that it had to be treated in a way altogether different from, for instance, the Indo-European languages.  The backlog of this

---

1.  It is still the practice in Old Testament Hebrew dictionaries to blind the reader with the word's prehistory, which is unnecessary except in the case of very rare words and ἅπαξ λεγόμενα . See for example, BDB, KB, TDNT, and D. Hill, op. cit., pp. 19ff. and pp. 82-162, where the semantic description of δίκαιος begins with Ugaritic ṣdk.

2.  See pp. 107-9.

misapprehension is still present in a good deal of Semitic and Old Testament research.[1] We have seen how as a religious text, the Old Testament has some distinctive features, and we might add now the fact that the Semitic languages certainly do have some unique phonological, grammatical and semantic characteristics: this is why it is possible to find an answer to the question "What is a Semitic language?"[2] But the sum of all these distinguishing features is not so great as the number of features which Hebrew has in common with other languages. Hebrew is just another language and the application of linguistic "universals"[3] to Hebrew, although in its infancy, proved rewarding.

The application of the theory of associative fields to Old Testament Hebrew, for example, produces the kind of result described in Chapter Three; the notion of the lexical-group, (i.e. a sector within the larger field) was of considerable importance when it came to defining the meaning of HOŠIA$^c$. The problem of root-meanings can be tackled in a new and profitable way with reference to the distinction between transparent and opaque words. Is HE$^{ʾ}$MIN in

---

1. e.g. J.G. Herder, The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry (quoted by Barr, op. cit., pp. 85f); T. Boman, Hebrew Thought compared with Greek, pp. 144f. This attitude is not, of course, due to wilful distortion, but to the same exaggerated reverence for a sacred text as that of the Massoretes. It would come under the heading of folk-linguistics. Cf. the "folk-etymology" of HOŠIA$^c$ (p. 212), which is of considerable interest to a student of modern linguistic method. See, for example, H.M. Hoenigswald, "A proposal for the study of folk-linguistics."

2. E. Ullendorff in Or., xxviii (1958), pp. 66-75.

3. See pp. 113ff.

245.

Isaiah 7:9 more transparent than English believe? Linguistic factors

operating in the frequent metaphorical transference from the legal

sphere into the HOŠIAᶜ -field, and the avoidance of anthropomorphism

in words like BARAʾ, have still to be fully analysed, but are clearly

important.

Other distinctions that can clarify and on occasion solve

semantic problems are between general and particular terms (pataḥ

"open" as opposed to paqaḥ "open (eyes, ears)"), polysemy (semantic

divergence, e.g. paṣa I. "open", II. "rescue ");[1.] and homonymy

(phonetic convergence, e.g. ṣur I. "shut in", II. "rock")[2.] extension

and restriction in meaning (e.g. the extension of meaning in dabar

("word" > "thing"), led to the borrowing of Aramaic milla "word").[3.]

Semantic borrowing in Old Testament Hebrew has only been

examined according to source languages, and the factors involved in

this universal phenomenon have not been studied. But already a number

of points can be made. There is evidence that semantic borrowing

among the Semitic languages in the HOŠIAᶜ -field was common, and this

provides support for any theory that seeks to find cognates apparently

denoting "save".[4.] It seems that on occasion loanwords from Aramaic

---

1. II. is borrowed from Aramaic. See p. 229.

2. I. < PS ṢWR; II. < PS ṮWR. See also pp. 117ff.

3. See pp. 123f.

4. We noted the following examples: Aramaic paṣa, paraq in Old Tes-
tament Hebrew (pp.227-9 ); Hebrew hošiaᶜ in Aramaic, Early South
Arabian (p. 210); Hebrew hilles in Arabic (?) (p. 225); Old Tes-
tament Hebrew hiṣṣil in Aramaic and Early South Arabian (?) (p. 216).

into Old Testament Hebrew can be explained with reference to exegetical method, a process rather unusual in the field of semantic borrowing.[1.] Taboo has a number of linguistic consequences in most languages, and Old Testament Hebrew is no exception. For instance the fact that yadaᶜ "know" is used as a euphemism for sexual intercourse is paralleled by English "have", and tells us nothing about the "basic" meaning of yadaᶜ.[2.]

Finally analogy is an important factor in semantic change in every language. This is best explained as a kind of interference between words of related meaning. šapaṭ min "(lit.) judge from (sc. pass judgement so as to rescue from, hence vindicate)" is due to interference from HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc., and occurs in the case of several other words in the field.[3.]

4. A structural approach is required as much for semantic description as for phonological and grammatical analysis. As a first step in achieving such an approach, it was found that the rudiments of transformational grammar can profitably be applied in two important areas of linguistic description, a practical one and a semantic one. On the one hand, when it is realised that a basic structure YHWH+ HOŠIAᶜ + Noun Phrase underlies not only sentences containing the verb HOŠIAᶜ, but also those with the nouns yešaᶜ, yᵉšuᶜa, etc., or to put it another way, that the sentence YHWH HOŠIAᶜ li can be rewritten as

---

1. See pp. 125f.
2. See p. 127.
3. Cf. ᶜana, rib. See pp. 128f.

YHWH NATAN li tᵉšuᶜa, without any fundamental change of meaning,[1] then one has the immediate practical advantage of being able to speak of the incidence of HOŠIAᶜ and the precise relations which hold between it and other lexical items in all the various forms and complex sentences where it occurs. On the other hand transformational analysis unearthed an interesting distinction between HOŠIAᶜ and HISȘIL, which has semantic implications: the fact that HOŠIAᶜ has no less than four nominal transforms, while HISȘIL has none, means that the semantic range of the former is far wider and richer than that of the latter: expressions like kobaᶜ yᵉšuᶜa "the helmet of salvation" and maᶜyane hayyᵉšuᶜa "the wells of salvation" do not occur with hisṣil.[2]

Two main approaches toward a structural theory of semantics have been put forward in recent years, associated with the names of John Lyons, on the one hand, and J. Katz on the other. In Structural Semantics (1963) Lyons takes "meaning-relations" as his model. Incompatibility, antonymy, hyponymy, the relation that holds between converse terms like buy and sell, consequence and synonymy are analysed and the meaning of linguistic items defined without reference to extra-lingual features (reference is a relation of a different kind).[3] In the event, most of these meaning-relations are not contracted by HOŠIAᶜ, HISȘIL, etc., and the question arises whether a method of semantic analysis designed for the description of part of

---

1. See pp. 163-76.
2. See p. 178.
3. See p. 189.

the vocabulary of Plato is applicable to all linguistic data. One
general distinction which did emerge from an analysis of meaning-
relations, however, was that HOSIAᶜ contracts relations (poetic paral-
lelism, hyponymy, antonymy) with terms denoting general physical and
psychological health, HISṢIL with terms denoting movement from one
place to another.[1]

The other main approach to semantic theory "componential
analysis", manifestly modelled on modern theories of transformational
grammar, seeks to identify in natural language a set of semantic
elements ("markers", "sememes") and a set of "projection rules" from
which meaningful sentences are produced.[2] Without entering into the
debate as to whether these "semantic markers" are part of the cognitive
structure of the human mind,[3] or indeed whether the meaning of a term
can adequately be defined in terms of the sum total of its semantic
constituents, the notion of semantic markers has one valuable contribu-
tion to make to a study like the present, in which a group of related
words is under discussion. Semantic markers enable us to make general
statements about groups of words: e.g. man, bull, stallion have in
common the semantic markers (Male) and (Adult), as opposed to woman,
cow, mare which have in common the markers (Female) and (Adult).[4]
In the same way we found it possible to speak of "an element of
separation" common to HOSIAᶜ, HISṢIL, etc. Such an element is, like

1. See pp. 180f.
2. e.g. J. Katz, The Philosophy of Language, pp. 151-4.
3. Op. cit., pp. 240-82.
4. Op. cit., pp. 157f.

transitivity, synonymy and other linguistic features, thoroughly context-bound, and moreover varies in degree from one member of the lexical group to another: this provided us with another important distinction between HOŠIAᶜ and HIṢṢIL. [1]

5. Finally, semantic analysis must be monolingual. [2] In this respect the Hebrew language department in the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, is at a distinct advantage over corresponding departments in Europe and America. Even although Modern Hebrew is in many ways to be carefully distinguished from Old Testament Hebrew, at all levels, phonological, grammatical and semantic, there is inevitably a much wider cultural overlap there than there is between Hebrew and English, or between Hebrew and German. One of the chief obstacles to good semantic theory in such Old Testament scholarship has been the persistent practice of overestimating the importance of English equivalents: dabar means both "word" and "thing"; yešuᶜa means "victory" as well as "salvation". [3] Only at the very end of the study of the meaning of a given item is it appropriate to suggest English equivalents: only after the semantic description is complete, are we ready to contemplate translation.

In the present study, it had been established that HOŠIAᶜ has a

---

1. See above, pp. 178ff.

2. I am indebted to Professor Rabin for focussing my attention on this basic principle.

3. Cf. Barr's unsympathetic criticisms of this practice in the works of Torrance and Pedersen (Semantics, pp. 129-37). Again this is an age-old type of linguistic activity of considerable value and interest and can be investigated under the heading of folk-linguistics. Cf. p. 244, note 1.

distinctively religious application not only in Hebrew but in every
other language where it occurs. In English <u>save</u> would be the equiv-
alent.[1] A forensic application is also detectable especially in the
expression w<sup>e</sup>ʾen mošiaʿ and in this case the English equivalent might
be "and he (she, etc.) had no <u>defence</u>".[2]

Another besetting danger in much Old Testament linguistics has
long been comparative philology. Rather than examine the text itself
for the kind of semantic features outlined above, it has been regular
practice to go straight from the Old Testament text to the lexica of
other Semitic languages. In the case of <u>hapax legomena</u> such an
approach is necessary and profitable.[3] But it is entirely gratuitous
and often misleading in cases where there is abundant evidence in the
text. <u>HOŠIAʿ</u>, <u>yešaʿ</u>, etc. occur more than 300 times in Old Testament
Hebrew, and if it is impossible to discover their precise meaning
without adducing the evidence of other languages, evidence which may
be dated and located far away from Old Testament Hebrew, then there
must be something very seriously wrong with the semantic method. It
is hoped that the present experiment has illustrated the kind of
semantic information still available within Old Testament Hebrew and
formalized a possible method for collecting it.

---

1. To avoid <u>save</u> and <u>salvation</u> because they are "too religious," as
some would suggest, is to miss the essential distinction between
HOŠIAʿ and the other words in its field.

2. See pp. 213f.

3. Even in the case of ἁπαξ λεγόμενα , MT provides a
possible interpretation (see pp. 18f), so that it is only when our
concern is to discover the "original meaning" that the monolingual
approach has to be implemented with comparative philology.

Appendix A    The "compiler" and "final form of the text."

Our decision to work from the final form of the text makes the notion of the compiler an important question in its own right. What is more, like the final form of the text, this is a question which is frequently glossed over in modern scholarship. Koch's short survey of recent research in the field of Redaktionsgeschichte, for example, shows how this branch of Biblical form-criticism is still young.[1] While the compiler or redactor is a much used term in the commentaries, there have been few systematic attempts to define it in general terms. The following are some suggestions.

1. The term "compiler" is the last process in the development of the literary form of a text.[2] It seems better to think in terms of a process than of an individual person. To put this another way, the question of the purpose of the compiler and the question of the meaning of the final form of the text are virtually indistinguishable. The assigning of certain Psalms to David, for instance, probably reflects conditions at a time of renewed Davidic fervour in face of Samaritan rivalry,[3] and, when we speak of the compiler, there is no need to imagine a person living at this time, with particular aims and interests. This also avoids rather pointless discussions of whether one should think of one compiler or several compilers.[4]

---

1. K. Koch, Was ist Formgeschichte?, pp. 68-71.
2. Cf. K. Koch, op. cit., pp. 62f.
3. A. Weiser, The Psalms, p. 98.
4. e.g. H.W. Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, p. 19.

2. By restricting the term to the last process, a useful distinction can be maintained between, for example, the Deuteronomistic theology (detectable in one redaction of the Books of Samuel) and a later stage.[1] The danger of neglecting this final stage can be partially avoided by giving it a precise name. Driver scarcely distinguished between "the Hebrew historiographer" and the "compiler or arranger of pre-existing documents," while both are given second place to the "Hebrew writers" and "older narratives."[2]

3. A further point is that, while in some cases it is possible to date the compiler with some degree of precision, this is normally a question best left open. Beyond stating that the compiler comes after JEDP, $R^J$, $R^E$, $R^D$, etc., and before MT, the date is unimportant. When for instance were the three parts of the Book of Isaiah combined and by whom? The answer is of less importance for the study of the final form of the text, than the fact that they have been and the purpose of this process. The question, not always seriously discussed,[3] about the purpose of the compiler of the Book of Job (including the Elihu speeches) is more important than his date or Sitz im Leben. The same is true of the Book of Amos where the purpose of the compiler is generally assumed to be of less importance than the meaning of the ipsissima verba, which, of course, exclude the "happy ending."[4]

---

1. Cf. H.W. Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 241. But throughout the commentary it is evident that the compiler belongs to deuteronomistic circles. Cf. p. 19.

2. S.R. Driver, Introduction, p. 5. Cf. H. Gunkel, Genesis, pp. lxxxii-lxxxv.

3. e.g. S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job, p. lxiii.

4. e.g. W.R. Harper, The Book of Amos, p. cx.

While the date and _Sitz im Leben_ of the compiler may at times be of considerable interest, his purpose and his place in the development of tradition are the main subjects for _Redaktionsgeschichte_.

4. The compiler is not simply the arranger of separate sources in written form. Koch seems almost to identify the _Redaktor_ with the first written stage in the development of the text.[1] Without raising the whole question of the relation between oral tradition and the written literature, we now know that the boundary line between them is very indistinct. To try to identify the compiler with the process by which the former is converted into the latter would therefore be exceedingly risky. On the one hand, material handed down by oral tradition can be so fixed that there is no reason why a compiler could not operate in the preliterary stage; on the other hand, it seems certain that long after it was first written down the text underwent considerable changes before it reached its present form. The Chronicler, for example, worked with written texts. The compiler as we would define it, then, is the final arranger of the separate sources in written form.

5. Careful consideration of the part played by the compiler in Biblical tradition distinguishes the present approach both from that of the majority of form-critics and from that of the fundamentalists. By acknowledging the existence and the importance of this later process, by which earlier traditions are combined, elaborated, brought

---

1. _Op. cit._, p. 63.

up to date and finally crystallized, we can avoid the form-critic's arbitrary preoccupation with the earlier strands,[1] while at the same time admitting, unlike the fundamentalist, the importance of the text's prehistory. The compiler is the link between the two questions (1) what separate traditions are juxtaposed here? (2) what was the purpose in combining them, i.e. what is the meaning of the text as it stands?

6. A question avoided by B.S. Childs in his important discussion of the problem of evaluating diverse traditions in the Bible,[2] is the relation between the compiler and the canon. Of the six accounts of the Assyrian crisis, five occur in the Book of Isaiah: is the relation between these five, juxtaposed by the compiler of the Book of Isaiah, the same as that between all six as combined by the decision of a religious community to include them all in the Old Testament? Is the problem of inconsistencies within the Book of Judges the same as that of the inconsistencies between II Samuel and I Chronicles? While the process whereby the first set of inconsistencies arose is defined as the compiler of the Book of Judges, and can probably be described in terms of his purpose or theological interests, the process whereby the other set of diversities was created demands a wider definition of the term compiler. In dealing with the notion of historical development in the Bible, the relation between the Old and New Testaments, and

1. See above, pp. 7ff.
2. Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis, pp. 121-7. Cf. above, pp. 9ff.

other questions of this kind, such a definition is clearly of
considerable practical, as well as theoretical importance. Is it
legitimate to avoid this question, as von Rad does, and let each part
of the Bible speak for itself, however inconsistently?[1] Those
critics who consider that the purpose of the compiler was no more
than to make as complete a collection as possible of the traditions
of the past by juxtaposing fragments from earlier histories "regard-
less of the fact that these fragments were inconsistent with one
another,"[2] are no less guilty of begging the question.

7. Finally, over against the picture of diversity just
discussed, it will be remembered that a remarkable stylistic consist-
ency emerged from our study of language addressed to God in the Old
Testament. This cannot but suggest some final process of levelling,
like later massoretic activity, or, in English, the activity of King
James' translators. The most striking example of this is the language
of HITPALLEL-utterances,[3] which can hardly be a coincidence and which
implies a much more substantial contribution on the part of the
compiler than that of the massoretes. Any answer to questions of the
type What is Old Testament teaching on X? or What actually happened?
must acknowledge the possibility of this kind of overall consistency,
however "late" or "unscientific" the process may be by which it came
about.

---

1. Old Testament Theology, II, p. 427.
2. A. Lods, Israel, p. 10.
3. See above, pp. 58f.

Appendix   B     Abrupt changes of person in Old Testament Hebrew.

Abrupt changes of person have long been recognized as a peculiar
feature of Old Testament Hebrew.  Several explanations are customarily
offered in the commentaries and grammars.  The first is simply that
the massoretic text is corrupt.  GK, for instance, in quoting examples
from "poetic (or prophetic) language" inserts the parenthesis "supposing
the text to be correct," and actually explains away some of his examples
as scribal errors:  e.g. Isa. 1:29; Mal. 2:15.[1]  BH very frequently
emends the text in such a way as to remove abrupt changes of person:
e.g. Gen. 49:4; Lev. 2:8; Isa. 10:12; 44:7; 45:8; 52:14; 61:7; Pss.
34:6; 37:36; 65:4; 68:36; 75:11; 81:7; 89:2.  RSV regularly follows BH
and adds a few more emendations, citing ancient versions:  e.g. Gen.
19:17; Isa. 14:30; Ps. 109:15.  In many cases this may be the correct
explanation, but in dealing with the final form of the text, we must
still ask what the text means as it stands.[2]

A second solution to the problem, again a historical one, is to
separate originally distinct sources.  The following quotation is not
uncharacteristic:  "the alternation between the use of the second
person singular and the second person plural immediately indicates
certain breaks in homogeneity.  In fact the contents do not make a
perfect whole."[3]  Again this kind of explanation may in some cases
be historically correct;  but it does not help us to understand the

---

1.   Para. 144p.
2.   See above, pp. 16ff.
3.   G. von Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 49.

final form of the text in which abrupt changes of person occur so frequently.

A third approach to the problem retains MT and attempts to rationalize it in various ways. For example, in the case of the Deuteronomy passages referred to in the above quotation, it is argued that the person addressed is the collective "Israel", which can be taken as singular or plural.[1] The difficulty is hardly resolved, however, since alternation between persons in the same sentence is still left unexplained. Another type of rationalization consists in reconstructing an original situation, usually liturgical, in which several speakers are envisaged, for instance, an individual ("I") and a chorus ("we"): e.g. Isa. 52:14- 53:12.[2] Alternatively it is maintained that the "I" and the "we" in the Royal Psalms are often semantically indistinguishable insofar as the speaker is the representative of his community: "whether the king says 'I' or 'we'... does not matter."[3] Psychological and anthropological conclusions on the "king ideology", corporate personality and the like are then related to these abrupt changes of person,[4] but their implications for Biblical semantics are glossed over.

A more imaginative and delightful example of this liturgical explanation is the notion that, with the unheralded change from

---

1. S.R. Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 21.
2. "A prophetic liturgy": cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, II, pp. 255f; C.R. North, The Second Isaiah, pp. 234ff.
3. S. Mowinckel, Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, p. 61.
4. e.g. J. Pedersen, Israel I-II, pp. 263ff.

historical statements about God to language addressed directly to God
(e.g. Deut. 26:9f), "the speaker has taken his place in the story of
salvation, and, in a splendid foreshortening of time, has acknowledged
himself to be the direct recipient of the act of salvation which was
the gift of the promised land."[1]. There are many cases of this change
from third person to second person and vice versa in the Psalms, and
recourse to an original cultic setting certainly gives a possible
explanation: "the alternation between the hymnic testimony to God
and the style of prayer which depends on the reference of the Psalm
to cultic proceedings, produces a vivid dynamic form, which effectively
contrasts with the consistency of the thought-sequence."[2]. We must
still ask, however, what happens to this device when the original
situation no longer exists. The abruptness of these changes of person
is due to the complete lack of introductory formulae or rubrics, and
it is only with great difficulty that we can reconstruct the original
situation. Assuming that MT is meaningful as it stands today, that
is to say, without precise cultic referents, how are we to explain
it?

The solution has already been put forward; it remains for us
now to draw attention to it in the context of Biblical semantics and
add a few refinements. This abrupt change of person (e.g. in Isa.
52:14) "is a primitive stylistic device: a passage begins with a

---

1. G. von Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 159.
2. A. Weiser, Psalms, p. 618.

purely rhetorical apostrophe, but then the description passes over into the natural third person."[1] Nyberg thus accepts this as a feature of Old Testament Hebrew, without attempting in the first instance to explain it away or rationalize it, and this is the most important step in the argument. That it is a "primitive device" is open to question since it is a regular feature of Amharic and Arabic.[2] One factor in the "challenge of Amharic," and, we might add, in the challenge of Hebrew, is just this peculiar feature, so unfamiliar and perplexing to the European;[3] but this does not mean that it is necessarily a primitive feature. Indeed, if we are right in assuming that some of these changes of person are due to scribal innovations and the juxtaposition of originally separate sources, then we must also allow that MT may represent a more sophisticated stage in the development of the Hebrew language, in which alternation between persons is natural and accepted usage.

Furthermore, this feature is a far more frequent one than Nyberg suggests ("in a number of passages");[4] but he is right in observing that it is a feature of poetry and high style. We have seen many examples of it in "set-piece" language addressed to God, not only, that is to say, in hymns and prayers in poetical form, but also in "Deuteronomic prayers" (e.g. Dan. 9:4-19; Ezr. 9:6-15).[5]

---

1. H.S. Nyberg, "Smärtornas man. En studie till Jes. 52, 13-53, 12," p. 48.
2. E. Ullendorff, The Challenge of Amharic, pp. 7f.
3. Op. cit., pp. 6-11.
4. Loc. cit.
5. See above, pp. 56f.

There is one final observation to be made on this feature of Old Testament Hebrew. If it is accepted that abrupt changes of person are a regular characteristic of Old Testament Hebrew, as of other Semitic languages, then they cannot be taken on their own as proof of textual corruption, separate sources or particular cultic proceedings in ancient Israel.

Table 1.    Incidence of HOŠIAᶜ, HIṢṢIL, etc. in register.

| Style \ Lexeme | HITPALLEL (pp.51ff) | QARAᵓ (pp.59ff) | ṢAᶜAQ (pp.65ff) | ŠIR (pp.82ff) | BEREK (pp.86ff) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HOŠIAᶜ | I Sam.2:1<br>II K.19:19<br>Isa.33:2<br>37:20<br>38:20<br>64:4<br>Jer.3:23<br>14:8<br>14:9<br>17:14<br>Jon.2:10<br>Hab.1:2<br>3:8<br>3:13<br>3:18<br>I Ch.16:35<br>16:35<br>II Ch.6:41<br>20:9 | Jud.15:18 | Jer.2:27c<br>Hos.14:4 | Ex.15:2<br>II Sam.22:3<br>22:3<br>22:3<br>22:4<br>22:28<br>22:36<br>22:42<br>22:47<br>22:51<br>Isa.12:2<br>12:2<br>12:3<br>26:1 | Gen.49:18<br>Deut.33:29 |
| HIṢṢIL | Gen.32:12<br>Isa.44:17<br>I Ch.16:35 | | Jud.10:15<br>I Sam.12:10 | II Sam.22:18<br>22:49 | |
| ᶜAZAR | | II Ch.14:10<br>14:10 | | Jud.5:23 | Gen.49:25<br>Deut.33:7<br>33:26<br>33:29 |
| PILLET | Lam.2:22<br>Ezr.9:8<br>9:13<br>9:14<br>9:15 | | | II Sam.22:2<br>22:44 | |
| PARAQ | Lam.5:8 | | | | |
| HILLEṢ | | | | II Sam.22:20 | |

Note  1. For the reduction of the number of relevant styles to five, see p.108.
2. Nominalizations are underlined.  See pp.164ff.

Table 2.  Part of the associative field of HOŠIAᶜ in Old Testament Hebrew.

**SPACIOUSNESS:** Ps.4:2 (HIRḤIB)
(pp.150f)  Job 32:20 (RAWAḤ)
Gen.9:27 (HIPTA᾽)

**LEADING:** Dt.32:12 (HINḤA)
(pp.144f) Isa.49:10 (NEHEL)
Deut.30:3 (ŠUB ŠᵉBUT)
Ex.15:13 (NAHA)
Ps.119:133 (HEKIN PAᶜAM)
Ps.18:34 (ŠIWWA RAGLAYIM)

**OPENING:** Ps.102:21 (PITTEAḤ)
107:16 (ŠIBBER DELET)

**LIFTING:** Ps.18:17 (MAŠA)
18:34 (HEᶜEMID ᶜAL BAMOT)
30:2 (DILLA)
27:5 (ROMEM)
40:3 (HEᶜᵉLA)
107:41 (ŠIGGEB)

**HEALING:** Isa.61:1 (ḤABAŠ)
Jer.17:14 (RAPA᾽)
30:17 (HEᶜᵉLA ᾽ARUKA)
Ps.119:25 (ḤIYYA)

**REFINING:** Isa.1:25 (ṢARAP)
(pp.157f) Mal.3:3 (ZIQQEQ)

**CLEANING:** Ps.51:4 (TEHER)
51:9 (ḤITTE)
51:9 (KIBBES)
2 K.21:13 (MAḤA)

H O Š I A ᶜ
H I Š Ṣ I L
ᶜA Z A R
H I L L E Ṭ
P I L L E Ṭ
M I L L E Ṭ
H I L L E Ṣ
P A Ṣ A
P A R A Q

**KNOWING:** Amos 3:2 (YADAᶜ)
(p.140) Hos.3:1 (᾽AHEB)
Isa.44:1 (BAHAR)
Ps.106:4 (ZAKAR)
102:20 (HIBBIṬ)
Deut.7:7 (ḤAŠAQ)
Ps.4:2 (ḤANAN)
18:51 (ᶜAŠA ḤESED)
128:5 (BEREK)

**LIGHT:** Isa.61:1 (BA᾽ ᾽OR)
(pp145f) Ps.132:17 (ᶜARAK NER)
18:29 (HIGGIAH ḤOŠEK)
118:27 (HE᾽IR)

**LAWCOURT:** Ps.119:114, (GA᾽AL)
(pp.141f.) 78:42 (PADA)
54:3 (DIN)
22:22 (ᶜANA)
Isa.33:22 (ŠAPAṬ)
51:5 (QAROB ṢEDEQ)

**KEEPING:** Ps.32:7 (NAṢAR)
78:50 (ḤASAK)
121:5 (ŠAMAR)

**MILITARY:** 2 K.19:34 (GANAN)
Isa.59:17 (LABAŠ ŠIRION)
Ex.14:14 (NILḤAM)
Ps.34:8 (ḤANA ṢABIB)

**SUPPORT:** Ps.3:6 (SAMAK)
4:1:13 (TAMAK)
18:36 (SAᶜAD)
2 Ch.20:20 (NE᾽ᵉMAN)

I Sam.24:16 (RIB)

Note 1. Opposites of HOŠIAᶜ (e.g. HISPIL, ᶜAZAB) are not included in this table, nor are terms related
to it phonologically (e.g. tušiyya, yišaʿ) or morphologically (e.g. bᵉtula, gᵉbula; cf. yᵉšuᶜa).
2. The page-numbers refer to any discussion of individual sectors of the field in Chapter III.
For general comments on 'field theory', see pp.136ff.

Table 3.    Incidence of intransitivity in HOSIA͟c, HIṢṢIL, etc.

|  | Surface structure | Deep structure | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|
| HOŠIA͟c | Gen. 49:18<br>I Sam. 2:1<br>II Sam. 22:42<br>Isa. 12:3<br>Jon. 2:10<br>Hab. 3:8 | Jer. 14:9<br>Hab. 1:2<br>II Ch. 20:9 | 9 (25%) |
| HIṢṢIL | | | 0 |
| ͟cAZAR | Deut. 33:7 | | 1 (14%) |
| PILLET | | | 0 |
| PARAQ | Lam. 5:8 | | 1 (14%) |
| HILLEṢ | | | 0 |

Note.    The maximum includes cases of surface intransitivity which may be due to a deletion of the object in nominalization.    See pp. 178ff.

Table 4.    The element of separation

|  | min-adjunct | Poetic parallels<br>(1) spatial | Poetic parallels<br>(2) non-spatial |
|---|---|---|---|
| HOŠIA͟c | II Sam.22:3<br>22:4<br>II K. 19:19<br>Isa. 37:20 | HIŠPIL  II Sam.22:28<br>QIBBEṢ  I Ch.16:35 | QARA͗  II Sam.22:4<br>͟cANA  22:36<br>22:42<br>ḥesed  22:51<br>z͟eroa͟c  Isa.33:2<br>ḤATA͗  64:4<br>QIWWA  Jer.14:8<br>nidham  14:9<br>RAPA͗  17:14<br>ŠAMA͟c  Hab. 1:2<br>ŠAMEAḤ  II Ch.6:41 |
| HIṢṢIL | Gen. 32:12<br>I Sam.12:10<br>II Sam.22:18<br>22:49<br>I Ch. 16:35 | LAQAḤ  II Sam.22:17f<br>MAŠA  22:17f<br>HOŠT͗  22:49<br>ROMEM  22:49<br>QIBBEṢ  I Ch.16:35 | |
| ͟cAZAR | Deut. 33:7 | HEBI͗  Deut.33:7 | BEREK  Gen.49:25<br>GA͗A  Deut.33:29 |
| PILLET | II Sam.22:44 | | ŠAMAR II Sam.22:44 |
| PARAQ | Lam. 5:8 | | |

HILLEṢ/..

| HILLES | | | HOṢī ͗ II Sam. 22:20 | |
| | | | HIRHIB 22:20 | |

Note  1. "Poetic parallels" includes all terms related by the poetic
      structure, to the term in question.
   2. Complex relations are underlined.  See pp. 185 ff.

Table 5.   Reference.

| | A. Subject (other than YHWH) | B. Object (other than speaker) | C. Object of Separation | D. Other adjuncts |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HOSIA^( | Assyria Hos.14:4 | the king II Sam.22:51 Hab. 3:13 priests II Ch.6:41 the poor II Sam.22:28 a righteous nation Isa. 26:1f | injustice II Sam.22:3 enemies 22:4 Sennacherib II K.19:19 Isa. 37:20 joy Isa. 12:3 | invasion Isa.33:2 drought Jer.14:8 victory Jud.15:18 escape II Sam.22:51 joy Isa. 12:3 |
| HISSIL | wooden image Isa.44:17 | | Esau Gen. 32:12 enemies I Sam.12:10 II Sam.22:18 22:49 I Ch. 16:35 | invasion Jud.10:15 |
| ʿAZAR | Meroz Jud.5:23 | | enemies Deut.33:7 | victory Jud.5:23 II Ch.14:10 |
| PILLET | | | enemies II Sam.22:44 | exile Lam.2:22 return Ezr.9:13 |
| PARAQ | | | enemies Lam.5:8 | |
| HILLES | | | | |

Table 6.    Meaning-relations

|  | Opposition | Consequence | Implication |
|---|---|---|---|
| HOŠIAᶜ | MUT Jud. 15:18<br>NAPAL 15:18<br>HIŠPIL II Sam.22:28<br>QAṢAP Isa. 64:4<br>šeqer Jer. 3:23<br>nidham 14:9 | ʾaš ᶜre Deut.33:29a<br>NIGGEN Isa. 38:20<br>BAṬAH 12:2a<br>HODA I Ch. 16:35 | ʾel Deut.33:29<br>ᶜANA II Sam.22:36<br>ŠAMAᶜ Hab. 1:2<br>II Ch. 20:19<br>QIWWA Jer. 14:8<br>RAPAʾ 17:14 |
| HIṢṢIL |  | BAṬAH I Sam. 12:10<br>HODA II Sam.22:19<br>I Ch. 16:35<br>ZIMMER II Sam.22:19 | ʾel Isa. 44:17 |
| ᶜAZAR | NIKHAŠ Deut.33:29b |  | ʾel Deut. 33:26 |
| PILLET |  |  | ṣaddiq Ezr. 9:15 |
| PARAQ |  |  |  |
| HILLEṢ |  |  | HAPEṢ II Sam.22:20 |

Note  1. Complex relations are underlined.  See pp.185 ff.

## Abbreviations and symbols.

AL   Archivum Linguisticum, Glasgow.

ANET  Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament,
    ed. J. Pritchard. 2nd edition (Princeton, 1955).

AnOr  Analecta Orientalia, Rome.

ArOr  Archiv Orientální, Prague.

ASTI  Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem, Leiden.

ATD  Das Alte Testament Deutsch, Göttingen.

BASOR Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, New
    Haven, Conn.

BBB  Bonner Biblische Beiträge, Bonn.

BDB  F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English
    Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1907, reprinted 1959).

$BH^3$  Biblia Hebraica, ed. R. Kittel. Third edition (Stüttgart, 1937).

BKAT  Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament, Neukirchen.

BL   H. Bauer and P. Leander, Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen
    Sprache (Halle, 1922).

BSOAS Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London.

BWANT Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament (Leipzig),
    Stüttgart.

BZAW  Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
    (Giessen), Berlin.

CAD  The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago, edd. J.
    Gelb and others (Chicago, 1956-).

CambB Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, Cambridge.

CB   Coniectanea Biblica, Lund.

CentB  Century Bible, London.

ERRATUM

For Kautsch read Kautzsch.

| | |
|---|---|
| DLZ | Deutsche Literaturzeitung. |
| EAT | O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament. 3rd edition (Tübingen, 1964). |
| ERE | J. Hastings, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 13 Vols. (Edinburgh, 1917). |
| ESA | Epigraphic South Arabian. |
| ET | The Expository Times, Edinburgh. |
| EvTh | Evangelische Theologie, Munich. |
| GK | Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, ed. E. Kautsch. 2nd English edition by A.E. Cowley (Oxford, 1910). |
| GVGSS | C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprache, 2 Vols. (Berlin, 1908-13). |
| HAT | Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Tübingen. |
| ICC | The International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh. |
| JanLing | Janua Linguarum. Studia Memoriae Nicolai van Wijk Dedicata. Series Minor and Maior, The Hague. |
| JBL | Journal of Biblical Literature, New York, New Haven, Philadelphia. |
| JNES | Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Chicago. |
| JSS | Journal of Semitic Studies, Manchester. |
| KB | L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden, 1953). |
| LXX | Septuaginta, ed. A. Rahlfs (Stüttgart, 1933). |
| MT | Massoretic Text. |
| MVAG | Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch (-Aegyptisch) en Gesellschaft (Berlin), Leipzig. |
| ODEE | The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology, ed. C.T. Onions (Oxford, 1966). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Or | Orientalia, Rome. |
| OTMS | The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H. Rowley (Oxford, 1951). |
| OuSt | Oudtestamentische Studien, Leiden. |
| PEQ | Palestine Exploration Quarterly, London. |
| PLO | Porta Linguarum Orientalium. New series (Wiesbaden). |
| PPS | Publications of the Philological Society, Oxford. |
| PRU | Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit, edd. C. Virolleaud and J. Nougayrol (Paris, 1955-). |
| PS | Proto-Semitic. |
| PUNPS | Proceedings of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne Philosophical Society, Newcastle upon Tyne. |
| RSV | The Revised Standard Version of the Bible. |
| SBT | Studies in Biblical Theology, London. |
| SEÅ | Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, Lund. |
| SJT | Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh. |
| SVT | Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Leiden. |
| TBC | Torch Bible Commentaries, London. |
| TDNT | Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. G. Kittel, English translation by G.W. Bromiley, Vols. 1-IV (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1964-7). |
| TLZ | Theologische Literaturzeitung, Leipzig, Berlin. |
| TPS | Transactions of the Philological Society, Oxford. |
| TWNT | Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel (Stuttgart, 1933-). |
| VT | Vetus Testamentum, Leiden. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <u>WUS</u> | J. Aistleitner, <u>Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache</u>, ed. O. Eissfeldt. 3rd edition (Berlin, 1967). |
| <u>ZAW</u> | <u>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u> (Giessen), Berlin. |
| <u>ZTK</u> | <u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</u> (Freiburg i.Br, Leipzig), Tübingen. |

## Symbols

| | |
|---|---|
| $>$ | "develops historically into" |
| $\rightarrow$ | "is to be rewritten as"  (see pp. 166 f). |
| $\emptyset$ | zero  (see pp. 167 f.). |
| $+$ | concatenation |
| ( ) | semantic component  (see pp. 248 f.). |
| NP | Noun-phrase |
| V | Verb |
| <u>CAPITALS</u> | lexeme  (see p. 166). |
| <u>underlined</u> | transcription from particular context. |

Transliteration follows S. Moscati (ed.), <u>An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages</u>, q.v., pp. 20f., with one minor variation: <u>š<sup>e</sup>wa</u> is transcribed thus <sup>e</sup>, not thus ə. Since linguistic description is limited in the present essay to the lexical level (cf. p. 113 ), sub-phonemic variants (bh(<u>b</u>), dh(<u>d</u>), ā, ē, etc.) are ignored (cf. Moscati, p. 20).

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

This list includes all the works referred to in the notes and other standard books of reference, lexica, for example, which have been frequently consulted. Abbreviations are listed on pp. 267 ff.

ALBREKTSON, B., History and the Gods. An Essay on the Idea of Historical Events as Divine Manifestations in the Ancient Near East and in Israel (CB (OT Series) i, Lund, 1967).

ALBRIGHT, W.F., The Archaeology of Palestine (Harmondsworth, 1949).

BALLY, Ch., "L'arbitraire du signe" (Le Français Moderne, viii (1940), pp. 193-206).

BARR, J., The Semantics of Biblical Language (Oxford, 1961).
_____ Biblical Words for Time (SBT, 33, London, 1962).
_____ "Did Isaiah know about Hebrew 'root meanings'?" (ET, lxxv (1964), p. 242).
_____ Old and New in Interpretation (London, 1966).

BAUER, T., Die Ostkanaanäer (Leipzig, 1926).

BAZELL, C.E., CATFORD, J.C., HALLIDAY, M.A.K. and ROBINS, R.H., (edd.), In Memory of J.R. Firth (London, 1966).

BEESTON, A.F.L., Addenda to A.K. Irvine, "Homicide in pre-Islamic South Arabia" (BSOAS, xxx (1967), p. 292).

BEGRICH, J., "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel" (ZAW, lii (1934), pp. 81-92); reprinted in Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, ed. W. Zimmerli.
_____ see GUNKEL, H.

BENTZEN, A., King and Messiah (London, 1955).

BEYERLIN, W., Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen (Tübingen, 1961); English translation by S. Rudman (Oxford, 1965).

271.

BLOOMFIELD, L., Language (London, 1935).

de BOER, P.A.H., Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des Alten Testaments (Stuttgart, 1962).

BOMAN, T., Hebrew Thought compared with Greek (London, 1960).

BOUQUET, A.C., Sacred Books of the World (Harmondsworth, 1954).

BOWMAN, J., "The Exegesis of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans and the Rabbis" (OuSt, viii (1950), pp. 220-62).

van der BRANDEN, A., Les Textes Thamoudéens de Philby, Vol. I (Louvain, 1956).

BRANDON, S.G.F. (ed.), The Saviour God. Comparative Studies in the Concept of Salvation presented to E.O. James (Oxford, 1963).

BRIGGS, C.A. and BRIGGS, E.G., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms, 2 Vols. (ICC, Edinburgh, 1906).

BRIGHT, J., The Authority of the Old Testament (London, 1967).

BROCKELMANN, C., Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, 2 Vols. (Berlin, 1908-13).
          Lexicon Syriacum, 2nd edition (Halle, 1928).
          Hebräische Syntax (Neukirchen, 1956).

BURNEY, C.A., The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes (London, 1918).

CANTINEAU, G., Le Nabatéen, Vol. II (Paris, 1932).

CASTELL, E., Lexicon Heptaglotton (London, 1669).

CHILDS, B.S., Memory and Tradition in Israel (SBT, 37, London, 1962).
          review of J. Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language in JBL, lxxx (1961), pp. 374-7.
          Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis (SBT (second series), 3, London, 1967).

CHOMSKY, N., Syntactic Structures (Jan. Ling. 4, The Hague, 1957).
          Current Issues in Linguistic Theory (Jan. Ling. (series minor) xxxviii, The Hague, 1964).

CHOMSKY, N., _Aspects of the Theory of Syntax_ (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

_____ "A Universal Grammar" (_The Listener_, 30th May, 1968).

_The Church Hymnary_. Revised edition (Oxford, 1927).

CLARK, K., _Leonardo da Vinci_. Revised edition (Harmondsworth, 1958).

CRIPPS, R.S., _A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos_.
          Second edition (London, 1955).

CROSS, F.M. and FREEDMAN, D.N., "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving" (_JBL_, lxxii
          (1953), pp. 15-34).

_____ "The Song of Miriam" (_JNES_, xiv (1955), pp. 237-50).

CRYSTAL, D., _Linguistics, Language and Religion_ (London, 1965).

DALMAN, G., _Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und_
          _Midrasch_. Second edition (Frankfurt, 1922).

DAUBE, D., _The Exodus Pattern in the Bible_ (All Souls Studies, ii, London,
          1963).

DAVIDSON, A.B., _Hebrew Syntax_ (Edinburgh, 1894).

DONNER, H. and RÖLLIG, W., _Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften_, 3 Vols.
          (Wiesbaden, 1962).

DRIVER, S.R., _An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament_.
          Seventh edition (Edinburgh, 1898).
          _The Book of Daniel_ (CambB, Cambridge, 1912).

_____ _Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel_.
          Revised edition (Oxford, 1913).

_____ and GRAY, G.B., _A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book_
          _of Job_ (ICC, Edinburgh, 1921).

EICHRODT, W., _Theologie des Alten Testaments_, Teil I (Göttingen, 1959);
          English translation by J.A. Baker (London, 1961).

EISLER, R., "Jahves Hochzeit mit der Sonne. Ein Neumonds- und Hüttenfestlied
          Davids aus dem salomonischen Buch der Lieder (Zu Psalm xix, 2-7
          und I Kon. viii, 12f. (53 LXX))" (_MVAG_, xxii (1917), pp. 21-70).

ELLIGER, K., Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer (Tübingen, 1953).

ELLIS, J., "On contextual meaning", in In Memory of J.R. Firth, edd. C.E. Bazell and others (London, 1966), pp. 79-95.

ENGNELL, I., Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East. Second edition (Oxford, 1967).

ENKVIST, N.E., SPENCER, J. and GREGORY, M.J., Linguistics and Style (Language and Language Learning Series, 6, Oxford, 1964).

FILLMORE, C.J. "The position of embedding transformations in a grammar" (Word, xix (1963), pp. 208-31).

FIRTH, J.R., Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951 (Oxford, 1951).
_____ see BAZELL, C.E. (ed.).

GARDINER, A., Egyptian Grammar, An Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs. Third edition, revised (Oxford, 1957).

GEMSER, B., "The rib- or controversy pattern in Hebrew mentality" (SVT, iii (1955), pp. 120-37).

GLEASON, H.A., An introduction to Descriptive Linguistics. Revised edition (New York, 1966).

GOODENOUGH, W.H., "Componential analysis and the study of meaning" (Language, xxxii (1956), pp. 195-216).

GORDON, C.H., Ugaritic Textbook (An Or, 38, Rome, 1965).

GRAY, G.B., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah, Vol. I (I-XXVII) (ICC, Edinburgh, 1912).
_____ see DRIVER, S.R.

GRAY, J., Joshua, Judges and Ruth (CentB (New edition), Edinburgh, 1967).

GREEN, E.M.B., The Meaning of Salvation (London, 1965).

GUILLAUME, A., "The Arabic Background of the Book of Job", in Hooke Festschrift (Edinburgh, 1963), pp. 106-27.

GUIRAUD, P., La Sémantique (Paris, 1955).

GUIRAUD, P., "Les champs morpho-sémantiques" (Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, lii (1956), pp. 265-88).

GUNKEL, H., Genesis, übersetzt und erklärt. Fifth edition (Göttingen, 1922).

_____ "Grundprobleme der israelitischen Literaturgeschichte" (DLZ, xxvii (1906), pp. 29-38).

_____ Einleitung in die Psalmen, ed. J. Begrich (Göttingen, 1933).

HALLIDAY, M.A.K., The Language of the Chinese 'Secret History of the Mongols (PPS, xvii, Oxford, 1959).

_____, McINTOSH, A. and STREVENS, P.D., The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching (London, 1964).

HARPER, W.R., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea (ICC, Edinburgh, 1905).

HARRIS, Z.S., Methods in Structural Linguistics (Chicago, 1951); reprinted as Structural Linguistics (1961).

HASTINGS, J. (ed.), A Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. IV (Edinburgh, 1902).

HAUGEN, E., "The analysis of linguistic borrowing" (Language, xxvi (1950), pp. 210-31).

HEMPEL, J., "Jahwegleichnisse der Propheten" (ZAW, xlii (1924), pp. 74-104).

HERTZBERG, H.W., Die Samuelbücher (ATD, 10, (revised edition) Göttingen, 1960); English translation by J.S. Bowden (London, 1964).

HILL, D.W., Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings. Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms (SNTS Monograph Series, 5, Cambridge, 1967).

HOENIGSWALD, H.M., "Folk-linguistics" in Sociolinguistics, ed. W. Bright (Jan Ling (Series Maior, 20), The Hague, 1966), pp. 16-27.

HONEYMAN, A.M., "The pottery vessels in the Old Testament" (PEQ, lxxi (1939) pp. 76-90).

HOOKE, S.H. (ed.), Myth and Ritual. Essays on the Myth and Ritual of the Hebrews in relation to the Culture Pattern of the Ancient Near

_East_ (London, 1933).

HOOKE, S.H., _Promise and Fulfilment. Essays presented to S.H. Hooke_, ed. F.F. Bruce (Edinburgh, 1963).

HOPE, T.E., "The analysis of semantic borrowing" in _Essays presented to C.M. Girdlestone_ (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1960), pp. 123-41.

_____ "Loanwords as cultural and lexical symbols" (_AL_, xiv (1962), pp. 111-21; xv (1963), pp. 29-42).

HORNIG, B., "Das Prosagebet der nachexilischen Literatur" (_TLZ_, lxxxiii (1958), cols. 644-6).

HORST, F., _Habakkuk_: see ROBINSON, T.H. and HORST, F.

JASTROW, M., _A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature_, 2 Vols. (London, 1903).

JEAN, C.-F., _Studia Mariana_, (ed. A. Parrot), Vol. IV (Leiden, 1950).

_____ and HOFTIJZER, J., _Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest_ (Leiden, 1965).

JEPSEN, A., "The Scientific Study of the Old Testament" in _Essays on Old Testament Interpretation_, ed. C. Westermann (English translation by J.L. Mays, (London, 1963), pp. 246-84).

JIRKU, A., "Mantik in Alt Israel" in _Von Jerusalem nach Ugarit. Gesammelte Studien_ (Graz, 1966), pp. 109-162.

JOHNSON, A.R., "The Psalms" in _OTMS_, pp. 162-209.

_____ _Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel_ (Cardiff, 1955).

JONES, D.R., _Isaiah - II and III_ in _Peake's Commentary on the Bible_. Revised edition by M. Black and H.H. Rowley (London, 1962), pp. 516-36.

KAHLE, P., _The Cairo Geniza_. Second edition (Oxford, 1959).

KATZ, J., _The Philosophy of Language_ (New York, 1966).

KIRKPATRICK, A.F., _The Book of Psalms_ (CambB, Cambridge, 1903).

KNIERIM, R., _Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde_ (Gütersloh, 1965).

KNIGHT, G.A.F., Deutero-Isaiah. A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40-55 (New York, 1965).

KOCH, K., Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese (Neukirchen, 1964).

KOSMALA, H., "Form and Structure in Ancient Hebrew Poetry (A New Approach)" (VT, xiv (1964), pp. 423-45; xvi (1966), pp. 152-80).

KRAUS, H.-J., Threni (BKAT, xx, Neukirchen, 1960).
_____ Psalmen, 2 Vols. (BKAT, xv, Neukirchen, 1961).
_____ Gottesdienst in Israel. Second edition (Münich, 1962); English translation by G. Buswell (Oxford, 1966).

KRITZECK, J. (ed.), Anthology of Islamic Literature (Harmondsworth, 1964).

KRONASSER, H., Handbuch der Semasiologie (Heidelberg, 1952).

LODS, A., Israel from its Beginnings to the Middle of the Eighth Century (English translation by S.H. Hooke, London, 1932).

LOWTH, R., Isaiah. A new translation with a preliminary dissertation and notes, critical, philological and explanatory (London, 1778).

LYONS, J., Structural Semantics (PPS, xx, Oxford, 1963).
_____ Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics (Cambridge, 1968).

McKANE, W., I and II Samuel (TBC, London, 1963).
_____ Proverbs (London, forthcoming).

MALINOWSKI, B., "The problem of meaning in primitive languages". Supplement I to Ogden and Richards, The Meaning of Meaning (1923).

MANDELKERN, S., Veteris Testamenti concordantiae, Hebraicae et Chaldaicae (Leipzig, 1900).

MAUCHLINE, J., Isaiah 1-39 (TBC, London, 1962).

MERCIER, G., Vocabulaires et Textes Berbères dans le dialecte berbère des Ait Izdeg (Rabat, 1937).

MONTGOMERY, J.A. and GEHMAN, H.S., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Kings I and II (ICC, Edinburgh, 1951).

MOORE, G.F., _A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges_ (ICC, Edinburgh, 1895).

MOSCATI, S. (ed.), _An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. Phonology and Morphology_ (PLO (New series) VI, Wiesbaden, 1964).

MOWINCKEL, S., _Han som kommer_ (Copenhagen, 1951); English translation by G.W. Anderson (Oxford, 1959).
_____ _Religion and Kultus_ (Göttingen, 1953).
_____ _The Psalms in Israel's Worship_, 2 Vols., English translation by D.R. Ap-Thomas (Oxford, 1962).

MUILENBERG, J., "The gains of form criticism in Old Testament Studies" (_ET_, lxxi (1959-60), pp. 229-233).

NEUBAUER, A. (ed.), _Book of Hebrew Roots_ by Marwan b.Janah (Oxford, 1875).

NICHOLSON, E.W., _Deuteronomy and Tradition_ (Oxford, 1967).

NIDA, E.A., _Morphology. A Descriptive Analysis of Words_. Second edition (Michigan, 1949).

Nötscher Festschrift. _Alttestamentliche Studien_, edd. H. Junker and J. Botterweck (BBB i, Bonn, 1950).

NORTH, C.R., _The Second Isaiah_ (Oxford, 1964).

NOTH, M., _Die israelitischen Personennamen_ (BWANT, iii Folge, 10, Stuttgart, 1928).
_____ _Das zweite Buch Mose. Exodus_ (ATD, 5, Göttingen, 1959); English translation by J.S. Bowden (London, 1962).
_____ _Das dritte Buch Mose. Leviticus_ (ATD, 6, Göttingen, 1962); English translation by J.E. Anderson (London, 1965).

NYBERG, H.S., "Smärtornas man. En studie till Jes. 52, 13-53, 12" (_SEÅ_, vii (1942), pp. 5-82).

OEHMANN, S., "Theories of the Linguistic Field" (_Word_, ix (1953), pp. 1-123).

OGDEN, C.K. and RICHARDS, I.A., The Meaning of Meaning. Eighth edition (London, 1946).

OLDFIELD, R.C. and MARSHALL, J.C. (edd.), Language (Harmondsworth, 1968).

PEDERSEN, J., Israel. Its Life and Culture, 2 Vols. (London, 1926).

PETERMANN, J.H., Brevis Linguae Samaritanae grammatica, litteratura, chrestomathia cum glossario (Berlin, 1873).

PFEIFFER, R.H., "Die Disputationsworte im Buche Maleachi" (EvTh, xix (1959) pp. 546-68).

PORTEOUS, N.W., "Actualization and the Prophetic Criticism of the Cult" in Weiser Festschrift, edd. E. Würthwein and O. Kaiser (Göttingen, 1963); reprinted in Living the Mystery. Collected Essays (Oxford, 1967), pp. 127-41.
_____ Daniel. A Commentary (London, 1965).

PORUBCAN, S., Sin in the Old Testament. A Soteriological Study (Rome, 1963).

RABIN, C., "ha-titaken semantiqa miqraᵓit?" (Bet-miqra, Quarterly of the Society of Biblical Research in Israel (Jerusalem, 1962), pp. 17-27).
_____ tahbir lᵉšon ha-miqra (Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1963).
_____ "Hittite words in Hebrew" (Or., xxxii (1963), pp. 113-139).
_____ "millim hodiyot ba-ᶜibrit" (lᵉšonenu laᶜam, cxl-cxli (1962), pp. 232-45).

von RAD, G., Das erste Buch Mose. Genesis (ATD, 2-4, Göttingen, 1956); English translation by J.H. Marks (London, 1961).
_____ Theologie des Alten Testaments, 2 Vols. (Munich, 1957); English translation by D.M.G. Stalker (Edinburgh, 1962).
_____ Das fünfte Buch Mose. Deuteronomium (ATD, 8, Göttingen, 1964); English translation by D. Barton (London, 1966).

RAMSEY, I.T., Religious Language. An Empirical Placing of Theological Phrases (London, 1957).

RINGGREN, H., _Israelite Religion_ (London, 1966).

ROBINSON, T.H. and HORST, F., _Die zwölf kleinen Propheten._ Third edition
        (HAT, 14, Tübingen, 1964).

ROSÉN, H.B., _A Textbook of Israeli Hebrew_ (Chicago, 1962).

ROSSINI, K.C., _Chrestomathia Arabica Meridionalis Epigraphica_ (Rome, 1931).

ROWLEY, H.H., _From Moses to Qumran. Studies in the Old Testament_ (London,
        1963).

RUDOLPH, W., _Esra und Nehemia_ (HAT, 20, Göttingen, 1949).
⎯⎯⎯⎯    _Chronikbücher_ (HAT, 21, Göttingen, 1955).
⎯⎯⎯⎯    _Jeremia_ (HAT, 12, Göttingen, 1958).
⎯⎯⎯⎯    "Eigentümlichkeiten der Sprache Hoseas" in _Studia Biblica et
        Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen dedicata_, edd. W.C. van
        Unnik and A.S. van der Woude (Wageningen, 1966), pp. 313-7.

de SAUSSURE, F., _Cours de Linguistique Générale._ Fifth edition (Paris,
        1955).

SAWYER, J.F.A., "What was a mošia᷾ ?" (_VT_, xv (1965), pp. 475-86).
⎯⎯⎯⎯    "Root-meanings in Hebrew" (_JSS_, xii (1967), pp. 37-50).
⎯⎯⎯⎯    "Context of Situation and Sitz im Leben" (_PUNPS_, i (1967), pp.
        137-47).
⎯⎯⎯⎯    "An analysis of the context and meaning of the Psalm-headings".
        Paper read to GUOS in March, 1968.
⎯⎯⎯⎯    Review of _TDNT_, Vol. IV in _SJT_, xxi (1968), pp. 91-3.
⎯⎯⎯⎯    "Spaciousness. An essential element in Old Testament language
        about salvation" (_ASTI_, forthcoming).

SCHARFSTEIN, Z., ᵓoṣar ha-millim wᵉha-nivim. Third edition (Tel Aviv,
        1964).

SCHACHTER, H., _The New Universal Hebrew-English Dictionary_ (Tel Aviv, 1960).

SCHMIDT, H., _Das Gebet des Angeklagten im Alten Testament_ (BZAW, 49,
        Berlin, 1928).

SCHOTTROFF, Gedenken im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament. Die Würzel zkr im Alten Testament (Neukirchen, 1964).

SCHULTENS, A., Origines Hebraeae sive Hebraicae Linguae antiquissima natura et indoles ex Arabiae penetralibus revocata (Lyons, 1761).

SCHULTHESS, Fr., Lexicon Syropalaestinum (Berlin, 1903).

SCHWARZENBACH, A., Die geographische Terminologie im Alten Testament (Leiden, 1954).

SCOTT, R.B.Y., "The literary structure of Isaiah's oracles" in Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H.H. Rowley (Edinburgh, 1950), pp. 175-86.

SEGAL, M.Z., sipre šᵉmuᵓel (Jerusalem, 1956).

SEGERT, S., "Die Sprache der moabitischen Königsinschrift" (ArOr, xxix (1961), pp. 197-268).

SHOTWELL, W.A., The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr (London, 1965).

SIEVERS, E., Studien zur hebräischen Metrik, II (Berlin, 1904-5).

SIMON, A., A Theology of Salvation. A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55 (London, 1953).

SINCLAIR, J., "Beginning the Study of Lexis" in In Memory of J.R. Firth, edd. C. Bazell and others (London, 1966), pp. 410-30.

SINGER, S., The Authorised Daily Prayer-Book (London, 1892).

SKINNER, J., The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. Chapters XL-LXVI (CambB, Cambridge, 1902).
_____ A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. Second edition (ICC, Edinburgh, 1930).

SNAITH, Jewish New Year Festival. Its Origins and Development (London, 1948).
_____ Leviticus and Numbers (CentB (New edition), Edinburgh, 1967).

SPENCE, N.C.W., "Linguistic field, conceptual spheres and the Weltbild" (TPS (1961), pp. 87-106).

SPERBER, H., Einführung in die Bedeutungslehre (Bonn, 1923).

STEINER, F., Taboo (Harmondsworth, 1967).

STRACK, H.L., Hebräisches Vokabularium in grammatischer und sachlicher Ordnung. Twelfth edition, revised by A. Jepsen (Münich, 1929).

STRANG, B.M.H., Modern English Structure (London, 1962).

STREANE, A.W., The Book of Jeremiah (CambB, Cambridge, 1926).

STRIČEVIĆ, G., "Drama as an Intermediary between Scripture and Byzantine Painting" in Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes, Vol. I (Bonn, 1967), pp. 106-27.

STRUCK, E., Bedeutungslehre. Grundzüge einer lateinischen und griechischen Semasiologie (Stüttgart, 1954).

SWEET, H., A New English Grammar, Logical and Historical (Oxford, 1891-8).

THOMAS, D.W. (ed.), Documents from Old Testament Times (London, 1958).

THORNE, J.P., "Grammars and Machines" (TPS, (1964), pp. 30-45); reprinted in Language, edd. R.C. Oldfield and J.C. Marshall (Harmondsworth, 1968).

TRIER, J., Der deutsche Wortschatz in Sinnbezirk des Verstandes, I (Heidelberg, 1931).

ULLENDORFF, The Challenge of Amharic (School of Oriental and African Studies, London, 1965).

ULLMANN, S., The Principles of Semantics. Second edition (Oxford, 1957).
_____ Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning (Oxford, 1962).
_____ Language and Style (Oxford, 1964).

URBAN, W.M., Language and Reality (London, 1939).

de VAUX, R., Ancient Israel. Its Life and Institutions (London, 1961).

VRIEZEN, T.C., An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford, 1960).

WAGNER, M., Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramäismen in alttestamentlichen Hebräisch (BZAW, xcvi, Berlin, 1966).

WARD, W.A., "Comparative studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic" (JNES, xx (1961), pp. 31-40).

WATTS, J.D., "The Song of the Sea - Ex. xv" (VT, vii (1957), pp. 371-80).

WEHR, H., A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, ed. J.M. Cowan (Wiesbaden, 1961).

WEINHEIMER, H., Hebräisches Wörterbuch in sachlicher Ordnung (Tübingen, 1918).

WEISER, A., Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Fourth edition (Göttingen, 1957); English translation by D.M. Barton (London, 1961).
_____ Die Psalmen. Fifth edition (ATD, 14/15, Göttingen, 1959); English translation by H. Hartwell (London, 1962).
_____ "Das Deboralied" (ZAW, lxxi (1959), pp. 67-97).

WESTERMANN, C., Das Loben Gottes in den Psalmen (Berlin, 1954); English translation by K.R. Krim (Richmond, Virginia, 1965).
_____ Probleme alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik (Munich, 1960); English translation by J.L. Mays (London, 1963).
_____ Das Buch Jesaja. Kapitel 40-66 (ATD, 19, Göttingen, 1966).
_____ "Struktur und Geschichte der Klage im Alten Testament" (ZAW, lxvi (1954), pp. 44-60).

WOLFF, H.W., Dodekapropheten, I. Hosea (BKAT, xiv/1, Neukirchen, 1961).

WÜRTHWEIN, E., "Der Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede" (ZTK, xlix (1952), pp. 1-16).

ZIEGLER, J., "Die Hilfe Gottes 'am Morgen'" in Nötscher Festschrift, edd. H. Junker and J. Botterweck (Bonn, 1950), pp. 281-8.

ZIFF, P., Semantic Analysis (New York, 1960).

ZIMMERLI, W., "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel. Ein Beitrag zum Problem an Hand von Ez. 14:1-11" (_ZAW_, lxvi (1955), pp. 1-26).

_____ _Ezechiel_. Fascicles 1-15 (BKAT, xiii, Neukirchen, 1955-68).