C.M. van den Heever

Idioms in Biblical Hebrew

Towards their identification and classification
with special reference to 1 and 2 Samuel

2013

Idioms in Biblical Hebrew

Towards their identification and classification
with special reference to 1 and 2 Samuel

Cornelius Marthinus van den Heever

Dissertation presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Stellenbosch University

Promoter: Prof C H J van der Merwe

Co-promoter: Prof E R Wendland

December 2013

Declaration

By submitting this dissertation electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

C M van den Heever

Date: 29 October 2012

SUMMARY

This study seeks to identify and classify idioms in the Hebrew Bible. Based on a survey of literature on idioms in general, and in Biblical Hebrew in particular, the necessary conditions for idiomaticity are identified as (1) multi-word character, (2) semantic non-compositionality, (3) unit status, (4) conventionalisation, (5) a verbal nucleus, and (6) a content message. Restricted variability and uniqueness may also be indicative of idiomaticity, although these are not regarded as necessary conditions. Accordingly, *idiom* is defined as a conventionalised multi-word symbolic unit with a verbal nucleus and a content message, whose global meaning is a semantic extension of the combined meanings of its constituent elements.

These criteria were applied to 1 and 2 Samuel, and 104 idioms were identified. The results suggest that the proposed definition is an effective aid to identifying idioms, with certain caveats. In line with Granger and Paquot's phraseological classification, the multi-word character of idioms is interpreted to imply a verb plus at least one more semantic (as opposed to grammatical) element. Semantic compositionality is shown to be a complex concept that should be understood as the overall meaning of an expression being an extension of the combined meanings of its individual lexical constituents. Conventionalisation and unit status prove to be virtually impossible to determine with certainty for expressions in the Hebrew Bible. Researchers should also be aware that there is an inevitable degree of subjectivity involved in the application and interpretation of the idiom characteristics proposed in this study.

A preliminary semantic classification of the idioms found in 1 and 2 Samuel is proposed, based on the lexicographical system developed by De Blois (2000) for the *Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*. The results of this study suggest that, with some improvements and adjustments, De Blois's framework is suitable for classifying and representing Biblical Hebrew idioms. The greatest obstacle in using this system is shown to be the counterintuitive names of a number of categories. A complete alphabetical list of idioms from 1 and 2 Samuel is provided in Appendix A, together with the relevant semantic information for each. A classification of these idioms according to lexical semantic domains is presented and discussed in Chapter 5, while alternative ways of arranging them (viz. by contextual semantic domains, underlying conceptual metaphors, and terms for body parts) are provided in Appendices B to D.

This study demonstrates that idioms are semantically motivated (by conceptual metaphor, metonymy, symbolic acts, etc.) although their meaning is semantically non-compositional. It also indicates the need for a more systematic treatment of idioms in Biblical Hebrew lexicons.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie poog om idiome in die Hebreeuse Bybel te identifiseer en te klassifiseer. Die volgende noodsaaklike voorwaardes vir idiomatisiteit is geïdentifiseer op grond van 'n oorsig van die literatuur oor idiome in die algemeen en in Bybelse Hebreeus in die besonder: (1) meerwoordigheid, (2) semantiese nie-komposisionaliteit, (3) eenheidstatus, (4) konvensionalisering, (5) 'n werkwoordelike kern en (6) 'n inhoudelike boodskap. Beperkte veranderbaarheid en uniekheid kan ook dui op idiomatisiteit, maar dit word nie as noodsaaklike voorwaardes beskou nie. Gevolglik word *idioom* gedefinieer as 'n gekonvensionaliseerde, meerwoordige simboliese eenheid met 'n werkwoordelike kern, waarvan die geheelbetekenis 'n semantiese uitbreiding is van die gekombineerde betekenisse van die elemente waaruit dit saamgestel is.

Die bogenoemde kriteria is in 1 en 2 Samuel toegepas, en daar is 104 idiome geïdentifiseer. Die resultate dui daarop dat die voorgestelde definisie van idiomatisiteit, met inagneming van sekere voorbehoude, 'n effektiewe hulpmiddel vir die indentifisering van idiome is. In lyn met Granger en Paquot se fraseologiese klassifikasie word daar van die veronderstelling uitgegaan dat die meerwoordigheid van idiome 'n werkwoord plus minstens een ander semantiese (teenoor grammatikale) komponent behels. Daar word aangetoon dat semantiese komposisionaliteit 'n komplekse begrip is en dat dit verstaan moet word as 'n uitbreiding van die kombinasie van die betekenisse van die afsonderlike leksikale elemente waaruit 'n uitdrukking saamgestel is, om 'n geheelbetekenis te vorm. Om die konvensionalisering en eenheidstatus van uitdrukkings in die Hebreeuse Bybel met sekerheid vas te stel, blyk feitlik onmoontlik te wees. Navorsers moet ook daarvan bewus wees dat daar 'n onvermydelike mate van subjektiwiteit betrokke is by die toepassing en verstaan van die idioomkenmerke wat in die huidige studie voorgestel word.

'n Voorlopige semantiese klassifikasie van die idiome wat in 1 en 2 Samuel geïdentifiseer is, word voorgestel, gebaseer op die leksikografiese sisteem wat deur De Blois (2000) vir die *Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew* ontwikkel is. Die resultate van hierdie studie doen aan die hand dat De Blois se raamwerk, met 'n paar veranderinge en verbeteringe, geskik is vir die klassifisering en uiteensetting van idiome in Bybelse Hebreeus. Daar word aangetoon dat die grootste hindernis om die genoemde sisteem te gebruik, die teen-intuïtiewe benaminge van 'n aantal kategorieë is. 'n Volledige alfabetiese lys van die idiome uit 1 en 2 Samuel, met toepaslike semantiese inligting by elk, word in Bylae A aangebied. 'n Klassifikasie van hierdie idiome volgens leksikale semantiese domeine word in Hoofstuk 5 voorgehou en bespreek, terwyl alternatiewe indelings (nl. volgens kontekstuele semantiese domeine, onderliggende konsepsuele metafore en terme vir liggaamsdele) in Bylaes B tot D aangebied word.

Hierdie studie toon aan dat idiome semanties gemotiveer word (deur konsepsuele metafore, metonimie, simboliese handelinge ens.), alhoewel hulle betekenis nie-komposisioneel is. Die behoefte aan 'n meer sistematiese bewerking van idiome in Bybelse Hebreeuse leksikons word ook uitgewys.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my promoter, Christo van der Merwe, and co-promoter, Ernst Wendland, not only for the invaluable academic guidance they have given me, but also for their grace and patience when this dissertation sometimes moved to the back burner due to work and family responsibilities. Thank you both for helping me hone my thinking and writing throughout the course of working on this dissertation.

To my precious wife, Lettie: The phrase "thank you" seems so utterly inadequate when trying to convey to you the depths of my appreciation for standing by me in your special, unassuming way. A more excellent companion and cheerleader no man could desire. Times without number you have been my sheltered little corner of sanity and rest when the gale-force winds were raging outside. I love you.

To my children, Hesmari, Daniël, Anna-Mart, Juanita, Johannes, and Amanda: Most of you are too young to read this right now. However, writing this dissertation has affected your lives in more ways than you have perhaps realised, and I want to express my love and appreciation to each of you. Thank you for your unwavering love and admiration for me, regardless of how bleary-eyed and crusty I may have been during crunch times. No man, least of all I, deserves such wonderful kids!

To my dear parents, Marius and Mart van den Heever: Thank you for teaching and helping me in so many ways to appreciate, develop, and enjoy the gifts God put in me. You have cared for me selflessly, lovingly, and consistently through the years; you allowed me the freedom to grow up and pursue my dreams, strange though some of them may have seemed to you. For that, I salute you.

To Prof Jan Kroeze, who taught me Biblical Hebrew: Thank you for fostering in me a love of Hebrew, not merely as a subject, but as a "real" language.

To God Almighty, Whom I call "Father" through our Lord Jesus Christ: I have nothing to give but what You have given me. May this quite imperfect offering serve in some way to bring honour and praise to You who created me and imbued me with a fascination with human languages and cultures.

וְלִי מַה־יָּקְרוּ רֵעֶיךָ אֵל מֶה עָצְמוּ רָאשֵׁיהֶם:

תהלים 139:17

Table of contents

List of abbreviations and symbols used

Reference works, Bible texts, versions, and other works cited

BDB	The enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English lexicon
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
CEV	Contemporary English Version
CHALOT	A concise Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament
CTAT	Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament
DBL Hebrew	Dictionary of biblical languages with semantic domains: Hebrew (Old Testament)
ESV	English Standard Version
FCL	La Bible en Français Courant
GCL	Gute Nachricht Bibel
GHCLOT	Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee lexicon to the Old Testament
GNB	Groot Nieuws Bijbel
GNT	Good News Translation
HALOT	The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament
HSV	Herziene Statenvertaling
KJV	King James Version, with American Bible Society additions
LUT	Die Bibel (Luther revised, 1984)
LXX	The Septuagint (ed. Rahlfs-Hanhart)
MT	The Masoretic Text
NAV	Nuwe Afrikaanse Vertaling
NBJ	Nouvelle Bible de Jerusalem
NBV	Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling
NET	New English Translation
NIV	New International Version
NJPS	New translation of the Hebrew Bible by the Jewish Publication Society
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTLH	Nova Tradução na Linguagem de Hoje
NVL	Nova Vulgata
REB	Revised English Bible

1

TOB	Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible
TPC	Tradução em Português Corrente
WV	Willibrordvertaling

Books of the Bible

Gen	Genesis
Ex	Exodus
Lev	Leviticus
Num	Numbers
Deut	Deuteronomy
Josh	Joshua
Judg	Judges
Ruth	Ruth
1 Sam	1 Samuel
2 Sam	2 Samuel
1 Kgs	1 Kings
2 Kgs	2 Kings
1 Chr	1 Chronicles
2 Chr	2 Chronicles
Ezra	Ezra
Neh	Nehemiah
Esth	Esther
Job	Job
Ps	Psalms
Prov	Proverbs
Ecc	Ecclesiastes
Is	Isaiah
Jer	Jeremiah
Lam	Lamentations
Ezek	Ezekiel
Dan	Daniel
Hos	Hosea
Joel	Joel

Amos	Amos
Jon	Jonah
Hab	Habakkuk
Zeph	Zephaniah
Hag	Haggai
Zech	Zechariah
Mal	Malachi

Biblical Hebrew abbreviations

כ׳	כלום (= something)
פ׳	פלוני (= someone)

General abbreviations

adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
app.	appendix
art.	article
ch.	chapter
conj.	conjunction
def. art.	definite article
dir. obj.	direct object
Hiph	Hiphil
Hith	Hithpael
indef. art.	indefinite article
L1	first language
lit.	literally
n.	noun
Niph	Niphal
NP	noun phrase
obj.	object
Pi	Piel

PP   prepositional phrase

prep.   preposition

sb   somebody

sth   something

v.   Verb

Symbols

*   marks hypothetical, unacceptable examples, e.g. *the rightest hand*

\>   represents a change from one form to another, e.g. *think > thought*

Chapter 1

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Many people learn a foreign language mainly by studying its grammar and lexicon, with only limited exposure to the language as it is used — in speech and in writing — by its native speakers. However great their knowledge of the grammar and lexicon, they are inevitably struck by their inability to sound natural when attempting to keep up a conversation of any considerable length in that language. Very often native speakers will react with something like, "We just don't say it that way," even though a particular sentence may be grammatically well-formed and perfectly comprehensible. An example from Taylor (2002:547) illustrates this point well: Although the sentence, "Please let me know if it is your desire to drink more coffee," conforms to the grammar and lexicon of the English language, it would sound decidedly unnatural if used in the context of offering someone another cup of coffee. Most native speakers of English would rather say something like, "Would you like some more coffee?" or, "May I offer you some more coffee?" These sentences will normally be regarded as idiomatic, i.e. the natural way of offering someone another cup of coffee in English.

Biblical Hebrew is no exception, and so the same phenomenon is to be expected when one studies this language. Even though most students of Biblical Hebrew will probably never attempt to write an essay or have a conversation in this language, they will not fail to notice its many peculiar ways of expression — that is, "peculiar" from the students' own linguistic backgrounds. For example, the way in which the preposition בין ("between") is used in Biblical Hebrew may strike English-speaking students as strange. Since the English preposition *between* is used only once in a construction to indicate a relationship between two or more parties (e.g. "enmity between you and the woman" — Gen 3:15, NIV), the Biblical Hebrew usage, where the preposition is required with every party involved (e.g. איבה...בינך ובין האשה "enmity between you and between the woman" — Gen 3:15) probably seems odd to most English-speaking students at first. The construction בין ... ובין ("between ... and between") is, however, natural (i.e. idiomatic) Biblical Hebrew.

Besides this difficulty (mainly related to producing speech or text in a second or third language), idiomaticity[1] poses a second, more serious, obstacle to effective communication in the form of idioms proper, or idiomatic expressions. Students of a second or third language will often read or hear expressions that make little sense to them, even though the words and grammar of such expressions may be familiar to them. Non-native speakers of English will probably be baffled when someone says, "You know, John really has a chip on his shoulder," if they are not familiar with the expression *have a chip on one's shoulder*. They may know the meaning of every word in that sentence and understand all the grammatical rules that make it well-formed, and yet be none the wiser as to what the speaker actually means.[2] *Have a chip on one's shoulder* can be called an idiom in the sense that it is a "fixed expression with nonliteral meaning" (*Encarta World English Dictionary*, 1999:935).[3] An example from Biblical Hebrew is found in Genesis 31:20, where גנב את־לב פ׳ means not "steal someone's heart" in the sense of capturing someone's affections (as English-speaking readers may infer), but rather "deceive someone" (see Koehler *et al.*, 1999:198 [HALOT]; Brown, Driver & Briggs, 2000:170 [BDB]).

The text of the Hebrew Bible contains many such idiomatic expressions, and they are the object of the present study.

1.2   Problem

This study seeks to identify and classify idioms in the Hebrew Bible in order to facilitate understanding of the biblical text. As can be seen from the foregoing, *idiomaticity* can refer both to the natural way of using a language and to the

---

[1]   I do not use the term *idiomaticity* in a specialised technical sense, as some scholars (e.g. Fernando, 1996) do. In this study, it simply indicates the quality of being idiomatic, where *idiomatic* is used to mean "pertaining to, or characteristic of, an idiom".

[2]   Sufficient context may, of course, help someone not familiar with such an expression to deduce its meaning (see Omazić, 2008:70). Context, however, cannot simply be assumed. In the example mentioned here, the speaker may say nothing else about John nor adapt a particular facial expression, leaving the listeners who do not know the expression to guess as to which aspect of John's character or behaviour is being referred to.

[3]   This definition is offered here to reflect the general usage of the term *idiom* in dictionaries and linguistic writings. Its implications will be discussed in more detail further on, especially in ch. 2 and 3.

kind of semantically opaque[4] expressions known as *idioms*.[5] The focus will be on *idiomaticity* in the second sense mentioned above (semantically opaque expressions); *idiomaticity* in the first-mentioned sense (the natural way of using a language) falls outside the scope of this study.

Due to the constraints on the length of this dissertation, the proposed identification and classification of idioms in the Hebrew Bible will be tested and applied to a limited corpus, viz. the first and second books of Samuel.[6]

Although idioms in the Hebrew Bible have often been recognised and interpreted as such,[7] this has been done more or less intuitively. Lexicons of Biblical Hebrew and commentaries on the Hebrew Bible mention most idioms, but this is not done within a consistent theoretical framework, which sometimes leads to giving insufficient information on a specific idiom. In the case of the expression אורו עיניו, for example, HALOT (1999:24) offers the gloss "to be light: eyes". This may be a correct translation of the senses of the individual words, but the reader is not informed of the idiomatic meaning of this expression, viz. "experience an increase in one's joy and vitality". This is insufficient information, especially for a Bible translator needing to understand the meaning of the expression before looking for an equivalent in his or her own language. In the same way, both HALOT (1999:28) and BDB (2000:25) mention that אזר חיל is "metaphorical" or "figurative" without any hint as to this expression's actual idiomatic meaning, viz. "be strengthened".

---

[4]   The term *opaque* is used here in the sense of "difficult or impossible to understand" (*Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 2004: "opaque").

[5]   This general description is not intended as a definition of *idiom*, a topic that will be dealt with in subsequent chapters of this dissertation.

[6]   A personal interest in Samuel was probably the first factor that prompted the choice of this corpus. Additionally, from some of my preliminary reading it seemed that idioms occur more often in direct speech, which meant that a corpus consisting of narrative with a high percentage of direct speech, such as Samuel, should render a variety of idioms. Also, I consciously steered away from poetic texts (although there are some in Samuel), due to the difficulty I was foreseeing in distinguishing between conventionalised idioms and novel figures of speech.

[7]   See the translation of חרה אפו ("his nose became hot", i.e. "he became furious") in 1 Sam 11:6 as ἐθυμώθη ὀργὴ αὐτοῦ σφόδρα ("his wrath was made very angry", i.e. "he became very angry") in the LXX, or *iratus est furor eius* ("his anger became furious", i.e. "he became furious") in the Vulgate.

In recent years, research in cognitive linguistics has shed some light on the concept of meaning and, consequently, on the nature and meaning of idioms. The present study will draw on insights from cognitive linguistics, although not exclusively, in developing a theoretical framework for identifying and classifying idioms in Biblical Hebrew.

1.3 Preliminary study

The research conducted in the present study has arisen from my interest in Bible translation and my work in this field. I soon became convinced that a systematic study of Biblical Hebrew idioms would help enhance translators' understanding of the Hebrew Bible, thus leading to translations that more accurately convey the intention of the authors of the source text. According to Warren-Rothlin (2005:203), "Bible translators need to know the appropriate cultural equivalents [of idioms] in their target language." A classification of idioms will also help lexicographers to treat idioms more consistently and meaningfully in lexicons of Biblical Hebrew.

A randomly selected popular lexicon, the *Encarta World English Dictionary*, gives the following four senses of *idiom* (1999:935):

> **idiom** /íddiəm/ *n.* **1.** FIXED EXPRESSION WITH NONLITERAL MEANING a fixed, distinctive, and often colourful expression whose meaning cannot be understood from the combined meanings of its individual words, e.g., 'to have sb in stitches' **2.** NATURAL WAY OF USING A LANGUAGE the way of using a particular language that comes naturally to its native speakers and involves both knowledge of its grammar and familiarity with its usage **3.** STYLISTIC EXPRESSION OF PERSON OR GROUP the style of expression of a specific individual or group **4.** ARTS DISTINGUISHING ARTISTIC STYLE the characteristic style of an artist or artistic group

Of the four senses mentioned above, my main focus will be on 1 and, to a very limited extent, 2. *Idiom* in sense 1 ("fixed expression with nonliteral meaning") refers to expressions such as *to have a chip on one's shoulder* or the Biblical Hebrew expression גנב את־לב פ׳ ("to deceive someone"). Sense 2 ("natural way of using a language") refers to what we mean when we say that an expression such as, "Please let me know if it is your desire to drink more coffee" sounds unnatural while, "Would you like some more coffee?" sounds natural in the context of offering someone another cup of coffee. Sense 3 ("stylistic expression of person or group") seems to be of only marginal interest to the subject of the present discussion. Although it describes an aspect in the domain of linguistics, it focuses more on the differing lects (i.e. varieties within a language) that people use, such as idiolect (variety peculiar to an individual), sociolect (variety

as used by a specific social group), and dialect (regional variety). This does not mean to say that the stylistic expression of certain people or groups cannot shed any light on aspects such as meaning and function of Biblical Hebrew idioms. However, this sense of *idiom* does not seem to bring us any closer to characterising the particular type of expressions discussed here. For the purposes of this study, sense 4 ("distinguishing artistic style") can be regarded as irrelevant, since it is merely an extension of sense 3 to the field of art.

Specialised linguistic dictionaries provide more nuanced definitions. Two examples are the *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* (Bussmann, 1996) and *An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Language and Languages* (Crystal, 1992). These two dictionaries define *idiom* as follows:

> **idiom** (*also* colloquial expression, colloquialism, idiomatic expression, set phrase)
>
> A set, multi-elemental group of words, or lexical entity with the following characteristics: (a) the complete meaning cannot be derived from the meaning of the individual elements, e.g. *to have a crush on someone* ('to be in love with someone'); (b) the substitution of single elements does not bring about a systematic change of meaning (which is not true of non-idiomatic syntagms), e.g. **to have a smash on someone*; (c) a literal reading results in a homophonic non-idiomatic variant, to which conditions (a) and (b) no longer apply (⇒ **metaphor**). Frequently there is a diachronic connection between the literal reading and the idiomatic reading (⇒ **idiomatization**). In such cases, the treatment of the idiom as an unanalyzable lexical entity is insufficient. Depending upon the theoretical preconception, sayings, **figures of speech**, **nominal constructions**, and **twin formulas** are all subsumed under idioms.
>
> The idiosyncratic features of an **idiolect**, a **dialect**, or a language.
>
> (Bussmann, 1996:216)
>
> **idiom** A sequence of words which is semantically and often syntactically restricted, so that it functions as a single unit. The meanings of the individual words cannot be combined to produce the meaning of the idiomatic expression as a whole. For example, the meanings of *go*, *fly*, and *kite* cannot account for the use of the sentence *Go fly a kite!* in its sense of 'Go away' or 'Don't be silly'.
>
> (Crystal, 1992:180-181)

From these dictionary entries it seems that sense 1 of the *Encarta World English Dictionary* ("fixed expression with nonliteral meaning") is the primary sense in which linguists use the term *idiom*. As mentioned earlier, this will also be the main focus of the present research. The sense "the idiosyncratic features of an idiolect, a dialect, or a language" (Bussmann, 1996; *Encarta World English*

Dictionary, 1999) is generally only mentioned in passing in literature on idiom theory and will not be considered in the present study.

The cited definitions of *idiom* in sense 1 ("fixed expression with nonliteral meaning") have the following common characteristics:

1) *Multi-word character:* Idioms are multi-word expressions, therefore excluding the possibility of idioms consisting of a single word — "expression ... combined meanings of its individual words" (*Encarta World English Dictionary*, 1999); "multi-elemental group of words" (Bussmann, 1996); "sequence of words" (Crystal, 1992).

2) *Restricted variability:* Idioms are fixed expressions that tolerate little or no variation, whether lexically or syntactically — "fixed expression" (*Encarta World English Dictionary*, 1999); "a set ... group of words ... the substitution of single elements does not bring about a systematic change of meaning" (Bussmann, 1996); "semantically and often syntactically restricted" (Crystal, 1992).

3) *Non-compositionality of meaning:* The meaning of an idiom cannot be deduced from the meanings of its constituent elements — "expression whose meaning cannot be understood from the combined meanings of its individual words" (*Encarta World English Dictionary*, 1999); "the complete meaning cannot be derived from the meaning of the individual elements" (Bussmann, 1996); "the meanings of the individual words cannot be combined to produce the meaning of the idiomatic expression as a whole" (Crystal, 1992).

As will be noted during the review of idioms in the following chapters, these characteristics often appear in literature on idiom theory. Whether they are applicable to all idioms everywhere remains to be seen.[8] Apart from multi-word character, restricted variability, and semantic non-compositionality, some other characteristics of idioms are also mentioned in literature on idioms, e.g.

---

[8] It is interesting, for example, to note Bussmann's (1996) view that treating an idiom as an unanalysable lexical unit is unsatisfactory in those cases where there is a diachronic link between the literal interpretation and the idiomatic interpretation (which would be problematic to determine in Biblical Hebrew). It would seem, then, that these characteristics of idioms — or at least this one, viz. semantic non-compositionality — are not to be regarded as absolutes, as it were laws cast in stone.

10

picturesqueness, unitary function, and figurative meaning. These, and other, aspects of idiomaticity will be addressed in Chapters 2 and 3.

It might seem that these characteristics could provide sufficient parameters within which to conduct my research on Biblical Hebrew idioms. However, a cursory look at the literature on idioms soon leads the reader to see that pinning down the phenomenon described here as *idiom* is not quite as simple a matter as it might appear at first glance.[9] In fact, there is significant disagreement on the issue of distinguishing between the idiomatic and the non-idiomatic. Cognitive linguists have convincingly argued that the classical "watertight compartment" view of categories — i.e. that categories have clear-cut boundaries and that membership of categories is absolute — can no longer be maintained (see Lakoff, 1987; Taylor, 1995, 2002; Lee, 2001). This view may cause some to question the validity of an attempted delimitation of idiomaticity, but the need remains for some parameters to help the researcher focus on a specific phenomenon within the broader field — in this case, idioms.

The researcher also encounters a gap between Biblical Hebrew research (traditionally often a part of general biblical studies) and modern linguistic studies. Shead (2007:2) points out:

> Biblical Hebrew is a 'dead' language with a limited corpus. Many modern linguistic theories and methods focus on living languages, and can base their empirical studies on the intuitive judgments of native speakers. [...] Such judgments are not possible in the case of [Biblical Hebrew]. Part of the task in applying modern linguistic insights, therefore, is either selecting some which are already applicable to the study of dead languages, or adapting others so as to make them applicable.

Fortunately, this gap has increasingly been bridged in recent years, as the literature review in this dissertation will show.

1.4   Objectives

The following objectives have been formulated for researching the problem explained in section 1.2:

1)   to formulate a definition of *idiom* for Biblical Hebrew;

---

9   Ishida (2008:276) points out that "the lack of scholarly agreement on the definition of *idiom* is a question that requires further discussion".

2) to apply this definition to identify the idioms in a specific corpus from the Hebrew Bible, viz. 1 and 2 Samuel;

3) to test the conditions for idiomaticity as proposed in existing literature, based on the idioms that have been identified; and

4) to offer a preliminary classification of types of Biblical Hebrew idioms.

1.5   Assumptions

In my research on idioms in Biblical Hebrew, the following is assumed:

1) It will be possible to develop a systematic framework for the identification and description of idioms in Biblical Hebrew by referring to literature on idioms, reflecting research from diverse linguistic and theoretical backgrounds.

2) The corpus chosen from the Hebrew Bible will render a sufficient number of idioms so as to be representative of idioms in Biblical Hebrew in general.

3) It will be possible to obtain the meaning of most of the idioms identified by referring to context, translations (ancient and modern), lexicons of Biblical Hebrew, and the work of other scholars, bearing in mind that in some cases (e.g. some *hapax legomena*) it may be impossible to determine the exact meaning. Still, these secondary sources represent a formidable history of studying and interpreting the text of the Hebrew Bible.

1.6   Hypotheses

The following hypotheses have been formulated as a basis for an evaluation of the present research:

1) Idioms are a cross-language phenomenon, which means that Biblical Hebrew idioms will not differ significantly from idioms in other languages, as presented in the literature researched in this study.

2) Consequently, a framework for identifying and classifying Biblical Hebrew idioms will be useful for research in other languages, and *vice versa*.

3) Insights from the field of cognitive linguistics will enhance our understanding of idioms in Biblical Hebrew.

4) The model developed by De Blois and used in the *Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew* (SDBH) for representing lexical items from the Hebrew Bible will be suitable for classifying and representing Biblical Hebrew idioms.

5) A classification of idioms in Biblical Hebrew will lead to a better understanding of these idioms and enhance Bible translators' understanding of the text of the Hebrew Bible, leading to more accurate translations.

These hypotheses will be revisited and evaluated in the final chapter of this dissertation.

1.7   Methodology

In order to identify and classify idioms in Biblical Hebrew, the following steps will be followed:

1) A survey will be made of literature on idiom research and theory. This survey will include research on idioms both in Biblical Hebrew and other languages.

2) A definition of *idiom* will be proposed as a tool for identifying idioms in the Hebrew Bible.

3) The meaning of the identified idioms will be determined by a study of context, ancient and modern translations, existing Biblical Hebrew lexicons, and the work of other scholars.

4) The idioms gathered from the corpus (1 and 2 Samuel) will be classified according to the model of the SDBH.

1.8   Research issues

Research difficulties may include the following:

1) Idiom research still lacks consensus on such basic issues as terminology and a widely accepted definition of its object (see Donalies, 1994; Svensson, 2004, 2008; Granger & Paquot, 2008). The lack of information and interaction between researchers (see Čermák, 2001:2) may pose a problem to research in this field. In order to avoid the premises of this study

13

being criticised by some as intuitive and arbitrary, definitions will be based on research from various schools, and explained and used as consistently as possible.

2) Biblical Hebrew being a "dead" language, it is possible (even probable) that the meaning of some idioms will remain obscure, defying all attempts at discovering their meaning beyond any doubt. The relatively small corpus of Biblical Hebrew available to us provides a limited range of occurrences of any given idiom. The insufficient quantity of data constitutes a barrier that has proved insuperable at times, as may happen in a few cases in the present research, too.

1.9   Expected contributions to the field

Idioms form part of the lexical stock of Biblical Hebrew, and a better understanding of their nature will benefit research on Biblical Hebrew lexicography. A systematic delimitation of idiomatic expressions should enable compilers of future Biblical Hebrew lexicons to make scientifically more sound decisions about which expressions to treat as idioms. The classification of Biblical Hebrew idioms according to the model of SDBH should provide useful guidelines for the kind of data to include in the entries on idioms in other lexicons.

More indirectly related to the current research, a dictionary or dictionaries incorporating the findings of this study will benefit Biblical scholars and translators — in fact, anyone working with the Hebrew Bible. This can be achieved by indicating idioms as such and providing information that will not only shed light on the understanding of a particular idiom, but also guide translators in making appropriate choices when looking for translation equivalents.

1.10 Outline

Due to the amount of space required for the presentation of the data and the information given about each individual idiom, the main body of this dissertation (Chapters 1 to 6) consists mainly of theoretical discussion. A delineation of all the idioms identified during the course of this study, as well as their classification, is provided in several appendices after the final chapter.

Following the introduction to the study, as presented in the current chapter, a survey of the theorising that has been done regarding idioms is given in *Chapter 2*. Research in languages other than Biblical Hebrew is reviewed in this

chapter. *Chapter 2* is intended to provide a broader perspective within which a working definition of *idiom* can be developed.

Progressing from the general to the more specific, *Chapter 3* consists of a review of research on idioms in Biblical Hebrew. In the second part of the chapter, the working definition proposed at the end of *Chapter 2* is assessed and adapted, as necessary.

Chapter 4 presents an introduction to the concept of classification, followed by a discussion of the system proposed for the classification of idioms in Biblical Hebrew.

In *Chapter 5*, the method followed in identifying and classifying idioms in the Hebrew Bible is explained in some more detail, and the results of its application are presented and discussed. Although a complete list of idioms and different ways of classifying them are presented in the appendices, a list of idioms classified according to lexical semantic domains is provided in this chapter for the sake of the theoretical discussion.

The conclusion to the theoretical part of this dissertation is presented in *Chapter 6*, where the hypotheses mentioned in the current chapter are reviewed and assessed. Ideas for future research are also offered.

In *Appendix A*, all the idioms identified in the chosen corpus are presented in alphabetical order, with an indication of lexical and contextual semantic domains as well as other relevant information (e.g. levels of derivation, definitions and other semantic features, translation equivalents, occurrences in the corpus, and synonymous and antonymous expressions).

Appendix B contains all the idioms identified in the corpus, arranged alphabetically according to the contextual semantic domains in which they occur.

An alphabetical list of idioms according to the metaphors that play a role in their semantic motivation is provided in *Appendix C*.

Appendix D contains all the body idioms identified in the corpus, i.e. idioms containing terms for body parts.

1.11 Conclusion

In this chapter the topic of my research, viz. the identification and classification of idioms in Biblical Hebrew, has been introduced. The broader context to this

topic and the study of it is provided by presenting preliminary research that has been done, assumptions, hypotheses, and expected contributions to the field. The methodology that will be followed is explained, as well as some research issues. Finally, an outline is presented for the structure of this dissertation.

Let us now turn our attention to a review of the literature on idioms in general, i.e. not including research on Biblical Hebrew.

Chapter 2

THE STATUS OF IDIOM RESEARCH

2.1 Introduction

In Chapter 1, some preliminary parameters for idiomaticity were identified and discussed within the context of my research on idioms in Biblical Hebrew. In this chapter, a survey of some of the theorising that has been done regarding idioms is given in order to provide a broader perspective within which a working definition of *idiom* can be developed. The discussion in this chapter is not intended as a comprehensive treatment of idiom research, nor as an in-depth critique of the various authors' work, but rather as a selection of representative idiom theories useful for the purpose of discovering the (identifying) characteristics of idioms. As Fernando (1996:2) rightly points out, "Though little has been done on idioms and idiomaticity in comparison with other areas of English vocabulary, there is enough to warrant selectivity." An evaluation of the idiom characteristics suggested by these different scholars will be undertaken in Chapter 3, when a working definition of *idiom* will be formulated for the purposes of identifying idioms in the Hebrew Bible.

2.2 A survey of existing work on idioms

None of the works referred to here focus specifically on Biblical Hebrew. The few contributions of which I am aware in the area of Biblical Hebrew will be considered in Chapter 3. This separate treatment is due to the fact that the work that has been done on Biblical Hebrew generally does not seem to be intended to develop idiom theory as such, but rather to arrive at a better understanding of idioms occurring in the Hebrew Bible. This study is no exception, as I attempt to apply recent linguistic scholarship to identify, classify, and interpret Biblical Hebrew idioms in a scientific way.

For practical reasons, the overview of literature on idioms is presented here in chronological order — i.e. starting with the earliest work and moving on to the latest — rather than sorted by the different linguistic schools. However, the theoretical framework within which an author writes will be indicated where this seems helpful for identifying specific affinities between authors as well as relevant theoretical trends.

2.2.1 Uriel Weinreich (1969)

In his article entitled *Problems in the analysis of idioms*, Weinreich (1969:42) defines *idiom* as "a phraseological unit that involves at least two polysemous constituents, and in which there is a reciprocal contextual selection of subsenses". He cites *red herring* ("phony issue") as an example of "a reciprocal contextual selection of subsenses". *Red* and *herring* are only interpreted figuratively, i.e. as "phony" and "issue" respectively, when they occur together in this expression. According to this definition, the expression *worth one's salt* ("worth one's pay", "worth having")[1] would not be granted idiomatic status, since it contains only one "polysemous" (i.e. ambiguous) element, viz. *salt*. The figurative meaning "one's pay" is only selected when following the construction *worth his/her/etc*.

Weinreich's definition may be interpreted as suggesting that the meaning of an idiom consists of the meanings of its constituent elements, e.g. by ascribing a subsense "phony" to the adjective *red* and a subsense "issue" to the noun *herring* in the idiom *red herring* (see Wood, 1986:17). He does, however, hold that idiomatic meaning is non-compositional. As an example he points out (Weinreich, 1969:38) that the constituent elements of the phrase *cats and dogs* (in e.g. *it is raining cats and dogs*) do not correlate to the elements of the paraphrase "in an intense manner". For instance, *cats* cannot be made to mean "intense" and *dogs* "manner".[2] Nevertheless, he also recognises (1969:45) that there is an exception to this apparent arbitrariness of idiomatic meaning to be observed in antonymous pairs, e.g. *to bury the hatchet* ("to make peace, abandon a quarrel") vs. *to dig/take up the hatchet* ("to resume a quarrel"). He observes that this phenomenon is characteristic of those expressions which literally describe symbolic behaviour in some non-linguistic — e.g. gestural — semiotic system.[3]

Concerning the morpho-syntactic structure of idioms, Weinreich (1969:47) observes that all phraseological units — subsuming idioms — are restricted in terms of variability. Of all the idioms and other phraseological units that he

---

[1] See Gulland & Hinds-Howell (1986:163).

[2] This does not seem like an ideal example, as the phrase *cats and dogs* only applies to rain, making it collocationally very restricted.

[3] This concept is more fully developed in the cognitive linguistic school (e.g. Lakoff, 1987; Taylor, 2002; Langlotz, 2006). These scholars' approach is discussed below.

studied in four or five languages, Weinreich did not find a single one that did not have some transformational defect. He indicates (1969:48) that in phraseological units of the adjective-noun type, for example, the predicative use of the adjective does not have the same sense as the attributive use. Hence, one may talk about a *blind date*, but saying **the date is blind* does not mean the same thing.[4] Adjective-noun phrases of this kind do not allow nominalisation, e.g. **the blindness of the date*.[5] He also mentions (1969:50-51) irreversible binomials such as *on pins and needles*, which do not tolerate a reversal of order, e.g. **on needles and pins*, repetition of the preposition, e.g. **on pins and on needles*, nor variation of the conjunction, e.g. **on pins or needles*.[6] Some idioms have variants where a synonym is substituted for one of its elements, e.g. *to bury the tomahawk/hatchet*. Weinreich (1969:45) holds that the existence of such variants does not affect the integrity of the idiom, just as the existence of allophones, e.g. /ˌiːkəˈnɒmɪk/ — /ˌekəˈnɒmɪk/ does not affect the integrity of the phoneme. Working in a structuralist framework, Weinreich does not offer any explanation for syntactically ill-formed idioms such as *to trip the light fantastic*, and he maintains (1969:46) that "categorical anomalies" such as *by and large* or *to blow someone to kingdom come* "account for only a small fraction of the phraseological resources of a language".

Weinreich's idiom theory supports most of the idiom characteristics mentioned in the previous chapter. He regards *multi-word character* as an essential feature of idioms, since he defines (1969:42) *idiom* as a "phraseological unit", implying two or more words. By observing that idioms are transformationally deficient (1969:47), he clearly subscribes to the characteristic of *restricted variability*. Weinreich also seems to agree with the *non-compositionality of idiomatic meaning* to some extent, insofar as he regards idiomatic meaning as arbitrary in some cases. In this regard, he points out (1969:38) that the constituent elements of an idiom do not necessarily correlate with the constituents of a paraphrase of that particular expression (see the example of *cats and dogs*

---

[4] Barring, of course, wordplay, e.g. in some literary work.

[5] Weinreich (1969:48) points out, however, that English and some other languages do have some strictly attributive adjectives, e.g. *right* (hand), which do not occur in predicates, e.g. **the hand is right*, nor nominalisations, e.g. **the rightness of the hand*, nor do they yield to comparative or superlative formation, e.g. **the righter/rightest hand*. These adjective-noun combinations cannot be classified as idioms on this account.

[6] It is conceivable that such irregular forms, e.g. *on needles and pins, on pins or needles*, may be used intentionally for some stylistic effect, especially in literary works.

above). In a later work, he defines idiomaticity as "a phenomenon which may be described as the use of segmentally complex expressions whose semantic structure is not deducible jointly from their syntactic structure and the semantic structure of their components" (Weinreich, 1972:89). The idea that an idiom has a figurative meaning as opposed to a literal meaning — which is very closely tied to semantic non-compositionality — also seems to be implicit in Weinreich's view of *idiomatic sense* and *literal sense* (1969:32).

Weinreich indicates two additional characteristics[7] for the identification of idioms, viz. (1) the *presence of at least two ambiguous (polysemous) elements*, and (2) a *reciprocal contextual selection of subsenses*.

Weinreich does not accept the unit status of idioms in terms of their treatment in a lexicon (as single lexical units), but rather proposes a separate "idiom list".

2.2.2 Adam Makkai (1972)

Makkai's work *Idiom structure in English* (1972) was one of the most thorough treatments of idioms that existed at the time it was published. Concerning the different senses of *idiom* in the *Oxford English Dictionary*,[8] Makkai (1972:24-25) differentiates between *idioms of encoding* and *idioms of decoding*.

He describes *idioms of encoding* as "phraseological peculiarities"[9] which do not involve misunderstanding, unintelligibility, the ability to mislead, or ambiguity. He points out that in many European languages, for instance, one drives *with* a certain speed (French <u>*avec*</u> *une certaine vitesse*,[10] German <u>*mit*</u> *einer gewissen*

---

[7] That is, additional to the characteristics identified in ch. 1 (section 1.3).

[8] See the discussion in the previous chapter with reference to the *Encarta World English Dictionary*.

[9] He is careful, however, to point out that "certain 'peculiar phrases' are only 'peculiar' insofar as they exist at all and not insofar as it is impossible to deduce their meanings from their components" (Makkai, 1972:24).

[10] Makkai's (1972:24-25) example is somewhat infelicitous, as the French preposition *à* ("at") seems more idiomatic here than *avec* ("with"), i.e. <u>*à*</u> *80 km/h* rather than <u>*avec*</u> *80 km/h* (Atkins *et al.*, 1987:33). The point remains, however, that the idiomatic use of prepositions differs from language to language.

Geschwindigkeit), whereas the English usage is *drive <u>at</u> a certain speed*. *Idioms of encoding* is the term used to refer to the natural way of using a language.[11]

According to Makkai (1972:25), *idioms of decoding* are "genuine, or semantic idioms". These idioms involve potential misunderstanding, unintelligibility, the ability to mislead, and ambiguity.[12] All idioms of decoding are also idioms of encoding, but not necessarily *vice versa*. For instance, the expression *hot potato* ("embarrassing issue")[13] is an idiom of decoding, since it could mislead a hearer to think that the speaker is referring to a food item at a high temperature. It is also an idiom of encoding, insofar as that is what English speakers say when talking about an embarrassing issue and not, for example, *tight shoes*, *burning chestnut*, or *a porcupine in your hands* (Makkai, 1972:25). Makkai's treatment of idioms focuses on idioms of decoding.

Makkai proposes a structural framework based on a stratified view of language in which the term *idiom* is reserved for two phenomena, viz. lexemic and sememic idioms. Each of these represents a specific idiomaticity area in the English language.[14] Entering into the intricacies of stratificational linguistics is beyond the scope of the present study, and I will therefore restrict my attention to the two idiomaticity areas that Makkai singles out.[15]

The first idiomaticity area is on what Makkai calls the *lexemic stratum*. According to him (1972:122), a lexemic idiom is "any polylexonic lexeme[16] which

---

[11] This corresponds to sense 2 in the *Encarta World English Dictionary* as discussed in ch. 1.

[12] These are idioms according to sense 1 in the *Encarta World English Dictionary* as discussed in ch. 1.

[13] This is the definition given by Makkai. The *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* (2004: "hot potato") defines this phrase as "a controversial and awkward issue or situation".

[14] Makkai (1972:117) defines the term *idiomaticity area* as "the structural relationships existing between the elementary units and the realized units of the lexemic and sememic strata".

[15] In this discussion of Makkai's work, I try as much as possible to avoid terminology which is specific to stratificational linguistics, since this discussion aims to highlight what I understand to be central to Makkai's idiom theory rather than explain stratificational linguistics as such.

[16] The term *lexeme* in this case refers to a construction consisting of more than one word, or lexon.

is made up of more than one minimal free form[17] or word (as defined by morphotactic criteria), each lexon of which can occur in other environments as the realization of a monolexonic lexeme". This basically means that a lexemic idiom is a multi-word expression whose constituent elements can occur independently in other contexts. He mentions (1972:122-123) three types of elements which are compulsory in the expressions where they occur, viz. (1) singular and plural morphemes[18] such as *s* in *hammer and tongs*; (2) the conjunction *and* in binomials such as *hammer and tongs*; and (3) articles such as *a* in *to pull a fast one*. These elements are not subject to the requirement that they be able to occur independently in other contexts,[19] nor do they ever realise any meanings other than for instance "plural", "additive conjunction", or "definite article". Apart from these exceptions, according to Makkai's main definition, all the words in a multi-word expression must be able to occur independently in other environments as the realisation of a minimal lexical unit if that particular multi-word expression is to be considered idiomatic. This seems like quite a roundabout way of saying that idioms are multi-word expressions.

Makkai's definition begs the question as to what constitutes the difference between (lexemic) idioms and any other multi-word expression. He points out (1972:122) that the difference between lexemic idioms and other multi-word expressions lies in the fact that lexemic idioms are subject to possible misunderstanding, even though the listener is familiar with the meanings of the components, or to erroneous decoding. It is clear that he regards ambiguity as central to the notion of idiomaticity — or at least of lexical idioms. Multi-word expressions containing one or more elements which do not occur independently in other environments are not ambiguous and are therefore not idioms. Makkai (1972:123) calls this type of expression *pseudo-idioms*, e.g. *to and*

---

[17] Makkai (1972:120-121) defines a *minimal free form* as follows:

> That smallest meaningful form of a spoken or written language which can occur in isolation, thus constituting an utterance by itself, in addition to occurring in conjunction with other minimal free forms. All complex, morphotactically permissible words in a language are FREE FORMS ... but not all such words are MINIMAL FREE FORMS.

[18] The singular morpheme in English is realised as /Ø/, whereas the plural is realised in various ways, including /s/.

[19] However, this exception seems to apply only to the singular/plural morphemes, since conjunctions such as *and*, and definite/indefinite articles can and do occur independently in other contexts.

fro (_fro_ does not occur elsewhere as an independent word and is therefore not ambiguous). According to Makkai (1972:124), expressions whose meaning can be deduced from the meanings of their constituent elements are not idioms but _literal constitutes_, e.g. _spaghetti and meatballs._

Makkai's second idiomaticity area concerns what he calls the _sememic stratum_. He defines (1972:128) _sememic idiom_ as follows: "A polylexemic construction whose aggregate literal meaning derived from its constituent lexemes functions additionally as the realization of an unpredictable sememic network."[20] This basically means that a multi-word expression which has an arbitrary, non-literal meaning in addition to its literal meaning is what Makkai calls a _sememic idiom_. Take for instance the expression _don't count your chickens before they're hatched_. A sememic idiom has two possible interpretations: one that applies when a sentence such as _don't count your chickens before they're hatched_ is meant literally,[21] and one that applies when the sentence is meant figuratively. The link that ties the literal meaning to the figurative is called the _hypersememic link_ (1972:129). Interpreting a sememic idiom therefore includes checking if there is a hypersememic link that leads to a figurative interpretation besides that of the literal meaning.

Makkai mentions a possible third idiomaticity area, viz. that of _cultural_ or _hypersememic idioms_. He defines such idioms as "multi-network idioms" (1972:134) or "simultaneous double sememic network idioms" (1972:179). This basically means that hypersememic idioms can be interpreted along a network of various related meanings, as opposed to the one figurative meaning of sememic idioms as discussed above. These idioms are culture- and education-specific, and familiarity with them does not depend on being a mature native speaker of the language, but rather on culture or education. He provides the following example (1972:134): If a lady says, "It's getting chilly," a polite young man may rush to fetch her coat, whereas a rude, untutored fellow may answer,

---

[20] It seems that what Makkai means by _sememic network_ is the meaning or interpretation of a multi-word expression.

[21] It is hard to imagine a context where a literal interpretation of this expression mentioned by Makkai would be intended, except in cases of wordplay, where the literal meaning would be a humorous extension of the conventionalised figurative meaning. However, there are some idioms which can conceivably be interpreted literally in specific contexts, e.g. _to sail against the wind_, or _to look the other way_.

"Yeah, so what?"[22] Makkai does not, however, develop this category any further, but rather focuses on lexemic and sememic idioms.

After discussing the characteristics of the two idiomaticity areas, Makkai (1972:135-179) describes the most important types of English lexemic and sememic idioms, of which a schematic representation is offered on the following pages:[23]

Lexemic idioms

	Types	Description	Examples
1.	Phrasal verb idioms	v. + prep./adv. (+ prep.)	*put up, get back at*
2.	Tournure idioms	polylexonic lexeme larger than phrasal verb, consisting of at least 3 lexons	*have it in for*
	Subclasses:	a) v. + *it* + adv.	*have it out (with)*
		b) compulsory nonrepresentative *it* last in sequence	*come off it*
		c) with nonrepresentative def. art.	*fly off the handle*
		d) with nonrepresentative indef. art.	*pull a fast one*
		e) v. + irreversible binomial	*rain cats and dogs*
		f) prep. + irreversible binomial	*through thick and thin*

---

22 It can be argued that this example is more one of pragmatics than idiomaticity.

23 This schematic representation, based on Makkai's discussion of the various idiom classes, differs slightly from his own diagram of the idiom structure of English provided at the end of his discussion of the two idiomaticity areas in English (Makkai, 1972:185). In the first idiomaticity area on his diagram, Makkai mentions a class of idiom that he calls *proverbial idioms*, which corresponds to the class of idiom given here as *phrasal verb idioms*. It is not exactly clear to me why he does so, since he uses the term *phrasal verb idioms* in his discussion of this class of idiom (1972:135-148). This is possibly a typographical error on his diagram. He also lists only five classes of idiom in the second idiomaticity area on his diagram, whereas my schematic representation has nine. It seems that the last class, which he calls "additional hypothetical classes", includes the additional types of idiom in the second idiomaticity area as expressed in his discussion and reproduced in my schematic representation.

		g)	v. + dir. obj. + optional modifiers (no *it*, *a*, *the*)	*cash in one's chips*
		h)	v. + modifier (no dir. obj.)	*dance on air*
		i)	forms headed by *be* (may be conjugated)	*be up a creek*
3.	Irreversible binomial idioms		parts A and B joined by a finite set of links	*salt and pepper*
	Subclasses:	i.	morphotactically irreversible binomials	*ups and downs (*downs and ups)*
		ii.	morphotactically reversible binomials	*cloak-and-dagger* (idiom) vs. *dagger and cloak* (separate items)
		iii.	tournure doublets	*rain cats and dogs* vs. **rain dogs and cats*
		iv.	multinominals	*Tom, Dick and Harry*
4.	Phrasal compound idioms			*bookworm*
5.	Incorporating verb idioms		complex lexemes whose 1st lexon is a n. or adj. in other environments; literal encoding reveals a related structure: v. + dir. obj. / PP	*eavesdrop*
	Patterns:	a)	n.-v.	*baby-sit*
		b)	adj.-n.	*blackmail*
		c)	n.-n.	*mastermind*
		d)	adj.-v.	*blacklist*
6.	Pseudo-idioms		lexemic idioms containing a cranberry morph	*kith and kin*

Sememic idioms

	Types	Description	Examples
1.	"First base" idioms	based on nation-wide cultural institution such as American baseball	*have two strikes against one*
2.	Idioms of institutionalized politeness	lexically expressed traditional forms of politeness	*may I ... X?*
3.	Idioms of institutionalized detachment / indirectness	lexically expressed traditional forms indicating detachment / indirectness	*it seems that X ...*
4.	Idioms of proposals ended as questions	lexically expressed traditional forms indicating an offer / proposal encoded in question form	*How about a drink?*
5.	Idioms of institutionalized greeting	lexemically unalterable forms of greeting	*How do you do?*
6.	Proverbial idioms with a moral	well recognized proverbs with a "moral"; traditionally expressed in a standard format with minimal changes	*Too many cooks spoil the broth*
7.	Familiar quotations as idioms		*Brevity is the soul of wit*
8.	Idiomaticity in institutionalized understatement	form that lessens the impact of a blunt statement	*it wasn't exactly my cup of tea*
9.	Idiomaticity in institutionalized hyperbole	traditionally fixed forms describing a situation in obviously false (exaggerated) terms	*he won't even lift a finger*

Makkai seems to basically agree with the characteristics attributed to idioms in the dictionaries consulted in Chapter 1. He acknowledges that there are scholars (e.g. Charles Hockett) who recognise monomorphemic words as idioms, but he concludes (1972:38) that it is "far more meaningful [...] to use the term *idiom* only for units realized by at least two morphemes", thereby agreeing

with the *multi-word character* of idioms.[24] Concerning *restricted variability*, Makkai seems to agree with Bruce Fraser's hierarchies of syntactic frozenness,[25] albeit with some qualifications. This means that Makkai recognises a degree of restriction with regard to the variability of a large number of English idioms, if not all. His insistence on ambiguity in the case of lexemic idioms, and arbitrary, non-literal meaning in the case of sememic idioms, seems to indicate *semantic non-compositionality* of idiomatic meaning. As for *unitary function*, he states that both lexemic and sememic idioms are realised units or *–emes* in their respective strata of language.

In addition to these characteristics, Makkai holds that idioms are *conventionalised expressions*. In his discussion of institutionality (i.e. conventionalisation), he also mentions "the tacit agreement of all speakers that they will not decode these sequences [i.e. idioms] literally but treat them as unitary lexemes" (1972:160).

Makkai's description of idioms does not support picturesqueness as a characteristic of idioms. Although some lexemic idioms (e.g. *be up a creek*) and also some sememic idioms (e.g. *too many cooks spoil the broth*) may be described as "colourful", there is nothing particularly picturesque about others, such as the idiom of institutionalised politeness *may I … X?*

2.2.3 Jürg Strässler (1982)

In his book entitled *Idioms in English: A pragmatic analysis*, Strässler establishes and analyses idioms as a functional element of language. He uses the following working definition of *idiom*:

> An *idiom* is a concatenation of more than one lexeme whose meaning is not de-rived from the meanings of its constituents and which does not consist of a verb plus an adverbial particle or preposition. The concatenation as such then consti-tutes a lexeme in its own right and should be entered as such in the lexicon.
>
> (Strässler, 1982:79)

This definition excludes Makkai's *phrasal verb idioms* (see section 2.2.2), e.g. *put up*. Strässler (1982:79) points out, however, that this is for practical reasons,

---

[24]   The notion of *multi-word* as referring to compound words will be discussed in more detail in ch. 3, where I formulate a working definition for *idiom*.

[25]   See Fraser (1970, quoted in Makkai, 1972:152).

in order to restrict the term *idiom* to a more specific feature of language. He mentions some other types of construction which are also excluded from his definition of *idiom*. Whereas monolexemic metaphors (e.g. parts of the human body such as *leg*, *tongue*, and *face* used in combination with other nouns such as *chair*, *shoe*, and *clock*) are not relevant to Strässler's study in view of the definition of *idiom* as a "concatenation of more than one lexeme" (i.e. a multi-word expression), what he calls *predicative* and *sentential metaphors* (1982:79-80) are. He then points out that a predicative metaphor such as *rid your soul of weeds* is not an idiom by his definition, since *weeds* is the only element with a figurative meaning[26] in the metaphor (and it still shows features of its literal meaning). He regards the sentential metaphor *John has lost his marbles*, however, as an idiom according to the same definition. Strässler (1982:80) also excludes from his definition of *idiom* similes (even when the comparison is figurative) and collocations containing only one element with a figurative meaning (e.g. *get a kick out of*, where *kick* means "thrill").

In his survey of research that has been done on the distribution of idioms, Strässler (1982:83) comes to the conclusion that "idioms really do not occur as often as people tend to believe". He reasons (1982:84) that, if idioms are just a category of lexemes,[27] there is no reason why idioms should occur more often than any other category of lexemes.[28] He suggests (1982:85) that all idioms have an idiomatic as well as a literal interpretation (e.g. *kick the bucket* can be interpreted idiomatically as "die" and literally as "hit the pail with one's foot"),[29] and that this is the reason for the fact that isolated idioms — i.e. idioms with no context — are highly ambiguous. In this sense, all idioms hypothetically have a literal interpretation in addition to their idiomatic interpretation. In actual language use, however, a number of idioms will probably never, or only

---

[26] Strässler (1982:80) calls an element with a figurative meaning a "deviant element".

[27] This view is based on conclusions by certain psycholinguists, viz. that idioms are stored and processed like single lexical items (see McDonnell, 1982; Gries, 2008).

[28] It needs to be borne in mind, however, that one's definition of *idiom* will determine the relative frequency of idioms.

[29] Strässler (1982:85) distinguishes between *literal interpretation* and *literal counterpart*. The literal interpretation of an idiom is based on the meanings of the constituent parts of the idiom (e.g. *kick the bucket* is literally interpreted as "strike the pail with one's foot"), whereas the literal counterpart is a "non-idiomatic synonym on the semantic level" which is "a concatenation of lexemes the meaning of which is the sum of the meanings of its parts" (e.g. *kick the bucket* has the literal counterpart "die").

in exceptional cases, be interpreted literally by mature mother-tongue speakers (e.g. *don't count your chickens before they're hatched*).

Strässler also provides a fascinating discussion of the functional aspect of idioms in conversation. He considers the pragmatic impact of an idiom such as *to kick the bucket* over against the use of its literal counterpart *to die*. The limited corpus of Biblical Hebrew, however, poses a serious obstacle to any extensive research on the functional aspect of Biblical Hebrew idioms.[30] For this reason, I will not discuss here the functional aspect of idioms as represented in Strässler's research.[31]

Although Strässler's main focus is on the functional aspect of idioms, his analysis contains some points of interest for the present discussion. His view of idioms — like Makkai's — seems to basically support all the characteristics of idioms put forward in Chapter 1. *Multi-word character* ("a concatenation of more than one lexeme") and *non-compositionality of meaning* ("a concatenation...whose meaning is not derived from the meanings of its constituents") are both explicitly mentioned in his working definition of *idiom* (1982:79). *Figurative meaning* is clearly implied in his view of idiomatic meaning as opposed to literal meaning (1982:85). His definition also agrees with the *unitary function* of idioms: "The concatenation as such then constitutes a lexeme in its own right and should be entered as such in the lexicon." As for *restricted variability*, he recognises this feature of idioms when he mentions (1982:18) that "it could very well be the case that the grade of idiomaticity imposes restrictions on certain syntactic transformations". He also recognises (1982:26) *frozenness* to be an important concept in the various studies of idiomaticity.

Strässler proposes an additional characteristic for idiom recognition, viz. the *presence of at least two elements with a figurative meaning*, which seems almost identical to Weinreich's (1969:42) claim that an idiom "involves at least two polysemous constituents". This denies the idiomaticity of expressions with only

---

[30] Notwithstanding this drawback, one must grant that the Hebrew Bible contains some expressions (e.g. אם־נא מצאתי חן בעיניך "if I have found favour in your eyes") whose function may be deduced from the co-text (see Babut, 1999:149 ff.). More research in this area could yield interesting results, not only regarding Biblical Hebrew, but also idiom theory in general (i.e. across language borders).

[31] This does not mean that the functional aspect, or pragmatic impact, of idioms will not at all be considered in my research. Although this is not the focus of my study, pragmatics will be referred to as necessary.

one element that has to be interpreted figuratively. Strässler (1982:79) also defines *idiom* as "a concatenation … which does not consist of a verb plus an adverbial particle or preposition". This exclusion, however, is introduced for practical reasons particular to his research and should not necessarily influence the definition of *idiom* put forward in this study.

It seems that Strässler denies picturesqueness as a characteristic of idioms when he states (1982:115) that, unlike figures of speech, idioms have given up vividness in favour of increased compactness. However, his claim to "the presence of at least two elements with a figurative meaning" seems to imply picturesqueness to some degree.

2.2.4 Cheryl J. McDonnell (1982)

McDonnell's research on idioms was done from a psycholinguistic perspective. Her major aim as stated in her dissertation entitled *Access of meaning for idiomatic expressions* is to discern whether both a literal and idiomatic meaning are activated when an idiomatic phrase is read (McDonnell, 1982:35). Although the focus of my study is not on psycholinguistics, some valuable insights can be gained from research in this field, especially the psychological processing of idioms over against syntactically similar, non-idiomatic phrases.[32]

McDonnell (1982:2) recognises that the definition of *idiom* is a central issue in linguistic literature.[33] She describes what she calls a "general understanding of what constitutes an idiom", which I here take as her working definition of *idiom*, viz. "a group of words whose overall meaning is something other than what a general syntactic analysis would imply".

She points out (1982:3) that distinguishing between simple polysemy and idiomaticity is a general problem in linguistics. She then discusses (1982:4-6) Weinreich's explanation of the relationship between idiomaticity and polysemy (see section 2.2.1 above), concurring with him that the border between

---

[32] A considerable number of psycholinguistic studies have dealt with idiom processing, and McDonnell's research is presented here as representative of the school which regards idioms as single lexical units.

[33] More than thirty years later, this still seems to hold true, although scholars in the field of phraseology have made valuable contributions towards greater uniformity in terminology (see the discussion of Granger & Paquot, 2008, in section 2.2.15 below).

polysemy and idiomaticity cannot be indicated as a fixed line, but should rather be viewed as a continuum.

McDonnell discusses psycholinguistic research that has been conducted on the processing of meaning. Research by other psycholinguists (e.g. Bobrow & Bell; Swinney & Cutler) suggests that an idiom is perceived as a unit (McDonnell, 1982:12-13) albeit only under conditions that bias the idiomatic meaning.[34] As regards other figurative speech forms, studies such as Ortony *et al.* on the comprehension of metaphors and idioms with and without context suggest that a literal interpretation is attempted first when there is insufficient context, but that idioms used in their idiomatic sense take no longer to process than when used in their literal sense (McDonnell, 1982:14). McDonnell points out (1982:15) that idioms are stored as single lexical units and that the idiomatic sense is therefore accessed even faster than the literal sense.

In terms of our current discussion, the main points of interest from McDonnell's study pertain to semantic non-compositionality and the unitary function of idioms. Her working definition of *idiom* — viz. "a group of words whose overall meaning is something other than what a general syntactic analysis would imply" — supports both the *multi-word character* of idioms and *non-compositionality of idiomatic meaning*. As has been indicated, various psycholinguistic studies seem to support the view that an idiom is stored as a *lexical unit* and is retrieved and used as such.[35] McDonnell's differentiation between idiomatic and literal meaning also corroborates the idea that an idiom has an *idiomatic* (i.e. figurative) *meaning* as opposed to a literal meaning.

The only one of the preliminary characteristics of idioms, as presented in Chapter 1, which McDonnell does not address pertinently is that of restricted variability. She also does not propose any additional characteristics for idiom identification.

---

[34] Although McDonnell does not explain what she means by "conditions which bias the idiomatic meaning", it seems that she is referring to linguistic environments (co-text) which favour the figurative interpretation (i.e. idiomatic meaning) of an expression rather than a literal interpretation.

[35] See also Gries (2008:8), who views "completely lexically filled and frozen expressions" such as *of course* or *at least* as "synchronically single lexemes". He also maintains (2008:13) that "unit status correlates positively with a speaker/hearer not analyzing the internal structure of a unit". However, Langlotz (2006) quotes a number of psycholinguistic studies that seem to convincingly disprove the conclusions drawn in studies like that of McDonnell's and the scholars' cited by her (see section 2.2.13 below).

2.2.5 Mary M. Wood (1986)

Wood's dissertation entitled *A definition of idiom* is an attempt to provide a scientifically acceptable definition of *idiom*. She states (Wood, 1986:1) that the miscellaneousness of work on idioms is the consequence of a wild diversity of linguistic models as well as the degrees of sensitivity, thoughtfulness, and thoroughness applied in investigating them.

Wood (1986:2) defines *idiom* as "a complex expression which is wholly non-compositional in meaning and wholly non-productive in form". She points out that semantic compositionality is a continuum varying between the utterly opaque and the fully predictable, with idioms at the very end of the continuum (zero compositionality). Variability ("productivity of form") is likewise a continuum which ranges from expressions which permit no variation to those with freely variable constituents. Here, too, idioms are restricted to the zero point. She explains (1986:6) what she means by the terms *compositionality* and *productivity of form*: When the sum of the independent meanings of the constituent elements of an expression equals the meaning of the whole, such an expression shows absolute compositionality of meaning. This phenomenon in its absolute form is probably only found in non-natural languages which have no semantic irregularities. Productivity of form refers to the ability to form new combinations freely. Wood is careful to point out that this refers to lexical productivity, not syntactic productivity — which she describes as a "conspicuous and interesting feature of phrasal idioms". The opposite of lexical productivity is lexical frozenness, which Wood suggests as a defining characteristic of idioms.

Regarding the relationship between idiomaticity and metaphor, Wood (1986:7) points out that both Weinreich (see section 2.2.1) and Makkai (see section 2.2.2) have linked idiomaticity and metaphor on the grounds of ambiguity. According to her, they claim that idioms are ambiguous and that metaphor is the most common source of ambiguity.[36] What is of significance here is that she rejects ambiguity as a defining characteristic of idioms, and for this reason she holds (Wood, 1986:7) that "this link with metaphor must fall". According to her view,

---

[36] It is clear that both Weinreich and Makkai regard ambiguity as essential to idiomaticity, but I have not been able to locate any claim by either that metaphor is its most common source. Wood may, of course, be referring to sources to which I have not had access.

32

opacity[37] rather than ambiguity is a defining characteristic of idioms. She grants (1986:57-58) that ambiguity can contribute to opacity, but considers it to be too strong a requirement *per se*. Conversely, ambiguity has a weaker scope insofar as it can derive from any one element of an expression, e.g. <u>hit</u> *the books, have a* <u>hand</u> *in*, whereas opacity requires the non-contribution of every element to the meaning of the whole, e.g. *by and large, hell for leather* (1986:56).

Wood then proceeds to discuss idioms in terms of two main aspects, viz. meaning and form. In her discussion of meaning, she starts off with the issue of semantic compositionality. She states (1986:30) that the notion of "compositionality is almost universally made central to the definition of idiom", but that scholars in the generative movement — of which Weinreich is an exponent — do not agree with this at all.[38] She indicates (1986:31) that phrases and compound words[39] can be arranged along a continuum of degrees of compositionality, ranging from the fully opaque to the fully predictable. As mentioned earlier, she holds that only fully opaque expressions should be called idioms. Since the investigation of idioms implies a differentiated continuum — i.e. the phenomena in the continuum are not homogeneous, but rather show a progression, a gradient change in the rate or degree of the common feature in question (1986:4-5) — distinguishing between fully opaque expressions and those right next to it on the way to less opaque is no simple matter. Wood (1986:47) indicates that to her this is the crucial question: Where do we draw the line between idioms and non-idioms (i.e. between expressions that are fully opaque and those that are even ever so slightly less opaque)?[40] As

---

[37]   Although Wood does not offer a definition of *opacity*, she seems to regard it as the opposite of predictable: "A careful look at some of the expressions commonly called 'idioms' leads us to postulate a gradient or continuum of semantic compositionality, shading by degrees from the utterly opaque to the fully predictable" (Wood, 1986:2). By proposing that idioms are opaque, she apparently holds that the meaning of an idiom cannot be predicted simply by combining the meanings of its constituent elements.

[38]   However, see the discussion of Weinreich (1969) in section 2.2.1.

[39]   Wood (1986:93) holds that certain compound words can be idioms, e.g. *eyewash* ("nonsense").

[40]   A legitimate objection to Wood's attempt at drawing such a line may be raised in view of what cognitive linguists (e.g. Lakoff, 1987; Taylor, 1995) have demonstrated, viz. that we are dealing with fuzzy conceptual boundaries in idiomatic as well as literal language. This fuzziness has to be borne in mind in an attempt to define the category *idiom*. In this study, I take a less restrictive view than Wood, whilst aiming at identifying clear, scientifically justifiable, parameters for identifying idioms in the Hebrew Bible.

I have indicated, it is commonly held that the combined meaning of the whole should be unpredictable in order for an expression to qualify as an idiom. Wood, however, subscribes to the view that no constituent element of an idiom should have its literal meaning. She indicates that "many or most of the expressions commonly called 'idioms' fall into groups with a common and thus predictable element […] and/or include a literal constituent" (1986:50), and are therefore not idioms according to her view.

In defence of her claim that expressions with "a common and thus predictable element" are not idioms, Wood turns to a discussion of collocations and explains why they are not to be considered idioms. She defines *collocation* as "a composite of lexical items with a specialized, but not strictly unpredictable meaning", e.g. *heavy drinking* (1986:50). She points out (1986:52) that collocations are at least roughly predictable because of the relation between the meanings of words in isolation and the meanings they contribute to collocations, whereas idioms are totally unpredictable. Another characteristic that disqualifies collocations from Wood's definition of idiomaticity is the fact that some collocations allow the substitution of synonyms, e.g. *to pay heed/attention*, whereas she holds that this is impossible for idioms. She suggests (1986:62) that all idioms should be listed as units in a lexicon, but that collocations should not. According to this view, Makkai's *idioms of decoding* are true idioms, but his *idioms of encoding* are collocations (1986:54).[41]

Concerning the status of expressions containing unique elements,[42] Wood (1986:64) holds that when the unique element is opaque, the expression is non-compositional and therefore an idiom, e.g. *by <u>dint</u> of, to <u>eke</u> out*. According to her, an expression containing a unique, but nevertheless intelligible, element is not necessarily an idiom, e.g. *to and <u>fro</u>, hither and <u>yon</u>*. She recognises that this distinction is subject to considerable idiolect variation and she states that "someone familiar with the history of the language will be able to make sense of far more fossils than will the average unsophisticated speaker".

The second main aspect of idiomaticity that Wood discusses is that of form, addressing the issue of variability. She describes (1986:82) this phenomenon as the possibility of variation in one element of a unit. As mentioned earlier,

---

[41]   See section 2.2.2 above.

[42]   An element is said to be unique when its form and/or meaning only occur in one particular expression, and nowhere else in the language. These words are also called *cranberry morphs* (see Spencer, 2002:227).

Wood regards lexical — not syntactic — invariability as a defining characteristic of idioms. She points out (1986:69) that syntactic opacity — i.e. where no coherent syntagmatic pattern can be found, e.g. *hell for leather* ("in a mad hurry") — is related to semantic opacity, but that it is not simply an automatic correlate. A hypothetical language could, for instance, insist on syntactic regularity at all times while allowing idiomatic variation at the lexical/semantic level. Syntactic opacity in English is also far less common than semantic opacity and she regards it as a corollary of her definition of *idiom*. As is the case with compositionality of meaning, the degrees of variability are continuous. Here, too, Wood (1986:81) recognises only forms which tolerate no variation whatsoever as idioms, and the question once more arises: Where do we draw the line between idioms and non-idioms? She points out (1986:82-83) the parallel between adult speech production and child language acquisition. Research[43] has shown that children often learn collocations/idioms first and that new forms are mastered as collocations/idioms, e.g. *throw-ball*, *throw-sand*. Only subsequently do they learn the constituent elements by analogy and thus the grammar is extended to generate that form, e.g. from *throw-ball*, *throw-sand* the child later works out the meaning of *throw* and then generates *throw-food*. This type of creative analogy leads to the loss of idioms rather than creating them. Wood (1986:83) states that every idiom is potentially variable, losing its idiom status as soon as someone models on it a new form (or, presumably, paradigm, as in the cited example).[44]

Another issue pertaining to the form of idioms is that of multi-word character. Simply looking at the number of words written on a page cannot be a defining characteristic of idioms. This becomes clear when considering those expressions which are realised as multi-word phrases in English, but appear as a single word in other languages like Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, or Hungarian. The verb + particle class is an example of this type of expression. In English, for instance, we have phrases such as *take on*, *hand over*, and *put across*, whereas Ancient Greek has similar expressions that are realised as single words, e.g. ἐπικάθημαι (lit. "sit on") "to besiege", or προδίδωμι (lit. "give before") "to betray" (see 1986:92). Wood holds that the "relatively trivial language-specific surface ordering patterns" must not be the determining factor as is often the case in the

---

43 Wood (1986:83) cites research by Bolinger and Bever, Carroll, and Hurtig.

44 One may assume that this does not apply in the (hypothetical) case of a new idiom being based on the form of another, but that Wood is strictly referring to non-idiomatic forms developing from an idiom.

"no single words" account of idioms. Orthography — being a matter of convention — is a "notoriously unreliable criterion" (1986:88) for differentiating between compound words (e.g. *topsoil*, *hilltop*) and phrasal collocations (e.g. *top sheet*, *mountain top*). Then there are also the hyphenated items (e.g. *top-heavy*, *fighting-top*) that resist easy classification. Wood (1986:93) proposes that compound words can be idioms for the same reasons, in the same ways, and with the same characteristics as their longer, multi-word counterparts. Therefore, if a compound word is wholly non-compositional in meaning and tolerates no variation, e.g. *eyewash* "nonsense" or *slap-up* "high-class", it is an idiom.

Wood (1986:95) summarises her decisions on various questions and the characteristics which she proposes for English idioms in seven points:

1) True idioms are wholly non-compositional, or opaque, in meaning.

2) Ambiguity is a common but not a necessary feature of idiomaticity.

3) The meaning of an idiom should not be distributed over the entries of its constituents in a lexicon.

4) Forms with a unique constituent need not be idioms, but those containing a cranberry form are.

5) True idioms can be opaque in structure.

6) True idioms are wholly non-productive in form.

7) Single compound words can be idioms.

If one compares Wood's idiom characteristics with the ones proposed earlier, it would seem that she subscribes to *restricted variability* (in the sense of lexical frozenness; see point 6 above), *non-compositionality of meaning* (point 1), and *unitary function* (point 3). *Figurative meaning* is implied under point 1 (non-compositionality/opacity of meaning), insofar as a literal interpretation of an idiom does not render its figurative, or idiomatic, sense.[45] She clearly disagrees with multi-word character as a defining characteristic of idioms (point 7). However, depending on how one defines *word*, compound words such as the examples she provides may also be considered as having a multi-word

---

[45] *Figurative meaning* is used here as a synonym for *idiomatic meaning*.

character. Ambiguity (point 2) and opacity in structure (point 5) are optional and should therefore not be considered as defining characteristics of idioms.

Wood proposes an additional characteristic of idioms, viz. *the presence of a cranberry form* (point 4). This, however, is not a necessary condition for idiomaticity, as it is only one of the possible causes of opacity in meaning.[46]

2.2.6 George Lakoff (1987)

Lakoff devotes some attention to idioms from a cognitive perspective in his book on categorisation entitled *Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. He points out (Lakoff, 1987:448) the classical theory of idiomatic meaning, viz. that "idioms have arbitrary meanings: any series of words could have any meaning at all". In keeping with the theory of cognitive models, he holds that in a large number of cases idiomatic meaning is in fact not arbitrary but motivated.

Lakoff (1987) explains the motivation of idiomatic meaning in terms of an independently existing link: "The relationship between A and B is *motivated* just in case there is an independently existing link, L, such that A-L-B 'fit together.' L *makes sense* of the relationship between A and B." This link consists of *image + knowledge + metaphors* (1987:449). He discusses as an example the idiom *spill the beans*. Most speakers have an unconscious image associated with this idiom: The container where the beans are kept is roughly the size of a human head; the beans are supposed to be kept in the container; spilling the beans is, or appears to be, accidental; the beans spill all over the place, i.e. not into a neat pile; the spilled beans are not easy to retrieve; and the spill is always messy. The knowledge that a native speaker has about this image is that when someone spills the beans, the information goes all over the place (the beans cannot be retrieved), with messy results. The metaphor that applies to this image is the CONDUIT METAPHOR: The beans correspond to information; the container to the head; and spilling to letting the information out, whether accidentally or apparently so. These motivating links for idioms — viz. *conventional image + knowledge + metaphors* — are traditionally referred to as *folk etymologies* (1987:451). Lakoff (1987:452) holds that these folk etymologies

---

[46] The presence of a cranberry form is, however, a sufficient condition for idiomaticity, since an expression containing a cranberry form will invariably show semantic non-compositionality, or opacity, as well as invariance, and will be considered an idiom on that account. For more on necessary and sufficient conditions, see section 2.2.12.

are the way ordinary speakers try to make sense of (especially novel) idioms, since people function more efficiently with additional information that helps them make sense of otherwise random information. He also states:

> Any adequate psychological account of the learning of, and memory for, the human lexicon will have to take account of the phenomenon of folk etymology — that is, it will have to include an account of why expressions with motivating links are easier to learn and remember than random pairings.

(Lakoff, 1987:452)

Lakoff (1987:450-451) is careful to point out that claiming motivation for the relation between the meaning and the form of idioms does not imply that the meaning or form of idioms is predictable. We cannot, for instance, predict why there are beans in *to spill the beans*, but the image + knowledge about the image + the CONDUIT METAPHOR constitute a sensible link between our knowledge about beans that are spilled and the meaning of *to spill the beans*. In this sense, the meaning of *to spill the beans* is motivated, albeit unpredictable. He also clearly states (1987:451) that he makes no claim to the effect that all speakers make sense of all idioms. He acknowledges the existence of some idioms that are completely arbitrary for all speakers, while holding that "most native speakers seem to make at least partial sense of most idioms, with much of the meaning being motivated and perhaps some being arbitrary" (1987:451).

Concerning the form, or grammar, of idioms, Lakoff makes an interesting observation in that he offers a possible explanation for the syntactic variations tolerated by some idioms. He points out (1987:451) that the elements of an idiom may have metaphorical referents, e.g. *beans*, which refers to information that is supposed to be kept secret in *to spill the beans*. He suggests that "being a noun phrase and having referents in both source and target domains will permit the idiom to be passivized".[47]

In *Women, fire and dangerous things*, Lakoff offers no helpful suggestions regarding the identification of idioms. His theory is nevertheless significant for this discussion, inasmuch as it suggests an explanation for the variations which idioms allow (*restricted variability* as it has been called here). If, as he claims, idiomatic meaning is in fact motivated, the notion of non-compositionality of

---

[47] Langlotz (2006) discusses this phenomenon more fully in his study of idiomatic creativity (see section 2.2.13 below).

38

meaning as implying arbitrariness for idiomatic meaning needs to be reconsidered.[48]

2.2.7 Elke Donalies (1994)

In her article entitled *Idiom, Phraseologismus oder Phrasem? Zum Oberbegriff eines Bereichs der Linguistik*, Donalies deals with the bewildering variety of terms and their definitions circulating in the fields of phraseology and idiom studies.[49]

Before suggesting a suitable term for the phenomenon under consideration, she evaluates the characteristics suggested by definitions of the various terms. The first characteristic concerns multi-word character. She points out (Donalies, 1994:337) that it is necessary to distinguish clearly between this term — i.e. *idiom*[50] — and complete sentences or clauses. At this point she distinguishes between various other subcategories of phraseme (based on size), viz. *sentence lexeme* (German *Satzlexem*), *syntagm* and *fixed syntagm* (German *festes Syntagma*). A problem with multi-word character as a criterion for idiomaticity is the nature of the constituent elements, since most definitions use the vague term *word* and leave it at that.[51]

A second often suggested characteristic is invariance. Donalies agrees with other scholars[52] that this is a misleading notion, since very few phraseological units are *fixed* in the sense of being invariable. She indicates (1994:344) that there are plenty of variations tolerated by idioms on morpho-syntactical level and also in the case of language games, which means that such variations are both possible and acceptable. Calling an expression *invariable* may make sense at the level of intuition and colloquial usage of the term, but such descriptions lack the necessary clarity expected of scientific terminology and definition (1994:338). This agrees with other scholars like Wood's (1986) view that

---

[48]   This will be done in ch. 3.

[49]   Nearly two decades later, this is still an issue: See Granger and Paquot (2008:27), who mention the "vast and confusing terminology associated with [phraseology]".

[50]   Although Donalies (1994:346) suggests a suitable term — viz. *phraseme* — at the end of her article, my main concern here is not with the proper term for the linguistic phenomenon under discussion. For expediency's sake, I will refer to it as *idiom*.

[51]   See also the discussion of Wood in section 2.2.5 above.

[52]   Donalies (1982:337-338) mentions Pilz and Burger, Buhofer, and Sialm in this regard.

variability is best regarded as a continuum. Donalies (1994:339) also points out that little attention has been paid to the diachronic aspect of the increased stability of expressions.[53]

Donalies (1994:339) states that the third characteristic which she discusses, viz. idiomaticity,[54] is probably the most often mentioned criterion for defining what I here call *idiom*. She indicates that this term comes from Anglo-American linguistic research and that it is generally rejected as an appropriate scientific term[55] because of its polysemy. (See the discussion of the various senses of the term *idiom* in the previous chapter.) She points out (1994:340) that the term actually should include all idiomatic single and composite words, e.g. *Engel* ("angel") as "lieber Mensch" ("dear, kind person") and *Schnapsdrossel* ("schnapps throat") as "Trinker" ("drinker").[56] Donalies (1994:344) holds that *idiomaticity* as a characteristic of idioms is problematic, since it excludes too many multi-word phenomena which she would like to include here.[57]

Unitary status (or lexicality) is a fourth characteristic evaluated by Donalies. She explains (1994:341) that this refers to a multi-word construction which

---

[53] She provides no examples of this, but it seems that she is referring here to *ad hoc* expressions becoming increasingly stable until they are conventionalised and therefore become idioms. An example from English would be *to wear one's heart on one's sleeve.* Apparently, William Shakespeare first used this phrase in *Othello*, I, I: "But I will wear my heart upon my sleeve / For daws to peck at" (Gulland & Hinds-Howell, 1986:175). This phrase eventually became a stable, conventionalised (idiomatic) expression meaning "to show one's feelings too obviously".

[54] As mentioned in the previous chapter, I will not distinguish between *idiom* and *idiomaticity* in this study. Since my purpose is to determine what constitutes idiomaticity (i.e. what characterises an idiom), this point of Donalies's is irrelevant to the present discussion. It seems like a tautology to say that *idiomaticity* is a characteristic of *idiom*. However, when one bears in mind that Donalies calls the linguistic object of her research *phraseme*, her argument about idiomaticity is understandable.

[55] The reference here is obviously to researchers working in the non-Anglophone world. Although the term *idiom* has also been, to some extent, the subject of scientific debate in the Anglophone world, it is fairly well established and accepted in the relevant literature as a scientific term.

[56] To my mind, these are better described as figurative uses of the words, especially in the case of "Engel".

[57] That is, of course, following her understanding of the term *idiomaticity*. Depending on how this term is defined, it could also be claimed to be too inclusive, e.g. according to Fernando's (1996) view of *idiom* and *idiomaticity*.

functions as a unit, i.e. as a single lexeme. According to her view, idiomaticity is concerned with the reception or decoding of linguistic expressions, whereas unitary status is concerned with production or encoding. She states that there is general consensus in the linguistic field that reproduction/production is the decisive criterion for classifying certain expressions as phraseological units. Pre-formed units of language are, therefore, classified as idioms according to her view.

The fifth and final characteristic that Donalies discusses is conventionalisation. She explains (1994:342) that conventionalisation in this context does not refer to the statistical frequency of a given expression, but rather to its availability and its presence in the vocabulary arising from repeated use by a language community. She also points out the function of argumentation in this regard: Conventionalised expressions are used for the concise representation of facts without wasting time on developing lengthy arguments.

Donalies (1994:344) concludes that the central defining criteria for idiomaticity are multi-word character and unitary status. She holds that multi-word character is an essential condition for defining *idiom* as a phraseological object of research, whereas unitary status emphasises the processing and memorising of expressions as single units without necessarily implying the invariance of such an expression or assuming, in all cases, a non-compositional meaning that cannot be deduced from the meanings of its constituent elements. She then defines (1994:345) idioms as "units consisting of at least two words, which are perceived and reproduced as a whole" (translation mine — CMvdH).

It has to be realised that, although I have used the term *idiom* all through my discussion of Donalies's article, what she describes may in fact not be idioms in my sense of the word at all. By rejecting restricted variability and non-compositionality of meaning as *a priori* defining characteristics of idioms, she seems to cast her net wider than many scholars' theories would allow. But then again, so do some other scholars who explicitly use the term *idiom*. Makkai's *idioms of encoding*, for instance, seem to fit the criteria suggested by Donalies comfortably. As can be seen from a comparison with other literature on idioms, the phenomenon that she describes is, broadly speaking, what I am concerned with in this discussion. In conclusion, then, Donalies subscribes to the proposed characteristics of *multi-word character* and *unitary function*, whereas she regards restricted variability and non-compositionality of meaning as questionable. According to her view, these latter two may apply to some, but definitely not all, expressions described by her term *phraseme*. In addition, it seems that she considers *conventionalisation* as an important characteristic of idioms.

2.2.8 Geoffry Nunberg, Ivan A. Sag, and Thomas Wasow (1994)

In their article entitled *Idioms*, Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow point out some of the problems involved in defining *idiom.* They state (Nunberg, Sag & Wasow, 1994:492):

> 'Idiom' is applied to a fuzzy category defined on the one hand by ostension of pro-totypical examples like English *kick the bucket* [...] and on the other by implicit opposition to related categories like formulae, fixed phrases, collocations, clichés, sayings, proverbs, and allusions.

They describe (1994:492-493), various dimensions to idiomaticity, including the following:

- *Conventionality:* The meaning of an idiom cannot be entirely predicted based on the conventions that apply to its constituents used in isolation.

- *Inflexibility:* Idioms typically only appear in a limited number of syntactic frames or constructions.

- *Figuration:* Idioms typically involve figuration such as metaphor, metonymy, or hyperbole. Although speakers may not always be able to identify the motive for a figure, they can generally perceive the presence of figuration in that they can assign a "literal meaning" to the idiom.

- *Proverbiality:* Situations described by idioms are typically recurrent and of particular social interest, and involve homey, concrete things and relations.

- *Informality:* Idioms are normally associated with informal or colloquial registers.[58]

- *Affect:* Idioms typically describe situations towards which a certain evaluation or affective stance is conveyed, rather than situations that are regarded neutrally.

Of these, the only necessary property of idioms is conventionality (Nunberg, Sag & Wasow, 1994:493). However, if a fixed expression is missing several of these properties, Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow state that "we become increasingly reluctant to call it an idiom" (1994:494). They cite collocations like *resist temptation* or *right to life* as examples of fixed expressions that involve no figuration, proverbiality, or informality. They further argue that a definition of

---

[58]   This agrees with Strässler's (1982) findings.

idiom needs to consider more than just the semantic properties or syntax of idioms; "the figurational processes that underlie [idioms] and the discursive functions that they generally serve" have to be taken into account in order to fully explain the properties of idioms (1994:494).

According to Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow, "a great many difficulties in the analysis of idioms arise directly from a confusion of key semantic properties associated with the prototypical instances of the class" (1994:498). As can be seen from the above-mentioned dimensions of idiomaticity, they understand some of these terms differently from many other scholars. They define three of the key properties associated with idioms in the following way (1994:498):[59]

- *Conventionality:* "The discrepancy between the idiomatic phrasal meaning and the meaning we would predict for the collocation if we were to consult only the rules that determine the meanings of the constituents in isolation, and the relevant operations of semantic composition".

- *Opacity (transparency):* "The ease with which the motivation for the use[60] [...] can be recovered".

- *Compositionality:* "The degree to which the phrasal meaning, once known, can be analyzed in terms of the contributions of the idiom parts".

The two terms that Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow seem to regard as especially confused in the literature on idioms are *conventionality* and *compositionality*. They explain their view as follows (1994:499):

> So inasmuch as the use of an idiom like *spill the beans* requires learning some facts about the collocation itself, over and above the rules that govern the use of each of its constituents in isolation, it has seemed to follow that the phrase could not be compositional, particularly if one believes as well that the test for compositionality should be a speaker's ability to produce or comprehend the expression solely on the basis of knowledge about its constituents and about the relevant semantic combinatorics. Thus conventionality has seemed to entail noncompositionality, with the result that many linguists use the two terms interchangeably in talking about idioms. In contrast, we have suggested that while phrasal idioms involve special conventions, these do not entail the noncompositionality of such expres-

---

[59] These definitions seem to reflect the way these idiom properties are generally understood, rather than the way Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow view them.

[60] Presumably, this refers to the use of a particular idiom.

sions; the conventions can be attached to the use of the idiom constituents, rather than to the collocation as a whole.

In the light of these arguments, Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow distinguish between *idiomatic phrases* and *idiomatically combining expressions* (or *idiomatic combinations* for short). They reserve the latter term for "idioms whose parts carry identifiable parts of their idiomatic meanings" (1994:496). They mention *pull strings* ("exploit personal connections") as an example of an *idiomatic combination*, where *pull* can mean "exploit" with *strings* as object, and *strings* can refer to "personal connections" when used as the object of *pull*. Another example of this kind of phrase is *spill the beans* ("divulge the information"). *Idiomatic phrases*, on the other hand, are understood by Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow to be "expressions [...] whose idiomatic interpretations cannot be distributed over their parts, and which must therefore be entered in the lexicon as complete phrases" (1994:497). As examples of this kind of phrase, they mention *saw logs*, *kick the bucket*, and *shoot the breeze*. Although both idiomatic phrases and idiomatic combinations are conventionalised (in the above-mentioned sense, i.e. having an unpredictable global meaning), Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow consider only idiomatic combinations as compositional, i.e. analysable.

This distinction is central to their views on the correlation between semantic analysability and syntactic processes of idioms, viz. that only idiomatically combining expressions permit syntactic transformations.

In support of their view that idiomatically combining expressions are not necessarily semantically non-compositional, they argue that parts of these idioms can be modified (e.g. *leave no <u>legal</u> stone unturned* — emphasis mine, CMvdH), quantified (e.g. *touch a <u>couple of</u> nerves* — emphasis mine, CMvdH), emphasised through topicalisation (e.g. *<u>that hard a bargain</u>, only a fool would drive* — emphasis mine, CMvdH), omitted in elliptical constructions (*my goose is cooked, but yours isn't*), or serve as antecedents for pronouns (anaphora) (e.g. *we thought that tabs were being kept on us, but <u>they</u> weren't* — emphasis mine, CMvdH) (1994:500-503). They also mention "families of idioms" (1994:504) that can arise due to the compositionality of idioms, e.g. the same verb in different environments such as *hit the hay/sack*; *drop a bomb/bombshell/brick*; *laugh on the other side of one's face/on the wrong side of one's mouth/out of the other corner of one's mouth*, or the same noun phrase occurring with different verbs such as *keep/lose/blow one's cool*; *stop/turn on a dime*; *clap/set/lay eyes on*. They argue that this is possible, since the semantic relationship between different elements in their literal interpretations may be preserved by some of the mappings to idiomatic interpretations. To Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow,

44

idioms are "situational metaphors" (1994:505). In the case of words appearing only in idioms, e.g. *heed* or *dint*,[61] they claim that such words still carry parts of the meanings of idioms, although "their highly restricted distributions indicate that their meanings are so highly specialized as to be compatible with only one or two predicates" (1994:506).

Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow point out the theoretical inadequacy of existing discussions of the so-called "transformational deficiencies" of idioms. Their theory suggests "that there is a principled basis for certain syntactic properties of phrasal idioms". The reason for this is that idiomatically combining expressions "consist of a fundamentally semantic (typically figurative) dependency among distinct lexemes, however restricted in distribution these lexemes might be" (1994:507). Thus, they predict "a strong correlation between semantic analyzability and 'transformational productivity'" (1994:508). They acknowledge, however, that the distinction between idiomatic phrases and idiomatic combinations (with only the latter subject to transformational processes) cannot fully account for "the puzzling variable distribution of idiomatic interpretation" (1994:509).

After a detailed discussion of the syntax of idioms, which is not relevant to our current purpose, Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow observe that the NPs in phrasal idioms mostly have inanimate, as opposed to animate (specifically human), references (1994:528). This, they claim, is due to both the figurative character and proverbiality of idioms. They refer to the generally accepted tendency of meaning transfer, viz. "(i) that abstract situations are described in terms of concrete ones; and (ii) that animates are mapped onto animates" (1994:531). Thus, since idiomatic meaning is mostly abstract and animates are of necessity concrete, it is to be expected that idioms would contain relatively few animate NPs. Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow are careful to point out (1994:531), however, that "the tendency of metaphorical mappings to go from concrete to abstract doesn't fully explain the extreme rarity of concrete (and hence, animate) idiomatic meanings in phrasal idioms". They observe that verb + argument phrases where each constituent refers figurally to a concrete entity (and particularly in the case of an animate NP) are seldom conventionalised, i.e. considered idioms, although they "have no good reasons to offer as to why such constituents should be more readily detachable when their references are concrete things" (1994:532).

---

[61] Also known as *cranberry morphs* or *cranberry forms* (see Wood, 1986).

Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow acknowledge that the difference between their view and that of other scholars, such as Wood (1981),[62] "is perhaps merely terminological" (Nunberg, Sag & Wasow, 1994:499). It seems that they use the term *compositionality* for what many others call *analysability*. They also understand *conventionality* to mean *(non-)compositionality*. Bearing in mind these terminological issues, Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow seem to agree with many other scholars that *semantic non-compositionality* (what they call *conventionality*) is an essential condition for idiomaticity. They also mention other properties common to idioms, viz. *inflexibility* (or *restricted variability*), *figuration, proverbiality, informality*, and *affect.* Although these are not essential for idiomaticity, at least some of them have to be present in order for an expression to be considered idiomatic.[63] The *multi-word character* of idioms is not explicitly mentioned by Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow, but it is clearly implicit throughout their argumentation, especially in their view about the non-compositionality of idiomatic meaning.

2.2.9 Chitra Fernando (1996)

Fernando's book *Idioms and idiomaticity* is a discussion of idioms from a functional perspective. Fernando (1996:38) describes idioms as "conventionalized multiword expressions often, but not always, non-literal". Elsewhere she states (1996:30) that "idioms are indivisible units whose components cannot be varied or varied only within definable limits". She indicates (1996:3) the three most frequently mentioned features of idioms as compositeness, institutionalisation, and semantic opacity. Regarding compositeness, she explains that idioms are commonly accepted as a type of multi-word expression, e.g. *red herring.* She points out that some scholars accept single words as idioms, but states that it is a minority view (see 1996:40). The second feature that she mentions is institutionalisation. She describes idioms as conventionalised expressions that started off as novel, *ad hoc* expressions. As for semantic opacity, she points out that the meaning of an idiom is not the sum of its constituents, i.e. idioms are often non-literal. "Semantic opacity" is here to be understood as referring to the meaning that is construed by combining the meanings of an idiom's constituent elements. Idioms can be said to be semantically opaque insofar as the sum of their

---

[62]   Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow's reference is to Wood's *A definition of idiom*, of which the 1986 edition is referred to in the present study.

[63]   This corroborates the notion that idiomaticity is best considered on a continuum.

individual elements' meanings does not make sense, or at least is ambiguous. However, if a language user is familiar with an idiom, it is not "semantically opaque" to him or her, since the idiom is interpreted as a unit.

Fernando (1996:30) distinguishes between *idiom* (in the sense "ready-made expression") and *idiomaticity* (in the sense "acceptable language usage"). She states that both idioms and idiomaticity are based on the habitual, predictable co-occurrence of specific words. However, idioms, as "indivisible units whose components cannot be varied or varied only within definable limits", have a narrower range than idiomaticity. All idioms show idiomaticity, but not all word combinations showing idiomaticity — e.g. *to catch a bus* — are idioms, since the latter are relatively unrestricted as far as adjectival and nominal variants are concerned, e.g. *to catch a bus/plane/ferry/tram*. Fernando (1996:43) points out that the constraints regarding the replacing of words in an idiom with others, even synonyms, is a significant distinguishing feature between idioms and non-idioms. Besides the restricted variability of idioms, she holds that conventionalisation also serves to differentiate between expressions showing idiomaticity and idioms proper (see 1996:31). She proposes a scale of idiomaticity that indicates the relation as well as the difference between idioms and habitual collocations, based on the degree of variability. On this scale, the semantics of idioms and collocations is not crucial, and it contains both literal and non-literal expressions in both categories. Fernando's scale of idiomaticity for English (1996:32) is given here to facilitate this discussion of her theory of idioms and idiomaticity.

Multi-word expressions

Idioms		**Habitual collocations**

I.   Pure idioms

invariant, non-literal

a.   devil-may-care, backlash, chin wag, red herring, make off with, spick and span, smell a rat, the coast is clear, etc.

Restricted variance, non-literal

b.   pitter-patter/pit-a-pat, take/have forty winks, seize/grasp the nettle, get/have cold feet, etc.

II.   Semi-literal idioms

invariant

a.   drop names, catch fire, kith and kin, foot the bill, fat chance you've got, etc.

Restricted variance

b.   chequered career/history, blue film/story/joke/gag/comedian, good morning/day, etc.

↔   **I.   Restricted variance, semi-literal**

explode a myth/theory/notion/idea/belief, catch the post/mail, thin/flimsy excuse, etc.

III.   Literal idioms

invariant

a.   on foot, one day; in sum; in the meantime; on the contrary; arm in arm; very important person (VIP); potato crisps; tall, dark and handsome; waste not, want not; happy New Year, etc.

Restricted variance

b.   opt in favour of/for, for example/instance, in order that/to, happy/merry Christmas, etc.

↔   **II.   Restricted variance, literal**

addled brains/eggs, in the-not-too-distant past/future, for certain/sure, potato/corn/wood, etc. chips, etc.

III.   Unrestricted variance, semi-literal

catch a bus/plane/ferry/train, etc. run a business/company/theatre, etc. by dint of hard work/patience/repetition, etc.

IV.   Unrestricted variance, literal

beautiful/lovely, etc. sweet woman, smooth/plump, etc. glowing/rosy cheeks, etc.

48

Literal idioms

IV. Restricted variance, optional elements		V. Restricted variance, literal, optional elements
abstain (from), (even) worse, worse (still), develop (from) (into), etc.	↔	shrug (one's shoulders), nod (one's head), clap (one's hands), etc.

Fernando (1996:35-36) identifies three subclasses of idioms, viz. pure idioms, semi-idioms, and literal idioms. According to this classification, pure idioms are "a type of conventionalized, non-literal multi-word expression", e.g. *spill the beans*. Semi-idioms are those idioms which have "one or more literal constituents and at least one with a non-literal subsense, usually special to that co-occurrence relation and no other", e.g. *catch one's breath*, where *one's breath* is "literal" and *catch* has a "non-literal subsense".[64] Although literal idioms are semantically less complex than pure idioms and semi-idioms, they do meet what Fernando calls "the salient criterion for idioms", viz. invariance or restricted variation. Examples of literal idioms that she mentions are *on foot* or *a merry Christmas and a happy New Year*.

Fernando (1996:34-35) then discusses four factors that favour the acquisition of conventionalised multi-word expression status. Firstly, multi-word expressions need to conform to the grammatical rules of the language. She does, however, grant that grammatical idiosyncrasies appear in some well-known expressions,[65] e.g. *long time no see, white lie,*[66] or *foot the bill*. These have become conventionalised by usage. The second and third factors are invariance or fixity of the expression, combined with non-literalness. Both fixity and non-literalness are a matter of degree, ranging from the completely fixed, semantically non-literal, e.g. *pins and needles* ("the tingling sensation following

---

[64] This is, of course, disputable, since *catch* can also be interpreted here in its "literal" sense of "to take hold of or stop sth that is travelling through the air" (*Encarta World English Dictionary*, 1999:299-300). There is an obvious cognitive link between the notion of taking hold or stopping one's breath as an object travelling through the air and the meaning "cease breathing momentarily in surprise or fear" (*Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 2004: "breath"). Also, Fernando's classification obviously does not include grammatical words such as articles (*the*, *a*), prepositions (*of*, *on*), etc. when considering literal vs. non-literal senses.

[65] I do not find stating that idioms must conform to the grammar of the language useful for identifying idioms, especially not in the light of the fact that "grammatical idiosyncrasies do appear in some well-known ones".

[66] This is perhaps rather a *semantic* idiosyncrasy.

numbness") to the unrestricted semi-literal, e.g. *catch a bus/train*, etc. ("be in time for"). Fourthly, culturally salient encodings favour the emergence of multi-word expressions. These expressions capture some phenomenon prominent in the collective consciousness, e.g. *blue blood* ("aristocratic birth"), signifying "the blue veins of the Spanish showing through their white skins in contrast to the invisibility of those of the swarthy Moors" (Fernando, 1996:35).[67]

Fernando's discussion then moves on to the lexicogrammar[68] of English idioms. She states (1996:42) that "one of the purposes of examining the lexicogrammar of idioms is to identify those elements which make up the essential parts of an idiom as opposed to those that are optional". Regarding compounds, she holds (1996:41) that they are the lower limit for idioms, since they are multi-word expressions that represent habitual co-occurrences between two or more words, e.g. *foxglove, overtake, devil-may-care*. Compounds are classifiable into parts of speech: nouns, e.g. *baby-sitter*; adjectives, e.g. *devil-may-care*; verbs, e.g. *overtake*; and adverbs, e.g. *pitter-patter*. They can be literal, e.g. *mother-in-law*; semi-literal, e.g. *baby-sitter*; or non-literal, e.g. *eavesdrop*. It is also possible to transform certain semi-clauses into compounds, e.g. *lick sb's boots > boot-licker*. Whereas compounds are regarded as the lower limit for idioms, complex clauses can be considered the upper limit, and are regarded as such by dictionaries of idioms. Fernando states (1996:41-42) that no idiom consists of more than two subordinating clauses and that longer expressions tend to be shortened, e.g. *don't count your chickens* for *don't count your chickens before they are hatched*. The commonest expressions are the short ones that can be easily remembered, irrespective of the number of clauses, e.g. *I came, I saw, I conquered*.

Fernando discusses the transformations that idioms can undergo in considerable detail. She notes four types of transformation, viz. replacements or substitutions, additions, permutations, and deletions. Regarding replacements or substitutions, she points out (1996:43) several types of variation of the

---

[67]   This seems to involve some culturally-conditioned metaphoric and/or metonymic association. In the cited example (*blue blood*), the conceptual metonymy BLOOD FOR PEOPLE, even BLOOD FOR RACE, seems to feature.

[68]   A term from the framework of Systematic Functional Linguistics, coined by Michael Halliday, to indicate a unified stratum in the language, consisting of "lexis (a structured system of signs which serves to organise the vocabulary of a language) and grammar (a structured system of choices which serves to organise sequences of signs into texts)" (Gledhill, 2011:7).

elements of an idiom. Variation can be in terms of number and tense (inflectional changes), e.g. *red herring* can have the variant *red herrings*, and *smell a rat* can appear in various tenses, e.g. *he smelt a rat, some women would have begun to smell a rat* (1996:44), or even lexical changes, e.g. *burn one's boats/bridges* (1996:45). Some idioms permit only minimal variation, e.g. *kick the bucket* for tense, whereas others are totally invariant, e.g. *fat chance you've got*[69] (1996:46).

The next type of transformation that Fernando mentions is additions. She states (1996:47-48) that idioms generally do not permit additions, excepting those needed for the correct form, e.g. *twist sb's arm > sb's arm was twisted*. Extraneous elements may, however, be introduced in order to make a message more precise, e.g. *Rudyard Kipling took the art world bull by the horns when he wrote, "It's clever, but is it art?"*[70] This type of innovative addition "requires a certain intuitive feel for the limits beyond which the idiomatic cannot be pushed"[71] (1996:48).

The third type of transformation that Fernando (1996:49-51) discusses, viz. permutations, varies from one idiom to the next. Some idioms permit no permutations whatsoever, e.g. *say no more > *no more was said*. Particle shift is an optional permutation, e.g. *they beat up people/they beat people up*, which can be obligatory, as in the case of an intervening pronoun, e.g. *they blew it up*. Verb + object predicates can be converted into nominals, e.g. *sb drops a brick > a brick dropper*. Some idioms also tolerate passivisation, e.g. *shed crocodile tears > crocodile tears have been shed*. Sometimes language users reverse subject and object, thus creating a foregrounded once-off variant of a particular idiom, e.g. *to look like the cat that's swallowed the canary > It looked faintly as if the canary had swallowed the cat*[72] (on the analogy of *the tail wagging the dog*).

The fourth type of idiom transformation is deletion. Fernando (1996:52) points out that deletion is unlikely or even impossible with a large number of idioms, especially those made up of a verb + preposition/particle, e.g. *to see through sb*

---

[69] However, some English L1 speakers may find *Fat chance you'll have* an acceptable variation.

[70] *The Sydney Morning Herald* (4 December 19789, quoted in Fernando, 1996:48).

[71] These limits would, of course, differ between various lects. Also, what "could not" be done last year, may be quite possible this year in informal speech.

[72] *The Australian* (16 August 1975, quoted in Fernando, 1996:51).

or *to bring the house down*. Some idioms, however, are well established in their truncated form so that the shorter form is now the norm, e.g. *red herring* from *draw/trail a red herring across the track/path*. Native speakers can sometimes delete parts of idioms that are current in the language in their full form, e.g. *to dangle a carrot before the donkey > Thatcher waves <u>trade carrot</u>*.[73] This indicates confidence and fluency on the part of the language user.

Like Strässler (1982),[74] Fernando's discussion focuses on the functional aspect of idioms. Since the function of idioms falls outside the scope of the present research, I will not go into the details of Fernando's discussion of the same here.

Fernando also discusses idioms as a vocabulary resource. She points out (1996:217-218) that core vocabulary is typically general, unmarked and neutral (e.g. *kitchen*, *left*, *right*), whereas specialist terminology is context-restricted (e.g. nautical terms like *galley*, *port*, *starboard*). Core vocabulary also has a capacity for extension, i.e. for forming new, complex word forms, e.g. *fire > fireman, fire brigade, bush fire*. Fernando (1996:218) mentions that the concept of *core* is relative and that there are several core vocabularies associated with different registers. Idioms are clearly part of the non-core vocabulary, "functioning as packages of very specific kinds of information, in contrast to relatively under-specified core words" (1996:219). One can think of examples supporting this statement, e.g. *kick the bucket*. This idiom conveys more specific information than the "under-specified" core word *die*. To many speakers it would seem callous to refer to a close family member as having "kicked the bucket", rather than saying that the person "died". This is because the idiom carries with it a specific "flavour" (specific connotations of vulgarity or levity), over against the more or less neutral core word. The assumption that idioms belong to the non-core vocabulary may not hold true in all cases, but this needs to be confirmed by more research.

Of particular interest to me in the study of Biblical Hebrew idioms is determining the meaning of idioms. In her discussion, Fernando does not propose a specific strategy for discovering the meaning of an unfamiliar

---

[73] *The Australian* (6 August 1988, quoted in Fernando, 1996:51). A restriction that has to be borne in mind here is that the language of newspaper headlines has its own conventions that may not apply to language used in other contexts. In this example, there is no article (*a*) *before carrot*, which would be unusual in other contexts.

[74] See section 2.2.3.

expression, but she points out the interplay between grammatical knowledge, context, and co-text. She states (1996:237) that interpretation of an idiom is done from one's knowledge of the world. The availability of specific information is very important here: A language user who is ignorant of the very specific package of information that an idiom like *bottom line* conveys (i.e. the meaning "what an issue/situation, etc. is about", "the essentials", from the field of accountancy), will probably experience difficulty in understanding the idiom. It is absolutely necessary that readers or listeners access the right piece of information, whether co-textual or contextual, when interpreting an idiom. Fernando and Flavell (1981, quoted in Fernando, 1996:238) have found that once a mismatch is recognised between reality and what is asserted, a non-literal interpretation is triggered. She provides the following example: *Create jobs: let fat cats quit at 55.*[75] Since cats are not normally employed nor do they live to fifty five years, the listener or reader will look for some non-literal meaning of *fat cats*, that is to say, they will seek for relevance in the linguistic and extralinguistic setting. Thus, discoursal incoherence is a further cue to figurative interpretation. Fernando (1996:240) states that "inferring the meaning of vocabulary requires grammatical and situational knowledge, as well as an ability to see the relationship between a lexical item and its co-text".

In terms of the preliminary defining characteristics mentioned in the previous chapter, Fernando seems to recognise all of them except picturesqueness.[76] Her definition of idioms as "conventionalized multiword expressions often, but not always, non-literal" covers *multi-word character* ("multiword expressions") as well as *non-compositionality of meaning*, i.e. figurative meaning ("often, but not always non-literal"). As for *restricted variability*, Fernando (1996:36) regards invariance or restricted variation as "the salient criterion for idioms". She does not explicitly mention the unitary function of idioms, but it seems to be implicit in her discussion of idiomatic expressions as vocabulary resource (1996:215-244).

---

[75] *The Australian* (1 April 1976, quoted in Fernando, 1996:238).

[76] As has been mentioned before, picturesqueness is not commonly regarded as a necessary characteristic of idiom. It ties in closely with the notion of figurative meaning and it may even be regarded as a sub-category of it.

2.2.10   František Čermák (2001)

In his article entitled *Substance of idioms: Perennial problems, lack of data or theory?* Čermák (2001:2) points out some of the problems resulting from a "situation of somewhat fragmented groups and individuals working in partial isolation". He mentions, for example, the astonishing lack of knowledge that exists among scholars oriented towards English concerning other schools of research, such as the Russian, Polish, Czech, German, or Swiss. This "unnatural and vexing lack of information and contact" is reflected in the disagreement that still exists about something as basic as a common term for the central phenomenon studied in this field, viz. idioms. The most acceptable terms seem to be *idiom* and *phraseme*.[77]

Čermák (2001:6) proposes that the problems regarding the identification and analysis of idioms "be handled in three inter-connected approaches, linking together their form [...], meaning [...] and function".

Regarding the formal aspects of idioms, Čermák (2001:6) states:

> As yet, there has been no reliable way suggested of handling the idiom's *identification* (and identity) in texts, such that would not leave many borderline cases open and even types of idioms unaccounted for, and which would be able, at the same time, to draw a distinct line between various types of combinations suggested so far.

He indicates that stability seems to be one of the few basic attributes of idioms about which linguists may have some sort of consensus. Determining stability, however, is problematic, since frequency — the obvious criterion — is a scalar notion which offers no sharp distinctions between the extremes. Another characteristic that some regard as decisive for idiomaticity is (restricted) variability.[78] In this regard, Čermák (2001:7) points out that variability cannot really be a characteristic used for the identification of idioms, as one is again

---

[77]   As with Donalies, the reference here is presumably to the non-Anglophone scholarly world. Although the term *idiom* has also been, to some extent, the subject of scientific debate in the Anglophone world, it is fairly well established and accepted in the relevant literature as a scientific term.

[78]   It is not quite clear how *stability* is to be distinguished from *restricted variability*. Čermák (2001:7) describes variability as a "complementary feature to that of stability or fixity", but he offers no further clarification as to the relation between these two concepts.

faced with a continuum, "ranging from inconspicuous grades of it to those which are strikingly obvious". The question of variability of idioms is a very basic problem.[79] In some cases (e.g. when two of the three constituent elements of an idiom are variable, i.e. more than 50% of the idiom is variable) it is not quite clear whether one is dealing with a single idiom or with two separate idioms. Concerning another feature which has been emphasised as central to the character of idioms, viz. multi-word character, he poses two questions (2001:7-8): Firstly, how many words are included by *multi-*? Can sentence idioms or even those made up of more than one sentence be included under this criterion?[80] Secondly, are idioms only to be found on the collocational and propositional levels, or are below-the-word combinations (e.g. *bottleneck*) included here?[81] He warns (2001:8) of the danger of models that are tailor-made to suit some European languages or even some theories only, which could exclude typologically different languages.[82] Research done on idioms in such typologically different languages will enable scholars to modify the existing models based on languages such as English or German, bringing us one step closer to a truly universal account of idiomaticity. Regarding derivations[83] (e.g. *twist sb's arm > arm-twisting*) as a possible identifying characteristic of idioms, he states that there seem to be no clear criteria for distinguishing these.

Addressing the semantic aspect of idioms, Čermák (2001:8-9) points out that, although semantic non-compositionality seems to be an essential idiom characteristic, in some cases the individual constituent element does make some semantic contribution, a phenomenon he describes as yet not reliably studied.[84] However, he agrees (2001:11) that — semantically speaking —

---

[79] This problem has been addressed by cognitive linguists such as Langlotz (2006), for which see section 2.2.13.

[80] See section 2.2.9 for Fernando's (1996:41-42) view that no idiom consists of more than two subordinating clauses and that longer expressions tend to be shortened.

[81] See section 2.2.5 for a discussion of Wood (1986:93), who holds that compound words like *alewife* can be idioms if they are semantically non-compositional and tolerate no variation.

[82] Of particular concern here is the danger of being misled by orthographical differences, especially in terms of word division. See Wood (1986:88, 92), discussed in section 2.2.5 above).

[83] Or rather, restrictions on derivations. Fernando (1996:49) calls these *permutations* (see section 2.2.9 above).

[84] Cognitive linguistic studies have, of course, shed much light on this area (see Lakoff, 1987; Taylor, 2002; Langlotz, 2006).

idiomaticity is "a holistic, Gestalt phenomenon [...] which by definition precludes any possibility of an objective and exhaustive semantic analysis". As a consequence, he rejects the cognitive approach as "far from being part of the exact linguistic methodology which is so much needed in the field".[85] Vagueness is another important aspect of the meaning of idioms which, according to Čermák, has never been given due attention.

Čermák's main concern seems to be with the fluidity, or imprecise nature, of most of the characteristics commonly proposed for idioms. He shares some of Donalies's (1994) doubts regarding the validity of many of these characteristics as scientifically exact.

In the light of these considerations, Čermák (2001:16) subscribes to the definition of *idiom* as used in what he calls "the Czech approach", viz. "a unique and fixed combination of at least two elements for which it holds that at least some of these do not function, in the same way, in any other combination or combinations of the kind, or occur in a highly restricted number of them, or in a single one only".

According to this view, *multi-word character* and *non-compositionality of meaning* are characteristic for idioms, but restricted variability is not mentioned as essential for idiomaticity. In addition to the characteristics mentioned at the outset of this discussion, Čermák's definition claims *uniqueness* and *fixedness* as essential to idiomaticity. An idiom is "unique" in the sense that at least some of its elements do not occur elsewhere — or only in a highly restricted number of combinations — in the same way. It would seem that what Čermák means by the *fixedness* of an idiom is its conventionalised nature and not invariance or restricted variability of form. The conventionalised nature of idioms is also recognised by other scholars (see Makkai, 1972; Fernando, 1996).

---

[85] This is quite a subjective statement, as research within the cognitive approach — especially in the area of cognitive metaphor — has been able to explain many of the perplexing questions raised by scholars who studied idioms. Perhaps Čermák rejects the whole theoretical framework of cognitive linguistics, but given recent developments in this field, it would hardly seem fair, nor accurate, to accuse the cognitive approach of being linguistically inexact.

2.2.11   John R. Taylor (2002)

Taylor dedicates a whole chapter in his book *Cognitive grammar* (2002) to idioms, formulas, and fixed expressions. As can be seen from the title of his book, Taylor writes from a cognitive linguistic perspective. He states (2002:558):

> The study of the idiomatic is worth pursuing only if it leads to 'deeper generaliza-tions'. [...] The study of the idiomatic does indeed lead to a deeper understanding of the nature of language [...]. The grammar comes to be characterized, not in terms of ever more general rules and principles, but as a huge inventory of rather particular facts, interrelated by schemas of varying levels of schematicity. Far from being marginal to the grammar, the idiomatic occupies the central place.

This view of the idiomatic, viz. that "the idiomatic occupies the central place" in language is a corollary of the view that all constructions[86] are idioms of some kind (2002:541) and that there is therefore no clear-cut distinction between the idiomatic and the regular or non-idiomatic (2002:561). True to the view of the cognitive school, he conceives of idiomaticity as part of a continuum, a category with fuzzy borders. Although the discussion of idioms does not occupy a central place in his book, Taylor makes a number of observations that are helpful to my study.

First, let us consider his view on the semantic characteristics of English idioms. He points out (2002:13) that "complex expressions nearly always have a meaning that is more than, or even at variance with, the meaning that can be computed by combining the meanings of the component parts". It stands to reason, therefore, that idioms — being a more narrowly defined class of complex expressions — are basically non-compositional in terms of their meaning. However, he states (2002:549) that there are some fundamental problems with this approach. In the first place, he points out (2002:550) that strict compositionality is rarely, if ever, encountered and that most expressions, if not all, are non-compositional to some degree.[87] It is also not always possible

---

[86]   Taylor (2002:561) broadly defines construction as "any linguistic structure that is analysable into component parts".

[87]   Wood (1986:6) also states that "absolute semantic compositionality [...] is most easily (perhaps only) to be found in non-natural languages". She mentions examples like the truth-connectives of formal logic, computer languages, and the formal languages of the sciences (algebra, chemistry, etc.) in this regard.

to ascertain what the "basic" or "non-idiomatic" meaning of a word is, for instance in the case of cranberry forms which are restricted to the idioms in which they occur (e.g. *take umbrage at sb or sth, under the auspices of, in cahoots with*). This, of course, makes it difficult to claim idiomatic status for an expression like *take umbrage (at sb or sth)* on the grounds that the "literal" meaning of *umbrage* does not contribute to the meaning of the idiom.

Taylor (2002:550-551) argues that, ultimately, the appeal to non-compositionality of meaning as a defining characteristic of idioms is circular, as also stated by Cruse:

> A traditional definition of idiom runs as follows: an idiom is an expression whose meaning cannot be inferred from the meanings of its parts. [...] The definition must be understood as stating that an idiom is an expression whose meaning cannot be accounted for as a compositional function of the meanings its parts have when they are not parts of idioms. The circularity is now plain: to apply the definition, we must already be in a position to distinguish idiomatic from non-idiomatic expressions.

<div align="right">Cruse (1986:37)</div>

Another view traditionally held regarding idioms is semantic unanalysability, i.e. an idiom functions as a semantic simplex which cannot be broken down into smaller semantic constituents. Taylor finds this view unacceptable. He points out (2002:551-552) that, "for quite a large number of idioms it is possible to map components of the idiom onto components of its semantic interpretation". So, for example, *let the cat out of the bag* can be explained as "reveal a secret", where *let [...] out of the bag* corresponds to "reveal" and *the cat* corresponds to "a secret". The same can be observed in *bury the hatchet* ("agree to forget an old dispute") and *have a bee in one's bonnet* ("have an obsessive idea in one's head"). He does mention (2002:552) instances where, rather than having components which can be semantically interpreted, idioms invoke "a concrete and easily imageable scene, which is taken as emblematic of the situation which it is used to refer to", e.g. *paint the town red, burn the candle at both ends*, or *have one foot in the grave*. In other words, he holds (2002:552-553) that, while there are idioms which, in the one extreme, are semantically uninterpretable (e.g. *that's the bee's knees*), there are also at the other end of the scale those whose meanings are not at all unexceptional (e.g. *he has what it takes*).

Regarding the formal aspect of idioms, Taylor basically agrees with Fernando's view, viz. that idioms are invariable[88] or that variation is restricted. This is in line with the proposed idiom characteristic of restricted variability. Taylor (2002:553) agrees that some idioms are "rigidly fixed", e.g. *How do you do?* which does not tolerate any (formal) variation. Other idioms do tolerate some variation. There are idioms with a slot which can be filled by a possessor (e.g. *do [one's] best, pull [sb's] leg*), a nominal (e.g. *take advantage of [sth/sb], give [sb] a wide berth*), or a place of expression (e.g. *the buck stops [here]*). He also mentions those idioms containing slots that can be filled only from a very limited scope of possibilities, e.g. *put/hold a pistol/gun to sb's head*, or *add oil/fuel to the flames/fire*. A second type of formal variation can be observed when parts of an idiom can be modified and the idiom can appear in different syntactic configurations (2002:553-554), e.g. *poke fun at sb > they poked malicious fun at him*, or *nobody likes being poked fun at*. He observes (2002:554) that relatively opaque idioms "tend to be fairly rigid in their form", e.g. *kick the bucket* (**he kicked the old bucket*, **the bucket was finally kicked by the old man*).[89] He suggests "the reason, clearly, being that there is no conceptual unit which can be mapped on to the nominal *the bucket*".[90]

According to Taylor (2002:541), "the key to the Cognitive Grammar approach lies in the notion of the symbolic unit". He defines (2002:591) *symbolic unit* as "a conventionalized association of a phonological structure with a semantic structure", and goes on to say that "symbolic units can vary with respect to their degree of schematicity[91] and their internal complexity". It is not clear to me how Taylor's description of *symbolic unit* distinguishes it from any other lexeme. Surely every single word is a "conventionalized association of a phonological structure with a semantic structure", e.g. /kæt/ which, in English, is conventionally associated with a furry animal kept for hunting mice and rats. Taylor (2002:541) submits that idioms comfortably fit into the notion of *symbolic unit*, and he accordingly describes idioms as "multi-word expressions

---

[88] Taylor uses the term "fixed".

[89] This does not mean, of course, that these unusual variants of the idiom can never be used to create a special effect, e.g. in literary discourse.

[90] This should not be interpreted as a negation of the fact that, etymologically speaking, the *bucket* had a real referent (e.g. the bucket a person stands on when committing suicide by hanging, or the beam to which a pig's hind feet were tied before being slaughtered).

[91] Taylor (2002:591) states, "A unit may be said to be schematic if it is specified in rather general terms, lacking specific detail."

that speakers have learned as conventionalized associations of a phonological form with a semantic representation". By claiming that idioms are symbolic units, Taylor does not imply that they function as lexical units (according to the traditional concept of idioms as lexical units), as can be seen from his view of semantic compositionality and idiomatic meaning.

Taylor (2002:554-555) finds the distinction that scholars traditionally make between the idiomatic and the non-idiomatic — e.g. Fillmore, Kay, and O'Connor (1988:502) "between what it is that speakers of a language know outright about their language and what it is that they have to be able to figure out" — problematic. Taylor observes that "the range of application of even the most general principles [...] has to be learned, and to this extent even general statements are tinged with idiomaticity". Moreover, the idiomatic and the exceptional only rarely lack any motivation at all. He gives an example (2002:557) to indicate that even syntax, which was "traditionally thought of as the province of the regular and the predictable", has the marks of idiomaticity: We can *shoot sb dead*, but we cannot **shoot him wounded*, nor can we **beat sb dead* or **poison sb dead* — in Standard English, at least.[92] The grammaticality of expressions like *shoot sb dead*, *strip sb naked*, or *paint the house green* (over against e.g. **undress sb naked*) "cannot be 'figured out' solely by reference to general principles". Hence it is clear why he holds (2002:558) — as mentioned earlier on — that there is no clear-cut distinction between the idiomatic and the regular.

Also of interest to this discussion are the categories of idioms that Taylor proposes. He points out (2002:542) that his list of categories is not intended to be "a definitive or scientific classification", nor are these categories mutually exclusive; his purpose with this categorisation is merely to indicate the scope of the phenomena that are generally called *idioms*. Taylor's list of categories, however, provides valuable insights on idioms from the cognitive perspective.

The first category that he mentions (2002:542) is *idioms* in the narrow sense of the word. The idiomatic character of these expressions resides in their semantic value on the one hand, and on their formal aspects on the other. In terms of their semantic value, he states (2002:543) that the meaning of idioms such as *kick the bucket*, *spill the beans*, and *red herring* cannot be deduced from the meanings which their components have elsewhere, i.e. their meaning is non-

---

[92] These examples seem to apply to semantics, rather than syntax.

compositional.[93] These idioms are often picturesque insofar as they evoke concrete and easily imageable scenes.[94] Although some of these idioms may be interpreted in metaphorical terms, Taylor indicates that even the metaphorical mappings are "idiomatic". In the case of *spill the beans*, for instance, there is no schematic conceptual metaphor in English which maps information onto legumes. Regarding the formal aspects, he explains (2002:543) that the syntax of idioms such as *by and large, not at all*, and *to the best of my ability* is sometimes somewhat deviant. Often there is a collocational requirement which is not fully predictable, e.g. prep. + conj. + adj. in the case of *by and large*. These idioms are usually not picturesque, and only seldom do they allow a literal interpretation alongside their idiomatic meaning. Variation of idioms like these is limited, and the boundary between the idiomatic and non-idiomatic is extremely fuzzy (2002:543-544).

A second category that Taylor mentions is *formulas*, which he characterises (2002:544) as "expressions which have a conventionalized function within the language". He recognises three subcategories of formulas, viz. multi-word expressions that are conventionally associated with certain kinds of social situation (e.g. *How do you do? Bye-bye, Thank you*), expressions with a distinctive discourse-structuring function (e.g. *by the way, as I was saying, in the first place*), and conventionalised ways of expressing speaker attitude (e.g. *Is that a fact? You've got to be joking, Over my dead body!*).

Taylor's third category is expressions in the form of chunks of *pre-formed language* which speakers have committed to memory (2002:545). In this category are found memorised texts or text fragments (e.g. religious texts, nursery rhymes, book and film titles, song lyrics) which often function as mere allusions (e.g. *To be or not to be, All's well that ends well, Lead on, Macduff!*); proverbs, sayings, and aphorisms (e.g. *Too many cooks spoil the broth, Make hay while the sun shines, Shut the stable door after the horse has bolted*); and catchphrases and clichés (e.g. *What's a nice girl like you doing in a place like this? That's the sixty-four thousand dollar question, It ain't over till the fat lady sings*).

---

[93]   This is not meant to deny the possibility of discovering the etymology of these expressions.

[94]   However, when an idiom becomes sufficiently fossilised, the original image will not be consciously registered in every instance it is used.

The fourth and last category that Taylor discusses is what Makkai (1972) calls *idioms of encoding*.[95] He explains (Taylor, 2002:547) that the idiomaticity of such expressions "resides in the fact that *this* happens to be the conventionalized way to say something, rather than some other, equally plausible way". He points out that if this category of idioms is recognised, idiomaticity may well threaten to take over a substantial part of the lexicon.

In his chapter on constructions, Taylor (2002:568) mentions another type of English idiom which he calls *constructional idioms* or *formal idioms*. These are "constructions whose properties — indeed, whose very existence in language — cannot be derived from more general principles". He states that, unlike lexical idioms such as *kick the bucket*, formal idioms are "characterized in terms of a constructional schema with slots that can be filled by any items which match the construction's specifications", but points out (2002:574) that this difference is a matter of degree, not a difference in character. He discusses (2002:568-573) various types of constructional idiom: the incredulity response question (e.g. *(What?!) Him write a novel?!*); the negative polarity question (e.g. *Didn't Harry leave?*); the construction *What's X doing Y?* (e.g. *What are you doing lying on the floor?*); the construction *the X-er the Y-er* (e.g. *the more the merrier, the fewer the better*); the construction *One more X and Y* (e.g. *One more beer and I'll be off, One more botch-up like that and you're fired*); the *may* construction (e.g. *He máy be a professor, but he sure is dumb*); various clefting and focusing constructions (e.g. the neutral *I don't like cheese* vs. the clefted *It's cheese that I don't like, It's me that doesn't like cheese*); and the *way* construction (e.g. *I had to fight my way to the exit, We can't legislate our way out of the drug problem*). He also provides other examples such as *day in day out, it's up to you, the car burst a tyre,* and *the tent sleeps six,* where the underlined items are slots that can be filled by items matching the construction's specifications. Some of these examples cannot be considered idiomatic if the preliminary characteristics suggested in the previous chapter are used as criteria.

It seems that the only characteristic for idioms proposed so far with which Taylor agrees is that of *multi-word character*. I have mentioned the unitary function of idioms as a possible characteristic of idioms. In this regard, Taylor (2002:26) points out that "fixed expressions and formulas, of varying degrees of internal complexity, almost by definition, have unit status". He also observes (2002:540) that these units of language are pre-formed, and are often used and

---

[95] See the discussion of Makkai's work on idioms in section 2.2.2 above.

heard; in fact, they are part of a language user's knowledge of a given language. As such, they can be said to be conventionalised, although he is careful to point out (2002:30) that conventionalisation is a matter of degree. Taylor's discussion of idioms does not offer much in terms of proposing characteristics for the identification of idioms. This is a corollary of his view that the distinction between the idiomatic and the non-idiomatic in language is problematic at best.

2.2.12   Maria H. Svensson (2004)

In her PhD dissertation on the criteria of fixedness, Svensson focuses on what she calls *fixed expressions*[96] in modern French. According to her (Svensson, 2004:16), an expression is "fixed" when none of the constituent elements can be changed (i.e. morphosyntactic fixedness). Change in this sense entails lexical as well as grammatical changes. A fixed expression also evidences a psychological fixedness, i.e. the expression exists as a conscious unit in the memory of the speaker. The term *fixed expression*, in Svensson's research, covers the phenomenon variously referred to as *locution, idiom, fixed phrase, set/fixed expression, lexical function*, and *phraseme* (2004:13).[97] Svensson's concept of *fixed expression* is not quite the same as *idiom* in the narrower sense, as used in the present study. However, her research on the criteria for fixed expressions provides useful insights for our discussion.

Svensson examines the following six characteristics that are often mentioned by researchers as properties of fixed expressions:

1) ***Memorisation:*** According to Svensson, this is the most important criterion of fixedness, one of two that are necessary for the identification of a fixed expression (2004:182). She points out that fixedness leaves its marks in the memory of a speaker.

2) ***Unique context:*** This refers to the presence of a word that only occurs in the context of the particular expression (2004:183).[98] An example

---

[96]   *Expressions figées* in the original.

[97]   These translate the French *locution, idiome, phrase figée, expression toute faite, fonction lexicale*, and *phraseme*. In this regard, she also mentions the English terms *clause, conventional collocation, colligation, discourse structuring device, formulae idiom, irreversible binomial, phrase, prefab, quotation*, and *simile*.

[98]   These are sometimes called *cranberry forms* or *cranberry morphs*.

would be the French word *fur*, which only occurs in the expression *au fur et à mesure*. (A similar example in the English language might be *cropper* in the expression *come a cropper*.)

3) **Non-compositionality:** Svensson views this characteristic as the most complex of all. She discusses four different aspects (in the form of dichotomies) of compositionality, viz. motivation vs. non-motivation, literal meaning vs. figurative meaning, transparency vs. opacity, and analysability vs. non-analysability (2004:183).

4) **Marked syntax:** Only a limited number of fixed expressions have this characteristic, as many fixed expressions are syntactically productive, following the normal syntactic rules (2004:183).

5) **Lexical frozenness:** This refers to the impossibility of replacing a word that is part of a fixed expression, without changing its meaning, even rendering it incomprehensible (2004:183).

6) **Grammatical frozenness:** Svensson finds this a difficult concept to study, as it depends a lot on the intuition of the researcher. She points out that it is impossible to find negative evidence if one chooses to base one's research on real examples of language usage (2004:184).

After discussing these six characteristics that are often proposed for fixed expressions, Svensson studies them in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions.[99] She finds that certain properties, e.g. marked syntax and grammatical frozenness, cannot be absolutely connected to fixedness, although they often indicate the presence of fixedness (2004:144). She summarises her findings as follows:

---

[99] "A necessary condition for some state of affairs S is a condition that must be satisfied in order for S to obtain," and "a sufficient condition for some state of affairs S is a condition that, if satisfied, guarantees that S obtains" (Hausman, n.d.).

Criterion	Necessary Condition	Sufficient Condition	Indication
memorisation	+	-	
unique context	-	+	
non-compositionality			
• *non-motivation*	-	+	
• *figurative meaning*	-	-	*indication*
• *opacity*	-	+	
• *non-analysability*	-	+	
marked syntax	-	-	*indication*
lexical frozenness	+	+	
grammatical frozenness	-	-	*indication*

From this table, it can be seen that Svensson finds only one criterion both necessary and sufficient for fixedness, viz. lexical frozenness. The only two necessary conditions are memorisation and lexical frozenness. Marked syntax and grammatical frozenness, as well as figurative meaning as a facet of non-compositionality, turn out to be neither necessary nor sufficient conditions for fixedness. Svensson does note, nonetheless, that all the criteria she studied are in some way related to fixedness.

Svensson also examined the relationship that exists among the different criteria in identifying fixed expressions in several modern French corpora. She found that applying different criteria very often led to the identification of the same expressions, but only seldom was there total correspondence between groups of expressions identified by means of different criteria. Her research shows the following with regard to specific criteria:

1) Memorisation and lexical frozenness are present in all fixed expressions (2004:184).

2) There is a close relationship between lexical frozenness and unique context, as expressions with a unique context allow no lexical transmutation (2004:184).

3) Although lexical frozenness is not absolute, the number of variants and transmutations is restricted (2004:184).

4) Grammatical frozenness is mostly dependent on syntactic structure, and change in grammatical number is seldom tolerated (2004:184).

5) Where a fixed expression contains an adjective used adverbially, the corresponding adverb is either disallowed or not attested (2004:184).[100]

Finally, Svensson tentatively explores the theory of *family resemblances* as better suited to defining fixed expressions as a category than is the concept of necessary and sufficient conditions. She points out, however, that the overlap between different groups of fixed expressions, identified by means of these criteria or idiom characteristics, is hard to describe (2004:184). This is indicative of the confusion that still characterises attempts at classifying or categorising fixed expressions (2004:179). Svensson does not offer a theoretical framework for describing fixed expressions in terms of family resemblance(s), but rather indicates this as a fertile field for further study.

Although the object of Svensson's research, viz. fixed expressions, does not necessarily correspond exactly to idioms as in the present study, her findings are relevant,[101] especially her description of non-compositionality as a complex notion, comprising the aspects *non-motivation*, *figurative meaning*, *opacity*, and *non-analysability*. Barring the aspect of figurative meaning, which she views as indicative of fixedness at most, the presence of one or more of the other three aspects of non-compositionality is, according Svensson's view, sufficient for establishing fixedness. On the whole, it seems that she agrees with *non-compositionality of meaning* as an idiom criterion, albeit not a necessary condition. Her concept of *memorisation* is closely related, but not identical, to *conventionalisation* as used in this study. *Lexical* and *grammatical frozenness* correspond to *restricted variability* as used by many other scholars. She does not mention *multi-word character*, but it is obvious throughout her discussion

---

[100] Of course, this finding specifically represents fixed expressions in French, as the focus of Svensson's study.

[101] See Sinclair (2008:XVII).

that it is an essential condition for fixed expressions. *Unique context*, or *cranberry forms*, is a sufficient, but not necessary indication of fixedness. Another aspect she mentions is *marked syntax*, although she considers it neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition; at most, it can serve as an indication that a given expression may be a fixed expression.

2.2.13   Andreas Langlotz (2006)

Langlotz's book (2006) on idiomatic creativity provides a thorough and much needed discussion of idioms and idiomaticity from a cognitive linguistic perspective. He discusses and tests the hypothesis that "many idioms can be attributed an intrinsically creative semantic structure" and that "the degree to which this structure can be (re)motivated by a cogniser in relation to a set of entrenched conceptual metaphors, metonymies and emblems correlates with their potential for systematic lexicogrammatical variation" (Langlotz, 2006:288).

Langlotz (2006:3) provides the following parameters for defining idioms:

Semiotic dimension	Feature	Term
GRAMMATICAL STATUS	Degree of conventionalisation or familiarity	*institutionalisation*
FORM	Formal complexity of construction: multi-word unit	*compositeness*
	Lexicogrammatical behaviour: restricted syntactic, morphosyntactic and lexical variability	*frozenness*
MEANING	Meaning cannot be derived from constituent words but is extended/figurative	*non-compositionality*

While Langlotz's view of the concepts *institutionalisation* and *frozenness* correspond to the characteristics of *conventionalisation* and *restricted variability* as used in the present dissertation, his definition of *compositeness* and *non-compositionality* bear some consideration. Describing compositeness, he uses the phrase "multi-word unit", but this must not be confused with the view that has been put forward by many scholars, viz. that idioms are multi-word units acting as single lexical items. Langlotz (2006:53) states:

Linguistic and psycholinguistic evidence speaks for the representation of idioms as complex, composite word-configurations rather than lexical units. Mentally, these word-configurations nevertheless have unit status because their idiomatic meaning can be unfolded through direct stipulation once the most salient constituent — the key — is heard.

As an example, he mentions lexical key constituents such as *rails, road, course, doldrums, lion's den, swallow, pill,* or *bitter,* that can evoke the idioms in which they occur[102] and are therefore "sufficient [...] for the idiomatic meaning to be activated" (2006:282).[103] In other words, although language users can retrieve an idiom as a unit (e.g. *walk into the lion's den*) from a key constituent (e.g. *lion's den*), this does not imply that such an idiom is a lexical unit on the same level as any other word in the language. Langlotz (2006:9) holds that "idioms cannot merely be described as lexical items; rather, they seem to occupy a position between the lexicon and syntax, leading to a fuzzy dividing line between the productive and reproductive aspects of linguistic competence".

As regards semantic non-compositionality, Langlotz recognises that the notion of compositionality implies a continuum. He states (2006:4), "The more discrepancy between the literal and the idiomatic meaning a construction features, the more *opaque* it is." Recognising that there are semantically[104] unanalysable expressions (e.g. *spick and span*), he also notes (2006:15) that "a great number of idioms can be attributed an internal semantic structure which makes them semantically motivated and/or analysable. Such idioms do not constitute semantic units and can therefore be processed compositionally" (e.g. *grasp the nettle* "tackle a problem"). Thus, insofar as compositionality is considered to imply predictability of meaning, Langlotz agrees that idioms are generally semantically non-compositional. However, many idioms are still analysable (i.e. their meaning can be motivated though not predicted).

---

[102] Viz. *keep on the rails/the road/course, in the doldrums, walk into the lion's den,* and *swallow a bitter pill.*

[103] Discussing "canonical forms" of idioms and their variations, Philip (2008:100) states, "Sometimes the recognition of the canonical phrase is triggered by a core collocation (e.g. *red rag*)." As an example, he mentions the idiom *like a red rag to a bull.* The "core collocation" *red rag* is the key (as Langlotz calls it), not only to the canonical form *like a red rag to a bull,* but also to variations such as *as a red rag to a bull, a red rag to the Unionist bull,* or even *like bulls to a red rag.*

[104] Calling these expressions "semantically unanalysable" does not mean that their etymology cannot be discovered.

On the basis of compositionality as describing "the direct literal contribution of a constituent to the idiomatic meaning" (2006:111), Langlotz distinguishes between the following types of idioms:

1) *Partially non-compositional idioms*: These are idioms that are "partly analysable and partially motivated (2006:112)".

   > E.g. *shoot a glance at sb*, where *glance* can be interpreted literally on the level of the idiomatic meaning (2006:112).

2) *Literally non-compositional idioms*: These are idioms that cannot attribute a meaningful interpretation to the composite literal meaning (2006:112); "their formal constituent structure does not evoke a rich literal scene" (2006:113).

   > E.g. idioms with unique constituents that "are not embedded in rich conceptual networks, but only appear in the constructional context of these idioms" (cranberry collocations), such as *gaff* in blow the *gaff* (2006:112).

3) *Constructionally idiosyncratic idioms*: These idioms "reflect asyntactic patterns [...] or unconventional internal valency relations that do not correspond to the general conventions of the language" (2006:112).

   > E.g.
   >
   > - *trip the light fantastic*: no head noun (2006:112-113);
   > - *shoot the breeze*: *shoot* is ungrammatically collocated with an inanimate noun outside of the SHOOTING frame (2006:112);
   > - *come a cropper*: non-transitive verb *come* is used transitively and combined with a cranberry morph *cropper* (2006:112).

In the light of these considerations, Langlotz (2006:5) defines *idiom* or *idiomatic construction* as follows:[105]

> An idiom is an institutionalised construction that is composed of two or more lexical items and has the composite structure of a phrase or semi-clause, which may

---

[105] Although Langlotz provides this definition in his introductory chapter, even calling it a "preliminary definition" (2006:5), it clearly reflects his hypothesis and subsequent analysis of idiom creativity.

feature constructional idiosyncrasy. An idiom primarily has an ideational discourse-function and features figuration, i.e. its semantic structure is derivationally non-compositional. Moreover, it is considerably fixed and collocationally restricted.

The statement that idioms have the composite structure of phrases or semi-clauses reflects a practical consideration in Langlotz's study. He mentions (2006:3) that some linguists exclude idiomatic compounds (e.g. *chatterbox*), phrasal verbs (e.g. *see through*), and proverbs (e.g. *Birds of a feather flock together*) from their analyses of idioms, although "these also belong to the group of composite idiomatic constructions".

In his analysis of idiomatic creativity, Langlotz convincingly disproves the traditional or orthodox view of idioms according to which "idioms must be regarded as non-compositional, unanalysable, and unmotivated semantic units. Therefore, idioms have the status of lexical units and they are processed non-compositionally by means of direct lexical retrieval" (2006:11). From his review of relevant linguistic and psycholinguistic literature, it becomes clear that there is sufficient evidence that idioms are represented "as complex, composite word-configurations rather than lexical units".[106] For this reason, he adopts what he seems to consider the only feasible model, viz. a hybrid view of idioms, which he describes (2006:11) as follows:

> Such a hybrid view can best account for the fact that the form as well as the internal semantic structure of idioms can be very diverse. At one pole, one can find semantically unanalysable units such as *spick and span* whereas at the other pole there are highly transparent expressions such as the proverb *people who live in glass houses should not throw stones*. For metaphorical idioms or proverbs of the latter type we have a clear idea of the constituents' contribution to the overall meaning. On the semantic continuum between word-like and metaphor-like idioms there are a number of motivated and/or analysable strings such as *spill the beans* which tend to be processed like compositional constructions. Given this diversity of semantic motivation and analysability, one must also assume corresponding diversity in idiom comprehension and production. This diversity must be accounted for by a model of idiom representation, which does not reduce these linguistic units to long words, but regards them as complex mental representations

---

[106] Langlotz quotes a number of psycholinguistic studies that seem to convincingly disprove the conclusions drawn in studies like that of McDonnell's (1982; see section 2.2.4 above).

that have the potential of unfolding various levels of structural and semantic representation.

In view of this diversity and the fact that idioms occupy a place in the continuum somewhere between the lexicon and syntax, he assigns idioms an independent node in the cognitive grammar network. He points out (2006:97) that idiom "is a subtype of symbolic unit that is lexically-rich, constructionally-complex and semantically-idiosyncratic".

Central to Langlotz's description of idioms is the concept of what he calls *idiomatic activation sets*. He defines (2006:95) an *idiomatic activation set* as "the mental network that can be potentially activated when an idiom is used", or in other words, "a complex mental configuration that consists of several coordinated symbolic and conceptual units that constitute its immanent substructures". An idiomatic activation set is a "mental network that can be *potentially* activated" (italics mine — CMvdH), since "the internal semantic structure of idioms is potentially variable from speaker to speaker: while an idiom may be motivated for speaker A, it is potentially opaque for another speaker B" (2006:127). Hence, Langlotz states:

> The idiom-activation-set model must […] be understood as reflecting a dynamic cognitive structure with degrees of complexity and node-activation that are different from idiom to idiom, from speaker to speaker, and from speech-context to speech-context.
>
> (Langlotz, 2006:127)

It is clear, then, that not only do different idioms vary in terms of their analysability, but a given idiom's analysability or motivation also varies between different language users.

Langlotz (2006:45) describes *motivation* as "a speaker's ability to make sense of an idiomatic expression by reactivating or remotivating their figurativity, i.e. to understand why the idiom has the idiomatic meaning it has with a view to its literal meaning". He then identifies two alternative dimensions of motivation, viz. global motivation and constituental motivation. The first occurs when "the semantic extension from the literal to the figurative scene is still transparent", e.g. *rock the boat*, where "the relationship between the literal scene (ROCK THE BOAT) and its figurative interpretation (SPOIL A COMFORTABLE SITUATION) seems well motivated" (2006:113). Constituental motivation occurs when "constituents possess *lexicalised figurative senses* that also appear outside the phrasal context of the idiom" (2006:113). An example of this is the expression *swallow a bitter pill*:

> *Swallow* has the lexicalised figurative sense 'accept patiently'. This meaning is present in idioms like *swallow a bitter pill* (accept an unpleasant fact) or *strain at a gnat and swallow a camel* (accept a major wrong thing while being concerned with a minor one).
>
> (Langlotz, 2006:113)

As far as analysability is concerned, Langlotz states (2006:117) that it "is most straightforward for idioms that feature constituental motivation; via the lexicalised figurative senses direct correspondences can be established between the literal and the idiomatic meaning". As an example, he mentions (2006:118) the fully analysable expression *swallow the bitter pill*, where *swallow* means "accept" and *(bitter) pill* means "unpleasant fact" outside the context of the idiom. The idiom *kick the bucket*, on the other hand, is unanalysable, since "the literal scene consists of a force-dynamic relationship between an agent (the subject) and a patient (*the bucket*)", whereas "the idiomatic meaning ['die'] is *not* force-dynamic" but rather "conceived as an experiencer's non-volitional, inherent change of state; it is an intransitive process" (2006:117).

Langlotz also considers the conceptual patterns that shape the semantic structure of many idioms, thus enabling language users to motivate and analyse the meaning of such idioms. These conceptual patterns form the basis on which the literal scene of an idiom can be associated with its idiomatic scene. He identifies the following conceptual patterns:

1) *Conceptual metaphor*: Langlotz (2006:121) states that "psycholinguistic experiments prove conceptual metaphors to be one central cognitive parameter for the motivation of semantic regularities in idioms". One or more conceptual metaphor(s) may underlie a number of idioms that "can be assumed to be linked associatively". The coherent conceptual representation of these metaphors shapes the internal semantic structure of idioms possessing a common element from such a conceptual metaphor. As an example, he mentions the general metaphorical model GOAL-ORIENTED HUMAN (INTER)ACTIONS ARE CARD GAMES, "on the basis of which [...] individual idioms are conceptually connected", e.g. *the ace in your hand, have an ace in the hole, play your ace, hold all the aces, hold/keep one's cards close to one's chest/vest, pass the buck, the buck stops here, have a card up your sleeve, lay your cards on the table*, and *stack the cards*.

2) *Metonymy*: Langlotz mentions (2006:122-123) the concept of STUPIDITY, which is metonymically characterised as an effect of the "abnormal" constitution of parts of body where mental activities supposedly take place

72

(HEAD),[107] underlying idioms such as *be soft in the head, have a shallow brain, be a numbskull, be addle-pated*, and *be dead from the neck up*. He points out (2006:124) that one of the primary factors leading to opacity is the loss of the linking domain in metonymy-based idioms, as they "can only be transparent as long as the relevant knowledge that underlies the metonymic shift remains accessible to the language users".

3) *Emblems*: Langlotz (2006:124) indicates that "emblems transport stereo-typical cultural information which can serve as a direct basis for idiom motivation". He mentions the example of WOLF as a cultural stereotype for DANGER, HUNGER, and EVIL. This emblem underlies idioms like *a wolf in sheep's clothing, cry wolf, throw somebody to the wolves*, and *keep the wolf from the door*.

4) *Conceptual blending*: Some idioms are based on a blending of metaphors leading to a literal meaning that has no basis in real-life experience. These idioms "evoke hybrid images" (2006:125) that are formed by blend-ing distinct concepts. Langlotz gives the example of the idiomatic ex-pression *like greased lightning*, which constitutes a blending of the LIGHTNING-frame and the MACHINE-frame "to create a hybrid but concrete model for extreme velocity".

Having established the conceptual patterns underlying figuration, Langlotz proceeds to identify different types of figuration in idioms. He proposes (2006:128-133)[108] the following classification which serves as basis for his analysis of idiom variation:

1) *Core types*: These are idioms with an inconspicuous, fully compositional literal meaning, including the following subtypes:

---

[107] One can speak of conceptual metonymy here, where the associative linkage is based on some conventionalised associative relationship.

[108] I provide a summary of his discussion of a few pages in the form of this grid, mostly quoting Langlotz verbatim.

a) Idioms with literal compositionality, (global) motivation and figurative-literal isomorphism,[109] e.g.: *grasp the nettle, take the bull by the horns, spill the beans, burst/prick the bubble, upset the applecart,* etc.;

b) Idioms with literal compositionality, global motivation, constituental motivation, and figurative-literal isomorphism, e.g.: *swallow the bitter pill, jump on the bandwagon, make headway,* etc.;

c) Idioms with literal compositionality and global motivation, e.g.: *grit one's teeth, spin one's wheels, turn the page, go round in circles,* etc.;

d) Idioms with literal compositionality but with neither motivation nor isomorphism, e.g.: *kick the bucket, pop your clogs, bite the dust, buy the farm, carry the can, trail your coat,* etc.

The idioms in this last category are opaque for one of the following reasons:

   i. The idiomatic meaning cannot be understood relative to the literal meaning because it is impossible to activate entrenched metaphors, metonymies, or emblems relative to which this link could be established.

   ii. It is impossible to evoke a literal meaning domain on the basis of which conceptual correspondences to the idiomatic meaning could be established.

   iii. The constituents do not have independent figurative meanings that can be activated to link the two meanings in the absence of salient conceptual or image-schematic correspondences.

2) *Marginal types*: These are idioms with conspicuous or non-compositional literal meanings, including the following subtypes:

---

[109] Langlotz (2006:115) explains that "isomorphism captures the degree of analysability between the idiomatic meaning [...] and the idiomatic constituents". He provides the example of the expression *rock the boat*: "[This idiom] is isomorphic because its idiomatic meaning (SPOIL A COMFORTABLE SITUATION) can be transferred to the constituents *rock* and *boat*. *Boat* corresponds to the comfortable situation, while *rock* matches the idea of spoiling this situation."

a) Idioms with a compositional but experientially unrealistic literal meaning: blended metaphorical idioms, e.g.: *cook the books, rack one's brains, like greased lightning,* etc.;

b) Partly compositional idioms, e.g.: *know one's onion* [sic]*, look daggers at sb., rain cats and dogs,* etc.;

c) Literally non-compositional, constructionally idiosyncratic idioms, e.g.: *trip the light fantastic, come up roses, shoot the breeze, go places,* etc.;

d) Literally non-compositional idioms with cranberry morphs, e.g.: *the whole kit and caboodle, put the kibosh on sth, cock a snook, blow the gaff,* etc.;

e) Idioms with absent literal compositionality due to the presence of highly specialised word meanings and garden-path constituents,[110] e.g.: *hide your light under a bushel, have had one's chips, across the board, chomp at the bit, kick the bucket*, etc.

For the remainder of his book, Langlotz focuses on idiom variation and variability, demonstrating the following:

---

[110] Langlotz (2006:133-134) describes *garden path constituents* as follows:

A garden-path constituent is a word that possesses a number of polysemous or homonymous meanings. If, for this constituent, the language user is unable to activate the specific sub-sense by which the idiomatic meaning can be motivated, global motivation is blocked. [...] From a cognitive-linguistic point of view, constituents like *bit* work as garden-path constituents: they are likely to mislead a language user in the process of (re)motivating corresponding idioms. Assuming that the speaker does not know the etymological basis for *champ/chomp at the bit* and *get the bit between your teeth*, he or she is very likely to evoke the prototypical meaning of *bit* (small amount of sth.) to make sense of these expressions. However, in doing so, one is led up a semantic garden path and, as a result, becomes unable to motivate the expression.

> The semantic and the formal structure of a given idiom define its variation poten-
> tial and constrain the ways of how the idiom's base-form can be altered in a con-
> crete context of use. To the extent that the association between the literal and the
> idiomatic scene can be motivated and analysed on the basis of underlying concep-
> tual patterns of semantic extension, the cognitive micro-model can be systemati-
> cally manipulated. In the absence of motivating conceptual bases, an idiom's po-
> tential for systematic variation is restricted.

(Langlotz, 2006:193-194)

Although idiom variation falls outside the scope of this study, Langlotz's discussion is nevertheless most useful in that he provides a coherent theoretical framework "that can adequately handle the structural and semantic heterogeneity of idiomatic constructions" (2006:54).

Langlotz's (2006:5) definition of *idiom* supports most of the preliminary idiom characteristics, albeit with some qualifications. He seems to agree with *multi-word character* ("composed of two or more lexical items") and *restricted variability* ("considerably fixed and collocationally restricted") as viewed by most other scholars and also defined in this study. He also seems to hold that figurative meaning is closely tied to *semantic non-compositionality* ("features figuration, i.e. its semantic structure is derivationally non-compositional").

Over and above these characteristics, Langlotz adds *conventionalisation* ("institutionalised construction") to his definition. He states that idioms have "the composite structure of a phrase or semi-clause", but mentions that he has adopted this view for practical reasons; as indicated earlier, he grants idiom status to idiomatic compounds (e.g. *chatterbox*). He also mentions *constructional idiosyncrasy* and a *primarily ideational discourse function* as idiom characteristics.

When stating that Langlotz agrees to idiomatic meaning as figurative and therefore non-compositional, one must be careful to point out that he strongly disagrees with the traditional view of idioms as semantically simple expressions functioning as lexical units. Rather, he views compositionality as a continuum, with many idioms being analysable to a lesser or greater degree. In line with most other authors, he does not mention picturesqueness as an idiom characteristic.

2.2.14   Marija Omazić (2008)

Along the same lines as Langlotz (2006), Omazić discusses idioms from a cognitive linguistic perspective, paying special attention to their processing, in

her 2008 article entitled *Processing of idioms and idiom modifications*. Although she offers no definition of *idiom*, her exposition of idiom processing makes a valuable contribution to this discussion, especially in terms of understanding the interpretation of idioms and, consequently, semantic non-compositionality.

Omazić proposes a theoretical framework that seems to successfully combine various views on how idiomatic meaning is to be accounted for, e.g. etymology, metaphor, and conceptual integration. According to her, the interpretation of an idiom depends on a combination of some or all of the following interrelated factors (Omazić, 2008:72):

1) Cognitive mechanisms

   a) Conceptual metaphor and metonymy

   b) Conceptual mapping

2) Knowledge of the language

   a) Semantics

   b) Syntax

   c) Etymology

   d) Discourse analysis (contextual clues)

3) Knowledge of the world

   a) Cultural and historical background

   b) Imagery

   c) Symbolism

Such processing (i.e. interpretation of an idiom's meaning) constitutes numerous processes occurring in real time rather than a single activity (2008:76).

Omazić then considers the interpretation of modified idioms. She argues that "none of the models proposed for idiom processing fully accounts for the specificities of processing idiom modification" (2008:72). Thus, "the entire process of modification processing is possible thanks to the same factors as play a role in the interpretation of idioms, but reinforced by the process of comparison" (2008:73). In this regard, Omazić argues that conceptual blending "is not only a meaning construction process but also an 'unpacking mechanism' for interpreting idiom modifications" (2008:76). She proposes the following sequence for processing idiom modifications (2008:76-77):

1) Recognition of the modification (using lexical, structural, semantic, or conceptual links)

2) Retrieval of the original

3) Comparison of the original idiom and the modification (using knowledge of the language, knowledge of the world, and cognitive modelling)

4) Recognition of the communicative intent

5) Understanding of idiom modification

Omazić also discusses the limitations of idiom modification, but these fall outside the scope of the present study and will not be presented here.

Omazić's discussion of the processing and modification of idioms reveals certain characteristics that she seems to accept for idioms. The *multi-word character* of idioms is clearly implied in her discussion of processing the meanings of the constituent parts of idioms. As in other cases (e.g. Langlotz, 2006), it can be cautiously claimed that she subscribes to *semantic non-compositionality*, albeit with certain caveats. Omazić certainly does not agree with the view that idioms function as lexical units (as proposed by e.g. McDonnell, 1982).

2.2.15   Sylviane Granger and Magali Paquot (2008)

In their chapter entitled *Disentangling the phraseological web*, Granger and Paquot (2008) give an overview of the field of phraseology. They point out that the terminological confusion existing in the field of phraseology "hinders communication between linguists and generally increases the impression of fuzziness in the field" and that "this impression is amplified by the unwieldy terminology employed, with different terms covering the same units and the same terms used to denote quite different units" (2008:28).[III]

[III]   The standardisation of terminology lies outside the scope of the present study, but it is important to note that much confusion is caused by the seemingly perennial challenge of varying terminology, as already indicated by e.g. McDonnell (1982) and Čermák (2001).

One aspect of their work pertinent to this discussion is the categorisation they propose for multi-word units.[112] According to this classification, there are three major categories of phraseological units (2008:42), viz.:

1) ***Referential phrasemes:*** These convey a content message, referring to objects, phenomena, or real-life facts. Examples of referential phrasemes are lexical collocations, idioms, and irreversible bi- and trinomials.

2) ***Textual phrasemes:*** These are used to structure and organise the content of any type of discourse, such as texts. Textual phrasemes include complex prepositions, complex conjunctions, and linking adverbials.

3) ***Communicative phrasemes:*** These are used to express feelings or beliefs, or to address interlocutors in order to focus their attention, include them as discourse participants, or influence them. Examples of communicative phrasemes are speech act formulae, attitudinal formulae, and proverbs.

Of these three major categories, the one of interest to us is referential phrasemes, as it includes idioms. In order to indicate how Granger and Paquot distinguish idioms from other referential phrasemes, this category is presented here as it is in their chapter (2008:43):

Category	Definition and illustration
(Lexical) collocations	(Lexical) collocations are usage-determined or preferred syntagmatic relations between two lexemes in a specific syntactic pattern. Both lexemes make an isolable semantic contribution to the word combination but they do not have the same status. Semantically autonomous, the 'base' of a collocation is selected first by a language user for its independent meaning. The second element, i.e. the 'collocate' or 'collocator', is selected by and semantically dependent on the 'base'. Examples: *heavy rain, closely linked, apologize profusely*.

---

[112] This categorisation is an extended version of the classification presented by Burger (1998).

Idioms

The category of idioms is restricted to phrasemes that are constructed around a verbal nucleus. Idioms are characterized by their semantic non-compositionality, which can be the result of a metaphorical process. Lack of flexibility and marked syntax are further indications of their idiomatic status. Examples: *to spill the beans, to let the cat out of the bag, to bark up the wrong tree*.

Irreversible bi- and trinomials

Irreversible bi- and trinomials are fixed sequences of two or three word forms that belong to the same part-of-speech category and are linked by the conjunction 'and' or 'or'. Examples: *bed and breakfast, kith and kin, left, right and centre*.

Similes

Similes are sequences of words that function as stereotyped comparisons. They typically consist of sequences following the frames '*as* ADJ *as* (DET) NOUN' and 'VERB like a NOUN'. Examples: *as old as the hills, to swear like a trooper*.

Compounds

Compounds are morphologically made up of two elements which have independent status outside these word combinations. They can be written separately, with a hyphen or as one orthographic word. They resemble single words in that they carry meaning as a whole and are characterized by high degrees of inflexibility, viz. set order and non-interruptibility of their parts. Examples: *black hole, goldfish, blow-dry*.

Grammatical collocations

Grammatical collocations are restricted combinations of a lexical and a grammatical word, typically verb/noun/adjective + preposition, e.g. *depend on, cope with, a contribution to, afraid of, angry at, interested in*. The term 'grammatical collocation' is borrowed from Benson et al. (1986) but our definition is slightly more restricted as these authors also use the term to refer to other valency patterns, e.g. avoid + *-ing* form, which we do not consider to be part of the phraseological spectrum.

Phrasal verbs

Phrasal verbs are combinations of verbs and adverbial particles. Examples: *blow up, make out, crop up*.

80

Granger and Paquot's definition of *idiom* is generally in line with what other scholars propose. *Semantic non-compositionality* is the main characteristic that they claim for idiom status. They also agree with *restricted variability* ("lack of flexibility") as a possible indication of idiomaticity. According to their view, *marked syntax* is also often indicative of idioms.[113] They agree that idioms have a *multi-word character*, as "phraseological units are made up of at least two words" (2008:32). It might be claimed that they also agree with the *unit status* of idioms, insofar as it is implied by the concept of *phraseological unit* (or *phraseme*), which is the very focus of their research in the field of phraseology. Another condition for idiom status presented by Granger and Paquot is the *presence, even the centrality, of a verb*. This is clear from their description of idioms as "phrasemes constructed around a verbal nucleus" (2008:43). Although many scholars (e.g. Wood, 1986; Fernando, 1996; Langlotz, 2006) consider non-verbal phrases such as compounds to be part of the category *idiom*, Granger and Paquot's classification does not allow that. I think that their classification of phrasemes is significant in terms of promoting greater uniformity of terminology. Their distinction between idioms and other referential phrasemes, even textual and communicative phrasemes, can prove useful in defining *idiom*, generally, but also for the purposes of the present study. More will be said about this in Chapter 3.

2.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, an overview was given of various scholars' discussion of idioms. From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that the concept of *idiom* is in many ways a bone of contention among the various linguistic schools as far as the term and also its precise delimitation are concerned. However, it also became apparent that there are a number of idiom characteristics about which many scholars agree. In Chapter 3, some contributions in the field of Biblical Hebrew will be discussed, after which I will turn my attention to formulating a working definition of *idiom* for this study, based on the theoretical considerations presented in these two chapters.

---

[113]   See Svensson (2004).

Chapter 3

IDIOM RESEARCH IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

3.1 Introduction

The discussion in the previous chapter concerned the theory of idioms in general, focusing mainly on research done in modern European languages (e.g. English, German, Hungarian, and Czech). Special attention was paid to the various authors' definition of *idiom* and their views on the preliminary characteristics of idioms that had been identified in Chapter 1. Additional characteristics proposed by some authors were also noted. Some of these characteristics (e.g. multi-word status, non-compositionality of meaning, conventionalisation, and unit status) seem useful for identifying idioms in texts.

The possibility of determining these factors, however, presupposes a familiarity with the language, which we simply do not possess in the case of Biblical Hebrew. Although multi-word status poses no serious problems, conventionalisation is not as easily identified in the text of the Hebrew Bible. Bearing in mind that conventionalisation is not merely a matter of frequency, but rather of conforming to usage so that these expressions do not attract attention (see Donalies, 1994:342; Fernando, 1996:251),[1] it is obvious that we do not possess the means to readily discover conventionalised expressions in a language with no living mother-tongue speakers and only a limited written corpus. The fact that the meaning of some Biblical Hebrew words remains unclear or even unknown to modern scholarship means that semantic non-compositionality and unit status are sometimes equally difficult to determine for certain expressions in the Hebrew Bible.

In this chapter, a survey of research on idioms in Biblical Hebrew is offered in order to indicate how scholars of Biblical Hebrew have dealt with these issues. The first section contains an overview of a few important studies on idiomatic

---

[1]   However, see also Gries (2008:5), who considers "an expression a phraseologism if its observed frequency of occurrence is larger than its expected one".

82

usage in Biblical Hebrew, paying special attention to the authors' definition of *idiom* and the characteristics they propose for idioms. In the final section of the chapter, I will conclude this theoretical discussion started in Chapter 2 and formulate a working definition of *idiom* for the purpose of identifying idioms in the Hebrew Bible.

3.2 Review of idiom research in Biblical Hebrew

The role of figuration (e.g. metaphor, metonymy, emblems) in the motivation of idiomatic meaning is discussed by a number of authors reviewed in the previous chapter. The Hebrew Bible features a lot of figurative language, and many of its idiomatic expressions can be shown to have their basis in conceptual metaphors, metonymy, etc. Commenting on the often picturesque nature of Biblical Hebrew, Davidson and Mauchline (1966:6-7) write:

> The notable absence of abstract words, the practice of using a metaphor from everyday life in place of an adverb of manner, the use of an auxiliary verb rather than an adverb to describe how an action was done repeatedly, or quickly, or slowly, etc., and the significant fact that not a few nouns have a primary and a secondary meaning, such as those which mean nose and anger, heat and wrath, weight and honour, height and pride, smoothness and flattery, etc., and other characteristics which might be noted, give a colourfulness, a directness and a concreteness to Hebrew which make it a vigorous and effective instrument of communication and make it difficult for anyone using the language to wrap his thought in verbal obscurities or to darken it with complicated modes of expression of uncertain intent.

It is clear that Davidson and Mauchline have the highest regard for the ancient language of the Hebrew Bible. Although Biblical Hebrew is not especially different from other natural languages, both ancient and modern, I agree that "not a few [Hebrew] nouns have a primary and a secondary meaning" (as do, of course, nouns in other languages too).[2] *Primary meaning* in this context corresponds to what some authors (e.g. Strässler, 1982; Wood, 1986) call *literal meaning* ("nose", "heat", "weight", "height", and "smoothness") and *secondary meaning* to what they call *idiomatic meaning* ("anger", "wrath", "honour", "pride", and "flattery"). These "secondary" or "idiomatic" meanings often

---

[2]   De Blois (2000:22) also indicates, as a structural phenomenon in Biblical Hebrew, that "many words that basically denote a particular *Object* are also used to refer to the type of activity that that *Object* is normally used for. In addition to this, there are words in Hebrew that technically should be considered *Events*, but that — in certain contexts — are used to denote the most prominent *Object* in the argument structure of that *Event*."

indicate the presence of conceptual metaphors in Biblical Hebrew. ANGER IS HEAT, for instance, is a conceptual metaphor attested to in various unrelated languages such as English, Japanese, Hungarian, and Wolof (Kövecses, 1995:187). Expressions such as דבר על־לב פ׳ (2 Sam 19:8) "reassure/encourage someone" (lit. "speak on someone's heart") seem to have become conventionalised in Biblical Hebrew and may therefore be called *idioms*. Some scholars have been intrigued by Biblical Hebrew idioms such as this, and it is to their work that I now turn my attention.

To my knowledge, not much extensive research has been done on Biblical Hebrew idioms. I will briefly consider four authors who have focused on various aspects of this subject. As in the previous chapter, my aim here is not to provide an in-depth critique of these authors, but rather to present an overview of such work as has been done in the field, with special focus on the definition and identification of idioms.

3.2.1 Irene Lande (1949)

Lande's book *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im Alten Testament* is a very useful compilation of formulaic expressions in Biblical Hebrew. She presents the Biblical Hebrew formulaic expressions which she has identified in the following main categories:[3]

1) Encounters

   a) Greeting, e.g. שלום לך (Judg 19:20) "May you have prosperity", i.e. "No danger threatens you" (lit. "Peace/prosperity to you")

   b) Starting a conversation, e.g. שמעו־נא (Gen 37:6) "Listen, please!"

   c) Calling to someone, e.g. משה משה (Ex 3:4) "Moses! Moses!"[4]

   d) Forms of address, e.g. אחי (2 Sam 13:12) "My brother"

---

[3] This representation of Lande's categorisation is a summary that I have made of pp. 1-114 of her book. Under every category, I have chosen a single example from the many she discusses. The English translations provided are my own, based on the German equivalents that Lande provides for every Hebrew formulaic expression.

[4] Lande (1949:20) points out that when God calls to someone, the addressee's name is often repeated (as in the example cited here), whereas this usage never occurs in other, everyday, conversations recorded in the Hebrew Bible.

e) Soliciting background information, e.g. מי שמך (Judg 13:17) "What is your name?" (lit. "Who is your name?")

f) Invitation, e.g. סורה (Judg 4:18) "Come [on] in"[5] (lit. "Turn aside")

2) Conversations

a) Continuation of a conversation, e.g. ועתה (Judg 6:13) "And now" or "But now"

b) Reviving a conversation, e.g. ראה (Gen 41:41) "See"

c) Various types of emphasis and comparison, e.g. אין זה כי אם (Gen 28:17) "That is nothing other than..." (lit. "This is not [anything] but...")

d) "Yes" and "No" in a Hebrew conversation, e.g. לא (Judg 12:5) "No"

e) Hebrews referring to themselves in conversation, e.g. עבדך (2 Sam 9:2) "(Yes,) your slave" (lit. "Your servant", used rather than saying, "Yes, I am")

f) Referring to a third party in Old Testament conversation, e.g. זה משה האיש (Ex 32:1) "This man Moses"

g) Summarising the message and the conversation, e.g. כה אמר (Gen 32:5) "Thus says ..."

h) Closing a conversation, e.g. רב־לך (Deut 3:26) "I have had enough" (lit. "Enough for you")

3) Formulaic expressions for moods, emotions, and feelings

a) Well-being and state of health, e.g. מה השלום (2 Kgs 9:22) "What, peace!" (lit. "What, the peace?")

b) Wishes impossible or unlikely to be fulfilled, e.g. מי יתן (Ex 16:3) "If only ..." (lit. "Who would give ...?")

c) Reassurance, e.g. אל־תירא (2 Kgs 6:16) "Do not be afraid"

d) Favour, e.g. מצא חן בעיני (1 Sam 16:22) "find popularity, favour with someone" (lit. "find favour in someone's eyes")

---

5   Lande (1949:43-44) translates סורה with the German *einkehren*. The English equivalent "come [on] in" should be understood here as an invitation to stop over in someone's house or tent for a while to eat, rest, etc. The archaic "Tarry awhile" would perhaps better convey this meaning.

e) Approval and disapproval, e.g. לא־טוב (Neh 5:9) "It is not right" (lit. "It is not good")

f) Negative differentiation between people, e.g. מה־לי ולך (Judg 11:12) "What is it now between you and me?" (lit. "What is there for me and for you?")

g) Reproach, e.g. מה־תעשׂה (Ecc 8:4) "What are you doing?"

h) Disparagement, e.g. מי אנכי...ומי ביתי (2 Sam 7:18) "Who am I ... and who is my family?"

i) Admiration and self-consciousness, e.g. אישׁ אשׁר כמני (Gen 44:15) "a man such as I" (lit. "a man that [is] like me")

j) Stating common political interest, e.g. כמני כמוך כעמי כעמך כסוסי כסוסיך (1 Kgs 22:4) "As am I, so you are to be, as are my people, so your people are to be, as are my horses, so your horses are to be" (lit. "As I [am], so you, as my people [are], so your people, as my horses [are], so your horses")

k) Requests and thanks, e.g. הואל־נא (Judg 19:6) "Please"

l) Blessings, e.g. ברוך אתה (1 Sam 26:25) "Blessed be you"

m) Curses and oaths, e.g. כה יעשׂה אלהים וכה יוסיף (1 Sam 3:17) "May God do so (to you) and may he so repeat it!"

4) Formulaic expressions for objective states of affairs

a) Small indefinite quantities, e.g. שׁנים שׁלשׁה סריסים (2 Kgs 9:32) "some courtiers" (lit. "two, three eunuchs")

b) Reference, e.g. מי אפוה הוא (Gen 27:33) "Who on earth was it that ...?" (lit. "Who, then, that...?")

One may disagree with Lande's system of categorisation or the titles given to the various categories (and her work is by now admittedly quite outdated), but her book remains, after many years, a thorough treatment of those expressions she discusses.

Lande's book does not offer much theorising in terms of defining *idiom* apart from the short introduction in which she delimits the subject of her study, viz. formulaic expressions. Although her understanding of *formula* is not exactly in line with some of the idiom characteristics discussed so far, it is clear that her

concept of *formulaic expressions* (German *formelhafte Wendungen*) is, to some extent, similar to the notion of *idiom*.[6] Given this overlap between Lande's formulae and idioms as the object of the present study, some of her comments are relevant to the present discussion.

Lande (1949:ix) explains the difference between *formula* and *expression* as follows: A formula gives expression to a situation[7] which frequently occurs, and consequently — through frequent use — becomes a fixed expression. She points out, however, that the boundary between formula and expression is not always clearly defined. According to her, formulas are found most frequently in the colloquial, spoken language, since the situations described by those same fixed expressions are mostly encountered in daily life. From there, the expressions make their way into the language of poetry, ritual, reporting, and historiography. However, she is careful to point out that this does not mean that no formulaic expressions could originate in these latter areas of language usage. Lande (1949:x) considers formulaic expressions as expressions whose meaning is not immediately apparent at a first reading. She does not focus on figures of speech as such, unless they have become fixed expressions referring to frequently recurring speech situations, i.e. unless they have become conventionalised.

It is interesting to note that Lande seems to regard conventionalisation (*fixed expressions referring to frequently recurring situations*) as essential to formulaic expressions, although she offers no suggestion as to how one is to go about to determine this in Biblical Hebrew. She holds (1949:ix) that a single word can also function as a formula, e.g. the invitation סורה (Judg 4:18) "come in" or "please come on in" (see Lande, 1949:44). Expressions of this kind (consisting of a single word) would not be considered idioms according to the generally accepted multi-word status of idioms.[8]

Lande's view that the meaning of formulaic expressions in Biblical Hebrew is not immediately apparent at a first reading seems to agree with the notion of

---

[6]   Lande's *formulaic expressions* cover a wider range of phraseological units than *idioms* in the strict sense of the word, probably fitting in Granger and Paquot's (2008) category *communicative phrasemes*, including *speech act formulae* and *attitudinal formulae* (see ch. 2, section 2.2.15).

[7]   *Situation* in Lande's work seems to refer to specific socio-cultural conversational contexts, e.g. greeting, ending a conversation, blessings, and oaths.

[8]   See the discussion on multi-word character in section 3.3.1.1 further below.

semantic non-compositionality, since the literal (i.e. compositional) meaning should, under normal circumstances, be apparent at a first reading.[9] Like a number of other scholars, Lande gives *conventionalisation* a central place in her view of idioms (or rather, formulaic expressions).

One of the preliminary characteristics of idioms put forward in the previous chapters, with which Lande definitely disagrees, is multi-word character. As indicated above, she holds that a single word can constitute a formulaic expression.

3.2.2 Jean-Marc Babut (1999)

Babut's *Idiomatic expressions of the Hebrew Bible* (1999)[10] is the most comprehensive treatment of Biblical Hebrew idioms that I have come across to date. He states (1999:3) that, to his knowledge, "there have been no in-depth studies devoted to idiomatic expressions in Biblical Hebrew" and that his study "explores practically virgin territory and applies new methods of investigation" (1999:10). He mentions two comprehensive studies of which he is aware, viz. König's *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die biblische Literatur* (1900) and Lande's *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im Alten Testament* (1949). Concerning these, Babut points out (1999:7-8) that the constructions with which they deal are not always proper idioms, that is to say "most of them can be understood perfectly well on the basis of their constituent parts". He also observes that, in spite of their great detail, these works lack the solid base with which modern linguistics could provide them, and as a consequence their proposals are almost always open to question. Elaborating on the need for research on idioms in Biblical Hebrew, he indicates (1999:62) that many of the expressions which he has identified as idioms "have already received scholarly attention, but they are rarely treated as idiomatic expressions as such, that is, as *semantic units*" (emphasis in the original — CMvdH). This can be seen in many of the modern translations[11] of the Bible, in which the literal meaning[12] of many

---

[9] That is, to an L1 speaker.

[10] This work was first submitted as a doctoral thesis in French, entitled *Expressions idiomatiques de l'hébreu biblique*.

[11] Babut does not mention whether he is referring to formal equivalent translations or to translations in general. It would certainly seem that he has in mind formal equivalent translations, and very likely French ones, although he does not say so explicitly.

[12] Babut (1999:62) calls this the *transparent meaning*.

such expressions is rendered, leaving the reader to guess what these expressions actually mean.

Babut's view of idiomatic expressions does not differ substantially from the general view of idioms as discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. He proposes (1999:27) three criteria for identifying idioms, viz. exocentric meaning, relatively strong stereotypicality, and monosemy, each of which will be briefly discussed here.

According to Babut (1999:20), exocentric meaning is an essential characteristic of idioms. The meaning of a compound word or an expression is exocentric when it cannot be derived from the meanings of its constituent elements, i.e. the word or expression is semantically non-compositional. Conversely, he views *endocentric meaning* as the meaning at which one arrives when simply adding together the meanings of the elements in a compound word or expression.[13] The endocentric meaning is predictable (see Makkai, 1972:115-116), and for that reason Babut (1999:20) also calls it the *transparent meaning*. An expression with an endocentric meaning is — in the terminology which I have used thus far — semantically compositional.[14] It is clear, then, that Babut regards non-compositionality as essential to idiom status. For that reason, he holds (1999:21) that expressions whose meaning can be deduced from their constituent parts are not idioms, e.g. אשר תמצא ידך "whatever opportunity presents itself" (lit. "whatever your hand will find").[15]

Babut (1999:16) points out that the connection between the exocentric and the transparent (or endocentric) meanings varies from expression to expression. In

---

[13] From a cognitive linguistic viewpoint, such an "additive" conceptual process is questionable, because different senses within a word's frame of reference interact with its context to specify one that is consistent with the mutually specified senses of other words.

[14] In order to avoid an overdose of terminology it might at first seem advantageous to use the well-known terms *figurative* and *literal* for *exocentric* and *endocentric* respectively. Although these terms overlap to a considerable extent, such a terminological substitution will not be very helpful in discussing Babut's work. In his classification of Biblical Hebrew idioms (Babut, 1999:275), which will be discussed further on, he distinguishes "non-figurative" as well as "figurative" expressions under the heading "endocentric meaning". It would certainly sound nonsensical to talk about non-figurative and figurative literal expressions!

[15] As was indicated in the previous chapter, compositionality constitutes a continuum. This example quoted by Babut is a case in point: The meaning of *whatever your hand may find* may not be equally clear to everyone, for example, the biblical scholar as distinct from an ordinary reader.

the case of an expression such as ׳גחלים חתה על־ראש פ (Prov 25:22) "take up hot coals on sb's head" the transparent meaning seems clear, but the exocentric meaning is indecipherable.[16] In other expressions like הסיך את־רגליו (1 Sam 24:4) "relieve oneself", "evacuate (the bowels)" (lit. "cover one's feet"), the connection between the transparent and global[17] (exocentric) meaning is relatively easy to discern via two series of metonymy: When a man wearing a robe crouches, his feet are covered, and a man crouches down in order to defecate. Babut (1999:17) points out that idioms of this kind function like simple metaphors: "The phrase develops just as if a supplementary semantic component of purely cultural origin had been added." In the case of ׳פרש כנפו על־פ (Ruth 3:9) "commit oneself [man] to marry sb [woman]" (lit. "spread one's wing over [a woman]"), he indicates (1999:18) a sharp discontinuity between the transparent (endocentric) and global (exocentric) meanings. Here we see a double metaphorical process: *Wing* corresponds to the flap of a man's coat,[18] and the gesture of raising the arm to lift the coat flap has the symbolic significance of the man's commitment to marry the woman.[19] Babut sees the difference between this type of idiom and metaphor in the multi-word character of the idiom.[20]

Babut (1999:18-19) quotes another example to show that some expressions can be considered idiomatic only under specific conditions: ׳בוא אל־פ (2 Sam 12:24) "come/go to sb [woman]" (sexual relations implied). Expressions of this type are unidirectional. In this instance, the agent is always male and the recipient female. If a woman is said to ׳באה אל־פ ("come/go to sb") there is never a sexual connotation, i.e. only the literal meaning is activated.

---

[16] Babut is obviously thinking of the expression *per se*. If factors like the co-text and context are considered, a fair guess as to the meaning of such expressions can mostly be made.

[17] Babut seems to use the terms *exocentric meaning* and *global meaning* interchangeably, as he does with *endocentric meaning* and *transparent meaning*. He explains (1999:285) the term *global meaning* as "the non-additive meaning of the whole expression".

[18] So Babut (1999:18), but referring to "the hem of a man's garment" (see HALOT, 1999:486; BDB, 2000:489) would perhaps be better.

[19] There are, of course, other interpretations for this controversial passage (see De Waard & Nida, 1991:49, 52), but the point here is discussing Babut's explanation of the idiom's exocentric meaning as based on two metaphors.

[20] This distinction is not quite clear to me. Although an idiom always consists of two or more lexical items, I am not aware of any rule that restricts the expression of metaphors to monolexemes.

As mentioned earlier, Babut considers the exocentric character of an expression's meaning as an essential characteristic of idiomaticity. He does not grant expressions such as חרה אפו ("his nose became hot", i.e. "his anger broke out"[21]), idiom status, because, as he points out (1999:20-21), "אף used in the sense of 'anger' is found 210 times as opposed to only 25 times in the sense of 'nose', so it can be said to be a dead metaphor".[22] By the same token he does not consider the expression בחן לבות וכליות ("examine hearts and kidneys")[23] to be an idiom. He states that this expression has no exocentric meaning, since לב and כליות are used in their conventional metaphorical[24] senses ("centre of personality" and "centre of conscience"). He observes that this expression is also not stereotypical (i.e. not restricted in terms of variability): In Jer 17:10,12 and Ps 26:2 the elements are arranged differently without any apparent change in meaning.

Before moving on to a discussion of Babut's view of stereotypicality (or restricted variability), it is worth noting the other types of expressions mentioned by Babut which have exocentric meaning but are not regarded as idioms, viz. unitary complexes and composites. According to Nida (1975:114), "unitary complexes consist of two or more potential free forms, that is, words, in which the combination as a whole operates differently from the semantic class of the head word", e.g. *pineapple* which is not a kind of apple. Babut (1999:28) cites Biblical Hebrew examples of unitary complexes such as אור פנים "light of the face" (not a light, but benevolence), or אם הדרך "mother of the road" (not a mother, but a fork [in a road]). However, he points out (1999:62) that Nida's definition does not make a clear enough distinction between idioms

---

[21] See HALOT (1999:351) "his wrath was kindled" and BDB (2000:354) "(one's) anger was kindled, burned".

[22] By this, Babut claims that the expression has become so conventionalised or fossilised that it does not (necessarily) evoke the original image of, for example, a nose that feels hot when blood rushes to the face when a person becomes angry. It may, of course, be argued that the metaphor can be "revived" at any given time, e.g. through some literary play on the so-called "dead" meaning to emphasise a different concept. It may be mentioned at this point that, even with the "conventional metaphorical sense" of אף ("anger"), the expression "his anger became hot" is still non-literal and can for that reason be considered idiomatic.

[23] This phrase has been translated as "test the heart and mind" (NIV) or "test people's thoughts and feelings" (GNT).

[24] However, these extensions can also — more strictly — be termed metonymic extensions.

and unitary complexes; it could equally apply to idioms, since it simply describes a semantically exocentric phrase. Babut suggests that idioms differ from unitary complexes "in that they have a more elaborate syntactic structure".[25]

A second class of expressions with exocentric meanings regarded by Babut as non-idiomatic are *composites*. He observes (1999:30-31) that these are expressions which belong to the same semantic class as the head word, but "the lexical items in combination with the head word do not reveal the meaning of the expression as a whole". He mentions examples such as איש אף "aggressive person" (lit. "man of nose"), and חזק מצח "resolute", "obstinate" (lit. "hard of forehead").

Babut also draws the distinction between idioms and metaphor on the basis of exocentric meaning. He points out (1999:16) that a metaphor, like most idioms, has both a transparent — i.e. endocentric — and an exocentric meaning. However, unlike an idiom, a metaphor's exocentric meaning is not without motivation. Using the example of calling someone a "wolf", Babut (1999:15-16) demonstrates that different cultures may focus on different "supplementary features", i.e. different semantic components which are significant for the metaphor. *Wolf* has a set of basic features associated with it, e.g. "wild canine larger than a dog", "straight ears", "thick, pendulous tail", "lives in cold climates", etc. In the popular western mentality, implacable ferocity is associated with *wolf*, and so calling a person a wolf in the western context has a strongly derogatory connotation. However, this negative connotation is not in focus when Jacob says בנימין זאב יטרף "Benjamin is a ferocious wolf" (Gen 49:27). In this context, the Hebrew metaphor conveys the image of a formidable character. Although neither of these connotations is part of the "basic meaning" of *wolf*, they are not totally unrelated to the other components of its basic meaning. Therefore, both "implacable ferocity" and "formidable character" can be said to be semantically motivated.

A second characteristic of idioms identified by Babut is stereotyped character. This corresponds to what Wood (1986) calls *non-productivity in form*, and what has been called *restricted variability* in this study. Babut (1999:21) claims that

---

[25] I find this distinction rather vague — and for that reason unhelpful — due to the subjectivity involved in distinguishing between more and less elaborate syntactic structure. Babut may, of course, have certain specific criteria in mind, but he unfortunately does not mention any.

כנף "wing", for instance, always occurs in the dual, but in the expression (איש)
פרשׂ כנפו על-(אשה) "(man) spreads his wing over (woman)" it is always
singular.[26] The preposition על is also unique to this construction (the pair פרשׂ +
כנף takes אל or ל in all other cases). He points out (1999:22) that some idioms
are more variable than others, e.g. in the case of *gird the loins*, where *gird* can
be one of two verbs in Biblical Hebrew (חגר or אזר) and *loins* can also be one of
two nouns (מתנים or חלצים). Babut (1999:24) holds that idioms are characterised
by restricted variability, i.e. their form is more or less fixed. Restricted
variability does not exclude the requirements of inflection pertaining to verbs.
He explains (1999:25) that the formal difference between חגר מתניו and אזר חלציו
reflects a difference in exocentric meaning, where the former means "prepare
oneself for imminent departure" and the latter means "be prepared" (no
immediate departure implied). Their endocentric meanings, however, are more
or less the same, viz. "gird the loins". He maintains that the addition of a
complement changes the status and meaning of the phrase, since idioms do not
tolerate elaboration. Prov 31:17, for instance, says "she girds her loins with
strength" (חגרה בעוז מתניה). According to Babut, the addition of בעוז "with
strength" causes the idiom to break down.[27] Unlike exocentricity of meaning,
which to Babut is a *sine qua non* for idiom status, restricted variability is not
absolutely essential according to his view (although he obviously holds that
additions to, or elaborations on, idioms cause the idioms in question to break
down).[28] In Jer 1:17, where the formula is mixed (i.e. אזר מתניו), Babut holds that
it is the image which is restricted in terms of variation. As was mentioned in

---

[26] The use of the dual applies to the meaning of כנפים "wings" as a pair, although the
singular "wing" also occurs (e.g. 1 Kgs 6:24). In addition, כנף has the meaning of "edge,
extremity" (HALOT, 1999:486), e.g. of the earth (Is 24:16, singular; Job 37:3, plural) or of
a garment (1 Sam 24:5,6,12, singular). Babut's claim may perhaps be interpreted as
presupposing that the meaning "extremity" (of the earth, a garment) is a semantic
extension of the meaning "wing".

[27] Saying that this idiom breaks down (i.e. loses both its idiomatic status and meaning)
must not be stretched to imply the exclusion of the (hypothetical) possibility that the
extended construction can be a separate idiom with its own meaning. In fact, many
modern language versions translate this expression with the exocentric meaning
(according to Babut's terminology) of "she tackles her work diligently" or an equivalent
(e.g. NIV, GNB, REB, NAV, FCL, GCL, TPC). CEV has opted for rendering the whole
verse חגרה בעוז מתניה ותאמץ זרעותיה (lit. "she girds her loins with strength and she
strengthens her arms") as a single expression with an exocentric meaning, viz. "she
always works hard".

[28] Elsewhere Babut (1999:269) calls stereotypicality a "relative feature" of idioms.

Chapter 2, restricted variability does not seem to be a particularly helpful concept for identifying idioms in a limited corpus such as the Hebrew Bible.[29]

Babut (1999:26) states that idioms differ from most other lexemes insofar as they are monosemic. This means that if a fixed expression has more than one global meaning, it does not qualify for idiomaticity according to his view. He points out that an idiom can evolve with the language and thus have different meanings at different stages of the language's development.[30] However, he holds (1999:26) that "within each new stage of the language, the meaning remains univocal and unchanged". The same phrase can also have an endocentric meaning in some contexts and an exocentric meaning in other contexts, e.g. ראה פני פ׳ "see the face of sb" (endocentric meaning, Gen 31:2) as well as "be admitted into sb's presence" (exocentric meaning, Gen 32:21). Expressions such as the various Biblical Hebrew forms with the transparent meaning of *strike the hands*, which can mean "applaud", "hold in derision", or "show irritation", are not considered idiomatic according to this view.

Having set these parameters for idiom status, Babut proceeds to discuss the specific idioms which he studied as well as the way in which componential analysis was applied to determine their meaning. Of interest to this discussion on idiom theory is his proposed classification of Biblical Hebrew idioms.

Babut considers four possible types of classification: (i) a historical classification, (ii) a classification based on the relation between idiomatic expressions and their context, (iii) a classification based on meaning, and (iv) a classification based on structure. He points out (1999:272-273) that a historical classification is unsatisfactory, since it would yield only two categories with very different sizes, viz. expressions that have completely lost any endocentric meaning and those that still have a transparent meaning. Moreover, this would be impossible to determine with absolute certainty. Regarding a classification based on the relation between an idiomatic expression and its context,[31] he observes (1999:273) that such a classification, too, would have only two categories very different in size, viz. self-contained expressions ("expressions that make up a self-sufficient statement", e.g. איש לאהליו "every man for

---

[29] That is not to say, however, that I disagree with the claim that many idioms tolerate only limited formal variation.

[30] My view of this is discussed in more detail under section 3.3.1.12 below.

[31] More precisely, *co-text*.

94

himself!"), and conditional expressions ("expressions [that] are part of larger utterances and as such contribute to the meaning of the utterances", e.g. ראה פני פ׳ "see sb's face"). He points out that a classification based on meaning (according to conceptual fields[32]) will only be possible after the Biblical Hebrew speaker's view of the world, individual, society, etc. has been established. Since such a framework was not available to Babut,[33] he opts for a classification based on structure. His proposed classification is shown in the following table (1999:275):

---

[32] According to Babut, this is not the same as *semantic domains*. He states, "The semantic domain [...] takes on variable and arbitrary dimensions, and should not be confused with a 'conceptual field'" (Babut, 1999:67). The reason for this statement is that "the same unit may belong to several different semantic domains, depending on the needs of the analysis". As examples, he mentions טלה "lamb" and צון "a flock of small livestock": טלה belongs to the semantic domain *ovine*, but, along with כבשׂה ("young ewe-lamb"), גדי ("kid"), and גדיה ("kid"), it also belongs to the domain *the young of small livestock*; in a broader semantic domain, e.g. *small livestock*, terms like צון ("a flock of small livestock") as well as שׂה ("a head of small livestock") must be included. A *conceptual field*, on the other hand, "would consist of the group of words, for example, that designate 'knowledge'". This distinction seems somewhat arbitrary to me, and in discussing Babut's work it seems unnecessary to maintain this distinction. In fact, Babut himself (1999:273) mentions that he prefers to call the *semantic domains* listed by Nida "conceptual fields".

[33] De Blois (2000) has developed an adaptation of Louw and Nida's (1989) semantic domains for a new dictionary of Biblical Hebrew based on semantic domains (see the discussion in ch. 4). Also, Van Steenbergen (2002) has proposed an analysis tool with which the typical world view structure underlying a given culture can be identified.

LOCUTIONS			
Endocentric Meaning		Exocentric Meaning (Idiomatic Expressions)	
Non-figurative	Figurative	Transparent Meaning	No Transparent Meaning
Example: מה־לי ולך	Example: חרה אפו	2 Metaphors, Example: פרשׂ כנפו על	Example: שׁוב שׁבות
		2 Metonyms, Example: הסיך את־רגליו	
		1 Metaphor + 1 Metonym, Example: דבר על־לב	
		Global Metaphor of Gesture, Example: השׁליך נעלו על	
		Global Metonym, Example: אמצא חן בעיניך	

As far as the preliminary idiom characteristics identified in Chapter 1 are concerned, Babut seems to agree with *non-compositionality of meaning* (which he calls "exocentric meaning") and *restricted variability* (which he calls "relatively strong stereotypicality"). The *multi-word status* of idioms is also implicit in his view,[34] although he does not explicitly suggest this as a characteristic of idioms. An additional characteristic that Babut considers essential for idiom status is that of *monosemy*.

---

[34] See the discussion of Babut's differentiation between idiom and metaphor above.

3.2.3 John C. Lübbe (2002)

In his article entitled *Idioms in the Old Testament*, Lübbe considers the formal transformations of Biblical Hebrew idioms as well as their lexicographical treatment. He uses the definition of *idiom* proposed by Nida and Taber (1982:202),[35] viz. "an expression consisting of several words and whose meaning cannot be derived from the meanings of the individual words … also called exocentric expression" (quoted by Lübbe, 2002:46). Lübbe (2002:46-47) seems to regard the fact that "Nida and Taber's definition has been specifically formulated for those who work with the languages of the biblical text" as significant in his choice of a definition of *idiom*.

For his empirical research, Lübbe focuses on idioms containing the verb נשא. Of these he identifies nineteen in conjunction with words denoting body parts, e.g. נשא עינים (Gen 13:10) "look" (lit. "lift up eyes"), נשא יד (2 Sam 18:28) "rebel" (lit. "lift up hand"), and נשא בשר בשנים (Job 13:14) "risk one's life" (lit. "lift up [own] flesh in teeth"). He then makes some observations about the variability of Biblical Hebrew idioms, based on his analysis of these idioms with נשא. He identifies different categories of variation, which he calls *syntactic and stylistic flexibility*, *lexical and semantic variety*, and *semantic variation*.

Under *syntactic and stylistic flexibility* he mentions

1) the optional use of the direct object marker את,[36] e.g. וישא עיניו (Gen 18:2) "and he lifted his eyes [i.e. looked]" vs. וישא את־עיניו (Gen 33:5) "and he lifted (obj. marker) his eyes [i.e. looked]" (Lübbe, 2002:50);

2) the optional use of the particle נא[37] in commands, e.g. שא נא עיניך (Gen 13:14) "lift (emphasis) your eyes [i.e. look]" vs. ושא עיניכ (Deut 3:27) "and lift your eyes [i.e. look]" (Lübbe, 2002:51);

3) words intruding between components of the idiom, e.g. שאו לשמים עינכם (Is 51:6) "lift your eyes [i.e. look] <u>to the heavens</u>" (Lübbe, 2002:51);

---

[35] Unfortunately Lübbe does not include this work in his bibliography. I assume that he is referring to a 1982 edition of their well-known work, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Nida & Taber, 1969).

[36] Lübbe uses the traditional term *nota accusativi*.

[37] Lübbe calls this particle a *marker of emphasis*.

4) variation between *verb : object* and *object : verb* sequences, e.g. לֹא־יִשָּׂא פָנִים לְזָקֵן (Prov 30:13) "does not lift the face of [i.e. respect] the old" vs. פְּנֵי יְהוֹשָׁפָט...אֲנִי נֹשֵׂא (2 Kgs 3:14) "the face of Jehoshaphat ... I lift [i.e. respect]" (Lübbe, 2002:52); and

5) morphological variation between the active and passive forms of the Qal, e.g. יִשָּׂא פָנָי (Gen 32:21) "he will lift my face [i.e. respect me]" (active) vs. אִישׁ גָּדוֹל...וּנְשֻׂא פָנִים (2 Kgs 5:1) "a great man [i.e. important] ... and lifted of face [i.e. respected]" (passive) (Lübbe, 2002:52).

As examples of *lexical and semantic variety*, Lübbe (2002:53-54) mentions הרים/נשׂא עינים "look" (lit. "raise/lift eyes"), נתן/נשׂא קול "make a loud vocal sound" (lit. "give/lift voice"), נשׂא ראש/יד "rebel" (lit. "lift head/hand"), and נשׂא ראש/פנים "be confident" (lit. "lift head/face").

Lübbe (2002:55) describes *semantic variation* as "instances of the same combination of verb and object having more than one meaning". He points out that "נשׂא פנים may describe events of showing partiality, treating with respect or granting a request", and that "נשׂא יד may describe an act of rebellion, or the swearing of an oath". Granting these expressions idiom status would cast serious doubt on Babut's claim that idioms are necessarily monosemic.[38]

Lübbe (2002:59) concludes that this variability in the idioms which he analysed

> may be due to their not having become conventionalised — in which case their status as idioms becomes debatable. Or these changes may be due to temporal and/or geographical influences, i.e. they may reflect dialectical [sic] differences.

Since the surviving Biblical Hebrew corpus is relatively small, it would be impossible to determine with any reasonable degree of certainty which variations are tolerated by Biblical Hebrew idioms and which are not.

In line with Nida and Taber's definition of *idiom*, Lübbe seems to agree with *multi-word character* ("expression consisting of several words") and *semantic non-compositionality* ("whose meaning cannot be derived from the meanings of the individual words") as idiom characteristics. He also agrees that idioms are characterised by *conventionalisation*. His focus on (semantic, syntactic, etc.)

---

[38] See the discussion of Babut's research in section 3.2.2. The claim to monosemy in idioms is further discussed in section 3.3.1.12 below.

variation seems to imply *restricted variability* as characteristic of idioms, although he does not state so explicitly.

3.2.4 Andy L. Warren-Rothlin (2005)

In his article entitled *Body idioms and the Psalms*, Warren-Rothlin discusses idiomatic language and idioms in Biblical Hebrew, with special focus on body idioms. His approach is semantic, i.e. he considers "the relationship between 'idiomatic meaning' and 'literal meaning', together with the symbolic acts and social context which have produced the idiom" (Warren-Rothlin, 2005:204). He describes idioms as having "an *opaque* literal meaning, such that the brain has to consider a range of factors in the process of interpretation" (2005:201, italics in the original). True body idioms, according to Warren-Rothlin, are "expressions in which a term for a body part collocates with other words to form an expression with a new, distinct meaning" (2005:206).

Discussing idioms in general, he points out that idioms "may involve multiple metaphorization of first a noun and then the whole phrase and are often derived from culture-specific symbolic acts which may have since died out" (2005:201). As an example of this process, he considers the English expression *take off one's hat to someone* as a speech act ("I take my hat off to you!"). Initially a symbolic act indicating the acknowledgement of a superior's social status, lifting one's hat took on the meaning of indicating congratulations when done to one's peers. This gesture gave rise to idiomatic expressions such as "he took his hat off to him", even when hats were no longer commonly worn. Similarly, by saying that God tosses his sandal on Edom, the psalmist indicates God's disdain, "perhaps based on a symbolic act of claiming territory by placing one's foot on it, or on a taboo on placing footwear on something respected" (2005:202). Since idiomatisation is a process, "a given idiom may be at any point along the road to full fossilization"; in such cases, "the derivation [...] has been lost, leaving only a linguistic trace with little or no original meaning" (2005:209).[39]

---

[39] See Williams (2008), whose research on certain key words from the New Testament, then Shakespeare, and finally the British National Corpus, shows that contextual collocations (e.g. those containing *God* in the New Testament) move to restricted collocations and finally to the purely formulaic. Thus, *God forbid* can simply indicate that something is undesirable, i.e. without referring to *God* as in the context of the New Testament (2008:172).

Warren-Rothlin then moves on to consider specific types of terms occurring frequently in idioms. According to him, terms for body parts and items of clothing occur most commonly in idioms (2005:202).[40] Bodily functions and senses (e.g. *stand* in Ps 134:1, i.e. "serve"), colours (e.g. *blackness* in Eccl 11:10, i.e. "youth"), and verbs of motion and phrasal verbs (e.g. *go in to* in Gen 39:14, i.e. "have sex with") are also common in idioms. Of these, body idioms "are by far the most common type of idiom in most languages, largely because of the role of body parts in symbolic social communication and the range of associations attached to body part terms" (2005:203).[41] The number of body part terms occurring in Biblical Hebrew idioms is also quite high, viz. 59[42] (2005:206). Of the various possible derivations of body idioms, Warren-Rothlin states that their derivation from symbolic-functional associations (e.g. lifting a hat or throwing a sandal) is most distinctive (2005:208).

Regarding the productivity of body part nouns, Warren-Rothlin points out how their semantic range is greatly extended by culturally defined associations. So, *lip* may be extended to mean "edge" (spatial association), *eye* to indicate "seeing" (functional association), *throat* to denote personhood (psychophysical association), or *left hand* to refer to "evil, sinister" (superstitious association) (2005:204-205). He further shows (2005:205-206) how body part terms in Biblical Hebrew are also often grammaticalised (e.g. *in the intestines of your temple*, i.e. "inside your temple" in Ps 48:10), or used in literary tropes such as metaphors (*Absalom's hand*, i.e. "Absalom's monument" in 2 Sam 18:18) or euphemistic metonymy (e.g. *hand* or *foot* for genitalia).

Warren-Rothlin's research of body idioms has corroborated findings in other studies (e.g. Fernando, 1996; Langlotz, 2006) concerning the flexibility of idioms. Contrary to what has often been asserted in literature on idioms, he

---

[40]   In their study of the occurrences of the words *foot, feet, mouth* and *mouths* in the British National Corpus, Lindquist and Levin (2008:147) found that these words are used in phrases in more than 50% of the cases. In fact, they state that these terms "are frequent at least partly because they occur in conventional phrases that express common meanings".

[41]   Warren-Rothlin (2005:205) indicates that body part terms make up 5.7% of the lexical stock of the Psalms and occur in all but seven Psalms. However, in most of these occurrences, body part terms are used in grammaticalisation, literary tropes, proverbs, or body idioms.

[42]   From a list compiled by Warren-Rothlin and supplemented from other sources. See also app. D of this dissertation, where all the body idioms I have identified in 1 and 2 Samuel are presented — 73 idioms out of a total of 104.

finds that "there may in fact be a lot of stylistic and syntactic flexibility in the form of an idiom" (Warren-Rothlin, 2005:206).

In terms of the meaning of body idioms, Warren-Rothlin convincingly demonstrates that "there is no simple one-to-one correspondence between an idiom and a meaning" (2005:206). Rather, idioms may be polysemous (e.g. *lift face* can mean "show partiality", "spare", "grant a request", "be confident", or "show favour") or synonymous (e.g. *lift one's hand* and *lift one's head*, both meaning "rebel") (2005:207).[43] A single expression may also have a literal, metaphorical or idiomatic meaning (2005:2008).

Due to the prevalence of literary tropes in Biblical Hebrew poetry, it can be hard to tell the difference between an idiom (as a conventionalised expression) and a unique phrase used by the poet. Warren-Rothlin identifies some helpful ways of distinguishing between literal and idiomatic meanings (mostly in the Psalms), with special reference to body idioms. He states that idiomaticity is suggested in the following cases (2005:210-211):

1) when the person referred to does not possess the body parts in question, e.g. David's horn (Ps 89:24), God's wings (Ps 91:4);

2) divine possessor or subject,[44] e.g. "the LORD says … 'Sit at my right hand'" (Ps 110:1);

3) divine object, e.g. "they have raised their heads [against God]" (Ps 83:2);

4) "big vision" generalisations, e.g. the anointed king "lifting his head" (Ps 110:7);

5) interpretation by moral abstractions, e.g. "I have washed my hands in innocence" (Ps 73:13);

6) nominalisations, e.g. "my head-lifter" (i.e. "my Saviour", Ps 3:3);

7) indications in the context that a symbolic act took place, e.g. Boaz' response to Ruth's request ("Spread your wing over your maidservant",

---

[43] This challenges Babut's (1999) notion that idioms are monosemic (see section 3.2.2 above). This is discussed in more detail in section 3.3.1.12.

[44] According to Warren-Rothlin (2005:210), God is consistently portrayed in the Hebrew Bible as having no physical form, which means that in cases of a divine possessor or subject idiomatic meaning can be assumed.

101

Ruth 3:9) indicating that she wanted more than a piece of his blanket; and

8) cultic ritual acts expressed as performative form (i.e. a speech act, where the act is in the words), e.g. "I spread out my hands to you"[45] (Ps 143:6).

Warren-Rothlin's research on body idioms in the Psalms confirms the view held by cognitive linguists, viz. that idioms are motivated. Langlotz (2006:45) states that speakers can make sense of an idiom "by reactivating or remotivating their figurativity, i.e. to understand why the idiom has the idiomatic meaning it has with a view to its literal meaning". By indicating the continuum from a symbolic action to a fossilised idiomatic expression that leaves a dead metaphor, Warren-Rothlin convincingly challenges the notion that semantic non-compositionality means that an idiomatic expression is no more than a multi-word lexical item (i.e. word).

Warren-Rothlin's description of body idioms ("expressions in which a term for a body part collocates with other words to form an expression") implicitly agrees with the notion of *multi-word character*. He also holds that idioms have an opaque literal meaning. This is in line with the common view that idioms are *semantically non-compositional*. However, Warren-Rothlin also clearly indicates that idiomatic meaning can be motivated.[46] Regarding the variability of idioms, he agrees with Lübbe (2002) that idioms do show a degree of flexibility, thus contradicting the view that idioms allow no formal variation.

This concludes the overview of research done on Biblical Hebrew idioms to date. I will now consider the various idiom characteristics proposed by the authors covered in this and the previous chapter in an attempt to arrive at a working definition of *idiom* that can be used for identifying idioms in the chosen corpus.

---

[45]   This wording is from the NIV; Warren-Rothlin suggests that this is a performative and should be read as "I hereby [spread out my hands]…" (2005:211).

[46]   See the discussion of Langlotz (2006) in ch. 2 (section 2.2.13).

3.3   A definition of *idiom* revisited

Although a fairly representative overview of the theorising about idioms — in general as well as in Biblical Hebrew — has been provided here, this dissertation is not primarily intended to be a comprehensive discussion of idioms *per se*. Rather, it is an attempt to identify and classify idioms in the Biblical Hebrew corpus, and thus to shed some light on their interpretation and translation. It is with these aims in view that I propose a working definition of *idiom*. Ideally, this definition will be as inclusive as possible to ensure that all the relevant data can be gathered from the corpus. With a view to this, characteristics that apply to all idioms ("necessary conditions")[47] will be included in this working definition. An expression can hardly be excluded from consideration because it does not conform to a standard that usually, but not always, applies. However, stating that such secondary characteristics[48] will not be considered part of the criteria for the identification of idioms does not imply that they do not have their proper place when it comes to describing and classifying the idioms that have been identified.

Before formulating a working definition of *idiom*, I will evaluate the various idiom characteristics identified in the literature surveyed in the foregoing chapters. It is on these characteristics, considered in relation to one another, that a definition can be based.

3.3.1 Idiom characteristics

The following characteristics have been proposed in the reviewed literature as typical of, or essential to, idiomaticity.

3.3.1.1   Multi-word character

Multi-word character is an essential condition for idiomaticity on which basically all scholars are agreed. Although this assumption held by researchers from diverse schools may be challenged, one would be hard pressed indeed to attempt to distinguish between monolexemic "idioms" and monolexemic

---

[47]   See Svensson (2004:144).

[48]   I will use the term *secondary characteristics* to indicate those characteristics that apply to some, but not all, idioms, e.g. the presence of a cranberry morph (see ch. 2, section 2.2.5). These characteristics are indicative of, but not necessary for, idiom status (see Svensson, 2004).

"words". A simple word used in what might be called an "idiomatic" way (although I am not sure what exactly that would mean) remains a word that can be looked up in a lexicon. Lande's example of the Hebrew סורה is a case in point (see section 3.2.1). One need but turn to the verb סור in a dictionary of Biblical Hebrew to discover that it means "to turn aside", with one specific sense "come across here" (HALOT, 1999:748). Now one might possibly argue that the translation equivalent offered by HALOT is not satisfactory or perhaps that a sense like the German "einkehren", as proposed by Lande should be added, but סורה remains a simple word that does not present the uninformed[49] reader with the same types of difficulty that a complex expression such as הסיך את־רגליו does. A dictionary may of course explain the meaning of this expression, but if it does not and only offers a translation equivalent for each of its constituent words, the uninformed reader is faced with a potentially bewildering assortment of lexical information without much hope of fitting it all together successfully. For the purposes of my present research, I will accept the notion of multi-word character as a *sine qua non* for idiom status.

In principle, the term *multi-word* does not exclude compound words, but can refer to any compound consisting of two or more words which occur on their own elsewhere.[50] Very often orthography confuses matters, as the same expression could be represented as a single word in one language and as two words in another language, e.g. English *ghost town* "town whose former inhabitants have all left" vs. German *Geisterstadt* or Afrikaans *spookdorp*, or English *silver screen* "the cinema industry" vs. Afrikaans *silwerdoek.*[51] In the case of Biblical Hebrew, this fortunately does not pose a real problem, since Biblical Hebrew does not form compounds written as one word except in the case of combinations with pronominal suffixes, prepositions, and the conjunction ו. Words that are regarded as one in terms of tone and pointing are joined by the *maqqeph* (־) and are still clearly recognisable as separate elements (see Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:63; Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:43), e.g. בני־מות (1 Sam 26:16) "ones who deserve to die/are doomed to die" (lit. "sons of death"), or the typical compounds with לא (see Gesenius, Kautzsch

---

49   "Uninformed" is not used in a derogatory way (i.e. meaning "uneducated or ignorant"), but rather to signify someone "lacking awareness or understanding of the facts" (see *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 2004: "uninformed"), i.e. a reader who does not know the meaning of this idiom, or a non-specialist.

50   *Word* is used here to indicate the minimal autonomous unit in a given language, i.e. the smallest unit that can occur meaningfully on its own.

51   See Wood (1986:88, 92) and Granger and Paquot (2008:32) in this regard.

& Cowley, 1910:478), such as לֹא־צֶדֶק (Jer 22:13) "unrighteousness" (lit. "not-righteousness").

Multi-word character is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for idiomaticity, i.e. all idioms consist of two or more words, but not all multi-word expressions are idioms. Thus, compounds such as in the above-mentioned examples, are not considered idioms in the strictest sense of the word, although they meet the condition of multi-word character.[52]

By proposing multi-word character as a defining feature of idioms, the lower limit for idiom status has been set at expressions consisting of two or more ("semantic") words in the sense explained above.

Setting an upper limit — e.g. complex clauses (Fernando, 1996:41) — is deemed unwise at this stage, as it could potentially exclude idioms because of some *a priori* limit based on English idiom studies. However, it is likely that Fernando's claim — i.e. that no idiom consists of more than two subordinating clauses — will be proved valid in the case of Biblical Hebrew. After the data have been analysed, more may be said about the upper limit for idiom status.

3.3.1.2   Restricted variability

Many of the authors consulted agree that a substantial number of idioms show transformational deficiencies, i.e. restricted variability. There are, however, some scholars (e.g. Donalies, 1994; Čermák, 2001) who do not consider restricted variability to be of much help in identifying idioms, since, as they rightly point out, restricted variability constitutes a continuum ranging from the inconspicuous to the salient. Moreover, this is a phenomenon which applies to many, but not all, idioms (see Crystal, 1992:180). For this reason, restricted variability cannot be considered a necessary characteristic of idioms. Following Wood's (1986:95) suggested solution to this problem, i.e. accepting as idioms only expressions that are wholly invariable, would exclude too many items that need to be considered in a study of idioms.

When working with Biblical Hebrew, it becomes even clearer that restricted variability is not a satisfactory characteristic for determining idiom status.

---

[52]   A multi-word expression that does not contain a verb is not considered an idiom (see section 3.3.1.13 below). Also, phrases consisting of a "lexical word" (e.g. a verb) plus a "grammatical word" (e.g. a preposition) will be considered grammatical collocations, not idioms (see the discussion of Granger & Paquot, 2008, in ch. 2 section 2.2.15).

Firstly, it remains to be proved empirically that the same transformational principles obtain for idioms in Biblical Hebrew as for English idioms. Currently, Lübbe's (2002) contribution is the only study of variation in Biblical Hebrew idioms of which I am aware.[53] He describes and classifies the types of variation observed in the idioms he selected, but he suggests no theoretical framework within which idiom variation can be explained.[54] A second difficulty lies in the limited corpus of Biblical Hebrew at our disposal. This corpus does not really permit comprehensive research on the variability of the idioms it contains, and it will of necessity imply arguments from silence.[55] I conclude that restricted variability characterises many, but not all, idioms[56] and that it is therefore an indication of idiomaticity, rather than a necessary characteristic of idioms.

3.3.1.3 Non-compositionality of meaning

Non-compositionality of meaning also seems to be a *sine qua non* for idiomaticity. However, it is necessary to define more precisely what is meant by non-compositionality of meaning than has been done in previous chapters.

---

[53] Warren-Rothlin does not study idiom variation in Biblical Hebrew *per se*, but he does point out that "there may in fact be a lot of stylistic and syntactic flexibility in the form of an idiom" (Warren-Rothlin, 2005:206).

[54] Cognitive linguistics offers such a theoretical framework. Compare, in this regard, Langlotz's (2006) explanation, within a cognitive linguistic framework, of the factors involved in idiom variation. In his conclusion he states (2006:289) that "systematic idiom-variation is a reflex of idiom-transparency, i.e. conceptual structuring. Systematic lexicogrammatical alterations are constrained and motivated by the specific quality of a given idiomatic activation-set."

[55] It is possible that some light may be shed on a number of idioms from later rabbinic usage. Information gained from such documents should be treated with caution, however, since the degree to which a given idiom's use corresponds to the Biblical Hebrew period can probably not be determined satisfactorily. Rabbinic usage may nevertheless be a valuable source of information that can serve to corroborate conclusions drawn from the Hebrew Bible and stimulate further thinking. A researcher may also decide to favour one hermeneutical option over another, based on rabbinic usage. Comparing the findings of my present research with later rabbinic texts would be a useful research project.

[56] Langlotz (2006) convincingly argues that the degree to which an idiom is semantically motivated and analysable is related to the degree to which it can be subjected to different types of variation. He concludes (2006:289) that "general syntactic rules of article use, number variation, adnominal modification and lexical substitution are preserved to the extent that an idiom can be semantically penetrated in relation to the conceptual backgrounds".

Svensson (2008:82) indicates that non-compositionality is a very complex notion and proposes four dichotomies, as well as some other features, associated with (non-)compositionality that need to be taken into account in our present discussion. The following dichotomies related to non-compositionality are presented in her discussion:

1) *Motivation vs. non-motivation*: This refers to "the possibility of accounting for the contribution of each word to the whole, once the meaning of the expression (in this case an idiom) is known" (Svensson, 2008:83). Since motivatability can vary from one language user to another, Svensson suggests that "non-motivatability does not function well in definitions of fixed expressions" (2008:83).

2) *Transparency vs. opacity*: Here, the focus is on "the difficulty with which an expression can be understood" (2008:84). An expression is transparent when "a language user understands it without any problems, without any other previous knowledge than understanding the separate words that make up the expression".

3) *Analysability vs. unanalysability*: "Here, we are concerned with the contribution of each word in the expression to the meaning of the whole" (2008:85). An expression can be said to be unanalysable when "the words contribute to the meaning, but not individually, since it is not possible to say which part means what" (2008:86).

4) *Literal meaning vs. figurative meaning*: Acknowledging the problem of defining literal and figurative language, Svensson points out that figurative language constitutes "a logical contradiction or an absurdity if interpreted literally", an utterance that "deviates from its context" (2008:86).

Expressions may conform to virtually any combination of the properties in these dichotomies, as Svensson indicates (2008:87-88). She gives examples of expressions in every combination except "figurative, non-motivatable, transparent and unanalysable", which she states are "particularly hard to find" (2008:88).

For the purposes of identifying idioms, I propose that the senses *opacity* and *figurative meaning* (dichotomies no. 2 and 4 above) are necessary characteristics of idioms. Thus, considering an idiom to be semantically non-compositional seems to imply (1) that it cannot be understood simply by knowing the meanings of the separate constituent words, and (2) that the

global meaning[57] would constitute "a logical contradiction or an absurdity if interpreted literally" (Svensson, 2008:86).

Non-motivation and *unanalysability* (dichotomies no. 1 and 3 above) are not helpful in this regard. It has been observed (by e.g. Lakoff, 1987; Langlotz, 2006; and Svensson, 2008), on the one hand, that a substantial number of idioms are semantically motivated and, on the other hand, that most expressions (if not all) are non-compositional to some degree (see Taylor, 2002). If semantic non-compositionality is viewed as comprising *opacity* and *figurative meaning*, as argued above, it follows that semantic motivation cannot be equated to semantic compositionality, insofar as motivation does not necessarily entail predictability of meaning. An adequate knowledge of the grammar and vocabulary of a given language should enable a language user to recognise the meaning of any well-formed phrase in that language.[58] Put differently, the meaning of a phrase should be predictable if it consists of familiar words employed in accordance with the grammar of the language. The meanings of an idiom's constituents, however, are insufficient for its final interpretation although they play a definite role in its processing (Omazić, 2008:69). Therefore, while it may be true that the meanings of most expressions are non-compositional to some degree, those of idioms are not predictable.

It should also be borne in mind that non-compositionality of meaning alone does not constitute idiomaticity. In natural language usage, there are semantically non-compositional phrases that are not idioms, since they do not comply with other idiom characteristics such as conventionalisation. For instance, *thoughts prey on sb's heart-strings* cannot be said to be an English idiom meaning "someone has a guilty conscience" based on the phrase, "Thoughts, like old vultures, prey upon their heart-strings" (from Isaac Watts'

---

[57] See Babut (1999:285).

[58] I should hasten to add … all other things being equal. In real language usage all sorts of "noise" can impede proper comprehension. In this context, "noise" refers to diverse factors that can interfere with successful communication. Such noise can be physical (noisy air-conditioning, people talking in the background, traffic, etc.), psychological (disturbing emotions, worries, etc.), physiological (sleepiness, illness, etc.), or semantic (fluency in the language of communication, accent, jargon, etc.) (see Samovar, Porter & McDaniel, 2009:9). Incidentally, this terminology is germane to the so-called code model of communication, whereby the sender encodes a message and delivers it like a package to the receiver, who has to decode the message in order for communication to take place. However, the point here is that factors other than a familiarity with the grammar and vocabulary of a language affect comprehension in actual language usage.

poem *The Day of Judgment: An Ode, Attempted in English Sapphick*). This is a figure of speech that is, as far as I know, unique to Watts' poem, i.e. it is not a conventionalised expression. The phrase *thoughts prey on sb's heart strings [like old vultures]* is clearly figurative and, to some extent at least, opaque, making it semantically non-compositional. However, it cannot be considered idiomatic, since it is not a conventionalised expression in the English language.

One problem with non-compositionality of meaning as a characteristic of idioms is the fact that it constitutes a continuum and, as such, cannot be easily ascribed to a given expression in a precise way. Svensson (2008:90), for example, discusses "partial compositionality", indicating that compositionality is a scalar notion. Consequently, some scholars (e.g. Wood, 1986) have opted for absolute non-compositionality or opacity of meaning as an identifying characteristic of idioms. This does not seem to be a helpful approach for the present study. As in the case of variability, following this line would lead to the exclusion of too many expressions that can otherwise be considered idioms. While it is true that non-compositionality of meaning constitutes a continuum, I propose that it can be satisfactorily delimited as a semantic extension of a construction's global meaning from the combined meanings of its individual lexical constituents (see Langlotz, 2006:4). Such semantic extension renders an expression difficult to understand (based solely on the meanings of its constituent words) as well as illogical or absurd (based on a literal interpretation). Therefore, if an expression's global meaning shows a degree of such semantic extension, I propose that it can be considered semantically non-compositional. Specifying the degree of non-compositionality or distinguishing between "partial" or "complete" non-compositionality is not necessary for the purposes of the current study.

There is also the issue of circularity: Scholars like Taylor (2002:550-551) have argued that applying semantic non-compositionality as a defining characteristic of idioms logically would imply that we already know which expressions are idiomatic and which not (see the discussion of Taylor, 2002, in Chapter 2, section 2.2.11). However, this does not necessarily hold true. In the case of searching the Biblical Hebrew corpus for idioms, non-compositionality of meaning may very well be the main characteristic alerting the researcher to the possible presence of an idiom. Without knowing (or having decided) beforehand which expressions are idiomatic and which are not, the researcher may suspect that he is dealing with an idiomatic expression when the sum of its constituents' meanings does not make sense (i.e. the opacity and illogicality or absurdity referred to above). Still, only if the expression complies with other criteria (which can often only be determined by further research), such as

conventionalisation, can it be classified as an idiom. It must be granted that this is a slightly idealistic model, since no researcher comes to the text of the Hebrew Bible "innocent", i.e. with no knowledge of the background, structure or general meaning of the text. And, of course, there are numerous excellent translations, commentaries, lexicons, and other helps from which the reader can gather that he is dealing with an idiom. However, I would like to maintain that non-compositionality of meaning is an important idiom characteristic without which it would be very hard indeed to identify idioms.

A word about the relationship between idiomaticity and metaphor is in order at this point. The claim that the sum of the meanings of an idiom's constituent parts does not equal the idiom's global meaning raises a question about words with a conventionalised metaphorical sense. If a given semantic extension has become conventionalised to the point of being taken up in a lexicon, it may be argued that the presence of such a word does not render an expression semantically non-compositional, and for that reason the expression cannot be granted idiom status (see Babut, 1999:21). According to this view, an expression such as חרה אפו "become intensely angry" (lit. "one's nose becomes hot") would be considered semantically compositional, because the word אף is used in its conventional abstract sense "anger". However, if it can be indicated that this sense of the word is limited to a certain expression or group of expressions, the meaning of such an expression or expressions can be considered non-compositional.[59] This distinction, inevitably, implies a degree of subjectivity. For example, the English idiomatic expression *swallow an insult* "put up with an insult without reacting to it" can be considered semantically non-compositional. Yet, *swallow* does have a — possibly conventionalised — sense "put up with or meekly accept" (*Concise Oxford English dictionary*, 2004: "swallow"). This presents the researcher with a challenge, viz. attempting to determine the degree of conventionalisation attached to a given semantic extension of a word. No solution to this dilemma seems evident, and I propose that the best course would be to carefully weigh the lexicon entries for each word, taking special note of the range of expressions in which a given semantic extension occurs. In summary, it seems best — for the purposes of the present study — not to consider the meaning of an expression non-compositional merely on the basis of one of its constituent parts being used in a metaphorically extended sense, if that sense has become conventionalised to the point that it is not bound to a specific expression or group of expressions.

---

[59] See also the discussion in ch. 5 (section 5.3.3).

110

3.3.1.4   Unit status

Another characteristic of idioms on which many scholars agree is that of its unitary function or status. Many seem to regard idioms as lexical units[60] which function as such and should be incorporated in the lexicon as units. However, recent research (especially from the cognitive linguistic school) has convincingly demonstrated that idioms are "complex, composite word-configurations rather than lexical units" (Langlotz, 2006:53). Even so, idioms cannot easily be denied unit status, specifically those whose internal structure does not have to be, or is no longer, analysed by a hearer or speaker (see Gries, 2008:13). Langlotz (2006:53) concedes, "Mentally, these word-configurations nevertheless have unit status because their idiomatic meaning can be unfolded through direct stipulation once the most salient constituent — the key — is heard." It is clear, then, that idioms are units in the sense that they are constructions that are "subject to cognitive routinisation" (2006:77) and should be entered in the lexicon as such.[61] As Taylor (2002:541) also points out, the concept of *symbolic unit* comfortably accommodates idioms.[62] However, it should be borne in mind that idioms are much more complex, allowing substantially more variation and creativity, than mere composite words (e.g. *raindrop*).

Determining unit status, however, is not a straightforward matter. As has been pointed out, unit status is also a matter of degree, depending on one's previous linguistic experience (Taylor, 2002:27). Compared to native speakers, speakers with only a basic knowledge of a given language are less likely to perceive idioms and idiomatic expressions as units. Take for instance the expression *kick*

---

[60]   *Lexical unit* can be defined as "a form-meaning composite that represents a lexical form, and single meaning of a lexeme" (SIL International, 2004).

[61]   Discussing conceptual metaphors, Shead (2007:59) argues that "the meaning of a conventionalised metaphor is *directly retrieved* (along with its frame) from the mental lexicon. That is, no cognitive "searching" is required to construct a meaningful interpretation [...]." If the meaning of idioms, being conventionalised expressions often based on conceptual metaphors, is retrieved in the same way (i.e. from a "mental lexicon"), it can certainly be argued that they function as units and should be indicated as such in a written lexicon. This does not deny their motivation or analysability.

[62]   In a cognitive linguistic framework, *symbolic unit* can be described as any grammatical unit that "is subject to cognitive routinisation" (Langlotz, 2006:77). This notion can be extended to include anything from grammatical morphemes to constructions of virtually "any degree of structural complexity", as long as it manifests cognitive routinisation.

the bucket. Native speakers of English — and of course those who have a good knowledge of the language — will be more apt to regard this expression as a unit meaning "die" than a foreign student of English, who may regard it as a composite with the meaning "strike the pail with one's foot". In the case of Biblical Hebrew, no-one's linguistic experience can be compared to that of a native speaker of a living language. On the one hand, there are words and expressions whose meanings we simply do not know; on the other, there are cases where diachronic study and comparative Semitic studies have enabled us to discover the meanings of words which may have fallen into disuse during some stage of the language's development and which consequently became semantically opaque to the language users of the time, except as part of certain constructions (compare cranberry forms in English, e.g. *kith* in *kith and kin*, or *umbrage* in *take umbrage at*). As a result of our limited, and in some ways unbalanced, knowledge of Biblical Hebrew, researchers are dependent on the written corpus (i.e. the *co-text*) to provide the necessary cognitive frame of reference in an attempt to understand those aspects of the language on which they are focusing. It is therefore doubtful that anyone's previous linguistic experience can be shown to affect their view of Biblical Hebrew idioms.[63]

For the purposes of this study, I will regard unit status of expressions in the corpus as a defining characteristic of idioms. Although it will not be possible, in all cases, to determine whether a given expression comprises a symbolic unit or not, unit status will be considered a necessary characteristic of idioms insofar as it can be demonstrated.

3.3.1.5   Figurative meaning

Figurative or idiomatic meaning has been proposed by many (e.g. Strässler, 1982; McDonnell, 1982) as a defining feature of idioms, while others (e.g. Taylor, 2002) reject this view. Defining *idiom* as a construction with "idiomatic meaning" seems very unhelpful, to say the least. Also, depending on what one means by *figurative* or *idiomatic meaning*, the difference between figurative meaning and non-compositionality of meaning is not entirely clear. For instance, saying that the expression *to spill the beans* has a figurative meaning (viz. "to disclose secret information") different from the meaning obtained from a literal interpretation (viz. "to cause the leguminous seeds to fall out of a

---

[63] Scholars may have differing levels of "linguistic experience" — that may be much higher than those of non-scholars — but nothing comparable to that which an L1 speaker of Biblical Hebrew would have had.

container") is not very different from saying that its meaning is non-compositional (i.e. not made up from the meanings of *spill* "cause to fall out of a container" and *beans* "leguminous seeds"). I propose that, for the purposes of the present study, figuration should be considered a facet of semantic non-compositionality, as has been convincingly argued by e.g. Svensson (2008).

3.3.1.6   Picturesqueness

The connection between picturesqueness and figuration is quite close, and the former can be argued to be a result of the latter. Furthermore, picturesqueness is far too imprecise and indefinite a notion to serve as part of any definition. At best it can be stated that some (not all) types of idiom are often (not always) of a picturesque nature.[64] For this reason, picturesqueness is left out of account in this description of idioms.

3.3.1.7   Conventionalisation

Another characteristic of idioms mentioned by a number of authors (e.g. Fernando, 1996; Čermák, 2001; Taylor, 2002) is that of conventionalisation or institutionalisation. This seems to be a necessary condition for idiom status. If a language user creates a new word it cannot come to be considered a lexeme of that language unless the language community (or some part of it) "agree" to the link between this new word (sign) and its meaning (signifier).[65] In the same way, an *ad hoc*, semantically non-compositional expression on whose use and meaning a given language community have not "agreed" can hardly be said to be a symbolic unit[66] in that language.[67] Just as conventionalisation seems to dictate the status of every lexeme in a language, an expression has to be conventionalised or institutionalised in order to be called an *idiom*. Although it may be difficult, and in many cases impossible, to ascertain whether a given

---

[64]   I.e. it can be an indication of idiomaticity (see Svensson, 2004:144).

[65]   A speaker or writer may coin a term which gains immediate acceptance in his or her language community, whether because the word or expression "says it so well" or because such a person is regarded as having some authority (a popular figure, a highly educated individual, etc.). The speech community in which this word or expression finds acceptance may represent only a given lect (dialect or sociolect), or the language community as a whole.

[66]   I.e. a construction that is subject to cognitive routinisation (see Langlotz, 2006:77).

[67]   See the example of *thoughts prey on sb's heart-strings* from Isaac Watts' poem discussed in section 3.3.1.3 above.

expression in the Biblical Hebrew corpus did enjoy conventionalised status, I will consider conventionalisation as a defining characteristic of idioms in those cases where conventionalisation or a lack thereof can be determined with reasonable certainty.

3.3.1.8   Ambiguity

Although some scholars (e.g. Weinreich, 1969; Makkai, 1972) insist that idioms are characterised by ambiguity, I am inclined to agree with researchers, like Wood (1986), who reject ambiguity as a necessary characteristic of idioms. Claiming ambiguity as essential to idiomaticity would exclude idioms which are semantically opaque without necessarily being ambiguous, e.g. *as dead as a doornail.*[68] Semantic opacity would be a much more likely candidate for a list of idiom characteristics. However, since it is subsumed under non-compositionality of meaning, semantic opacity should not be considered a separate characteristic.

3.3.1.9   Uniqueness and fixedness

Čermák's (2001:16) definition indicates that he considers an idiom to be a "unique and fixed combination". *Fixed* in this case refers to conventionalisation (see Čermák, 2001:6), a notion which has already been discussed (see section 3.3.1.7 above). It is not clear to me what Čermák means by stating that an idiom is a "unique" combination. From his definition of *idiom* it seems that a "unique combination" contains at least some (presumably two or more) elements which only rarely occur together in other constructions. If uniqueness were to be considered a necessary characteristic of idioms, one would encounter some theoretical difficulty. A proposed idiom characteristic can hardly be regarded helpful in terms of identifying idioms if it applies in a large number of, but not all, cases. The combination of *spill* and *beans* in *spill the beans*, for instance, is not unique. It is conceivable that someone can say, "John spilt the beans all over the floor", meaning it quite literally.[69] Although many

---

[68]   See the discussion of Wood's research on idiom (ch. 2, section 2.2.5), where it was pointed out that ambiguity, although it can contribute to opacity, is too limiting a requirement *per se*.

[69]   It is, of course, possible — even likely — that the idiomatic meaning of *spill the beans* will be activated alongside the literal meaning, in spite of the context favouring the literal interpretation. Such a situation will often be perceived as amusing.

idioms certainly are "unique combinations", I submit that uniqueness should not be considered a necessary idiom characteristic.

3.3.1.10 Polysemous constituents and reciprocal selection of subsenses

As for Weinreich's (1969) proposed criteria, viz. that an idiom must contain at least two polysemous constituents[70] and that there must be a reciprocal selection of subsenses,[71] I reject both as too restrictive. These requirements exclude idiomatic expressions with only one polysemous constituent (i.e. only one element with various subsenses to choose from), such as *drop* in *to drop names*, or semantically opaque idioms, none of whose constituents seems to contribute to the figurative meaning by having an alternative sense associated with it, such as *kick the bucket*.

3.3.1.11 "Pre-formed chunks of language"

Taylor (2002:545) also calls a certain category of idioms "pre-formed chunks of language". In the case of Biblical Hebrew, however, it will be impossible in many, if not all, cases to ascertain whether an expression was available to language users as a "pre-formed chunk of language". The notion of ready-made expressions is in fact subsumed under conventionality,[72] and does not need to be considered separately as a criterion for idiom status.

3.3.1.12 Monosemy

Babut (1999:26) claims monosemy as an essential characteristic of idioms. This is interesting, since most other scholars in the field do not seem to give much

---

[70] This is similar to Strässler's (1982:79-80) claim that a predicative metaphor such as *rid your soul of weeds* is not an idiom since *weeds* is the only element with a figurative meaning in the metaphor and it still shows features of its literal meaning (see ch. 2, section 2.2.3), or Wood's (1986:56) proposal that only completely opaque expressions (where not one element makes a semantic contribution to the meaning of the whole) be considered idioms (see ch. 2, section 2.2.5).

[71] See ch. 2 (section 2.2.1).

[72] It could be argued that the concept of "pre-formed chunks of language" is identical to that of conventionality. However, not all idioms are "pre-formed" or "ready-made". Many of them have slots that need to be filled (e.g. subject, object, or complement of a preposition). For that reason, it seems that ready-made expressions is a subcategory of conventionalisation.

consideration to this notion. [73] He refers to Nida (1975) in this regard. The latter holds that idioms are highly specific in their meaning, but he does not seem to mention monosemy as such on the page to which Babut refers. However, he (1975:116) does say the following:

> One of the important aspects of the meanings of multiple-word units is that the greater the number of words the more specific the meaning is likely to be. Unitary complexes and composites are more likely to be specific in meaning, that is, refer to a narrower semantic area, than are individual words; and idioms are generally more specific in meaning than are single words belonging to the same semantic domains. For example, *tempest in a teapot* has quite specific components, e.g. conflict (often verbal), extensive or intensive, and relating to relatively insignificant events. Similarly, *have his cake and eat it too* involves (1) taking full advantage of certain circumstances and (2) achieving an end at no or very little sacrifice, such as would normally be regarded as justified for such a benefit. There are few individual words likely to possess these very specific types of components. At the same time, it is generally true that the greater the specificity of meaning, the greater the impact. To a certain extent, idioms are to conversation what illustrations are to a lecture. Illustrations, as subunits of discourse, are usually highly specific in their meanings, and are normally chosen because there is no convenient word or phrase which can convey the same information.

Nida's point here is the very specific nature of an idiom's meaning. It is not clear to me why Babut construes this to mean that idioms cannot be polysemous.

Lübbe (2002; see section 3.2.3) and Warren-Rothlin (2005; see section 3.2.4) both mention polysemous idioms, e.g. נשׂא פנים "lift face" (i.e. "show partiality",

---

[73] Although the majority of idioms certainly seem to be monosemous, there are no doubt also polysemous idioms. An example of a polysemous idiom in English is *draw/pull in one's horns,* described in *The Penguin Dictionary of English Idioms* (Gulland & Hinds-Howell, 1986:75) as

> (1) to reduce one's spending. "With the cut in my salary, I've been obliged to draw in my horns, so we won't be taking a holiday this year." (2) to retract a statement, or withdraw from a position in a debate or controversy. From the snail which retracts its horns when it feels itself threatened.

This idiom has two clearly different meanings based on the same metaphor (see also Bosman, 2000:22). According to Babut's view *draw/pull in one's horns* would not be considered an idiom.

"respect greatly", "grant request", "show favour", etc.).[74] Contending (as does Babut, 1999:26) that an idiom can have different meanings at different stages of the language's development but that "within each new stage of the language, the meaning remains univocal and unchanged" seems an inadequate explanation for the apparent polysemy in the examples cited by Lübbe and Warren-Rothlin. The fact that dating certain portions of the Hebrew Bible remains problematic makes arguing from the stages of Biblical Hebrew a highly contentious issue and not very helpful for my purposes.

It can be argued that there is one culturally specific symbolic action at the root of the various senses of נשׂא פנים, i.e. actually lifting, or ordering to be lifted, an inferior's face. In the case of נשׂא יד, however, the symbolic action of lifting the hand when swearing an oath does not seem to be in any way linked to the metaphorical lifting of the hand in rebellion.

I will not consider monosemy as an essential characteristic of idioms, since it would mean the exclusion of expressions — such as the two discussed here — that would be considered idiomatic on all other accounts.

3.3.1.13 Verbal nucleus

Phraseologists have attempted to classify and define the various kinds of phrasemes (or phraseological units) that are the object of their research. In the previous chapter, Granger and Paquot's (2008) classification was presented as a useful model from the field of phraseology. [75] It seems to me that a definition of *idiom*, benefitting from especially semantics and cognitive linguistic insights, can be enhanced by cross-pollination from insights in the field of phraseology.[76] Since the object of phraseological studies is word combinations and their structure, meaning, etc. (2008:28), the definitions and categories presented by researchers in this field should certainly be given serious

---

[74] See also Warren-Rothlin (2005:207): "An error frequently made by biblical scholars is to assume that a given expression has just one basic meaning from which all others are derived according to context."

[75] See section 2.2.15.

[76] This is perhaps quite necessary in general, since "the field with which phraseology has arguably the strongest — and at the same time fuzziest — links is semantics" (Granger & Paquot, 2008:30).

consideration when dealing with word combinations, such as idioms.[77] Doing so will help avoid further terminological confusion.

Idioms share many of the properties discussed here with other multi-word expressions (e.g. compounds, phrasal verbs, and proverbs), but they can be distinguished from these categories based on their lexico-grammatical structure and discourse function (Ishida, 2008:276). This is the case in Granger and Paquot's classification, where a verbal nucleus differentiates between idioms and compounds, irreversible binomials, etc. For this reason, I will not regard verbless phrases (NPs, PPs, etc.) as idioms.

Two cases where the concept of a *verbal nucleus* is perhaps not entirely clear are grammatical collocations and phrases containing participial verbs. In line with Granger and Paquot's phraseological classification, expressions consisting of a verb and a grammatical word[78] (e.g. a preposition) are not considered to be idioms, but rather grammatical collocations. An example from Biblical Hebrew is the phrase [אשה] בוא אל, "sleep with [a woman]", i.e. "have intercourse with" [a woman]. Typical of a grammatical collocation, the verb is followed by a so-called grammatical word (אל in this example) and a slot that can be filled by a number of words (in this case, a word denoting a woman). So also, the phrase הפיל בין פ׳ ובין פ׳[79] ("cast the lot to determine which of two parties is guilty") is considered to be a grammatical collocation rather than an idiom.

Expressions containing participles functioning as verbs are considered to comply with the criterion of having a verbal nucleus. Thus, the Hiphil participle מסיך in the phrase מסיך הוא את־רגליו "he is covering his feet", i.e. "he is relieving himself" is considered to be the verbal nucleus.[80] However, participles

---

[77] Even more so when one considers the claim that "*idioms* are regarded as the central [...] category of phrasemes" (Piirainen, 2008a:213).

[78] I presume that they use the term *grammatical word* to refer to what is also called a *function word*, i.e. a word that chiefly indicates a grammatical relationship but has relatively little identifiable semantic content (see *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 2003: "function word"; *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 2004: "function word").

[79] This collocation consists of the verb הפיל + grammatical word (preposition) בין (repeated according to Biblical Hebrew usage) + slot (פ׳).

[80] It may also be argued that such participles are actually the complement of an implied copula, which means that they function as adjectives. However, from a semantic perspective, such participial verbs can express actions, states, etc. in the same way that

functioning as other word categories, such as nouns, cannot be granted idiom status even though they may fulfil all the other conditions for idiomaticity (e.g. גאל הדם, "redeemer of blood").

3.3.1.14 Content message

Another useful insight from phraseological studies is the differentiation between various kinds of phrasemes, viz. referential, textual, and communicative (see Granger & Paquot, 2008). I consider this insight useful insofar as it helps to promote greater uniformity of terminology in the field of linguistics generally, and of phraseology specifically, by making a distinction between idioms on the one hand and proverbs, speech act formulae, and attitudinal formulae on the other. Since there are at least some communicative phrasemes[81] that could perhaps be considered idioms based on the proposed conditions for idiomaticity, a criterion that sets referential phrasemes (including idioms) apart will be useful for identifying idioms. The conveying of a content message is the distinctive characteristic of referential phrasemes, over against the expression of feelings or beliefs and focusing the attention of interlocutors (typical of communicative phrasemes), or even the function of structuring and organising the content of any discourse (typical of textual phrasemes). I will only consider expressions with a content message (i.e. referential phrasemes) as idioms.

3.3.2 Defining *idiom*

The characteristics of idioms can be summarised under the headings *necessary conditions* (characteristics that apply to all idioms and are essential to for idiom status) and *indications* (characteristics that apply to many idioms and, when encountered, may be indicative of the presence of an idiom):

---

verbs do (see Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:162), for which reason I will consider them to be functioning as verbs.

[81]   I am not aware of any examples of textual phrasemes that would qualify as idioms based on the definition I propose. Examples of communicative phrasemes that could be considered idioms, according to the other conditions for idiomaticity proposed in this study, are e.g. the speech act formulae אם(־נא) מצאתי חן בעיניך "if you are pleased with me" (lit. "if I have found favour in your eyes") and יהוה (יהיה) ביני ובינך עד־עולם, a statement that YHWH is witness to a covenant and will make sure that the parties always keep their promises (lit. "YHWH be between me and you forever").

Necessary conditions	**Indications**

Necessary conditions

1. **Multi-word character**

   Expressions consisting of two or more words

2. **Semantic non-compositionality**

   Expressions whose global meaning cannot be understood or interpreted literally

3. **Unit status**

   Constructions that are subject to cognitive routinisation

4. **Conventionalisation**

   Expressions whose form and meaning have become customary by tacit agreement of the members of a speech community

5. **Verbal nucleus**

   Expressions with a verb at their core

6. **Content message**

   Expressions conveying content, as opposed to emotions or opinions, or attempting to influence the addressee

Indications

1. **Restricted variability**

   Expressions that tolerate little or no lexical or syntactic variation

2. **Uniqueness**

   Expressions containing elements that only rarely occur together in other constructions

Only the necessary characteristics can be part of a definition used to identify idioms. In the light of these characteristics, I propose the following definition of *idiom* for the purposes of this study:

> *An idiom is a conventionalised multi-word symbolic unit with a verbal nucleus and a content message, whose global meaning is a semantic extension of the combined meanings of its constituent elements.*

This definition is an attempt to reflect the necessary characteristics of idioms as discussed in this and the previous chapter, viz. conventionalisation, multi-word character, unit status, verbal nucleus, content message, and non-compositionality of meaning.

How well this definition will handle the identification and classification of idioms in Biblical Hebrew remains to be demonstrated in subsequent chapters. For the present, suffice it to say that the proposed definition is intended to reflect idiom theory as based on research mainly in modern languages,[82] on the assumption that idioms are a cross-language phenomenon and that Biblical Hebrew should prove no exception. The specific problems related to a linguistic study of Biblical Hebrew (e.g. the absence of a sufficiently extensive corpus ideally needed for this type of research) will have to be dealt with as they arise.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter (section 3.2 "Review of idiom research in Biblical Hebrew"), I have offered an overview of several key scholars' work on idioms in Biblical Hebrew. Although some good work has been done on Biblical Hebrew idioms, it is clear that a lot of ground still remains to be covered. Babut's (1999) treatment of idiomatic expressions in the Hebrew Bible is quite thorough, but his definition of *idiom* is too restrictive.[83] Lübbe (2002), on the other hand, uses a more "orthodox" definition of *idiom*. The scope of his article is very limited, though, and he gives little consideration to the theoretical issues underlying his chosen definition. This is understandable, as his main focus is on the lexicographical issues surrounding Biblical Hebrew idioms rather than identifying them. Warren-Rothlin's (2005) contribution is the only one that draws extensively from insights gained from cognitive linguistic studies in the last few decades, but focuses on just one type of idiom, viz. body idioms.

The idiom characteristics proposed in linguistic writings on both modern languages (Chapter 2) and Biblical Hebrew (section 3.2) are evaluated in the third section of this chapter (section 3.3 "A definition of *idiom* revisited"). From this discussion, it has become clear that the few contributions in the field of Biblical Hebrew do not suggest any defining features of idioms that have not been identified in research on other languages already. The only characteristic

---

[82] Of the contributions from the field of Biblical Hebrew discussed in this chapter, only Babut and Warren-Rothlin shed any light on the characteristics and definition of idiom.

[83] As Babut (1999:36) admits, "we have [...] seen just how uncertain definitional boundaries remain, in spite of attempts by linguists to bring precision to their definitions". This, of course, affects the way in which one regards his list of idiomatic expressions from the Hebrew Bible. He is careful to point out (1999:37), however, that his list "is subject not only to additions, but also to debate".

that has not been encountered in my review of idioms in general is that of monosemy, proposed by Babut. However, I have indicated that this feature is too restrictive, since it does not apply to all idioms. In conclusion, the necessary (or primary) defining features of idioms have been established as conventionalisation, multi-word character, unit status, verbal nucleus, content message, and non-compositionality of meaning.

In Chapter 4, I will discuss some theoretical considerations regarding classification, with special reference to idioms as defined in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4

SOME THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING CLASSIFICATION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO IDIOMS

4.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapters, an overview has been provided of the literature on idioms and idiomaticity in general, and the available research on idioms in Biblical Hebrew in particular. Since the purpose of the present research is a description and classification of idioms in Biblical Hebrew, it is necessary to consider the concept of classification before going on to a discussion of the methodology employed in this study and an analysis of the data. First, the concept of classification will be discussed, with a brief description of some significant moments in the development of the philosophy of classification or categorisation. Then, different systems that have been suggested for the classification of idioms will be revisited and evaluated. Finally, a system used for classifying words in Biblical Hebrew will be discussed in some detail and reasons provided for applying it to the classification of idioms in the present research.

4.2 An overview of the history of classification (or categorisation)

According to the *New World Encyclopedia* (2008a), "categorization is the process in which ideas and objects are classified or differentiated into a set of basic concepts". Although Plato's so-called *Statesman dialogue* contains the first known grouping of objects based on similar properties, it is in Aristotle's *Organon*, in the treatise *Categories*, that we find the first thoroughly systematised treatment of categorisation or classification. According to the classical view of classification, "categories should be clearly defined, mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive", and "any entity of the given classification universe belongs unequivocally to one, and only one, of the proposed categories". The focus during the classical and medieval periods was ontological, i.e. different categories were seen to be determined (objectively) by the nature of the members of those categories.

In the 18th Century, however, German philosopher Immanuel Kant viewed any category as a "pure concept of the understanding" (*New World Encyclopedia*, 2008a), rather than something inherent in the objects of classification. For Kant, categories should be interpreted as "principles of how the mind organizes experiences". He held that "the objective order of nature and the causal necessity that operates within it are products of the mind in its interaction with what lies outside of mind (the 'thing-in-itself')" and that what lies outside of mind "can never be known except through the forms that the mind imposes upon it" (*New World Encyclopedia*, 2008b). Thus, the focus in classification shifted from ontological principles to mental processes.

More recently, the so-called "Prototype Theory" emerged, based on research by Eleanor Rosch and George Lakoff in the 1970s. According to this theory, classification is based on prototypes, rather than categories with clearly defined boundaries. Since categories are rooted in people's experience, they normally have fuzzy boundaries and are "inconsistent in the status of their constituent members" (*New World Encyclopedia*, 2008a). Categories are also not identical across cultures, nor indeed for all individual members of a given culture.[1]

The cognitive approach to classification[2] has given us a yet more developed theoretical framework within which to explain anomalies in classification, both within specific cultural-linguistic groups as well as between different cultural-linguistic groups. A well-known example of such perceived incongruity (from a modern, western viewpoint) in the Hebrew Bible is the grouping of bats along with different birds in the lists of clean and unclean animals (Lev 11:13,19; Deut 14:11,18). Whereas most English L1 speakers' perception of animals has been shaped by the Linnaean taxonomy, according to which *bird* belongs to the class AVES and *bat* to the class MAMMALIA, speakers of Biblical Hebrew

---

[1] While categories as a mental or cognitive concept is accepted by many, if not most, scholars, universal consent can by no means be claimed for the concept of fuzzy boundaries — at least not in an absolute sense. See Shead (2007:43-44) for arguments by some other scholars indicating that there are categories with quite clear boundaries (e.g. the EVEN NUMBERS category) and also that the variation in different individuals' construal of category boundaries does not necessary imply that such boundaries are fuzzy. It seems prudent to follow Shead's (2007:43-44) advice: "Whether these arguments entirely invalidate fuzzy boundaries is debatable; but caution is certainly warranted."

[2] For a more detailed discussion of categorisation from a cognitive linguistic perspective, see Lakoff (1987), Taylor (1995, 2002), and Langlotz's (2006:57 ff.) chapter entitled "The cognitive architecture of meaning and language".

124

apparently classified צפור ("bird", including different species of bird) together with עטלף ("bat") as עוף (FLYING CREATURES). Any flying creature, regardless of body covering, or way of producing offspring, seems to have qualified for membership of the עוף class. The Linnaean class AVES, however, is reserved for winged creatures that are covered with feathers and lay eggs. Animals that are covered with fur and give birth to live young (with or without wings) are definitely considered MAMMALIA. These different criteria (e.g. body covering, oviparity or viviparity) seem to become increasingly pertinent towards the periphery of the respective categories, where less prototypical members are found. The less prototypical a member of a given category, the more consciously the characteristics of the category have to be applied in order to identify it as belonging to the specific category. This is true although the prototypical member of each category may be similar. For instance, the prototypical member of the BIRD category in most English speakers' minds may actually look quite similar to most Biblical Hebrew speakers' concept of the prototype of the עוף category, presumably something like a sparrow, a dove, or even a hawk. The characteristic features of the prototypical *bird* may differ for reasons of geography (e.g. commonly occurring species of bird in a given part of the world), culture (e.g. species of bird commonly kept or hunted by a given people group), etc.

4.3 Classification of idioms

With this general overview in mind, let us turn our attention once more to idioms. Compared to the way we become familiar with categories of objects, events, relations, etc. in the world around us from an early age, both through our own sensory experiences and through the language(s) we are taught, classifying idioms seems a rather more artificial, academic pursuit. Although this perception may be true to a certain extent, insights from semantics and the cognitive linguistic framework have helped us understand how such a higher level activity as linguistic theorising can be firmly rooted in the world as perceived and interpreted by children from a young age. Being of academic nature, the classification of idioms may not be practical or technical as such,[3]

---

[3] See *Concise Oxford English dictionary* (2004: "academic") for a definition of *academic* as "relating to education and scholarship ▶ scholarly rather than technical or practical" and "not related to a real or practical situation and therefore irrelevant". However, this should not be misconstrued to imply that the classification of idioms can have no practical/technical value (e.g. for describing them in a semantic dictionary).

but it can certainly be more intuitive than some of the theories that have been proposed.

Various frameworks have been proposed within which idioms may be classified. Of these, the two main bases of classification seem to be structural/morphological and semantic. There are conceivably various other theoretical possibilities, such as a diachronic/historical classification of idioms (e.g. to which periods of a language they belong), a stylistic classification (e.g. to which registers of a language they belong), a syntactic classification (e.g. the kinds of combination possibilities for different classes of idiom), a literary classification (e.g. their literary functions or the genre(s) in which they tend to occur most), etc. All of the classifications of idioms that I have reviewed, however, seem to be either structural/morphological or semantic in nature.

4.3.1 Existing classifications of idioms

The following examples represent some of the most important classifications proposed for idioms.

1) The idioms in Lande's (1949) work on formulaic expressions in Biblical Hebrew[4] are assigned to categories, although she does not discuss her system of classification. She recognises four main categories, viz. encounters, conversations, formulaic expressions for moods, emotions and feelings, and formulaic expressions for objective states of affairs. Each of these categories also has various subcategories. It seems that Lande's classes represent, in a rudimentary way, what De Blois (2000) calls contextual semantic domains (see the discussion in section 4.3.3 below). A classification system based on a Biblical Hebrew idiom's occurrence within a specific cognitive frame or frames could be quite helpful in enhancing a reader's understanding of the Hebrew Bible. This idea is elaborated further on.

2) Writing from the framework of stratificational linguistics, Makkai (1972)[5] proposes a structural classification of idioms. According to this view, two main categories of idioms may be distinguished by the linguistic strata in which they occur, viz. lexemic and sememic idioms (with hypersememic idioms as a possible third category). Without revisiting the de-

---

[4] For a more detailed discussion of Lande's idiom theory, see ch. 3 (section 3.2.1).

[5] For a more detailed discussion of Makkai's idiom theory, see ch. 2 (section 2.2.2).

tails of this classification with all the subcategories of lexemic and sememic idioms, suffice it to say that a classification of Biblical Hebrew idioms according to Makkai's model will not be very helpful for my purpose in researching idioms in Biblical Hebrew, viz. to enhance our understanding of the Hebrew Bible.[6]

3) Fernando's (1996)[7] classification is similar to Makkai's insofar as she also assigns idioms and idiomatic expressions to categories based on morphological grounds. She differentiates between pure idioms, semi-idioms and literal idioms. Semi-idioms and literal idioms are distinguished from pure idioms by having at least one literal constituent with a non-literal sub-sense, in the case of the former, and by exhibiting invariance or restricted variation in the case of the latter. Each of these categories also has some subcategories. As with Makkai's model, Fernando's proposed classification is not useful for my current purposes.

4) In his doctoral thesis on Biblical Hebrew, Babut (1999)[8] proposes a classification of idioms based on (semantic) structure. He distinguishes between locutions with endocentric meaning and locutions with exocentric meaning, with only the latter qualifying as idioms according to his view. Idiomatic expressions, in turn, can either have transparent meaning or not have transparent meaning. Considering the (semantic) structure of an idiom may be helpful to some extent in understanding the motivation of its meaning, but it does not provide much insight about the expression as a whole, such as its level of derivation (e.g. *State, Process, Action*) or its lexical and contextual meanings (see De Blois, 2000:23-24). The structural classification that Babut proposes does not really serve to enhance our understanding of the meaning of idioms in Biblical Hebrew.

---

[6] Of course, an idiom's meaning has to be known in order to be able to classify it, so I am not implying that certain types of classification will be more helpful to a researcher trying to discover the meaning of a particular idiom. What I mean by enhancing our understanding of the meaning of idioms in Biblical Hebrew is that a suitable classification and presentation of these idioms in a lexicon will hopefully be an aid to the reader (of the Hebrew Bible and the lexicon).

[7] For a more detailed discussion of Fernando's idiom theory, see ch. 2 (section 2.2.9).

[8] For a more detailed discussion of Babut's idiom theory, see ch. 3 (section 3.2.2).

5) Writing from a cognitive linguistic perspective, Taylor (2002)[9] proposes four categories of idioms. However, his system of classification does not differ significantly from those of Makkai or Fernando in that it is not fully based on semantic considerations. The composition, form and function of the various idioms are the criteria he uses. In this way, he distinguishes between idioms (identified by their semantic and formal aspects, i.e. semantic non-compositionality and limited variation), formulas (characterised by conventionalisation), expressions (chunks of pre-formed language, e.g. memorised texts or proverbs), and expressions that are idiomatic in the sense that that is how speakers of a given language happen to say something. He also mentions a fifth category, viz. constructional idioms or formal idioms (idioms whose composition cannot be accounted for by the general principles of the language). Although Taylor's discussion of idioms deals with idioms from a cognitive perspective, his largely structural classification can be discarded from this discussion, for the same reason as those of Makkai, Fernando, and Babut.

6) In much the same vein as Taylor, Langlotz (2006)[10] differentiates between partially non-compositional idioms, literally non-compositional idioms, and constructionally idiosyncratic idioms. He also categorises idioms according to different types of figuration, viz. core types and marginal types, with various subcategories under each. Langlotz does provide a thorough and tremendously insightful discussion of idioms within the cognitive linguistic framework, but a classification based on compositionality and structure will not significantly enhance our understanding of the Biblical Hebrew text. As with Babut, Langlotz's classification may be helpful in terms of our understanding of the motivation of idiomatic meaning, but not of the idiom as a whole. The focus in this classification system is on the nature and extent of semantic compositionality of idioms, which means that Langlotz's categories will not be suitable for my purposes.

7) Buckingham (2006) distinguishes between a didactic and a lexicographic classification of idioms. Whereas a lexicographic classification would focus on surface-level features and group idioms together under key

---

[9]   For a more detailed discussion of Taylor's idiom theory, see ch. 2 (section 2.2.11).

[10]   For a more detailed discussion of Langlotz's idiom theory, see ch. 2 (section 2.2.13).

words, a didactic classification would focus on the underlying conceptual framework of idioms. This latter approach "encourages cross-linguistic comparison at a conceptual level rather than at a surface lexical level" (2006:36). Buckingham seems to suggest a classification of metaphors based on source domains (2006:37), although she does not fully develop it nor provide a sample of such a classification. Classifying Biblical Hebrew idioms according to the source domains of the metaphors on which they are based can be useful in terms of understanding the motivation of the respective idioms, which can enhance our understanding of the text of the Hebrew Bible to some extent. However, as with Babut, Buckingham's classification will not help us a great deal in terms of understanding the idioms as wholes.

Of all these classifications proposed for idioms, only Lande's and Buckingham's seem really suitable for enhancing our understanding of the meaning of Biblical Hebrew idioms. This by no means denies the value of a structural analysis of Biblical Hebrew idioms, which does provide insight into the workings of Biblical Hebrew. The point here is that I am attempting to classify Biblical Hebrew idioms according to a system that will shed light on their meaning and the meaning of the texts in which they occur. Although Lande's classification is certainly helpful for an understanding of such idiomatic expressions as she discusses, it will not serve my purpose either. Viewing idioms in the contextual domains where they occur is an intuitive step, as it were, in the right direction, but her system still lacks the necessary theoretical underpinnings. Also, much research has been conducted since her work was published (1949), especially in the more recent fields of semantics and cognitive linguistics.

Buckingham's classification will not be helpful to me as a model to follow. Although conceptual metaphor and idiom motivation are quite closely connected and a great number, perhaps the vast majority, of idioms are based on conceptual metaphors, I propose that not all idioms are. For this reason, a classification of idioms only in terms of source domains for conceptual

metaphors would not serve my purposes, interesting and enlightening though that may be.[11]

4.3.2 An alternative way of classifying idioms

With no available system for the classification of idioms that would serve the purpose of my present research, there seem to be two options: developing a suitable classification myself, or using and adapting an existing system for the classification of some other linguistic item. I have opted for the second possibility, viz. to use, and possibly adapt, a system used for classifying lexical items. While the necessary caution and descriptive precision must be employed when describing idioms in terms of their unit status, they are manifestly units in some sense of the word. Langlotz (2006:53) points out this fine distinction:

> Linguistic and psycholinguistic evidence speaks for the representation of idioms as complex, composite word-configurations rather than lexical units. Mentally, these word-configurations nevertheless have unit status because their idiomatic meaning can be unfolded through direct stipulation once the most salient constituent — the key — is heard.

Therefore, while acknowledging that idioms are "composite word-configurations", it is clear that they are often mentally processed as units. In the light of this, I would suggest that a system for classifying lexical items, based on semantic rather than structural considerations, can be useful for classifying and interpreting idioms in the Hebrew Bible. I propose that the lexicographical system developed by De Blois provides just such a classification as I will be able to use, with some minor modifications.

4.3.3 De Blois's system of classifying lexical items

In his doctoral thesis (2000), De Blois proposes a theoretical framework for a new dictionary of Biblical Hebrew based on semantic domains, with special application to the letter ח. This dictionary is known as the *Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew* (SDBH) and has been developed extensively since De Blois's

---

[11] Although a more inclusive classification system (e.g. also incorporating those idioms that are not based on conceptual metaphors) is the point here, understanding which conceptual metaphors function in idiom motivation is certainly still helpful. For this reason, I provide a list of the idioms in 1 and 2 Samuel that are based on one or more metaphors, arranged alphabetically according to the metaphors that play a role in their semantic motivation (app. C).

thesis. Given the insights gained during recent years from research in semantics and cognitive linguistics in particular, the classification system developed by De Blois seems to be the most suitable as a framework for classifying Biblical Hebrew idioms, for the following reasons:

1) De Blois's system was developed especially for Biblical Hebrew, with special reference to its underlying world view.[12] This is a major consideration in selecting a classification system for Biblical Hebrew idioms.[13]

2) Also, De Blois takes cognizance of recent insights from research on semantics, lexicography, etc., which is to some extent lacking in many of the other systems that I have considered.

3) The SDBH is a semantic database of Biblical Hebrew words and their meanings, which seems to be able to accommodate idioms. This dictionary is intended especially for the benefit of Bible translators (see De Blois, 2000:1-2). Since my present research is also aimed at enhancing our understanding of the text of the Hebrew Bible, especially for the purpose of translation, it would be most gratifying if my contribution on Biblical Hebrew idioms can enhance this very useful source in some way.

Central to De Blois's approach is the concept of *semantic fields* or *semantic domains*. He defines *semantic domain* as a "group of words that have certain aspects of meaning in common", and points out that it is only in relation to other words belonging to the same semantic domain that the meaning of a word can be fully understood (2000:4). Since no universal set of semantic domains exists, he explains that a systematic semantic study of a given language is prerequisite to producing a dictionary for that language, especially one as old as Biblical Hebrew (2000:5).

---

[12]   De Blois's system is certainly not without its problems. In Van Steenbergen's discussion of the SDBH, he expresses the valid criticism that "it [...] remains unclear how and to what extent world view issues have played a role in defining the semantic domains" in SDBH (2005:176). Nevertheless, De Blois's system remains (as far as I know) the best that is available for Biblical Hebrew to date. Since in-depth research on the world view of the speakers of Biblical Hebrew and a critique of SDBH fall outside the scope of my study, I will use De Blois's system and make what recommendations I can in my findings.

[13]   This is significant, since many idioms are motivated on the basis of shared cultural knowledge (see Piirainen, 2008a:213).

In his framework, De Blois distinguishes between *lexical* semantic domains and *contextual* semantic domains (2000:23). This distinction is based on the concepts of *lexical* meaning, which focuses on "those semantic features that are shared by a group of obviously related instances", and *contextual* meaning, taking into consideration "all relevant aspects of the context of a particular instance". This means that every entry (i.e. word) in the SDBH that has more than one lexical meaning will also be assigned to the corresponding number of lexical domains. The different contexts in which each lexical meaning occurs, in turn, determine the contextual semantic domains for each lexical meaning.

De Blois's SDBH is based on the framework of Louw and Nida's *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament based on semantic domains* (1989), but with significant modifications in order to accommodate the Biblical Hebrew world view, as well as more recent insights into semantics, lexicography, and information technology. These include the important distinction between lexical and contextual semantic domains (2000:23 ff.), arranging the dictionary alphabetically rather than according to semantic domains (2000:25 ff.),[14] and incorporating some elements from the frame theory (2000:26).[15]

Without going into the intricacies of De Blois's dictionary, an overview is provided here of the semantic classes (Arabic numerals), lexical semantic domains (alphabetical characters) and their subdivisions (Roman numerals), where applicable, as proposed for the SDBH.[16]

---

[14] De Blois points out the advantages of this more traditional arrangement: "For those who prefer to work with printed dictionaries two indexes (one for *lexical* and one for *contextual* domains) will be provided that will help them to find and compare all entries that belong to the same domain. Those, however, who will make use of the computer program will have the additional advantage of being able to look up all (sub)entries that belong to one particular *lexical* or *contextual* domain (or a combination of both) in a much easier (and quicker) way" (2000:26).

[15] In this regard, De Blois provides a conceptual frame for each lexical semantic domain. He points out "that because of the fact that Biblical Hebrew is an ancient language with a limited corpus of data, we will have to keep our conceptual frames relatively simple, with a limited number of slots, as we have to limit ourselves to information that is available" (2000:26).

[16] This overview summarises the *Domain Table* provided on the SDBH website (SDBH, n.d. [Lexical semantic domains]). Although different levels of subdivision are indicated for certain lexical semantic domains, only subdomains of the first level are represented here.

1) *Objects:* all animate and inanimate entities, both natural and supernatural

   a) *Creatures*: all natural animate entities, such as humans and animals

      i. *Animals*: all living creatures except human beings

      ii. *People*: all human beings

   b) *Deities*: all deities and other supernatural beings

   c) *Parts*: all *Objects* that cannot exist in isolation but are an integral part of another *Object*

   d) *Vegetation*: all plants and trees, covered by the Biblical Hebrew generic term דשא

      i. *Plants*: all plants, covered by the Biblical Hebrew generic term עשׂב

      ii. *Trees*: all trees, covered by the Biblical Hebrew generic term עץ

   e) *Products*: all inanimate *Objects*, usually of a relatively small size, produced by *People, Deities, Animals*, or *Plants*

      i. *Artefacts*: all terms covered by the Biblical Hebrew generic term כלי

      ii. *Body products*: all body products, such as excrement, sweat, blood, etc.

      iii. *Food*: all terms for food items, covered by the Biblical Hebrew generic term לחם

   f) *Scenery*: all inanimate *Objects*, except *Plants*, that usually cannot be moved, and are part of the scenery in which events in the Hebrew Bible take place

      i. *Constructions*: all constructions, such as huts, shelters, houses, fortresses, and palaces

      ii. *Depressions*: all depressions, such as holes, gorges, and valleys

      iii. *Elevations*: all elevations and land formations, such as height, hills, rocks, and mountains

      iv. *Land*: all terms referring to land

      v. *Roads*: all terms referring to roads, paths, streets

      vi. *Universe*: heaven and earth and all that is in it

vii. *Water*: all bodies of water, such as seas, lakes, rivers, pools

g) *Substances*: all inanimate *Objects* that cannot be counted but are measured, and from which other *Objects* can be produced[17]

 i. *Cloth*: cloth and substances used for making clothes

 ii. *Darkness*: darkness as the absence of light

 iii. *Fire*: terms such as fire, spark, flame, etc.

 iv. *Liquids*: all liquids

 v. *Light*: light as a substance

 vi. *Metal*: all metals

 vii. *Paint*: substances used to colour other objects

 viii. *Rain*: all forms of precipitation

 ix. *Sand*: terms such as dust, sand, clay, mud, etc.

 x. *Spices*: substances such as fragrant spices, powders, and ointments

 xi. *Stone*: all types of אבן

 xii. *Wind*: meteorological phenomena such as wind, whirlwind, storm, etc.

2) Events: all states, processes, actions, and causative actions, featuring one or more Objects or other Events

a) *Description*: all *Events* that describe the features of *Objects* or other *Events*

 i. *Attribute*: *Events* describing the physical features of an *Object*

 ii. *Attitude*: *Events* describing non-physical features of (usually animate) *Objects*, such as attitudes and emotions

 iii. *Modification*: *Events* describing the features of *Events*

b) *Position*: all *Events* that describe the relationship between *Objects* and *Events* and their environment

---

[17] This definition may perhaps more accurately read, "[…] from which other *Objects* can *often* be produced", since it is hard to imagine objects being produced from e.g. *Darkness* or *Wind*.

> i. *Location*: *Events* describing relations between *Objects* and their physical environment
>
> ii. *Existence*: *Events* describing relations between *Objects* and their non-physical environment (existence, time, etc.)
>
> iii. *Occurrence*: *Events* describing relations between other *Events* and their environment

c) *Connection*: all *Events* that describe relations between *Objects* and other *Events* that are connected to each other

> i. *Attachment*: *Events* describing relations of physical attachment between *Objects*
>
> ii. *Association*: *Events* describing relations of non-physical attachment between *Objects* (e.g. possession, acquaintance)
>
> iii. *Involvement*: *Events* describing relations between *Objects* and *Events* (e.g. involvement, commitment)

d) *Perception*: all *Events* that describe the relationship between *Objects* and *Events* and the mind of animate beings

> i. *Sensation*: *Events* describing the physical aspects of the relationship between *Objects* and *Events* and the mind of animate beings
>
> ii. *Cognition*: *Events* describing the non-physical aspects of the relationship between *Objects* and *Events* and the mind of animate beings

3) Relationals: all lexical units that link, point to, or substitute for Objects and Events

a) *Linkers*: all *Relationals* that are used to link *Objects* and/or *Events*

> i. *Descriptors*: *Relationals* that link *Events* in the lexical domain of *Description* and the *Objects* and *Events* that are described
>
> ii. *Positors*: *Relationals* that link *Events* in the lexical domain of *Position* and the *Object* or *Event* functioning as position
>
> iii. *Connectors*: *Relationals* that link *Events* in the lexical domain of *Connection* and the *Object* or *Event* that it is connected to
>
> iv. *Perceptors*: *Relationals* that link *Events* in the lexical domain of *Perception* and the *Object* or *Event* that is perceived

b) *Markers*: all *Relationals* that highlight, or focus on, an *Object* or *Event*

    i. *Identifiers*: *Relationals* that put the focus on an *Object* or *Event*

    ii. *Extenders*: *Relationals* indicating that an object or event has been added to the range of *Objects* or *Events* in focus

    iii. *Negators*: *Relationals* that negate an entire *Event* or one of its arguments

    iv. *Probability*: *Relationals* that focus on the probability of an *Event* happening

    v. *Restrictors*: *Relationals* indicating that an *Object* or *Event* is the only one in focus

c) *Referentials*: all lexical units that substitute for *Objects* or *Events*

    i. *Exclamations*: short expressions that substitute for an entire proposition

    ii. *Names*: names of people, deities, locations, and other *Objects*

This overview only covers the lexical semantic domains based on De Blois's proposal. He also proposes a tentative list of 85 contextual domains based on his study of the Biblical Hebrew words starting with the letter ח (De Blois, 2000:90 ff.). As he points out, additional domains and subdomains may be added after further study of the entire vocabulary of Biblical Hebrew.

I propose that Biblical Hebrew idioms, according to my definition, will be able to fit into the SDBH's category of events with its lexical semantic domains and subdomains (as well as their contextual semantic domains).

In line with De Blois's system, idioms in the corpus chosen for the present study are presented alphabetically under headwords. However, with the right software, the semantic information provided for each entry should enable researchers to view the data by lexical or contextual domains, levels of derivation, synonymous/antonymous expressions, etc.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter concludes the theoretical foundation of my research on idioms in Biblical Hebrew. Having considered the nature and identification of idioms, the concept of classification or categorisation, and De Blois's categorisation of

Biblical Hebrew words, it is time to turn our attention to the data. In the next chapter, a discussion is provided of the methodology followed in collecting the data before proceeding to an examination thereof.

Chapter 5

TOWARDS THE IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF IDIOMS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

5.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapters, a theoretical background was provided with a view to identifying and classifying idioms in Biblical Hebrew. We now turn our attention to the method employed in identifying idioms in 1 and 2 Samuel and their subsequent classification. First, a description is provided of the method that was employed in collecting the data.

5.2 Identification of idioms in the Hebrew Bible

Idioms in the Hebrew Bible were identified by carefully reading the text, keeping in mind the idiom characteristics proposed in Chapter 3 (section 3.3.2). Phrases that appear to exhibit these characteristics were entered into a database, along with notes from the various sources consulted. After this first phase, the database was then rigorously scrutinised, with particular attention to borderline expressions (i.e. cases where idiom status, according to my working definition and criteria, is doubtful). Any expressions that were found lacking in any of the principal areas of idiomaticity were removed. In this section, the resources and criteria employed, as well as certain exceptions are discussed.

5.2.1 Resources

Although numerous resources were consulted during the course of this study, the following formed the basis of my research and were consulted more or less throughout my reading of the source text and analysis of the data:

5.2.2 Source text

The Paratext 7[1] version of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS, including textual apparatus) was used as a source for the Hebrew text of Samuel, with reference also being made to the interlinear text in Paratext's Source Language Tools as well as *The Lexham Hebrew-English Interlinear Bible* (Van der Merwe, 2004) in Logos Bible Software 4. For textual critical issues, I referred to the critical apparatus of the BHS in the Logos electronic edition as well as the English electronic version of *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (CTAT) in Paratext 7.

5.2.3 Translations

The following translations and versions, both ancient and modern, were consulted in Paratext 7 and Logos Bible Software 4:

1) KJV: King James Version, with American Bible Society additions

2) NRSV: New Revised Standard Version

3) ESV: English Standard Version

4) NIV: New International Version

5) NET: New English Translation[2]

6) REB: Revised English Bible

7) NJPS: New translation of the Hebrew Bible by the Jewish Publication Society

8) GNT: Good News Translation, United Kingdom edition

9) CEV: Contemporary English Version, United Kingdom edition

10) LUT: Die Bibel (Luther Bible, Revised 1984)

11) GCL: Gute Nachricht Bibel

12) TOB: Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible

---

[1] "Paratext and related tools are a collection of software programs for Windows developed by the United Bible Societies which allow you to input, edit, check, and publish a translation of the Scriptures, based on the original texts (Greek, Hebrew), and modeled on versions in major languages" (ParaTExt, n.d.).

[2] The Logos Bible Software 4 version of the NET Bible (2006), as well as the NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006), was used.

13) NBJ: Nouvelle Bible de Jerusalem

14) FCL: La Bible en Français Courant

15) HSV: Herziene Statenvertaling

16) NBV: Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling

17) WV: Willibrordvertaling

18) GNB: Groot Nieuws Bijbel

19) NAV: Nuwe Afrikaanse Vertaling

20) NTLH: Nova Tradução na Linguagem de Hoje

21) TPC: Tradução em Português Corrente

22) NVL: Nova Vulgata

23) LXX: Septuagint (ed. Rahlfs-Hanhart)

Although many more languages and versions are available in Paratext, these were chosen to represent relatively well-known translations from different faith traditions (e.g. Jewish, Catholic, Protestant), done in different periods (e.g. ancient, Jacobean, modern) and within different theoretical frameworks (e.g. formal correspondence, functional equivalence). These, and occasionally other versions, were consulted to determine the interpretation of Biblical Hebrew idioms in different periods and traditions. All occurrences of every idiom were also checked in the BHS by using the search function in the Source Language Tools of Paratext 7.

5.2.4 Translator's handbooks

The UBS translator's handbooks on 1 and 2 Samuel were consulted in electronic format (Paratext):

1) *A Handbook on the First Book of Samuel* (Omanson & Ellington, 2001a)

2) *A Handbook on the Second Book of Samuel* (Omanson & Ellington, 2001b)

5.2.5 Hebrew lexicons

The following lexicons of Biblical Hebrew were consulted in electronic format (Logos Bible Software 4):

1) HALOT: *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Koehler *et al.*, 1999)

2) BDB: *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Brown, Driver & Briggs, 2000)

3) GHCLOT: *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* (Gesenius & Tregelles, 2003)

4) CHALOT: *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Holladay, 2000)

5) DBL Hebrew: *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament)* (Swanson, 1997)

5.2.6 Theological lexicons

1) *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (Botterweck & Ringgren, 1974-1990; Botterweck, Ringgren & Fabry, 1995-2006)

2) *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Jenni, Westermann & Biddle, 1997)

3) *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Harris, Archer & Waltke, 1999)

5.2.7 Commentaries

Various commentaries were consulted, but the following were the most often referred to:

1) *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes & Commentary* (The Anchor Bible, Vol. 8) (McCarter, 1980)

2) *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes & Commentary* (The Anchor Bible, Vol. 9) (McCarter, 1984)

3) *1 Samuel* (Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 10) (Klein, 1998)

4) *2 Samuel* (Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 11) (Anderson, 1998)

5) *1, 2 Samuel* (The New American Commentary, Vol. 7) (Bergen, 1996)

6) *Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 & 2 Samuel* (Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. 2) (Keil & Delitschz, 1996b)

7) *Das erste Buch Samuelis*. (Stoebe, 1973)

8) *Das zweite Buch Samuelis* (Stoebe, 1994)

9) *I & II Samuel: A Commentary* (Hertzberg, 1964)

In addition, reference was made to other literature such as academic articles and dissertations, when available.

5.3 Criteria

The criteria for idiom status proposed in Chapter 3 were employed as a heuristic tool to identify idioms, viz.:

1) Conventionalisation

2) Multi-word character

3) Unit status

4) Verbal nucleus

5) Content message

6) Semantic non-compositionality

Although an expression should manifest all of these characteristics in order to qualify unequivocally as an idiom, it is not always possible to determine the presence of all of them beyond any doubt. The difficulties related to determining conventionalisation, unit status, and semantic non-compositionality in an ancient language such as Biblical Hebrew were pointed out in Chapter 3. It stands to reason, therefore, that these five criteria cannot be applied mechanically as though they consistently carried equal weight in all cases; nor is it possible to bear all of them in mind and apply them simultaneously to every phrase as it is read. My experience in going through the corpus was that one characteristic would draw my attention to a phrase, and that I would then test it for idiomaticity by applying the other criteria one by one.

The proposed idiom criteria were discussed in detail in Chapter 3, but a few remarks in terms of their practical application in identifying idioms in the Hebrew Bible are in order here.

5.3.1 Multi-word character

The criterion of multi-word character was at the back of my mind throughout, since I was looking for idiomatic phrases, not single words. One might say that this characteristic acted as a sort of first hurdle that any piece of text had to clear on its way to being entered into my database. No matter how figurative a single word's meaning might be in a given context, if it did not form part of a greater (i.e. containing more words) unit, I did not pause to give it any

consideration. Multi-word character also seems to be the most straightforward of the criteria I proposed.

5.3.2 Verbal nucleus

This characteristic of idioms is also quite basic and served to distinguish proper idioms such as הסיך את־רגליו ("cover one's feet", i.e. "relieve oneself") from other phraseological units such as lexical collocations (e.g. יום טוב, "feast day", "holiday"), compounds (e.g. איש־הבנים, "infantryman", "champion"), or similes (e.g. כאיש אחד, "all at once", "all together").[3]

5.3.3 Semantic non-compositionality

Of the remaining three idiom characteristics, semantic non-compositionality was no doubt the one that alerted me most often to the presence of an idiom. When the sum of the meanings of the constituent parts in a phrase did not make sense in the context, or conform to what I knew or suspected to be the global meaning of the expression, I assumed that I was probably dealing with an idiom. A look at the secondary sources (Biblical Hebrew lexicons, theological dictionaries, translator's handbooks, commentaries, and translations of Samuel) often confirmed whether the phrase in question was in fact a conventionalised unit with a global meaning constituting a semantic extension of the sum total of the meanings of its constituents.[4]

Certain problems regarding semantic compositionality have to be mentioned here. A number of expressions defy categorisation by applying the simple definition of semantic non-compositionality as "a semantic extension of a construction's global meaning from the combined meanings of its individual lexical constituents" (as proposed in Chapter 3, section 3.3.1.3). The first such difficulty concerns words with a conventional abstract meaning or meanings. Take, for example, the expression נתן ביד פ׳ "give into somebody's hand". If only the literal meaning[5] of יד ("hand") is considered, this expression can be considered semantically non-compositional. However, as a cursory look at a Biblical Hebrew lexicon such as BDB will reveal, this word also has various

---

[3] See Granger and Paquot's (2008:43) categorisation of phraseological units.

[4] Even more so when these sources pointed out the occurrence of the idiom in question in other biblical books, which might indicate that it had become conventionalised.

[5] I.e. the "usual or most basic sense" of a word.

conventional abstract meanings. Thus, יד often means "power" or "control" and occurs in other expressions with this sense. Although such expressions are idiomatic to a certain degree, it seems best not to consider them idioms in the narrowest sense of the word, at least for the purposes of the present study. It stands to reason, however, that an expression containing an element with a conventional abstract meaning or meanings, such as יד, but whose overall meaning is still an extension of the combined meanings of its individual lexical constituents, can be regarded as semantically non-compositional.

Even having established this, there remains the problem of determining whether a given word does in fact have a conventional abstract meaning. There are two specific aspects of this problem that have to be addressed. First, the abstract meaning of a word given in a dictionary is possibly only activated in the context of a certain expression or set of expressions. According to BDB (2000:671), the verb נשא (Qal) can have the meaning "forgive", in addition to its most basic sense "lift" and the related meanings "carry" and "take away". The special sense "forgive" seems to be based on the meaning "take away", i.e. God takes away the guilt of the one forgiven.[6] The question is whether the sense "forgive" is conventionalised for נשא in the same way as "carry" or "take away", or whether the meaning "forgive" only exists in a restricted[7] set of conventionalised expressions, e.g. נשא עון or נשא פשע. It seems that it can reasonably be claimed that the sense "forgive" is only activated when the object is a word denoting guilt, transgression, sin, etc. Cases like this are similar to the English *catch* in the sense "reach in time and board (a train, bus, or aircraft)" (*Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 2004: "catch"). Since there is a slot in the expression that can be filled by a variety of words within a certain category — guilt/sin/transgression, or means of public transport in the above-mentioned examples — these expressions are not idioms in that they are not conventionalised units. These habitual (lexical) collocations (see Fernando, 1996:32; Granger & Paquot, 2008:43) are certainly idiomatic insofar as they conform to the natural, and somewhat peculiar, way of using the Biblical Hebrew and English language respectively,[8] but they are not idioms in the narrow sense of the word, viz. "a conventionalised multi-word symbolic unit with a verbal nucleus and a content message, whose global meaning is a

---

[6] See Stolz (1997b:772) and Kaiser (1999b:601).

[7] Restricted in the sense that the object slot can be filled only by a specific set of words, e.g. those that refer to guilt, transgression, sin, and so on.

[8] See the discussion on idioms and idiomaticity in ch. 1.

semantic extension of the combined meanings of its constituent elements" (see Chapter 3, section 3.3.2).

A second difficulty is encountered in cases like אַף, where a word's conventionalised abstract meaning ("anger") seems to stem from an idiomatic expression, rather than the expression deriving its meaning from the literal meaning of the word ("nose"). It would appear that the expression חרה אפו ("become furious", lit. "one's nose becomes hot") is based on the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS HEAT and the very real physical sensation of one's face becoming hot when one's temper flares.[9] It is interesting, however, to note that אַף is sometimes used by itself in the Hebrew Bible in the sense of "anger", i.e. without another word denoting heat (e.g. חרה or חרון). It is presumably for this reason that Biblical Hebrew lexicons and theological lexicons of the Old Testament give "anger" as a conventional abstract meaning of אַף, although they start with the literal meaning "nose".[10] The difficulty here is whether חרה אפו should be considered semantically compositional or not. Concerning this expression, I think a case can be made for semantic non-compositionality insofar as חרה ("become hot") is also used figuratively, regardless of one's view on the meaning of אַף in the expression ("nose" or "anger"). However, focusing on אַף, I propose that it is the literal meaning ("nose") that is activated in this expression, as the subject of חרה ("become hot"), not the abstract sense

---

[9]   Note the image of fire, and thus heat, even in the English usage of *flare up* for bursting into anger!

[10]   Svensson (2008:89) proposes that "it is not always the case that the literal meaning is the prototypical meaning". This holds true insofar as prototypicality is equated with frequency. An example is the case of English *way*, where corpus investigation has shown the extended metaphorical sense "fashion", "means" is used much more frequently in modern English than the concrete sense "path", "road". If frequency is viewed as determining prototypicality, the abstract sense "fashion" or "means" is to be considered prototypical, rather than the concrete sense "path" or "road". So also, a cursory glance at BDB or HALOT reveals that אַף occurs more frequently in the Hebrew Bible with the sense "anger" than "nose" or "face". In fact, Sauer (1997b:167) points out that אַף occurs 25 times in the Hebrew Bible with the meaning "nose", 42 times as reference to human anger, and 168 times as reference to God's anger. Consequently, "anger" might be considered the prototypical sense of אַף. However, a case can certainly be made for prototypicality being more than mere frequency. In this regard, Violi (2001:120) indicates that frequency does not always explain prototypicality.

("anger").[11] For that reason too, חרה אפו is semantically non-compositional. As for the conventional abstract meaning "anger", I suggest that the use of אף in this sense, by itself, is possible because the idiom חרה אפו is or was present as a conventionalised symbolic unit to speakers of Biblical Hebrew.[12] Also, אף is probably associated with "anger" based on other physiological reactions than blood rushing to the face, e.g. flaring nostrils[13] and heavy breathing.[14]

Moving on to other problems regarding semantic compositionality, we have to deal with expressions containing figurative language where the meaning is more or less clear. An example of this is נשׂא את־עיניו ("lift one's eyes"). Although this expression is not quite literal insofar as one does not literally "pick up and lift" one's eyes, it is not too difficult to make sense of the expression as "lift one's gaze",[15] i.e. "look up".[16] Since the meaning "look up" is not exactly what a strictly literal interpretation of נשׂא את־עיניו yields, i.e. "lift one's eyes", I will consider this expression, and others like it, to be semantically non-compositional.

Symbolic acts such as lifting someone's face (1 Sam 25:35) also pose a challenge to one's application of the notion of semantic non-compositionality. Can expressions like נשׂא פני פ׳ ("lift someone's face") be considered semantically

---

[11]   It seems more likely in this case that the nose as a prominent part of the face is conceptualised as becoming hot than that the emotion of anger should increase in heat. Thus DBL Hebrew (1997:678) describes one meaning of אף as to "have a strong feeling of displeasure over a person or a situation, as a figurative extension of the nose as an area that can change color when blood rushes to it while one is angry". However, it should be noted that, based on the seemingly universal conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER, the emotion of anger can be conceptualised as increasing in heat. This metaphor probably underlies English expressions describing anger as "flaring up" or "reaching boiling point".

[12]   Scholarly opinion is divided on the original meaning of the root אנף, and other explanations are possible. For instance, the meaning "to snort" has been proposed, from which both "nose" and "anger" could be derived (see the next footnotes, and also Johnson, 1974:351).

[13]   See Van Groningen (1999b:58)

[14]   See Johnson (1974:351), Sauer (1997b:168), and even HALOT (1999:76) which indicates that אף possibly means "the snorting one".

[15]   This is metonymy, where "eyes" stands for the act of looking.

[16]   We are here dealing only with this basic meaning of the expression, leaving finer, context-specific nuances such as "look with desire" (Gen 39:7) or "see/detect suddenly" (1 Sam 6:13) out of consideration for the moment.

non-compositional if they refer to literal, symbolic actions? I propose that, although literal symbolic actions may be the source from which these expressions developed, these actions are not always in focus when such expressions are used, but rather the (conventionalised) meaning that these actions represent. In other words, in 1 Sam 25:35, David was not necessarily referring to having literally lifted a kneeling or prostrate Abigail's face; rather, he indicated that he had received her favourably and granted her request. The symbolic action in this example (i.e. lifting Abigail's face) may or may not have taken place, but the focus is on the conventionalised meaning. For this reason, I will consider expressions based on symbolic acts as semantically non-compositional. I should also add that these symbolic actions are culturally specific. In cultures where people do not kneel or prostrate themselves before those of higher status (for instance in modern western cultures), this expression would not be clear. Also, in cases where the symbolic act is presumably always literally implied, e.g. נשׂא אפוד ("fulfil a priestly function", lit. "bear an ephod"), where literally bearing the ephod was an integral part of fulfilling the priestly function, the cultural specificity causes this expression to be unintelligible to readers not familiar with the religious rites and customs of the ancient Israelites. Such expressions will also be considered semantically non-compositional.[17]

5.3.4 Unit status and conventionalisation

Although multi-word character, a verbal nucleus, and semantic non-compositionality were doubtless the most actively employed criteria in identifying idioms, the criteria of unit status and conventionalisation also had to be met before an expression could be entered in my database of idioms. As already indicated, determining unit status or conventionalisation in Biblical Hebrew is no simple matter. In the light of the existing restraints on studying Biblical Hebrew, e.g. a limited corpus and no living mother-tongue speakers, I had to content myself with referring to secondary sources such as Biblical Hebrew lexica and translations of the Hebrew Bible. Any description of the unit status or conventionalisation of an expression occurring only once in the

---

[17] I realise that this argument can be claimed to be theoretically inconsistent, as the rites and customs in question would have been known to L1 speakers of Biblical Hebrew. However, this research is aimed at describing and classifying idioms in the Hebrew Bible in order to enhance non-native speakers' understanding of the text, for which reason expressions based on culturally unknown rites and customs (from the reader's viewpoint) will be included in my research.

Hebrew Bible (e.g. נעצר לפני יהוה, "be detained before YHWH", i.e. "be obliged to remain at YHWH's sanctuary", in 1 Sam 21:8) can be tentative at best. If other instances of this expression are found in an extra-biblical text, one might argue that נעצר לפני יהוה could have been conventionalised in Biblical Hebrew and should, for that reason, be treated as a symbolic unit in the lexicon. However, what needs to be acknowledged here is that such methods as were at my disposal to establish the presence of unit status or conventionalisation for expressions in the Hebrew Bible would have been unsatisfactory in studying the conventionalisation and unit status of expressions in a modern (living) language.

5.4 Unavoidable subjectivity

Although every attempt was made to rigorously adhere to the parameters set out for this study, a measure of subjectivity in this endeavour must be acknowledged. First, I came to the text armed with many years of reading, studying, and hearing the Bible expounded in translation, and also more than a decade of reading and studying the Hebrew Bible. This means that I often had a good idea of what to expect in my encounter with the text. In fact, since the culture I grew up in had been shaped in significant ways by the Bible, some of the idiomatic expressions in the text are quite familiar in my mother tongue (Afrikaans). For example, *doen wat jou hand vind om te doen* (עשה לך אשר תמצא ידך, "do whatever comes to hand") is a well-known expression understood by most speakers of Afrikaans, even those who are not familiar with the Bible. The danger here is that the researcher may fail to recognise an expression as semantically non-compositional due to the fact that this expression and its meaning are familiar to him or her.

In addition to this, the reader may (often unconsciously) assume that the meaning associated with the expression in his or her language is the same as in Biblical Hebrew. The Afrikaans expression *iemand se hart steel* ("steal someone's heart", i.e. "capture someone's affections"), for instance, does not mean the same as the Biblical Hebrew גנב את־לב פ׳ ("deceive someone").[18]

---

[18] See גנב in HALOT (1999:198), BDB (2000:170), and Smith (1999a:168). See also Ishida (2008), who proposes a method for the contrastive analysis of idioms between two languages, exactly because few idioms actually share full semantic correspondence. It has to be borne in mind, however, that the idioms referred to by Ishida are not always formally similar, but rather semantically similar, e.g. the idioms of anger *hara ga tatsu* "one's belly rises up" (Japanese) and *blow one's stack/top*.

Second, my thinking is shaped by language, whether my L1 or other languages with which I am familiar. No natural language that I know of is devoid of semantic extension, and corresponding expressions in two or more languages[19] may be embedded in the same conceptual domains. Consequently, it may be difficult to recognise semantic non-compositionality in a Biblical Hebrew expression if a similar expression, based in the same conceptual domain, occurs in my L1. For example, the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS AN OBJECT has given rise to similar expressions containing *life* (as something that can, for instance, be taken) in Biblical Hebrew and English. In both languages *take someone's life* (לקח את־נפש פ׳) means "kill someone".

It is often difficult to draw a sharp distinction between one's own cognitive processes and even one's L1 being shaped by interaction with the Bible, and being shaped by one's L1 (quite independently of the Bible), as the similarity between the examples cited here shows. Nevertheless, the researcher needs to at least be aware of these potential pitfalls when searching for idioms in the Hebrew Bible.

5.5 Classification of the idioms in Samuel

During the first round of reading through the corpus, a large number of potential idioms were identified. After subsequent scrutiny of their characteristics and information contained in secondary sources, especially in the light of some of the considerations mentioned in section 5.3 above, many expressions were removed, leaving a total of 104 idioms.[20]

All the idioms found in 1 and 2 Samuel are presented here according to their semantic classification, and their meanings as well as a literal translation are given. As was mentioned in Chapter 4, the semantic classification developed by De Blois is followed in this study, so definitions for the categories are those provided by De Blois, unless otherwise indicated. I only present the idioms from my chosen corpus according to lexical semantic domains here. For other

---

[19]   According to Piirainen (2008b:251), some idioms occur in dozens of (unrelated) languages.

[20]   This figure represents semantically distinct idioms, not forms. One form can represent two or more semantically distinct idioms. Thus, the form נשׂא פניו ("lift up one's face") is counted as two idioms, viz. *have sufficient courage* and *be favourably disposed towards someone*.

ways of arranging them (e.g. according to contextual semantic domains), please see the appendices.

5.5.1 Classification by lexical semantic domains

The following needs to be noted with regard to the format in which the idioms are represented here:

1) The order in which the idioms are presented here follows the order of lexical semantic domains and subdomains, in decreasing level, given in De Blois's classification. If there are several Biblical Hebrew idioms in a given domain, these are presented in alphabetical order.

2) Not all SDBH's lexical semantic domains are presented here, but only the ones in which idioms from the corpus occur.

3) The description of each lexical semantic domain is taken from SDBH, unless otherwise indicated. This includes examples of lexical items considered prototypical of the respective domains (although examples are not provided in all cases in SDBH). In cases where a new domain is suggested, the descriptions offered are mine.

4) Every semantically distinct variant (idiom) of a form is treated separately, e.g. the expression נשׂא פניו ("lift up one's face") which occurs in different lexical and contextual semantic domains in each case:[21]

   a) have sufficient courage

   b) be favourably disposed towards someone

5) When more than one lexical semantic domain is appropriate for an idiom, the idiom is presented under each. This does not imply, however, that these are semantically distinct forms of the idiom.

6) In cases where the meaning of an idiom is uncertain, each possibility is treated separately although they may occur in the same lexical and contextual semantic domains. This does not imply that they are different idioms. An example of this is the expression בוא באנשים ("come/go among men") which can have one of the following meanings:

---

[21]   See app. A for a discussion of this idiom.

a) pertaining to a man who is famous or important, and respected in society

b) pertaining to a man who is old

7) When the central verb of an idiom occurs in different stem formations,[22] these forms are treated as separate idioms, e.g. אורו עיניו ("one's eyes become light") in the Qal and האיר עיני־פ׳ ("cause someone's eyes to become light") in the Hiphil:

a) experience an increase in one's joy and vitality (Qal)

b) increase someone's joy and vitality (Hiphil)

Only stem formations other than the Qal are indicated in brackets.

8) The central verb of an idiom is given in the perfect,[23] 3rd person, masculine, singular form, unless the subject requires otherwise.

9) The Biblical Hebrew idiom is in every instance followed first by a description of its meaning and then by a literal translation, e.g.

סגר רחמת־פ׳	keep a woman from having children	close someone's womb

10) Where possible, the meaning of each idiom is given in the form of a definition rather than a translation equivalent (e.g. *have sufficient courage to do something that can have negative consequences* rather than *dare*). However, translation equivalents are provided in Appendix A, along with more complete definitions containing semantic features such as source/cause, function/result, and connotations, where relevant.

11) Since this is a classification of idioms, descriptions of meaning are not explained or defended here. Where necessary, annotations are provided in Appendix A.

12) In order to save space, masculine pronouns (he, his, or him) are used throughout in the descriptions of meaning and literal translations,

---

[22] Or *binyanim*.

[23] Or suffix conjugation, or *qaṭal* form.

rather than the wordier "he/she". Only when the person concerned is explicitly female, are feminine pronouns (she, hers, or her) used.

13) Some extra lexical semantic fields and subfields are suggested in addition to those currently used for the SDBH. These are indicated by an asterisk (*), and a description of the proposed field is offered.

I.   Description

Events that describe features of objects or other events.

A. Attribute

Events describing the physical features of an object.

1. Alive

Events involving the attribute of being alive; opposite Dead.

אור עיני־פ׳ (Hiph)	enable someone to be physically alive	cause someone's eyes to be light

2. Dead

Events involving the attribute of being dead; opposite: Alive.

בקש את־נפש פ׳ (Pi)	want to, or try to, kill someone	seek someone's life
לקח את־נפש פ׳	kill someone	take someone's life
נפל דמו ארצה	be killed (associated with a violent death)	one's blood falls to the ground
נקש בנפש פ׳ (Hith)	try to catch someone in an activity that can lead to their death	strike at/set traps for someone's life
צדה את־נפש פ׳	want to kill someone	lie in wait for someone's life
שכב עם־אבתיו	die	lie down with one's fathers

152

שפך דם	kill someone deliberately	pour out blood

3. Excrete

Events involving the excretion of body products, e.g. spitting, urinating, sweating, vomiting, etc.

סכך את־רגליו (Hiph)	empty the bowels (euphemism)	cover one's feet

4. Infertile*

Events denoting that a person or animal is unable to procreate, e.g. עָקַר.

סגר רחמת־פ׳	keep a woman from having children	close someone's womb

5. Old

Events denoting relatively old age, e.g. זָקֵן*; opposite:* Young.

בוא באנשים	pertaining to a man who is old	come/go among men
קמה עיניו (also קמו עיניו)	said of an old person whose eyes are no longer able to see	one's eyes stand

6. Sick

Events involving the attribute of suffering from some sort of sickness.

מות לבו בקרבו	suffer a sudden debilitating attack of illness	one's heart dies within one

7. Strong

Events denoting a relatively large amount of physical strength.

אורו עיניו	experience an increase in one's joy and vitality	one's eyes become light

153

אור עיני־פ׳ (Hiph)	increase someone's joy and vitality	cause someone's eyes to be light
אזר חיל	be strengthened	gird on strength
אזר־פ׳ חיל (Pi)	strengthen someone	gird someone with strength
רמה קרנו	be strong and prevail against one's enemies	one's horn is exalted
שבה רוחו אליו	regain one's vitality and strength	one's spirit returns to one

B. Attitude

Events describing non-physical features of (usually animate) objects, such as attitudes and emotions.

1. Accept

Events describing an animate object's willingness to associate or be involved with another object or event, e.g. אבה; opposite: Refuse.

נשא פני פ׳	receive someone (of lower status) favourably and grant his/her request; show special favour to someone and choose their side or declare them innocent when judging a dispute	lift up someone's face
ראה את־פני פ׳	be allowed to appear in the presence of someone in a position of power	see someone's face
רוח מנחה (Hiph)	accept a sacrifice, thereby accepting the one who offers it	smell an offering
שמע בקול פ׳	pay attention to what someone says and mentally accept, or take some action in accordance with, what was said	listen to someone's voice

154

2. Afraid

Events describing emotions of fear, e.g. ירא.

חרד לבו	be very frightened	one's heart trembles
נפל לבו	lose courage	one's heart falls
נפל פחד עליו	become very afraid	dread falls on one
רפו (רפה) ידיו	lose one's courage	one's hands grow slack

3. Angry

Events describing an emotion of anger or displeasure, e.g. אַף; *opposite:* Patient.

חרה אפו	become intensely angry	one's nose becomes hot
עלתה חמתו	become angry	one's heat goes up

4. Confident

Events describing feelings of confidence and lack of fear.

דבר על־לב פ׳ (Pi)	increase someone's confidence or hope by speaking or acting in a kind or affectionate way	speak on someone's heart
חזקו ידיו	gain confidence or hope	one's hands become strong
מצא את־לבו	have sufficient courage	find one's heart
נשׂא פניו	have sufficient courage	lift up one's face
שׂים את־נפשו בכפו	expose oneself to the danger of death, willingly and purposely	place one's life in the palm of one's hand

155

5. Distress

Events denoting that someone is under severe pressure as a result of anguish, sorrow, and/or fear,[24] *e.g.* צָרָה.

צללו שתי אזניו	be intensely disturbed emotionally and mentally	one's two ears resonate

6. Faithful

Events denoting that someone is committed to do what s/he is supposed to do or has promised to do,[25] *e.g.* חֶסֶד.

נטה את־לב (Hiph)	be loyal, or cause someone to be loyal	turn the heart

7. Great

Events describing the greatness of people and/or supernatural beings; opposite: Small

בוא באנשים	pertaining to a man who is famous or important, and respected in society	come/go among men

8. Grief

Events describing an emotion of grief or sadness; opposite: Joy.

אדב את־נפשו (Hiph)	cause someone to feel deep sorrow	cause someone's soul to faint
נכה לבו אתו (Hiph)	feel bitter regret	one's heart strikes one

---

[24] This description is suggested in the absence of a description in SDBH.

[25] This description is suggested in the absence of a description in SDBH.

רעע לבבו	feel depressed	one's heart is bad

9. Hope

Events describing an emotion of expectation and desire associated with a belief that the expectation and desire will be fulfilled,[26] e.g. קוה.

דבר על־לב פ׳ (Pi)	increase someone's confidence or hope by speaking or acting in a kind or affectionate way	speak on someone's heart

10. Joy

Events describing an emotion of joy or gladness, e.g. גיל*; opposite:* Grief.

אורו עיניו	experience an increase in one's joy and vitality	one's eyes become light
אור עיני־פ׳ (Hiph)	increase someone's joy and vitality	cause someone's eyes to be light

11. Merciful

Events describing an attitude of compassion, e.g. חנן*; opposite:* Cruel.

נשׂא פניו	be favourably disposed towards someone	lift up one's face

---

[26] This description is suggested in the absence of a description in SDBH.

12. Respect

Events denoting having or showing high or special regard for someone,[27] *e.g.* כבד*; opposite:* Despise.

נשׂא פני פ׳	have, or show, respect for someone of higher status	lift up someone's face

13. Ungenerous*

Events denoting a lack of generosity; opposite: Generous.

רעע לבבו	have a reluctant, ungenerous attitude	one's heart is bad

II.   Position

Events describing relations between objects and events and the environment in which they are located or occur.

A. Location

Events describing relations between objects and the physical environment in which they are located.

1. Flee

To go to another location to save one's life.

נצל עין פ׳ (Hiph)	escape from someone	snatch someone's eye

---

[27]   This description is suggested in the absence of a description in SDBH.

2. Move

(1) To move from one location to another (State/Process), (2) to go from one location to another (Action), or (3) to bring an object from one location to another (Causative), e.g. הלֹךְ.

הלך לדרכו	go away[28]	go to one's road
הפך לדרכו	go back to where one has come from[29]	turn round to one's road
פנה שכמו (Hiph)	turn away in order to leave[30]	turn one's shoulder

B. Existence

Events describing relations between objects and the non-physical environment (existence, time, etc.) in which they are located.

1. Descendants*

Events describing the continuation or cessation of someone's family line by having, or failing to have, descendants.

בנה לפ׳ בית	provide a long line of descendants for someone	build a house for someone
כבה את־גחלת פ׳ (Pi)	destroy someone's hope for their family line to continue	extinguish someone's burning coal
עשׂה לפ׳ בית	provide a long line of descendants for someone	make a house for someone

---

[28] This expression may more properly be accommodated in a subfield *Leave* (for events involving the movement of objects away from a location) rather than *Move* (for events involving the movement of objects from one location to another).

[29] See the previous footnote.

[30] See footnote 28.

2. Time

Events describing existence in time rather than in space, e.g. עֵת.

מלאו ימים	expression indicating that a specific period of time has reached its end	(the) days are filled

C. Occurrence

Events describing relations between other events and the environment in which they occur.

1. Happen

(1) To happen (State/Process), (2) to perform an event (Action), or (3) to cause something to happen (Causative), e.g. עשׂה, היה.

בוא יומו	the time comes when one will be struck by disaster or death	one's day comes
בקשׁ מיד פ׳ (Pi)	require someone to do something considered to be their religious duty	seek from someone's hand

2. Non-happen

(1) To not happen (State/Process), (2) to refrain from performing an event, or (3) to keep something from happening (Causative).

אסף ידו	stop what one is doing	draw back one's hand

III.　　Connection

Events describing relations between objects and events that are in one way or another connected to each other.

A. Attachment

Events describing relations of physical attachment between objects.

1. Fight

To wrestle or fight with someone.

מצאה ידו פ׳	find and take aggressive action against someone	one's hand finds someone
שׂים לפ׳ בדרך	wait for and attack someone who is passing by	place against someone in the road
שלח יד בפ׳	take aggressive action against someone	send (one's) hand against someone

B. Association

Events describing relationships of non-physical attachment between objects (e.g. possession, acquaintance).

1. Associate

(1) To be in league with an individual or group for a common purpose (State/Process), (2) to join oneself to an individual or group for a common purpose, and (3) to bring to individuals or groups together for a common purpose, e.g. בְּרִית

כרת ברית עם־פ׳	conclude a formal agreement with someone	cut a covenant with someone

161

2. Chastise

Events denoting the administration of punishment to someone else, both as a means of correction and as retribution. [31]

ידע פ׳ דבר (Hiph)	cause someone to bear the unpleasant consequences of their behaviour or actions	let someone know a thing
חלו דמי פ׳ על ראשו	be punished for someone's death	someone's shed blood swirls down on one's head
כבדה ידו על/אל	deal severely with	one's hand is heavy against/towards
שוב כ׳ בראש פ׳ (Hiph)	punish someone for some wrong they have done	bring back something on someone's head

3.   Control

(1) To have control over someone else (State/Process), (2) to put oneself in control of someone else (Action), and (3) to put someone else in control of someone (Causative).

נכר פ׳ ביד פ׳ (Pi)	give someone into someone else's power	make someone a stranger in someone's hand
נפל ביד פ׳	come under control of someone	fall into someone's hand
קרא שמו על (Niph)	one's ownership or dominance over someone or something is acknowledged	one's name is called over

---

[31]   This description is suggested in the absence of a description in SDBH.

4. Free

(1) To be free (State/Process), (2) to free oneself (Action), and (3) to free someone else (Causative); this category differs from Rebel *in that the former has a sense of legality which the latter does not.*

שלח פ׳ בדרך טובה	let someone go free without harming them	send someone away in a good road

5. Help

(1) To be a helper to someone or to support someone (State/Process), (2) to help someone (Action), or (3) to cause someone to help someone else, e.g. עזר.

(Pi) חזק את־ידי פ׳	give support, confidence, or hope to someone	strengthen someone's hand(s)
(Hiph) ישע ידו לו	help oneself or keep oneself safe from danger	one's (own) hand helps for one
שמר רגלי פ׳	keep someone safe from harm	watch over someone's feet
שפט מיד פ׳	rescue someone from someone else's power	judge from someone's hand

6. Oppress

Events describing how people mistreat and oppress another.

כבדה ידו על/אל	deal severely with	one's hand is heavy against/towards

7. Possess

Events denoting (1) being in possession or gain possession of an object (State/Process); (2) taking possession of an object (Action); (3) giving someone else possession of an object (Causative).

מצאה ידו כ׳	have enough of something that is requested or required of one	one's hand finds something

163

8. Rebel

(1) To live in a state of not submitting to someone else's authority (State/Process), (2) to remove oneself from under someone else's authority (Action), or (3) to remove someone else from another party's authority (Causative); e.g. מרד*; opposite:* Submit.

כבד את־לבבו (Pi)	refuse to obey	make one's heart insensible
נשׂא את־ידו ב	fight against, or resist, a ruler	lift up one's hand against

9. Serve

Events describing humans serving deities or other humans.

הלך ברגלי פ׳ (Hith)	follow or support someone as their servant	walk about at someone's feet
נשׂא אפוד	fulfil a priestly function, especially that of consulting YHWH	bear an ephod
עצר לפני יהוה (Niph)	be obliged to remain at YHWH's sanctuary	be detained before YHWH
ראה את־פני יהוה (Niph)	come to a sanctuary to appear in the presence of YHWH, to serve and worship Him	be seen with the presence of YHWH

164

10. Submit

(1) To be under someone else's authority (State/Process), (2) to place oneself under someone else's authority (Action), (3) or to put someone else under your (or another party's) authority (Causative); opposite: Rebel.

שמע ל/בקול פ׳	pay attention to what someone says and mentally accept, or take some action in accordance with, what was said	listen to someone's voice

11. Worship*

Events describing people showing reverence and adoration for a deity.

בקש את־פני יהוה (Pi)	make an effort to establish contact with YHWH	seek the face of YHWH

C. Involvement

Events describing relationships between objects and events (e.g. involvement, commitment).

1. Affect

(1) To affect someone (of events; State/Process), and (2) to cause an event to affect someone else (Causative).

גנב את־לב פ׳ (Qal, Pi)	deliberately cause someone to believe something that is not true	steal someone's heart
נגע בלב־פ׳	create in someone a desire to do something	touch on someone's heart
נטה את־לב (Hiph)	be loyal, or cause someone to be loyal	turn the heart

165

2. Bear

(1) To bear the responsibility an event (State/Process), (2) to take the responsibility for an event upon oneself (Action), or (3) to put the responsibility of an event upon someone else (Causative).

בקש מיד פ׳ (Pi)	require someone to bear the responsibility for some act or event	seek from someone's hand

3. Guilty*

Events denoting that someone can be justly charged with some wrongdoing; opposite: Innocent.

שׂים דבר בפ׳	say that someone is guilty of some wrongdoing	place a matter on someone

4. Possible*

Events denoting another event that is capable of being realised.

מצאה ידו כ׳	have the opportunity to do something	one's hand finds something

5. Sin

(1) To live in a state of guilt (State/Process), (2) to be involved in morally or ethically unjust activities (Action), or (3) to lead other people astray (Causative).

הושיעה ידו לו (Hiph)	administer justice by force	one's (own) hand helps for one
שפך דם	slaughter an animal as a sacrifice to YHWH in a place other than at the sanctuary	pour out blood

166

6. Innocent*

Events describing a person being not guilty of a crime or offence; opposite: Guilty.

לֹא מָצָא בְיַד פ׳ מְאוּמָה	find no reason to accuse someone of wrongdoing	not find anything in someone's hand

7. Succeed

Events denoting that an event has been performed successfully; opposite: Fail.

לֹא נָפַל דָּבָר (Hiph)	not allow something that was said to remain undone or unfulfilled	not let a word fall

8. Unsafe*

Events denoting hardship; opposite: Safe.

נצל עין פ׳ (Hiph)	harm someone	snatch someone's eye

9. Urge

Events denoting (1) feeling pressurised to perform an event, (2) urging oneself to perform an event, and (3) urging someone else to perform and event.

נטה את־לֵב (Hiph)	have, or cause someone to have, a desire	turn the heart
שִׂים דְּבָרִים בְּפִי־פ׳	tell someone what to say	place words in someone's mouth
שסע פ׳ בדברים (Pi)	persuade someone to refrain from doing something	tear someone in pieces with the words

167

IV.   Perception

Events describing relations between objects and events and the mind of animate beings.

A. Sensation

Events describing the physical aspects of the relationship between objects and events and the mind of animate beings (e.g. seeing, hearing, smelling, feeling, etc.).

1. See

(1) To see (State/Process), (2) to look (Action), or (3) to cause to see, show (Causative), e.g. ראה.

נשׂא את־עיניו	begin to look or see	lift up one's eyes
נשׂא את־עיניו אל	direct one's attention to someone or something by looking at it/them	lift up one's eyes to

2. Utter[32]

Events denoting the utterance of sounds.

a.   Ask

Events denoting speech used for obtaining an answer or information,[33] e.g. שאל.

שמע מה בפי פ׳	inquire after someone's opinion	hear what is in someone's mouth

---

[32] I would suggest that this domain be classified directly under *Perception*, on the same level as *Sensation* and *Cognition*. It is difficult to make sense of its current position as a subdomain of *Sensation*.

[33] This description is suggested in the absence of a description in SDBH.

b. Curse

Events denoting speech used for insulting and cursing;[34] *opposite:* Praise.

רחב פיו על	express satisfaction over someone else's failure	one's mouth opens wide against

c. Greet*

Events denoting speech used for greeting and asking about someone's welfare.

שאל לפ׳ לשלום	inquire about someone's welfare	ask someone about peace

d. Lament

Events denoting speech used for expressing one's grief and sorrow. [35]

נשׂא את־קולו ובכה	begin to weep loudly	lift up one's voice and weep
שפך את־נפשו	express feelings of sadness, grief, pain, distress, anxiety, etc.	pour out one's soul

e. Pray*

Events describing people addressing prayers to a deity.

בקשׁ את־פני יהוה (Pi)	make an effort to establish contact with YHWH	seek the face of YHWH
קרב אל־האלהים	seek advice, guidance, information, help, etc. from God	approach God

---

[34] This description is suggested in the absence of a description in SDBH.

[35] This description is suggested in the absence of a description in SDBH.

169

f. Shout

Events denoting loud speech.[36]

| נשׂא את־קולו | speak or call out in a loud voice | lift up one's voice |

g. Speak

(1) to speak (Action), or (2) to cause to speak (Causative), e.g. אמר.

| שׂים דברים בפי־פ׳ | tell someone what to say | place words in someone's mouth |

B. Cognition

Events describing the non-physical aspects of the relationship between objects and events and the mind of animate beings (e.g. knowing, thinking, remembering, etc.).

1. Ignore

Events describing the brain's failure to process information; (2) to put far away the thought of something (Action); opposite: Think.

| עלם עיניו (Hiph) | deliberately take no notice of a situation | hide one's eyes |

2. Know

Events dealing with information stored in the brain; (1) to know, learn, remember (State/Process); (2) to study (Action); (3) to teach (Causative), e.g. ידע; *opposite* Forget.

| גלה את־אזן פ׳ | give someone knowledge of a matter | uncover someone's ear |

---

[36] This description is suggested in the absence of a description in SDBH.

170

3. Think

Events describing the processing of information by the brain; (2) to think (Action); opposite: Ignore.

נשׂא את־עיניו אל	direct one's attention to a deity (physically looking or seeing not profiled)	lift up one's eyes to
(Pi) ׳סבב את־פני כ	change the way someone thinks about a matter	reverse the face of something
ראה לעינים	form an opinion of someone based on their outward appearance	see according to the eyes

A complete list of these data (including occurrences in the corpus, translation equivalents, conceptual frames, and synonymous and antonymous expressions) is provided in Appendix A. The data are presented in other ways in the other appendices (by contextual semantic domains, cognitive metaphors, etc.).

5.5.2 Evaluation of the classification of SDBH

It would appear that, with some modifications and additions, De Blois's system of lexical semantic fields can accommodate Biblical Hebrew idioms. This is to be expected, since idioms are symbolic units. However, in the process of classifying the idioms from 1 and 2 Samuel, I noticed some problems that bear mentioning here. This short discussion is by no means intended as a systematic or in-depth review of the domains in SDBH and their classification; it is incidental to my study, and the classification of idioms and can at best be tentative.

A salient problem is that the names of some categories are counterintuitive. For example, the classification of lexical items indicating the uttering of sounds (e.g. נשׂא את־קולו ובכה "lift up one's voice and weep", i.e. "begin to weep loudly") in the lexical semantic domain *Perception* and its subdomain *Sensation* seems incorrect. The terms "perception" and "sensation" simply do not easily suggest themselves as descriptions of utterances or weeping aloud. However, once one familiarises oneself with the various semantic domains and considers the definitions provided for them, rather than their names, the rationale behind the system becomes somewhat clearer. Thus, if one understands *Perception* as

171

"events describing relations between objects and events and the mind of animate beings" (SDBH, n.d. [Lexical semantic domains]), the inclusion of *Utter* as a subdomain seems less strange. An utterance can conceivably be understood as a kind of link between an object (i.e. the addressee) or event (e.g. a situation causing the utterance) on the one hand, and the mind of the person making the utterance. However, since few of the end-users of a semantic dictionary can be expected to spend a lot of time and mental energy on understanding the finer details of the system and learning unusual senses of otherwise familiar terms, such counter-intuitive names may prove most unhelpful to them.

More serious than just confusing terminology, is the issue of some seemingly illogical classifications. I have tried to demonstrate that the difficulty with including *Utter* under *Perception*, for example, is a problem of terminology rather than content. The same, however, cannot be said of the subdomain *Sensation* under which De Blois groups *Utter*. Considering the description of the domain *Sensation* ("events describing the physical aspects of the relationship between objects and events and the mind of animate beings, e.g. seeing, hearing, smelling, feeling, etc.") does not make it seem any more logical as a superordinate for a domain containing utterances. This is clearly not merely a problem of terminology. I propose that the domain *Utter* should be moved up to a position directly under *Perception*, on the same level as *Sensation* and *Cognition*.

Not all idioms seem to fit comfortably into De Blois's classification, and a few additional lexical semantic fields are suggested for these (and possibly other words and/or expressions that are semantically related):

1) *Infertile* as a subfield of *Attributes (Description)*, to denote that a person or animal is unable to procreate (*Fertile* may also be necessary to denote persons or animals that are able to procreate);

2) *Ungenerous* as a subfield of *Attitudes (Description)*, to denote a lack of generosity (opposite: *Generous*);

3) *Descendants* as a subfield of *Existence (Position)*, to describe the continuation or cessation of someone's family line by having, or failing to have, descendants;

4) *Worship* as a subfield of *Association (Connection)*, to describe people showing reverence and adoration for a deity;

172

5) *Guilty* as a subfield of *Involvement (Connection)*, to describe someone that can be justly charged with some wrongdoing (opposite: *Innocent*);

6) *Possible* as a subfield of *Involvement (Connection)*, to describe an event that is capable of being realised (*Possible* may also be necessary to describe events that are capable of being realised);

7) *Innocent* as a subfield of *Involvement (Connection)*, to describe a person being not guilty of a crime or offence (opposite: *Guilty*);

8) *Unsafe* as a subfield of *Involvement (Connection)*, to describe events denoting hardship (opposite: *Safe*);

9) *Greet* as a subfield of *Perception (Events)*, to denote speech used for greeting and asking about welfare;

10) *Pray* as a subfield of *Association (Connection)*, to describe people addressing prayers to a deity;

This incomplete range of semantic domains is not a serious issue. SDBH is a work in progress, with comments from users being welcomed by the editor (De Blois). The existing categories have been created to accommodate those Biblical Hebrew lexical items that have been studied, and new domains are added as necessary. The lack of a specific domain, then, simply means that no item belonging to that domain has been studied yet. Alternatively, the item in question may fit better in an existing domain according to De Blois's interpretation.

Van Steenbergen (2005:179) criticises De Blois for not sufficiently taking into account the Biblical Hebrew world view: "The semantic classes that are proposed for the Hebrew language are those of the researcher and not those that emanate from the Hebrew culture and world view." This is a serious shortcoming indeed, especially given De Blois's recognition of the fact that categories in a semantic dictionary of Biblical Hebrew have to be based on the ancient world view, rather than on the approach of the modern scientist (De Blois, 2000:28). Due to the scope and nature of the present research, I am not able to comment at any length about SDBH's shortcomings in terms of the Biblical Hebrew world view. The fact that De Blois's classification seems to accommodate the idioms from 1 and 2 Samuel without excessive difficulty may be interpreted as an indication that his system is not fatally flawed. The problems that I have pointed out above may possibly indicate areas where a modern theoretical framework has been forced on the Biblical Hebrew language.

5.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, the process by which the data were collected and interpreted has been explained in terms of the resources used and how the criteria proposed in earlier chapters were applied to the identification of idioms in 1 and 2 Samuel. Based on the data in this corpus, areas have been indicated where these criteria need refining, as well as exceptions to their application, and these have been discussed in some detail. A classification of Biblical Hebrew idioms is provided, based on De Blois's model used for the SDBH and containing all the idioms identified in the corpus. In the following, and final, chapter of this dissertation, I will provide concluding remarks about the results of this study, as well as suggestions for further study.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Introduction

This study constitutes an attempt to identify and classify idioms in the Hebrew Bible in order to facilitate understanding of the biblical text. The background, objectives, assumptions, hypotheses, methodology, research issues, and expected contributions to the field are discussed in Chapter 1. Some basic characteristics of idioms are also proposed, based on the preliminary study that was conducted.

In Chapter 2, a chronological overview is provided of some of the literature in the field of idiom study. Various different languages and schools of thought are represented. This discussion is continued in Chapter 3, where the focus is on literature on idioms in Biblical Hebrew specifically. After a discussion of some individual contributions, the characteristics gleaned from the various authors are discussed, and some necessary conditions and indications of idiomaticity are proposed. Based on these, a definition of *idiom* is formulated.

Chapter 4 deals with the classification of idioms. After a brief discussion of the history and concept of classification, various options are considered, and a suitable system of classification is proposed, viz. that of the SDBH developed by De Blois (2000). The remainder of the chapter is dedicated to an overview of De Blois's system and the categories that he suggests.

A discussion of the resources consulted and the methodology followed in this study is provided in Chapter 5. After discussing the criteria used in my research, I point out some challenges that I faced while working through the corpus to identify idioms. Then, an overview is given of the idioms found in my chosen corpus, classified according to De Blois's system. I also mention some of the problematic issues I had to deal with when applying De Blois's system to my data.

The present chapter concludes the theoretical part of this dissertation. In this chapter, I revisit the objectives and hypotheses stated in Chapter 1 in the light of the data I was able to collect and my subsequent classification of those data. I also present my findings and suggestions for further research.

6.2 Objectives

In the first chapter of this dissertation, I stated four objectives for my study, viz.:

1) to formulate a definition of *idiom* for Biblical Hebrew;

2) to apply this definition to identify the idioms in a representative corpus from the Hebrew Bible, viz. 1 and 2 Samuel;

3) to test the conditions for idiomaticity as proposed in existing literature, based on the idioms that have been identified; and

4) to offer a classification of types of Biblical Hebrew idioms.

In the following paragraphs, I will point out how these objectives have been addressed in the present study.

6.2.1 Formulating a definition of *idiom* for Biblical Hebrew

This objective has been satisfactorily attained. Based on the review I offered of literature on idioms, in various languages and specifically in Biblical Hebrew, I identified the following idiom characteristics that seemed to be theoretically justifiable, divided into necessary conditions for, and possible indications of, idiomaticity:

Necessary conditions	**Indications**

1. **Multi-word character**

   Expressions consisting of two or more words

2. **Semantic non-compositionality**

   Expressions whose global meaning cannot be understood or interpreted literally

3. **Unit status**

   Constructions that are subject to cognitive routinisation

4. **Conventionalisation**

   Expressions whose form and meaning have become customary by tacit agreement of the members of a speech community

5. **Verbal nucleus**

   Expressions with a verb at their core

6. **Content message**

   Expressions conveying content, as opposed to emotions or opinions, or attempting to influence the addressee

1. **Restricted variability**

   Expressions that tolerate little or no lexical or syntactic variation

2. **Uniqueness**

   Expressions containing elements that only rarely occur together in other constructions

With the above-mentioned necessary conditions for idiomaticity in mind, I proposed the following definition of *idiom*:

> *An idiom is a conventionalised multi-word symbolic unit with a verbal nucleus and a content message, whose global meaning is a semantic extension of the combined meanings of its constituent elements.*

6.2.2 Applying the definition of *idiom* to the identification of idioms

This objective has also been successfully accomplished. I used the proposed definition to identify idioms in 1 and 2 Samuel. I found it to be a satisfactory heuristic tool, although there are certain caveats (summarised in section 6.2.3). Applying the definition and criteria proposed in Chapter 3, I was able to

177

identify 104 idioms in 1 and 2 Samuel. These are presented in alphabetical order in Appendix A.

6.2.3 Testing the conditions for idiomaticity

I was able to achieve this objective as I applied the conditions for idiomaticity to the corpus in my search for idioms. The conditions I had proposed for idiomaticity enabled me to make reasonably consistent decisions about all the expressions I came across in the text. However, I became aware of certain caveats that have to be clearly stated when applying the conditions for idiomaticity proposed in this study. These are discussed in Chapter 5 and are mentioned here in summary:

1) In the light of especially phraseological terminology, the criterion of multi-word character was interpreted as a verb plus at least one more semantic (as opposed to grammatical) component.

2) Semantic non-compositionality remains a complex concept that is not always easy to identify. I have opted for the definition of semantic non-compositionality as describing an expression whose global meaning is a semantic extension of the combined meanings of its constituent elements. This implies that an expression cannot be considered semantically non-compositional based on only one of its components having a conventional abstract meaning; its overall meaning has to be an extension of the combined meanings of its individual lexical constituents in order for the expression to be semantically non-compositional.

3) Both conventionalisation and unit status have proved to be virtually impossible to determine with certainty for expressions in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, although these two conditions for idiomaticity make good theoretical sense, they are of limited benefit in identifying idioms in the Hebrew Bible.

4) The researcher applying this definition to identify idioms is influenced by his or her experience and knowledge of languages in general. This means that, however rigorously these criteria are applied, an inevitable degree of subjectivity must be acknowledged.

Bearing these qualifications in mind, I conclude that the conditions for idiomaticity as proposed in this study are useful for identifying Biblical Hebrew idioms, insofar as it is possible to determine whether they are met.

6.2.4 Classification of idioms in Biblical Hebrew

This objective, too, has been successfully attained. I have been able to classify the idioms identified in 1 and 2 Samuel, following the system developed for the SDBH by De Blois (2000). This classification, based on lexical semantic domains, is offered in Chapter 5. Other ways of presenting the idioms within the framework of the same semantic classification (e.g. by contextual semantic domains or conceptual metaphors) are presented in Appendices B, C, and D. More is said about the classification system as a whole in the discussion of hypotheses below.

6.3 Hypotheses

Some hypotheses were formulated and presented in Chapter 1 as a basis for assessing the present research, and a brief evaluation of each is offered here.

1) Idioms are a cross-language phenomenon, which means that Biblical Hebrew idioms will not differ significantly from idioms in other languages, as presented in the literature researched in this study.

   Evaluation: I believe that this hypothesis has been substantiated by my research. The conditions for idiomaticity and the definition of *idiom* proposed in this study were all based on research done in languages other than Biblical Hebrew. The subsequent review of contributions specifically about Biblical Hebrew did not lead to any additional idiom characteristics, nor changes to the definition. The proposed criteria and definition of *idiom* were found to work equally well for Biblical Hebrew.

2) Consequently, a framework for identifying and classifying Biblical Hebrew idioms will be useful for research in other languages, and *vice versa*.

   Evaluation: This hypothesis cannot be said to be proved by this study *per se*. However, in the light of my evaluation of the first hypothesis, viz. that idioms are a cross-language phenomenon, it is quite likely that this hypothesis, too, will hold true.[1]

---

[1] Of importance here is the overarching theoretical framework and the principles on which it is built. Lexical and contextual semantic domains will have to be adapted for each language and its underlying world view.

3) Insights from the field of cognitive linguistics will enhance our under-standing of idioms in Biblical Hebrew.

   Evaluation: This has no doubt been the case. Insights from cognitive linguistics, especially about conceptual metaphor and metonymy, have been most helpful in understanding the motivation of many idioms. It bears repeating, however, that this must not be understood to mean that these insights will enable us to predict the meaning of any expression. Motivation only refers to "the possibility of accounting for the contribu-tion of each word to the whole, once the meaning of the expression (in this case an idiom) is known" (Svensson, 2008:83). Thus, the conceptual metaphor BAD IS DOWN, as well as the metonymy by which the לב as locus of courage can represent courage itself, enables one to understand how נפל לבו ("one's heart falls") can mean "to lose courage". Such insights have also aided me in deciding on definitions for the meanings of some idioms as well as in classifying them. In the case of התהלך ברגלי פ׳ ("walk about at someone's feet"), I have been able to formulate a definition "fol-low or support someone as their servant", because of the following in-sights from a cognitive linguistic perspective: (1) by metonymy, feet can refer to the entire person; (2) by further extension, walking about at someone's feet means proximity to their person, whether standing, sit-ting, walking, etc.; (3) a loyal follower or servant remains near the one they are following or serving, ready to help them and do their bidding; and (4) the recognition of the conceptual metaphor OBEYING IS FOLLOWING. These insights, in turn, have helped me understand that this idiom logically falls into the lexical semantic domain *Serve* and the con-textual semantic domain *Service*.

4) The model developed by De Blois and used in the SDBH for representing lexical items from the Hebrew Bible will be suitable for classifying and representing Biblical Hebrew idioms.

   Evaluation: My research seems to have substantiated this hypothesis. Although some improvements and adjustments to several of De Blois's categories will definitely enhance his system, the overall framework and most of the categories have proved to be suitable indeed for classifying and representing Biblical Hebrew idioms (see the discussion and sugges-tions provided in Chapter 5).

5) A classification of idioms in Biblical Hebrew will lead to a better under-standing of these idioms and enhance Bible translators' understanding of the text of the Hebrew Bible, leading to more accurate translations.

Evaluation: I cannot quite claim to have proved this hypothesis valid in the present study. Classifying the idioms from 1 and 2 Samuel has certainly helped me to understand them better. For example, identifying the semantic domains for the expression נשׂא פני פ׳ helps to distinguish between the different meanings of this phrase. When it occurs in the lexical semantic domain *Respect*, the expression means "have, or show, respect for someone of higher status". In the case of the lexical semantic domain, however, two meanings are possible. These can be distinguished by identifying the contextual semantic domains involved. The meaning "receive someone favourably, irrespective of whether they are deserving, and grant their request, whether explicit or implicit" (translated as "accept someone", "grant someone's request", etc.) is activated in the contextual semantic domains *Affection* and *Compassion*, whereas the meaning "show special favour to someone and choose their side when judging a dispute, or declare them innocent, irrespective of their guilt or innocence" (translated as "show favouritism to someone", "be partial to someone", etc.) is selected in the contextual semantic domains *Dispute* and *Justice*. Whether others, especially Bible translators, will be aided by this classification of idioms remains to be seen in the course of time. If the data presented in Appendix A (and more from the rest of the Hebrew Bible) will be incorporated in resources such as SDBH, I propose that Bible translators' understanding of the text of the Hebrew Bible can be expected to be enhanced, leading to more accurate translations.

6.4 Findings

The findings from the research conducted can be summarised as follows:

1) True idioms are not as ubiquitous as I had expected at the outset of this study. Although there is a lot of figuration and semantically non-compositional language in the Hebrew Bible, many of those are communicative phrasemes (e.g. חי נפשׁך "as surely as you live"), grammatical collocations (e.g. ירא מפני "be afraid of"), compounds (e.g. מר נפשׁ "bitterness of soul"), etc.[2] After my first reading of 1 and 2 Samuel, I had identified nearly 400 potential idioms, but this total was worked down to 104 as I rigorously applied the criteria for idiomaticity.

---

[2] This clearly depends to a great extent on how one defines *idiom* and the other kinds of phrasemes involved.

2) Fernando's claim that no idiom consists of more than two subordinating clauses (Fernando, 1996:41-42) seems to be validated by my research. I have not found one instance of an idiom consisting of more than two subordinating clauses; in fact, all of the idioms I identified consist of a single clause. Communicative phrasemes, however, sometimes consist of more than one clause, albeit coordinating clauses, e.g. כה יעשׂה אלהים וכה יוסיף אם "thus YHWH will do and thus He will add if" (1 Sam 3:17) and its variants.

3) As has been convincingly argued, particularly by cognitive linguists, idiomatic meaning is motivated, though not predictable. This is substantiated by the idioms I have identified in Samuel. Without exception, the meanings of these idioms can be shown to be motivated. Put differently, none of the idioms studied is so opaque that absolutely no motivation can be discovered for its meaning.[3] The following seem to be important kinds of motivation for idiomatic meaning in Biblical Hebrew (at least for those idioms in my database):

   a) conceptual metaphor, e.g. GUILT IS AN OBJECT that can be given to someone to hold or carry, in the case of שׂים דבר בפ׳ "place a matter on someone" (i.e. "accuse someone of a matter");

   b) metonymy, e.g. "eyes" as metonym for the act of seeing, in the expression העלים עיניו "hide one's eyes" (i.e. "ignore");

   c) symbolic acts, e.g. the symbolic act of allowing someone bowing with their face to the ground to look up, or even to get up, in the case of נשׂא פני פ׳ "lift up someone's face" (i.e. "receive someone favourably");

   d) cultural associations, e.g. the heart which is considered to be the locus of volition, in the expression כבד את־לבבו "make one's heart insensible" (i.e. "be stubborn"); and

---

[3] This refers specifically to the idioms discussed in the present study, and it does not imply that there are no idioms that will defy our attempts at discovering their semantic motivation. In English, idioms such as *to trip the light fantastic* or *to kick the bucket* are quite opaque (at least synchronically, to those who do not know their etymology), and a knowledge of the circumstances surrounding their origin is probably necessary for understanding their semantic motivation. However, in the present study, even in cases where the meaning of an idiom is uncertain, at least some underlying conceptual metaphor, metonymy, symbolic act or cultural association of which we are aware can be discovered (e.g. הציל עין פ׳ — see app. A).

e) concrete images, e.g. the warmth and light of a burning coal applied metaphorically to someone's continued family life and the hope it entails, in the case of כבה את־גחלת פ׳ "extinguish someone's burning coal" (i.e. "destroy someone's hope").

4) The unit status of idioms becomes clear from the relative ease with which I was able to classify the idioms according to the semantic system developed for single lexemes. Presumably, this would not have been possible if idioms did not function as units. Thus, an idiom such as אסף ידו "draw back one's hand" (i.e. "stop what one is doing") comfortably fits into the classification system along with a single lexeme such as חדל ("stop doing something") in the lexical semantic domain *Non-happen* (SDBH, 2009: "חדל"). Also, many of the idioms discovered are based on image metaphors (i.e. their meaning can be motivated in terms of a concrete image), for example אזר חיל "gird on strength", where being strengthened to face a challenge is based on the concrete image of a warrior girding on his belt (and weapons). It is clear, then, that idioms display the same kinds of semantic development as single lexemes. This does not mean that idioms are (semantically speaking) simple words dressed up as phrases, even sentences. The motivation indicated for parts of certain idioms clearly indicates that idioms are much more complex than single lexemes. However, idioms do function as units that can be interpreted as such, once the "key"[4] is heard (see Langlotz, 2006:53), sometimes leaving certain elements implicit. An example is the expression כרת עם "cut with" (i.e. "conclude a formal agreement with someone [by cutting up sacrificial animals]"), where the key כרת seems to be sufficient to activate the entire idiom, leaving ברית "covenant" implicit.

5) There is a definite need for a more systematic treatment of idioms in Biblical Hebrew lexicons, as becomes evident from the great amounts of time needed to look for information about idioms in lexicons, commentaries, and other sources. Sometimes, idioms are mentioned as units in a

---

[4]   Actually, saying "keys" may be more appropriate. Sometimes one lexical key constituent is not sufficient to evoke the appropriate expression. For example, the key constituent *swallow* may evoke the expression *swallow a bitter pill*, but also *swallow one's words*, *swallow one's pride*, *look like the cat that swallowed the canary*, *strain at gnats and swallow camels*, *swallow something hook, line and sinker*, or even *one swallow does not make a summer*. Clearly more than one "key" may be needed to evoke an expression, such as *swallow* and *bitter* and/or *pill* to evoke *swallow a bitter pill*.

lexicon without any indication of their meaning, e.g. התהלך ברגלי פ׳. This phrase is mentioned with a Scripture reference under sense 1 of הלך (Hith) in HALOT (1999:248) — "to walk about, behave". However, no suggestion is provided as to how this meaning applies to the expression as a whole. It is doubtful that the reader will easily arrive at the meaning "follow or support someone as their servant" just by referring to HALOT. Turning to BDB (2000:236) is helpful in this case, as the meaning "attend, follow, of retainers" is suggested. However, in the case of חזקו ידיו, for example, BDB is quite unhelpful. The meaning of חָזַק is given as "be or grow strong", adding "of physical strength of hands" (2000:304), leaving the reader unaware that this expression refers to gaining confidence or hope, rather than the "physical strength" of one's hands increasing. In this case, HALOT (1999:303) is more helpful, offering the meaning "to find the courage". A semantic dictionary that systematically provides information for every idiom, such as lexical semantic domains, derivation, contextual semantic domains, etc. would be an invaluable help to anyone who works with the text of the Hebrew Bible, and especially Bible translators.

6.5 Further research

Some hypotheses remain unsubstantiated, and a number of questions have emerged as a result of this study. The following issues for further research emanate from this study:

1) The hypothesis that a classification of idioms in Biblical Hebrew will lead to a better understanding of these idioms and enhance Bible translators' understanding of the text of the Hebrew Bible, leading to more accurate translations, needs to be further investigated. It would be interesting to learn what effect including Biblical Hebrew idioms in a semantic dictionary such as SDBH has on Bible translation.[5]

2) The present study has been limited to the books of 1 and 2 Samuel. My only research outside of this chosen corpus has been to study the occurrences of idioms identified in Samuel in the rest of the Hebrew Bible, in order to determine the appropriate lexical and contextual semantic domains for them, and subsequently their meaning. Much more can be

---

[5] This is not to imply that no idioms are included in SDBH. However, specific, in-depth research on idioms and their systematic inclusion in a lexicon is the point here.

discovered about idioms in general, and even the idioms in my chosen corpus in particular, by comparing my results with the rest of the Hebrew Bible as well as extra-biblical Hebrew texts.[6] Not only may the researcher be able to learn more about the meanings of some difficult idioms from their occurrences in other texts, but more synonymous and antonymous expressions may be found from the rest of the Hebrew Bible and even extra-biblical texts. In the present study, synonymous and antonymous expressions are limited to those occurring in 1 and 2 Samuel. It would be interesting to compare such expressions from the rest of the Hebrew Bible (and extra-biblical Classical Hebrew texts), such as דרש את־יהוה ("seek YHWH") with related expressions from Samuel, such as בקש את־פני יהוה ("seek the face of YHWH").

3) As mentioned in Chapter 1, I purposely avoided poetic texts (although there are some in Samuel), due to the difficulty I was foreseeing in distinguishing between conventionalised idioms and novel figures of speech. It would be interesting to test the idiom characteristics and definition used for the present study in poetic texts. Warren-Rothlin (2005:209-212) proposes some criteria for distinguishing between literal and idiomatic meanings in the Psalms, and these might be combined with my findings when studying idioms in poetic texts.

4) In an attempt to consistently apply sound theoretical principles, many semantically non-compositional expressions have been excluded from this study. Phrasemes such as speech act formulae (e.g. בי אדני "in me, my lord", i.e. "by your leave, my lord" or "please, my lord"), attitudinal formulae (e.g. חלילה לי "to the profane for me", i.e. "far be it from me"), and even complex prepositions (e.g. מלפני "from to the face/front of", i.e. "because of") have not been studied, as they are not "pure" idioms according to the definition I propose. Also not considered in this study are copula phrases (e.g. היתה ידו בפ׳ "one's hand is on someone", i.e. "take aggressive action against someone") — including nominal clauses (e.g. דמו על־ראשו "one's blood [is] on one's head") and clauses with a predicator of existence (e.g. יש אל־תחת־ידו "there is [object] under one's hand"). However, many of these phrasemes, especially the ones that are not semantically compositional, are of interest to Bible translators and their mean-

---

ings as symbolic units need to be clearly indicated in lexicons. For this reason, these should also be studied with a view to their systematic representation in dictionaries of Biblical Hebrew.

5) De Blois's system of semantic classification, on the whole, has been shown to accommodate idioms well, but some of its problems have been identified (see the discussion in Chapter 5, section 5.5.2). Many of the categories have names that seem confusing to the uninitiated, and some of the relationships between lexical semantic domains and their subdomains are not clear. Since a systematic and in-depth critique of this system has simply not been feasible within the scope of the present study, no attempt has been made to rename domains as long as the definitions of such domains seem appropriate. More research on idioms in Biblical Hebrew, including the results of the present study, will certainly benefit the SDBH by refining the current system of semantic domains and making them more user-friendly. Further research will also help to extend its range of semantic domains and make it more representative of the whole corpus of Biblical Hebrew.

6) As Van Steenbergen (2005:180) points out with reference to SDBH, there is a "lack of a comprehensive theory of world view that is complemented by a systematic analytical approach towards the concept of world view." Further research on the Biblical Hebrew world view, based on rigorous principles of analysis, such as those proposed by Van Steenbergen, will certainly enhance our understanding of Biblical Hebrew generally, and idioms in the Hebrew Bible in particular. De Blois's lexicographical categorisation of Biblical Hebrew, including the present categorisation of idioms from 1 and 2 Samuel, can be improved and rendered more accurate as a result of research of that kind. Such research can also serve to confirm, add to, or even challenge, semantic and cognitive linguistic theories based on research in other — mostly modern — languages.

7) It would be interesting to compare similar research conducted by speakers of languages from other families. In that way, the extent to which the subjectivity discussed in Chapter 5 has actually affected the results of the current study could be determined. This holds true especially for the concept of semantic compositionality, which is coloured by one's mother tongue. The idiomaticity of an expression such as לקח את־נפש פ׳ "take someone's life" can be easily overlooked by a speaker of a language or languages — such as English — where the same phrase occurs with a similar meaning (i.e. "kill someone") and its semantic non-compositionality is not obvious. HALOT (1999:534), for example, simply

186

— and adequately so for English-speaking readers — glosses this phrase as "to take someone's life". Researchers from more diverse linguistic backgrounds may identify idioms that have been missed in this study (and others by e.g. English-speaking researchers) and so enhance the accuracy of the results presented here.

6.6 Conclusion

I hope that other linguists and biblical scholars will benefit from, and take further, the findings and suggestions for further research proposed in this dissertation. If the results of the present study and those of other researchers' work can be incorporated in dictionaries of Biblical Hebrew, such as SDBH, I have no doubt that Bible translators will benefit from it, resulting in more accurate translations. Other users of such dictionaries, such as biblical scholars, can also profit from access to such information.

Appendix A

IDIOMS IN 1 AND 2 SAMUEL ARRANGED ALPHABETICALLY

This appendix contains all the idioms identified in 1 and 2 Samuel. The idioms are presented in alphabetical order, with an indication of lexical and contextual semantic domains, following the model of SDBH. Since more information (e.g. literal translation, synonymous and antonymous expressions) is presented here than would be included in SDBH, the layout of SDBH is not followed. However, these results are offered with sufficient semantic information in the hope that SDBH and other works of similar nature may benefit thereby to some degree.

The following conventions were followed in the presentation of idioms:

1) Since these data are intended to be incorporated in other works such as SDBH, all idioms are listed under a headword as found in SDBH, BDB, etc. For example, the idiom נפל לבו is listed under the headword נפל. The headword in every case is the verb at the centre of the idiom and is indicated in large, bold type, e.g. **נפל**.

2) Under the headword, the part of speech to which it belongs is given with an Arabic numeral (1). The stem formation or *binyan* of each verb is indicated in brackets, e.g. "verb (Qal)".

3) On the next level, idiomatic expressions containing the headword are provided in unvocalised Hebrew script and numbered alphabetically, e.g. (a) נפל לבו, followed by a literal translation in square brackets on the next line, e.g. [one's heart falls].

4) The next level under the idiomatic expression is indicated by Roman numerals (i). It contains the most specific lexical semantic domain.[1] These semantic domains are based on SDBH, unless otherwise indicated. In cases where more

---

[1] Initially, the semantic class (e.g. *Events*) and the various lexical semantic domains in increasing level of specification were provided, separated by an arrowhead (>), e.g. Description > Attitude > Afraid. I finally decided to only mention the most specific domain (e.g. *Afraid*), since the names of many of these domains are counter-intuitive and will probably distract, rather than assist, readers. The hierarchy, names, and definitions of the various domains and subdomains are provided in ch. 5, for the sake of completeness. Also, the SDBH does not mention the various layers of lexical semantic domains within which the most specific domain is included, presumably for reasons similar to mine.

than one lexical semantic domain is appropriate or possible with one meaning, the two options are separated by a semicolon (;), e.g. Chastise; Oppress.

5) The level of derivation of every Event is indicated in brackets after the semantic domains, e.g. (Action).

6) Following the semantic class and lexical semantic domains, the contextual semantic domain, numbered with an Arabic numeral (1) is given, e.g. Security. Contextual semantic domains are based on SDBH, unless otherwise indicated.

7) Underneath the contextual semantic domain, a definition or description of the meaning of the idiomatic expression is provided. In the definition, the following symbols are used to indicate specific semantic features, where applicable:[2]

   a) = precedes the basic description, or definition, which contains relevant lexical information;

   b) ◄ designates semantic features associated with source or cause;

   c) ► marks semantic features associated with function or result;

   d) ≈ introduces connotations;

   e) < indicates semantic motivation;[3]

   f) ● indicates the agent, causer or affected of an event, or the specific entity to which the event applies.

8) The definition is followed by some glosses, or translation equivalents, in italics and separated by a semicolon, e.g. *one's courage fails one; lose heart*.

9) Following the definition are all the occurrences of the idiom in the Hebrew Bible, indicated in brackets, e.g. (1 Sam 17:32).

10) Synonymous and antonymous expressions are indicated after the occurrences of some idioms. These terms are interpreted quite broadly. Similar expressions occurring in a given lexical semantic domain are indicated, as well as expressions occurring in opposite lexical semantic domains. For example, כבדה ידו על/אל ("deal severely with someone"), השיב כ׳ בראש פ׳ ("punish someone for the wrong they have done"), and חלו דמי פ׳ על ראשו ("be punished for someone's death") are indicated as similar expressions in the lexical semantic domain

---

[2]   These symbols are used, as far as possible, in the same way as in SDBH.

[3]   In some cases, the motivation comes out in the explanation and connotations; in such cases the semantic motivation of the idiom is not discussed separately.

Chastise. Formally, they may be more different that the term "synonymous expression" would suggest, but semantically they are similar. I attempt to identify and indicate their differences in terms of the aspect of their semantic potential being profiled, or connotations (if any), in order to facilitate a clearer idea of their meaning. The following conventions have been followed:

a) Similar expressions are indicated by ~, and opposite expressions by ≠.

b) Only such similar and opposite expressions as were found in the corpus (1 and 2 Samuel) are presented here. There may be many more in the rest of the Hebrew Bible.

c) In the case of similar expressions, an attempt has been made to provide some information regarding their relationship with the idiom in question. For a full description of the meaning of similar expressions, each expression must be looked up under its own headword.

d) Scripture references are not given for these expressions, since that would take up unnecessary space. The occurrences of each of these expressions are provided with the discussion of the relevant expression under its headword.

11) Some semantic domains are suggested in addition to those currently used for SDBH, marked with an asterisk (*).

12) Occurrences where a phrase is semantically compositional (i.e. used with its so-called "literal" meaning) are not listed, e.g. עמד לפני פ׳ ("stand before someone") in cases where the phrase simply indicates someone's position, rather than an idiomatic meaning, such as "serve someone".

13) Only the stem formations (or *binyanim*) present in the idioms identified in Samuel were checked for their occurrence in the rest of the Hebrew Bible. In other words, if an idiom describes an Event or Action in the Qal, a search was not conducted for possible causative forms (e.g. in the Hiphil) unless examples of such usage were encountered in the text of Samuel.

14) In cases where an expression has more than one meaning, or the meaning is uncertain and more than one possible sense can be proposed, the idiom will be listed twice (i.e. discussing each possible meaning separately). This is done even when the two senses fall within the same lexical and contextual semantic domains, e.g. בוא באנשים for which two possible meanings are given, viz. "pertaining to a man who is old" and "pertaining to a man who is famous or important". This does not imply that they are two different idioms; each possible meaning is merely treated separately for the sake of completeness.

190

15) In order not to clutter the discussion of the idioms themselves, references are provided in footnotes. Some footnotes are duplicated various times. This has been done to enable the reader to consider an idiom with as much as possible information at hand, rather than being referred back to the first time a given reference occurs.

אדב[4]

(1) verb (Hiph)

    (a) ′האדיב את־נפש־פ

       [cause someone's soul to faint]

          (i)   Grief (Causative[5])

              (1) Grief

                 = cause someone to feel deep sorrow;[6] < by semantic extension, the נפש[7] is conceptualised as the essence of a person's life;[8] grief is conceptualised as depleting one's inner life force;[9] ● applies to: human: *cause someone grief; grieve someone's heart*

                 (1 Sam 2:33)

                 ≠ ′האיר עיני־פ

---

[4]   Some suggest emending the text (לַאֲדִיב) to read לְהָדִיב, meaning that the verbal root will be דוב (see HALOT, 1999:11) or even דאב (GHCLOT, 2003:191). There is no textual evidence for this, so the root is here given as it occurs in the text, viz. אדב.

[5]   This level of derivation is based on the interpretation of the MT (given a {B} rating in CTAT) that Eli's descendants and what happens to them will cause his נפש to faint (see Keil & Delitzsch, 1996b:391; NET Bible 1st Ed. notes, 2006: 1 Sam 2:33; KJV; NJPS; NBV; TOB; NVL). CTAT, on 1 Sam 2:33, explains "that the punishment of a descendant (Abiathar under Solomon) is a suffering and a punishment for the ancestor, Eli". An alternative interpretation based on the LXX, viz. that they will cause their own נפש to faint (see McCarter, 1980:86; Klein, 1998:22; NRSV), would imply *State/Process* as level of derivation.

[6]   See NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 2:33).

[7]   The concrete meaning of נפש has been proposed as "breath" (Waltke, 1999:588) or "throat" (Westermann, 1997a:744; Seebass, 1998a:504; HALOT, 1999:712). Breathing (which involves the throat) was seen as "the essence of life" (Vine, Unger & White, 1996:237; see Seebass, 1998a:505).

[8]   See Westermann (1997a:752-754), Seebass (1998a:512), Waltke (1999:589-590), and GHCLOT (2003:559). Cameron (1996:1124) states that the primary meaning of נפש is "possessing life", and De Blois (2010:7-8) explains that *life* in the Hebrew Bible is associated with a properly functioning נפש.

[9]   It seems unlikely that the throat or breath can be the object of אדב. The meaning "life" (see HALOT, 1999:713) or "soul" (see NET Bible 1st Ed. notes, 2006: 1 Sam 2:33; Stoebe, 1973:115) as expressing "joy in life, vitality" (Seebass, 1998a:509) seems much more likely in this context as the object that is being caused to faint. REB ("his appetite [will] fail") represents an alternative interpretation, viz. that נפש here means *appetite* (see CHALOT, 2000:243; Westermann, 1997a:746; Waltke, 1999:588).

אור

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) אורו עיניו

        [one's eyes become light]

           (i) Strong; Joy (State/Process)

               (1) Strength

                  = experience an increase in one's joy and vitality;[10] ◄ due to an energising activity, such as eating; < metonymically,[11] shining eyes represent vitality and joy;[12] ● applies to: human: *be refreshed; feel stronger*

                  (1 Sam 14:27,29)

                  ~ שבה רוחו אליו: possibly recovery from a less serious condition of weakness than אורו עיניו

                  ~ אזר חיל: military strength is profiled, although the expression is sometimes used figuratively

                  ~ חזקו ידיו: inward strength is profiled

                  ≠ רעע לבבו

---

[10]   See McCarter (1980:249), Klein (1998:159), and Aalen (1974:158).

[11]   I use *metonymy* here to include *synecdoche*, i.e. without making a distinction between them as separate figures of speech.

[12]   See Jenni (1997a:877) and Aalen (1974:158); also Kövecses (2008:136-137) for a discussion of the conceptual metonymy BRIGHT EYES FOR HAPPINESS.

(2) verb (Hiph)

  (a) האיר עיני־פ׳

    [cause someone's eyes to become light]

      (i) Alive (Causative)

        (1) Life

          causative of אורו עיניו: = enable someone to be physically alive;[13] < metonymically, shining eyes represent life;[14] ● agent: God; affected: human: *give life to someone*

          (Prov 29:13[15])

      (ii) Strong; Joy (Causative)

        (1) Strength

          causative of אורו עיניו: = increase someone's joy and vitality;[16] < metonymically, shining eyes represent vitality and joy;[17] ● agent: God; affected: human: *raise someone's spirits; refresh someone; strengthen someone*

          (Ezra 9:8; Ps 13:4; 19:9[18])

          האדיב את־נפש־פ׳ ≠

---

[13] See Murphy (1998:222) and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Prov 29:13).

[14] See Jenni (1997a:877), Stendebach (2001:31), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Prov 29:13).

[15] This occurrence can also be interpreted as "increase someone's joy and vitality", i.e. in the lexical domain *Strong* or *Joy* rather than *Alive*.

[16] See Williamson (1998:136), Breneman (1993:153), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Ezra 9:8).

[17] See Jenni (1997a:877) and Aalen (1974:158); also Kövecses (2008:136-137) for a discussion of the conceptual metonymy BRIGHT EYES FOR HAPPINESS.

[18] In the context of Ps 19:9, this expression can perhaps mean "bring understanding/wisdom to someone" (see Bratcher & Reyburn, 1991:193; Wolf, 1999d:25). Thus, the NET Bible (2006) reads, "give insight for life".

אזר

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) אזר חיל

        [gird on strength]

            (i) Strong (State/Process)

                (1) Warfare

                = be strengthened;[19] ▶ to be able to face a challenge; ≈ often associated with military might;[20] < strength is conceptualised as a soldier's belt that is girded on in preparation for battle;[21] ● applies to: human: *be strengthened; grow strong; find one's strength reinforced*

                (1 Sam 2:4)

                ~ אורו עיניו: recovery from a condition of weakness, possibly less serious than שבה רוחו אליו, is profiled

                ~ שבה רוחו אליו: recovery from a condition of weakness, possibly more serious than אורו עיניו, is profiled

                ~ חזקו ידיו: inward strength is profiled

---

[19]   See NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 2:4) and Klein (1998:159).

[20]   See Eising (1980a:349), Bergen (1996:76), and Wolf (1999a:29).

[21]   See DBL Hebrew (1997:273).

(2) verb (Pi)

    (a) אזר־פ׳ חיל

        [gird someone with strength]

            (i) Strong (Causative)

                (1) Warfare

causative of אזר חיל: = strengthen someone;[22] ► enabling them to face a challenge; ≈ often associated with military might;[23] < strength is conceptualised as a soldier's belt that is girded on in preparation for battle;[24] ● causer: God; affected: human: *make someone strong; give someone strength*

(2 Sam 22:40; Ps 18:33,40)

---

[22]   See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:1141) and NET Bible (2006: 2 Sam 22:40).

[23]   According to NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Ps 18:32), "this refers to physical and emotional strength for battle".

[24]   See DBL Hebrew (1997:273).

אסף

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) אסף ידו

        [draw back one's hand]

            (i) Non-happen (Action)

                (1) Action

                = stop[25] ◄ what one is doing; < idiomatisation[26] of the action of withdrawing one's hand that has been extended to some object;[27] ● agent: human: *stop what one is doing; stand back; leave alone*

                (1 Sam 14:19)

---

[25] See HALOT (1999:74) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:458).

[26] The terms *idiomatisation* and *idiomatise* are used here to indicate the process whereby an expression based on an action or event gradually loses its literal reference, i.e. the literal action or event no longer needs to take place or even be in mind for the meaning of the expression to be activated (see Warren-Rothlin, 2005:201-202). In this instance, the withdrawing of a hand extended to some object was probably no longer necessary (either physically or mentally, as part of the interpretation of the idiom) for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[27] See DBL Hebrew (1997:665).

184

בוא

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) בוא באנשים

        [come/go among men]

           (i) Old (State/Process)

               (1) Age

one possible meaning: = pertaining to a man who is old;[28]
► and past the age where he is able or required to go to war;[29]
● applies to: human: *old*

(1 Sam 17:12)

           (ii) Great (State/Process)

               (1) Age, Status

one possible meaning: = pertaining to a man who is famous or important, and respected in society;[30] ◄ because of ripe old age; < coming and going among the (older) men, i.e. being

---

[28] This meaning, suggested by HALOT (1999:114) and many commentaries (e.g. McCarter, 1980:301; Klein, 1998:169, 171; Keil & Delitzsch, 1996b:484; Bergen, 1996:191; Baldwin, 1988: 1 Sam 17:12), as well as many translations (e.g. GNT, NIV, NRSV, ESV, REB, NET, NJPS, NBV, LUT, TOB, NVL), is arrived at by following the emended reading בֹּא בַשָּׁנִים "advanced in years". This emendation has no textual evidence except the Syriac and LXX readings that suggest בַשָּׁנִים rather than בָּאֲנָשִׁים. However, as Stoebe (1973:322) points out, בַיָּמִים would be expected as more usual than בַשָּׁנִים.

[29] This meaning is based on an emendation suggested by Klostermann (1887, quoted and followed by Hertzberg, 1964:143; and Stoebe, 1973:322), reading מִבּוֹא for בָּא, or even בְאַנְשֵׁי מִלְחָמָה for בָאֲנָשִׁים (see also Tsumura, 2007: 1 Sam 17:12; Bergen, 1996:191). Translations based on this interpretation include NBV, LUT, GCL ("too old to go to war"), or TOB ("he had supplied some men").

[30] This meaning is based on the MT as it stands (בָאֲנָשִׁים), and interprets the expression as referring to a man who enjoys a respected status, as he moves about with the (older) men, i.e. to the city gates where cases are judged, etc. Although supported by surprisingly few sources, this seems to be the best option, as the MT constitutes the *lectio difficilior*. CTAT gives a {C} rating to the MT (meaning that this form of the text possibly represents the text of the Second Phase, but there is considerable doubt) and suggests that "the expression זקן בא באנשים means 'an elder notable among men' / 'an elder, distinguished among men'". This interpretation is followed by few translations, such as NBJ and FCL.

185

part of their company, is considered an indication of status;[31]

● applies to: human: distinguished; notable; respected

(1 Sam 17:12)

(b) בוא יומו

[one's day comes]

(i) Happen (State/Process)

(1) Death, Judgment

= the time comes when one will be struck by disaster or death;[32] ◄ as a result of God's judgment;[33] < references to a coming day are often associated with God's judgment of the wicked;[34] motivated by the conceptual metaphor TIME IS SOMETHING MOVING TOWARD YOU;[35] ● applies to: event: *one's time comes [to die]; one's day of reckoning comes*

(1 Sam 26:10; Ps 37:13; Jer 50:27,31; Ezek 21:30,34)

---

[31] Commenting on the honour in which the aged were held throughout the ancient Near East, Wiseman (1996:18) states, "Among the Hebrews this was [...] because the attainment of 'fullness of days' or 'entering into (many) days' was considered to be a sign of divine favour for fearing the Lord and keeping his commands [...]and thus showing dependence on the God-appointed authority." Thus, "older men were expected to lead in positions of authority and responsibility as elders". (See also Manser, 1999: "old age, attitudes to".)

[32] Sæbø (1990:18) and Jenni (1997b:531) both mention יומו as "the day of (his) death", and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Ps 37:13) states that "'his day' refers to the time when God will destroy evildoers".

[33] See Bergen (1996:256).

[34] See Preuss (1975:34-38), Sæbø (1990:28-31), Jenni (1997b:531), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Ps 37:13).

[35] See Lakoff (1994).

בנה

(1) verb (Qal)

(a) בנה לפ׳ בית

[build a house for someone]

(i) Descendants*[36] (Action)

(1) Posterity

= provide a long line of descendants for someone;[37] ► who will rule or serve in his place; < the figurative extension of בית ("house") to mean "family"[38] lies at the basis of this expression, where the sense "family" is further extended to mean "dynasty";[39] providing descendants is conceptualised as building a house; probably involved also is the conceptual metaphor FAMILY IS A BUILDING;[40] ● agent: God: *establish a dynasty for someone*

(1 Sam 2:35; 2 Sam 7:27; 1 Kgs 11:38)

~ עשׂה לפ׳ בית: near synonym ~

≠ כבה את־גחלת פ׳

---

[36] The lexical semantic domain *Descendants* is proposed for events describing the continuation or cessation of someone's family line by having, or failing to have, descendants.

[37] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:86) and NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 2:35).

[38] See Hoffner (1975:113) and Goldberg (1999:105).

[39] See Hoffner (1975:114-115), Jenni (1997c:235), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: 1 Sam 2:35).

[40] See Yamada (1993:59-61) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor in Japanese and English.

בקשׁ

(1) verb (Pi)

    (a) בקשׁ מיד פ׳

       [seek from someone's hand]

         (i) Bear (Causative)

            (1) Punishment, Responsibility

= require[41] someone to bear the responsibility;[42] ◀ for some act or event; ≈ indicating that the person involved is considered guilty of some wrong; < by semantic extension יד, as the body part with which things are grasped and held, refers to possession or control,[43] and the responsibility is conceptualised as an object held in the hand of the person responsible, based on a conceptual metaphor RESPONSIBILITIES ARE POSSESSIONS;[44] ● causer: human, God; affected: human: *hold someone responsible (for something or someone); require someone to replace (something); require someone to pay (for something); require someone to be punished (for something); call someone to account (for something)*

(1 Sam 20:16; Gen 31:39; 43:9)

~ שׂים דבר בפ׳: the supposed guilt of the accused is profiled; guilt has not been determined

≠ לֹא מצא ביד פ׳ מאומה

---

[41]   See Wagner (1975:235).

[42]   See BDB (2000:135) and Tsumura (2007: 1 Sam 20:16).

[43]   See Ackroyd (1986:409), Alexander (1999:362-363), and Van der Woude (1997a:500).

[44]   See Lakoff (1994).

188

(ii) Happen (Causative)

(1) Authority, Devotion

= require[45] someone to do something;[46] ≈ considered to be their religious duty; < by semantic extension יד, as the body part with which things are grasped and held, refers to possession or control,[47] and the responsibility is conceptualised as an object held in the hand, based on a conceptual metaphor RESPONSIBILITIES ARE POSSESSIONS;[48] ● causer: God; affected: human: *require (something) of someone*

(Is 1:12)

(b) בקש את־נפש פ׳

[seek someone's life]

(i) Dead (Causative)

(1) Aggression, Death

= want to, or try to, kill someone;[49] ≈ associated with enmity, rather than a mere criminal act against a victim unknown to the perpetrator;[50] < the desire and attempt to do something is conceptualised as seeking for it,[51] here with the implication of destroying someone's life if it is found; also, by semantic extension, the נפש[52] is conceptualised as the essence of a

---

[45] See Wagner (1975:240).

[46] See BDB (2000:135).

[47] See Ackroyd (1986:409), Alexander (1999:362-363), and Van der Woude (1997a:500).

[48] See Lakoff (1994).

[49] See BDB (2000:134) and Omanson and Ellington (2001a:424).

[50] Wagner (1975:234) states that "in this form *biqqesh* denotes the personified effort to take the life of someone else, an enemy or a mortal foe."

[51] See HALOT (1999:152). Regarding the use of the Piel verb בקש, Gerleman (1997b:252) holds, "If the obj. is a quality or ideal and therefore the goal is not to locate but rather to fulfill a wish or to realize a plan, the verb acquires an emotional nuance: 'to strive after something, be busy, be concerned'." According to him, this verb has an object-oriented and resultative meaning, whereas the near-synonym דרש is activity-related.

[52] The concrete meaning of נפש has been proposed as "breath" (Waltke, 1999:588) or "throat" (Westermann, 1997a:744; HALOT, 1999:712). Breathing (which involves the throat) was seen as "the essence of life" (Vine, Unger & White, 1996:237).

person's life,[53] and the notion of seeking it seems to be motivated by the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS AN OBJECT;[54] ● agent: human: *want to kill someone; try to kill someone; be out to kill someone; seek someone's life*

(1 Sam 20:1; 22:23 [2×]; 23:15; 25:29; 2 Sam 4:8; 16:11; Ex 4:19; 1 Kgs 19:10,14; Ps 35:4; 38:13; 40:15; 54:5; 63:10; 70:3; 86:14; Prov 29:10; Jer 4:30; 11:21; 19:7,9; 21:7; 22:25; 34:20,21; 38:16; 44:30 [2×]; 46:26; 49:37)

~ 'צדה את־נפש פ: near synonym; planning is perhaps profiled somewhat more strongly

~ 'התנקש בנפש פ: the aspect of malicious plans to cause someone's death indirectly is profiled

≠ 'השליח פ' בדרך טובה; שמר רגלי פ

---

[53] See Westermann (1997a:752-754), Seebass (1998a:512), Waltke (1999:589-590), and GHCLOT (2003:559). Cameron (1996:1124) states that the primary meaning of נפש is "possessing life", and De Blois (2010:7-8) explains that *life* in the Hebrew Bible is associated with a properly functioning נפש.

[54] See Nagy (2005:81).

(c) בקשׁ את־פני יהוה

[seek the face of YHWH]

(i) Pray*,[55] Worship*[56] (Action)

(1) Prayer, Devotion

= make an effort to establish contact with YHWH;[57] ◄ by means of worshipping and praying to Him;[58] ► in order to obtain some blessing from Him, such as his favour,[59] help,[60] knowledge about the cause of some disaster,[61] instructions about what to do, where to go, how to do something, etc.;[62] ≈ often associated with a specific holy place and ritual;[63] < YHWH's פנה is used metonymically to represent his whole person/being,[64] and by extension, his presence[65] and relationship with people;[66] ● agent: human: *seek an audience with YHWH; consult YHWH; inquire of YHWH; worship YHWH; pray to YHWH; seek the presence of YHWH*

(2 Sam 21:1; 1 Chr 16:11; 2 Chr 7:14;[67] Ps 24:6; 27:8 [2×]; 105:4)

---

[55] The lexical semantic domain *Pray* is proposed for events describing people addressing their thanks, requests, questions, etc. to a deity.

[56] The lexical semantic domain *Worship* is suggested for events describing people expressing their reverence, respect, loyalty, etc. to a deity.

[57] See McCarter (1980:440), who states that this expression means "seeking an audience with Yahweh". Some versions attempt to convey this meaning by referring to seeking YHWH's nearness or presence, e.g. NBV and GCL. (See also DBL Hebrew, 1997:1335.) For an explanation of the use of the Piel verb בקשׁ, see footnote 51 above.

[58] See Bratcher and Reyburn (1991:266) and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Ps 27:8). In 2 Sam 21:1, Stoebe (1994:453) sees in the word בקשׁ a general reference to David's call for help.

[59] See NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Ps 27:8).

[60] See Van der Woude (1997b:1010).

[61] See Hertzberg (1964:382).

[62] See Gerleman (1997b:253), Van der Woude (1997b:1010), and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:677).

[63] See Wagner (1975:237-238) and Anderson (1998:248).

[64] See Van der Woude (1997b:1010). This is an obvious anthropomorphism.

[65] See Van der Woude (1997b:1005) and Simian-Yofre (2001:595).

[66] See Van der Woude (1997b:1006).

[67] In this instance, YHWH is referred to by the possessive suffix 1st person singular, i.e. וִיבַקְשׁוּ פָנַי.

גלה

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) גלה את־אזן פ׳

       [uncover someone's ear]

          (i) Know (Causative)

             (1) Communication

                = give someone knowledge of a matter;[68] ◀ of which they normally could or would have no knowledge;[69] < the ears, as organs of hearing, are conceptualised as the means of understanding and knowing;[70] opening someone's ears enables them to hear, which is figuratively extended to mean enabling them to know something; probably motivated by the conceptual metaphor UNDERSTANDING IS HEARING;[71] ● agent: God, human: *inform someone; tell someone; reveal (a matter) to someone; disclose (a matter) to someone; let someone know*

                (1 Sam 9:15; 20:2,12,13; 22:8 [2×],17; 2 Sam 7:27; Ruth 4:4; 1 Chr 17:25; Job 33:16; 36:10,15)

---

[68] See McCarter (1980:178). Klein (1998:88) seems to view this expression as indicating communication, whether "used of God's communication to humans […], or of one human reporting to another".

[69] See McCarter (1980:178).

[70] See Liedke (1997a:72) and Wolf (1999b:29). Zobel (1975:483) points out that, in occurrences with God as subject, obedience is linked to the understanding brought about by his revelation.

[71] See Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2002:105-106) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor in English, Spanish and Basque.

גנב

(1) verb (Qal, Pi[72])

    (a) גנב את־לב פ׳ (also גנב את־לבב פ׳)

       [steal someone's heart]

         (i) Affect (Causative)

            (1) Truth and Falsehood, Heart

            = deliberately cause someone to believe something that is not true;[73] < the לבב/לב is conceptualised as the seat of the mind, both intellect and volition,[74] and if these are affected or changed without one's knowledge, one's לבב/לב is

---

[72] The distinction between the Qal and the Piel forms of this expression is not entirely clear. HALOT (1999:198) and BDB (2000:63), for instance, both gloss the Qal form of this expression as "deceive" (figurative meaning), but the Piel form of the verb (citing 2 Sam 15:6, with the object לב) is said to mean "appropriate by theft" (HALOT, 1999:198) or "steal away" (BDB, 2000:63) — the literal meaning being virtually identical to the Qal. It is possible that the Piel form of גנב carries a resultative meaning, i.e. indicating the result of the action of deceiving described in the Qal (see Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:80). As Van der Merwe *et al.* point out, this semantic difference "is difficult to determine and is sometimes difficult to reflect in English" (1999:80). Alternatively, the Piel form may indicate an intensification of the action described in the Qal (see Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:141). Thus, גנב את־לב פ׳ can indicate a strengthening or repetition of the action of deceiving, i.e. Absalom repeatedly (day after day) deceiving the Israelites by playing "the role of an empathetic, humble, and justice-minded monarch" (Bergen, 1996:397). (See footnote 76 below on the expression in 2 Sam 15:6.)

[73] According to Anderson (1998:193), "v 13 may imply that the people had willingly transferred their loyalties to Absalom". DBL Hebrew (1997:1704) also claims that "a certain willingness on the part of the victim to be deceived" is implied. However, it is not clear to me how this can be determined from the context of 2 Sam 15:6 (the only occurrence cited in DBL Hebrew), nor even verse 13 (as quoted by Anderson), especially given the basic meaning of the verb, viz. "to take that which belongs to another without his consent or knowledge" (Smith, 1999a:168).

[74] See Fabry (1995:419, 423), Bowling (1999a:467), and Stolz (1997a:639). Many mental and emotional functions are ascribed to the לב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature".

193

conceptualised as being stolen;[75] ● causer/affected: human: *deceive someone; trick someone; cheat someone*

(2 Sam 15:6;[76] Gen 31:20,26)

~ הטה את־לב: falsehood or trickery is not profiled

---

[75] See also Bowling (1999a:466) for the possibility of metonymy, i.e. that לב is used in Gen 31 to represent Laban as the object of Jacob's subtlety.

[76] Although the meaning of the idiom in this instance may seem close to the English *steal someone's heart* "gain someone's affection" (as apparently preferred by Stoebe, 1994:356), the sense *deceive* is clear from the context. Hamp (1978:41) interprets גנב as "cheat" in this expression, and Fabry (1995:417) points out that Absalom gained the men's affection, or willingness to follow him, "by fraud". Absalom told the Israelites who came to the king's court that he would see to it that justice would be done if he were a judge, since the king supposedly had no-one to hear the Israelites' cases. Many translations (e.g. NIV, NRSV, REB) suggest that, in this instance, the English idiom *steal someone's heart* (i.e. *gain someone's affection*) is a possible equivalent. However, since the English idiom does not necessarily imply deceit or trickery, I would suggest the translation, "Absalom deceived the Israelites", or even, "Absalom beguiled the Israelites" (see McCarter, 1984:357). If gaining their affection needs to be made more explicit, one could consider rendering the phrase as, "Absalom won the loyalty of the Israelites by his deceitful words". Some attempt at expressing this can be seen in FCL "il gagnait insidieusement l'affection des Israélites" ("he cunningly won the affection of the Israelites").

דבר

(1) verb (Pi)

    (a) דבר על־לב פ׳

       [speak on someone's heart]

          (i) Confidence, Hope (Causative)

              (1) Affection, Kindness*[77]

                  = increase someone's confidence or hope;[78] ◄ by speaking or acting[79] in a kind or affectionate way;[80] ≈ sometimes associated with love;[81] < לב is conceptualised as the seat of a person's psychological and emotional life,[82] so speaking to the לב means addressing, or making an appeal to, the psychological or emotional aspect of that person; perhaps

---

[77] The contextual semantic domain *Kindness* is proposed for the frame of people having an attitude of kindness and performing actions of kindness.

[78] See Mathews (2005:593), Wenham (1998:311), and NET Bible (2006: 2 Sam 19:6). Babut claims that this expression's meaning changed over time. He proposes (1999:92-93) that, between the 8th and 6th Centuries B.C., it meant "(for a person in a superior position) to offer to a partner a (new) positive relationship, to (re)establish a relationship of mutual trust". He then indicates (1999:95) that, by the time of the Chronicler, the idea of rekindling trust had been lost and that the focus had shifted to communicating assurance. I find this fine distinction (based on dating that remains debatable) unnecessary for the purposes of this study and suggest that the definition offered here adequately explains the meaning of this expression in all its occurrences in the Hebrew Bible.

[79] It seems that many interpret the verb דבר to mean that speech is central to the meaning of this idiom (e.g. HALOT, 1999:210; BDB, 2000:181; Keil & Delitzsch, 1996b:665; Pfeiffer, 1962: 2 Sam 19:5; Spence & Exell, 1909b:465). However, in most contexts, reassurance is clearly communicated by the combination of actions, demeanour, and words. In one context at least (2 Sam 19:8-9) דבר על־לב takes place without any verbal communication (see Akanni & Weanzana, 2006:402). I suggest that the verb דבר be interpreted metaphorically for the totality of communication to someone's לב (see Babut, 1999:98 f. for a similar view). This would be in line with those translators and commentators who render this expression with more general equivalents (i.e. not requiring speech as the exclusive means of communication), such as "reassure" (GNT), "encourage" (NIV), "give courage to" (NET), or even "placate" (McCarter, 1984:399) or "mollify" (Anderson, 1998:219).

[80] See HALOT (1999:210).

[81] See Fabry (1995:417). Stolz (1997a:639) also seems to say that trust is implied in this expression.

[82] See Fabry (1995:414), Stolz (1997a:639), and Bowling (1999a:466-477). Many mental and emotional functions are ascribed to the לב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature".

based on the conceptual metaphor AFFECTING IS SPEAKING;[83]
● agent: human, God: *reassure someone; encourage someone; allay someone's fears; speak kindly to someone; speak tenderly to someone*

(2 Sam 19:8; Gen 34:3; 50:21; Judg 19:3; Ruth 2:13; 2 Chr 30:22; 32:6;[84] Is 40:2; Hos 2:16)

---

[83] Although I have not been able to find any reference to this conceptual metaphor in the literature surveyed, its presence is suggested by expressions such as *speak to* in the sense "to address, indicate, or signal something" (*McGraw-Hill Dictionary of American Idioms and Phrasal Verbs*, quoted in the *Free Dictionary*, 2002), e.g. *that book really spoke to me*.

[84] Here, לבב is used rather than לב.

הלך

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) הלך לדרכו

        [go to one's road]

           (i) Move (Action)

               (1) Motion, Journey[85]

               = go away;[86] ◄ from a person or place; ► in order to return to where one has come from or to continue on a journey;[87] ≈ implies a path to a specific goal;[88] < by metonymy, דרך can refer to the action of moving along a way;[89] together with הלך, it then expresses the idea of going to one's journey; ● agent: human: *leave; continue one's journey; go one's way; be on one's way; go back; return*

               (1 Sam 1:18; 26:25; 30:2; Gen 19:2;[90] Num 24:25; Josh 2:16; Judg 18:26; 19:27; 1 Kgs 1:49; 19:15)

               ~ הפך לדרכו: returning is possibly more generally profiled, i.e. beginning the journey, rather than the journey itself

               ~ הפנה שכמו: leaving to begin one's journey is possibly profiled somewhat more strongly, and less so returning to where one has come from

---

[85] The domain *Journey* is appropriate in some passages, but not all, since the destination is not always far away (as may be implied in the word *journey*).

[86] See Reyburn and Fry (1998:414) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:378); also, NET Bible's (2006) rendering *go (on) one's way* (1 Sam 1:18; 1 Sam 26:25), or *be on one's way* (Gen 19:2).

[87] This can be seen from the context of the majority of occurrences in the Hebrew Bible.

[88] See Helfmeyer (1978:391) and Sauer (1997a:344).

[89] See Koch (1978:282-283) and Sauer (1997a:344).

[90] In this instance, the agent is not human, but it can be argued that the angels appeared to Lot as humans and that his words to them were intended as an invitation to human visitors.

(2) verb (Hith)

(a) התהלך ברגלי פ׳

[walk about at someone's feet]

(i)   Serve (Action)

(1)   Service*[91]

= follow or support someone;[92] ◄ as their servant;[93] < by metonymical extension, feet can refer to the entire person;[94] by further extension, walking about at someone's feet means proximity to their person,[95] whether standing, sitting, walking, etc.; a loyal follower or servant remains near the one they are following or serving, ready to help him and do his bidding; also involved is the conceptual metaphor OBEYING IS FOLLOWING;[96] ● agent: human: *be a follower of someone; accompany someone*

(1 Sam 25:27)

≠ נשׂא את־ידו ב; כבד את־לבבו

---

[91]   The contextual semantic domain *Service* is proposed for all terms belonging to the frame of rendering assistance as a servant.

[92]   See NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 25:27) and Akanni and Weanzana (2006:370). Klein (1998:250) also speaks about the "adherents of David".

[93]   See the explanation of ברגלי in BDB (2000:920): "which follow one, hence obey or belong to one". Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:529) mention "the young men in my lord's train", and White (1999:832) points out, "The main force of the word [רֶגֶל] throughout the OT is the individual whose feet are mentioned as traveling or holding dominion."

[94]   See Stendebach (2004:317).

[95]   See White (1999:831).

[96]   See Lingnan University (2005).

הפך

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) הפך לדרכו

      [turn round to one's road]

        (i) Move (Action)

          (1) Movement*

          = go back; ▶ to where one has come from;[97] ≈ implies starting on a path to a specific goal; < by metonymy, דרך can refer to the action of moving along a way;[98] together with הפך, it then expresses the idea of turning round to one's journey; ● agent: human: *turn back; go back*

          (1 Sam 25:12)

          ~ הלך לדרכו: possibly the path followed to the place where one has come from is profiled somewhat more strongly

          ~ הפנה שכמו: leaving to begin one's journey is possibly profiled somewhat more strongly, and less so returning to where one has come from

---

[97] See HALOT (1999:253).

[98] See Koch (1978:282-283) and Sauer (1997a:344).

חול

(1) verb (Qal)

  (a) חלו דמי פ׳ על ראשו

      [someone's shed blood swirls down[99] on one's head]

        (i) Chastise (State/Process)

            (1) Crime, Judgment

            = be held responsible for someone's death;[100] ≈ associated with divine judgment; < ראש is conceptualised as the locus of bearing moral responsibility[101] and metonymically represents the whole person;[102] דם is conceptualised as the locus of life,[103] and, by extension, refers to violent loss of life[104] in the case of shed blood;[105] being responsible for someone's death is conceptualised as their blood dancing or swirling round on one's head;[106] ● applies to: event: *be punished for someone's death; be responsible for someone's death; the punishment for someone's death falls on one*

            (2 Sam 3:29)

            ~ כבדה ידו (על/אל): more general; the cause for severe dealing is possibly profiled less

            ~ השיב כ׳ בראש פ׳: the punishment (for any kind of wrongdoing) is profiled; the semantic agent is the grammatical subject

---

[99] See DBL Hebrew (1997:2565). Alternatively, "may … whirl over" (NET), or even, "is hurled upon" (see GHCLOT, 2003:265). The root חול means "dance" (Eising, 1980b:260), which sense can be extended to mean "go round" (see HALOT, 1999:297), i.e. "swirl" (as in DBL Hebrew, 1997:2565).

[100] See McCarter (1980:118). Rather than an immediate act of punishment, McCarter also states that "responsibility for the death of Abiner is to rest upon Joab and his family as a permanent liability".

[101] See Beuken (2004a:258).

[102] See Müller (1997:1187).

[103] See Gerleman (1997a:338) and Hartley (1998:274).

[104] See Kedar-Kopfstein (1978:241) and Hamilton (1999a:191).

[105] Gerleman (1997a:337) states that דם is an "ethically qualified concept" that can mean "bloody deed" or "bloodguilt".

[106] See Eising (1980b:261), who describes this imagery as "especially harsh".

חזק

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) חזקו ידיו

        [one's hands become strong]

            (i) Confident (State/Process)

                (1) Confidence

                = gain confidence or hope;[107] ▶ so as to be able to face a specific situation; ≈ that is viewed as difficult or frightening; < by metonymy, יד as body part with which one can manipulate one's environment represents the force and ability needed to accomplish something;[108] by further metonymy, יד represents the entire person being strengthened (psychologically); ● applies to: human: *be encouraged; take courage; be courageous*

                (2 Sam 2:7; 16:21; Judg 7:11; Ezek 22:14; Zech 8:9,13)

                ~ אורו עיניו: recovery from a condition of weakness, possibly less serious than שבה רוחו אליו

                ~ שבה רוחו אליו: recovery from a condition of weakness, possibly more serious than אורו עיניו

                ~ אזר חיל: military strength is profiled, although the expression is sometimes used figuratively

                ~ נשׂא פניו, מצא את־לבו: the inner strength to face a situation or person is possibly profiled more strongly

                ≠ רפו ידיו; נפל פחד עליו; חרד לבו; נפל לבו

---

[107] See McCarter (1984:85) and NET Bible (2006: 2 Sam 2:7).

[108] See Van der Woude (1997a:500), Alexander (1999:363), and DBL Hebrew (1997:3338).

(2) verb (Pi)

   (a) חזק את־ידי פ׳

      [strengthen someone's hand(s)]

        (i)   Help (Causative)

           (1) Confidence

causative of חזקו ידיו: = give support, confidence, or hope to someone;[109] ► to be able to perform a specific action or face a specific situation; ≈ that is viewed as difficult or frightening;[110] < by metonymy, יד as body part with which one can manipulate one's environment represents the force and ability needed to accomplish something;[111] by further metonymy, יד represents the entire person being strengthened (psychologically); ● causer: human, God; affected: human: *encourage someone; support someone*

(1 Sam 23:16;[112] Judg 9:24; Ezra 6:22; Neh 2:18;[113] 6:9; Jer 23:14; Ezek 13:22)

---

[109] See Ackroyd (1986:4-7-408), NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 23:16), and McCarter (1980:374).

[110] See McCarter (1980:374).

[111] See Van der Woude (1997a:500), Alexander (1999:363), and DBL Hebrew (1997:3338).

[112] In this instance, the singular יד, rather than the plural ידי is used.

[113] This occurrence is reflexive, i.e. "they strengthened their [own] hands" > "they encouraged themselves". This can be translated with a passive, "they were encouraged".

חרד

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) חרד לבו

       [one's heart trembles]

          (i) Afraid (State/Process)

             (1) Confidence

= be very frightened;[114] ► causing one's heart to beat faster;[115] < based on the physiological reaction to fear;[116] possibly also motivated by the conceptual metaphor THE HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS,[117] whereby the emotion of fear is contained in (and may be spilled out of) the לב;[118] ● applies to: human: *be terrified; one's heart beats wildly*

(1 Sam 28:5; Job 37:1)

~ רפו ידיו, נפל לבו: the result of fear, viz. loss of courage, is profiled

~ נפל פחד עליו: the state of fear is profiled

≠ חזקו ידיו; מצא את־לבו; נשׂא פניו

---

[114] See Bergen (1996:265).

[115] McCarter (1980:417) suggests the translation, "he became so frightened that his heart beat violently".

[116] See Buckingham (2006:40) for a discussion of the conceptual metaphorical model of BODY + SHAKING/JUMPING MOVEMENT for fear.

[117] See Pérez (2008:30-31) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor and its related expressions in English and Spanish.

[118] See Fabry (1995:413), who proposes that, rather than the heart as organ, it is the vital centre of the individual that is described as being affected in this idiom.

חרה

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) חרה אפו

       [one's nose becomes hot]

          (i)   Angry (State/Process)

              (1) Anger

= become intensely angry;[119] < based on the physiological reaction to anger, i.e. blood rushing to the face, making it feel hot;[120] ● applies to: human, God: *become furious; be enraged; be incensed*

(1 Sam 11:6; 17:28; 20:30; 2 Sam 6:7; 12:5; 24:1; Gen 30:2; 39:19; 44:18; Ex 4:14; 22:23; 32:10,11; 32:19,22; Num 11:1,10,33; 12:9; 22:22,27; 24:10; 25:3; 32:10,13; Deut 6:15; 7:4; 11:17; 29:26; 31:17; Josh 7:1; 23:16; Judg 2:14,20; 3:8; 6:39; 9:30; 10:7; 14:19; 2 Kgs 13:3; 23:26; 1 Chr 13:10; 2 Chr 25:10,15; Job 32:2 [2×],3,5; 42:7; Ps 106:40; 124:3; Is 5:25; Hos 8:5; Hab 3:8; Zech 10:3)

~ עלתה חמתו: the inward experience of anger is possibly profiled somewhat more strongly[121]

---

[119] See NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 11:6), Omanson and Ellington (2001a:227), and McCarter (1980:198).

[120] See DBL Hebrew (1997:678), describing the meaning "anger" of אף as "a figurative extension of the nose as an area that can change color when blood rushes to it while one is angry". Kövecses (2000:164-165) indicates that heat in the head and face as a result of anger occurs in expressions from languages as diverse as English, Chinese, Japanese, and Hungarian. The conceptual link between אפים "nose, nostrils" and פנים "face" in Biblical Hebrew (Sauer, 1997b:168) is probably also based on the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER, where the head is a container (Kövecses, 2000), or ANGER IS HEAT and THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS (Lakoff, 1994).

[121] See Sauer (1997c:435).

ידע

(1) verb (Hiph)

    (a) הודיע פ׳ דבר

       [let someone know a thing]

          (i) Chastise (Causative)

              (1) Punishment, Aggression

              = cause someone to bear the unpleasant consequences; ◄ of their behaviour or actions;[122] ≈ associated with a defiant and contemptuous challenge to an aggressor;[123] < possibly based on the situation where someone perceived as being in a higher position teaches someone in a lower position, the promised lesson being somewhat of a threat of punishment; ● causer/affected: human: *teach someone a lesson; show someone a thing or two*

              (1 Sam 14:12)

---

[122] See Bergen (1996:156).

[123] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:278). Spence and Exell (1909a:244) also point out, "The last clause is a popular phrase, and expresses a sort of amused contempt for the two adventurers. Raillery of this sort is not at all uncommon between the outposts of two armies."

205

ישע

(1) verb (Hiph)

    (a) הושיעה ידו לו

        [one's (own) hand helps for one]

            (i)   Help (Action)

                (1)   Help*[124]

                    = help oneself or keep oneself safe from danger; ◄ by means of one's own strength;[125] < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[126] here, one's יד is personified as rescuing or helping one; ● agent: human: *save oneself; deliver oneself*

                    (Judg 7:2)

            (ii) Sin (Action)

                (1)   Sin

                    = administer justice by force;[127] ► leading to a state of guilt; ≈ considered to be something that one does not have the authority to do and that should be left to someone else who does;[128] < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[129] here, one's יד is personified as helping one repay someone for a wrong; ● agent: human: *take the law into one's own hands; take matters into one's own hands*

                    (1 Sam 25:26,31,[130]33)

---

[124]   The contextual semantic domain *Help* is proposed for all terms relating to doing something to improve someone's situation or supporting them.

[125]   See NET Bible (2006: Judg 7:2) and NBV (Judg 7:2). Ackroyd (1986:422) points out the "contrast to deliverance through divine power".

[126]   See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363).

[127]   See versions and commentators that use words such as *avenge* (NIV), *take revenge* (GNT), or *gain/get victory* (McCarter, 1980:391; Klein, 1998:244).

[128]   See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:532) and Bergen (1996:250).

[129]   See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363).

[130]   Here, יד is omitted.

כבד

(1) verb (Qal)

 (a) (על/אל) כבדה ידו

  [one's hand is heavy (against/towards)]

   (i) Chastise/Oppress (Action)

    (1) Punishment, Judgment

     = deal severely with someone;[131] < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force[132], which is conceptualised as heavy, difficult, or burdensome;[133] also, the conceptual metaphor CONTROL OR FORCE IS UP[134] or CONTROL IS PUSH DOWN[135] probably motivates the image of the force that is being exercised pressing heavily from above on the one being oppressed or punished;[136] ● agent: God, human: *severely oppress; punish severely; torment*

     (1 Sam 5:6,11; Judg 1:35; Job 23:2;[137] Ps 32:4)

     ~ השיב כ׳ בראש פ׳: the punishment (for any kind of wrongdoing) is profiled

     ~ חלו דמי פ׳ על ראשו: the punishment for killing someone is profiled; the subject is the shed blood of the victim

---

[131] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:126).

[132] See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363). Kövecses (2002:245) also mentions the conceptual metonymy THE HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL, which provides the basis for expressions such as *gain the upper hand* ("attain an advantage over another person") or *keep a strict hand upon a person* ("keep under total control").

[133] See Stenmans (1995:18).

[134] See Lakoff and Johnson (1980:14-19).

[135] See Lingnan University (2005).

[136] At least in those cases where the preposition על is used.

[137] This instance is not entirely clear. Some translations (NIV, REB, NRSV, LUT, NVL) follow the LXX, with the meaning, "his hand is heavy on account of (*or* in spite of) my groaning" (see NET Bible 1st Ed. notes, 2006: Job 23:2), which indicates God dealing severely with Job. However, others (ESV, HSV, TOB) follow the MT, with the meaning, "my hand is heavy on (*or* on account of) my groaning", i.e. Job tries to suppress his groans. In that case, Job would not be dealing severely with someone, but rather suppressing the action of groaning (see Clines, 2006:593).

(2) verb (Pi)

    (a) כבד את־לבבו (also כבד את־לבו)

        [make one's heart insensible]

          (i) Rebel (Action)

              (1) Resistance*,[138] Will

                  = refuse to obey;[139] < the לב as locus of volition[140] is conceptualised as being made sluggish, with the result that it functions improperly,[141] leading to disobedience; possibly motivated by the conceptual metaphor DIFFICULTY IS HEAVINESS[142] or LESS ACTIVE IS SLOW,[143] where the heart struggles, or fails, to function properly when it is made heavy;
● agent: human: *be stubborn; be obstinate; refuse to obey*

                  (1 Sam 6:6 [2×])

                  ≠ התהלך ברגלי פ׳

---

[138]   The contextual semantic domain *Resistance* is proposed for all terms relating to not accepting someone else's authority.

[139]   See Fabry (1995:427) and Omanson and Ellington (2001a:137).

[140]   See Fabry (1995:423) and Stolz (1997a:639). This is one of the many functions ascribed to the לב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature". Fabry (1995:425) and Stolz (1997a:640) both view hardness of heart as manifested in the part of a person relating to God. However, the context of 1 Sam 6:6 (where the Philistines are advised not to harden their לבב) seems to rather indicate a semantic motivation in the realm of volition (although the relationship between people and God is certainly involved).

[141]   See Stenmans (1995:18-19, 20-21), Westermann (1997b:592), and Oswalt (1999:426). Presumably, the ideal condition of the לב is to be אחרי יהוה "behind YHWH", i.e. loyal to YHWH.

[142]   See Siqueira *et al.* (2009:160) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor in English.

[143]   See Lingnan University (2005).

כבה

(1) verb (Pi)

    (a) כבה את־גחלת פ׳

      [extinguish someone's burning coal]

        (i) Descendants* (Action)

          (1) Posterity

            = destroy someone's hope for their family line to continue;[144] ◄ by killing their last descendant or heir; < a single remaining heir that is able to procreate is conceptualised as a glowing coal,[145] giving warmth and life;[146] possibly motivated by the conceptual metaphors HOPE IS LIGHT[147] and LIFE IS A FIRE / A FLAME / HEAT,[148] whereby extinguishing the burning coal means destroying the continued life of someone's family and, consequently, their hope; ● agent: human: *destroy someone's hope; put out someone's only flame of hope*

            (2 Sam 14:7)

            עשׂה לפ׳ בית ;בנה לפ׳ בית ≠

---

[144] See Baumann (1995:39), Omanson and Ellington (2001b:904), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006b: 2 Sam 14:7).

[145] See Smith (1999b:158) and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: 2 Sam 14:7).

[146] See Fuhs (1975:463).

[147] See Lakoff (1994).

[148] See Sjöblad (2009:101-105) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor in Latin.

כרת

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) (כרת ברית לפ׳ or כרת ברית את־פ׳ (also כרת ברית עם־פ׳ [149]

        [cut a covenant with someone]

        (i)   Associate (Action)

            (1)   Covenant

                = conclude a formal agreement with someone;[150] ◄ ratified by certain rituals and symbolic acts involving sacrifice,[151] blood,[152] salt,[153] a communal meal,[154] oaths,[155] gifts,[156] intermarriage,[157] a memorial,[158] a written document,[159] etc.; ► according to which both parties have certain specified obligations,[160] e.g. loyalty, protection, or obedience to the other party;[161] ≈ viewed not merely as a legal agreement, but as a religious act, with a deity or his representative commonly invoked as witness;[162] < idiomatisation[163] of the self-imprecatory[164] action of cutting

---

[149] An elliptical form of this idiom (כרת לפ׳ or כרת עם־פ׳) also occurs, with the same meaning, in 1 Sam 11:2; 20:16; 22:8; 1 Kgs 8:9; 2 Chr 5:10; 7:18.

[150] See Williamson (2003:139), Herion (2000:288), and Omanson and Ellington (2001a:224). However, Weinfeld (1975:255-256) argues that ברית originally meant "imposition", "liability", or "obligation", rather than "agreement", and that the sense "pact" is a later development.

[151] See Williamson (2003:140), Fensham (1996:234), and Smick (1999a:128).

[152] See Fensham (1996:236).

[153] See Péter-Contesse and Ellington (1992:34).

[154] See Smick (1999a:128) and Fensham (1996:234).

[155] See Weinfeld (1975:262), Williamson (2003:140), Herion (2000:289), and Smick (1999a:128).

[156] See McCarter (1980:305).

[157] See Smick (1999a:129) and Fensham (1996:235).

[158] See NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Ex 12:14) and Smick (1999a:128).

[159] See Smick (1999a:129).

[160] Weinfeld (1975:255) sees "imposition", "liability", or "obligation" as the original meaning of ברית, rather than "agreement".

[161] See Herion (2000:288), Kutsch (1997a:258-265), and Unterman (1985:190).

[162] See Herion (2000:289).

[163] In many, if not most, instances, the cutting up of a sacrificial animal was probably no longer necessary (either physically or mentally, as part of the interpretation of the idiom) for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[164] See Keown (1998:189), Huey (1993:311), and Freeman and Chadwick (1998:371).

up an animal when making certain covenants;[165] ● agent: human, God: *make a covenant with someone; make a pact with someone; make a treaty with someone*

(1 Sam 11:1; 18:3; 23:18; 2 Sam 3:12,13,21; 5:3; Gen 15:18; 21:27,32; 26:28; 31:44; Ex 23:32; 24:8; 34:10,12,15,27; Deut 4:23; 5:2,3; 7:2; 9:9; 28:69 [2×]; 29:11,13,24; 31:16; Josh 9:6,7,11,15,16; 24:25; Judg 2:2; 1 Kgs 5:26; 8:21; 20:34; 2 Kgs 11:4,17; 17:15,35,38; 23:3; 1 Chr 11:3; 2 Chr 6:11; 21:7; 23:3,16; 29:10; 34:31; Ezra 10:3; Neh 9:8; Job 31:1; 40:28; Ps 50:5; 83:6; 89:4; Is 28:15; 55:3; 61:8; Jer 11:10; 31:31,32,33; 32:40; 34:8,13,15,18; Ezek 17:13; 34:25; 37:26; Hos 2:20; 10:4; 12:2; Zech 11:10)

---

[165] See Hasel (1995:349), Smick (1999b:457), Kutsch (1997b:636), and Fensham (1996:234). Weinfeld (1975:259) agrees with this, although he points out the possible figurative meaning of כרת, viz. "decide, decree".

לקח

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) לקח את־נפש פ׳

        [take someone's life]

           (i) Dead (Causative)

               (1) Aggression, Death

= kill someone;[166] < by semantic extension, the נפש[167] is conceptualised as the essence of a person's life;[168] the notion of seizing and taking away life[169] seems to be motivated by the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS AN OBJECT;[170] ● agent: human, God: *kill someone; take someone's life*

(1 Sam 24:12; 1 Kgs 19:4,10,14; Ps 31:14; Prov 1:19; Jon 4:3)

~ שפך דם: the violence of the killing is profiled; also the unlawfulness of the killing, except in the case of legitimate revenge for the death of a relative

---

[166] See NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 24:11) and BDB (2000:543).

[167] The concrete meaning of נפש has been proposed as "breath" (Waltke, 1999:588) or "throat" (Westermann, 1997a:744; HALOT, 1999:712). Breathing (which involves the throat) was seen as "the essence of life" (Vine, Unger & White, 1996:237).

[168] See Westermann (1997a:752-754), Seebass (1998a:512), Waltke (1999:589-590), and GHCLOT (2003:559). Cameron (1996:1124) states that the primary meaning of נפש is "possessing life", and De Blois (2010:7-8) explains that *life* in the Hebrew Bible is associated with a properly functioning נפש.

[169] See HALOT (1999:534).

[170] See Nagy (2005:81).

מות

(1) verb (Qal)

   (a) מות לבו בקרבו

      [one's heart dies within one]

         (i) Sick (State/Process)

            (1) Sickness

            = suffer a sudden debilitating attack of illness;[171] ◄ brought on by trauma; ► causing the loss of power to move, speak, etc.; < the לב as locus of vitality[172] is conceptualised as dying, causing the affected person to be motionless and unresponsive;[173] ● applies to: human: *have a stroke; have a seizure; have an apoplectic fit*

            (1 Sam 25:37)

---

[171] HALOT (1999:562) render this expression as having an "apoplectic seizure", and NEB (2006: 1 Sam 25:37) and Bergen (1996:252) as having a "stroke that resulted in a coma".

[172] See Fabry (1995:413). This is one of the many functions ascribed to the לב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature". It seems less likely that the heart as physical organ (see Stolz, 1997a:638; Bowling, 1999a:466) or the mind (psychological faculties) (see Bergen, 1996:252) is conceptualised as dying. If indeed the physical organ is in view here, its function, however important, was obviously not considered necessary for the rest of the body to stay alive, as the example of Nabal shows. His heart died within him, but he continued living about another ten days: וַיְהִי כַּעֲשֶׂרֶת הַיָּמִים וַיִּגֹּף יהוה אֶת־נָבָל וַיָּמֹת (1 Sam 25:38).

[173] See Klein (1998:252).

מלא

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) מלאו ימים

       [(the) days are filled]

          (i)   Time (State/Process)

              (1)   Time

                    = expression indicating that a specific period of time, such as life,[174] pregnancy,[175] a work contract,[176] burial rituals,[177] or purification rituals,[178] has reached its end;[179] < probably based on the conceptual metaphor TIME IS A CONTAINER;[180] in this case the container of time is conceptualised as having become full, with some event taking place when the fullness of time is achieved;[181] ● applies to: event: *the time is up; the time comes; one's time comes; the period (of consecration, purification, etc.) is over; reach the end of one's life*

                    (1 Sam 18:26; 2 Sam 7:12; Gen 25:24; 29:21; 50:3 [2×]; Lev 8:33; 12:4,6; Num 6:5,13; 1 Chr 17:11; Esth 1:5; 2:12; Jer 25:34; Lam 4:18; Ezek 5:2; Dan 10:3)

---

[174]   See 2 Sam 7:12.

[175]   See Gen 25:24.

[176]   See Gen 29:21.

[177]   See Gen 50:3,4.

[178]   See Lev 12:4.

[179]   See Kaiser (1999a:505) and Delcor (1997:666). Many translations (e.g. NRSV, NJPS, GNB, KJV, WV, GCL, TOB, and NBJ) render this expression with "the time (of/for something) had expired" or an equivalent.

[180]   See Lakoff (1994).

[181]   See Snijders (1997:299) and Delcor (1997:666).

מצא

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) מצאה ידו כ׳

       [one's hand finds something]

          (i)   Possess (State/Process)

              (1)   Availability

                = have enough of something;[182] ◄ that is requested or required from one; ► to be able to give it for some purpose; < by extension, יד as body part which can grasp indicates possession;[183] here, יד metonymically represents the whole person;[184] ● applies to: event: *be able to afford; be able to spare; have available*

                (1 Sam 25:8; Lev 12:8)

          (ii) Appropriate (State/Process)

              (1)   Action

                = have the opportunity to do something;[185] < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[186] here, יד metonymically represents the whole person;[187] ● applies to: event: *what one can do; what is in one's power to do; as the occasion may demand*

                (1 Sam 10:7; Judg 9:33; Ecc 9:10)

---

[182] See Klein (1998:248) and Omanson and Ellington (2001a:520).

[183] See Ackroyd (1986:409), Alexander (1999:363), and CHALOT (2000:128).

[184] See Ackroyd (1986:408).

[185] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:431) and HALOT (1999:619). Thus, NJPS renders the expression in 1 Sam 10:7 as "when the occasion arises" (see also KJV, LUT, GCL, FCL, and NBJ). Some versions focus on the opinion of the agent, rather than the opportunity that presents itself, e.g. NRSV (1 Sam 10:7) "whatever you see fit to do" or NBV (1 Sam 10:7) "zoals uw hart u ingeeft" ("as your heart tells/inspires you").

[186] See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363).

[187] See Ackroyd (1986:408).

(b) מצאה ידו פ׳

[one's hand finds someone]

    (i) Fight (Action)

        (1) Aggression

= find and take aggressive action against someone;[188] ≈ associated with enmity, rather than a mere criminal act against a victim unknown to the perpetrator;[189] < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[190] here, יד metonymically represents the whole person;[191] ● agent: human, God: *get one's hands on someone; lay hold of someone*

(1 Sam 23:17; Ps 21:9)

~ שלח יד בפ׳: aggressive action in general is profiled

~ שים לפ׳ בדרך: context of military attack

---

[188] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:492).

[189] The word מצא generally seems to imply "a result following a time of 'seeking'" (Hamilton, 1999c:521) or "striving" (see Shead, 2007:215-216).

[190] See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363).

[191] See Ackroyd (1986:408).

(c) ‏לא מצא ביד פ׳ מאומה‎ (also ‏לא מצא בפ׳ מאומה‎)
[not find anything in someone's hand]

(i) Innocence* (State/Process)

(1) Punishment

= find no reason to accuse someone of wrongdoing;[192] < by extension, ‏יד‎ as body part which can grasp indicates possession;[193] here, wrongdoing and its consequent guilt seem to be conceptualised as an object that can be held; probably based on a conceptual metaphor GUILT IS AN OBJECT;[194] ● applies to: human: *have no fault to find with someone; have no complaint about someone*

(1 Sam 12:5; 29:3)

‏שים דבר בפ׳ ;בקש מיד פ׳‎ ≠

---

[192] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:237) and NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 12:5).

[193] See Ackroyd (1986:409), Alexander (1999:363), and CHALOT (2000:128).

[194] Although I have not been able to find this conceptual metaphor specifically mentioned in any of the literature I consulted, there is evidence that it exists. In Lev 16:22, we read that the scapegoat carries (‏נשא‎) the sins (‏עֲוֹנֹת‎), i.e. the guilt resulting from sin, of the people. According to Num 9:13, people can also bear (‏נשא‎) their sin (‏חֵטְא‎), i.e. the guilt of their sin. So, forgiving sin is conceptualised as lifting (‏נשא‎) transgression (‏פֶּשַׁע‎) or sin (‏חַטָּאת‎), or rather the burden of guilt that rests on the sinner as a result of sin (Gen 50:17). The existence of this conceptual metaphor is also evident in English expressions like *have no guilt, carry the blame, give someone the blame for something*, etc.

217

(d) מצא את־לבו

[find one's heart]

    (i) Confident (State/Process)

        (1) Confidence

= have sufficient courage;[195] ► to do something that can be seen as presumptuous;[196] < as a person's psychological centre,[197] the לב is conceptualised as the locus of courage and, by extension, representing courage;[198] when one is said to find one's לב, it seems to imply the conceptual metaphor COURAGE IS AN OBJECT;[199] ● applies to: human: *dare; venture; make so bold*

(2 Sam 7:27)

~ נשׂא פניו: near synonym

~ חזקו ידיו: courage in general

≠ נפל לבו; חרד לבו; נפל פחד עליו; רפו ידיו

---

[195] See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:773). Wagner (1997:481) interprets this expression to simply mean "to find courage" or "to gain confidence", but the context does seem to imply sufficient courage to do something presumptuous.

[196] See Anderson (1998:128). Probably anything dangerous could be implied by this expression, but possible presumption seems to be specifically involved in the one instance of מצא את־לבו in the Hebrew Bible.

[197] See Stolz (1997a:639).

[198] See Fabry (1995:425) and Bowling (1999a:467). This is one of the many functions ascribed to the לב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature".

[199] See Álvarez *et al.* (2009) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor in pop and metal lyrics. Velasco (2002:52) also indicates that, in English language usage, courage "is conceived of as a physical entity with its associated properties (e.g. it can be possessed)".

נגע

(1) verb (Qal)

(a) נגע בלב־פ׳

[touch on someone's heart]

(i) Affect (Causative)

(1) Heart

= create in someone a desire;[200] ► causing them to do something;[201] < the לֵב is conceptualised as the locus of emotion,[202] such as desire; probably based on the conceptual metaphor AFFECTING IS TOUCHING;[203] ● causer: God; affected: human: *inspire someone (to do something)*

(1 Sam 10:26)

---

[200] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:221).

[201] See Coppes (1999a:552) and GHCLOT (2003:532).

[202] See Fabry (1995:414), Bowling (1999a:467-468), and Stolz (1997a:639). This is one of the many functions ascribed to the לֵב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature".

[203] See Boers (1996:106) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor in English, and Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2002:107) for the same in English, Spanish, and Basque.

219

נטה

(1) verb (Hiph)

  (a) הטה את־לב (also הטה את־לבב)

    [turn the heart]

      (i)   Faithful; Affect (Action/Causative)

        (1)   Faithfulness, Heart, Will

          = be loyal or devoted,[204] or cause someone to be loyal or devoted;[205] ≈ sometimes implying a change of loyalty; < the לב is conceptualised as the seat of the will,[206] i.e. where the choice is made as to one's loyalties; the conceptual metaphor CHANGE IS TURNING[207] probably motivates the concept of turning the לב; ● agent/causer: human, God; affected: human: *be loyal; commit oneself; submit; make (someone) loyal; let (someone) be drawn (to something); win (someone) over; sway (someone's) heart*

          (2 Sam 19:15; Josh 24:23; 1 Kgs 8:58; 11:2,3,4)

          ~ גנב את־לב פ׳: associated with falsehood and trickery

---

[204]   See Butler (1998:276), Howard (1998:439), and Bratcher and Newman (1983:311).

[205]   See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:1038).

[206]   See NET Bible (2006: Josh 24:23), Bowling (1999a:467), and Stolz (1997a:639). This is one of the many functions ascribed to the לב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature". Alternatively, loyalty can be a function of the לב as the locus of emotions such as gratitude, a willingness to follow a leader, etc. (see Fabry, 1995:417).

[207]   See Lakoff and Johnson (1999:207).

220

(ii) Urge (Action/Causative)

    (1) Heart

= have, or cause someone to have, a desire;[208] ▶ and decide to pursue what is desired; ≈ possibly implying a change of mind; < the לֵב is conceptualised as the seat of the mind, both intellect and volition,[209] i.e. where the one thinks about and decides on one's actions; the conceptual metaphor CHANGE IS TURNING[210] probably motivates the concept of turning the לֵב; ● agent/causer: God, human; affected: human: *desire; make someone desire (something); direct (someone's) desires*

(Ps 119:36; 141:4; Prov 2:2;[211] 21:1)

---

[208] See Bratcher and Reyburn (1991:1008) and Reyburn and Fry (2000:437-438).

[209] See Fabry (1995:419, 423), Bowling (1999a:467), and Stolz (1997a:639). This is one of the many functions ascribed to the לֵב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature".

[210] See Lakoff and Johnson (1999:207).

[211] Garrett (1993:75) holds that, here, the לֵב "refers to faculties of perception" (rather than volition).

נכה

(1) verb (Hiph)

    (a) הכה לבו אתו

      [one's heart strikes one]

        (i) Grief (State/Process)

          (1) Grief, Heart

          = feel bitter regret;[212] ◄ for something one has done; ≈ showing that one is guilty of wrongdoing; < the לב is conceptualised as the seat of conscience;[213] it is here personified as striking[214] one, possibly motivated by the conceptual metaphor CRITICISING IS HITTING;[215] ● applies to: human: *feel remorse; be conscience-stricken*

          (1 Sam 24:6; 2 Sam 24:10)

---

[212] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:504) and Bergen (1996:239).

[213] See Fabry (1995:426) and Stolz (1997a:640). This is one of the many functions ascribed to the לב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature".

[214] Or "hurting" or "punishing" (see Conrad, 1998:422).

[215] See Goatley (2007:429).

נכר

(1) verb (Pi)

    (a) נכר פ׳ ביד פ׳ [216]

        [make someone a stranger in someone's hand]

           (i) Control (Causative)

               (1) Control

                    = give someone into someone else's power;[217] ≈ associated with enmity between the person handed over and the one into whose power the former is given; < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[218] here, יד metonymically represents the whole person;[219] the meaning "hand over" is a semantic extension of נכר ("alienate, make a stranger"), indicating a repudiation of relationship or covenant with the one handed over;[220] ● causer: God; affected: human: *hand someone over to (an enemy)*

                    (1 Sam 23:7)

                    ≠ שפט מיד פ׳

---

[216] Many (e.g. Omanson & Ellington, 2001a:485; Klein, 1998:228; McCarter, 1980:369; NET Bible 1st Ed. notes, 2006: 1 Sam 23:7) seem to consider the verb נכר ("alienate; make a stranger") to make this a difficult, if not impossible, expression and suggest the reading סכר ("hand over") instead, or following the LXX πιπράσκω ("sell as a slave"). However, the textual evidence for this is weak, and CTAT gives an {A} rating to the MT נכר, suggesting the translation "he has handed him over". I propose that the MT, as the *lectio dificilior*, be followed, as some sense can be made of it from a cognitive linguistic perspective.

[217] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:485) and Bergen (1996:234).

[218] See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363).

[219] See Ackroyd (1986:408).

[220] See Tsumura (2007: 1 Sam 23:7), Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:519), and DBL Hebrew (1997:5796).

נפל

(1) verb (Qal)

> (a) נפל ביד פ׳
>
>> [fall into someone's hand]
>>
>>> (i) Control (State/Process)
>>>
>>>> (1) Control, Judgment
>>>>
>>>>> = come under control of someone;[221] ≈ implies aggressive action by the one into whose power one falls;[222] < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[223] the use of the verb נפל is probably based on the conceptual metaphors LOSING POWER/CONTROL IS DESCENDING[224] and LOSS OF CONTROL IS DOWN/FALLING,[225] indicating the lack of control of the subject; ● applies to: human: *be captured by someone; fall into someone's power; fall into someone's hands; be conquered by someone*
>>>>>
>>>>> (2 Sam 24:14 [2×]; Judg 15:18; 1 Chr 21:13 [2×]; Lam 1:7)

---

[221] See Reyburn (1992a:23) and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Lam 1:7).

[222] Seebass (1998b:494) points out that "falling into someone's hands has deadly results" in many cases, e.g. Judg 15:18 and Lam 1:7. Some of Seebass's examples, e.g. 1 Chr 5:10 and 20:8, however, can be interpreted as dying by the hand of someone rather than coming under their control, as in the present idiom. The sense "dying by the hand of someone" is not considered an idiom according to the approach followed in the current study, since it is semantically compositional. The verb נפל with the sense "die" can collocate with many other prepositional phrases: one can "fall", i.e. "die", בחרב "by the sword" (Num 14:43), על־פני השׂדה "in the open field" (Ezek 29:5), etc.

[223] See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363).

[224] See Lingnan University (2005).

[225] See Lakoff (1994) and New York Times Company (2002). Another conceptual metaphor that may come into play is BAD IS DOWN (see Álvarez *et al.*, 2009), whereby coming under the control of the party involved is shown to be a negative experience. Even "falling into the hand of God" is viewed as negative, since it implies judgment and punishment.

(b) נפל דמו ארצה

[one's blood falls to the ground]

    (i)   Dead (State/Process)

        (1)   Death

        = be killed;[226] ≈ possibly associated with a violent death at someone else's hand;[227] < דם is conceptualised as the locus of life,[228] and, by extension, refers to violent loss of life[229] in the case of shed blood;[230] ● applies to: human: *be killed*

        (1 Sam 26:20)

        ~ שׁכב עם־אבתיו: associated with the death of rulers

---

[226] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:535) and Vine, Unger and White (1996:20).

[227] See Klein (1998:259).

[228] See Gerleman (1997a:338) and Hartley (1998:274).

[229] See Kedar-Kopfstein (1978:241) and Hamilton (1999a:191).

[230] See Gerleman (1997a:337), stating that דם is an "ethically qualified concept" and can mean "bloody deed" or "bloodguilt".

(c) ‎נפל לבו[231]

[one's heart falls]

(i) Afraid (State/Process)

(1) Confidence, Heart

= lose courage;[232] ◄ because of a frightening or difficult situation; < the ‎לב is conceptualised as the locus of courage and, by metonymy, representing courage;[233] when the ‎לב is said to fall, it seems to imply the conceptual metaphor BAD IS DOWN;[234] ● applies to: human: *one's courage fails one; lose heart; become fearful*

(1 Sam 17:32)

~ ‎רפו ידיו: near synonym

~ ‎חרד לבו: the immediate response of fear, viz. the heart beating wildly, is profiled

~ ‎נפל פחד עליו: the state of fear is possibly profiled more strongly

≠ ‎חזקו ידיו; מצא את־לבו; נשא פניו

---

[231] 1 Sam 17:32 reads ‎אל־יפל לב־אדם עליו. Here, I have interpreted this idiom as ‎נפל לבו, with ‎עליו indicating cause, i.e. "because of him [Goliath]". (See Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:292 on the use of ‎על to indicate cause.) This interpretation (viz. that the expression is complete without the phrase ‎עליו) seems to be supported by Keil and Delitzsch (1996b: 1 Sam 17:32-40), Bergen (1996:193), and Bowling (1999a:1071). NIV apparently also interprets the idiom in this way, since it adds the causal phrase "on account of this Philistine", presumably a translation of ‎עליו. However, others (Klein, 1998:170; Omanson & Ellington, 2001a:370; NET Bible 1st Ed. notes, 2006: 1 Sam 17:32) seem to consider ‎עליו to be a part of the idiom, i.e. ‎נפל לבו עליו ("one's heart falls on one"). Seebass (1998b:493) interprets the heart as falling on someone else, referring to the spreading of fear. Whichever interpretation one follows, the idiom refers to a loss of courage.

[232] See NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 17:32) and Bergen (1996:193).

[233] See Fabry (1995:425) and Bowling (1999a:467). This is one of the many functions ascribed to the ‎לב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature".

[234] See Álvarez *et al.* (2009) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor in pop and metal lyrics in English.

226

(d) נפל פחד עליו

[dread falls on one]

(i) Afraid (State/Process)

(1) Confidence

= become very afraid;[235] ◄ because of a frightening action or show of might by someone, whether human or divine;[236] < fear is conceptualised as an object[237] that falls on one; the conceptual metaphor CONTROL IS UP[238] or CONTROL IS PUSH DOWN[239] probably lies at the basis of fear conceptualised as coming down on one from above, i.e. controlling one; ● applies to: human: *be terrified; be seized by fear; be overwhelmed by fear*[240]

(1 Sam 11:7; Ex 15:16;[241] Esth 8:17; 9:2,3; Job 13:11; Ps 105:38)

~ נפל לבו: the result of fear, viz. loss of courage, is possibly profiled more strongly

~ רפו ידיו: the result of fear, viz. loss of courage, is possibly profiled more strongly

~ חרד לבו: the immediate response of fear, viz. the heart beating wildly, is profiled

≠ נשׂא פניו; מצא את־לבו; חזקו ידיו

---

[235] See Reyburn (1992b:253-254).

[236] See Stähli (1997a:981) and Bowling (1999b:721). Müller (2001:522) mentions "the overwhelming spontaneous experience of the numinous" even when the object of fear is human, e.g. in the context of war.

[237] See Álvarez *et al.* (2009) for a discussion of the conceptual metaphor FEAR IS AN OBJECT in English pop and metal lyrics. Alternatively, fear can be conceptualised as an opponent (Sirvydė, 2006:83) attacking one (see HALOT, 1999:710).

[238] See Lakoff (1994).

[239] See Lingnan University (2005).

[240] According to Seebass (1998b:495) "*napal ʿal* means something like 'overwhelm'".

[241] In this instance, the word אימה is added, i.e. תִּפֹּל עֲלֵיהֶם אֵימָתָה וָפַחַד.

227

(2) verb (Hiph)

    (a) לא הפיל דבר

       [not let a word fall]

          (i) Succeed (Causative)

             (1) Success and Failure

= not allow something that was said to remain undone or unfulfilled;[242] < דבר is used metonymically to represent entire utterances;[243] the description of unfulfilled words as falling is probably motivated by the conceptual metaphor FAILURE IS FALLING;[244] ● causer: God, human; affected: event: *make words come true; not leave words unfulfilled*

(1 Sam 3:19; Esth 6:10)

---

[242] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:100), Bergen (1996:88), and McCarter (1980:99).

[243] Schmidt (1978:103) states that "*dabhar* can mean either a single word [...] or speech".

[244] See Goatley (2007:430) and HALOT (1999:710).

נצל

(1) verb (Hiph)

    (a) [245] הציל עין פ׳

       [snatch someone's eye]

          (i) Unsafe*[246] (Causative)

             (1) Aggression

                meaning uncertain; one possible meaning: = harm someone;[247] ► in a way that cannot be remedied;[248] < possibly motivated by the figure of the eye — indicating one of the most important body parts,[249] hence a very valuable, irreplaceable possession[250] — being torn out;[251] ● agent: human: *do someone great harm*

                (2 Sam 20:6)

---

[245] Although some have suggested emending the MT (e.g. McCarter, 1984:426), Anderson (1998:234) points out that the variant readings proposed "may point to an unusual idiom rather than to a corrupt text".

[246] The contextual semantic domain *Unsafe* is proposed for all events denoting hardship, as the opposite of *Safe*.

[247] See Anderson (1998:234) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:672).

[248] See Anderson (1998:234).

[249] According to Stendebach (2001:31), the concept of honour also finds expression in the עין. Thus, putting out the eyes causes disgrace.

[250] See Schultz (1999:662) and Stendebach (2001:40). Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:672) also point out that the apple of the eye signifies "the most valuable possession".

[251] Some versions interpret this harm in the form of Sheba taking fortified cities from David, e.g. NBV, LUT, GCL. Along the same lines, but with a slightly different focus, Anderson (1998:234) takes this as a metaphor for permanent injury.

(ii)   Flee (Action)

(1)   Security

meaning uncertain; one possible meaning: = escape from someone;[252] < possibly based on the eye as organ of sight being extended to mean the act of seeing,[253] and the verb הציל interpreted as "withdraw" or "remove";[254] ● agent: human: *escape from someone; elude someone*

(2 Sam 20:6)

---

[252]   See Fisher (1999:594) and McCarter (1984:426). This meaning also seems to be supported by most translations, e.g. KJV, GNT, CEV, NIV, NRSV, ESV, REB, NET, NJPS, FCL, NBJ, TOB, NTLH, and NVL.

[253]   See Schultz (1999:662) and BDB (2000:664).

[254]   See Fisher (1999:594). Alternatively, McCarter (1984:426) proposes reading הצל "cast a shadow over", following the LXX σκιάσει, which can also motivate the meaning "escape from someone".

נקש

(1) verb (Hith)

    (a) התנקש בנפש פ׳

        [strike at someone's life/set traps for someone's life]

            (i) Dead (Causative)

                (1) Aggression, Death

= try to catch someone in an activity ▶ that can lead to their death;[255] ≈ associated with malice and craftiness; < by semantic extension, the נפש[256] is conceptualised as the essence of a person's life,[257] and the notion of setting traps to catch — and presumably destroy — it seems to be motivated by the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS AN OBJECT;[258] ● agent: human: *try to trick someone; try to trap someone; set/lay a trap for someone*

(1 Sam 28:9)

~ בקש את־נפש פ׳: the desire or intention to kill someone directly is profiled

~ צדה את־נפש פ׳: the desire or intention to kill someone directly is profiled

≠ השליח פ׳ בדרך טובה; שמר רגלי פ׳

---

[255] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:542).

[256] The concrete meaning of נפש has been proposed as "breath" (Waltke, 1999:588) or "throat" (Westermann, 1997a:744; HALOT, 1999:712). Breathing (which involves the throat) was seen as "the essence of life" (Vine, Unger & White, 1996:237).

[257] See Westermann (1997a:752-754), Seebass (1998a:512), Waltke (1999:589-590), and GHCLOT (2003:559). Cameron (1996:1124) states that the primary meaning of נפש is "possessing life", and De Blois (2010:7-8) explains that *life* in the Hebrew Bible is associated with a properly functioning נפש.

[258] See Nagy (2005:81).

נשׂא

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) נשׂא אפוד

       [bear an ephod]

          (i) Serve (Action)

              (1) Priesthood

= fulfil a priestly function,[259] especially that of consulting YHWH;[260] < by extension, wearing the ritual priestly garment,[261] or carrying and using the ritual divination device,[262] serves to indicate priestly service in general;[263] ● agent: human: *act as priest; consult YHWH; wear the priestly garment; carry the ephod*[264]

(1 Sam 2:28; 14:3; 22:18)

---

[259] See Bergen (1996:82) and Hertzberg (1964:37).

[260] See CEV, GNT, and FCL (1 Sam 2:28).

[261] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:79), Feinberg (1999:63), Bergen (1996:82), McCarter (1980:90), and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:389).

[262] See Klein (1998:135), Omanson and Ellington (2001a:273), and Stoebe (1994:263).

[263] See Bergen (1996:82) and Hertzberg (1964:37). It is possible that the symbolic act of wearing this ritual garment (or of carrying this "oracle-producing device" — see Klein, 1998:26-27) has become idiomatised. If that is the case, the ephod and its function are no longer necessary for the idiomatic meaning "fulfil a priestly function" to be activated.

[264] If this translation equivalent is chosen, some additional information about the *ephod* should be provided (e.g. in a footnote or a glossary entry).

(b) נשׂא את־ידו ב

    [lift up one's hand against]

        (i)   Rebel (Action)

            (1)   Resistance*, Aggression

            = fight against, or resist;[265] ≈ implying the aim of overthrowing a ruler; < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[266] the lifting of the hand to resist someone in control is probably motivated by the conceptual metaphor CONTROL IS UP;[267] ● agent: human: *rebel against*

            (2 Sam 18:28; 20:21)

            התהלך ברגלי פ׳ ≠

---

[265] See Freedman and Willoughby (1999:37), Omanson and Ellington (2001b:1021), Kaiser (1999b:600), and NET Bible (2006: 2 Sam 18:28, 2 Sam 20:21). Ackroyd (1986:411) interprets this expression in the context of swearing an oath, but he acknowledges "a hostile sense […] implicit in the oath".

[266] See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363).

[267] See Lakoff (1994).

233

(c) נשׂא את־עיניו

[lift up one's eyes]

(i) See (Action)

(1) Sight*[268]

normally followed by a verb of seeing, or וֹ plus the deictic particle הִנֵּה: = begin to look or see;[269] ≈ the deliberateness of seeing is profiled;[270] a degree of eagerness or carefulness is sometimes implied;[271] < by metonymy, the eyes as organ of sight refer to the action of seeing;[272] the concept of the eyes being lifted up is probably based not only on the physical action of turning the head and gaze upward,[273] but also the conceptual metaphor AWARENESS IS HIGH;[274] ● agent: human: *look; look about; look up; look back; look closely*

(1 Sam 6:13; 2 Sam 13:34; 18:24; Gen 13:10,14;[275] 18:2; 22:4,13; 24:63,64; 31:10,12; 33:1,5; 37:25; 43:29; Ex 14:10; Num 24:2;[276] Deut 3:27; 4:19; Josh 5:13; Judg 19:17; 1 Chr 21:16; Job 2:12; Is 40:26; 49:18; 51:6; 60:4; Jer 3:2; 13:20; Ezek 8:5 [2×]; Dan 8:3; 10:5; Zech 2:1,5; 5:5,9; 6:1)

---

[268] The contextual semantic domain *Sight* is suggested for all terms relating to seeing.

[269] See Jenni (1997a:876).

[270] See Stendebach (2001:35); also the NET Bible 1ˢᵗ Ed. notes (2006: Gen 13:10), where this expression is said to draw "attention to the act of looking," and also to call "attention to the importance of what was seen".

[271] See Freedman and Willoughby (1999:38) and Spence and Exell (1909d:196).

[272] See Schultz (1999:662) and Jenni (1997a:875).

[273] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:141).

[274] See Lingnan University (2005).

[275] Stendebach (2001:35) points out the possibility that נשׂא את־עיניו in Gen 13:14 reflects "the ancient legal practice of taking effectual ownership of land by a visual survey".

[276] See Stendebach (2001:35) for the view that, in this instance, "the raising of Balaam's eyes means that he conveys a blessing."

(d) נשׂא את־עיניו אל[277]

[lift up one's eyes to]

(i) See (Action)

(1) Sight*

= direct one's attention to someone or something; ▶ by looking closely at it/them;[278] ≈ the deliberateness of seeing is profiled;[279] a certain degree of desire, longing or dependence is implied;[280] < by metonymy, the eyes as organ of sight refer to the action of seeing and even to mental perception;[281] the concept of the eyes being lifted up is probably based not only on the physical action of turning the head and gaze upward, but also the conceptual metaphor AWARENESS IS HIGH;[282] ● agent: human: *take notice (of); look longingly (at); gaze (at); look up (at)*

(Gen 39:7; Ps 121:1)

---

[277] Although very similar to the previous expression (even sharing the same lexical and contextual semantic domains), it seems best to treat נשׂא את־עיניו followed by אֶל separately. Besides the formal difference in terms of the preposition, the mental aspect of this expression's semantic potential is also profiled, which seems to imply a degree of longing or dependence not present in נשׂא את־עיניו without the preposition.

[278] See Reyburn and Fry (1998:893).

[279] See Stendebach (2001:35); also the NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Gen 39:7), where this expression is said to focus on "deliberate and careful scrutiny".

[280] See Stendebach (2001:35), Stolz (1997b:771), and Jenni (1997a:877). This is also made explicit in some versions (e.g. GNT, REB, WV, and NTLH).

[281] See Stendebach (2001:35), Schultz (1999:662), and Jenni (1997a:875).

[282] See Lingnan University (2005).

(ii) Think (Action)

    (1) Heart

= direct one's attention[283] to a deity;[284] ≈ the action of physically looking or seeing is not profiled; a certain degree of desire, longing, expectation, or dependence is implied;[285] < by metonymy, the eyes as organ of sight refer to the action of seeing and even to mental perception;[286] besides being an idiomatisation[287] of the act of looking up, this expression is probably motivated by the conceptual metaphors AWARENESS IS HIGH[288] and DESIRE IS UP;[289] ● agent: human: *look (to); pray (to); long (for); worship*

(Ps 123:1; Ezek 18:6,12,15; 23:27; 33:25)

---

[283] See Stendebach (2001:34).

[284] See Freedman and Willoughby (1999:38).

[285] See Allen (2002:217), Stendebach (2001:35), Keil and Delitzsch (1996f:144), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Ezek 18:6). Some suggest the rendering "pray to" for this expression (see Bratcher & Reyburn, 1991:1059-1060), and various versions render this expression in Ezek 18 as "pray to" (e.g. NET, GCL) or "worship" (GNT, NBV; see also Spence & Exell, 1909e:322), indicating the longing for, or dependence on, the deity being prayed to.

[286] See Stendebach (2001:35), Schultz (1999:662), and Jenni (1997a:875).

[287] In this instance, the gaze turned upward (either physically or mentally, as part of the interpretation of the idiom) is no longer necessary for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[288] See Lingnan University (2005).

[289] See Kuźniak (2001:59).

(e) נשׂא את־קולו

    (i) Shout (Action)

        (1) Communication

        = speak or call out in a loud voice;[290] ► and so make oneself heard;[291] < apparently based on the conceptual metaphors THE VOICE IS AN OBJECT[292] and LOUD IS UP;[293] ● agent: human: *call out; shout; roar*[294]

        (Judg 9:7; Ps 93:3;[295] Is 24:14; 42:2)

(f) נשׂא את־קולו ובכה

    [lift up one's voice and weep]

    (i) Lament (Action)

        (1) Mourning

        = begin to weep loudly;[296] ≈ as a sign of distress;[297] < extension of the meaning of נשׂא את־קולו "speak or call out in a loud voice";[298] ● agent: human: *burst into tears; begin crying loudly; break into weeping*

        (1 Sam 11:4; 24:17; 30:4; 2 Sam 3:32; 13:36; Gen 21:16; 27:38; 29:11; Num 14:1; Judg 2:4; 21:2; Ruth 1:9,14; Job 2:12)

---

[290] See HALOT (1999:725), Freedman and Willoughby (1999:38), Labuschagne (1997a:1135), Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:262), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Judg 9:7).

[291] See Spence and Exell (1909f:101).

[292] I could find no evidence of such a conceptual metaphor mentioned in the literature I surveyed. However, similar Biblical Hebrew expressions such as הרים קולו or נתן את־קולו "increase the volume in which one speaks" (lit. "give one's voice" and "raise one's voice", or even קול גדול "loud voice" (lit. "big voice") may be indicative of its existence. Also, English idiomatic expressions such as *raise one's voice, lose one's voice, get one's voice back,* or *have no voice* probably imply the same conceptual metaphor.

[293] See Hurtienne (2009:49-50) for a discussion of the conceptual metaphor MORE IS UP and how this also applies to volume.

[294] Of water, when personified.

[295] This is a personification of נשׂא את־קולו, where roaring rivers are said to lift up their voice.

[296] See Labuschagne (1997a:1135), Stolz (1997b:771), McCarter (1980:198), and NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 11:4).

[297] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:226).

[298] Considering the occurrences of this expression in the Hebrew Bible, the inchoative aspect of speaking or calling out in a loud voice seems to be profiled here.

(g) ‏נשׂא פני פ׳‎

[lift up someone's face]

(i) Accept (Action)

(1) Affection, Compassion*[299]

= receive someone favourably;[300] ◄ irrespective of whether they are deserving; ► and grant their request, whether explicit or implicit;[301] ≈ the one received is either of lower social status, or acting humbly because of the request they are making;[302] < possibly derived from the symbolic act of allowing someone who bowed with their face to the ground to look up or even to get up;[303] by extension, ‏פנים‎ "face" can refer to the entire person who is conceptualised as being raised;[304] probably also involved is the conceptual metaphor STATUS IS UP,[305] i.e. raising someone's position means increasing their status; here, receiving someone favourably is conceptualised as a temporary increase in their status; ● agent: human, God: *do what someone asks; grant someone's request; receive someone favourably; accept someone*

(1 Sam 25:35; Gen 19:21; 32: 21; Job 42:8,9; Mal 1:8,9)[306]

---

[299] The contextual semantic domain *Compassion* is suggested for all terms belonging to the frame of concern and pity for the suffering of others.

[300] See Freedman and Willoughby (1999:37), Reyburn and Fry (1998:759), Stolz (1997b:771), Keil and Delitzsch (1996a:194), and NET Bible 1ˢᵗ Ed. notes (2006: Gen 32:20).

[301] See Klein (1998:251), McCarter (1980:400), and Omanson and Ellington (2001a:537).

[302] This can be seen when considering all the occurrences of this expression in the Hebrew Bible. Freedman and Willoughby (1999:37) mention "the ruler's show of favor toward a petitioner" in this regard.

[303] See Warren-Rothlin (2005:201-202) for a discussion of the process whereby a symbolic act (e.g. allowing a prostrate person to rise) can eventually become idiomatised and gradually lose its literal reference (e.g. Mal 1:8, where the Lord says that the governor will not "lift the face" of someone offering a blind, sick or lame animal, i.e. he will not receive them favourably) and finally turn into a speech act (e.g. 1 Sam 25:35, where David says to Abigail, "I have lifted your face", i.e. "I have granted your request").

[304] See Van der Woude (1997b:1000).

[305] See Lingnan University (2005).

[306] Another occurrence of this expression is in Prov 6:35, where it is not a person, but a thing ("ransom") that is favourably received (or "regarded" — see NET). This is a figurative extension of the idiom ‏נשׂא פני פ׳‎.

(2) Dispute, Justice

= show special favour to someone;[307] ▶ and choose their side or declare them innocent when judging a dispute;[308] ◀ irrespective of their guilt or innocence; ≈ such partiality is regarded as a perversion or abrogation of justice;[309] < possibly derived from the symbolic act of allowing someone who bowed with their face to the ground to look up or even to get up;[310] by extension, פנים "face" can refer to the entire person who is conceptualised as being raised;[311] probably also involved is the conceptual metaphor STATUS IS UP,[312] i.e. raising someone's position means increasing their status; here, showing someone special favour is conceptualised as a temporary increase in their status; ● agent: human, God: *show favouritism to someone; be partial to someone*

(Lev 19:15; Deut 10:17; Job 13:8; 32:21; 34:19; Ps 82:2; Prov 18:5)

---

[307] See Hamilton (1999b:727) and Péter-Contesse and Ellington (1992:289).

[308] See Stolz (1997b:771), Hartley (1998:316), Rooker (2000:257), and Simian-Yofre (2001:601).

[309] See Freedman and Willoughby (1999:38) and Hartley (1998:316); also Clines (1998:308), who points out that it is wrong "to be partial (נשׂא פנים)".

[310] See Warren-Rothlin (2005:201-202) for a discussion of the process whereby a symbolic act (e.g. allowing a prostrate person to rise) can eventually become idiomatised and gradually lose its literal reference (e.g. Mal 1:8, where the Lord says that the governor will not "lift the face" of someone offering a blind, sick or lame animal, i.e. he will not receive them favourably) and finally turn into a speech act (e.g. 1 Sam 25:35, where David says to Abigail, "I have lifted your face", i.e. "I have granted your request").

[311] See Van der Woude (1997b:1000) and Simian-Yofre (2001:594).

[312] See Lingnan University (2005).

(ii) Respect (Action)

    (1) Respect

= have, or show, respect for someone;[313] ◄ of higher status;[314] ≈ is regarded as proper, socially acceptable conduct;[315] < possibly derived from symbolic act of allowing someone who bowed with their face to the ground to look up or even to get up;[316] by extension, פנים "face" can refer to the entire person who is conceptualised as being raised;[317] probably also involved is the conceptual metaphor STATUS IS UP,[318] i.e. raising someone's position means increasing their status; here, showing someone respect is conceptualised as acknowledging their high status; ● agent: human: *respect someone; show respect for someone*

(Deut 28:50;[319] 2 Kgs 3:14; Lam 4:16)

---

[313] See Hobbs (1998:29), Reyburn (1992a:123), and HALOT (1999:725). Stolz (1997b:771) suggests the meaning "to take into consideration", although he interprets the expression נְשֻׂא פָנִים (with the Qal passive participle) as "esteemed, well regarded".

[314] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996e:532).

[315] This can be inferred from the occurrences of this expression in the Hebrew Bible. People seem to be expected to respect others' status, whether because of position or age.

[316] See Warren-Rothlin (2005:201-202) for a discussion of the process whereby a symbolic act (e.g. allowing a prostrate person to rise) can eventually become idiomatised and gradually lose its literal reference (e.g. Mal 1:8, where the Lord says that the governor will not "lift the face" of someone offering a blind, sick or lame animal, i.e. he will not receive them favourably) and finally turn into a speech act (e.g. 1 Sam 25:35, where David says to Abigail, "I have lifted your face", i.e. "I have granted your request").

[317] See Van der Woude (1997b:1000) and Simian-Yofre (2001:594).

[318] See Lingnan University (2005).

[319] In this occurrence, the form of the idiom is נשא פנים לפ׳, rather than נשא פני פ׳.

(h) נשׂא פניו

[lift up one's face]

(i) Confident (Action)

(1) Confidence

often followed by the preposition אל: = have sufficient courage;[320] ▶ to come into the presence of someone whom one has reason to fear or before whom one has reason to be ashamed; ≈ regarded as a sign of good conscience;[321] < the פנים is the front part of the head, including the eyes as organs of sight, so turning the face upward means looking up,[322] implying a lower position than the person being looked up to; the act of looking up has probably become idiomatised[323] to indicate daring;[324] ● agent: human: *face; show one's face to; look (someone) in the eye; hold one's head high; not be ashamed; look (at someone) with confidence*

(2 Sam 2:22; Job 11:15; 22:26)

~ מצא את־לבו: near synonym

~ חזקו ידיו: courage in general

≠ נפל לבו; חרד לבו; נפל פחד עליו; רפו ידיו

---

[320] See Kaiser (1999b:600) and HALOT (1999:725).

[321] See Freedman and Willoughby (1999:37), Omanson and Ellington (2001b:665), and Stolz (1997b:771).

[322] See Van der Woude (1997b:1000) and Simian-Yofre (2001:600).

[323] In this instance, the action of lifting the head and looking up towards someone (either physically or mentally, as part of the interpretation of the idiom) is no longer necessary for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[324] See Van der Woude (1997b:999). Alternatively, the expression may be motivated by the Ancient Near Eastern cultural association of the face with the concept of honour (see Pilch, 2000:498). This association is probably based on the conceptual metaphor DIGNITY IS FACE, in its turn the result of metonymy, viz. FACE STANDS FOR A FEELING (see Yu, 2008:254). If the cultural association of honour/shame is considered to be the basis for this expression, the confidence of its subject would be based on the absence of disgrace rather than the absence of fear, as is arguably the case with Abner in 2 Sam 2:22 (see Anderson, 1998:44). Also, the semantic domain — both lexical and contextual — *Honour and Shame* might be suggested for this expression, in addition to *Confident/Confidence*.

    (ii)   Merciful (Action)

        (1)   Affection, Compassion*

followed by the preposition אל: = be favourably disposed towards someone;[325] ▶ and treat them kindly;[326] < the פנים is the front part of the head, including the eyes as organs of sight, so turning the face upward means looking up,[327] here, looking at (אל) is profiled rather than looking up; by semantic extension, the act of looking at (as opposed to ignoring[328]) someone represents affection and interest;[329] ● agent: God: *look on (someone) with favour; be good to*

(Num 6:26)

---

[325]   See Budd (1998:76) and Cole (2000:131).

[326]   See Freedman and Willoughby (1999:37). According to NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Num 6:26), "if God lifts his face toward his people, it means he has given them peace — peace, prosperity, completeness, health, safety, general well-being, and the like."

[327]   See Van der Woude (1997b:1000).

[328]   See העלים עיניו "cover one's eyes", i.e. "deliberately take no notice of a situation".

[329]   See Van der Woude (1997b:1000), Bergen (1996:131), Simian-Yofre (2001:600), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Num 6:26).

סבב

(1) verb (Pi)

    (a) סבב את־פני כ׳

      [reverse the face of something]

        (i) Think (Causative)

          (1) Heart

            = change the way someone thinks about a matter;[330] ≈ probably associated with tact and good judgment in human relations;[331] < the פנים as the part of the head visible to others can metonymically indicate appearance,[332] not only of a human or animal, but by extension also of inanimate objects;[333] the conceptual metaphor CHANGE IS TURNING[334] probably motivates the concept of turning the פנים of a matter; ● causer: human; affected: event: *put another face on (a matter); help (someone) see (a matter) from another perspective*

            (2 Sam 14:20)

---

[330] See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:914) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:643). So, in 2 Sam 14:20 CEV has "to show you the other side of this problem" (see also GNB and HSV). García-López (1999:130) suggests the meaning "change the course of affairs", an interpretation underlying the renderings of NRSV, LUT, FCL, and TOB.

[331] Based on the context of the single occurrence of this expression, viz. 2 Sam 14:20).

[332] See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:914). Van der Woude (1997b:999-1000) also points out that פנים can, in a figurative sense, mean "a circumstance, or an event facing the observer".

[333] See Van der Woude (1997b:1002).

[334] See Lakoff and Johnson (1999:207).

סגר

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) סגר רחם־פ׳

       [close someone's womb]

          (i) Infertile (Causative)

             (1) Childbirth

                = keep a woman from having children;[335] ▶ by making her infertile; < the womb is pictured as having doors or gates that can be shut, preventing entry;[336] possibly being receptive, in this case the womb to fertilisation, is conceptualised as being open;[337] ● causer: God; affected: human: *keep (a woman) from having children; make (a woman) infertile*

                (1 Sam 1:5,6)

---

[335] See Kronholm (2004:457), Omanson and Ellington (2001a:29), and Bergen (1996:66-67).

[336] See Patterson (1999:617).

[337] This implies a conceptual metaphor RECEPTIVE IS OPEN. Although I have not been able to find this conceptual metaphor specifically mentioned in the literature I surveyed, it seems that a case can be made for its existence. In English, one can say that someone is *open to suggestions or new ideas*; one can be *open-minded*; someone can *open up* to communication in a given situation. Conversely, UNRECEPTIVE IS CLOSED. Hence, various organs (similar to the Hebrew רחם in this expression) can be "closed", i.e. making a person unreceptive to input from outside, e.g. *close one's eyes to something, close one's ears to something*. Examples of this kind can also be found in the Hebrew Bible.

סכך

(1) verb (Hiph)

    (a) הסיך את־רגליו

       [cover one's feet]

          (i) Excrete (Action)

              (1) Body, Euphemism

                = empty the bowels;[338] ≈ euphemism;[339] < idiomatisation[340] of the action of crouching down to defecate, causing the robe to cover the feet;[341] ● agent: human: *relieve oneself*

                (1 Sam 24:4; Judg 3:24)

---

[338] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:502), Klein (1998:239), Bergen (1996:239), and McCarter (1980:383).

[339] See Stendebach (2004:315).

[340] In this instance, the robe literally covering the feet of a crouching person was probably no longer necessary (either physically, as in the case of someone wearing a short tunic, or mentally, as part of the interpretation of the idiom) for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[341] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:502), NET Bible 1ˢᵗ Ed. notes (2006: Judg 3:24), Babut (1999:17), and HALOT (1999:754). Bergen (1996:239) proposes an alternative motivation for this expression, viz. "the Israelite practice of disposing of human excrement in a sanitary manner through covering it over with dirt". This interpretation presumes the meaning "faeces" for רגלים (see White, 1999:832).

עלה

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) עלתה חמתו

      [one's heat goes up]

        (i) Angry (State/Process)

          (1) Anger

          = become angry;[342] < based on the conceptual metaphors ANGER IS HEAT[343] and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER;[344] the idiom describes the hot fluid of anger inside a person[345] rising, i.e. increasing, which involves the conceptual metaphor MORE IS UP;[346] ● applies to: human, God: *become angry; one's anger flares up*

          (2 Sam 11:20; 2 Chr 36:16; Ezek 38:18)

          ~ חרה אפו: the outward manifestation of anger, i.e. heavy breathing, is possibly profiled somewhat more strongly[347]

---

[342] See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:832), Anderson (1998:151), and McCarter (1984:278).

[343] See Lakoff (1994) and Van Groningen (1999a:374).

[344] See Kövecses (2000:161).

[345] See Van Groningen (1999a:374).

[346] See Hurtienne (2009:49-50).

[347] See Sauer (1997c:435).

246

עלם

(1) verb (Hiph)

    (a) העלים עיניו

       [hide one's eyes]

           (i) Ignore (Action)

                (1) Sin, Justice, Help*

= deliberately take no notice of a situation;[348] ◄ which one has the ability and/or obligation to address;[349] < by metonymy, the eyes as organ of sight refer to the process of seeing;[350] the act of covering the eyes shows a refusal to see something and has become idiomatised[351] to indicate deliberately ignoring a situation; the conceptual metaphor KNOWING IS SEEING[352] (conversely, NOT KNOWING IS NOT SEEING) probably motivates this expression; ● agent: human, God: *ignore; pretend not to see; disregard; close one's eyes (to someone or something); turn a blind eye*

(1 Sam 12:3; Lev 20:4; Prov 28:27; Is 1:15; Ezek 22:26)

---

[348] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:236), Stendebach (2001:36), Hartley (1998:338), BDB (2000:761), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: Prov 28:27).

[349] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:442).

[350] See Schultz (1999:662) and Jenni (1997a:875).

[351] In this instance, covering one's eyes was probably no longer necessary (either physically or mentally, as part of the interpretation of the idiom) for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[352] See Kövecses (2002:65). Locher (2001:150) also points out the cognitive aspect of knowing or not knowing involved in this expression.

עצר

(1) verb (Niph)

    (a) נעצר לפני יהוה

        [be detained before YHWH]

           (i) Serve (State/Process)

               (1) Devotion

meaning uncertain: = be obliged to remain at YHWH's sanctuary;[353] ► for some ceremonial purpose;[354] < by metonymy, the sanctuary of YHWH (where people went to sacrifice to Him, consult Him, etc.) represents YHWH and his presence;[355] the concept of religious duties as detention is probably motivated by the conceptual metaphor NO FREEDOM IS ENCLOSURE/LIMIT TO SPACE;[356] ● applies to: human: *be detained before YHWH; fulfil a religious obligation at the sanctuary*

(1 Sam 21:8)

~ נראה את־פני: the act of coming to the sanctuary is possibly profiled more strongly

---

[353] See HALOT (1999:871) and BDB (2000:783).

[354] See Tsumura (2007: 1 Sam 21:7) and McCarter (1980:349). Various versions explicitly mention the purpose of Doeg's presence at the sanctuary as fulfilling some religious obligation, e.g. GNT, NBV, FCL, and NTLH. This detention was probably an act of penance, to fulfil a vow, or to observe a day of rest (see HALOT, 1999:871). McCarter (1980:350) states that this expression refers to "celebrating a holiday before Yahweh in the temple", whereas Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:512) suggest that the reason for the person being "kept back [...] before Jehovah" was "either for the sake of purification or as a proselyte, who wished to be received into the religious communion of Israel, or because of supposed leprosy, according to Lev. 13:4". Bergen (1996:223) also mentions the possibility of Doeg's presence at Nob being a form of punishment, while Tsumura (2007: 1 Sam 21:7) speculates that "his retreat could be related to the 'seven-day' period for waiting". Wright and Milgrom (2001:313) find these interpretations unconvincing and propose that "it is more likely that [Doeg] was kept away from the sanctuary on account of uncleanness or similar reasons". However, Doeg seems to have been *at* the sanctuary, not kept away from it.

[355] See Averbeck (2003:824).

[356] See Lingnan University (2005).

עשׂה

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) עשׂה לפ׳ בית

      [make a house for someone]

        (i) Descendants* (Action)

          (1) Posterity

            = provide a long line of descendants for someone;[357] ▶ who will rule or serve in his place;[358] < the figurative extension (metonymy) of בית ("house") to mean "family"[359] lies at the basis of this expression, where the sense "family" is further extended to mean "dynasty";[360] providing descendants is conceptualised as building, or making, a house; possibly involved also is the conceptual metaphor FAMILY IS A BUILDING;[361] ● agent: God: *establish a dynasty for someone*[362]

            (1 Sam 25:28; 2 Sam 7:11; 1 Kgs 2:24)

            ~ בנה לפ׳ בית :near synonym

            ≠ כבה את־גחלת פ׳

---

[357] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996c:25) and Spence and Exell (1909c:38).

[358] See McCarter (1980:398-399).

[359] See Hoffner (1975:113) and Goldberg (1999:105).

[360] See Hoffner (1975:114-115) and Jenni (1997c:235).

[361] See Yamada (1993:59-61) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor in Japanese and English.

[362] See בנה לפ׳ בית.

פנה

(1) verb (Hiph)

    (a) הפנה שכמו

        [turn one's shoulder]

            (i) Move (Action)

                (1) Motion

= turn away;[363] ◄ from someone; ► in order to leave; ≈ no negative connotation;[364] < the action of turning the shoulder or upper back to someone has been idiomatised[365] to mean turning away in order to leave;[366] ● agent: human: *turn around*

(1 Sam 10:9)

~ הלך לדרכו: the path followed to return to the place where one has come from is possibly profiled somewhat more strongly

~ הפך לדרכו: returning in general is possibly profiled more strongly

---

[363] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:209) and NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 10:9).

[364] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:209). In English, turning one's back on someone normally has negative connotations of ignoring or rejection. The expression *give someone a cold shoulder* ("be unfriendly to someone on purpose") also comes to mind here.

[365] In this instance, the mental image of the shoulder/upper back being turned was probably no longer necessary for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[366] See HALOT (1999:1495).

צדה

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) צדה את־נפשׁ פ׳

        [lie in wait for someone's life]

        (i) Dead (Causative)

            (1) Aggression, Death

= want to kill someone;[367] ≈ associated with enmity, rather than a mere criminal act against a victim unknown to the perpetrator;[368] seems to imply some measure of planning; < the intention to kill someone is conceptualised as positioning oneself to surprise and hunt down someone to kill them;[369] by semantic extension, the נפשׁ[370] is conceptualised as the essence of a person's life;[371] the notion of lying in wait to seize a life seems to be motivated by the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS AN OBJECT;[372] ● agent: human: *want to kill someone; be out to kill someone; hunt someone down*

(1 Sam 24:12)

~ בקשׁ את־נפשׁ פ׳: planning is perhaps profiled less

~ התנקשׁ בנפשׁ פ׳: the aspect of malicious plans to cause someone's death indirectly is profiled

≠ השׁליח פ׳ בדרך טובה; שׁמר רגלי פ׳

---

[367] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:507).

[368] See Bergen (1996:241). The context of the one occurrence of this idiom (1 Sam 24:12) implies the deliberate pursuit of a (perceived) enemy.

[369] See DBL Hebrew (1997:7399).

[370] The concrete meaning of נפשׁ has been proposed as "breath" (Waltke, 1999a:588) or "throat" (Westermann, 1997a:744; HALOT, 1999:712). Breathing (which involves the throat) was seen as "the essence of life" (Vine, Unger & White, 1996:237).

[371] See Westermann (1997a:752-754), Seebass (1998a:512), Waltke (1999:589-590), and GHCLOT (2003:559). Cameron (1996:1124) states that the primary meaning of נפשׁ is "possessing life", and De Blois (2010:7-8) explains that *life* in the Hebrew Bible is associated with a properly functioning נפשׁ.

[372] See Nagy (2005:81).

צלל

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) צללו שתי אזניו (also צללו אזניו)

        [one's two ears resonate]

           (i)   Distress (State/Process)

               (1) Confidence,[373] Heart

                  = be intensely disturbed emotionally and mentally;[374] ◄ by news of a frightening nature;[375] ≈ implies a state of fear;[376] < by figurative extension, the ringing of the ears as a result of receiving a blow to the head refers to being mentally stunned by frightening news;[377] ● applies to: human: *be shaken; shudder; be shocked*

                  (1 Sam 3:11; 2 Kgs 21:12; Jer 19:3)

---

[373] This contextual semantic domain may be more appropriately called *Confidence and Fear*, as it includes "all terms belonging to the frame of confidence and fear" (SDBH, n.d. [Contextual semantic domains]).

[374] See Newman and Stine (2003:438), Bergen (1996:87), and Wolf (1999b:29). In 1 Sam 3:11, CEV, FCL, and NTLH render this expression so as to make explicit the shocking or frightening effect of the report on the hearer.

[375] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:95).

[376] See Spence and Exell (1909g:422)

[377] See DBL Hebrew (1997:7509). A possible conceptual metaphor A MENTAL SHOCK IS A BLOW may be behind this expression, although I could find no evidence of such a conceptual metaphor in the literature I surveyed. English idiomatic expressions based on boxing metaphors such as *be floored* "nearly faint at the shock of hearing some news", or *be a knockout* "make such an impact that one nearly falls over as a consequence" (Sporting metaphors, n.d.) may be indicative of its existence.

קום

(1) verb (Qal)

   (a) קמה עיניו (also קמו עיניו)
       [one's eyes stand]

      (i) Old (State/Process)

         (1) Age

            = said of an old person whose eyes are no longer able to see;[378]
            ▶ and seem to be set in a blank gaze;[379] < the blank stare of
            blind eyes is conceptualised as standing, i.e. being motionless;
            the conceptual metaphor INACTIVITY IS IMMOBILITY[380] probably
            motivates this image; ● applies to: human: *one's eyes are fixed
            with a blank stare*

            (1 Sam 4:15; 1 Kgs 14:4)

---

[378] See Gamberoni (2003:593) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:399).

[379] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:115) and HALOT (1999:1087); also REB, NJPS, GNB, NBV,
WV, HSV, TOB, and NBJ.

[380] See Lingnan University (2005).

253

קרא

(1) verb (Niph)

(a) נקרא שם פ׳ על
[someone's name is called over]

(i) Possess; Control (State/Process)

(1) Naming, Possession, Authority

= someone's ownership or dominance over someone, someplace, or something is acknowledged;[381] ► by naming a person, place or object after the person;[382] < the act of calling someone's name over a person, place, or thing[383] became idiomatised to the point where the expression could probably be used whether or not the official ritual involving calling the name was performed or not;[384] the use of the preposition על "over" is probably motivated by the conceptual metaphor POWER/CONTROL IS ABOVE or IMPORTANCE/STATUS IS HIGH;[385] ● applies to: event: *be named as someone's very own; belong to someone; someone's name is attached to; be named after someone; be called by someone's name*

(2 Sam 12:28; Deut 28:10; 1 Kgs 8:43; 2 Chr 6:33; 7:14; Is 4:1; 63:19; Jer 7:10,11,14,30; 14:9; 15:16; 25:29; 32:34; 34:15; Dan 9:18,19 [2×]; Amos 9:12)

---

[381] See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:862), Anderson (1998:168), and McCarter (1984:312). Hossfeld and Kindl (2004:127) also indicate the importance attached to naming, which "does far more than simply label and distinguish different entities."

[382] See Bergen (1996:377).

[383] See McCarter (1984:312).

[384] See Warren-Rothlin (2005:201-202).

[385] See Lingnan University (2005).

קרב

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) קרב אל־האלהים

      [approach God]

        (i) Meet (Action)

          (1) Prayer

            = seek advice, guidance, information, help, etc. from God;[386] < probably an idiomatisation[387] based on the physical cultic action involved in presenting offerings to God at his designated place;[388] ● agent: human: *consult God; ask God for help; inquire of God*

            (1 Sam 14:36; Zeph 3:2)

---

[386] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:297), Bergen (1996:160), and McCarter (1980:249).

[387] In this instance, approaching the sanctuary with an offering was probably no longer necessary (either physically or mentally, as part of the interpretation of the idiom) for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[388] See Coppes (1999c:812) and Kühlewein (1997:1165).

ראה

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) ראה את־פני פ׳

      [see someone's face]

        (i) Accept (State/Process)

          (1) Access, Office

= be allowed to appear in the presence of someone in a position of power;[389] ≈ often associated with an official visit to a royal court;[390] < פנים is used metonymically to represent the whole person,[391] and by extension, their presence;[392] appearing in the presence of a person (of higher status) has become idiomatised[393] as seeing them;[394] ● applies to: human: *appear before someone; see someone; have access to someone; have an audience with someone*

(2 Sam 3:13 [2×]; 14:24 [2×],28,32; Gen 32:21; 33:10 [2×]; 43:3,5; 44:23,26; Ex 10:28 [2×],29; 2 Kgs 25:19; Esth 1:14; Jer 52:25)

---

[389] See Reyburn and Fry (1998:966), Wenham (1998:420), and Simian-Yofre (2001:604).

[390] See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:683), Fuhs (2004a:224), and Wenham (1998:420).

[391] See Simian-Yofre (2001:594).

[392] See Van der Woude (1997b:1001).

[393] In this instance, the physical act of seeing is not profiled and was probably no longer necessary for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[394] See Van der Woude (1997b:1001), who states that sometimes "it becomes a stylistic flourish lending the phrase a particular solemnity", as in the case of appearing before a king or some other person of high status.

(b) ראה לעינים
[see according to the eyes]

   (i) Think (Action)

      (1) Heart

= form an opinion of someone; ◀ based on their outward appearance;[395] < by metonymy, עינים as organs of sight can represent what is seen, i.e. the visual form of a person,[396] in contrast with their heart[397] as a person's self or inner person;[398] ● agent: human: *look at outward appearances; judge someone by what they look like; evaluate someone based on their appearance*

(1 Sam 16:7)

---

[395] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:338). The preposition ל indicates specification of the norm, i.e. *according to* what is seen (see Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:285).

[396] See Stendebach (2001:33) and Jenni (1997a:878).

[397] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:477).

[398] See Bowling (1999a:466).

257

(2) verb (Niph)

    (a) נראה את־פני יהוה (also נראה אל־פני יהוה or נראה פני יהוה)
        [be seen with the presence of YHWH]

        (i) Serve (Action)

            (1) Devotion

= come to a sanctuary;[399] ▶ to appear in the presence of YHWH, to serve and worship Him;[400] < to be seen, by extension, came to mean "to be present";[401] the פנים of YHWH is used metonymically to represent his whole person/being, and by extension, his presence;[402] ● agent: human: *be presented to YHWH; come to worship YHWH; appear before YHWH in a place of worship*

(1 Sam 1:22 Ex 23:15,17; 34:20,23,24; Deut 16:16 [2×]; 31:11)

~ נעצר לפני יהוה: the reason or cause for being in the sanctuary (or being excluded from the sanctuary) is possibly profiled more strongly

---

[399] See 1 Sam 1:22 in GNT, GCL, and NTLH.

[400] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:379). Bergen (1996:73) suggests that this refers "to annual sacrifice pilgrimage or solemn assembly meetings".

[401] See Vetter (1997:1178).

[402] See Van der Woude (1997b:1001). Simian-Yofre (2001:607) points out "the positive aspect of the interpersonal relationship" associated with God's presence (פנים).

רוח

(1) verb (Hiph)

    (a) הריח מנחה

       [smell an offering]

          (i) Accept (Action)

             (1) Sacrifice

= accept a sacrifice;[403] ► thereby accepting the one who offers it;[404] ≈ indicating that God will change his mind and not punish the one offering the sacrifice;[405] < God is conceptualised as smelling the aroma[406] of sacrifices brought to Him; by extension, smelling the aroma of a sacrifice can mean acceptance of an object or situation;[407] ● agent: God: *accept someone's offering; be appeased by an offering*

(1 Sam 26:19)

---

[403] See Payne (1999:836).

[404] See Bergen (1996:258) and McCarter (1980:408).

[405] In the case of 1 Sam 26:19, David could appease God by offering a sacrifice to Him so He would not cause David to be destroyed (Klein, 1998:258-259; Hohulin, 2001: 1 Sam 26:19). Alternatively, Saul might want to appease God with a sacrifice, as divine instigation to evil is a sign of his own sinful state and God's disfavour (NET Bible 1st Ed. notes, 2006: 1 Sam 26:19; Keil & Delitzsch, 1996b:534).

[406] Not necessarily a pleasant smell, as suggested by the word "aroma". However, the smell of sacrifices is often pictured in the Hebrew Bible as being pleasing to God, e.g. Gen 8:21; Ex 29:18; Lev 1:9 (see Omanson & Ellington, 2001a:553; HALOT, 1999:1196).

[407] See Bergen (1996:258), McCarter (1980:408), and DBL Hebrew (1997:8193).

259

רום

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) רמה קרנו

      [one's horn is exalted]

        (i) Strong (State/Process)

          (1) Strength

            = be strong and prevail against one's enemies;[408] ◄ usually with the help of God;[409] ≈ with the implication of dignity;[410] < קרן was seen as a symbol of strength, vitality, pride, victory, and power;[411] the image of an animal[412] lifting its horns high is reinforced by the conceptual metaphor MORE IS UP;[413] ● applies to: human: *be strong; overcome; succeed; be victorious; carry one's head high*

            (1 Sam 2:1; Ps 89:18,25; 112:9)

---

[408] See Stähli (1997b:1222) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:382).

[409] This aspect is probably not an intrinsic part of the idiom, but it is suggested by the context of all occurrences in the Hebrew Bible.

[410] McCarter (1980:72) states that this expression "implies a significant elevation in condition involving some kind of visible distinction".

[411] See Kedar-Kopfstein (2004:172-174), Omanson and Ellington (2001a:52), Coppes (1999d:815-816), Klein (1998:15), Tsumura (2007: 1 Sam 2:1), and NET Bible 1st Ed. notes (2006: 1 Sam 2:1). Kedar-Kopfstein (2004:168-169) suggests that the use of animal horns as weapons and tools (believed to be indwelt by the animal's power) motivates the conceptualisation of קרן as power, vitality, etc.

[412] Probably a wild ox (see McCarter, 1980:71-72; Stähli, 1997b:1222).

[413] See Hurtienne (2009:49-50).

רחב

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) רחב פיו על

        [one's mouth opens wide against]

            (i) Curse (Action)

                (1) Insulting, Contempt*[414]

                        = express satisfaction; ◄ over someone else's failure;[415] ≈ implies boldness to speak freely, even rudely,[416] e.g. because of the defeat of one's enemy;[417] < the פה as organ of speech can by metonymy refer to the speech produced by it;[418] opening the mouth wide may be an image of being free to speak,[419] rather than being restricted, even of saying more than one ought to;[420] ● agent: human: *gloat over; deride; laugh to scorn; loudly denounce*

                        (1 Sam 2:1)

---

[414] The contextual semantic domain *Contempt* is proposed for the frame of people showing contempt for other people or their achievements.

[415] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:52), Klein (1998:15), and NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 2:1). McCarter (1980:72) proposes an alternative view, viz. that opening the mouth wide against one's enemies means to triumph over them. He states the motivation of this expression as "opening the mouth wide for swallowing something [...] here and elsewhere applied figuratively to the defeat of one's enemy by swallowing him".

[416] See Klein (1998:15), who states that "this connotes a rude, scornful opening of the mouth, sticking out the tongue, and sneering 'Ha! Ha!'" A gaping mouth is still a sign of derision and contempt in the Middle East (Pfeiffer, 1962: 1 Sam 2:1).

[417] See Bartelmus (2004:431), Bergen (1996:75), and McCarter (1980:72).

[418] See Labuschagne (1997b:977). See Blumczyński (2008:41) for the view "that just as an opening provides access to the interior of a container, the mouth reveals the character of the inner person". According to him, opening the mouth wide against someone shows aggression.

[419] I.e. a psychological state (Bartelmus, 2004:431).

[420] The wide open mouth may be seen as too big in relation to the rest of the body. Radden (2004:553) gives examples of expressions in other languages where having a big or wide mouth signifies being self-important, talkative, or quarrelsome.

261

רעע

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) רעע לבבו

       [one's heart is bad]

          (i) Grief (State/Process)

             (1) Grief, Heart

             = feel depressed;[421] < the לבב is conceptualised as the seat of a person's psychological and emotional life,[422] so when it is said to be bad, a negative emotional state is implied;[423] ● applies to: human: *be downhearted; be in low spirits*

             (1 Sam 1:8)

             שבה רוחו אליו; אורו עיניו ≠

---

[421] See HALOT (1999:1269) and NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 1:8). Klein (1998:7) mentions that the connotation of a "grudging heart" may perhaps also be understood here.

[422] See Fabry (1995:414), Stolz (1997a:639), and Omanson and Ellington (2001a:31). Many functions are ascribed to the לב/לבב in Biblical Hebrew, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature."

[423] See Stolz (1997a:639) and Bowling (1999a:467).

(ii) Ungenerous*[424] (State/Process)

(1) Charity, Heart

= have a reluctant, ungenerous attitude;[425] ≈ regarded as an obstacle to God's blessing;[426] < the לבב is conceptualised as the seat of life of the inner person, including emotion, intellect, and volition;[427] as such, the לבב is where attitudes and one's true nature reside;[428] the negative attitude of selfishness and discontent is conceptualised as the לבב being bad;[429] ● applies to: human: *grudge; be selfish; be upset*

(Deut 15:10)

---

[424] The lexical semantic domain *Ungenerous* is proposed for describing a lack of generosity.

[425] See Christensen (2001:313) and Bratcher and Hatton (2000:274). Fabry (1995:414) considers this idiom in Deut 15:10 to mean the same as in the other occurrences of the idiom, viz. "be upset".

[426] See Merrill (1994:245).

[427] See Stolz (1997a:639). Many functions are ascribed to the לב/לבב, and Bowling (1999a:466) points out that "'heart' became the richest biblical term for the totality of man's inner or immaterial nature."

[428] See Bowling (1999a:466).

[429] See HALOT (1999:1269).

רפה

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) רפו ידיו

      [one's hands grow slack]

        (i) Afraid (State/Process)

          (1) Confidence

            = lose one's courage;[430] ◄ due to an alarming report or a frightening prospect;[431] < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[432] when the hands are said to grow slack, or hang limp, it symbolises a lack of strength,[433] which in turn signifies a loss of courage;[434] probably based on a physiological reaction to fear;[435] ● applies to: human: *be discouraged; be disheartened; be afraid; one's courage fails*

            (2 Sam 4:1; 2 Chr 15:7; Is 13:7; Jer 6:24; 50:43; Ezek 7:17; 21:12; Zeph 3:16)

            ~ נפל לבו: near synonym

            ~ חרד לבו: the immediate response of fear, viz. the heart beating wildly, is profiled

            ~ נפל פחד עליו: the state of fear is perhaps profiled more strongly

            ≠ חזקו ידיו; מצא את־לבו; נשׂא פניו

---

[430] See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:703).

[431] This can be inferred from the various occurrences of the expression in the Hebrew Bible.

[432] See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363).

[433] See Ackroyd (1986:413).

[434] See Van der Woude (1997a:500) and Alexander (1999:363). McCarter (1980:127) points out that "steady hands meant confidence".

[435] Fear is typically associated with PARALYSIS (Díaz-Vera, 2011:95), which may play a role in motivating the image of hands hanging slack, i.e. motionless, incapable of action.

שִׂים

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) שׂים דבר בפ׳

        [place a matter on someone]

        (i) Guilty*[436] (Causative)

            (1) Dispute, Punishment

= say that someone is guilty of some wrongdoing;[437] < conceptual metaphors such as GUILT IS AN OBJECT and GUILT IS A BURDEN seem to be at the basis of this expression, where guilt is conceptualised as something given to the patient that he must hold or carry;[438] ● agent: human: *accuse someone of something; consider someone guilty of something*

(1 Sam 22:15)

~ בקש מיד פ׳: the punishment of the accused is profiled; guilt is implied

≠ לא מצא ביד פ׳ מאומה

---

[436] The lexical semantic domain *Guilty* is proposed for events describing people that can be justly charged with some wrongdoing.

[437] See HALOT (1999:1323) and NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 22:15).

[438] Although I have not been able to find this conceptual metaphor specifically mentioned in any of the literature I consulted, there is evidence that it exists. In Lev 16:22, we read that the scapegoat carries (נשׂא) the sins (עֲוֹנֹת), i.e. the guilt resulting from sin, of the people. According to Num 9:13, people can also bear (נשׂא) their sin (חֵטְא), i.e. the guilt of their sin. So, forgiving sin is conceptualised as lifting (נשׂא) transgression (פֶּשַׁע) or sin (חַטָּאת), or rather the burden of guilt that rests on the sinner as a result of sin (Gen 50:17). The existence of this conceptual metaphor is also evident in English expressions like *have no guilt, carry the blame, give someone the blame for something*, etc.

(b) ‏שִׂים דברים בפי־פ׳‎ (also ‏שִׂים דבר בפי־פ׳‎)
   [place words in someone's mouth]

   (i) Urge (Action)

      (1) Communication

      = tell someone what to say;[439] < the conduit metaphor of communication, specifically WORDS ARE OBJECTS,[440] probably motivates this expression; the ‏פה‎ as organ of speech[441] here refers by metonymy to the person who performs the act of speaking;[442] ● agent: God, human: *tell someone what to say; give someone a message (for someone else)*

      (2 Sam 14:3,19; Ex 4:15; Num 22:38; 23:5,16; Ezra 8:17; Is 51:16; 59:21)

---

[439] See Schmidt (1978:110), Omanson and Ellington (2001b:900), and Bergen (1996:389).

[440] See Su (2002:606).

[441] See García-López (2001:495).

[442] See Labuschagne's (1997b:978) discussion of how YHWH puts words in people's mouths and how prophets can consequently be "like a mouth" for YHWH.

(c) שִׂים אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ בְכַפּוֹ

[place one's life in the palm of one's hand]

 (i) Confident (Action)

  (1) Danger

   = expose oneself to the danger of death;[443] ◄ willingly and purposely;[444] < by semantic extension, the נפשׁ[445] is conceptualised as the essence of a person's life;[446] probably based on the conceptual metaphors LIFE IS AN OBJECT[447] and CONTROL IS HOLDING IN THE PALM OF ONE'S HAND;[448] perhaps taking the נפשׁ in the palm of the hand is seen as playing with it or putting it in a position where it can be easily crushed;[449] ● agent: human: *risk one's life*

   (1 Sam 19:5; 28:21; Judg 12:3; Job 13:14)

---

[443] See Ackroyd (1986:413), Waltke (1999:590), Klein (1998:272), Westermann (1997a:753), and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:285).

[444] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996d:360).

[445] The concrete meaning of נפשׁ has been proposed as "breath" (Waltke, 1999:588) or "throat" (Westermann, 1997a:744; HALOT, 1999:712). Breathing (which involves the throat) was seen as "the essence of life" (Vine, Unger & White, 1996:237).

[446] See Westermann (1997a:752-754), Seebass (1998a:512), Waltke (1999:589-590), and GHCLOT (2003:559). Cameron (1996:1124) states that the primary meaning of נפשׁ is "possessing life", and De Blois (2010:7-8) explains that *life* in the Hebrew Bible is associated with a properly functioning נפשׁ.

[447] See Nagy (2005:81).

[448] See Yu (2000:165-168) for a discussion of this conceptual metaphor in Chinese and English.

[449] Keil and Delitzsch (1996d:360) propose another image as motivation for this idiom, viz. "to fight one's way through with one's fist, perishing so soon as the strength of one's fist is gone".

267

(d) שׂים לפ׳ בדרך

[place against someone in the road]

(i) Fight (Action)

(1) Aggression, Warfare

= wait for and attack someone;[450] ◄ who is passing by; < probably an idiomatisation[451] of the physical action of placing oneself in someone's way in order to forcibly prevent them from continuing their journey;[452] ● agent: human: *waylay someone; attack someone on the road; block someone's path/way*

(1 Sam 15:2)

~ שׁלח יד בפ׳: aggressive action in general is profiled

~ מצאה ידו פ׳: the process of finding the person against whom aggressive action is taken is profiled

---

[450] See Klein (1998:148); also CEV, NJPS, and NTLH. It is possible that this expression refers to a somewhat less violent action than the word "attack" might suggest. So McCarter (1980:258) suggests the rendering "confront", and many versions render this as "oppose" (e.g. NET Bible, GNT, REB, NRSV, GNB, HSV, and NVL) or "obstruct" (e.g. NBV, WV, LUT, GCL, FCL, TOB, and NBJ).

[451] In this instance, placing oneself directly in someone's way was probably no longer necessary (either physically or mentally, as part of the interpretation of the idiom) for its idiomatic meaning to be activated.

[452] See Spence and Exell (1909a:264), HALOT (1999:1322), and GHCLOT (2003:786).

שׁאל

(1) verb (Qal)

(a) שׁאל לפ׳ לשׁלום

[ask someone about peace]

(i) Greet (Action)

(1) Communication

= inquire about someone's welfare;[453] ▶ often as a form of greeting;[454] ≈ can sometimes be regarded as an attempt to establish community, whether sincerely or otherwise;[455] < idiomatisation[456] of the action of asking someone the question, הֲשָׁלוֹם;[457] ● agent: human: *greet someone; ask about someone's health; ask about someone's well-being*

(1 Sam 10:4; 17:22; 25:5; 30:21; 2 Sam 8:10; Gen 43:27; Ex 18:7; Judg 18:15; 1 Chr 18:10; Jer 15:5)

---

[453] See Mathews (2005:790), Fuhs (2004b:255), and NET Bible (2006: 1 Sam 10:4).

[454] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:204) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:429).

[455] E.g. in 1 Sam 25:5, where David sends a delegation to give Nabal his greetings and to ask payment in kind for prior protection (see Klein, 1998:248).

[456] In this instance, asking the question הֲשָׁלוֹם was probably no longer necessary in order for this idiomatic expression's meaning to be activated.

[457] E.g. Gen 29:6; 43:27; 2 Sam 18:32; 20:9; 2 Kgs 4:26. Compare also the Modern Hebrew greeting, מה שלומך.

שׁוב

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) שׁבה רוחו אליו

       [one's spirit returns to one]

          (i)   Strong (State/Process)

              (1) Strength, Health

              = regain one's vitality and strength;[458] ◄ due to an energising activity, such as eating or drinking; < רוח as breath signifies activity and life;[459] it is personified as leaving when one grows tired or weak, and returning when one regain's strength and vitality;[460] ● applies to: human: *be revived; recover*

              (1 Sam 30:12; Judg 15:19[461])

              ~ אורו עיניו: possibly recovery from a less serious condition of weakness than שׁבה רוחו אליו

              ~ אזר חיל: military strength, although sometimes used figuratively

              ~ חזקו ידיו: inward strength is profiled

              ≠ רעע לבבו

---

[458] See Klein (1998:282) and HALOT (1999:1198).

[459] See Tengström (2004:388), Albertz and Westermann (1997:1207-1208), and Payne (1999:836).

[460] Compare the English phrase *second wind* (Payne, 1999:836).

[461] Here, the expression occurs without אליו, i.e. "his spirit returned".

(2) verb (Hiph)

(a) (הֵשִׁיב כ׳ עַל־רֹאשׁ פ׳ or הֵשִׁיב כ׳ אֶל־רֹאשׁ פ׳ also הֵשִׁיב כ׳ בְּרֹאשׁ פ׳)
[bring back something on someone's head]

(i) Chastise (Action)

(1) Judgment

= punish someone; ◀ for some wrong they have done;[462] < רֹאשׁ is conceptualised as the locus of bearing moral responsibility[463] and metonymically represents the whole person;[464] conceptual metaphors such as GUILT IS AN OBJECT and GUILT IS A BURDEN seem to be at the basis of this expression, where guilt is conceptualised as something placed on the patient that he must bear;[465] ● agent: God: *repay someone for (some wrong); make someone suffer for (some wrong); punish someone for (some wrong)*

(1 Sam 25:39; Judg 9:57; 1 Kgs 2:32,44; Neh 3:36; Joel 4:4,7)

~ (עַל/אֶל) כָּבְדָה יָדוֹ: more general; the cause for severe dealing is possibly profiled less

~ חָלוּ דְמֵי פ׳ עַל רֹאשׁוֹ: the punishment for killing someone is profiled; the subject is the shed blood of the victim

---

[462] See HALOT (1999:1432).

[463] See Beuken (2004a:258).

[464] See Müller (1997:1187).

[465] Although I have not been able to find this conceptual metaphor specifically mentioned in any of the literature consulted, there is evidence that it exists. In Lev 16:22, we read that the scapegoat carries (נשׂא) the sins (עֲוֺנֹת), i.e. the guilt resulting from sin, of the people. According to Num 9:13, people can also bear (נשׂא) their sin (חֵטְא), i.e. the guilt of their sin. So, forgiving sin is conceptualised as lifting (נשׂא) transgression (פֶּשַׁע) or sin (חַטָּאת), or rather the burden of guilt that rests on the sinner as a result of sin (Gen 50:17). The existence of this conceptual metaphor is also evident in English expressions like *have no guilt, carry the blame, give someone the blame for something*, etc. Alternatively, guilt may also be conceptualised as clinging to a person's head, as Kedar-Kopfstein (1978:242) explains a victim's blood does to the head of a murderer.

שׁכב

(1) verb (Qal)

(a) שכב עם־אבתיו (also שכב את־אבתיו)
[lie down with one's fathers]

(i) Dead (State/Process)

(1) Death, Euphemism

= die;[466] ► and be reunited with one's ancestors who died earlier;[467] ≈ only said of rulers;[468] < based on the conceptual metaphor DEATH IS SLEEP;[469] the dead person was probably conceptualised as joining his ancestors resting in שאול;[470] ● refers to: human: *die; rest with one's ancestors; join one's ancestors*

(2 Sam 7:12; Gen 47:30; Deut 31:16; 1 Kgs 1:21; 2:10; 11:21,43; 14:20,31; 15:8,24; 16:6,28; 22:40,51; 2 Kgs 8:24; 10:35; 13:9,13; 14:16,22,29; 15:7,22,38; 16:20; 20:21; 21:18; 24:6; 2 Chr 9:31; 12:16; 13:23; 16:13; 21:1; 26:2,23; 27:9; 28:27; 32:33; 33:20)

~ נפל דמו ארצה: associated with violent death

---

[466] See NET Bible (2006: 2 Sam 7:12) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996c:24).

[467] Some view this as a simple reference to death (e.g. GNB, HSV, and GCL) or burial in the same place as the deceased's ancestors (so Omanson & Ellington, 2001b:759; also CEV, GNT, and NTLH). However, from 1 Kgs 2:10 it would seem as if lying down with one's ancestors includes more than merely being buried, as we read that David lay down with his ancestors *and* was buried in the city of David (וַיִּשְׁכַּב דָּוִד עִם־אֲבֹתָיו וַיִּקָּבֵר בְּעִיר דָּוִד). In this regard, Christensen (2002:772) points out that "its meaning becomes clear in the stories of the patriarchs: It is the act that takes place after dying but before burial. Thus it can neither mean to die nor to be buried in the family tomb. Rather, it means 'be reunited with one's ancestors' and refers to the afterlife in Sheol." Beuken (2004b:666) also states that "in death (not necessarily in the grave [...]), the deceased will be reunited with their ancestors who died earlier".

[468] This can be inferred from the various occurrences of the expression in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, according to Beuken (2004b:666), "textual evidence suggests that the expression derives from general royal ideology."

[469] See Sjöblad (2009:156-157). See also DBL Hebrew (1997:8886), and Bellis (2000:330).

[470] See footnote 467.

272

שלח

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) שלח יד בפ׳ (also שלח יד אל־פ׳)

        [send (one's) hand against someone]

            (i) Fight (Action)

                (1) Aggression

= take aggressive action against someone;[471] ► in order to harm or to kill them;[472] < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[473] by extension, stretching out one's hand towards someone means using one's capacity to exercise force against them;[474] ● agent: human, God: *harm someone; hurt someone; kill someone; use force against someone; attack someone; raise one's hand against someone*

(1 Sam 24:7,11; 26:9,11,23; 2 Sam 18:12; Gen 22:12; 37:22; Ex 24:11; Neh 13:21; Esth 2:21; 3:6; 6:2; 8:7; 9:2; Job 1:12)

~ מצאה ידו פ׳: the process of finding the person against whom aggressive action is taken is profiled

~ שים לפ׳ בדרך: context of military attack

---

[471] See Ackroyd (1986:412) and Delcor and Jenni (1997:1332).

[472] See HALOT (1999:1512).

[473] See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363).

[474] See GHCLOT (2003:826).

273

(2) verb (Pi)

    (a) שלח פ׳ בדרך טובה

      [send someone away in a good road]

        (i) Free (Causative)

          (1) Compassion*, Conflict

= let someone go free; ◄ without harming them;[475] ≈ associated with an enemy whom one would be expected to harm;[476] < the meaning of דרך "road" can be extended by metonymy to represent a journey;[477] letting an enemy go unharmed is conceptualised as sending him on a good journey;[478] ● agent: human: *let someone go free; leave someone unharmed*

(1 Sam 24:20)

≠ צדה את־נפש פ׳ ;בקש את־נפש פ׳ ;התנקש בנפש פ׳

---

[475] See Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:525).

[476] See Koch (1978:283) and Omanson and Ellington (2001a:511).

[477] See Helfmeyer (1978:391), Sauer (1997a:343), and Wolf (1999c:197). In this expression, Koch (1978:283) interprets דרך as the direction of a person's life, rather than merely a journey.

[478] See NET Bible's (2006: 1 Sam 24:20) rendering "send him on his way in good shape".

שמע

(1) verb (Qal)

(a) שמע בקול פ׳ (also שמע לקול פ׳)
[listen to someone's voice]

(i) Submit; Accept (Action)

(1) Submission*,[479] Help*, Prayer

= pay attention to what someone says;[480] ▶ and mentally accept, or take some action in accordance with, what was said;[481] < by metonymy, קול can refer to what is spoken,[482] and the meaning of שמע can be extended to mean submission or compliance with a request or requirement;[483] probably based on the conceptual metaphor OBEYING IS HEARING;[484] ● agent: human, God: *do as someone says; agree to what someone says; obey someone; grant what someone requests; listen to someone*

(1 Sam 2:25; 8:7,9,19,22; 12:1,14,15; 15:1,19,20,22,24; 19:6; 25:35; 28:18,21,22,23; 2 Sam 12:18; 13:14; Gen 3:17; 16:2; 21:12; 22:18; 26:5; 27:8,13,43; 30:6; Ex 3:18; 4:1,8,[485]9; 5:2; 15:26; 18:19,24; 19:5; 23:21,22; Num 14:22; 21:3; Deut 1:45; 4:30; 8:20; 9:23; 13:5,19; 15:5; 21:18 [2×],20; 26:14,17; 27:10; 28:1,2,15,45,62; 30:2,8,10,20; Josh 5:6; 10:14; 22:2; 24:24; Judg 2:2,20; 6:10; 13:9; 20:13; 1 Kgs 17:22; 20:25,36; 2 Kgs 10:6; 18:12; Ps 81:12; 95:7; 103:20; 106:25; 130:2; Prov 5:13; Is 50:10; Jer 3:13,25; 7:23,28; 9:12; 11:4,7; 18:10,19; 22:21; 26:13; 32:23; 35:8; 38:20; 40:3; 42:6,13,21; 43:4,7; 44:23; Dan 9:10,11,14; Hag 1:12; Zech 6:15)

---

[479] The contextual semantic domain *Submission* is suggested for all terms relating to being under someone else's authority.

[480] See Rüterswörden (2006:264).

[481] See Omanson and Ellington (2001a:75) and Klein (1998:26).

[482] See Kedar-Kopfstein (2003:582), Labuschagne (1997a:1134), and Coppes (1999b:792).

[483] See Rüterswörden (2006:258-259), Austel (1999:938), and Schult (1997:1376).

[484] See Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2002:105).

[485] Here, a personified object (אות) acts as grammatical object to the verb, rather than a person.

(b) שמע מה בפי פ׳

[hear what is in someone's mouth]

    (i) Ask (Action)

        (1) Communication

= inquire after someone's opinion;[486] < the conduit metaphor of communication, specifically WORDS ARE OBJECTS,[487] motivates this expression; the פה as organ of speech[488] here refers by metonymy to the person who performs the act of speaking,[489] and what the speaker says refers, by extension, to their thoughts;[490] ● agent: human: *ask someone's opinion; hear what someone has to say*

(2 Sam 17:5)

---

[486] See Omanson and Ellington (2001b:976) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:655).

[487] See Su (2002:606).

[488] See García-López (2001:495).

[489] See Labuschagne's (1997b:978) discussion of how YHWH puts words in people's mouths and how prophets can consequently be "like a mouth" for YHWH.

[490] The relation between thinking and speaking is clear from examples such as people *saying* (אָמַר), i.e. *thinking*, in their heart (Gen 17:17; Ps 53:1), or the Hebrew slave saying to Moses, "Are you thinking of killing me as you killed the Egyptian?" (Ex 2:14, NIV). In this sentence, "thinking" translates אֹמֵר "saying" (see also DBL Hebrew, 1997:606).

שמר

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) שמר רגלי פ׳

      [watch over someone's feet]

        (i) Help (Action)

          (1) Providence, Help*

          = keep someone safe from harm;[491] ► wherever they go;[492] < by metonymy, the feet represent the action of walking,[493] and by further extension, the entire person;[494] ● agent: God: *protect someone*

          (1 Sam 2:9)

          צדה את־נפש פ׳; בקש את־נפש פ׳; התנקש בנפש פ׳ ≠

---

[491] See CEV, FCL, and NTLH.

[492] See NET Bible 1ˢᵗ Ed. notes (2006: 1 Sam 2:9).

[493] See Stendebach (2004:317).

[494] See Stendebach (2004:317). In this sense, רגל comes quite close to דרך, although in the case of רגל the action of the walker or traveller is probably more strongly profiled. White (1999:832) also mentions that "the main force of the word throughout the OT is the individual whose feet are mentioned as traveling".

שׁסע

(1) verb (Pi)

    (a) שׁסע פ׳ בדברים

    [tear someone in pieces with the words]

        (i) Urge (Action)

            (1) Communication

            meaning uncertain; possibly: = persuade someone; ▶ to refrain from doing something;[495] ◀ by expressing strong disapproval of their intended action;[496] < by semantic extension, שׁסע "tear in pieces" can mean "rebuke" or "admonish";[497] probably motivated by the conceptual metaphor ARGUING/CRITICISING IS ATTACKING[498] or ARGUING/CRITICISING IS WOUNDING/CUTTING;[499] ● agent: human: *dissuade someone; convince someone (not to do something); rebuke someone and not allow them (to do something)*

            (1 Sam 24:8)

---

[495] See Bergen (1996:239), BDB (2000:1042), and McCarter (1980:380).

[496] See Klein (1998:240) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:524).

[497] GHCLOT (2003:841) and DBL Hebrew (1997:9117).

[498] See Lingnan University (2005).

[499] See Goatly (2011:19).

שׁפט

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) שׁפט מיד פ׳

       [judge from someone's hand]

         (i) Help (Action)

            (1) Control, Help*

               = rescue someone;[500] ◄ from someone else's power;[501] ► by executing justice on behalf of the one being rescued and so show their innocence;[502] < by extension, יד represents power or the capacity to exercise force;[503] here, שׁפט "judge" not only means giving a verdict on the person's innocence, but also executing, or causing to be executed, the decision;[504] ● agent: God: *save from someone; deliver from someone's power*

               (1 Sam 24:16; 2 Sam 18:19,31)

               ≠ נכר פ׳ ביד פ׳

---

[500] See Niehr (2006:421), Liedke (1997b:1394), and Culver (1999:948).

[501] See Niehr (2006:421) and Keil and Delitzsch (1996b:525).

[502] See Spence and Exell (1909a:460).

[503] See Ackroyd (1986:419), Van der Woude (1997a:500), and Alexander (1999:363). Kövecses (2002:245) also mentions the conceptual metonymy THE HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL, which provides the basis for expressions such as *gain the upper hand* ("attain an advantage over another person") or *keep a strict hand upon a person* ("keep under total control").

[504] See Culver (1999:948). In the case of someone pleading for justice, "*špṭ* can be understood as 'to deliver'" (Liedke, 1997b:1394), or "vindicate" (Bergen, 1996:241). Thus, Tsumura (2007: 1 Sam 24:15) translates this phrase as "do justice for me so that I may escape from your hand".

שפך

(1) verb (Qal)

    (a) שפך את־נפשו

        [pour out one's soul]

        (i) Lament (Action)

            (1) Communication, Grief

                = express feelings of sadness, grief, pain, distress, anxiety, etc.;[505] < by semantic extension, the נפש[506] is conceptualised as a person's inner self[507] and also the seat of emotion,[508] and by metonymy, can refer to the emotions experienced; the person's emotions are conceptualised as a substance or liquid, and expressing them as being poured out;[509] probably based on the conceptual metaphor EMOTIONS ARE SUBSTANCES[510] or EMOTION IS LIQUID;[511] ● agent: human: *pour out one's troubles; pour out one's feelings/heart; tell someone about one's problems*

                (1 Sam 1:15; Ps 42:5)

---

[505] See Bratcher and Reyburn (1991:401).

[506] The concrete meaning of נפש has been proposed as "breath" (Waltke, 1999:588) or "throat" (Westermann, 1997a:744; HALOT, 1999:712). Breathing (which involves the throat) was seen as "the essence of life" (Vine, Unger & White, 1996:237).

[507] See Waltke (1999:590), HALOT (1999:712), and GHCLOT (2003:559). Westermann recognises this sense of נפש, but maintains that it "should be understood against the background of threat and danger to life" (1997a:751-752) and that "the meaning 'life' for [נפש] is attested more often, more densely, and more uniformly than the meaning 'soul'" (1997a:752).

[508] See Westermann (1997a:748-751), Waltke (1999:589), HALOT (1999:713), and GHCLOT (2003:559).

[509] So Bratcher and Reyburn (1991:401) and Klein (1998:9). An alternative view (for which see Westermann, 1997a:749; Seebass, 1998a:509) is that נפש here represents "the lamenting self" which is being expressed. Thus, Tsumura (2007: 1 Sam 1:15) states, "The expression *pouring out my soul* denotes not simply an inward state of one's heart or mind, but an involvement of the whole being." The motivation for this interpretation would be the conceptual metonymy THE HEART FOR THE PERSON (see Pérez, 2008:50).

[510] See Kövecses (2005:261-262).

[511] See Lingnan University (2005).

(b) שפך דם

[pour out blood]

(i) Dead (Causative)

(1) Aggression, Death

= kill someone;[512] ◄ deliberately;[513] ► resulting in legal and moral guilt,[514] excepting cases of legitimate revenge, where the killing is lawful;[515] ≈ associated with violence; < דם is conceptualised as the locus of life,[516] and, by extension, refers to violent loss of life[517] in the case of shed blood;[518] ● agent: human: *kill; murder; shed blood*

(1 Sam 25:31; Gen 9:6; 37:22; Num 35:33 [2×]; Deut 21:7; 2 Kgs 21:16; 24:4; 1 Chr 22:8 [2×]; Ps 106:38; Prov 1:16; 6:17; Is 59:7; Jer 7:6; 22:3,17; Lam 4:13; Ezek 16:38; 18:10; 22:3,4,6,9,12,27; 23:45; 33:25; 36:18; Joel 4:19)

~ לקח את־נפש פ׳: more general; the violence of the killing is not especially profiled

---

[512] See Kedar-Kopfstein (1978:242), HALOT (1999:1629), Reyburn and Fry (1998:206), and Mathews (1996:404).

[513] See Reyburn and Fry (1998:206).

[514] See Liwak (2006:435).

[515] This can be inferred from the various occurrences of the expression in the Hebrew Bible.

[516] See Gerleman (1997a:338) and Hartley (1998:274).

[517] See Kedar-Kopfstein (1978:241) and Hamilton (1999a:191).

[518] See Gerleman (1997a:337), stating that דם is an "ethically qualified concept" and can mean "bloody deed" or "bloodguilt".

(ii) Sin (Action)

    (1) Sacrifice, Sin

= slaughter an animal as a sacrifice to YHWH in a place other than at the sanctuary;[519] ► resulting in legal and moral guilt;[520] < דם is conceptualised as the locus of life,[521] and, by extension, refers to violent loss of life[522] in the case of shed blood;[523] slaughtering a sacrificial animal without following the prescriptions of the Torah is conceptualised as taking life illegally;[524] ● agent: human: *sacrifice an animal*

(Lev 17:4)

---

[519] See Hartley (1998:271).

[520] Hartley (1998:272) states, "This declaratory formula elsewhere stands for killing a human; it suggests a verdict pronounced by a court."

[521] See Gerleman (1997a:338) and Hartley (1998:274).

[522] See Kedar-Kopfstein (1978:241) and Hamilton (1999a:191).

[523] See Gerleman (1997a:337), stating that דם is an "ethically qualified concept" and can mean "bloody deed" or "bloodguilt".

[524] "Not only murder is considered to be bloodshed, but also nonritual slaughter in which the blood of the animal is not brought to the altar" (Gerleman, 1997a:337). See also Keil and Delitzsch (1996a:592).

Appendix B

IDIOMS IN 1 AND 2 SAMUEL ARRANGED ACCORDING TO CONTEXTUAL SEMANTIC DOMAINS

This appendix contains all the idioms identified in 1 and 2 Samuel, arranged alphabetically according to the contextual semantic domains in which they occur, following the model of SDBH. Since Appendix A contains all the relevant information about these expressions, only the Hebrew form, literal translation, and meaning of each expression are presented here.

The following conventions were followed in the presentation of idioms:

1) The Hebrew form of each expression is followed by a literal translation and then a description of its meaning(s).

2) Contextual domains that are suggested in addition to those currently used for SDBH are marked with an asterisk (*).

3) The definition offered for each domain is quoted from the SDBH website, except in the cases of domains marked with an asterisk, where the definitions are my own.

4) When more than one contextual semantic domain is appropriate for an idiom, the idiom is presented under each. This does not imply, however, that these are semantically distinct forms of the idiom.

Access

All terms relating to the question whether certain locations or information are accessible or not.

ראה את־פני פ׳   see someone's face   be allowed to appear in the presence of someone in a position of power

Action

This contextual domain is only used in extensions of meaning, such as Body > Action. It covers cases where a part of the body is used to denote the action that it performs.

אסף ידו	draw back one's hand	stop what one is doing
מצאה ידו כ׳	one's hand finds something	have the opportunity to do something

Affection

All terms relating to the degree of affection between individuals or groups that have a certain relationship together.

דבר על־לב פ׳	speak on someone's heart	increase someone's confidence or hope by speaking or acting in a kind or affectionate way
נשׂא פני פ׳	lift up someone's face	receive someone favourably
נשׂא פניו	lift up one's face	be favourably disposed towards someone

Age

Frame of old age and everything that is associated with it, such as wisdom, status, grey hair, weakness of body, etc.

בוא באנשים	come/go among men	pertaining to a man who is old *OR* pertaining to a man who is famous or important, and respected in society because of ripe old age
קמה עיניו	one's eyes stand	said of an old person whose eyes are no longer able to see

Aggression

All terms relating to people performing acts of aggression to[1] other people.

בקש את־נפש פ׳	seek someone's life	want to, or try to, kill someone
הודיע פ׳ דבר	let someone know a thing	cause someone to bear the unpleasant consequences of their behaviour or actions
לקח את־נפש פ׳	take someone's life	kill someone
מצאה ידו פ׳	one's hand finds someone	find and take aggressive action against someone
הציל עין פ׳	snatch someone's eye	harm someone
התנקש בנפש פ׳	strike at/set traps for someone's life	try to catch someone in an activity that can lead to their death
נשׂא את־ידו ב	lift up one's hand against	fight against, or resist, a ruler
צדה את־נפש פ׳	lie in wait for someone's life	want to kill someone
שׂים לפ׳ בדרך	place against someone in the road	wait for and attack someone
שׁלח יד בפ׳	send (one's) hand against someone	take aggressive action against someone
שׁפך דם	pour out blood	kill someone deliberately

Anger

All terms belonging to the context of anger.

חרה אפו	one's nose becomes hot	become intensely angry
עלתה חמתו	one's heat goes up	become angry

---

[1]   Perhaps more appropriately "*against* other people".

Authority

All terms relating to the relationship between someone in authority and the people entrusted to his/her care.

בקשׁ מיד פ׳	seek from someone's hand	require someone to do something considered to be their religious duty
נקרא שׁמו על	one's name is called over	one's ownership or dominance over someone or something is acknowledged

Availability

All terms relating to the question whether certain goods are scarce or readily available.

מצאה ידו כ׳	one's hand finds something	have enough of something that is requested or required of one

Body

All terms relating to the body of animals and human beings, including all related natural processes.

הסיך את־רגליו	cover one's feet	empty the bowels

Charity

All terms belonging to the frame of people caring for the weak in the society.

רעע לבבו	one's heart is bad	have a reluctant, ungenerous attitude

286

Childbirth

All terms relating to menstruation, conception, pregnancy, and childbirth.

סגר רחמת־פ׳	close someone's womb	keep a woman from having children

Communication

All terms belonging to the frame of communication.

גלה את־אזן פ׳	uncover someone's ear	give someone knowledge of a matter
נשׂא את־קולו	lift up one's voice	speak or call out in a loud voice
שׂים דברים בפי־פ׳	place words in someone's mouth	tell someone what to say
שאל לפ׳ לשלום	ask someone about peace	inquire about someone's welfare
שמע מה בפי פ׳	hear what is in someone's mouth	inquire after someone's opinion
שסע פ׳ בדברים	tear someone in pieces with the words	persuade someone to refrain from doing something
שפך את־נפשו	pour out one's soul	express feelings of sadness, grief, pain, distress, anxiety, etc.

Compassion*

All terms belonging to the frame of concern and pity for the suffering of others.

נשׂא פני פ׳	lift up someone's face	receive someone favourably
נשׂא פניו	lift up one's face	be favourably disposed towards someone
שלח פ׳ בדרך טובה	send someone away in a good road	let someone go free without harming them

Confidence and Fear[2]

All terms belonging to the frame of confidence and fear.

חזקו ידיו	one's hands become strong	gain confidence or hope
חזק את־ידי פ׳	strengthen someone's hand(s)	give support, confidence, or hope to someone
חרד לבו	one's heart trembles	be very frightened
מצא את־לבו	find one's heart	have sufficient courage
נפל לבו	one's heart falls	lose courage
נפל פחד עליו	dread falls on one	become very afraid
נשא פניו	lift up one's face	have sufficient courage
צללו שתי אזניו	one's two ears resonate	be intensely disturbed emotionally and mentally
רפו ידיו	one's hands grow slack	lose one's courage

Conflict

All terms belonging to the frame of people in conflict.

שלח פ׳ בדרך טובה	send someone away in a good road	let someone go free without harming them

Contempt*

All terms belonging to the frame of people showing contempt for other people, their achievements, or actions.

רחב פיו על	one's mouth opens wide against	express satisfaction over someone else's failure

---

[2]   I would suggest calling this domain *Confidence and Fear*, in line with the description provided in SDBH.

Control

Frames in which one individual or party is in control of another, outside of the regular and legal path of authority.

נכר פ׳ ביד פ׳	make someone a stranger in someone's hand	give someone into someone else's power
נפל ביד פ׳	fall into someone's hand	come under control of someone
שפט מיד פ׳	judge from someone's hand	rescue someone from someone else's power

Covenant

All terms belonging to the context of covenants.

כרת ברית עם־פ׳	cut a covenant with someone	conclude a formal agreement with someone

Crime

Frame of crimes committed by one person to another.

חלו דמי פ׳ על ראשו	someone's shed blood swirls down on one's head	be punished for someone's death

Danger

All terms belonging to the frame of people experiencing aggression from other people.

שים את־נפשו בכפו	place one's life in the palm of one's hand	expose oneself to the danger of death

Death

All terms related to death.[3]

בוא יומו	one's day comes	the time comes when one will be struck by disaster or death
בקש את־נפש פ׳	seek someone's life	want to, or try to, kill someone

---

[3]   This definition is suggested in the absence of a definition for this domain on the SDBH website.

לקח את־נפש פ׳	take someone's life	kill someone
נפל דמו ארצה	one's blood falls to the ground	be killed
התנקש בנפש פ׳	strike at/set traps for someone's life	try to catch someone in an activity that can lead to their death
צדה את־נפש פ׳	lie in wait for someone's life	want to kill someone
שכב עם־אבתיו	lie down with one's fathers	die
שפך דם	pour out blood	kill someone deliberately

Devotion

All terms relating to people and their relationship to a particular deity.

בקש מיד פ׳	seek from someone's hand	require someone to do something considered to be their religious duty
בקש את־פני יהוה	seek the face of YHWH	worship and pray to YHWH
נעצר לפני יהוה	be detained before YHWH	be obliged to remain at YHWH's sanctuary
נראה את־פני יהוה	be seen with the presence of YHWH	come to a sanctuary to appear in the presence of YHWH, to serve and worship Him

Dispute

All terms referring to disputes in and out of courts of law, in which one party is right or innocent and the other, wrong or guilty.

נשׂא פני פ׳	lift up someone's face	show special favour to someone and choose their side or declare them innocent when judging a dispute
שׂים דבר בפ׳	place a matter on someone	say that someone is guilty of some wrongdoing

290

Euphemism

All terms referring to something unpleasant or embarrassing by substituting a mild or less direct expression.[4]

הסיך את־רגליו	cover one's feet	empty the bowels
שכב עם־אבתיו	lie down with one's fathers	die

Faithfulness

All terms relating to faithfulness, trustworthiness, loyalty, solidarity, etc.

הטה את־לב	turn the heart	be loyal, or cause someone to be loyal

Health

All terms belonging to the frame of health and sickness, such as diseases, wounds, treatment, medication, healing, etc.

שבה רוחו אליו	one's spirit returns to one	regain one's vitality and strength

Heart[5]

This contextual domain covers everything having to do with the "inner person".

גנב את־לב פ׳	steal someone's heart	deliberately cause someone to believe something that is not true
נגע בלב־פ׳	touch on someone's heart	create in someone a desire
הטה את־לב	turn the heart	(i) be loyal, or cause someone to be loyal; (ii) have, or cause someone to have, a desire
הכה לבו אתו	one's heart strikes one	feel bitter regret

---

[4]   This definition is suggested in the absence of a definition for this domain on the SDBH website.

[5]   Not all the expressions in this domain contain the word לבב/לב, which makes this name somewhat confusing. Perhaps *Inner person* (as in the description offered in SDBH) or *Mental and Emotional Faculties* would be more appropriate.

נפל לבו	one's heart falls	lose courage
נשׂא את־עיניו אל	lift up one's eyes to	direct one's attention to a deity (physically looking or seeing not profiled)
סבב את־פני כ׳	reverse the face of something	change the way someone thinks about a matter
צללו שתי אזניו	one's two ears resonate	be intensely disturbed emotionally and mentally
ראה לעינים	see according to the eyes	form an opinion of someone based on their outward appearance
רעע לבבו	one's heart is bad	(i) feel depressed; (ii) have a reluctant, ungenerous attitude

Help*

All terms belonging to the frame of people or God helping or supporting other people.

הושׁיעה ידו לו	one's (own) hand helps for one	help oneself or keep oneself from danger
העלים עיניו	hide one's eyes	deliberately take no notice of a situation
שׁמע בקול פ׳	listen to someone's voice	pay attention to what someone says and mentally accept, or take some action in accordance with, what was said
שׁמר רגלי פ׳	watch over someone's feet	keep someone safe from harm
שׁפט מיד פ׳	judge from someone's hand	rescue someone from someone else's power

Insulting

This domain comprises all terms used in insults.[6]

רחב פיו על	one's mouth opens wide against	express satisfaction over someone else's failure

Journey

All terms belonging to the frame of people travelling, either in groups or alone, including the preparations they make, their means or going (vehicle, donkey, horse), etc.

הלך לדרכו	go to one's road	go away

Joy and Grief

All terms relating to joy and grief.

האדיב את־נפשו	cause someone's soul to faint	cause someone to feel deep sorrow
הכה לבו אתו	one's heart strikes one	feel bitter regret
רעע לבבו	one's heart is bad	feel depressed
שפך את־נפשו	pour out one's soul	express feelings of sadness, grief, pain, distress, anxiety, etc.

Judgment

All terms relating to God's intervention in this world to punish people for their sins.[7]

בוא יומו	one's day comes	the time comes when one will be struck by disaster or death
חלו דמי פ׳ על ראשו	someone's shed blood swirls down on one's head	be punished for someone's death

---

[6]   I would suggest that this definition be expanded to cover the whole frame of insulting, i.e. not only the terms used in insults, but also the action of insulting.

[7]   Expressions describing people receiving punishment from other people are grouped in the contextual semantic domain *Punishment*.

כבדה ידו (על/אל)	[God's] hand is heavy (against/towards)	deal severely with someone
השיב כ׳ בראש פ׳	bring back something on someone's head	punish someone for some wrong they have done

Justice

All terms relating to justice and just behaviour[8] in government, court, and human relations.

נשׂא פני פ׳	lift up someone's face	show special favour to someone and choose their side or declare them innocent when judging a dispute
העלים עיניו	hide one's eyes	deliberately take no notice of a situation

Kindness*

All terms relating to the frame of people having an attitude of kindness and performing actions of kindness.

דבר על־לב פ׳	speak on someone's heart	increase someone's confidence or hope by speaking or acting in a kind or affectionate way

Life

All terms relating to the life span of animate objects.

האיר עיני־פ׳	cause someone's eyes to be light	enable someone to be physically alive

Mourning

All terms relating to mourning, such as weeping, rending one's garments, etc.

נשׂא את־קולו ובכה	lift up one's voice and weep	begin to weep loudly

---

8   More appropriately "just *and unjust* behaviour", as both are included in this domain.

Motion

All terms relating to movement.

הלך לדרכו	go to one's road	go away
הפך לדרכו	turn to one's road	go back to where one has come from
הפנה שכמו	turn one's shoulder	turn away in order to leave

Naming

All terms relating to naming people and other objects and events.

נקרא שמו על	one's name is called over	one's ownership or dominance over someone or something is acknowledged

Office

All terms relating to people working at a king's court.

ראה את־פני פ׳	see someone's face	be allowed to appear in the presence of someone in a position of power

Possession

All terms belonging to the frame of possession, including buying, selling, theft, loans, etc.

נקרא שמו על	one's name is called over	one's ownership or dominance over someone or something is acknowledged

Posterity

All terms belonging to the frame of having offspring and the need to preserve one's family line.

בנה לפ׳ בית	build a house for someone	provide a long line of descendants for someone

כבה את־גחלת פ׳	extinguish someone's burning coal	destroy someone's hope for their family line to continue
עשׂה לפ׳ בית	make a house for someone	provide a long line of descendants for someone

Prayer

All terms belonging to the frame of people that are praying.

בקשׁ את־פני יהוה	seek the face of YHWH	pray to YHWH to ask his instructions about what to do, where to go, how to do something, etc.
קרב אל־האלהים	approach God	seek advice, guidance, information, help, etc. from God
שׁמע בקול פ׳	listen to someone's voice	pay attention to what someone says and mentally accept, or take some action in accordance with, what was said

Priesthood

All terms belonging to the frame of priests, their function, dress, etc.

נשׂא אפוד	bear an ephod	fulfil a priestly function, especially that of consulting YHWH

Providence

All terms belonging to the frame of God who is actively involved with the people under his care.

שׁמר רגלי פ׳	watch over someone's feet	keep someone safe from harm

296

Punishment

All terms belonging to the frame of people being punished by other people for their misdemeanours;[9] when God punishes someone the frame Judgment is used.

בקשׁ מיד פ׳	seek from someone's hand	require someone to bear the responsibility for some act or event
הודיע פ׳ דבר	let someone know a thing	cause someone to bear the unpleasant consequences of their behaviour or actions
כבדה ידו (על/אל)	one's hand is heavy (against/towards)	deal severely with someone
לא מצא ביד פ׳ מאומה	not find anything in someone's hand	find no reason to accuse someone of wrongdoing
שׂים דבר בפ׳	place a matter on someone	say that someone is guilty of some wrongdoing

Resistance*

All terms relating to not accepting someone else's authority.

כבד את־לבבו	make one's heart insensible	refuse to obey
נשׂא את־ידו ב	lift up one's hand against	fight against, or resist, a ruler

Respect

All terms belonging to the frame of people showing respect for other people and/or their achievements.

נשׂא פני פ׳	lift up someone's face	have, or show, respect for someone of higher status

---

9   Perhaps "misdeeds" would be a more appropriate term here.

297

Responsibility

All terms belonging to the frame of responsibility for one's actions.

בקש מיד פ׳	seek from someone's hand	require someone to bear the responsibility for some act or event

Sacrifice

The different kinds of sacrifices and all related rituals, equipment, altars, etc.

הריח מנחה	smell an offering	accept a sacrifice
שפך דם	pour out blood	slaughter an animal as a sacrifice to YHWH in a place other than at the sanctuary

Security

All terms relating to feeling secure.

הציל עין פ׳	snatch someone's eye	escape from someone[10]

Service*

All terms belonging to the frame of rendering assistance as a servant.

התהלך ברגלי פ׳	walk about at someone's feet	follow or support someone as their servant

Sickness

All terms belonging to the frame of people being sick, including all symptoms and resulting conditions.

מות לבו בקרבו	one's heart dies within one	suffer a sudden debilitating attack of sickness

---

[10]   The meaning of הציל עין פ׳ is uncertain, and this is one possible sense.

Sight*

All terms relating to seeing

נשׂא את־עיניו	lift up one's eyes	begin to look or see
נשׂא את־עיניו אל	lift up one's eyes to	direct one's attention to someone or something by looking at it/them

Sin

All terms belonging to the frame of people that perform morally and ethically unacceptable acts.

הושׁיעה ידו לו	one's (own) hand helps for one	administer justice by force
העלים עיניו	hide one's eyes	deliberately take no notice of a situation

Status

All terms relating to one's position within the society.

בוא באנשׁים	come/go among men	pertaining to a man who is famous or important, and respected in society

Strength and Weakness[11]

All terms relating to physical weakness and strength.

אורו עיניו	one's eyes become light	experience an increase in one's joy and vitality
האיר עיני־פ׳	cause someone's eyes to be light	increase someone's joy and vitality
רמה קרנו	one's horn is exalted	be strong and prevail against one's enemies

---

[11] I would suggest naming this domain *Strength and Weakness,* according to the definition given in SDBH.

299

שבה רוחו אליו one's spirit returns to one regain one's vitality and strength

Submission*

All terms relating to being under someone else's authority.

שמע בקול פ׳ listen to someone's voice pay attention to what someone says and mentally accept, or take some action in accordance with, what was said

Success and Failure

All terms relating to the question whether certain actions[12] fail or are successful.

לא הפיל דבר not let a word fall not allow something that was said to remain undone or unfulfilled

Time

All terms belonging to the frame of time.[13]

מלאו ימים (the) days are fulfilled expression indicating that a specific period of time has reached its end

Truth and falsehood

All terms relating to the question whether something is truth[14] or false.

גנב את־לב פ׳ steal someone's heart deliberately cause someone to believe something that is not true

---

[12]   This includes speech, so perhaps "and words" should be added.

[13]   This definition is suggested in the absence of a definition for this domain on the SDBH website.

[14]   This should probably read "*true* or false".

Warfare

All terms belonging to the frame of warfare and related military activities.

אזר חיל	gird on strength	be strengthened
אזר־פ׳ חיל	gird someone with strength	strengthen someone
שׂים לפ׳ בדרך	place against someone in the road	wait for and attack someone

Will

All terms relating to the will of humans and deities, including the process of decision making.

כבד את־לבבו	make one's heart insensible	refuse to obey
הטה את־לב	turn the heart	have, or cause someone to have, a desire

Appendix C

IDIOMS IN 1 AND 2 SAMUEL ARRANGED ACCORDING TO CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS

This appendix contains the idioms in 1 and 2 Samuel that are based on one or more conceptual metaphors, arranged alphabetically according to the conceptual metaphors that play a role in their semantic motivation. Since Appendix A contains all the relevant information about these expressions and the conceptual metaphors on which they are based, only the Hebrew form, literal translation, and meaning of each expression are presented here.

The following conventions were followed in the presentation of idioms:

1) The Hebrew form of each expression is followed by a literal translation and then a description of its meaning(s).

2) When more than conceptual metaphor underlies an idiom, the idiom is presented under each. This does not imply, however, that these are semantically distinct forms of the idiom.

AFFECTING IS SPEAKING

דבר על-לב פ׳   speak on someone's heart   increase someone's confidence or hope by speaking or acting in a kind or affectionate way

AFFECTING IS TOUCHING

נגע בלב-פ׳   touch on someone's heart   create in someone a desire

ANGER IS HEAT

עלתה חמתו   one's heat goes up   become angry

ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER

חרה אפו   one's nose becomes hot   become intensely angry

302

עלתה חמתו	one's heat goes up	become angry

ARGUING/CRITICISING IS ATTACKING; ARGUING/CRITICISING IS WOUNDING/CUTTING

שסע פ׳ בדברים	tear someone in pieces with the words	persuade someone to refrain from doing something

AWARENESS IS HIGH

נשׂא את־עיניו	lift up one's eyes	begin to look or see
נשׂא את־עיניו אל	lift up one's eyes to	(i) direct one's attention to someone or something by looking closely at it/them; (ii) direct one's attention to a deity (physically looking or seeing not profiled)

BAD IS DOWN

נפל לבו	one's heart falls	lose courage

CHANGE IS TURNING

הטה את־לב	turn the heart	be loyal, or cause someone to be loyal; have, or cause someone to have, a desire
סבב את־פני כ׳	reverse the face of something	change the way someone thinks about a matter

CONTROL/FORCE IS UP[1]

כבדה ידו (על/אל)	one's hand is heavy (against/towards)	deal severely with someone
נפל פחד עליו	dread falls on one	become very afraid
נשׂא את־ידו ב	lift up one's hand against	fight against, or resist, a ruler

---

[1] See CONTROL IS PUSH DOWN.

CONTROL IS HOLDING IN THE PALM OF ONE'S HAND

שים את־נפשו בכפו	place one's life in the palm of one's hand	expose oneself to the danger of death

CONTROL IS PUSH DOWN

כבדה ידו (על/אל)	one's hand is heavy (against/towards)	deal severely with someone
נפל פחד עליו	dread falls on one	become very afraid

COURAGE IS AN OBJECT

מצא את־לבו	find one's heart	have sufficient courage

CRITICISING IS HITTING

הכה לבו אתו	one's heart strikes one	feel bitter regret

DEATH IS SLEEP

שכב עם־אבתיו	lie down with one's fathers	die

DESIRE IS UP

נשא את־עיניו אל	lift up one's eyes to	direct one's attention to a deity (physically looking or seeing not profiled)

DIFFICULTY IS HEAVINESS

כבד את־לבבו	make one's heart insensible (heavy)	refuse to obey

EMOTIONS ARE SUBSTANCES; EMOTION IS LIQUID

שפך את־נפשו	pour out one's soul	express feelings of sadness, grief, pain, distress, anxiety, etc.

FAILURE IS FALLING

לא הפיל דבר · not let a word fall · not allow something that was said to remain undone or unfulfilled

FAMILY IS A BUILDING

בנה לפ׳ בית · build a house for someone · provide a long line of descendants for someone

עשה לפ׳ בית · make a house for someone · provide a long line of descendants for someone

GUILT IS AN OBJECT

לא מצא ביד פ׳ מאומה · not find anything in someone's hand · find no reason to accuse someone of wrongdoing

שים דבר בפ׳ · place a matter on someone · say that someone is guilty of some wrongdoing

השיב כ׳ בראש פ׳ · bring back something on someone's head · punish someone for some wrong they have done

THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS[2]

חרה אפו · one's nose becomes hot · become intensely angry

THE HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS

חרד לבו · one's heart trembles · be very frightened

HOPE IS LIGHT

כבה את־גחלת פ׳ · extinguish someone's burning coal · destroy someone's hope for their family line to continue

INACTIVITY IS IMMOBILITY

קמה עיניו · one's eyes stand · said of an old person whose eyes are no longer able to see

---

[2] The conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER (the head) probably underlies the idea of one's nose becoming hot.

KNOWING IS SEEING

העלים עיניו	hide one's eyes	deliberately take no notice of a situation

LESS ACTIVE IS SLOW

כבד את־לבבו	make one's heart insensible (heavy)	refuse to obey

LIFE IS A FIRE/A FLAME/HEAT

כבה את־גחלת פ׳	extinguish someone's burning coal	destroy someone's hope for their family line to continue

LIFE IS AN OBJECT

בקש את־נפש פ׳	seek someone's life	want to, or try to, kill someone
לקח את־נפש פ׳	take someone's life	kill someone
התנקש בנפש פ׳	strike at/set traps for someone's life	try to catch someone in an activity that can lead to their death
צדה את־נפש פ׳	lie in wait for someone's life	want to kill someone
שים את־נפשו בכפו	place one's life in the palm of one's hand	expose oneself to the danger of death

LOSING POWER/CONTROL IS DESCENDING; LOSS OF CONTROL IS DOWN/FALLING

נפל ביד פ׳	fall into someone's hand	come under control of someone

LOUD IS UP

נשׂא את־קולו	lift up one's voice	speak or call out in a loud voice

A MENTAL SHOCK IS A BLOW

צללו שתי אזניו	one's two ears resonate	be intensely disturbed emotionally and mentally

306

MORE IS UP

רמה קרנו   one's horn is exalted   be strong and prevail against one's enemies

NO FREEDOM IS ENCLOSURE/LIMIT TO SPACE

נעצר לפני יהוה   be detained before YHWH   be obliged to remain at YHWH's sanctuary

OBEYING IS FOLLOWING

התהלך ברגלי פ׳   walk about at someone's feet   follow or support someone as their servant

OBEYING IS HEARING

שמע בקול פ׳   listen to someone's voice   pay attention to what someone says and mentally accept, or take some action in accordance with, what was said

POWER/CONTROL IS ABOVE

נקרא שם פ׳ על   someone's name is called over   someone's ownership or dominance over someone or something is acknowledged

RESPONSIBILITIES ARE POSSESSIONS

בקש מיד פ׳   seek from someone's hand   (i) require someone to bear the responsibility for some act or event; (ii) require someone to do something considered to be their religious duty

SOUND IS AN OBJECT

נשׂא את־קולו   lift up one's voice   speak or call out in a loud voice

307

STATUS IS UP

נשׂא פני פ׳   lift up someone's face

(i) receive someone favourably; (ii) show special favour to someone and choose their side or declare them innocent when judging a dispute; (iii) have, or show, respect for someone of higher status

TIME IS A CONTAINER

מלאו ימים   (the) days are filled

expression indicating that a specific period of time has reached its end

TIME IS SOMETHING MOVING TOWARD YOU

בוא יומו   one's day comes

the time comes when one will be struck by disaster or death

UNDERSTANDING IS HEARING

גלה את־אזן פ׳   uncover someone's ear

give someone knowledge of a matter

UNRECEPTIVE IS CLOSED

סגר רחמת־פ׳   close someone's womb

keep a woman from having children

THE VOICE IS AN OBJECT

נשׂא את־קולו   lift up one's voice

speak or call out in a loud voice

WORDS ARE OBJECTS

שׂים דברים בפי־פ׳   place words in someone's mouth   tell someone what to say

שמע מה בפי פ׳   hear what is in someone's mouth   inquire after someone's opinion

308

Appendix D

IDIOMS IN 1 AND 2 SAMUEL ARRANGED ACCORDING TO BODY PARTS

This appendix contains all the body idioms identified in 1 and 2 Samuel. As the name suggests, these idioms contain terms for body parts. Although body parts can be viewed as only physical organs and parts of the human body, I have decided to interpret the term more liberally to include anything that makes up part of the human person, or even an animal. For this reason, idioms containing terms for the invisible life-force of the body (e.g. רוח "spirit"), substances that form part of the body (e.g. דם "blood"), or even effects produced by the body and considered to be part of the person (e.g. קול "voice") are included here, as well as animal body parts (e.g. קרן "horn").

The idioms are grouped under headwords (body parts) and presented in alphabetical order. Only the Hebrew form of an idiom, a literal translation, and a definition of its meaning are given in this appendix. More complete information about each individual idiom can be found in Appendix A.

The following conventions were followed in the presentation of body idioms:

(1) Idioms are grouped together according to terms for body parts. These terms act as headwords under which the various idioms containing the term are listed. For example, the idiom גלה את־אזן פ׳ is listed under the headword אזן. The headword is indicated in large, bold type, e.g. **אזן**.

(2) Under the headword, a literal translation of the body part is provided in square brackets, e.g. [ear].

(3) After the literal translation, the cultural association[1] of the respective body part is indicated.

(4) Idiomatic expressions containing the headword are presented in three columns: The first column contains the Hebrew idiom in unvocalised script, e.g. גלה את־אזן פ׳; in the second column a literal translation of the idiom is offered in

---

[1] See Warren-Rothlin (2005:203 ff.). I do not wish to create the impression here that these cultural associations were determined by in-depth study or research, as such research would fall outside of the scope of the present study. Rather, these associations were identified according to their usage in the relevant idioms as well as by information contained in the various secondary sources consulted.

italics, e.g. *uncover someone's ear*; and in the third, a concise definition of the idiom's meaning is presented in ordinary Roman type, e.g. "give someone knowledge of a matter".

אֹזֶן

[ear]

   (1) organ of recognition/understanding

גלה את־אזן פ׳	*uncover someone's ear*	give someone knowledge of a matter
צללו שתי אזניו	*one's two ears resonate*	be intensely disturbed emotionally and mentally

אַף

[nose]

   (1) anger

חרה אפו	*one's nose becomes hot*	become intensely angry

דָּם

[blood]

   (1) locus of life[2]

בקש את־דם פ׳ מיד פ׳	*seek someone's blood from someone's hand*	require someone to bear the consequences for the death of another person
חלו דמי פ׳ על ראשו	*someone's shed blood swirls down on one's head*	be punished for someone's death
נפל דמו ארצה	*one's blood falls to the ground*	be killed

---

[2]   See Kedar-Kopfstein (1978:241), Gerleman (1997a:338), and Hartley (1998:274). However, Hamilton (1999a:191) holds an alternative view, viz. "that blood in the OT denotes not life, but death, or more accurately, life that is offered up in death".

(2) bloody deed

שפך דם	*pour out blood*	(i) kill someone deliberately; (ii) slaughter an animal as a sacrifice to YHWH in a place other than at the sanctuary

יד

[hand]

(1) power/control

נכר פ׳ ביד פ׳	*make someone a stranger in someone's hand*	give someone into someone else's power
נפל ביד פ׳	*fall into someone's hand*	come under control of someone
שפט מיד פ׳	*judge from someone's hand*	rescue someone from someone else's power

(2) strength/courage

חזקו ידיו	*one's hands become strong*	gain confidence or hope
חזק את־ידי פ׳	*strengthen someone's hand(s)*	give support, confidence, or hope to someone
רפו ידיו	*one's hands grow slack*	lose one's courage

(3) possession

מצאה ידו כ׳	*one's hand finds something*	have enough of something that is requested or required of one

312

(4) acts of aggression

כבדה ידו על/אל	*one's hand is heavy against/towards*	deal severely with someone
מצאה ידו פ׳	*one's hand finds someone*	find and take aggressive action against someone
נשׂא את־ידו ב	*lift up one's hand against*	fight against, or resist, a ruler
שלח יד בפ׳	*send (one's) hand against someone*	take aggressive action against someone

(5) punish

הושיעה ידו לו	*one's (own) hand helps for one*	administer justice by force

(6) action (in general)

אסף ידו	*draw back one's hand*	stop what one is doing
מצאה ידו כ׳	*one's hand finds something*	have the opportunity to do something

(7) responsibility

בקשׁ מיד פ׳	*seek from someone's hand*	(i) require someone to bear the consequences for some act or event; (ii) require someone to do something considered to be their religious duty
לא מצא ביד פ׳ מאומה	*not find anything in someone's hand*	find no reason to accuse someone of wrongdoing

(8) help

הושיעה ידו לו	*one's (own) hand helps for one*	help oneself or keep oneself from danger

313

כף

[palm of the hand]

    (1) control

שׂים את־נפשׁו בכפו	*place one's life in the palm of one's hand*	expose oneself to the danger of death

לב/לבב

[heart]

    (1) locus of vitality

מות לבו בקרבו	*one's heart dies within one*	suffer a sudden debilitating attack of sickness

    (2) locus of thought

גנב את־לב פ׳	*steal someone's heart*	deliberately cause someone to believe something that is not true

    (3) locus of emotion

דבר על־לב פ׳	*speak on someone's heart*	increase someone's confidence or hope by speaking or acting in a kind or affectionate way
רעע לבבו	*one's heart is bad*	feel depressed

    (4) locus of conscience

הכה לבו אתו	*one's heart strikes one*	feel bitter regret

    (5) locus of volition

כבד את־לבבו	*make one's heart insensible*	refuse to obey

314

הטה את־לב	*turn the heart*	be loyal, or cause someone to be loyal

(6) locus of courage

חרד לבו	*one's heart trembles*	be very frightened
מצא את־לבו	*find one's heart*	have sufficient courage
נפל לבו	*one's heart falls*	lose courage

(7) locus of desire

נגע בלב־פ׳	*touch on someone's heart*	create in someone a desire
הטה את־לב	*turn the heart*	have, or cause someone to have, a desire

(8) locus of attitude

רעע לבבו	*one's heart is bad*	have a reluctant, ungenerous attitude

נפש

[throat[3]]

(1) life

האדיב את־נפשו	*cause someone's soul to faint*	cause someone to feel deep sorrow
בקש את־נפש פ׳	*seek someone's life*	want to, or try to, kill someone
לקח את־נפש פ׳	*take someone's life*	kill someone
התנקש בנפש פ׳	*strike at/set traps for someone's life*	try to catch someone in an activity that can lead to their death

---

[3] The concrete meaning of נפש has been proposed as "breath" (Waltke, 1999:588) or "throat" (Westermann, 1997a:744; HALOT, 1999:712). Breathing (which involves the throat) was seen as "the essence of life" (Vine, Unger & White, 1996:237).

315

שׂים את־נפשו בכפו	*place one's life in the palm of one's hand*	expose oneself to the danger of death

(2) inner self

שפך את־נפשו	*pour out one's soul*	express feelings of sadness, grief, pain, distress, anxiety, etc.

עין

[eye]

(1) organ of sight

נשׂא את־עיניו	*lift up one's eyes*	begin to look or see
נשׂא את־עיניו אל	*lift up one's eyes to*	direct one's attention to someone or something by looking closely at it/them
קמה עיניו	*one's eyes stand*	said of an old person whose eyes are no longer able to see
ראה לעינים	*see according to the eyes*	form an opinion of someone based on their outward appearance[4]

(2) locus of perception

הציל עין פ׳	*snatch someone's eye*	escape from someone
נשׂא את־עיניו אל	*lift up one's eyes to*	direct one's attention to a deity (physically looking or seeing not profiled)
העלים עיניו	*hide one's eyes*	deliberately take no notice of a situation

---

4   This expression could perhaps also resort under עין (2) as locus of perception.

(3) indication of life and joy

אורו עיניו	*one's eyes become light*	experience an increase in one's joy and vitality
האיר עיני־פ׳	*cause someone's eyes to be light*	(i) increase someone's joy and vitality; (ii) enable someone to be physically alive

(4) very valuable body part/irreplaceable possession

הציל עין פ׳	*snatch someone's eye*	harm someone

פה

[mouth]

(1) organ of speech

רחב פיו על	*one's mouth opens wide against*	express satisfaction over someone else's failure
שים דברים בפי־פ׳	*place words in someone's mouth*	tell someone what to say
שמע מה בפי פ׳	*hear what is in someone's mouth*	inquire after someone's opinion

פנים

[face]

(1) (God's face) God's presence and, by extension, his grace/assistance

בקש את־פני יהוה	*seek the face of YHWH*	make an effort to establish contact with YHWH
נראה את־פני יהוה	*be seen with the presence of YHWH*	come to a sanctuary to appear in the presence of YHWH, to serve and worship Him

317

(2) appearance

סבב את־פני כ׳	*reverse the face of something*	change the way someone thinks about a matter

(3) locus of perception (representing the entire person)

נשׂא פניו	*lift up one's face*	(i) have sufficient courage; (ii) be favourably disposed towards someone
נשׂא פני פ׳	*lift up someone's face*	(i) receive someone favourably; (ii) show special favour to someone and choose their side or declare them innocent when judging a dispute; (iii) have, or show, respect for someone of higher status
ראה את־פני פ׳	*see someone's face*	be allowed to appear in the presence of someone in a position of power

קול

[voice]

(1) noise produced by animates/inanimates

נשׂא את־קולו	*lift up one's voice*	speak or call out in a loud voice
נשׂא את־קולו ובכה	*lift up one's voice and weep*	begin to weep loudly

318

(2) what is spoken

שמע בקול פ׳	*listen to someone's voice*	pay attention to what someone says and mentally accept, or take some action in accordance with, what was said

קרן

[horn]

(1) symbol of strength, vitality, dignity, and victory

רמה קרנו	*one's horn is exalted*	be strong and prevail against one's enemies

ראשׁ

[head]

(1) locus of bearing responsibility (also metonymy, where ראשׁ represents the entire person)

חלו דמי פ׳ על ראשׁו	*someone's shed blood swirls down on one's head*	be punished for someone's death
השׁיב כ׳ בראשׁ פ׳	*bring back something on someone's head*	punish someone for some wrong they have done

רגל

[foot]

(1) body part at lower end of leg

הסיך את־רגליו	*cover one's feet*	empty the bowels

(2) organ of motion, representing the entire person who travels

התהלך ברגלי פ׳	*walk about at someone's feet*	follow or support someone as their servant
שמר רגלי פ׳	*watch over someone's feet*	keep someone safe from harm

רוח

[breath[5]]

(1) vitality

שבה רוחו אליו	*one's spirit returns to one*	regain one's vitality and strength

רחם

[uterus]

(1) organ where children are conceived and carried until birth

סגר רחמת־פ׳	*close someone's womb*	keep a woman from having children

שכם

[shoulder]

(1) body part between upper arm and torso, representing entire body

הפנה שכמו	*turn one's shoulder*	turn away in order to leave

---

[5]   See Albertz and Westermann (1997:1207-1208) and Payne (1999:836).

Bibliography

Aalen, S. 1974. אוֹר. In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. I, pp. 147-167. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Ackroyd, P.R. 1986. יָד. In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. V, pp. 397-426. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Akanni, G. & Weanzana, N. 2006. 1 and 2 Samuel. In Adeyemo, T. (ed). *Africa Bible commentary*, pp. 325-409. Nairobi: WordAlive.

Albertz, R. & Westermann, C. 1997. רוּחַ. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1202-1220. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Alexander, R.H. 1999. יָד. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 362-364. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Allen, L.C. 2002. *Psalms 101-150* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 21). Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Álvarez, M.E.I., Ávila, D.S., Blanco, C.S., Gonzalez, N.C., Keim, K.R., Romero, R.R., Saavedra, R.L., Solar, L.R. & Villanovoa, M.C. 2009. Metaphors we sing by: A descriptive and comparative study of conceptual metaphors in pop and metal lyrics. Unpublished BA seminar thesis, University of Chile.

Anderson, A.A. 1998. *2 Samuel* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 11). Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Atkins, B.T.S., Robert, P. et al. 1987. *Collins-Robert French-English, English-French dictionary*. 2nd ed. London: Collins.

Austel, H.J. 1999. שָׁמַע. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 938-939. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Averbeck, R.E. 2003. Tabernacle. In Alexander, T.D. & Baker, D.W. (eds). *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, pp. 807-827. Electronic ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Babut, J-M. 1999. *Idiomatic expressions of the Hebrew Bible: Their meaning and translation through componential analysis*. North Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL Press.

Baldwin, J.G.   1988.   *1 and 2 Samuel: An introduction and commentary* (The Tyndale Old Testament commentaries, Vol. 8). Electronic ed.   Leicester: InterVarsity Press.

Bartelmus, R.   2004.   רָחַב.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIII, pp. 427-437.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Barthélemy, D. (ed).   n.d.   *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. English electronic ed. in Paratext 7.   United Bible Societies.

Baumann, A.   1995.   כָּבָה.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. VII, pp. 38-39.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

BDB *see* Brown, F., Driver, S.R. & Briggs, C.A.

Bellis, A. O.   2000.   Death.   In Freedman, D. N. (ed).   *Eerdmans dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 330-331. Electronic ed.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Benson, M., Benson, E. & Ilson, R.F.   1986.   *Lexicographic description of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bergen, R. D.   1996.   *1, 2 Samuel* (The new American commentary, Vol. 7). Electronic ed.   Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Beuken, W.A.M.   2004a.   ראֹשׁ.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIII, pp. 248-259.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Beuken, W.A.M.   2004b.   שָׁכַב.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIV, pp. 659-671.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Biblical Studies Press.   2006a.   *The NET Bible First Edition.* Electronic ed.   Biblical Studies Press.

Biblical Studies Press.   2006b.   *The NET Bible First Edition notes.* Electronic ed.   Biblical Studies Press.

Blumczyński, P.   2008.   "Et ouvrant sa bouche, il les enseignait en disant" "And he opened his mouth and taught them saying".   *Synergies Pologne*, No. 5, pp. 39-49.

Boers, F.   1996.   *Spatial prepositions and metaphor: A cognitive semantic journey along the Up-Down and the Front-Back dimensions.*   Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Bosman, N.   2000.   Die motiveringsteorie en idiome met hand.   *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, Vol. 18, pp. 15-23.

Bowling, A. 1999a. לְבַב. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds).
    Theological wordbook of the Old Testament, pp. 466-467. Electronic ed.
    Chicago: Moody Press.

Bowling, A. 1999b. פַּחַד. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds).
    Theological wordbook of the Old Testament, pp. 720-721. Electronic ed.
    Chicago: Moody Press.

Bratcher, R.G. & Hatton, H. 2000. *A handbook on Deuteronomy*. Electronic ed. New
    York: United Bible Societies.

Bratcher, R.G. & Newman, B.M. 1983. *A translator's handbook on the Book of Joshua*.
    Electronic ed. New York: United Bible Societies.

Bratcher, R.G. & Reyburn, W.D. 1991. *A translator's handbook on the Book of Psalms*.
    Electronic ed. New York: United Bible Societies.

Breneman, M. 1993. *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (The new American commentary,
    Vol. 10). Electronic ed. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Brown, F., Driver, S.R. & Briggs, C.A. 2000. *The enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs
    Hebrew and English lexicon*. Electronic ed. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research
    Systems.

Buckingham, L. 2006. A multilingual didactic approach to idioms using a conceptual
    framework. *Language Design*, Vol. 8, pp. 35-45.

Budd, P.J. 1998. *Numbers* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 5). Electronic ed. Dallas:
    Word, Incorporated.

Burger, H. 1998. *Phraseologie: Eine Einführung am Beispiel des Deutschen*. Berlin:
    Erich Schmidt.

Bussmann, H. (ed). 1996. *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. Translated
    and edited by Trauth, G. & Kazzazi, K. London: Routledge.

Butler, T.C. 1998. *Joshua* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 7). Electronic ed. Dallas:
    Word, Incorporated.

Cameron, W.J. 1996. Soul. In Wood, D.R.W., Marshall, I.H., Millard, A.R., Packer,
    J.I. & Wiseman, D.J. (eds). *New Bible dictionary*, p. 1124. Electronic ed.
    Leicester: InterVarsity Press.

Čermák, F. 2001. Substance of idioms: Perennial problems, lack of data or theory?
    International journal of lexicography, Vol. 14, No. 1, March 2001, pp. 1-20.

CHALOT *see* Holladay, W.L.

Christensen, D.L. 2001. *Deuteronomy 1-21:9* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 6A).
    Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Christensen, D.L.   2002.   *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 6B). Electronic ed.   Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Clines, D.J.A.   1998.   *Job 1-20* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 17). Electronic ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Clines, D.J.A.   2006.   *Job 21-37* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 18a). Electronic ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Cole, R.D.   2000.   *Numbers* (The new American commentary, Vol. 3B). Electronic ed. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Concise Oxford English dictionary. 11th ed. Electronic ed.   2004.   Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Conrad, J.   1998.   נָכָה.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. IX, pp. 415-423.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Coppes, L.J.   1999a.   נָגַע.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 551-552. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Coppes, L.J.   1999b.   קוֹל.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 792-793. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Coppes, L.J.   1999c.   קָרַב.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 811-813. Electronic ed.   Chicago: Moody Press.

Coppes, L.J.   1999d.   קָרַן.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 815-816. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Cruse, D.A.   1986.   *Lexical semantics*.   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D.   1992.   *An encyclopaedic dictionary of language and languages*.   Oxford: Blackwell.

CTAT *see* Barthélemy, D.

Culver, R.D.   1999.   שָׁפַט.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 947-949. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Davidson, A. B. & Mauchline, J.   1966.   *An introductory Hebrew Grammar: With progressive exercises in reading writing and pointing*. Revised ed.   Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

DBL Hebrew *see* Swanson, J.A.

De Blois, R.   2000.   Towards a new dictionary of Biblical Hebrew based on semantic domains.   Unpublished PhD dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

De Blois, R.   2010.   The soul of the Old Testament: Reconstructing concepts in an ancient language.   Paper presented at the Conference on Translation and Cognition, Nida School of Translation Studies, Murcia, 2010.[1]

Delcor, M.   1997.   מלא.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 665-666. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Delcor, M. & Jenni, E.   1997.   שלח.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1330-1334. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

De Waard, J. & Nida, E.A.   1991.   *A translator's handbook on the Book of Ruth*. Electronic ed.   New York: United Bible Societies.

Díaz-Vera, J.E.   2011.   Reconstructing the Old English cultural model for fear. *Atlantis: Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, Vol. 31, No 1, pp. 85-103.

Donalies, E.   1994.   Idiom, Phraseologismus oder Phrasem? Zum Oberbegriff eines Bereichs der Linguistik.   *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 334-349.

Eising, H.   1980a.   חַיִל.   In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. IV, pp. 348-355.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Eising, H.   1980b.   חול.   In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. IV, pp. 260-264.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Encarta World English Dictionary.   1999.   London: Bloomsbury.

Fabry, H-J.   1995.   לֵב.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. VII, pp. 399-437.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

---

[1]   This paper has been submitted for publication in the Nida Institute's journal *Translation*, but the publication date is not yet known (personal communication from the author).

Feinberg, C.L.   1999.   אָפֵד.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 63. Electronic ed.   Chicago: Moody Press.

Fensham, F.C.   1996.   Covenant, alliance.   In Wood, D.R.W., Marshall, I.H., Millard, A.R., Packer, J.I. & Wiseman, D.J. (eds).   *New Bible dictionary*, pp. 234-237. Electronic ed.   Leicester: InterVarsity Press.

Fernando, C.   1996.   *Idioms and idiomaticity*.   Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fillmore, C., Kay, P. & O'Connor, C.   1988.   Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of let alone.   *Language*, Vol. 64, pp. 501–38.

Fisher, M.C.   1999.   נָצַל.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 594. Electronic ed.   Chicago: Moody Press.

Free dictionary.   2002.   *Speak to*. http://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/speak+to [15 October 2012].

Freedman, D.N. & Willoughby, B.E.   1999.   נָשָׂא.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. X, pp. 36-39.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Freeman, J.M. & Chadwick, H.J.   1998.   *The new manners and customs of the Bible*. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos Publishers.

Fuhs, H.F.   1975.   גחל.   In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 461-465.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Fuhs, H.F.   2004a.   רָאָה.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIII, pp. 208-242.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Fuhs, H.F.   2004b.   שָׁאַל.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIV, pp. 249-264.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Gamberoni, J.   2003.   קום.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XII, pp. 589-612.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

García-López, F.   1999.   סבב.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. X, pp. 126-139.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

García-López, F.   2001.   פֶּה.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds).
  Theological dictionary of the Old Testament, Vol. XI, pp. 490-503.   Grand
  Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Garrett, D.A.   1993.   *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs* (The new American
  commentary, Vol. 14). Electronic ed.   Nashville: Broadman & Holman
  Publishers.

Gerleman, G.   1997a.   דָּם.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds).
  Theological lexicon of the Old Testament, pp. 337-339. Electronic ed.   Peabody,
  MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Gerleman, G.   1997b.   בקשׁ.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds).
  Theological lexicon of the Old Testament, pp. 251-253. Electronic ed.   Peabody,
  MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Gesenius, F.W., Kautzsch, E. & Cowley, S.A.E.   1910.   *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar*. 2nd
  English ed.   Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gesenius, F.W. & Tregelles, S.P.   2003.   *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee lexicon to the Old
  Testament*. Electronic ed.   Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

GHCLOT *see* Gesenius, F.W. & Tregelles, S.P.

Gledhill, C.   2011.   The 'lexicogrammar' approach to analysing phraseology and
  collocation in ESP texts.   *AS*, March 2011, pp. 5-23.

Goatley, A.   2007.   *Washing the brain: Metaphor and hidden ideology*.   Amsterdam:
  John Benjamins.

Goatly, A.   2011.   Metaphor as resource for the conceptualisation and expression of
  emotion.   In Ahmad, K. (ed).   *Affective computing and sentiment analysis:
  Emotion, metaphor and terminology*, pp. 13-26.   Dordrecht: Springer.

Goldberg, L.   1999.   בַּיִת.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds).
  Theological wordbook of the Old Testament, pp. 105-106. Electronic ed.
  Chicago: Moody Press.

Granger, S. & Paquot, M.   2008.   Disentangling the phraseological web.   In Granger,
  S. & Meunier, F. (eds).   *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 28-49.
  Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gries, S.T.   2008.   Phraseology and linguistic theory: A brief survey. In Granger, S. &
  Meunier, F. (eds).   *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 3-25.
  Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gulland, D.M. & Hinds-Howell, D.G.   1986.   *The Penguin dictionary of English idioms*.
  London: Penguin Books.

HALOT *see* Koehler, L., Baumgartner, W., Richardson, M.E.J. & Stamm, J.J.

Hamilton, V.P. 1999a. דָּם. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 190-191. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Hamilton, V.P. 1999b. פָּנָה. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 727-728. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Hamilton, V.P. 1999c. מָצָא. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 521. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Hamp, V. 1978. גָּנַב. In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. III, pp. 39-45. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Hartley, J.E. 1998. *Leviticus* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 4). Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Hasel, G.F. 1995. כָּרַת. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. VII, pp. 339-352. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Hausman, D.M. n.d. *Necessary versus sufficient conditions*. http://philosophy.wisc.edu/hausman/341/Skill/nec-suf.htm [16 August 2011].

Helfmeyer, F.J. 1978. הָלַךְ. In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. III, pp. 388-403. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Herion, G.A. 2000. Covenant. In Freedman, D.N., Myers, A.C. & Beck, A.B. (eds). *Eerdmans dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 288-292. Electronic ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Hertzberg, H.W. 1964. *I & II Samuel: A commentary*. 1st English ed. London: SCM Press.

Hobbs, T.R. 1998. *2 Kings* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 13:). Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Hoffner, H.A. 1975. בַּיִת. In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 107-116. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Hohulin, R.M. 2001. *Translator's notes on 1 Samuel: Helps on understanding and translating 1 Samuel.* Electronic ed. Dallas: SIL.

Holladay, W.L.   2000.   *A concise Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament: Based upon the lexical work of Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner.* Electronic ed.   Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Hossfeld, F.L. & Kindl, E-M.   2004.   קָרָא.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIII, pp. 126-131. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Howard, D.M.   1998.   *Joshua* (The new American commentary, Vol. 5). Electronic ed. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Huey, F.B.   1993.   *Jeremiah, Lamentations* (The new American commentary, Vol. 16). Electronic ed.   Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Hurtienne, J.   2009.   Image schemas and design for intuitive use: Exploring new guidance for user interface design.   Unpublished DIng thesis, Technical University of Berlin.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I.   2002.   Mind-as-body as a cross-linguistic conceptual metaphor.   *Miscelánea: A journal of English and American Studies*, Vol. 25, pp. 93-119.

Ishida, P.   2008.   Contrastive idiom analysis: The case of Japanese and English idioms of anger.   In Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (eds).   *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 275-291.   Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jenni, E.   1997a.   עַיִן.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds).   *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 874-878. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Jenni, E.   1997b.   יוֹם.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds).   *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 526-539. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Jenni, E.   1997c.   בַּיִת.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds).   *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 232-236. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Johnson, E.   1974.   אָנַף.   In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. I, pp. 348-360.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Kaiser, W.C.   1999a.   מָלֵא.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 505-506. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Kaiser, W.C. 1999b. נָשָׂא. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 600-602. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Kedar-Kopfstein, B. 1978. דָּם. In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. III, pp. 238-250. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Kedar-Kopfstein, B. 2003. קוֹל. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XII, pp. 576-588. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Kedar-Kopfstein, B. 2004. קֶרֶן. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIII, pp. 167-174. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Keil, C. F., & Delitzsch, F. 1996a. *Pentateuch* (Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. 1). Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Keil, C. F., & Delitzsch, F. 1996b. *Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 & 2 Samuel* (Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. 2). Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Keil, C. F., & Delitzsch, F. 1996c. *1 & 2 Kings, 1 & 2 Chronicles* (Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. 3). Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Keil, C. F., & Delitzsch, F. 1996d. *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job* (Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. 4). Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Keil, C. F., & Delitzsch, F. 1996e. *Jeremiah, Lamentations* (Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. 8). Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Keil, C. F., & Delitzsch, F. 1996f. *Ezekiel, Daniel* (Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. 9). Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Keown, G.L. 1998. *Jeremiah 26-52* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 27). Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Klein, R.W. 1998. *1 Samuel* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 10). Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Koch, K. 1978. דֶּרֶךְ. In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. III, pp. 275-293. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Koehler, L., Baumgartner, W., Richardson, M.E.J. & Stamm, J.J. 1999. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament*. Electronic ed. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Kövecses, Z.   1995.   Anger: Its language, conceptualization, and physiology.   In Taylor, J.R. & MacLaury, R.E. (eds).   *Language and the cognitive construal of the world*, pp. 181-196.   Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kövecses, Z.   2000.   The concept of anger: Universal or culture specific? *Psychopathology*, Vol. 33, pp. 159-170.

Kövecses, Z.   2002.   *Metaphor: A practical introduction*.   Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z.   2005.   *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*.   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Z.   2008.   The conceptual structure of happiness.   In Tissari, H., Pessi, A.B. & Salmela, M. (eds).   *Happiness, experience, language*, pp. 131-143.   Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies.

Kronholm, T.   2004.   רֶחֶם.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIII, pp. 454-459.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Kühlewein, J.   1997.   קרב.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1164-1169. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Kutsch, E.   1997a.   בְּרִית.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 256-266. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Kutsch, E.   1997b.   כרת.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 635-637. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Kuźniak, M.   2001.   The semantics of *desire*: An axiological-cognitive account.   *Studia Anglica Resoviensia*, Vol. 2, No. 42, pp. 55-63.

Labuschagne, C.J.   1997a.   קוֹל.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1132-1136. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Labuschagne, C.J.   1997b.   פֶּה.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 976-979. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Lakoff, G.   1987.   *Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*.   Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G.   1994.   *Conceptual metaphor home page.* http://cogsci.berkeley.edu/lakoff/.   [12 April 2012].

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M.   1980.   *Metaphors we live by*.   Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M.   1999.   *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*.   New York: Basic Books.

Lande, I.   1949.   *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im Alten Testament*. Leiden: Brill.

Langlotz, A.   2006.   *Idiomatic creativity: A cognitive-linguistic model of idiom-representation and idiom-variation in English*.   Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lee, D.   2001.   *Cognitive Linguistics: An introduction*.   Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liedke, G.   1997a.   אָזֵן.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 71-73. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Liedke, G.   1997b.   שפט.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1392-1399. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Lindquist, H. & Levin, M.   2008.   Foot and mouth: The phrasal patterns of two frequent nouns.   In Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (eds).   *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 143-158.   Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lingnan University.   2005.   *Metalude: Metaphor at Lingnan University, Department of English.*   http://www.ln.edu.hk/lle/cwd/project01/web/rootanalogy.html [12 April 2012; 17 April 2012; 20 April 2012; 21 October 2012].

Liwak, R.   2006.   שָׁפַךְ.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XV, pp. 431-442.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Locher, C.   2001.   עלם.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XI, pp. 147-154.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Louw, J.P. & Nida, E.A.   1989.   *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament based on semantic domains*. 1st South African ed.   Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

Lübbe, J.C.   2002.   Idioms in the Old Testament.   *Journal for Semitics*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 45-63.

Makkai, A.   1972.   *Idiom structure in English*.   The Hague: Mouton.

Manser, M.H.   1999.   *Dictionary of Bible themes: The accessible and comprehensive tool for topical studies*. Electronic ed.   London: Martin Manser.

Mathews, K.A.   1996.   *Genesis 1-11:26* (The new American commentary, Vol. 1A). Electronic ed.   Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Mathews, K.A.   2005.   *Genesis 11:27-50:26* (The new American commentary, Vol. 1B). Electronic ed.   Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

McCarter, P.K.   1980.   *I Samuel: A new translation with introduction, notes & commentary* (The Anchor Bible, Vol. 8).   New York: Doubleday.

McCarter, P.K.   1984.   *II Samuel: A new translation with introduction, notes & commentary* (The Anchor Bible, Vol. 9).   New York: Doubleday.

McDonnell, C.J.   1982.   Access of meaning for idiomatic expressions.   Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of South Carolina.

Merriam-Webster, I.   2003.   *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary*. Electronic ed. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc.

Merrill, E.H.   1994.   *Deuteronomy* (The new American commentary, Vol. 4). Electronic ed.   Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Müller, H-P.   1997.   ראשׁ.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1184-1194. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Müller, H-P.   2001.   פָּחַד.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XI, pp. 517-526.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Murphy, R.E.   1998.   *Proverbs* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 22). Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Nagy, G.T.   2005.   *A cognitive theory of style.*   Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

NET Bible *see* Biblical Studies Press.

NET Bible 1st Ed. notes *see* Biblical Studies Press.

Newman, B.M. & Stine, P.C.   2003.   *A handbook on Jeremiah*. Electronic ed.   New York: United Bible Societies.

New World Encyclopedia.   2008a.   *Categorization*. www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Categorization [29 June 2010].

New World Encyclopedia.   2008b.   *Kant, Immanuel*. http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Kant [29 June 2010].

New York Times Company.   2002.   *Summary of George Lakoff's metaphors of terror, published September 16, 2001.*   http://www.hodder.org/lakoff.htm [21 October 2012].

Nida, E.A.   1975.   *Componential analysis of meaning: An introduction to semantic structures*.   The Hague: Mouton.

Nida, E.A. & Taber, C.R.   1969.   *The theory and practice of translation*.   Leiden: Brill.

Niehr, H.   2006. שָׁפַט.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XV, pp. 411-431.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Nunberg, G., Sag, I.A. & Wasow, T.   1994.   Idioms.   *Language*, Vol. 70, No. 3, pp. 491-538.

Omanson, R. L., & Ellington, J.   2001a.   *A handbook on the First Book of Samuel*. Electronic ed.   New York: United Bible Societies.

Omanson, R. L., & Ellington, J.   2001b.   *A handbook on the Second Book of Samuel*. Electronic ed.   New York: United Bible Societies.

Omazić, M.   2008.   Processing of idioms and idiom modifications: A view from cognitive linguistics.   In Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (eds).   *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 67-79.   Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Oswalt, J.N.   1999. כָּבֵד.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 426-428. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

ParaTExt.   n.d.   *About UBS translation and publishing software*. http://paratext.org/about [24 October 2012].

Patterson, R.D.   1999. סָגַר.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 617-618. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Payne, J.B.   1999. רֵיחַ.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 836-837. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Pérez, R. G.   2008.   A cross-cultural analysis of heart metaphors.   *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, Vol. 21, pp. 25-56.

Péter-Contesse, R. & Ellington, J.   1992.   *A handbook on Leviticus*. Electronic ed.   New York: United Bible Societies.

Pfeiffer, C.F.   1962.   *The Wycliffe Bible commentary: Old Testament*. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Philip, G.   2008.   Reassessing the canon: 'Fixed' phrases in general reference corpora. In Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (eds).   *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 95-108.   Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Piirainen, E.   2008a.   Figurative phraseology and culture.   In Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (eds).   *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 207-228. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Piirainen, E.   2008b.   Phraseology in a European framework.   In Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (eds).   *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 243-258. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pilch, J.J.   2000.   Gestures.   In Freedman, D.N., Myers, A.C. & Beck, A.B. (eds). *Eerdmans dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 497-499. Electronic ed.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Preuss, H.D.   1975.   בוֹא.   In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 20-49.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Radden, G.   2004.   The metonymic folk model of language.   In Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and Kwiatkowska, A. (eds).   *Imagery in language: Festschrift in honour of Professor Ronald W. Langacker*, pp. 543-565.   Frankfurt: Lang.

Reyburn, W.D.   1992a.   *A handbook on Lamentations*. Electronic ed.   New York: United Bible Societies.

Reyburn, W.D.   1992b.   *A handbook on the Book of Job*. Electronic ed.   New York: United Bible Societies.

Reyburn, W.D. & Fry, E.M.   1998.   *A handbook on Genesis*. Electronic ed.   New York: United Bible Societies.

Reyburn, W.D. & Fry, E.M.   2000.   *A handbook on Proverbs*. Electronic ed.   New York: United Bible Societies.

Rooker, M.F.   2000.   *Leviticus* (The new American commentary, Vol. 3). Electronic ed. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Rüterswörden, U.   2006.   שָׁמַע.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XV, pp. 253-279.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Sæbø, M.   1990.   יוֹם.   In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. VI, pp. 12-32.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E. & McDaniel, E.R.   2009.   *Intercultural communication: A reader*.   Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Sauer, G.   1997a.   דֶּרֶךְ.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 343-346. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Sauer, G. 1997b. אַף. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 166-169. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Sauer, G. 1997c. חֵמָה. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 435-436. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Schmidt, W.H. 1978. דָּבַר. In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. III, pp. 84-125. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Schult, H. 1997. שׁמע. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1375-1380. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Schultz, C. 1999. עַיִן. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 662-663. Electronic ed.   Chicago: Moody Press.

SDBH *see* Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew.

Seebass, H. 1998a. נֶפֶשׁ. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. IX, pp. 497-519. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Seebass, H. 1998b. נָפַל. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. IX, pp. 488-497. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew. 2009.   United Bible Societies. http://www.sdbh.org/vocabula/index.html [12 October 2012].

Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew.   n.d.   *Domain table*. [Contextual semantic domains.] www.sdbh.org/vocabula/domaintable.php?2,en [14 June 2012; 12 October 2012].

Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew.   n.d.   *Domain table*. [Lexical semantic domains.] www.sdbh.org/vocabula/domaintable.php?1,en [14 June 2012].

Shead, S.L.   2007.   Radical Frame Semantics and Biblical Hebrew: Exploring lexical semantics.   Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Sydney.

SIL International.   2004.   *Glossary of linguistic terms*. www.sil.org/LINGUISTICS/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms [21 July 2009].

Simian-Yofre, H.   2001.   פָּנִים.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XI, pp. 589-615.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Sinclair, J. 2008. Preface. In Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (eds). *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. XV-XVIII. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Siqueira, M., De Oliveira, A.F.S., Hubert, D.D., De Almeida, G.F. & Brangel, L.M. 2009. Metaphor identification in a terminological dictionary. *Ibérica*, Vol. 17, pp. 157-174.

Sirvydė, R. 2006. Facing fear: A corpus-based approach to fear metaphors in English and Lithuanian. *Žmogus ir Žodis*, No. III, pp. 81-88.

Sjöblad, A. 2009. Metaphors Cicero lived by: The role of metaphor and simile in De senectute. Unpublished PhD thesis, Lund University.

Smick, E.B. 1999a. בְּרִת. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 128-130. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Smick, E.B. 1999b. כָּרַת. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 456-457. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Smith, J.E. 1999a. גָּנַב. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 168. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Smith, J.E. 1999b. גַּחֶלֶת. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 158. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Snijders, L.A. 1997. מָלֵא. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. VIII, pp. 297-307. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Spence, H.D.M. & Exell, J. (eds.) 1909a. *1 Samuel* (The pulpit commentary). Electronic ed. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Spence, H.D.M. & Exell, J. (eds.) 1909b. *2 Samuel* (The pulpit commentary). Electronic ed. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Spence, H.D.M. & Exell, J. (eds.) 1909c. *1 Kings* (The pulpit commentary). Electronic ed. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Spence, H.D.M. & Exell, J. (eds.) 1909d. *Genesis* (The pulpit commentary). Electronic ed. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Spence, H.D.M. & Exell, J. (eds.) 1909e. *Ezekiel* (The pulpit commentary). Electronic ed. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Spence, H.D.M. & Exell, J. (eds.) 1909f. *Judges* (The pulpit commentary). Electronic ed. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Spence, H.D.M. & Exell, J. (eds.) 1909g. *2 Kings* (The pulpit commentary). Electronic ed. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Spencer, A. 2002. Morphology. In Aronoff, M. & Rees-Miller, J. (eds). *The handbook of linguistics*. Blackwell Reference Online. www.blackwellreference.com/public/book?id=g9781405102520_9781405102520 [21 November 2008].

Sporting metaphors. n.d. *Boxing metaphors*. https://sites.google.com/site/sportingmetaphors/match-stats [17 April 2012].

Stähli, H-P. 1997a. פחד. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 979-981. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Stähli, H-P. 1997b. רום. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1220-1225. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Stendebach, F.J. 2001. עַיִן. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XI, pp. 28-44. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Stendebach, F.J. 2004. רֶגֶל. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIII, pp. 309-324. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Stenmans, P. 1995. כָּבֵד. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. VII, pp. 17-22. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Stoebe, H.J. 1973. *Das erste Buch Samuelis*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.

Stoebe, H.J. 1994. *Das zweite Buch Samuelis*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.

Stolz, F. 1997a. לֵב. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 638-642. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Stolz, F. 1997b. נשׂא. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 769-774. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Strässler, J. 1982. *Idioms in English: A pragmatic analysis*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Su, L.I. 2002. What can metaphors tell us about culture? *Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 589-613.

Svensson, M.H. 2004. Critères de figement: L'identification des expressions figées en français contemporain. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Umeå Universitet.

Svensson, M.H. 2008. A very complex criterion of fixedness: Non-compositionality. In Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (eds). *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 81-93. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Swanson, J.A. 1997. *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament)*. Electronic ed. Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Taylor, J.R. 1995. *Linguistic categorization: Prototypes in linguistic theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Taylor, J.R. 2002. *Cognitive grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tengström, S. 2004. רוּחַ. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XIII, pp. 365-396. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Tsumura, D. T. 2007. *The First Book of Samuel* (The new international commentary on the Old Testament). Electronic ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Unterman, J. 1985. Covenant. In Achtemeier, P.J. (ed). *Harper's Bible dictionary*, pp. 190-192. Electronic ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J. (general ed). 2004. *The Lexham Hebrew-English interlinear Bible*. Electronic ed. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J., Naudé, J.A. & Kroeze, J.H. 1999. *A Biblical Hebrew reference grammar*. Electronic ed. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems.

Van der Woude, A.S. 1997a. יָד. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 497-502. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Van der Woude, A.S. 1997b. פָּנִים. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 995-1014. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Van Groningen, G. 1999a. יָחַם. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 374-375. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Van Groningen, G. 1999b. אָנֵף. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 58. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Van Steenbergen, G.J. 2002. Componential analysis of meaning and cognitive linguistics: Some prospects for Biblical Hebrew lexicology. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 19-37.

Van Steenbergen, G.J.   2005.   *Semantics, world view and Bible translation: An integrated analysis of a selection of Hebrew lexical items referring to negative moral behaviour in the book of Isaiah*. Electronic ed.   Stellenbosch: SUN PReSS.

Velasco, O.I.D.   2002.   Metaphor, metonymy, and image-schemas: An analysis of conceptual interaction patterns.   *Journal of English studies*, Vol. 3, pp. 47-63.

Vetter, D.   1997.   ראה.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1176-1183. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Vine, W.E., Unger, M.F. & White, W. (eds).   1996.   *Vine's complete expository dictionary of Old and New Testament words*, Vol. 1. Electronic ed.   Nashville: T. Nelson.

Violi, P.   2001.   *Meaning and experience.*   Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Wagner, S.   1975.   בְּקֵשׁ.   In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 229-241.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Wagner, S.   1997.   מָצָא.   In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. VIII, pp. 480-483.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Waltke, B.K.   1999.   נֶפֶשׁ.   In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 587-591. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Warren-Rothlin, A.L.   2005.   Body idioms and the Psalms.   In Johnston, P.S. and Firth, D.G. (eds).   *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and approaches*, pp. 195-212. Leicester: IVP Apollos.

Weinfeld, M.   1975.   בְּרִית.   In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 253-279.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Weinreich, U.   1969.   Problems in the analysis of idioms.   In Puhvel, J. (ed).   *The substance and structure of language*, pp. 23-81.   Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Weinreich, U.   1972.   *Explorations in semantic theory.*   The Hague: Mouton.

Wenham, G.J.   1998.   *Genesis 16-50* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 2). Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Westermann, C.   1997a.   נֶפֶשׁ.   In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 743-759. Electronic ed.   Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Westermann, C. 1997b. כבד. In Jenni, E., Westermann, C. & Biddle, M.E. (eds). *Theological lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 590-602. Electronic ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

White, W. 1999. רָגַל. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 831-832. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Williams, G.C. 2008. The Good Lord and his works: A corpus-driven study of collocational resonance. In Granger, S. & Meunier, F. (eds). *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp. 159-173. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Williamson, H.G.M. 1998. *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Word biblical commentary, Vol. 16). Electronic ed. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Williamson, P.R. 2003. Covenant. In Alexander, T.D. & Baker, D.W. (eds). *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, pp. 139-155. Electronic ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Wiseman, D.J. 1996. Age, old age. In Wood, D.R.W., Marshall, I.H., Millard, A.R., Packer, J.I. & Wiseman, D.J. (eds). *New Bible dictionary*, p. 18. Electronic ed. Leicester: InterVarsity Press.

Wolf, H. 1999a. אָזַר. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, pp. 29-30. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Wolf, H. 1999b. אָזֵן. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 29. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Wolf, H. 1999c. דָּרַךְ. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 196-197. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Wolf, H. 1999d. אוֹר. In Harris, R.L., Archer, G.L. & Waltke, B.K. (eds). *Theological wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 25-27. Electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press.

Wood, M.M. 1986. *A definition of idiom*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Wright, D.P. & Milgrom, J. 2001. עָצַר. In Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H-J. (eds). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. XI, pp. 310-315. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Yamada, N. 1993. Metaphors of a pillar in English and Japanese. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 53-64.

Yu, N. 2000. Figurative uses of *finger* and *palm* in Chinese and English. *Metaphor and Symbol*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 159-175.

Yu, N.   2008.   Metaphor from body and culture.   In Gibbs, R.W. (ed).   *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*, pp. 247-261.   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zobel, H-J.   1975.   גָּלָה.   In Botterweck, G.J. & Ringgren, H. (eds).   *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 476-488.   Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.