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I.

THE COMMON STATEMENT that the form qôtel in biblical Hebrew (which goes back to a Proto-Semitic form qâtil) usually has the function of an active participle of the simple stem (qal), and that as a participle it exhibits a dual character of the verb and the noun,¹ is inaccurate. The qôtel-pattern contains a significant number of primary nouns, of denominatives, and of nouns connected with the derived stems. qôtel, then, differs essentially from the participles of the derived conjugations the linkage of which to their respective conjugation is exclusive and constant.² The very existence of nouns in the qôtel-pattern exerts a strong influence on the qôtel as qal participle. If one views the latter only from the angle of its syntactic behavior, one may indeed conclude that sometimes it has a verbal character, at other times a nominal character.³ When,


². On the participles of the derived stems see Moscati (1969, pp. 157f), Bauer-Leander (1922, pp. 323, 327f, 332).

³. Sellin (1889), in his thorough treatise, examines the occurrences of the participle when construed as a verb and when construed as a noun. Lambert (1932, p. 268) states: "Le participe . . . peut, d'un côté, avoir les mêmes compléments que le verbe . . . ; de l'autre, il peut se décliner comme le nom et prendre l'article."
however, our analysis includes semantic aspects, such absolute polarity vanishes. Between the two extremes of qötēl as substantive on the one hand, and qötēl in a pronouncedly verbal function on the other hand, there are gradations in which the verbal and nominal forces combine in varying intensity. 4

The question of genetic priority of the noun or the verb does not concern us here. 5 Starting from the observable stage of the Semitic languages in which the dichotomy is a linguistic fact, 6 we are bound to regard qötēl as one of the simple nominal patterns. It is typical of the individual patterns that they embrace heterogeneous elements; only occasionally we detect within a specific pattern a group of lexemes that exhibit a semantic affinity. Thus Hebrew qāqēl comprises noun adjectives, noun substantives and a group of terms denoting agricultural work (Bauer-Leander, 1922, pp. 470 f). In qittēl we find various nouns but also a specific use; namely, that of denoting bodily defects (Bauer-Leander, 1922, p. 477). It stands to reason that the powerful process of analogy has brought together those terms that belong to the same conceptual field.

This applies to qôtēl 7 as well. It annexed the function of an active participle and was subsequently almost absorbed by this function. Yet, as is well known, qôtēl never gained the sole status as qal participle: qâqēl and qâqēl compete with it. To say that the latter belong to stative verbs is to beg the question. If there is a strong tendency in that direction, this is probably also due to analogy. The distinction between active and stative verbs is not a product of logical classification (Brockelmann, 1913, p. 133). There can be no reason why words like bōdēd ("alone"), kō'ēb ("to feel pain"), nōbēl ("to wither") and many more like them have not been included amongst the stative verbs unless we close the vicious circle by declaring that to the Hebrew mind these verbs of state had an active connotation. It is also significant that occasionally qôtēl and qâqēl alternate: sōkēāh and sākēāh ("to forget"), lō'ēg and lā'ēg ("to deride") (Gesenius, 1910, §116b); 'ôrēb ("to stand surety") becomes in post-biblical Hebrew 'ārēb, and contrariwise, Isa 66:2 hārēd becomes hōrēd in the scroll 1 Q 1s a.

4. Lambert (1932) adduces as examples of substantival participles that express a constant action šōpēt ("judge") and mēneqet ("wet-nurse"). But šōpēt belongs to a nominal pattern; mēneqet does not, and the constancy of action differs extremely in the two instances.
5. For a summary of the different views see Sellin (1889, pp. 6–11).
7. Disregarding the variant spelling in the Hebrew Bible, יָעַף and יָעַף, we shall use the form qôtēl throughout this article.
We must admit, then, that not all qôṭēl-forms are qal participles, nor are all qal participles of the form qôṭēl. Before we set out to describe the semantic diversity within the bounds of the qôṭēl-pattern, we may ask ourselves if the ancient Hebrews were aware of this diversity. In other words, did or did not the use of one formal element entail the obliteration of the various significations it actually had? Was, e.g., the word sôpēt taken to mean “judge” in some contexts, “he is judging” in other contexts; or was it rather understood as “the judging one” at all times? Was rō’e “the seer, prophet” at one time, and “he sees” at another occasion, or is this a differentiation carried into the Hebrew from the point of view of alien tongues only? Those who assume that our thinking is decisively shaped, if not absolutely determined by the structure of our native tongue will be inclined to dismiss semantic discernment that lacks formal marks. But their basic assumption is questionable. The English speaker using the epicene word teacher in a definite situational context has in mind a clear notion of either a male or a female person, just like the German who is forced by the structure of his language to distinguish between Lehrer and Lehrerin. Similarly, in order to adduce an example closer to our purpose, the English speaker does also distinguish between the varied shades of signification of the morpheme -er in words like fisher (a profession), drinker (a habit), overseer (a task), onlooker (a transient activity) and the like.

It is provable that speakers of biblical Hebrew were cognizant of the semantic complexity of qôṭēl. They noticed a difference between rōzēn (“prince”) which does not possess any radical cognates in Hebrew and hōlēk (“walking”) which relates to a verbal root, although both qôṭēl-forms point to an agens of masculine gender. Indeed rōzēn exclusively maintains paradigmatic relations with nouns like melek (“king”) while hōlēk enters into syntagmatic relations with this noun. Contrast: “Listen, you kings; give ear, you rōzēnim (“princes”)” (Judg 5:3) with “And King David hōlēk (“was walking”)” (2 Sam 3:31).

Now a word like sôpēt (“judging; judge”) is capable of entering into either paradigmatic or syntagmatic relations with a noun. Compare: “And now, O kings, exercise prudence; let yourselves be corrected, O

---

8. Such view was put forward by B. L. Whorf. See Robins (1964, p. 301).
10. On syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations see Lyons (1968, pp. 70–74) and Robins (1964, pp. 44–46).
šōpēṯ (“judges”) of the earth” (Ps 2:10) with “A king šōpēṯ (“judging”) the poor in trueness . . .” (Prov 29:14). Evidently the word šōpēṯ connoted different notions in the two instances. In fact, some abortive attempts at differentiation are found in biblical Hebrew: yōledet (“mother; a woman that has given birth”) against yōledā (“a woman in travail, giving birth”);11 hōrā (“mother,” parallels ūem, “mother,” Cant 3:4) against hārā (“pregnant”), and if the text is correct, šōlēm (“a man of peace,” Ps 7:5) against šālēm (“peaceful,” Gen 3:21). Furthermore, denominatives like kōrēm (“vinedresser” from kerēm “vineyard”) prove that qōfēl had developed an additional morphemic value, that of an agent noun, which it could carry without the support of a verbal root.

Where nominal factor and verbal factor are present, namely, in qōfēl as participle qal, the potential intensity of each of these factors depends on the semantic character of the verb. A verb may denote an activity which in certain social conditions becomes a vocation; its qōfēl turns into a term of profession (though occasionally retaining the function of a genuine participle): yōšēr (“potter”), zōnā (“prostitute”). Such terms sometimes exist simultaneously with synonymous nouns: rōqēḥ and raq-qāh (“apothecary”), hōrēš and hārāš (“artisan”), hōḇēr and habbār or hāḇēr (“conjuror”), yōqēš and yāqōš (“fowler”). The existence of such a synonym is influential: mōšēl (“ruler”) has more nominal force than mōlēk (“kingly ruler”) because the later had to compete with the frequently used noun melek (“king”). mōšēl parallels the substantives qāsin and ’ādōn (“lord,” Prov 6:7, Ps 105:21), while mōlēk could be replaced in all its occurrences by verbal constructions (e.g. Esth 1:1 *āšer mālak “who ruled”).

Other verbs denote qualities or permanent occupations that are considered characteristic of the subject. Here also qōfēl undergoes a substantivation; again, it may have to compete with other nominal synonyms: hōtē beside haṭṭā (“sinner”), ’ōṣēq beside ’āṣōq (“oppressor”).12 Those verbs which express a persistent activity or state of mind developed similarly: ’ōhēb (“lover”), ’ōyēb (“enemy”), bōʾēr (“brute”), competing with synonymous baʿar, etc.

A great number of verbs, probably the majority, are from the first

11. On the feminine forms corresponding to qōfēl; namely, qōtelet, qōtalā, and qōtelā, see Brockelmann (1908, pp. 101f, 407), Gesenius (1910, §§ 84b, 94d), Bauer-Leander (1922, pp. 589–590). The difference between qōtelā and qōtelā is of a purely phonetic nature.

12. Driver (1892, p. 165) postulates a semantic difference between ’ōṣēq and ’āṣōq, which is absolutely unattested. The two lexemes appear in two otherwise identical phrases (Jer 21:12 and 22:3, “and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor”).
precluded from such evolution: they denote actions of limited duration. But even here qōṭēl-forms may occasionally assume the functions of substantives; namely, when the action described is considered essentially characteristic of the subject in a particular context: 'ōbēr ("passer-by"), qōne ("buyer").

It therefore seems inadequate to make grammatical form our only criterion in the analysis of qōṭēl. The difference between bāzîm dzhārāw ("despised his words," 2 Chr 36:16) and hōzē šāmî ("despising my name," Mal 1:6), hōsîm bō and hōsē bō ("trusting in him"), 'ōzāhūm and 'ōzōbē ("abandoning . . .") are almost negligible. On the other hand, one and the same form may represent divergent meanings. Thus hōlēk bəḥālīl ("he who walks with a flute," Isa 30:29) is a denotation of only temporary validity, i.e., a participant in a festive procession: hōlēk bəḥokmā ("he who walks with wisdom," Prov 28:26) denotes a permanent trait. hārōʾīm hārōʾīm 'et 'ammī ("the shepherds who tend my people," Jer 23:3) combines the uses of the same qōṭēl as term of profession and as participle of an activity. This combination should not be confused with an intended paronomasy like haṣṣōdēd sōdēd ("the spoiler spoils," Isa 21:2). The latter verse has to be understood roughly like this: "The one, of whose traits we are concerned only with his being a spoiler, continues his usual practice of spoiling." In the previously quoted verse (Jeremiah), the two identical forms meet, as it were, by accident.

Of course, once we focus our attention on semantic differences, we will notice problems hitherto unsuspected. We may, e.g., decide that qōne ("buyer") refers to the person who concludes a specific purchase; how does mōkēr ("seller") relate to this? Is he the one selling in one particular case (Akkadian nādinānu) or is he a merchant, a vendor (Akkadian nādinu; formally cognate with qōṭēl)? To this question of semantic ambiguity we shall return at the end of our review.

II.

We may now attempt a classification of the various qōṭēl-types according to the semantic value they carry. This classification does not boast absolute precision; it aims to be suggestive.

### Synopsis of Classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Formal Features</th>
<th>Signification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>sōrēq “choice”</td>
<td>rōzēn “prince”</td>
<td>kōrēmi “vine-dresser”</td>
<td>kōbēs “fuller”</td>
<td>šōpēt “judge”</td>
<td>šōnē “enemy”</td>
<td>qōne “buyer”</td>
<td>yōqēd “burning”</td>
<td>nōtēn “giving”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Formal Features

- Derived from nouns
- Connected with verbal root in derived stem
- Identical with participle of qal conjugation

#### Signification

- Substance denoting object
- Profession, term of agent
- Permanent activity
- Attributively denoted action
- Predicative denoting action
Class a. The qōtel-form of these lexemes seems incidental; it lacks any morphemic value. Thus, e.g., Hebrew ‘ōreb (“raven”) corresponds to Arabic ġurāb.\(^{15}\) In particular instances it may be difficult to decide whether a root is isolated in biblical Hebrew or, granting this be the case, if the limited scope of this literary source reflects the actual situations of the language in the course of centuries.\(^{16}\) But the impression we gather from the linguistic corpus as we have it before us is that lexemes pertaining to this class are either radically isolated or their etymology has become obscure or doubtful. In fact some may be loan words, while the qōtel-form of others appears spurious from a diachronic point of view. These questions need not, however, occupy us here. We are concerned with the attraction towards the nominal pole which this class exerts. The following words,\(^{17}\) in the qōtel-pattern to all appearance, denote objects: hōmā (“wall”), yōbēl (“horn”),\(^{18}\) mōrā (“razor”),\(^{19}\) sōhērā (“protective weapon? bulwark?”), Ps 91:4, sōheret (“marble?”), Esth 1:6,\(^{20}\) qōrā (“beam”),\(^{21}\) sōrēq (“vine”), sōrā (“millet”).\(^{22}\) 'ōreb (Job 30:17) has been explained either as “sinew,” “vein” or as “gnawer,” i.e., gnawing pain.

Mention should also be made of the proper names that belong here because of their pattern and the opacity of their etymology: bōṣēs, mōše, hōreb. dō'ēg could be a title; ‘ōdēd probably is one.

Class b. Again the roots of the lexemes to be included here are isolated but their qōtel-form is significant: it indicates the holder of an office or a profession, hōbēr (“astrologer,” Isa 47:13; 1Q Isq hōbēr), kōhēn

15. Namely qutāl, the Hebrew equivalent of which would be *'āreb. Akkadian āribu corresponds to the Hebrew form.
16. Post-biblical Hebrew, expanding the use of many roots, gives evidence of either early usage not preserved in the Bible or later linguistic development.
17. Chapter and verse are quoted only when the word is very rare or there may be a doubt as to the specific occurrence referred to. The English renditions do not pretend to be more than rough identifications.
18. Barth (1889, p. 149) regards this word (and other qōtel-forms of abstract meaning) as derived from an infinitive. According to the Babylonian Talmud (Rosh Hashanah 26a), yōbēl denoted “ram” in Arabic; this meaning is also in Phoenician. See Buhl (1915, p. 292), Kohler-Baumgartner (1953, p. 371).
19. Perhaps from a root 'r (Buhl, 1915, p. 408; Kohler-Baumgarter, p. 506), i.e., historically no genuine qōtel. But König (1910, p. 214) derives this word from mērah. (Thus Rashi ad Judg 13:5).
20. Apparently two loan words. See Buhl (1915, p. 541). Therefore Avineri's remark (1976, p. 418) on the formal difference between the two seems irrelevant.
21. Akkadian qarītu. The derivation from qrh (“to meet”), as König (1910, p. 406) proposes, is doubtful. maqāre and pi'ēl qrh are denominatives.
22. Same word and spelling in an Aramaic inscription, see Donner-Röllig (1964, Nr. 215, 6.9).
("priest"), \(^{23}\) nôqêd ("sheep-raiser"), \(^{24}\) ‘ôdêd (2 Chr 15:1, 28:9 mistakenly taken as a proper name; rather "seer, prophet," cf. the Aramaic phrase byd ḫyn ṭhyd ‘ādn, “through prophets and soothsayers," Donner-Röllig, 1964 Nr. 202 A 12), rôzên ("prince," Donner-Röllig, 1964, Nr. 26 A III, 12: ṭzn parallels mlk), šôfêr ("officer"), rôbe ("archer"). \(^{25}\) bôlês ši-qmîm (Amos 7:14) probably does not denote a temporary activity, as Versions and many commentators have it, but rather "a grower of sycamore trees." hôze (Isa 56:10; 1Q Is\(^{a}\) has the more common hôze) should perhaps also be understood as "diviner"; namely, a professional who claims to obtain knowledge of secret things in an artificially induced trance. The feminine form pôkeret hasšabâyîm (Ezra 2:57) though it figures in a list of personal names, seems to have some functional meaning: "hunter, binder of gazelles."

Class c. Lexemes of this class exhibit linguistic linkage within the Hebrew vocabulary but they are connected with items other than verbs. In a number of cases qôṭêl denotes a person who occupies himself with the object indicated by a noun from which the qôṭêl is derived. Thus bô-qêr ("herdsman") from bâqár ("cattle"), hôbêl ("sailor") from hebêl ("rope"), \(^{26}\) yôgêb ("field laborer?") from yâgêb ("field?"). \(^{27}\) kôrêm ("vinedresser") from kerem ("vineyard"), sô’êr ("gatekeeper") from šà’ar ("gate"). rôkêl ("merchant") possesses a common root with räkîl ("to go around [with defamatory intentions]"); the noun räkullâ ("merchandise") is derived from the qôṭêl. All these are terms of profession. Slightly different is the case of ‘ôrêah ("wayfarer") from ‘ôrah ("way") and of pôhêz ("loose") from a root phz which seems to denote something like "un-controllableness." We may assume, though, that originally both nouns also defined a status and did not just describe a transient situation: the wayfarer as well as the landless and loose person (Judg 9:4) were not protected by the community and its laws. sô’ên (Isa 9:4) is a difficult word and the text is doubtful. Whether or not the exact meaning of that verse is "for every boot stamps furiously," the ease with which a denominative

\(^{23}\) pi’él from khn are denominative forms. Thus it does not help to consider kôhên as "originally participle Qal" (Gesenius, 1910 § 84\(^{a}\)s).

\(^{24}\) Ugaritic nqd ("shepherd") and the honorific title rb nqdm. See Gordon (1947, p. 252).

\(^{25}\) To this hapax legomenon an explanatory synonym was added: qaššat.

\(^{26}\) This derivation like sc...ne others is not certain.

\(^{27}\) Köhler-Baumgartner (1953, p. 361): "unpaid laborers" and "compulsory service," respectively.
qôtel, namely sô‘ên, could be derived from the noun sô‘ôn ("shoe, boot"; Akkadian sênu) is noteworthy.

A peculiar item in this class is bôdêd which shares its root with lôbad ("separately") and bôdâd ("alone, isolated"). The word appears in difficult verses but it seems evident that we have to interpret it in a very active sense; the usual rendition "alone" will not do. bôdêd is someone who withdraws and wishes to keep aloof. This is confirmed by Ben-Sirach 12:9, "... when he is in need, even his friend bôdêd, i.e., withdraws."

Most of the terms adduced above are hapax legomena. It stands to reason that now and again a certain rare professional skill was borrowed from another culture together with its denomination. At any rate the independent morphemic value of qôtel is demonstrated again.

**Class d.** Members of this class are supported by verbal roots which, however, appear only in the derived stems, not in the simple stem qal. qôtel does not substitute for the regular participle of the respective conjugation: thus, e.g., we find pi‘êl dibber, kissâ (never qal *dâbar, *kâsâ) and the participles môdabbêr, môkasse beside the qôtel-forms dôbêr, kôse. Occasionally this absence of qal might be merely a matter of linguistic transmission: by chance no finite form of the simple stem has been preserved in biblical language. There are, however, too many instances of this phenomenon to permit such an assumption as an overall explanation. Rather this constitutes a confirmation of our preceding finding that qôtel has not contracted an exclusive relationship with the qal.

Professional terms are less predominant than in the previous classes: nôqêš ("fowler") from the root nqê which appears in nip‘al, pi‘êl and hit-pa‘êl; sôkên ("steward") from skn (hip‘îl); rôqêm ("weaver; needle-worker") from rqm (pu‘al); kôbêš ("fuller; laundryman") from a root kbs which appears in pi‘êl, pu‘al, and hotpa‘al.

Permanent status or occupation is denoted by ʿômên ("custodian") from ʿmn (nip‘al, hip‘îl), hôtên ("father-in-law") from hin (hatân "bridegroom," also hitpa‘êl). More frequently lexemes of this class denote permanent traits and behavioral patterns; in some cases the qôtel can fulfill this function only in conjunction with an explanatory noun:

28. Rabbinic Hebrew makes use of passive bôdâd, see Jastrow (1903, p. 139).
29. Lambert (1932, p. 269) is driven to this contradiction in terms: "Les participes actif et passif du qal se rencontrent parfois dans des verbes dans lesquels cette conjugaison n’existe pas... . . ."
30. The classical versions, however, read nip‘al from yqê.
31. On the etymology and meaning of sôkên see Donner-Röllig (1964, pp. 211f).
dōbēr 'ēmet (šālōm, tānim, etc.) ("speaker of truth, peace, integrity, etc."); the root dbr is used in pi'ēl. (This is also the case in the following examples, and thus pi'ēl will not be annotated.) kōzēb ("liar"); kōse da'at ("reticent") and kōse qālōn ("temperate"), lit. "concealer of wisdom and of affront," respectively; nōkēl ("deceiver"); pōsēq sāpātayim ("talkative"), lit. "he who opens wide his lips"; synonymously, poṭe sāpātayim; so'ē ("captive" Isa 51:14), lit. "he that is bent down"; šōsēa' šesa' (parsā) ("[animal] that cleaves [its claws]"). 'ōdēp ("remainder; surplus"); the hip'il with root 'dp is perhaps a denominative) and kōteret ("capital of column," from ktr, "to surround," pi'ēl) denote objects.32 qōhelet (Eccl 12:8) seems to denote an office ("assembler," qāhal "assembly," qhl in nip'al and hitpa'ēl) and was then taken as proper name (Eccl 1:1).

Class e. This class—like all the subsequent ones—consists of qōtēl-forms from roots present also in the simple qal stem. In fact, lexemes pertaining to this class are, from a historic point of view, qal participles and they maintain formal identity with those genuine participles of their respective roots that have preserved verbal function. Semantically, however, these lexemes have undergone an essential change: they no longer describe the actual exercise of an activity but have become fixed denotations labelling a subject on the basis of one distinctive feature which is durable and objectively observable.

The foremost group is that of terms for professions. 'ōrēg ("weaver"), bōne ("stone-cutter, builder," 2 Kgs 22:6), gōdēr ("mason," ibid.), zōnā ("prostitute"), hōbēr ("diviner"), hōze ("seer, prophet"), hōqēq ("law-maker," Isa 10:1), hōyēb ("stone-mason"), yōṣēr ("potter"), sōpēr ("scribe"), sōrēp ("goldsmith"), qōsēm ("diviner"), rō'e ("prophet"), rōqēāh ("apothecary"), sōher ("merchant"), rōpē ("physician," Gen 50:2), sōpēō ("judge"), sōmer ("watchman"), and so on. In many cases qōtēl becomes a substantive only in conjunction with other words; thus, e.g., terms denoting skills: yōdēa' naggēn ("musician," lit. "skilled in playing an instrument"), yōdēa' sayid ("hunter"), yōdēa' nehi ("hired mourner"), tōpēś kinnōr ("harp player"); denoting warlike occupations: dōrēk qešet or tōpēś qešet ("archer"), yōṣē šābā or 'ōrēk milhāmā ("warrior"). dōrēs 'el hammētīm and sō'ēl 'ōb (Deut 18:11) are specific kinds of diviners. rō'ē pānē hammelekh (2 Kgs 25:19) and tōmek sēbeṭ (Amos 1:5) denote persons

32. The late word keter ("crown") may be etymologically unrelated, see Buhl (1915, p. 369). ōmānōt (2 Kgs 18:16) is also a substantival qōtēl as an architectonic term.
of rank, lit. "he that is allowed to see the king's face, i.e., into his presence" and "the holder of the sceptre," respectively.

qôtēl describes a person's position in society: yôlêd ("father," Prov 17:21, lit. "begetter," parallel with 'ab "father"),33 yônéq ("suckling"), yôšêb ("inhabitant," Amos 1:8), yôšêb 'ôhel ("tent dweller"), gô'ēl, a participle of a verb signifying "to claim; to buy back; to redeem," frequently denotes the "repurchaser" of family property in specific cases; but when it broadens its meaning indicating any "next of kin" (Ruth 3:13), it pertains to the present class.

We might be inclined to view this substantival use of a participle as an originally elliptical construction: sôhârîm ("merchants") for 'ânâšîm . . . sôhârîm ("people going around, trading," Gen 37:28), zônâ for 'iśṣâ zônâ ("a prostitute woman," Josh 2:1), and so on. But as far as the observable stage of the language is concerned, such apprehension would be unsound. The addition of a word like 'iš ("man") to the qôtēl is appositional, exactly like 'îs nâbî ("a prophet man," Judg 6:8). However, where a qôtēl-form has become a fixed name of an animal or an object, the impression of ellipsis seems better grounded, e.g., qôrē ("partridge," Jer 17:11, lit. "the calling [bird]"). 'ôkēl (probably "locust," Mal 3:11, lit. "the devouring [insect]"). The last word belongs here if it was a commonly understood appellation of that insect; this use of 'ôkēl has to be distinguished from that in Judg 14:14 (Samson's riddle): "Out of the 'ôkēl ("the eater") came forth something to eat" (against Ehrlich, 1900, III, p. 497). In a riddle ambiguity is intentional: 'ôkēl was definitely not known as an epithet of "lion." 'ôlā ("burnt-offering," lit. "the ascending [offering]"). hôberet ("junction," Exod 26:4) stands elliptically for yârî'â hôberet ("the coupled tent-cloth"). Those expressions that are spontaneously created synonyms of commonly used nouns seem to be similarly elliptical: sôkebet hêqêkâ ("your wife," lit. "she that lies in your bosom," Mic 7:5), cf. Deut 13:7 "the wife of your bosom"; rô'ē hasšemes ("men alive," Eccl 7:11, lit. "those who see the sun"; cf. "all the living who walk under the sun," Eccl 4:15); tôhânôt ("teeth," lit. "the grinders") and rô'ôt ("eyes," lit. "the peering ones," Eccl 12:3).

The highest degree of remoteness from verbal function is exhibited by qôtēl-forms of abstract meaning: 'ôbêd ("destruction," Num 24:20),14

33. Evidently used substantively; against Avineri (1976, p. 386).
34. Regarding Barth's view on these words, see above note 18.
hōwā ("disaster," Isa 47:11), yōnā ("oppression," Jer 25:38), rō'e ("vision," Isa 28:7). That at least some of these forms were originally participles can be learned from comparing hā'īr hayyōnā ("the oppressive city," Zeph 3:11), hereh hayyōnā (either "the oppressive sword" or "sword of oppression," Jer 46:16) and hārōn hayyōnā ("wrath of oppression," Jer 25:38). Similarly, gōlā ("the exiles," "exile") is originally a feminine participle functioning as a collective noun, like yōsebet styyōn ("the inhabitants of Zion," Brockelmann, 1908, p. 427).

The pronouncedly nominal character of these lexemes does not need substantiation: their potentiality of occurrence equals that of ordinary nouns.

Class f. Lexemes of this class are qal participles that denote a permanent feature of the subject in character or behavior. Substantiation can take place when such a feature is considered sufficiently distinguishing as to function as denotation. This process is best observable in paronomastic constructions, direct or inverted: habboged bōged ("the traitor deals traitorously," Isa 21:2), lō'ahāba 'et sōnō'ēka wōlisnō 'et 'ōhābēka ("loving those hating you and hating those loving you," 2 Sam 19:7). In the speaker's view, the predominant quality of the subjects consists in their "dealing traitorously," "hating," and "loving," respectively. He can thus go further and turn this quality into an appellation.

Another aspect is indicated by the above examples: in contradistinction to the contiguous classes, the present one contains a strong element of emotive subjectivity. A sōpēt ("judge"; class e) and a qōsēr ("reaper"; class g) will appear as such from all points of view, including their own. Not so the qōtel-forms of the present class: the words hōṣē ("sinner"), hōse ("confiding [in God]") and their like reflect the speaker's sentiments. This class then has less nominal force than the previous class but since it contains denotations of abiding qualities, it has more nominal force than the following class.


'ōne in the obscure phrase ʻēr wōʻone (Mal 2:12) functions substantively, no matter how precisely we interpret the clause: "ʻēr wōʻone shall be cut off." (See Buhl, 1915, pp. 573f.)
It is not surprising that compounds abound in this class: hōlek, dōbēr, (“walking,” “speaking”) express transient activities; in combination with other words they become terms for abiding virtues and thus for denotation of persons: hōlek  şodāqōt  wədōbēr  mešārīm (“he that walks righteously, and speaks uprightly,” Isa 33:15). Thus we have: ʿōhēb rāʿā (“villain,” “lover of wickedness”), gōzēl ʿābīw  wə ʾimmō (“despoiler of his parents,” Prov 28:24), bōteāh  bə  YHWH (“he that trusts the Lord”), dōrēš rāʿā (“he that seeks evil”), hōsek  ṣibṭō (“he that spares his rod,” i.e., a lenient educator, Prov 13:24), yōdēaʾ šedeq (“righteous,” lit. “he that knows justice”), mōʾēs bōbeṣaʾ maʿāšaqqōt (“he that rejects the gain from extortions”), mōnēaʾ bar (“he that speaks in corn”), nōtēn lahmī (“my provider,” lit. “he who gives my bread,” Hos 2:5), mōšēl  bərōḥō (“temperate, restrained,” lit. “he that dominates his spirit,” Prov 16:32), ʿōkēr yisrāʿēl (“destroyer of Israel”), pōʿēl  āwen (“wrongdoer”), pōrēaʾ mūsār (“he that shuns discipline,” Prov 15:32), qōbēs ʿal yāʾd (“he that collects by slow labor,” lit. “... by the hand,” Prov 13:11), qōne lēb (“he that acquires wisdom,” lit. “... a heart,” Prov 19:8), sōmēr rūḥ (“he that watches the wind,” i.e., postponing his labor under a pretext), and many more like them. The gnomic saying especially makes use of qōtel in this way: it intends to depict its subject only by referring to his relevant trait.6

To this class belong also qōtel-forms referring to divine activities or attributes that have turned into epithets: bōrē (“Creator,” Eccl 12:1), hōbēb  ʿannīm (“He that cherishes the tribes [of Israel],” Deut 33:3), yōsēr (“Moulder,” Ps 94:9), yōsēb  hāsāmāyim (“the One sitting in the heavens”), yōsēb  kārūbīm (“He that sits between the cherubs”), nōsēr  hāʾādām (“Preserver of man,” Job 7:20), ʿōse (“Maker,” Job 4:17), rōkēb  hāʾārāḥōt (“the One riding through the clouds,” Ps 68:5), rōkēb  šāmāyim (“the One who rides upon the heaven,” Deut 33:26). One need not include here the many qōtel-forms that are used predicatively indicating divine attributes.7 Thus we may disregard a phrase like YHWH  bōrāʿākā (“YHWH, your creator” or “YHWH, who has created you,” Isa 43:1) and relevant verses such as Amos 4:13, 5:8, etc., Ps 136 and the like. Yet the divide is fluid: dōrēš  dānīm (Ps 9:13), originally a predicative state-
ment about God's justice ("He avenges the blood of the innocent") has become an epithet of God and the subject of the verse "The avenger of the blood remembers them..."; ḥōseš alom bimrômâw (Job 25:2, "He makes peace in his high places") becomes an epithet in a later prayer ("the Peace Maker in his high places shall bestow peace on us").

It seems evident that the substantival use of qôṭèl can be interpreted as elliptical to some extent.18 ḥânâšîm bôḏârim ("brutish men," Ezek 21:36) becomes shortened to bôḏârim (Ps 94:8); ḥôsâge ("person that errs, has erred," Ezek 45:20) becomes sôge (Prov 20:1). The nominal force of the qôṭèl of this class used absolutely can be clearly seen from its syntactic linkages: hôtâ joins râšâ, a noun, and stands in opposition to saddîq, a noun (Prov 11:31); similarly pôšèâ joins râšâ (Ps 37:38) and combines with the clearly nominal agent noun hattâ (Isa 1:28); and so on.

Some lexemes pertaining to this class have acquired abstract meanings: tōâ ("error," Isa 32:6), bôgîdîm (Prov 23:28) and bôgôdôt (Zeph 3:4) ("treachery"). hôbalîm ("union?"; according to Jewish commentators "destroyers," Zech 11:7) parallels the noun nô'îm.

Class g. To this class belong qal participles that function as substantival designation of a subject in a clearly definable situation of limited duration. The activity as expressed by the verb is considered sufficiently distinguishing and essentially describes the subject in that situation. Thus, e.g., Lev 16:27 orders the sin offerings to be burnt; then vs. 28 speaks of hâssôrêp (lit. "the burning one; burner"), i.e., the person about whom the only relevant information to be given at this point is his specific task. Isa 14:8, in a fragmentary allegory, reports the joy of the trees: "no kôrêt ("feller; woodcutter") comes up against us." Any specification would be superfluous: the only fact that concerns us in this context is that someone might cut the trees down. Similar is the notion behind paronomastic constructions that in biblical Hebrew stand for "whosoever hears it," "whosoever sees it": wâśâma' haśṣônêq ("the hearer will hear"), yîr'e hârô'î ("the onlooker will see") (2 Sam 17:9 and Isa 28:4, respectively; cf. Brockelmann, 1956, § 37).

In theory every verb has the potentiality of producing a qôṭèl-form that can serve as a designation under certain circumstances; in fact, however, such usage is arbitrarily limited. Somewhat analogously, English has dreamer, writer, killer, etc., but does not permit forms like

---

18. Evidently so in a case like Isa 32:9 hânôt bôṭshôt ("confident daughters") and vs. 11, just bôṭshôt.
THE PATTERN QOTEL

*frightener, *prover, *willer, and so on. Countless Hebrew verbs do not exhibit a substantival qotel, used absolutely. Those that do, present themselves in clusters.

Temporarily characteristic are the seasonal occupations of agriculture: töpēš maggāl ba’ēt qāṣir ("the one handling the sickle in the time of harvest," Jer 50:16). Thus bōṣēr ("grape gatherer"), dōrēk 'ānābīm and dōrēk baggat ("treader of grapes"), the latter also elliptically dōrēk (lsa 16:10), hōrēš ("plower"), zōrēd ("sower"), qōṭēp ("picker," Job 30:4), qōṣēr ("harvester"). Jurisprudence defines the delinquent according to his crime: gōzēl and gōnēb ("robber, stealer"), lōqēāh sōhad ("he that accepts a bribe"), nōqēb sēm YHWH ("blasphemer"), rōṣēāh ("murderer"), sōpēk dām ("he that sheds blood"). In the sphere of transactions: yōrēš ("inheritor"), lōwe ("borrower"), nōše ("creditor, usurer"), 'ōrēb ("guarantor, surety"), qōne ("buyer"). In battle: hōzēz ("plunderer"), hōréāh ("fleeing"), hōrēg ("slayer"), lōkēd i'r ("conqueror of a city"), nōpēl ("fallen warrior"), sōhe ("capturer"). People depicted in motion: hōlek ("walking"), rōkēb ("riding"), 'ōbēr ("passer by"), sōhe ("swimmer").

As abstracts of this class we suggest to consider the following forms: 'ōrēb ("ambush," 1 Sam 22:8),59 mōṣā'ōt (Josh 2:23) and qōrōt (Gen 42:29) ("happenings," lit. "[things] that have found, have met [a person]").40 bōkīm (Job 30:31) probably stands for "a whine."41

Finally, we should include in this class most of the negative statements of the pattern 'ēn qōṭēl ("there is no one who . . . "). Only a few instances could be interpreted as referring to a profession ('ēn yōʾēš, "there is no counsellor," Isa 41:28) or to a permanent situation ('ēn yōʾēb, "without an inhabitant," Jer 44:22). Usually such a qōṭēl denotes the activity expected under the circumstances: "they fell down but 'ēn 'ōzēr ("none to help," Ps 107:12); "I called but 'ēn 'ōne ("none did answer," Isa 66:44); "the cities . . . have been shut up and 'ēn poṭēāh ("there is no one opening them," Jer 13:19). Cf. 1 Sam 26:12, Isa 22:22, 63:5 and many more.

Class h. qōṭēl-forms of this class are adjuncts which in combination with primary words constitute junctions (cf. Jespersen, 1924, pp. 87, 108, 39. Josh 8:12, "and set them (plural) as 'ōrēb (singular)."
40. Perhaps also hōmīyvōt (Prov 1:21). The word denotes "noisy (places)" or perhaps, a further abstraction, "throng." But the Septuagint exhibits a variant reading (hōmīt).
41. Perhaps Ugaritic wšl bkm (Gordon, 1947, 76:III:30) could be compared. Gordon (p. 22) explains the form bkm as adverbial accusative.
By this definition we wish to exclude participles in appositions and in relative clauses which occasionally are described together with junctions as being the attributive use of participles. According to the semantic classification as suggested here, a clause like (hātānāw) lōqahē bənōtāw ("[his sons-in-law] married to his daughters," Gen 19:14) would be assigned to class े. In a relative clause, on the other hand, qōṭēl performs a verbal function and thus belongs to class ʃ.

By junction we mean a combination of a qualified noun and a qualifying qōṭēl that constitutes one conceptual and syntactic unit: birkayim kōrāʾōt ("knees giving way," Job 4:4), sukkat dāwīd hannōpelet ("the fallen tabernacle of David," Amos 9:11), sippōr nōdedet ("bird of passage," Prov 27:8).

Distinction between junction and nexus is admittedly not as formally precise as it is in European languages. English distinguishes between "a fire that devours (the stubble)" (Joel 2:5) and "a devouring fire" (Isa 33:14), while Hebrew exhibits in both instances 'ēš 'ōkēlā. The latter phrase taken by itself could either be a complete sentence ("a fire is devouring"); or a subject and a transitive verb to be completed by an object (as in the case in Joel), or else a junction (Isaiah) which is one element in the sentence. Consequently, an immediate constituent analysis is needed in Hebrew (cf. Hockett, 1958, pp. 147–156):

Only the second instance is a junction. Similarly:

The asyndetic relative clause is a construction contiguous to junction. This is not surprising since the relative clause may be understood as an expansion of an adjective, or for that matter of an adjectival participle. Compare: gepen pōrtīyyā ("fruit-bearing vine," Isa 32:12), a junction, with šōrēs pōre rōš walaʾānā ("a root that bears the fruit of poisonous plants and bitter plants," Deut 29:17).

Some qōṭēl-forms in junction are epitheta ornantia: 'ēš bōʾeret ("burning fire"), hereb nōqemet ("avenging sword," Lev 26:25), 'ēlōhīm sōpātim

The position of such a qōtēl resembles paradigmatically that of a noun adjective: beside lēb sōmēḏ (1 Kgs 3:9) we have lēb ḥāḵām (“wise heart,” 1 Kgs 3:12) and lēb raggāz (“angry heart,” Deut 28:65). It differs from the substantival qōtēl since it does not stand absolutely; it also differs from an adjective insofar as it does not express a fixed quality of a subject but rather its action, potential or real. This verbal force becomes evident when we compare qōtēl-constructions with synonymous verbal constructions: ‘arve tōrēp (“a ravening lion,” Ps 22:14) and za‘ēb yīṯrāp (“a ravening wolf,” Gen 49:27), ‘ēš bō‘ēret (“burning fire,” Jer 20:9) and lappid yib‘ār (“burning lamp,” Isa 62:1).

Class i. The qōtēl-form of this class functions as a predicate and thus substitutes for the two tenses, perfect and imperfect. ṣōphēt ‘āni ḫēt bētō (“I will judge his house.” 1 Sam 3:13) compares with ṣōphattīk (“I will judge you,” Ezek 7:3); hū yōsēb (“he was sitting,” Gen 18:1) compares with wawye šēb (“he was sitting,” Exod 17:12) and so on. Of course, there is a very specific use of the participle instead of a finite verb. This aspect has been frequently and well described and analyzed: there is no need to go into it here.42 Suffice it to say that the verbal potentiality of the qōtēl reaches its realization in this class.

To say that the use of the participle as predicate (in the case of qal: qōtēl) produces a noun-clause is justified only from a formal point of view. Formally all of the following verses are nominal sentences: “and Eli sōmēr (‘was watching’) her mouth” (1 Sam 1:12); “a guardian of his mouth, a sōmēr (‘keeper’) of his life” (Prov 13:3); “you ‘ōbarīm (‘are crossing’) the Jordan” (Josh 1:11); “you ‘ōzāḇē YHWH (‘are deserters of

42. Driver (1892, pp. 165–173); Brockelmann (1956, § 44; this paragraph is included in the chapter on the verbal sentence).
YHWH’)” (Isa 65:11). According to our classification only the second and fourth verses are genuine noun-clauses; their qōtēl-forms belong to a substantival class. The first and third verses, however, pertain to the present class: they contain qōtēl-forms of an evidently verbal force.

III.

If we have established the wide semantic range of the qōtēl-morpheme and the fact that the Hebrew speaker proved his awareness of it by the consistent use he made of the various classes, we may now sketch the consequent semantic ambiguity in particular instances. It is unnecessary for our purpose to adduce a great number of such instances; their exploration remains the task of every student of biblical texts. Some illustration of this ambiguity, however, may be required.

When rare and obscure words are of the qōtēl-pattern we must include this given fact in our attempts at elucidating the meaning. But our conclusions will hardly be clear-cut. dōbārōt (“log rafts,” 1 Kgs 5:22) is changed by the later narrator into rapsādōt (2 Chr 2:15). Is the earlier word to be understood as “the floating ones” which would indicate the perplexity of the Hebrew writer whose vocabulary lacked an appropriate term, or had *dōbārā already become the accepted term for “raft”? Similarly, mōšākōt (Job 38:31) may be taken as verbal “the drawing ones” or else as substantive “cords, bands.” kārūb hassōkēk (Ezek 28:16) may mean either “the covering cherub” or “the cherub of the defense” (cf. Nah 2:6).

Well-known lexical items present a similar problem: bāšōrā mōšēt (2 Sam 18:22), haššar sōʾēl (Mic 7:3). These two qōtēl-forms can be taken as active participles of transitive verbs in which case one has to supply the missing object (“a message finding a reward” and “a prince who asks for a bribe,” respectively); yet the qōtēl could denote qualities: “favorable message,” “corrupt prince.” Such a meaning probably developed through brachylogy but was later taken absolutely. “... In a land of peace ’attā bōṭēēh” (Jer 12:5) may be interpreted as “you have put your trust in a peaceful land, how then etc.” (cf. Qimḥi ad loc.) or, more convincingly, as “if you are careless in a land of peace, ...”

The famous phrase qōl qōrē (Isa 40:3) can be understood in various

43. Ehrlich (1900, pp. 238f); Driver (1913, p. 331); Avineri (1976, p. 387).
ways according to the value we assign to the qōṭēl: "a voice calls, is calling" (cf. Isa 40:6), "hark! a caller (someone is calling)," "the voice of a herald." The far-reaching theological consequences of the last-mentioned interpretation are well known (cf. Matthew 3:3).

Substantival meaning may be ascribed, but not necessarily, to the following words: šōmēʾ (2 Sam 15:3) in the verse "you have no one to hear on the part of the king"; šōmēʾ could refer to an official arbitrator. The same word stands for a "receiver of an oracle" (Num 24:4). Connected with oracles are also šōʾēl ("he that consults," Deut 18:11) and ūne ("he that delivers the response," 1 Kgs 18:29, Mal 2:12?).

A pronounced substantivation can be observed in Ezek 20:32 ḫāʾolāʾ 'al ruḥākem lo tihye ("what is coming up into your mind will not happen"). The relevant expression should not be compared to 'ālāʾ 'al šēb (Isa 65:17, Jer 3:16; "call something to mind, to remember"). ḫāʾolāʾ is the subject of the sentence and refers to the elders' intentions as specified there. Thus we may be tempted to translate: "the scheme you have on your mind will not work."

It is of historical interest whether šōdēd ("robber," Isa 16:4) was an accepted appellation of a specific invader, and whether ḫōṣîm ("the pious," Ps 17:7) was the appellation of a specific sect. It is of sociological interest whether nōṭērā (Cant 1:6), ḫōṭēb 'ēṣîm and šōʾēb mayîm are to be taken as participles denoting occasional occupations ("guarding," "cutting wood," and "drawing water," respectively) or as terms for professional and social rank (Deut 29:10). rōkēb ("riding") and ḥōlēk ("walking," Judg 5:11), though at first sight taken as descriptions of activities, are probably designations of opposite social ranks.

The term ūḇōdē haʾal stands in opposition to 'ābdē YHWH (2 Kgs 10:23). On the surface the meaning could be "worshippers of Baal" or even "those that worship Baal" as against the "servants of YHWH." However, the preceding verses (19-22) make it clear that the first term refers to cult personnel; ūḇōdē has an absolutely substantival meaning ("functionary"). 'ābdē YHWH is employed for the sake of an impressive antithesis (tendentious vocalization?) and it is noteworthy that ūḇōdē combines with the worship of an idol (2 Kgs 17:41) while 'ēbed combines with YHWH frequently. Thus, contrary to appearance, an appropriate rendition of the narrator's intention would be: "the cultic officials of Baal against the people who worship YHWH."

44. Cf. the commentaries by Guthe (1922, p. 617) and Chajes (1902, p. 31), respectively.
\[yô'ès\] (Prov 15:22) denotes either "official counsellor" or "one that gives advice." If the first interpretation is correct, the scene is a royal court (Prov 23:1), if not, it may be that of a family or a small community. \[wayshî bône\] (Gen 4:17) and \[wayshî 'ômèn\] (Esth 2:7) have been interpreted "he built" and "he brought up," respectively, or "he became a builder" and "he became a foster-father." \['ômèd 'al\] is commonly explained "to serve" and "to be in charge, superior in rank" and the like. These two meanings are contradictory. In view of 1 Kgs 12:8 ("they were the 'ômâdîm") we have to regard \['ômèd 'al\] as a title of a courtier, "minister." Thus also Zech 4:14b is not a relative clause but apposition: "the two anointed ones, the ministers of the Lord of the whole earth." Num 7:2 looks like an attempt to identify tribal chieftains with high government officials.

Many more examples could be cited. We content ourselves with pointing at one other area. Divine attributes are frequently formulated by means of participles. We should note, however, that some denote continuous activities (e.g. "who keeps \[sômèr\] truth forever," Ps 146:6), others denote a historic act (e.g. "who divided \[gôzèr\] the Red Sea," Ps 136:13). This situation creates a problem in countless occurrences of such a participle: Gen 14:19 (\[qône\]), Amos 4:13 (\[yôsèr\]), Amos 5:8 (\["ôse, hôpèk, qôrê\]), Isa 51:13 (\[nôte, yôsêd\]), Ps 33:7 (\[kônês\]), and so on. Finally, does \[bôrê\] (Isa 42:5) stand for "Creator," "the One who has created," or "the One who creates and is creating"?

Ambiguity is inherent in human language. Linguistic symbols can never reflect complex reality. In most cases ambiguity is due to the distance between speaker and listener: the speaker knows accurately enough what the notion is he wishes to convey. In some cases, however, ambiguity may have been the speaker's aim. Semantic ambiguity is the tragedy and the splendor of speech.
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