

# Artikel

## On the Hiphil Infinitive Absolute of *hālak*

John Briggs Curtis (Columbus, Ohio U.S.A.)

The verb *hālak* is one of the commonest verbs in the Hebrew Bible (BDB gives a count of 1545x) and manifests an enormous range of forms in most conjugations, especially in the qal, piel, hithpael, and hiphil. No forms occur in the pual and hophal, and only one occurrence is found in the niph'al (Ps 109:23). The real oddity for such a common verb is that its inflections are mixed. Some inflections follow the pattern of the pe guttural verb, but the vast majority of the forms of *hālak* take the pattern of the pe waw verb. It is precisely that the inflections are mixed that has created the problem at issue in this paper; the qal active participle and the hiphil infinitive absolute ought to have exactly the same form: *hōlēk* or *hōlēk*. But perusal of lexicons and grammars<sup>1</sup> leaves one with the feeling that the hiphil inf abs of *hālak* is an entity that exists in neither theory nor actuality. Examination of an exhaustive concordance (e.g., Mandelkern<sup>2</sup>) reveals that *hōlēk* or *hōlēk* occurs about 85x. Since the inf abs cannot be inflected and resists even being attached to inseparable particles<sup>3</sup>, except *waw* conjunction and interrogative *hē*, the numerous inflected forms of *hōlēk* are not considered in this count. Without doubt a good 80% of the occurrences of the term *hōlēk* are unequivocally instances of qal act part and need not concern us further here. Our interest is in that residue of about 20% of the occurrences of *hōlēk*, most of which occur in vexed and vexing passages; but, as will become clear, the vexation of the passage usually disappears when *hōlēk* is recognized as hiphil inf abs and is treated as such.

A case in point is the well-known passage in which the prophet in Ezek 31 compares Pharaoh king of Egypt to a majestic cedar in Lebanon. V 4 of this passage reads *mayim gidd<sup>e</sup>lūhū t<sup>e</sup>hōm rōm<sup>e</sup>māt<sup>e</sup>nū 'et-nah<sup>a</sup>rōtēhā hōlēk s<sup>e</sup>bibōt maṭṭā'ā w<sup>e</sup>'et-t<sup>e</sup>ālōtēhā šil<sup>e</sup>hā 'el kol-<sup>a</sup>šē haššādeh*. The only disturbing element here is *hōlēk*, which, if understood as qal act part masc sing, makes no sense at all. First of all, the subject must be *t<sup>e</sup>hōm*, which, whether considered a common or proper noun, is throughout this passage regarded as feminine.<sup>4</sup> Second, to make real sense a causa-

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., BDB 236; KBL<sup>3</sup>, 237; GKa § 69x; BLe § 55d'-i'; F. E. König, *Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache* (1979) 1, 1, 415-6 (§ 36, 7a).

<sup>2</sup> S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae* (1955) 1, 325.

<sup>3</sup> König (Lehrgebäude 3, 2, 2, 118-9 [§ 225bc]) treats the inf abs as object of a preposition. The only cases where inf abs is connected to an inseparable preposition (*b<sup>e</sup>*, *k<sup>e</sup>*, *l<sup>e</sup>*, or contracted *min*) appear to be Deut 32:8 (*b<sup>e</sup>hanhēl*); Judg 13:21 (*l<sup>e</sup>hērā'ōh*); 1 Sam 3:21 (*l<sup>e</sup>hērā'ōh*); 25:26, 33 (*mibbō'*); Isa 30:15 (*b<sup>e</sup>hašqēt*); Jer 42:2 (*mēharbēh*); 44:19, 25 (*ūl<sup>e</sup>hassēk*); Hos 6:9 (*ūk<sup>e</sup>hakkē*); Ps 89:10 [9] (*b<sup>e</sup>šō'*); Job 6:26 (*hal<sup>e</sup>hōkah*); 34:35 (*b<sup>e</sup>haškēl*); Neh 5:18; 2 Chr 11:12; 16:8 (*l<sup>e</sup>harbēh*); 24:10; 31:1 (*l<sup>e</sup>kallēh*).

<sup>4</sup> The word *t<sup>e</sup>hōm* in some form occurs 35x in the MT. Its gender is generally ambiguous but is clearly feminine in Gen 7:11; 49:25; Isa 51:10; Ezek 31:4, 15; Amos 7:4; Ps 36:7 [6]; Deut 33:13 and is masculine in Jon 2:6 [5]; Hab 3:10; Ps 42:8 [7]; Job 28:14; Exod 15:5; Ps 77:17 [16]; Deut 8:7 (?).

tive verb is required. BHK and BHS concur that *hōlēk* must be emended to *hōlikā*, hiphil pf 3rd fem sing, on basis of the LXX *ēgage* (which BHS cites). This proposed emendation is, of course, not unique to contemporary editions of the Bible, but is advocated also by numerous scholars, including C. H. Cornill, A. Bertholet, A. B. Ehrlich, I. W. Rothstein, G. A. Cooke, G. Fohrer, J. W. Wevers (?), W. Eichrodt, W. Zimmerli.<sup>5</sup> The most striking divergence from this consensus is the view of L. Boadt<sup>6</sup> that *hōlēk* is to be emended to *hālōk*, qal inf abs, which, however, he insists, is to be understood as having a causative sense, a sense that he admits is found nowhere else for the qal of *hālak*. All of these emendations are unnecessary. What is needed is to recognize that *hōlēk* is a hiphil inf abs. Since the inf abs can replace any form of the verb,<sup>7</sup> *hōlēk* can stand as a substitute for *hōlikā* and needs no emendation. The understanding of the LXX (*ēgage*) is then completely correct; it is the scholars' understanding of the LXX that is in error. The passage may then be rendered as follows: "Water caused it to grow. Tehom made it great, she made her streams go round about her plantation,<sup>8</sup> and she sent forth her watercourses to all the trees of the land."

A verse that exhibits a similar usage of *hōlēk* as hiphil inf abs substituting for a finite verb is Ezek 7:14. Unfortunately this verse has suffered much radical surgery at the hands of scholars to remove nonexistent problems in the text; not one word has escaped emendation or excision by one or more scholars. The tragedy of such

<sup>5</sup> C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (1886) 374–5; A. Bertholet, *Das Buch Hesekiel* (KCH; 1897) 161; A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (1968 [1908–1914] 5, 116; I. W. Rothstein, *Notes to BHK<sup>2</sup>* (1909) 2, 794; G. A. Cooke, *A Critical and* (HAT 1, 13; 1955) 175; J. W. Wevers, *Ezekiel* (The Century Bible, NS; 1969) 235; W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel, A Commentary* (OTL 6; 1970) 422–3; W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2, A Commentary on the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 25–48* (Hermeneia; 1983) 142.

<sup>6</sup> L. Boadt, *Ezekiel's Oracles against Egypt, A Literary and Philological Study of Ezekiel 29–32* (BiOr 37; 1980) 107.

<sup>7</sup> See GKa § 113y–gg; C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax* (1956) 47–8 (§ 46); König, *Lehrgebäude* 3, 2, 113–21 (§ 217a–226e). The use of the inf abs to replace a pf is quite standard usage, and there are a number of instances in which the inf abs stands in correlation with one or more pfs of different roots. Dan 9:5–6 has the configuration of 3 pfs, followed by 1 inf abs, followed by 1 pf, all correlative with one another and all of different roots; Esth 9:16–17 gives a pf, followed by 3 infs abs, followed by 1 pf, all correlative and all of different roots; Hag 1:6 uses a pf followed by 4 correlative infs abs; Esth 9:18 preserves a pf followed by 2 correlative infs abs. The instances of a single pf correlated with a single inf abs of a different root are numerous: Exod 36:7; 1 Sam 2:27–8; 1 Kgs 9:25; Isa 37:18–9; Jer 14:5; 19:3; 22:14; Ezek 7:14 (see below); Zech 3:4; 7:5; Eccl 8:9; 9:11; Esth 3:12–3; 9:1, 6, 12; Neh 9:8, 13; 1 Chr 5:20; 2 Chr 28:19.

<sup>8</sup> A very popular, but clearly incorrect, emendation is to read (following the LXX and Syr) *maṭṭā'ō* or *maṭṭā'ōh* "his plantation" for *maṭṭā'ā* "her plantation". The intent is, of course, to imply that the plantation is pharaoh's rather than Tehom's; but this is to miss the point of the text that pharaoh is the creation of Tehom. See BHK, BHS, Cornill (Ezechiel 374–5), Bertholet (Hesekiel 161), Rothstein (BHK<sup>2</sup> 2, 794), Cooke (Ezekiel 344), Fohrer (Ezechiel 175), Wevers (Ezekiel 235), Eichrodt (Ezekiel 422–3), Zimmerli (Ezekiel 2 142), Boadt (Ezekiel's Oracles 107). Ehrlich (Randglossen 5, 116) stands against the general tendency and argues to maintain the reading of the MT at this point. G. Hölscher (Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch [BZAW 39; 1924] 152–3) considers both the emendation of *hōlēk* to *hōlikā* and of *maṭṭā'ā* to *maṭṭā'ōh* but then rejects both in favor of considering the entire half verse, beginning with *'et*, to be secondary.

treatment is that the verse makes perfect sense as it stands in the MT.<sup>9</sup> Ezek 7 is an extended oracle, portraying in a series of grisly figures that the end has come to the land of Israel. Doom is the only prospect for the wicked and idolatrous people. Outside the city there is death by the sword, within the city there is death by famine

<sup>9</sup> The MT of Ezek 7:14 reads *tāq<sup>e</sup>ū battāqōa<sup>a</sup> w<sup>e</sup>hākīn hakkōl w<sup>e</sup>ēn hōlēk lammilhāmā kī h<sup>a</sup>rōnī 'el-kol-h<sup>a</sup>mōnā*. (a) The expression *tāq<sup>e</sup>ū battāqōa<sup>a</sup>* has met with general scholarly disapproval for two reasons: (1) The verb *tāq<sup>e</sup>ū* is perfect whereas imperative seems to be more appropriate. (2) The word *tāqōa<sup>a</sup>* in the sense "trumpet" is a hapax and thus is suspect. Bertholet (Hesekiel 41) cites with approval the suggestion of Cornill (Ezechiel 216) to read *tiq<sup>e</sup>ū tāqōa<sup>a</sup>* "blow continuously"; i.e., qal impv 2nd masc pl plus qal inf abs. This emendation is accepted by Rothstein (BHK<sup>2</sup> 2, 752); Fohrer (Ezechiel 45), Eichrodt (Ezekiel 98, 100), Zimmerli (Ezekiel 1, A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1–24 [Hermeneia; 1969] 198). Cooke (Ezekiel 81, 87) and apparently C. H. Toy (The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, A New English Translation [1899] 9) accept the emendation of the verb to impv but retain the phrase "on the trumpet". Ehrlich (Randglossen 5, 23) dissented from the emendation of the pf to the impv, because it rendered meaningless the words *w<sup>e</sup>ēn hōlēk lammilhāmā*, and then emended *battāqōa<sup>a</sup>* to *bit<sup>e</sup>qōa<sup>a</sup>* "in Tekoa," Tekoa being the name of a town near Bethlehem. Thus for Ehrlich the first two words constitute a wordplay similar to Jer 6:1: *ūbit<sup>e</sup>qōa<sup>a</sup> tiq<sup>e</sup>ū šōpār* "and in Tekoa sound the trumpet". BHS reads *tiq<sup>e</sup>ū*, citing 2 MSS, LXX, Syr, Vg and, offering no supporting evidence, hesitantly endorses *tāqōa<sup>a</sup>*. The LXX reads *salpitate en salpigi* "Sound the trumpet!" while the Vg has *canite tuba* "Sound the trumpet!". But the reading of the Syr *qrw bqrn* could be interpreted as either pf ("They sounded the horn") or impv (Sound the horn!). The Tg renders *napqin b<sup>e</sup>aswāhat qarnā* "They go out with the noise of the horn". In spite of the divergences it is clear that LXX, Vg, Syr, and Tg all understood *tāqōa<sup>a</sup>* to refer to a musical instrument, an understanding modern scholarship has been reluctant to accept. Perhaps the strangest proposed emendation is that of BHK, which emends to *haqqōneh baqqinyān* and connects to the last two words of the preceding verse, which are read as *lō<sup>a</sup> yah<sup>a</sup>ziq*, the reconstructed text then reading "the buyer does not hold on to his purchase." (b) The next two words *w<sup>e</sup>hākīn hakkōl* have suffered a fate similar to the two preceding words. BHK eliminates the difficulty by deleting all of *w<sup>e</sup>hākīn hakkōl w<sup>e</sup>ēn hōlēk lammilhāmā*. Again Bertholet (Hesekiel 41) following Cornill (Ezechiel 216) reconstructs as hipihil impv 2nd masc pl plus hipihil inf abs (see also Toy, Ezekiel 9) to give a perfectly balanced expression: *tiq<sup>e</sup>ū tāqōa<sup>a</sup> w<sup>e</sup>hākīnū hākēn* "Blow continuously and prepare thoroughly!" This reading is approved by Fohrer (Ezechiel 45) and Eichrodt (Ezekiel 100) and considered as a possibility by Zimmerli (Ezekiel 1, 198). But the strange reading of the LXX has affected most scholars: *kai krinate ta sympanta<sup>15</sup> ho polemos*. The verb *krinō* "to distinguish, choose, decide, judge" seems a poor translation of *hākīn* in spite of Zimmerli's derivative comment: "*Apud Hesychium κρῖναι inter alia exponitur τῷζα.*" The LXX actually translates the hipihil of *kwn* by the verb *krinō* only here and thus is suspect. But W. Zimmerli (Ezekiel 1, 198) proposes the alternate possibility that *krinate* may stand for an original *tādinū* "you should judge," though finally favoring *w<sup>e</sup>hākīnū*. Wevers (Ezekiel 74) reads *hkynw* but translates as passive "are prepared." The term *ta sympanta* "all together," "all at once," though plural seems a perfect translation of *hakkōl* as object. According to E. C. Dos Santos (An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint [n.d.] 91–2) *sympas* is used 26x, in the four basic MSS employed, to translate *kōl* but never to translate *k<sup>e</sup>lī*. Nevertheless numerous scholars have convinced themselves that *ta sympanta* represents a translation, not of *hakkōl*, but of *k<sup>e</sup>lē* "weapons of," a suggestion apparently deriving from Rothstein (BHK<sup>2</sup> 2, 752) who read *w<sup>e</sup>hākīnū k<sup>e</sup>lē milhāmā*. This proposal is supported by the LXX in the sense that the LXX omits *w<sup>e</sup>ēn hōlēk lam-* so that *milhāmā* appears originally to have followed directly upon *hakkōl* or (possibly) *k<sup>e</sup>lē*. But this is weak support because the LXX also omits the last clause of v 14 (*kī h<sup>a</sup>rōnī 'el-kol-h<sup>a</sup>mōnā*) and transfers *ho polemos* = *milhāmā* to v 15 as subject. Better support is that of the Tg: *m<sup>a</sup>taqinū*

or pestilence. Devastation is inevitable. In the midst of this oracle we find v 14: *tāq<sup>e</sup>û battāqôa' w<sup>e</sup>hākîn hakkōl w<sup>e</sup>ên hōlēk lammilḥāmâ kî ḥ<sup>a</sup>rōnî 'el-kol-h<sup>a</sup>mônâ* "They sound the trumpet and they prepare everything, but they do not lead out to battle because my anger is against all her multitude." The form of this verse is that of 4 sentences or clauses in a very ordinary configuration. A sentence with a perfect is continued by 2 sentences with infinitives absolute,<sup>10</sup> this configuration closed with a nominal sentence of cause. The only word which is odd in any way is *hākîn*, the hiphil inf abs of the root *kwn*. Standard rules of formulation would require a form of *hākēn*, but this form occurs only in Josh 3:17, whereas *hākîn* is found in Josh 4:3; Jer 10:23; Ezek 7:14 (BHK would emend or delete all three of these occurrences). A word should be said about interpreting *hōlēk* here as hiphil inf abs rather than as qal act part. The standard construction is that of a finite verb followed by one or more infinitives absolute (GKa § 113z), but there are occasions of sequences of a finite verb followed by inf abs followed by pf or impf cons or part or even adj.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, here the preferred interpretation has to be as hiphil inf abs. The devastation of the land is so appalling that, though the semblances of preparation for battle have been made, not one person is left with the courage to lead forth a foray against the enemy to face certain death. It is not, as qal act part would require, that no one is willing to go forth to battle, rather the author seems to be saying that the leaders are so distraught by the certainty of doom that none can innervate himself enough to lead out his troops to be butchered by an overwhelmingly superior enemy.<sup>12</sup>

At least three other instances can be adduced in which the hiphil inf abs serves in place of a finite verb. In each case the *hōlēk* is in a subordinate clause and in each case scholarly opinion has been that the passage needs some degree of repair or

*b<sup>e</sup>mānē z<sup>e</sup>yānā'* "they prepare instruments of weapons." The conclusion of some scholars is then that the original text was *w<sup>e</sup>hākînû* [or *w<sup>e</sup>hākēn*] *k<sup>e</sup>lē milḥāmâ* "and prepare weapons of war!" (Cooke, Ezekiel 87; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 198; BHS). Wevers (Ezekiel 74) reads simply *hkynw hkly* and translates "weapons are prepared." Fohrer (Ezekiel 45), apparently influenced by the LXX, omits everything in the verse after *hakkōl* of the MT (including *milḥāmâ*) as glosses. (c) As noted above, the LXX lacks the last clause of v 14 (*kî ḥ<sup>a</sup>rōnî 'el-kol-h<sup>a</sup>mônâ*) and there is considerable scholarly agreement to accept the omission as the best representation of the original text (Fohrer, Ezekiel 45 [as mentioned above]; Wevers, Ezekiel 74; Eichrodt, Ezekiel 100; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 198; BHS). When additional argument is given for omitting the clause, it is pointed out that the expression so closely resembles expressions in both v 12 and v 13 that the clause in v 14 must be an addition, especially since it changes from 3rd person to 1st person. Cooke (Ezekiel 81, 87) hesitantly retains the clause. BHK notes that the LXX omits the clause but still retains it after emending *'el* to *'al*. – This summary of scholarly treatment of Ezek 7:14 must end as it began: Not one of these changes is needed. The verse makes perfect sense both in isolation and in context.

<sup>10</sup> See GKa § 113z.

<sup>11</sup> See GKa § 113t–u.

<sup>12</sup> Since the inf abs, when used as a finite verb, intends usually to make a strongly positive statement or command, its use with a particle of negation is uncommon. Nevertheless there occur a few instances in which *'ên* negates an inf abs; e.g., *w<sup>e</sup>gam-hêtēb 'ên 'ôtām* "nor are they able to do good" (Jer 10:5); *ûl<sup>e</sup>bānôn 'ên dē bā'ēr* "and Lebanon is not sufficient for burning" (Isa 40:16); *'al-tihyū k<sup>e</sup>sūs k<sup>e</sup>pered 'ên hābîn* "do not be like a horse, like a mule which does not understand" (Ps 32:9). Perhaps Jer 5:13 preserves an anomalous vocalization of the hithpael inf abs: *w<sup>e</sup>ham<sup>e</sup>bi'im yihyū l<sup>e</sup>rūah w<sup>e</sup>haddibbēr 'ên bāhem* "the prophets will become wind, and they will not speak out."

improvement. For our purposes the passages will be cited and interpreted with a minimum of textual comment. (a) When Micah is warned not to preach words of doom lest his very mention of the awesome disasters should bring them to pass,<sup>13</sup> he rebukes his critics and says in part: *h<sup>a</sup>lô' d<sup>e</sup>bāray yêṭîbû 'im hayyāšār hōlēk*<sup>14</sup> "Surely my words do good as long as<sup>15</sup> one causes the right<sup>16</sup> to go forth!" (2:7b). Clearly this translation is much stronger than a traditional rendering like "Surely my words do good for him who walks uprightly." Micah is little concerned with a man's walking uprightly in the midst of a corrupt and decadent society; this is a rather egocentric concept of religious duty, uncharacteristic of eighth century prophecy. Rather he wants people to take positive steps to establish the right, to bring justice to those whom the system has crushed, to relieve the inequities produced by an exploitative establishment. A brief consideration of the message of Micah shows the consistency of the proposed interpretation as opposed to the more traditional view. Micah, like the other eighth century prophets, condemns the evil deeds of the well-to-do, established upper class, who are able to seize the property of the poor with impunity (2:1–2) and to deprive the needy of the barest essentials of life as if they were an enemy (2:8–9). Though they behave like the most brutal of cannibals (3:2–3) and have corrupted the system of justice (3:9), still they put their trust in religious functionaries whose favorable, but foolish, words they have bought (3:5, 11; 2:11). They are convinced that no day of reckoning will come (3:11b) and forbid prophets with unfavorable words to speak (2:6). In this moral climate Micah would, like his contemporary prophets (Amos 5:15a; 6:24; Isa 1:17; Hos 4:12), long to see the establishment of justice in the society and would care little for, if not reject, the notion that good things come to the man who walks uprightly – an idea more appropriate to wisdom than to classical prophecy. (b) On the day after Ishmael had murdered Gedeliah and his troops and before knowledge of the massacre had leaked out, a group of eighty men came from the north, overtly displaying signs of ritual mourning, while making their way to the ruined temple to make offerings. At this point we read *wayyēšē' yišmā'ē'l ben-n<sup>e</sup>tanyā liqrā'tām min-hammišpā hōlēk hālōk ūbōkeh* "And Ishmael son of Nethaniah went out from Mizpah to meet them, as they were going, continuously weeping" (Jer 41:6a). The causative force of *hōlēk* is not at all obvious in this case, but this is not a decisive argument against the current proposal. First, it is well known that many verbs express an internal causation in the hiphil that in English differs little from the sense of the qal.<sup>17</sup> Or one might even agree with Sperber<sup>18</sup> that the qal and hiphil are often

<sup>13</sup> On the power of the word to effect its own content see S. H. Blank, *The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell, and the Oath* (HUCA 23, 1 [1950–51] 73–95).

<sup>14</sup> BHK would read *h<sup>a</sup>lô' d<sup>e</sup>rākāyw yêṭîb 'im 'ammōh yišrā'ēl* or *h<sup>a</sup>lô' d<sup>e</sup>bārāyw* (with LXX) *yêṭîbū 'im 'ammōh yišrā'ēl*. BHS would emend to *h<sup>a</sup>lô' d<sup>e</sup>bārāyw yêṭîb 'im 'ammōh yišrā'ēl*.

<sup>15</sup> For 'im with the temporal sense "as long as," see BDB 768a: Ps 72:5. In Aram, see Dan 3:33 [4:3]; 4:31 [4:34].

<sup>16</sup> For *yāšār* as an abstract noun, see Job 33:27; Mic 3:9; Prov 16:13.

<sup>17</sup> See GKa § 53d. A rather common example could be the verb *šûb* which we expect to mean "to turn back" or "to return" in an intransitive sense in the qal and this, of course, regularly occurs (e.g., Judg 3:19; 8:13 et passim). But in the hiphil we expect *šûb* to be transitive "to return" or "to bring back" and this is the usual meaning. There are, however, occurrences where the causative sense, if it exists, is internal "to exhibit returning;" i.e., "to return" (intrans.; e.g., Ezek 14:6; 18:30, 32; Ps 85:4 [3]; Jon 1:13).

used interchangeably. Second, it seems probable that it is the pilgrims, not Ishmael, who are advancing and weeping;<sup>19</sup> thus taking *hōlēk* as qal act part describing the action of Ishmael would seem to be to misunderstand the text. Again (as with Ezek 31:4) the LXX [48:6] may correctly have understood *hōlēk* by translating *autoi eporeuonto*, but scholars have misunderstood the LXX by suggesting to emend *hōlēk* to *w<sup>e</sup>hēm̄mā hōl<sup>e</sup>kīm* on basis of the LXX.<sup>20</sup> (c) The most difficult of the passages of this type is found in Isa 57. The author is deploring the fate of the righteous, that they perish and no one seems to care. This complaint concludes with *yānūhū ʿal-mišk<sup>e</sup>bôtām hōlēk n<sup>e</sup>kōhō* (2aβb). The sense of this passage seems to be “They take their final rest upon their beds although they advanced his truth.”<sup>21</sup> Even though they have spent their years seeking to establish the ways of God, the righteous perish unnoticed. No one even cares.

In three passages in Ezekiel there occurs the idiom *libbām hōlēk* (33:31; 20:16; 11:21). It is proposed here that *hōlēk* is, in each of these cases, hiphil inf abs used in place of a finite verb in a subordinate clause. The expression is then to be rendered “they made their heart to go.” Since *libbām hōlēk* has traditionally been rendered something like “their heart goes,” and this rendering does make reasonably good sense, there needs to be some quite strong evidence for the rather unorthodox translation proposed here. This evidence is immediately at hand in the usage of the book of Ezekiel. For the argument of usage it does not matter whether the book is the work of one or of many authors; there was clearly one final editor, who imposed on the book what he understood to be the style of the prophet Ezekiel. In the usage of the book *lēb/lēbāb* in the sense of “human heart” is *never* an active principle. The “heart” is never the subject of action but rather is the object of action, often almost the passive object. Excluding the 3 occurrences at issue here, *lēb* or *lēbāb* occurs 34x in Ezekiel. Of these occurrences, in 16 cases “heart” is the direct object

<sup>18</sup> A. Sperber, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions to their Solution* (1966) 7–10.

<sup>19</sup> Certainty is not possible here, but in the context it is the pilgrims who can best be described as engaged in a continuous activity (see below on *hālōk* followed by another [usually] verbal element to express continuous action). At most Ishmael goes out of Mizpah to meet the pilgrims, a rather brief action, hardly to be described as continuous. There also seems no clear reasons why he should be weeping; he does not even make a pretense that he is planning to join them in their pilgrimage of ritual mourning to the temple. This was clearly the understanding of the LXX, which rendered the expressions as plural *autoi eporeuonto kai eklaion* (48:6). The most significant argument against this interpretation is that to refer to the pilgrims the text should nor read *ūbōkeh* but *ūbōkīm* or *ūbākōh* (BHK cites 15 MSS as having the latter reading). In spite of the attractiveness of the vocalization *ūbākōh* (which may be correct), there can really be no serious objection to *ūbōkēh*, since the participle is extraordinarily poor about (what we regard as) correct agreement in number with its context (see Prov 3:18; Mic 1:9; 1 Sam 14:40 [cf. Judg 9:37]; Exod 14:23 [cf. v 27]; Judg 20:25 [cf. v 35]; 1 Sam 18:16 [cf. 1 Kgs 4:20]; 13:15 [cf. v 16]; Jer 49:36; 51:48; Exod 30:13 [cf. v 14]; Isa 65:2; 2 Sam 13:34; Prov 18:21; Zech 11:5 (2x); Isa 16:4; Num 14:35; Exod 20:18; Josh 5:4; Jer 22:4; Hos 12:2; Deut 30:10; examples derived from Sperber, *Grammar* 84–93).

<sup>20</sup> E.g., Ehrlich, *Randglossen* 4, 346; cf. the caution of BHK.

<sup>21</sup> For *nākō<sup>a</sup>h* in the sense “truth,” see Isa 30:10.

of a verb<sup>22</sup> and 8x the object of a preposition,<sup>23</sup> while 4x “heart” is part of a modifying phrase.<sup>24</sup> In only 6 instances does “heart” appear as subject of a verb, but none of these cases involves an action verb: 4x the verb is stative in meaning, if not in form; once the verb is passive; the closest “heart” ever comes to action is “to stand.”<sup>25</sup> In view of this complete consistency of usage it would be difficult to make a strong argument that, in these 3 cases only (i.e., the occurrences of *libbām hōlēk*), the “heart” is the subject of action. It is, on the other hand, completely consistent to understand “the heart” as the object of action and to render “they made their heart to go.”

In the MT Ezek 33:31 reads *w<sup>e</sup>yābō<sup>e</sup>ū ’ēlēkā kim<sup>e</sup>bō<sup>e</sup>-’ām w<sup>e</sup>yēš<sup>e</sup>bū l<sup>e</sup>pānēkā ’ammī w<sup>e</sup>šām<sup>e</sup>ū ’et-d<sup>e</sup>bārēkā w<sup>e</sup>ōtām lō<sup>e</sup> yā<sup>e</sup>šū kī-’agābīm b<sup>e</sup>pīhem hēmmā ’ōšīm ’ah<sup>e</sup>rē biš<sup>e</sup>ām libbām hōlēk* “And they will come to you as people come and my people will sit before you and they will hear your words but they will not do them because they are performing lovesongs with their mouths, while they make their heart go after their unjust gain.” As with the verses treated above there have been many changes proposed for this verse.<sup>26</sup> At this point we take note only of the one textual proposal

<sup>22</sup> 6:9; 11:19 (3x); 13:22; 18:31; 21:20 [15]; 28:2 (2nd), 6; 32:9; 36:26 (3x); 40:4; 44:5 (2x).

<sup>23</sup> 3:10; 13:2, 17; 14:3, 4, 5, 7; 38:10.

<sup>24</sup> 2:4 (*w<sup>e</sup>hiz<sup>e</sup>qē-lēb* “and hard of heart”); 36:5 (*b<sup>e</sup>šimḥat kol-lēbāb* “with rejoicing of every heart”); 44:7 (*’ar<sup>e</sup>lē-lēb* “uncircumcised of heart”); 44:9 (*’erel lēb* “uncircumcised of heart”).

<sup>25</sup> *lēb/lēbāb* is subj of the qal of *gābah* in 28:2, 5, 17; of the qal of *rūm* in 31:10; of the niphāl of *māsas* in 21:12 [7]; of the qal of *’amad* in 22:14. Note that in 21:12 [7] it does not matter for the present argument whether *w<sup>e</sup>nāmēs kol-lēb* is understood “and every heart will melt” or “and every heart will be melted.” In neither case is the “heart” subject of action.

<sup>26</sup> For the clause in question here we note some additional textual matters: (a) The word *hōlēk* is lacking in the LXX; but though this omission is noted by Cooke (Ezekiel 372), BHK, and BHS, none of these is convinced that the omission represents the original text. On the other hand, Cornill (Ezechiel 398) and Rothstein (BHK<sup>2</sup> 2, 801) both omit *hōlēk*. (b) The word *biš<sup>e</sup>ām* is rendered in the LXX by *tōn miasmatōn*, gen pl of *miasma*, which translates *piggūl* “sacrificial meat that has become unclean” (Lev 7:18) and, in the form *ta miasmata autōn* translates *šiqqūšēhem* “their abominations” in Jer 32:34 (LXX 39:34). These data have convinced BHK and BHS (the latter with doubt) to replace *biš<sup>e</sup>ām* with *’āšabbīm* “idols.” The Syr *tr<sup>e</sup>yi* “opinions” seems to reflect a text in which *bš<sup>e</sup>m* had been corrupted to *m<sup>e</sup>šwt* “counsels.” (c) Zimmerli (Ezekiel 2, 196–7) and Eichrodt (Ezekiel 461) regard everything in the verse beginning with *’ammī* as a composite of successive additions and is to be stricken entirely. Zimmerli’s argument in part is as follows: (1) Since *’ammī* is lacking in LXX and OL it cannot be original (cf. Cornill, Ezechiel 398; Bertholet, Hesekeil 173; Toy, Ezekiel 59, 167; Ehrlich, Randglossen 5, 125; Rothstein, BHK<sup>2</sup> 2, 800; Cooke, Ezekiel 369; Fohrer, Ezechiel 189). (2) The words *w<sup>e</sup>šām<sup>e</sup>ū ’et-d<sup>e</sup>bārēkā w<sup>e</sup>ōtām lō<sup>e</sup> yā<sup>e</sup>šū* occur in slightly different form in v 32 and the word *’agābīm* occurs there also with considerably greater clarity. Thus it is argued that the second half of v 31 was (without *hēmmā ’ōšīm*) partially constructed of material from v 32 originally as a marginal note. This marginal note was entered into the text but made little sense; so *hēmmā ’ōšīm* (which is lacking in the LXX and Syr) was added to improve the text (see Cornill, Ezechiel 398; Bertholet, Hesekeil 173; Toy, Ezekiel 59; Rothstein, BHK<sup>2</sup> 2, 801; Cooke, Ezekiel 372; Fohrer, Ezechiel 189). Most scholars are unwilling to agree with Zimmerli and Eichrodt (see, however, Hölscher [Hesekeil 167–8], who may have originated the suggestion that 33:31aβb is entirely a gloss on 33:32) in discarding over half of v 31, though generally agreeing that *’ammī* and *hēmmā ’ōšīm* are secondary. (d) Though outside the clause

which the present writer regards as having any merit. The LXX, Syr, and Vg read *w<sup>e</sup>ah<sup>a</sup>rē* for MT *ʾah<sup>a</sup>rē*; this reading is approved by BHK, BHS, Cooke (Ezekiel 372), and Fohrer (Ezekiel 189). If the reading *w<sup>e</sup>-* is original, then it is greatly reinforced that the last clause is to be taken as circumstantial and temporal. The force of the clause is not the almost impersonal expression “while their heart goes after their unjust gain.” Rather the stubbornly recalcitrant and self-willed people, even after hearing the words of Yahweh’s prophet and saying pleasant words to him about his brilliant insights, return willfully and immediately to their pursuit of their own self-interest: “all the while they are making their hearts pursue their unjust gain.” This intensely personal understanding of these words makes much more graphic their self-determination to flaunt their rejection of God’s will.

Brief note will be taken here of the other two occurrences of *libbām hōlēk*: (a) Ezek 20 recounts the sinful rebelliousness of the people of Israel that has persisted from the day of Yahweh’s election of them down to the present. Repeatedly they have rejected him and he has sworn to destroy them but each time he has relented. At v 15 the prophet reminds that Yahweh even swore not to bring them into the glorious land that flowed with milk and honey; the reason for Yahweh’s solemn oath then follows: *ya’an b<sup>e</sup>mišpāṭay mā’āsū w<sup>e</sup>et-ḥuqqōṭay lō’-hāl<sup>e</sup>kū bāhem w<sup>e</sup>et-šabb<sup>e</sup>tōṭay ḥillēlū kī ʾah<sup>a</sup>rē gillūlēhem libbām hōlēk* “because they felt loathing revulsion<sup>27</sup> toward my judgments and did not walk by my statutes and profaned my sabbaths but made their hearts go after their idols” (v 16). Here again the interpretation of *hōlēk* as hiphil inf abs makes the sin of the people a more personal thing, a more deliberate intentional choice than the usual interpretation as qal act part. (b) The final example is so fraught with difficulties that BHS can do no better than regard the entire verse as an addition to the text. Nevertheless Ezek 11:21 seems to make rather good sense if translated literally: *w<sup>e</sup>el-lēb šiqqūšēhem w<sup>e</sup>tō’abōtēhem libbām hōlēk darkām b<sup>e</sup>rō’šām nātattī n<sup>e</sup>um ʾadōnāy yhw* “If they lead their heart unto the heart of their detested things and their abominations, I will visit their way upon their heads,” says the lord Yahweh.” If the people choose to meld their hearts with the hearts of their idols, Yahweh will most assuredly exact retribution upon them.

One of the most common and best established uses of the qal inf abs of *hālak* is to express continuity of action. The usual form is that the qal inf abs of *hālak* follows the finite verb or its surrogate, not necessarily immediately, but then is itself followed immediately by another term with *w<sup>e</sup>-*, to indicate the prolongation of the action of this last term. The configurations that occur<sup>28</sup> are: (a) qal inf abs of *hālak* followed by qal inf abs of another verb – Gen 8:3, 5; 12:9; Josh 6:9, 13bQ; Judg 14:9; 1 Sam 6:12; 2 Sam 3:16; Isa 3:16; Jer 50:4; (b) qal inf abs of *hālak* followed

of interest here, it should be noted that the word *ʾagābīm* has troubled many scholars, both because it recurs in v 32 in a more easily understood sentence and because the LXX and Syr seem to have read *k<sup>e</sup>zābīm* “lies.” The usual explanation is that *ʾagābīm* was copied by mistake from v 32 for the original *k<sup>e</sup>zābīm* (see Cornill, Ezekiel 398; Bertholet, Hesekeil 173; Toy, Ezekiel 59; Rothstein, BHK<sup>2</sup> 2, 801; Cooke, Ezekiel 372; Fohrer, Ezekiel 189, BHS). Zimmerli (Ezekiel 2, 196) objects that an original plural *k<sup>e</sup>zābīm* could not account for the singulars *pseudos* of the LXX or *dglwti* of the Syr; besides Ezekiel never uses the plural of *kāzāb*.

<sup>27</sup> That *mā’as* means “to feel loathing contempt and revulsion,” see J. B. Curtis, “On Job’s Response to Yahweh,” JBL 98 (1979) 501–3.

<sup>28</sup> For more details, see GKa § 113u.



by piel inf abs of another verb – 2 Kgs 2:11; (c) qal inf abs of *hālak* followed by qal pf of another verb – Josh 6:13a; 2 Sam 13:19; (d) qal inf abs of *hālak* followed by qal act part of another verb – Jer 41:6; (e) qal inf abs of *hālak* followed by an adj – Gen 26:13; Judg 4:24; 1 Sam 14:19; 2 Sam 5:10;<sup>29</sup> 18:25; Isa 20:2; 1 Chr 11:9.<sup>29</sup> Because of the frequency of these idiomatic formulations involving the qal inf abs of *hālak*, one would expect that analogous constructions exist involving the hiphil inf abs of *hālak*.

As one considers such a possibility, the question immediately arises as to how *hōlēk w<sup>e</sup>-* as hiphil inf abs plus some other element is to be distinguished from the well-established usage of *hōlēk w<sup>e</sup>-* as qal act part plus some other element. The distinction is rather easy to make because in the latter case the configuration is always the predicate of the sentence, not depending on another verb, whereas in the former case the expression is generally subordinate to a principal verb.<sup>30</sup> One finds *hōlēk w<sup>e</sup>-* as qal act part with following adj used as predicate in 1 Sam 2:26; 2 Sam 3:1; 15:12; Esth 9:4;<sup>29</sup> a similar construction with the following participle occurs in 1 Sam 17:15; Jon 1:11, 13. With this distinction in mind, one may adduce at least six instances of hiphil inf abs plus some other element as follows:

(a) hiphil inf abs of *hālak* followed by qal inf abs of another verb

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Josh 6:13b <i>hōlēk</i> [K] <i>w<sup>e</sup>tāqōa'</i> | continuously making<br>themselves blow        |
| Prov 4:18 <i>hōlēk wā'ōr</i>                           | continuously exhibiting<br>greater brightness |

(b) hiphil inf abs of *hālak* followed by an adj

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Exod 19:19 <i>hōlēk w<sup>e</sup>hāzēk</i>  | continuously making<br>itself stronger  |
| 1 Sam 17:41 <i>hōlēk w<sup>e</sup>qārēb</i> | continuously bringing<br>himself nearer |
| 2 Chr 17:12 <i>hōlēk w<sup>e</sup>gādēl</i> | continuously making<br>himself greater  |

(c) hiphil inf abs of *hālak* followed by hiphil inf abs of another verb

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| Jer 10:23 <i>hōlēk w<sup>e</sup>hākīn</i> | continuously making firmer |
|---|----------------------------|

It is appropriate here to make a brief comment about the two examples listed above in which the hiphil inf abs construction is not directly subordinate to another verb:

(a) In Jer 10:23 we have two coordinate nominal sentences which are objects of *yāda'tī*. In the second nominal sentence *hōlēk w<sup>e</sup>hākīn 'et-ša'a'dō* is subject; *hōlēk* is here regarded as hiphil inf abs because a strongly causative and purposive act seems more appropriate than the rather weaker force of the qal act part. The text reads: *yāda'tī yhw h kī lō' lā'ādām darkō lō'-l<sup>e</sup>'iš hōlēk w<sup>e</sup>hākīn 'et-ša'a'dō* "I know, O Yahweh, that man's way does not belong to him, it does not belong to man to make his step firmer continuously." (b) Less certain is Prov 4:18, which contains no finite verb but in which the hiphil inf abs seems subordinate to the initial nominal clause: *w<sup>e</sup>'ōrah šaddīqīm k<sup>e</sup>'ōr nōgah hōlēk wā'ōr 'ad-n<sup>e</sup>kōn hayyōm* "But the path of the righteous is like the light of the dawn, continuously exhibiting greater brightness

<sup>29</sup> Mandelkern (Concordantiae 1, 251) regards *gādōl* as qal inf abs in 2 Sam 5:10; 1 Chr 11:9; Esth 9:4. Contrast BDB 153a. Note also that KBL<sup>3</sup> 171 also takes *gādōl* as qal inf abs in some cases.

<sup>30</sup> The two striking exceptions to this general rule (Jer 10:23; Prov 4:18) are discussed below.

until the full brilliance of the day.” The internal causative sense here seems much stronger and more appropriate for the teacher who wants to give unwavering assurance to his students of the invariant rewards of the righteous life.

To conclude, it seems likely that there did exist a hiphil inf abs of *hālak* in classical Hebrew; but, because of its identity in form with the qal act part, its existence was forgotten. But when it is recovered, the effect is generally to make the biblical statements more forceful and to render unnecessary emendations of seemingly incorrect passages.

*Abstract:*

The mixed inflections of the verb *hālak* produce the result that the qal active participle and the hiphil infinitive absolute ought, in principle, to have exactly the same form: *hōlēk* or *hōlēk*. But up to the present the existence of a hiphil infinitive absolute has not been recognized; all forms *hōlēk* / *hōlēk* have simply been considered qal active participle. The present paper considers that small, but significant, set of passages in the MT wherein it seems that the treatment of *hōlēk* / *hōlēk* as hiphil infinitive absolute yields a better meaning and makes unnecessary some of the emendations usually proposed.

*Anschrift des Autors:*

Dr. J. B. Curtis, 754 East Tibet Road, Columbus, Ohio 43211, U.S.A.

# Das Problem der sogenannten semantischen Polarität im Althebräischen

J. H. Hospers (Groningen)

## I. Einleitung

Allbekannt ist der Ausspruch: jedes arabische Wort habe vier Bedeutungen, nämlich: 1) die ursprüngliche Bedeutung, 2) deren Gegenteil, 3) etwas Obszönes und 4) etwas in Beziehung zu einem Kamel<sup>1</sup>. Glücklicherweise ist es in der Praxis nicht so schlecht bestellt mit dieser weiträumigen Polysemie, aber die unter 2) aufgeführten „Wörter mit Gegensinn“ (arabisch *'addād*, Mehrzahl von *ḏidd* „ein Wort mit Gegensinn“), d. h. Wörter mit zwei einander entgegengesetzten und ausschließenden Bedeutungen kommen auf den ersten Blick doch nicht so selten vor, nicht nur im Arabischen, sondern auch in anderen semitischen Sprachen. Diese Wörter haben schon früh die arabischen Grammatiker beschäftigt. Ausführliche Listen wurden aufgestellt, wobei man sich manchmal des Eindrucks nicht erwehren kann, daß sie bemüht waren, eine möglichst große Anzahl dieser Wörter – wie in einer Art linguistischer Spielerei und auch aus anderen Gründen – als *'addād* zu bezeichnen<sup>2</sup>.

In diesem Artikel aber handelt es sich nicht um die arabischen *'addād* insbesondere, sondern vielmehr um die (semitischen) *'addād* im allgemeinen, namentlich auch anlässlich R. Meyers Publikation „Gegensinn und Mehrdeutigkeit in der althebräischen Wort- und Begriffsbildung“<sup>3</sup>. Dabei soll auch gezeigt werden, wie die sprachlichen Untersuchungen hierüber sich im Laufe dieses Jahrhunderts geändert haben. Es ist also nicht meine Absicht, das Problem der *'addād* ganz und gar aufs neue zu behandeln. Ich möchte nur ein paar Notizen machen in bezug auf das Problem.

## II. Die Veröffentlichungen über die Wörter mit Gegensinn in unserem Jahrhundert (in chronologischer Folge)

Die arabischen Grammatiker hatten ihre ausführlichen Listen solcher einzelner *'addād* natürlich noch aufgestellt ohne Rücksicht auf die Sprache als System. In unserem Jahrhundert aber hat man sich stets mehr bemüht, dieses Phänomen einer so extremen Polysemie sprachwissenschaftlich zu verstehen.

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. etwa M. C. Bateson, *Arabic Language Handbook*, Washington D.C., 1967, 87.

<sup>2</sup> Zur relevanten Literatur vgl. Th. Nöldeke, *Wörter mit Gegensinn (Aḏḏād)*. Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin 1910, 67–108, bes. 67, und D. Cohen, *Aḏḏād et ambigüité linguistique en arabe*, in: *Études de linguistique sémitique et arabe*, The Hague – Paris 1970, 79–100 (= *Arabica* VIII, 1961, 1–29), bes. 79 Anm. 2. Gleichzeitig sei auf die daselbst zusammengestellte Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts verwiesen.

<sup>3</sup> R. Meyer, *Gegensinn und Mehrdeutigkeit in der althebräischen Wort- und Begriffsbildung*, Berlin 1979 (= *UF* 11, 1979, 601–612).

<sup>4</sup> Vgl. oben Anm. 2.