

HEBREW PHILOLOGY,
HEBREW LEXICOGRAPHY



Hebrew Bible Monographs, 122

Other Volumes of Collected Essays

What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament (1990)

Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible (1995)

On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays (2 vols., 1998)

Joban Papers (2022)

Play the Man! Biblical Imperatives to Masculinity (2023)

Hebrew Philology, Hebrew Lexicography (2025)

Forthcoming

In Critique of the Hebrew Bible Vol. 1

In Critique of the Hebrew Bible Vol. 2

HEBREW PHILOLOGY, HEBREW LEXICOGRAPHY

David J.A. Clines



SHEFFIELD PHOENIX PRESS
2025

This is copyrighted material.

This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

Copyright © 2025 Sheffield Phoenix Press

First published in hardback, 2025

First published in ePDF, 2025

Published by Sheffield Phoenix Press

www.sheffieldphoenix.com

Sheffield Institute for Interdisciplinary Biblical Studies (SIIBS),
University of Sheffield, Sheffield S3 7RA

All rights reserved.

*No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by
any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any
information storage or retrieval system, without the publishers' permission in writing.*

A CIP catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Typeset by HK Scriptorium

ISBN: 978-1-914490-90-3 (HB)

ISBN: 978-1-914490-99-6 (ePDF)

This is copyrighted material.

This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations

Preface	ix
---------	----

PHILOLOGY

1. <i>Adam</i> , the Hebrew for 'Human, Humanity'	2
2. Alleged Basic Meanings of the Hebrew Verb <i>qdš</i> 'Be Holy': An Exercise in Comparative Hebrew Lexicography	17
3. The Ubiquitous Language of Violence in the Hebrew Bible	37
4. Was There an <i>ʿbl</i> II 'Be Dry' in Classical Hebrew?	56
5. Was There a ברה II 'Vex' or ברה III 'Wound, Bruise, Pierce' or ברה IV 'Bar' in Classical Hebrew?	66
6. 'The fear of the Lord is wisdom' (Job 28.28): A Semantic and Contextual Study	86
7. Cattle, Flocks and Other Beasts: Why Terms for Animal Groups Matter	118
8. Misapprehensions, Ancient and Modern, about Lions (Nahum 2.13)	138

LEXICOGRAPHY

9. The Challenge of Hebrew Lexicography Today	160
10. Towards a Science of Comparative Classical Hebrew Lexicography	172
11. The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language: The Astonishing Wealth of its Unrecognized Vocabulary	193
12. The Practical and the Political in Hebrew Lexicography	206

13. Made in Sheffield: The First Dictionary of the Ancient Hebrew Language	211
14. How my (Lexicographical) Mind Has Changed, Or Else Remained the Same	222
15. The Vocabulary of Classical Hebrew: New Facts and Figures	230
16. Byforms in Classical Hebrew	247
17. New Words in Classical Hebrew	266
18. Synonyms in Classical Hebrew	273
19. Synonym Hunting in Classical Hebrew	292
20. Denominative Verbs in Classical Hebrew	300
21. Defining Definitions: A Lexicographical Taxonomy	338
22. Reaping, Threshing and Winnowing: Twenty-One Agricultural Terms Defined	348
23. Mapping Semantic Fields in Classical Hebrew	357
24. Characteristic Qumran Vocabulary: Empirical Data	373
25. Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, Volume 1</i>	399
26. The New Qumran Dictionary	406
Index of Passages	412
Index of Authors	420

ABBREVIATIONS
(NOT IN SBL STYLE GUIDE)

CBSC	Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
CEB	Common English Bible
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HDO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
JPS	Jewish Publication Society Version
NAB	New American Bible
NEB	New English Bible
NJPS	New Jewish Publication Society Version
NLT	New Living Translation
REB	Revised English Bible

PREFACE

Philology and lexicography are quite different enterprises, though they have a lot in common.

The philologist is a 'lover of words', if we notice the etymology. A serial lover of words, I would say, one who will chase one word after another, falling in love, by preference, with words that are unusual, exotic and difficult. A philologist is a hunter, imbued with the spirit of the chase, and always eager for new quarry.

A lexicographer is by contrast a shepherd, gathering a flock together, marshalling them in their proper order, big words and little words, common words and rare words, and displaying each of them to its best advantage. To the lexicographer, all words are equally deserving of respect and nurture; a lexicographer cannot afford favourite love objects.

And then, a lexicographer, unlike a philologist, belongs to the world of business as much as to the world of scholarship. Any philologist can write a paper for a journal without a glance to the economics of publishing. But no one will spend years, decades perhaps, writing a lexicon on the off-chance that some publisher will pick it up when it is done. The market and the users have to be in the mind's eye of the lexicographer at every moment, even while the composer of the lexicon is straining for the utmost precision and concision and scholarly accuracy.

A philologist can polish off an article in 50 or 100 hours—or less—, but a lexicographer must be long-lived, immune to boredom, and possessed of an addictive personality.

Philologists have sometimes used the term 'lexicography' of their work, and not perhaps entirely inappropriately. Eitan wrote *Contributions to Biblical Lexicography*, Guillaume *Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography*, Dahood papers in Hebrew-Ugaritic lexicography, Greenfield lexicographical notes, Joüon and Held published on 'biblical lexicography'. Though none of these estimable scholars were lexicographers, they all saw their philological studies

as contributing to a future Hebrew lexicon, even to an ideal and unrealizable Hebrew lexicon of their dreams. But it is not lexicography proper if it does not seek to be comprehensive, and if (prosaically) it is not in alphabetical order.

I have been both a philologist and a lexicographer, and this volume consists of my papers of the last 25 years or so (with a few earlier ones), published and unpublished, in both areas.

In the first section, Philology, there are eight chapters, mostly on individual words.

In the second section, Lexicography, there are eighteen chapters, dealing first with my project of the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* in general (Chapters 9-14), then with features of the *Dictionary* that call for exposition and justification (Chapters 15-21), and finally with some individual studies arising from the lexicographical work (Chapters 22-26). I have long regretted that editors of earlier Hebrew dictionaries have left us little explanation of their methods and procedures, consigning us to infer their intentions and theories. I determined to explain myself, to a certain degree at least, so that users of the *Dictionary* present and future would know my conception of it and my intentions for it, as well as my views in general about byforms, synonyms, semantic fields, definitions and suchlike, and were not left with only my conclusions.

DJAC
Sheffield
August 2022

PHILOLOGY

1

ADAM, THE HEBREW FOR 'HUMAN, HUMANITY'

1. *The Issue*

In a recent article, James Barr has challenged the widely held view that אָדָם means 'human being' or, collectively, 'humanity'.¹ Barr's article has other concerns in addition to the point to be considered here. The title of his paper indicates that his principal interest is the exegetical question whether Gen. 1.26-27 envisages the creation on the sixth day of humanity as a species, or of a primaeval pair of humans, or of a male ancestor of the human race. A further interest, perhaps less obvious but lying behind this exegetical question, is to challenge the claim of some feminist scholars that Genesis 1 portrays a primitive egalitarianism between the sexes.²

Published in *Vetus Testamentum* 53 (2003), pp. 297-310. This paper was first posted on the Web in December 1996 under the title, 'Does אָדָם Mean "Humanity"? A Response to James Barr, "Words and Meanings, This Century and Next"'.

1. 'One Man, or All Humanity?', in Athalya Brenner and Jan Willem van Henten (eds.), *Recycling Biblical Figures: Papers Read at a NOSTER Colloquium in Amsterdam, 12-13 May 1997* (Leiderdorp, The Netherlands: Deo Publishing, 1999), pp. 3-21. See also the response by Johannes C. de Moor, 'The First Human Being a Male? A Response to Professor Barr', in the same volume, pp. 22-27. Barr had previously read his paper under the title 'Words and Meanings, This Century and Next', at the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in New Orleans in 1996.

2. This concern becomes evident at the end of the second last paragraph of the paper, where he asks why we should expect Genesis 1, deeply rooted in a patriarchal culture, 'surprisingly, at 1:26-27, suddenly to become the vehicle of modern egalitarian views about the position of women' (p. 21) — clearly indicating his disapproval of such an expectation. It would however be a mistake to regard all feminist scholars, or feminist-inclined scholars, as drawing such an inference from Genesis 1-3; to mention only one example, my own paper, 'What Does Eve Do to Help?', is precisely directed against any superficial perception

These points, however, are beyond my concern here, which is rather with a principal interest in his paper, viz. whether אָדָם means 'humanity' in general, without regard to gender, or whether it is 'essentially a male term'.³ This is the theme I should like to take up in this paper.

First I need to identify what exactly it is that Barr is arguing. I quote some key sentences in order to reproduce his wording exactly:

1. ' אָדָם is essentially a male concept—which, however, can include women when they are with men, and who then belong to אָדָם also' (p. 12).⁴
2. '[B]iblical Hebrew has no term for 'human being' that is not also a designation of 'man' (= male person)' (p. 12).
3. ' אָדָם is an essentially male term, which may however include women if they are counted as with men in the context. Women are included of course, when appropriate, but are included as an additional category of humanity; the designation given to humanity, in this sense, including women, is really that of "man"' (pp. 18-19).

We should note that Barr does not distinguish in these definitional statements between the uses of אָדָם in a collective and in an individual sense. In his phrase, 'a ... term, which may however include women', we need to be aware that he is dealing with the use of אָדָם in a collective sense, but in the sentence '[B]iblical Hebrew has no term for 'human being' that is not also a designation of 'man' (= male person)' it must be the use of אָדָם in the individual sense that is in view.

Summing up Barr's position in my own words, I should say that he believes that אָדָם , used of an individual, always refers to a male, and that, used collectively, it refers to humanity viewed

of 'egalitarianism' here (in *What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament* (JSOTSup, 94; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), Chapter 1.

3. Barr, 'One Man, or All Humanity', p. 18.

4. I will register here my unhappiness with the term 'concept' in this connection, and say nothing more about it. As I understand it, we are talking about a Hebrew *word*, not a *concept* at all. No doubt the Hebrews had a *concept* of humanity, but how that is related to the *word* אָדָם is problematic, and is in any case the very issue under discussion.

normally as the totality of males (though exceptionally as the collectivity of all males and all females).

The view that I will defend to the contrary is that אָדָם, whether used collectively or individually, is not gendered. That is, when used of an individual, it means 'human being', and, when used collectively, it means humanity – in both cases without reference to gender. The issue then is not whether 'אָדָם includes both man and woman' (as Barr puts it, p. 11), for that is to focus on the issue of gender, which, I would maintain, is not normally in view with the term אָדָם.

2. The Arguments

Here are the main arguments to be considered:

1. Barr's first argument for the male-gendered meaning of אָדָם is that 'it is never used to designate a woman or a group of women' (p. 11). I infer that he means that no individual woman is called an אָדָם ('A woman is a human being but that does not mean that she is an אָדָם'), and that no group of women is collectively called אָדָם. In other words, אָדָם is not used individually or collectively of women.

What are the facts? There are, to be sure, no sentences that say, Sarah was an אָדָם; or, there was not an אָדָם as wise as Hannah. But there is one case at least that should be considered, Num. 31.35, which was brought into the discussion by Johannes de Moor in a response to Barr.⁵ In a list of booty taken from the Midianites we have the notation:

וּנְפֹשׁ אָדָם מִן־הַנָּשִׁים אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדְעוּ מִשְׁכָּב זָכָר כָּל־נְפֹשׁ שְׁנַיִם
וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף

and in persons, women who had never slept with a man, thirty-two thousand in all (NJB)

and a total of 32,000 human beings, namely, the women who had not had carnal relations (NJPS)

This would seem to be a clear case of a group of women being referred to as אָדָם. But Barr responds that in this text אָדָם signifies humanity in contrast with the animals previously mentioned

5. De Moor, 'The First Human Being a Male? A Response to Professor Barr', p. 23.

as booty, and it so happens that the only example of Midianite humans left alive at this point in the narrative are females, so אָדָם must perforce refer to females. Nonetheless, argues Barr, 'the meaning contributed by the presence of the word is not the group of females, but the classification of humans, male and female, by contrast with the animals' (p. 12 n. 7). This does not seem a very strong reply to de Moor's point. Barr has elsewhere in his paper argued that women are included in אָדָם only if they are counted together with men (p. 18), and that אָדָם can include women when they are with men (p. 12), but here there are no men for them to be with or be counted with, and yet they still are אָדָם.⁶

Let us for now suppose that this text did not exist, and that there were indeed no cases where אָדָם is used of a women or a group of women. Would that prove what Barr thinks it does, viz. that a woman cannot be an אָדָם?⁷ For this argument to have any force, it would be necessary to show that אָדָם, though never used for a woman or a group of women, *is* used for a man or a group of men. Otherwise the point has no relevance for the question of whether אָדָם is 'essentially a male concept'.

Are there sentences that say such things of men? If there are, I do not know them.⁸ The only place I can find where אָדָם is in apposition to a male personal name is Josh. 14.15, where Arba is called the greatest אָדָם among the Anakim; even so, I do not know that that must mean that he was the greatest *male* rather than the greatest *person*. Perhaps it is not surprising that no one is called an אָדָם. For, on the whole, if a narrative is focusing on a specific person, that person is going to be perceived as a man or a woman rather than as a human being pure and simple; אָדָם is evidently a generic term, which applies either to the collectivity of humans or to an individual human as an example of the human

6. More tellingly still, Barr says of אָדָם that 'in principle, it includes males and females alike' – which appears to concede the whole issue; if in principle אָדָם includes males and females alike, might it not immediately be allowed that it is an ungendered term? It must be acknowledged, however, that this perhaps unguarded statement, made in a footnote secondary to the paper itself, and by way of rejoinder to de Moor's response, is not Barr's position in the remainder of his paper.

7. 'A woman is a human being, but this does not mean that she is an אָדָם' (p. 11).

8. Adam is of course a male who is called אָדָם, or rather, to be exact, אָדָםִּי. But all will acknowledge that this is a special case. See further below on Genesis 2–3.

race. It is not the term that is used normally when one is thinking of a specific individual.

Barr does not himself adduce any evidence that a male person or a group of males are called אָדָם. Rather, he limits himself to saying that while a man can be called a בֶּן-אָדָם, a woman cannot be called a בַּת-אָדָם.⁹ This observation, however, falls short of being an argument that אָדָם is male, since even if a woman were to be called a בַּת-אָדָם, it would not prove the point either way, for the daughter of an אָדָם might equally well be the daughter of a human or the daughter of a male.

I might as well ask whether a slave, or a child, is ever called an אָדָם. It would certainly be interesting to know whether Hebrews regarded children and slaves as human beings, but I am afraid that the evidence of the word אָדָם is not going to supply the answer. I am equally uncertain that we can say, as James Barr does, that 'A woman is a human being [I presume he means, in the thought of Hebrew-speakers], but that does not mean that she is an אָדָם'. How would we know that women are human beings unless they are regarded as אָדָם?

To conclude the point: Barr has argued that אָדָם is 'essentially a male concept' because in no place does it refer to a woman or a group of women. I reply that in no place does it refer to a man or a group of men, either, and that therefore no inferences can be drawn about the maleness of the term. In any case, I am arguing that אָדָם is a non-gendered term, i.e. that it refers to humanity in general or to an individual human, without consideration of their sex. Whether it is used of individual males or females is beside the point.

9. There is, however, at least one case where women, or a group of women, are called something like בַּת-אָדָם, viz. Gen. 6.2, where 'the sons of God saw the daughters of אָדָם'. Barr argues that בְּנוֹת הָאָדָם here does not mean "'members of the human category", i.e. women, but "daughters", i.e. daughters of the genealogy, from Adam onwards, which has directly preceded' (p. 12). He translates 'the sons of God saw the daughters of man', understanding by אָדָם the collectivity of males from the creation to the Flood. To do so, however, is to beg the question, for the precise issue at stake is whether אָדָם *does* mean the collectivity of *males*. If any other reader of Genesis 6 has interpreted the text in that way, it would be interesting to know of it, but Barr cites no support for this understanding, which can only be called special pleading.

2. Another approach to the question, Is אָדָם essentially a male term, would be to ask, Does אָדָם ever *exclude* women?¹⁰ Apart from the case of Genesis 2–3, which I will consider shortly, there is just one text in which this is alleged, a text that is frequently quoted in the discussion, Eccl. 7.28:

אָדָם אֶחָד מֵאֶלֶף מִצָּאתִי וְאִשָּׁה בְּכָל־אֱלֹהִים לֹא מִצָּאתִי

One man (אָדָם) among a thousand I found, but a woman among all these I have not found (RSV).

One man out of a thousand have I come upon, but a woman among them all I have not found (NAB).

I have found one man in a thousand worth the name, but I have not found one woman among them all (NEB).

BDB quote this verse as the one place outside Genesis 2–3 where it regards אָדָם as 'man' as opposed to 'woman'.¹¹ Barr notes that the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* regards this as an example of אָדָם meaning 'humans', but his sole comment is that 'I find this simply incredible' (p. 12). Obviously, the matter deserves some further investigation.

Now, at first sight there appears to be a contrast here between אָדָם and אִשָּׁה, and thus, one might think, between 'man' and 'woman'. But it is evidently possible to contrast a 'woman' with a 'person in general', i.e. a 'human', in Hebrew as in English. We can say, 'There were six people on the committee, not one of them a woman', without implying that women are not 'people'. So too it is possible for Qoheleth to say that he found one person in a thousand who met his standard, and that not one 'among all those' (בְּכָל־אֱלֹהִים) whom he found was a woman. The NJPS reflects the same understanding of the text:

10. I can admit in advance the possibility that אָדָם was thought to exclude women but that it so happens that there is no text where you can prove that unequivocally. If that were so, I would say that we cannot *know* whether women were excluded from the term or not.

11. Francis Brown, S.R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), p. 9a. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, I (ed. David J.A. Clines; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 126–27 (hereafter *DCH*), registers the passage under sense 2a 'individual, whether a particular person or an individual human', which may be presumed to mean that it does not regard אָדָם as signifying 'man, male' in this context.

As for what I sought further but did not find, I found only one human being in a thousand, and the one I found among so many was never a woman (Eccl. 7.28 NJPS).

If there were 100,000 people in Qoheleth's Jerusalem, that means to say, there were a hundred who met his standard; but among that hundred there was no woman. The hundred were all males, it is true, but in calling them אָדָם he is calling them people, since he was looking among people.

Not only is this a possible interpretation of the Qoheleth text, it is, I argue, a better interpretation, or rather, an indispensable one. For Qoheleth must have been considering the whole population of Jerusalem when he was searching for worthy persons, since if he had considered only men, he could not have been surprised that among them were no women. If he meant that he found only one male among a thousand (whether a thousand of men and women or only of men), it would be a tautology to say that among those (men) there was no woman.

It may therefore be argued not only that אָדָם in Qoh. 7.28 *can* mean 'human' but that it *must* mean 'human' rather than 'man, male'.

I turn to Genesis 2–3. Barr's only observation on these chapters is that the repeated phrase הָאָדָם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ is a clear case of אָדָם meaning 'man', since the phrase obviously means 'the man and his wife' (pp. 11, 12). But things are so not simple. In this narrative, which begins at a time when there is only one human being, that person is always called just that—הָאָדָם, 'the human'.¹² Even when the woman is created, the first human goes on being called 'the human'. And even when the narrative wants to refer to them both, and we might expect to hear of 'the man and his woman/

12. There are three exceptions to this rule in the Masoretic text, as is well known: at 2.20; 3.17, 21 לְאָדָם is vocalized לְאָדָם 'to Adam'. This vocalization is patently wrong, since it is inconceivable that the proper name should be used only in these three places when in every other place in Gen. 2–3 (21 occurrences) it is not. The proper name Adam occurs for the first time only toward the end of Gen. 4 (at 4.25, which contrasts with the use of הָאָדָם 'the human' in 4.1 in an otherwise identical sentence). The translational practice of the English versions differs: AV/KJV has Adam 11 times in these chapters, RSV Adam twice (at 3.17, 21 but not at 2.20), NJPS three times (the three cases with the prefixed lamed), NIV four times (at 3.20 as well as those three), and NRSV, NAB and NJB not at all. Of course, by the argument of this paper, 'the man' is not a better translation than 'Adam', since אָדָם is not a male term.

wife' (הָאִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ), we read no such thing, but 'the human and his woman/wife' (הָאָדָם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ), a strange expression (just twice, at 2.25; 3.8), which occurs nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible.

What shall we deduce from these facts? That the first woman is not a human being, that אָדָם is a male term, which correctly designates only the male person in the narrative? Let us admit that it is strictly illogical, if they are both human, for one of them to be called 'the human'. If there were two Canadians in a story, let us imagine, we could not bear it if the narrator insisted on referring to one of them as 'the Canadian'. But let us suppose that one of the Canadians is a patriarch and the other his son, who has come later into the story; we would not be too troubled if the narrative always called the older man 'the Canadian' and the younger one 'his son', and we would not suppose that the narrative was trying to tell us that the son was *not* a Canadian.¹³ So too in our story, it is not special pleading to suggest that the woman is not called 'the human' because she is not human but because that term has been applied from the beginning to the man. The human in question, from the beginning of the narrative, *is* a man, a man with a woman/wife (eventually); but the text, for its own good reasons,¹⁴ does not want to call him a 'man' (אִישׁ) but 'the human' (הָאָדָם), just as it does not want to call him 'Adam' (אָדָם) but 'the human' (הָאָדָם). The fact that the human *is* a man, and *is* Adam, does not mean that אָדָם *means* a man, any more than it *means* Adam (the proper name).

I conclude that there is no evidence that אָדָם ever excludes women, or that it ever means men as distinct from women,

3. A further line of reasoning employed by Barr is that there is a strong semantic overlap between אָדָם and אִישׁ, which does

13. Another example might be a phrase like 'the Israelite and his wife' or 'the Moabite and his wife'. I admit that I cannot find a place where such an expression occurs, and will have to trust to the agreement of readers that the expressions sound as normal in Hebrew as they are in English. If anyone needs more persuasion, consider a sentence like 'a certain man of Bethlehem in Judah went to sojourn in the country of Moab, he and his wife and his two sons' (Ruth 1.1) and imagine a variant '...the Bethlehemite and his wife and his two sons'. Would this imply that the wife and sons were *not* Bethlehemites? Or consider אִשְׁתּוֹ הַיְּהוּדִיָּה יָלְדָה אֶת־יֶרֶד 'And his Jewish wife bore Jered' (1 Chron. 4.18). Does that imply that her husband Mered was not Jewish?

14. Who can say just what those reasons are? Perhaps names are like clothes: they both come into existence only at the point when the couple are about to be driven out of Eden, and both conceal as well as reveal.

mean ‘a male’, and that therefore אָדָם is likely to mean ‘male’ – essentially, if not in every case. There are several elements in this argument:

(a) First, Barr argues against the view that אָדָם is a word for humanity – as distinct from God – by noting that אִישׁ is often used in that sense; the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* in fact cites 40 such occurrences.¹⁵ Likewise, אָדָם is not the inevitable term for humanity as distinct from beasts, for though the contrast of אָדָם and בְּהֵמָה is ‘very common’ and ‘close to being regular’ (p. 17),¹⁶ there are also cases where it is אִישׁ that is contrasted to בְּהֵמָה.¹⁷ This shows, says Barr, that ‘there is no clear distinction’ between the meaning of אָדָם and אִישׁ.

I question whether that is so. Just because a term that means ‘males’ (אִישׁ) is used for ‘humanity’, it does not follow that any term for humanity (such as אָדָם) must be a term for males. To argue that would be to fall prey to the fallacy of the undistributed middle.

(b) A second argument of Barr’s is that אָדָם and אִישׁ are not to be distinguished as collective versus individual. That distinction ‘does not work’, says Barr (p. 10), pointing to the use of phrases like אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל for ‘men of Israel’, which shows אִישׁ as a collective. Now, as far as I know, no one has ever argued that אָדָם is only ever a collective.¹⁸ Again taking my evidence from the *Dictionary*

15. Barr quotes Num. 23.19 in this connection; further cases cited in *DCH* are Gen. 32.29; Num. 2.19; Deut. 1.17; Josh. 10.14; Judg. 9.9, 13; 1 Sam. 2.25, 26; 26.15; Isa. 7.13; 31.8; 40.13; Hos. 11.9; Ps. 4.3; 62.10; Job 9.32; 32.13; Lam. 3.33; Sir. 10.4, 7; 45.1; 11QPsa 27.3; 11QT 64.12; 1QS 3.13; 4.15, 20, 26; 1QM 1.11; 11.14; 14.17 (Baillet); 1QH iii 22; fr. x 8; xi 4 (Licht); 1Q36 xxv ii 5; 4QWiles i 17; 4QShir^b i 11; 4QShirShab^a ii 2, 3; 4QShirShab^b xiv i 8; Kuntillet ‘Ajrud add. inscr. 2 (*DCH*, I, p. 222b).

16. By my reckoning, there may be some 7 cases where אִישׁ means humans as distinct from beasts, but there are perhaps 52 cases where אָדָם seems to be used in that sense. *DCH*, I, 125b, notes these cases of the collocation of אָדָם and בְּהֵמָה: Gen. 6.7; 7.23; Exod. 8.13, 14; 9.9, 10, 19, 22, 25; 12.12; 13.2, 15; Lev. 27.28; Num. 3.13; 8.17; 18.15; 31.11, 26, 47; Jer. 7.20; 21.6; 27.5; 31.27; 32.43; 33.10, 10, 12; 36.29; 50.3; 51.62; Ezek. 14.13, 17, 19, 21; 25.13; 29.8, 11; 32.13; 36.11; Jon. 3.7, 8; 4.11; Zeph. 1.3; Hag. 1.11; Zech. 2.8; 8.10; Ps. 36.7; 135.8; Eccl. 3.19. We could add Ps. 49.13, 21; Josh. 11.14. BDB mentions 41 examples in the Hebrew Bible alone, but it is including other words for ‘beast’ beside בְּהֵמָה in its reckoning. Of these references, Barr notes Exod. 9.25; 12.12.

17. The cases are: Exod. 11.7; 19.13; 34.3; Isa. 66.3; Ps. 22.7; 147.10; Sir. 13.18 (*DCH*, I, p. 222b). Barr quotes the first two of these.

18. The *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* of Koehler

of Classical Hebrew, I would reckon that in about half its usages $\square\aleph$ refers to an individual.¹⁹ Barr might say that that strengthens his case. If $\square\aleph$ can mean an individual, as $\aleph$ of course can, why should we suppose that there is any difference between them?

There is, of course, no reason in principle why we should suppose there is a difference. It is just that $\aleph$ is self-evidently a gendered word, a 'man', a 'male' (which Barr does not dispute), while it is at least arguable that $\square\aleph$ is not gendered (which is what Barr is disputing). The fact that both words can signify an individual has nothing to do with the question. There is no reason why $\aleph$ could not mean an individual of the male gender and $\square\aleph$ an individual of either gender.

In a moment I will look at the question whether $\square\aleph$ does indeed signify a human individual (without reference to gender), but first I will take up Barr's next argument against distinguishing $\square\aleph$ from $\aleph$.

(c) A third argument is that $\square\aleph$ and $\aleph$ are 'interchangeable and reversible' (p. 18) in poetic parallelism. I presume Barr does not mean that they always are, but that they can be. And I of course readily agree that there are some texts in which the two terms are used in what we call, loosely, synonymous parallelism. Barr cites seven such cases (Num. 23.19; Job 34.11; 38.26; Isa. 2.9, 11, 17; 5.15), but we should not suppose that there are many more. I identified 19 other cases where $\square\aleph$ and $\aleph$ are used in the same verse in some kind of parallelism (Isa. 31.88; 44.13; Jer. 2.6; 10.23; 31.30; Ps. 22.7; 39.12; 49.3; 62.10; 140.2; Job 11.12; 32.21; 37.7; Prov. 6.12; 12.14; 19.22; 20.26; 24.30; Eccl. 9.15).²⁰ This is not so very many when we consider that $\square\aleph$ occurs some 401 times in the poetic books and $\aleph$ some 574.²¹ I ignored the cases when it

and Baumgartner, p. 14a, admittedly, claims that the use of $\square\aleph$ for 'individual' is 'late and sporadic' and that 'in most cases the collective interpretation is possible'.

19. No statistics are given in *DCH*, but I observe that sense 1 'humanity' occupies 4 columns of text, while sense 2 'individual' occupies over 3.5 columns. In *BDB* the sense 'individual' has only a third of the space of the sense 'mankind', but *BDB* is not professing to make an exhaustive listing of the various senses, and so no inference about the frequency of either of the senses can be drawn from the space allocated.

20. Ezek. 23.42 and Zech. 13.5 might be considered for this list, but I thought they were different enough to be excluded.

21. I derived the data from Accordance Version 4.1, defining the poetic books as Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Qoheleth, Lamentations and Isaiah to Malachi

is בן אדם or בני אדם that is parallel to איש ,²² since the בני of humanity are likely to be male,²³ and a בן אדם is bound to be male, even if אדם itself is non-gendered.²⁴

The question is of course what the significance of parallelistic usage is. Barr is the first to admit that parallelism of terms does not show synonymy (and he quotes the parallel of ‘silver’ and ‘gold’, p. 18), and yet he argues that in Job 34.11,

He will render to an אדם a deed,
and according to the way of an איש he will cause it to light
upon him,

איש cannot be ‘intended to convey a different concept of humanity’ from אדם (p. 18). Well, ‘a different concept of humanity’ is putting it rather strongly. If we believe that אדם means an individual, without regard to gender, and איש means a male individual, that is hardly a matter of ‘a different concept of humanity’. It is the most natural thing in the world, especially in a man’s world like ancient Israel, to parallel a human being and a man – but that does not mean to say that the terms אדם and איש , ‘human being’ and ‘man’ respectively as I would argue, are coterminous.

Of course, if אדם means humans in general, it is very easy to argue that in many places it *means* males, and all the easier in places where it is paralleled to males. But such a conclusion does not follow; to think so would be to ignore the fundamental linguistic distinction between connotation and denotation (reference). Just because in one context or another אדם refers to males does not mean that such is the meaning of the word, any more than just because in some contexts ‘the French’ refers to ‘French footballers’ that is the meaning of the term ‘French’.

excluding Haggai, and searching for the noun איש and for the noun אדם in senses 1 and 4 (both meaning ‘human’).

22. I noted as examples Isa. 52.14; Jer. 32.19; 49.18, 33; 50.40; 51.43; Ezek. 8.12; Mic. 5.6; Ps. 80.18; Job 35.8; Prov. 8.4.

23. I say, likely to be, since בנים can be ‘sons and daughters’ (see, for example, Exod. 25.39).

24. This against Barr, who thinks it significant that in Num. 23.19 and Prov. 8.4, for example, איש is paralleled by בן אדם . It is surely an error to use the evidence of the phrase בן אדם for the question of the gender of those included in אדם , since the בן makes the בן אדם masculine whether or not אדם is gendered.

Furthermore, there are many cases in the Hebrew Bible where the sense is subtly preferable if we take אָדָם as non-gendered humanity (collective) or a non-gendered person (individual), as I am arguing are the correct senses of the term. I am thinking especially of texts like these:

- (a) a land where no שָׂרָפָה passed through,
where no אָדָם dwelt (Jer. 2.6).

The two terms are in 'synonymous parallelism', but they do not mean the same thing, and the difference between them is meaningful. In a patriarchal world, humans (people of both sexes) dwell, or do not dwell, but it is men who travel—as messengers, traders, soldiers and the like, the women being anchored to their domestic tasks.

- (b) And I arose in the night, I and some few אַנְשֵׁי with me;
neither told I any אָדָם what my God had put in my heart to
do at Jerusalem (Neh. 2.12).

This is not poetry, and it is not parallelistic, but the differentiation between the two terms is appropriate. On his night ride round Jerusalem Nehemiah had men with him (no women), but he told no one (man or woman) of his plans.

- (c) When an שָׂרָפָה or an אִשָּׁה shall commit any sin such as a human
(אָדָם) commits ... (Num. 5.6).

A woman will not be committing a sin such as a man commits, nor a man such as a woman commits, but either can commit a sin such as a human commits.

- (d) And the שָׂרָפָה who kills any אָדָם shall surely be put to death
(Lev. 24.17).

Only males (שָׂרָפָה) are likely to be killing (on the evidence of this text), but they may kill men or women (אָדָם).²⁵

25. Another example may be found in Job 36.24-25 where Job is admonished by Elihu: 'Remember to extol his work, which men (אֲנָשִׁים) have praised in song. Every person (אָדָם) has seen it; humans (אֲנוֹשׁ) have gazed on it from afar.' The

I conclude that there is no evidence, and especially not from poetic parallelism, that אָדָם and אִשָּׁה are 'interchangeable and reversible'. There are many occasions in a patriarchal culture on which women are not present or else not noticed, occasions therefore when the humans in question are (or appear to be) all males. But that is not a statement about linguistics, and not even a claim on the part of the males that women are not humans.

3. Conclusions

Finally, we need to reconsider the terms in which Barr has set up the debate. His concern has been to show that אָדָם is 'essentially a male concept' (p. 12), but he has not spelled out what being 'essentially a male concept' might mean. We can easily think of words that are *specifically* male, such as 'father' or 'king', but we would not say of such words that they are *essentially* male, which might suggest that they could include women under certain circumstances. So this is not the kind of word that Barr is thinking of. We can also think of words that *usually* refer to men, such as pilot or wrestler or lumberjack. Even these cannot be said to be *essentially* male; rather, they *usually denote* males. The moment we stop to think about it, we know that such terms are not *essentially* male, since there is no reason why a woman cannot be a pilot or wrestler or lumberjack, and we would not need a different word for a woman who was one of these. But perhaps this is the kind of word that Barr has in mind when he says that אָדָם is essentially male but can include women.

If we were to accept such a statement, we would have to be very clear what we meant by it. We would not mean that אָדָם is itself male, any more than we would mean that 'pilot' is male; we would only mean that in the world we are talking about, most pilots are male, that the word refers mostly to males (in a not so distant future world, that might well not be the case). A female pilot is a pilot in every way that a male pilot is. In other words, the term 'pilot' is not gendered, whereas the term 'father' is. Likewise, in the world of the Bible, it may well be that most individuals in view on many occasions when the term אָדָם was used were male, but that would not mean that the term was gendered, and

use of the terms would suggest that while humans generally are witnesses to God's 'work', it is males who have celebrated it in cultic hymns.

we would have to admit that 'essentially male' was not a very good way of describing a word that, while it most commonly refers to males, does not itself imply a male.

Barr's language is very informal, as when he writes that 'אדם is essentially a male concept—which however can include women when they are with men, and who then belong to אדם also' (p. 12). If women can be included in אדם, if they can 'belong' to אדם, it is not easy to see how the 'essence' can remain male. Elsewhere he writes: 'אדם is an essentially male term, which may however include women if they are counted as with men in the context. Women are included of course, when appropriate, but are included as an additional category of humanity' (pp. 18-19). This is even more difficult to decipher. If women are one category of humanity and men are another, that does not seem very problematic (any more than left-handed and right-handed people may be called two categories of humans); but if there are two categories of humans, one male and one female, then there is no call to say that the term 'human' is 'essentially male'—any more than there would be to say it is 'essentially female', or 'essentially right-handed'.

The conclusion to which I am drawn is that the traditional view that אדם means 'humanity, without distinction of gender' is to be upheld. Barr's paper does not reflect the fact that this is the *opinio communis* among Hebraists, judging from the lexica, at least. BDB, for example, stated the meanings of אדם as 'a man (= Ger. *Mensch*) = human being', and as 'man, mankind', meaning humanity in general.²⁶ It did regard Eccl. 7.28 and nine occurrences in Genesis 2-3 (2.22 [2x], 23, 25; 3.8, 12, 17, 20, 21)²⁷ as exceptional, meaning *man* as opposed to *woman*; but these were the only exceptions it noted to the general rule. Luis Alonso Schökel's dictionary also allows occasional uses of אדם as 'male', quoting the two occurrences of אדם ואשתו 'the human and his wife' (Gen. 2.25; 3.8), Gen. 3.12 ('the אדם said, "The אשה ..."') and Eccl. 7.28; but these are its only examples.²⁸ The lexicon of Meyer and Donner, which always translates אדם as '*Mensch, Menschheit*', likewise allows only Eccl. 7.28 in the sense of 'man as opposed to woman'; they

26. Brown, Driver and Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, p. 9.

27. But not, strangely, 3.9, 22, 24.

28. Luis Alonso Schökel (with Victor Morla and Vicente Collado), *Diccionario bíblico hebreo-español* (Madrid: Trotta, 1994), p. 32.

translate Gen. 2.25 and 3.12 as 'the human and his wife' (*der Mensch und seine Frau*).²⁹ Ludwig Koehler, for his part, acknowledged no meaning other than 'human, humanity' and quoted no text where he thought it meant 'male(s)';³⁰ he rendered אָדָם only as '*Menschen, Leute*' (for the collective use) and '*Mensch*' (for the individual use). The same is true of the third edition of the lexicon.³¹ Likewise Zorell's lexicon always uses the terms '*homo, homines*', never '*vir*', and does not note any passage where it refers to males.³²

For myself, as I have argued above, I deny that in any place אָדָם means 'a man' in the sense of a male, and affirm that the term is ungendered.

29. Rudolf Meyer and Herbert Donner, *Wilhelm Gesenius: Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 18th edn, 1987), p. 15.

30. Ludwig Koehler, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958), p. 12. Koehler's English glosses were of course 'man, mankind', since users of English had not then been sensitized to the gender implications of the terms. The German *Mensch* is not however ambiguous.

31. Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 3rd edn, 1967), I, p. 14.

32. Franciscus Zorell, S.J., *Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1946–84), pp. 13–14.

2

ALLEGED BASIC MEANINGS OF THE HEBREW VERB *QDŠ* 'BE HOLY': AN EXERCISE IN COMPARATIVE HEBREW LEXICOGRAPHY

None of us since James Barr's *Semantics of Biblical Language*¹ 60 years ago has felt very comfortable with the idea of a 'basic meaning' of words. There he ruthlessly exposed the failures of many eminent exegetes, not least in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (TDNT),² to come to terms with modern progress in the understanding of language. Writers in the TDNT were famous for their penchant for explaining the meaning of biblical words by reference to what were supposed to be their original meanings or basic meanings. Barr thundered, '[T]he etymology of a word is not a statement about its meaning but about its history'.³

So why am I resurrecting the opinions on 'basic meanings' of old dictionaries whose authors had never heard of Barr? It is (1) because many of the views of old dictionaries on this topic are still prevalent today and continue to mislead students and scholars alike, and (2) I want to spread the word of what dangers lie hidden in our standard lexicographical resources.

This paper was read at the meeting of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Stellenbosch, South Africa, September 2016. It is published in *Vetus Testamentum* 71 (2021), pp. 1-21.

1. James Barr (1924–2006), *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).

2. Gerhard Kittel (1888–1948) (ed.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1932–79; ET *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* [trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; 15 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–2006]).

3. Barr, *Semantics*, p. 109.

Some of the ideas held by lexicographers over the past five hundred years⁴ we can now easily recognize as false, but there are others that have embedded themselves in our current dictionaries and can only with difficulty be prised out of them. So for example with the root *qdš* 'be holy', well suited for an exercise in comparative lexicography.⁵

I will arrange the results of my researches in roughly reverse chronological order of the 'basic meanings' for the roots that have been propounded during the five hundred years of European bilingual Hebrew lexica.⁶

4. Many of the older Hebrew lexica mentioned in this paper are available online and downloadable in pdf format; to access them, one can use the Karlsruher Virtueller Katalog (KVK) at kvk.bibliothek.kit.edu, where such items are marked with a pdf icon.

5. My other papers on comparative lexicography are (1) 'Towards a Science of Comparative Classical Hebrew Lexicography', in *From Ancient Manuscripts to Modern Dictionaries: Select Studies in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek* (ed. Tarsee Li, Keith Dyer and Alexey Muraviev; Perspectives on Linguistics and Ancient Languages; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2017), pp. 227-46 (Chapter 10 below); (2) 'Misapprehensions, Ancient and Modern, about Lions (Nahum 2.13)', in *Poets, Prophets, and Texts in Play: Studies in Biblical Poetry and Prophecy in Honour of Francis Landy* (ed. Ehud Ben Zvi, Claudia V. Camp, David M. Gunn and Aaron W. Hughes; LHB/OTS, 597; London: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2015), pp. 58-76 (Chapter 8 below).

I am told by Daniel A. Klein that S.D. Luzzatto's 1847 commentary on Exodus, of which he has recently published a translation (*Shadal on Exodus: Samuel David Luzzatto's Interpretation of the Book of Shemot* [New York: Kodesh Press, 2015]), reviewed several of the proposals considered in this paper and found them wanting. I have not yet been able to see this volume.

6. I confine myself to these works, regretting that I have not been able for lack of resources to trace the history of the subject in mediaeval and modern monolingual Hebrew lexica.

I will leave out of account the claim that the 'basic meaning' is 'be brilliant', since that was based on a supposed Akkadian adjective *quddušu* (registered in Friedrich Delitzsch [1850-1922], *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* [Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1896], p. 581b), which current lexica do not recognize. August Dillmann (1823-1894), *Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1895), p. 254, appears to have been the originator of this proposal; it was adopted by T.C. Vriezen (1899-1981), *An Outline of Old Testament Theology* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2nd edn, 1970), p. 297 n. 2, while Norman H. Snaith (1898-1982), *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (London: Epworth Press, 1944), pp. 21-50, was much tempted by it.

1. *Separate*

This is the view that most scholars today will be familiar with, though no doubt not all of them would subscribe to it.

1.1 *Brown–Driver–Briggs*

In BDB (1906),⁷ for example, we read at the head of its article on the root *qđq*: ‘poss. orig. idea of separation, withdrawal’. So important is this sense to BDB that the whole article on *qđq* has as its principal gloss ‘apartness, sacredness’ (the sense ‘apartness’ preceding any term like ‘holiness’, we note), and the verb *qđq* is glossed ‘be set apart, consecrated’ (‘set apart’ here too stands in the first place); among the various senses of *qđq* are those labelled §1 apartness, sacredness, holiness of God, §2 of places set apart as sacred by God’s presence, and, among other items, §6 of things and persons ceremonially cleansed, and so separated as sacred. The concept of separation, in short, has in this lexicon been intruded systematically into the treatment of the whole field of holiness. But can such a sense be justified?

1.2 *Baudissin*

The origin of the idea of *qdš* as separation is generally attributed to W.W. Graf von Baudissin’s monograph on holiness in the Old Testament in 1878,⁸ who claimed that *qdš* is itself derived from a root *qd* ‘cut, separate, divorce’.⁹ Now, although there is an Arabic verb *qadda* ‘cut’, it does not seem to be a general word for ‘cut’, but is typically used with specific senses such as ‘cut the edges’, ‘cut into strips’.¹⁰ And there is no such root attested in Semitic

7. F. Brown (1849–1916) with the co-operation of S.R. Driver (1846–1914) and C.A. Briggs (1841–1913), *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906).

8. Wolf Wilhelm Friedrich Graf von Baudissin (1847–1926), *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte. II. Der Begriff der Heiligkeit im Alten Testament* (Leipzig: F.W. Grunow, 1878). The work is referred to by BDB, s.v. On the etymology of *qdš* Baudissin was following the Orientalist Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801–1888) (Baudissin, *Der Begriff der Heiligkeit*, p. 20).

9. *Begriff der Heiligkeit*, pp. 19–20. We may leave aside the even more fanciful etymology proposed by Julius Fürst (1805–1873), *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 2nd edn, 1863), p. 300a, that the root was originally *qđq* (cf. *qđq* ‘green grass’), thus ‘fresh, new young, pure’.

10. Jacob Golius (1586–1667), *Lexicon arabico-latinum* (Leiden: Bonaventura

generally;¹¹ it was postulated on the basis of some similar sounding words such as קָצַב 'be sharp', קָצַר 'cut', קָדַע 'hew', קָטַט II 'hew', קָצַב I 'cut' and קָדַשׁ 'new' (understood as 'separated from the old'). No one today would accept such an equivalence of qoph and heth and gimel; some of the words mentioned do not actually mean 'cut', and to 'cut' is in any case not necessarily a term for 'separate'. No one would entertain Baudissin's proposal if it were made today, so it is hard to see why it is still being followed (or even mentioned) in many of our standard resources. The idea that *qds* means 'separate' does not depend entirely on Baudissin's conjecture, nevertheless, and I will return shortly to some textual evidence that may support it.

1.3 After Baudissin

Despite its speculative nature, Baudissin's proposal had within five years entered the lexicographical mainstream with its adoption into the Gesenius tradition in the 9th edition of the *Handwörterbuch* (1883).¹² All the previous Gesenius editions had held that the root meant basically 'be pure' (which I will discuss in §2 below), but now the editors (F. Mühlau and W. Volck) were emboldened to assert of the word that it meant 'properly, to be separated, cut off from'. Within a couple of decades, the proposal had been incorporated into BDB (1906),¹³ which was the next in the line of Gesenius's descendants after the 11th edition of Gese-

and Abraham Elsevier, 1653), col. 1861; Georg Wilhelm Freytag (1788–1861), *Lexicon arabico-latinum*, III (Halle: C.A. Schwetschke, 1835), p. 404a; E.W. Lane (1801–1876), *An Arabic–English Lexicon*, VII (ed. Stanley Lane-Poole; London: Williams & Norgate, 1885), p. 2497c; Hans Wehr (1909–1981) and J. Milton Cowan (1907–1993) (eds.), *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961), p. 744b; Arabic *qadara* 'decide' is not relevant (*pace* Baudissin).

11. Despite the impression often given that there was. It is not found in Akkadian or Ugaritic, for example.

12. Friedrich Heinrich Wilhelm Gesenius (1786–1842), *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (ed. F. Mühlau and W. Volck; Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 9th edn, 1883), p. 727a: 'eig. abgesondert, abgeschieden sein' (they cited Baudissin and also Delitzsch). The view was maintained in the 12th edition (by Socin and Zimmern in 1895, 680a ('urspr. wohl ausgesondert, abgesondert s[ein]'). But by the 15th edition of Buhl in 1910 the view had been dropped altogether, supplanted to some extent by the return of the sense 'be pure' (see below), though Buhl's glosses throughout the article were mostly 'be holy, consecrate'.

13. The completed BDB was published in 1906, but the work had been issued

nius.¹⁴ BDB were not so certain about the proposal as Mühlau and Volck had been, noting only that ‘poss. orig. idea of separation, withdrawal’. That ‘poss.’ was soon forgotten by generations of teachers and students of the Old Testament, who believed that separation was indeed at the base of the meaning of *qdš*.

Whether from BDB or from the 11th edition of Gesenius, the ‘separation’ view spread. Otto Procksch in the *TDNT* accepted the proposal of a basic root קָדַשׁ ‘separate’,¹⁵ and W. Kornfeld in the *TDOT* affirmed that ‘most interpreters concur with Baudissin’s thesis’.¹⁶ Hans-Peter Müller in the *TLOT* remarked that the ‘often-accepted meaning “set apart” ... may only be inferred’, but he didn’t appear to deny it, and we may assume he counted himself among those accepting it. It is not clear that Ludwig Koehler was an adherent, for his definition read ‘heilig, dem gewöhnlichen Gebrauch entzogen ... sein / be holy, withheld from profane use’; he didn’t use the term ‘separate’, however, and he didn’t mention Baudissin.¹⁷ But as a sign of how persistent the view has been, even as late as the third edition of Koehler and Baumgartner’s lexicon *HALOT* (1996; = *HALAT* [1983]), and even though it does not approve of the view, it nevertheless finds it necessary to begin its article on קָדַשׁ with the disclaimer, ‘[it] can only with difficulty be traced back to a root קָדַשׁ “to cut”; if this is the case the basic meaning of קָדַשׁ would be “to set apart”’.¹⁸ Even that formula-

in 11 Parts between 1891 and 1906, so I assume that the Part with qoph had been published some years earlier than 1906.

14. Although BDB was published later than the 11th edition of Gesenius (1890), it was not based on it, for BDB was being published from 1891 onward. Clearly it relied on the 11th edition of Gesenius in this instance, but in general, as it announced on its title page, it was ‘based on the Lexicon of Wilhelm Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson’, the latest revision of Robinson having been published in 1854. It is a mystery to me why BDB did not base itself rather on any of the six editions of Gesenius that appeared between Robinson’s latest version (1854) and Mühlau and Volck’s 10th edition of Gesenius in 1886.

15. Otto Procksch (1874–1947), in Procksch and Karl Georg Kuhn (1906–1976), ‘ἅγιος, κτλ.’, in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, I (ed. Gerhard Kittel; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964; orig. 1932), pp. 88–115 (89).

16. W. Kornfeld (1917–1988) and H. Ringgren (1917–2012), ‘קָדַשׁ *qdš*’, in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, XII (ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), p. 523.

17. Ludwig Koehler (1880–1956), *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1953), p. 825a.

18. Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner (1887–1970), *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (HALOT)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994–1999),

tion does not rule out the possibility of such a derivation; it could perhaps imply that one should try to do things that are difficult, rather than accept warnings to avoid them.

Quite outside the realm of Hebrew lexicography, this explanation of the 'basic meaning' of *qdš* became the norm in twentieth-century scholarship. It can be found in Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*,¹⁹ in Eichrodt's *Theology of the Old Testament*,²⁰ and Norman Snaith's influential *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*²¹ and other Old Testament theologies such as those of Vriezen²² and Jacob,²³ as well, for example, in the Soncino translation of the Talmud.²⁴ Above all, it cohered perfectly with the thesis of Rudolf Otto's *The Idea of the Holy*,²⁵ one of the most important theological works of the century, defining the holy as the numinous, a mystery that is both terrifying (*tremendum*) and fascinating (*fascinans*), 'wholly other' (*ganz Andere*). Rudolf Bultmann and Karl Barth (at least the early dialectical Barth), from the perspective of Christian theology, were in accord, describing the deity as *totaliter aliter*. It

p. 1072a = *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (HALAT) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 3rd edn; 1967–1995), p. 1003a. The German 'kaum auf eine √ קר "scheiden" zurückgeführt werden kann' is perhaps a little more negative. Among other lexica post-BDB that adopt the same view, I might mention Eduard König (1846–1936), *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (Leipzig: Dietrich, 1910), p. 401a, and the Langenscheidt dictionaries of the twentieth century (Karl Feyerabend [1849–1916], *Taschenwörterbuch der hebräischen und deutschen Sprache zu den gelesenen Teilen des Alten Testaments* [Berlin-Schöneberg: Langenscheidt, 1905; and many later editions], p. 229b: 'abgesondert, heilig sein, geheiligt werden').

19. W. Robertson Smith (1846–1894), *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1889), p. 150: 'there is some probability that [שקר] implies "separation"; referred to by BDB, s.v.

20. Walther Eichrodt (1890–1878), *Theology of the Old Testament*, I (London: SCM Press, 1961; orig. 1933), I, pp. 270–71.

21. Snaith, *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, pp. 21–50 (24–32).

22. Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*, p. 297 n. 2.

23. Edmond Jacob (1909–1998), *Theology of the Old Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958; orig. 1955), p. 86.

24. The footnote to *Pesahim* 17a in the Soncino translation says, 'Kodesh is here translated unclean, from its root idea of "separation", "keeping at a distance from"' (Isidore Epstein [ed.], *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Mo'ed* [London: Soncino Press, 1978], f. 17a).

25. Rudolf Otto (1869–1937), *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational* (London: Oxford University Press, 1923; orig. 1919).

is a rare philological proposal that is so attuned to the spirit of the age.

1.4 *Before Baudissin*

The impression is usually given that separation as the ‘basic meaning’ of *qdš* goes back only to Baudissin, but it is in fact to be found much earlier in Hebrew lexicography. I have traced the view back to the very first attempt at Hebrew lexicography by a non-Jewish scholar, when Johannes Reuchlin in 1505 defined the verb as ‘Initiavit, consecravit, sanctificavit’, but went on to say, ‘id quod est consecratum seu sanctificatum separatur ab usu et commertio vulgi’ (‘what is consecrated or sanctified is separated from the use and commerce of the common people’).²⁶ I next find the idea in Johann Reckenberger (1749), who begins his lexicon article with the forthright announcement: ‘separatus fuit ab usu vulgari et communi et ad usum quendam specialem, v.c. sacrum destinatus’.²⁷ Nevertheless, he rarely draws on the sense ‘separate’ in the article itself.²⁸ A few years later it crops up again in the influential lexicon of Johannes Simonis (1757),²⁹ who writes: ‘ad peculiarem et sacrum separatus est, hinc sanctus fuit vel factus’. In 1762 the English lexicographer John Parkhurst defines it as ‘To *separate* or *set apart* from its common and ordinary to some higher use or purpose. This *separation* or *setting apart* is the ideal meaning of the word.’³⁰ Again, the same view was advanced by Johann David Michaelis in his *Supplementa ad lexica hebraica* (1784–92),³¹

26. Johann Reuchlin (1455–1522), *De rudimentis hebraicis* (Pforzheim, 1506), p. 463.

27. Johann Leonhard Reckenberger (1702–1773), *Liber radicum siue lexicon hebraicum* (Jena: Petrus Fickelscherr, 1749), p. 1323.

28. Only in reference to Mic. 3.5; Jer. 51.27; Ezek. 7.24, which texts are used by others for the sense ‘prepare’.

29. Johannes Simonis (1698–1768), *Lexicon manuale hebraicum et chaldaicum* (Halle: J.J. Curtius, 1757), p. 842 (2nd edn, 1771, p. 854). In the third edition of Simonis, however, edited by J.G. Eichhorn, the ‘basic meaning’ adopted had become ‘be clean’: ‘purus et sanctus fuit munditie lotionibus et lustrationibus parata’ (Halle: Heirs of [J.J.] Curtius, 1793, p. 1404).

30. John Parkhurst (1728–1797), *An Hebrew and English Lexicon without Points* (London: W. Faden, 1762), p. 310a; (London: William Baynes and H.S. Baynes, 1823), p. 602b. Parkhurst defends the sense by ‘comparing Lev. xx. 24, with ver. 26; and Deut. xix. 2, 7, with Josh. xx. 7... In like manner *St. Paul*, Gal. i. 15, alluding to Jer. i. 5, uses ἀφορίζειν to *separate* for שׁדק.’

31. Johann David Michaelis (1717–1791), *Supplementa ad lexica hebraica* (3 vols.; Göttingen: J.G. Rosenbusch, 1784–92), p. 2166.

and by Johannes Cocceius (1793), who defined it as ‘ab usu et statu communi ad peculiarem et sacrum separare’.³²

I have no idea, however, what these lexicographers based their view on. One attestation of the idea earlier than von Baudissin, however, I can trace: Franz Delitzsch, in his Psalms commentary of 1867, asserted that the *qdš* root properly meant ‘cut off’, comparing the Arabic *qadda*.³³ Now while Baudissin was much influenced by Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, citing him for his view of *qdš*, Delitzsch had actually been a pupil of Fleischer’s; that must be the explanation of how Delitzsch got Fleischer’s idea into print 11 years before Baudissin.

1.5 Textual Evidence

Strangely enough, it is rare in the discussion about the root meaning of *qdš* to find textual evidence cited; if the verb meant basically ‘separate’ one might have expected to find many texts in which it is accompanied by other verbs with a similar meaning. Such would be Lev. 20.26, ‘You shall be holy to me; for I the Lord am holy, and I have separated (בדל *hi.*) you from the other peoples to be mine’. But, as far as I can see, there are no others.³⁴ It is simply not associated with words for separation. As for Lev. 20.26, I explain the separation not in connection with holiness but in connection with belonging to Yahweh: that is to say, the separation from other peoples does not make Israel *holy*, but it does bring Israel into Yahweh’s possession.³⁵ Occasionally the term ‘set apart’ makes its way into a contemporary English translation, as with the NRSV of Jer. 12.3, ‘Pull them out like sheep for the slaugh-

32. Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669), *Lexicon et commentarius sermonis hebraici et chaldaici* (5th edn, Leipzig: Weygang, 1793), p. 470. In the first edition, Frankfurt and Leipzig: Reyher, 1714/1715, p. 732b (to my knowledge the first lexicon to gloss main senses in German), only the translations ‘sanctus, sacer’ and ‘heilig’ are used.

33. Franz Delitzsch (1813–1890), *Biblischer Commentar über die Psalmen* (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1867), p. 199 (on Ps. 22.4); see also his article ‘Heiligkeit’, in *Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (ed. J.J. Herzog; Hamburg: R. Besser, 2nd edn, 1854–68), V, pp. 714–18.

34. I checked for any verses where קדש or קדוּשׁ occurred together with a word for ‘separate’ such as ברר II, בדל II, פרס I, פלה I, פרר II, פרס II, פשק – without success.

35. Deut. 7.6, ‘For you are a people holy to the Lord your God; the Lord your God has chosen (בחר) you out of all the peoples on earth to be his people’, likewise suggests a separation, but that does not mean that the verb בחר means ‘separate’.

ter, and set them apart for the day of slaughter',³⁶ but that is no more than a translator's notion of how the line should run; it is not a philological proposal.

All in all, there is no evidence, philological or textual, that justifies the claim that the 'root meaning' of *qdš* is 'separate', and the only surprising thing is that such a weak claim has persisted so long in the scholarly literature.

2. *Be Clean*

This also, like the sense 'be separate', has been an enduring 'basic meaning' proposed for the root *qdš*. It was still being propounded as late as 1954,³⁷ in the 17th edition of Gesenius by Buhl. But I don't know how and when it originated.

2.1 *Gesenius*

The idea of the root meaning of *qḏṣ* as 'be clean' is certainly to be found in the work of Gesenius himself, to whom so much in our contemporary dictionaries can be traced. In his first dictionary, of 1810–1812, he had defined *qdš* solely as 'be holy, dedicated' (*heilig, geweiht seyn*), with one exception, when he defined the hithpael as 'make oneself holy, cleanse oneself (by washings, lustrations)', with a long note beginning 'That the terms be holy and be clean are closely related is shown especially by passages such as the following: Lev. 11.43, 44; Deut. 23.14; 2 Sam. 11.4'³⁸ (which he understood as 'cleanse oneself' from the impurity of sexual intercourse [*Beyschlaf*]).³⁹ But in his second dictionary, his *Hebräisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch* of 1815,⁴⁰ he promoted the idea of cleanness to the

36. I don't know what the justification for 'appoint nations against her' in the NJPS of Jer. 51.28 may be.

37. Frants Buhl (1850–1932), *Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (17th edn, reprint of 15th; Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1921, 1949, 1954), p. 702b, where the article *qḏṣ* begins 'rein, geheiligt'.

38. Friedrich Heinrich Wilhelm Gesenius, *Hebräisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch über die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, II (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1812), pp. 994b, 995b.

39. This seems to be a mistake, for Bathsheba has not yet had sex with David, and her husband, Uriah, is away on the battlefield. It is more likely that she is purifying herself after her period.

40. Gesenius, *Neues hebräisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch über das alte Testament mit Einschluss des biblischen Chaldaismus. Ein Auszug aus dem grössern Werke*

head of the article, affirming after the gloss of *heilig, geweiht seyn*, for the qal of שָׁדַק, that the ‘basic meaning appears to be clean; cf. Lev. 11.43, 44; Deut. 23.14; 2 Sam. 11.4’. He does not cite 2 Sam. 11.4 in the hithpael section of his article, where it belongs, but, surprisingly, brings this unusual sense into the qal, obviously because on the surface it props up the idea that שָׁדַק is basically about making clean.

If we then turn to the last lexicographical work of Gesenius himself, the first part of Volume 3 of his *Thesaurus* (1842),⁴¹ here too 2 Sam. 11.4 plays a key role: his qal paragraph begins ‘1) be pure, clean, prop. of physical cleanness (see Hithpa. No. 1 and adj. שָׁדַק); 2) be sacred, holy’. He goes on to justify this view with the further claim that ‘in all primitive religions, cleanness and purity were believed to portray holiness’.⁴² This basic sense, he argues, is to be preferred to that of ‘separation’, supposed by others. Hard cases make bad law, they say; odd verses make for bad philology, equally, I would say. It was a big mistake to promote the anomalous sense of (apparently) ‘wash’ to pole position at the head of the article, and equally hasty to suppose that, even if cleanness ‘portrayed’ holiness, holiness meant primarily cleanness.

(Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1815), p. 555b. Gesenius gives the reference as Deut. 23.14; it is 23.15 in the Hebrew numbering. The same statement about the ‘basic meaning’ was repeated in his *Lexicon manuale hebraicum et chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti libros* of 1833 (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel), p. 882b, and the 4th edition of his *Handwörterbuch* (1834) began ‘Grdbdtg: rein seyn’, citing 2 Sam. 11.4 (p. 466b).

41. Gesenius, *Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguae hebraeae et chaldaee Veteris Testamenti ... Editio altera secundum radices digesta, priore germanica longe auctior et emendatior* (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, III/1, 1842), p. 1195b (though much of the third volume of the *Thesaurus* was not written by Gesenius, these pages were). In 1847 (after his death) the second edition of the *Lexicon manuale* added that the verb שָׁדַק ‘be new’, which was claimed to mean basically ‘strive’, appeared to be related (p. 808a; cf. p. 293a). The idea of the basic meaning ‘be pure’ persisted until the 10th edition (1886); from the 11th edition onward ‘be separate’ became the standard basic sense. The two English translations of Gesenius that appeared in 1836 and 1885 naturally evidenced the sense ‘be pure’: Edward Robinson (1794–1863), *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Including the Biblical Chaldee, Translated from the Latin of William Gesenius* (Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1844; orig. 1836), p. 924a; Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (1813–1875), *Gesenius’s Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures Translated, with Additions and Corrections from the Author’s Thesaurus and Other Works* (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1846), p. 725a.

42. ‘[Q]uia in religionibus priscis, quotquot sunt, munditia et castitas sanctitatem repraesentare credebantur.’

2.2 Textual Evidence

Now no philological justification was offered for the sense ‘be clean’ for *qdš*, unlike the situation with the claimed ‘basic meaning’ of ‘be separate’. For the sense ‘be clean’, everything hung upon the textual evidence, which, it must be said, was slight. As for Lev. 11.43-44 (‘be holy; you shall not defile yourself’), I would argue that the text does not mean that being clean is what constitutes holiness, but that being unclean damages the state of holiness (an obvious and undisputed point). Israel is not to make itself unclean, for that would make it unholy. In Deut. 23.15 (‘your camp must be holy’) the words ‘clean’ and ‘unclean’ do not occur, but we can allow that ‘something indecent’ (עֲרֹוָה, lit. nakedness) would cause uncleanness; as in Lev. 11.43-44 nothing can be inferred from this text about the nature of holiness, since it is only being said that uncleanness would prejudice it. And as for 2 Sam. 11.4, where Bathsheba is ‘sanctifying herself from her uncleanness’, a very problematic text on several grounds, she is clearly washing herself to remove her (ritual) *uncleanness*, and that, strangely enough, is called ‘making herself holy (שְׁדָקָה *htp.*)’. Lustration is indeed commonly a preparation or prerequisite for being made or declared holy, but it is not itself the act of being made or declared holy. It is the same with anointing: when in Lev. 8.10 Moses took the anointing oil and anointed the tabernacle and all that was in it, and consecrated (שְׁדָקָה) them, no one suggests that a meaning of *qdš* is ‘anoint’. The anointing is a preparatory ritual, whereas the ‘making’ or ‘declaring’ holy is a subsequent verbal declaration.

2.3 *qdš* in Other Semitic Languages

So ingrained in Hebrew lexicography has been the idea that *qdš* means at base ‘be clean, be pure’ that lexicographers of other Semitic languages, who have in many cases been Hebraists as well, if not first of all, have been influenced. Thus Robert Payne Smith, famous for his great *Thesaurus syriacus*,⁴³ gave the first sense of the Syriac *qdš* as ‘*purum fuit, vel pronuntiavit*’ (‘was pure’, or ‘pronounced pure’), and as the first example of that sense instanced its first occurrence in the Bible, Gen. 2.3. He meant thereby that at the end of the works of creation God did not declare the sab-

43. R. Payne Smith (1818–1895), *Thesaurus syriacus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1868–1901), II, col. 3500.

bath holy but rather ‘made’ or ‘pronounced’ the sabbath *clean* or *pure*—a truly novel interpretation and without doubt incorrect: most would surely agree that it means that God laid claim to it, bringing it within the sphere of the holy. We may conclude that even such a stunning achievement as Payne Smith’s 4,500-column thesaurus may be faulted for a too ready acceptance of some general ideas about root meanings.

Then we have the case of Wolfram von Soden’s *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*,⁴⁴ where the article for the cognate *qadāšu* is glossed as simply as ‘rein werden, sein’ (‘be, become pure, clean’). The notion of purity is applied to each of the subdivisions of the article. But when we turn to the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* (CAD),⁴⁵ we find a rather wider repertory of senses given to *qadāšu*, including ‘consecrate, dedicate’. Even though CAD also gives the sense ‘to make ritually clean, to purify’, I see no example where ‘purify’ is more appropriate a translation than ‘dedicate’; in just one quoted text is washing spoken of in connection with *qadāšu*, but I think it is arguable that in that case while purification by washing may well be connoted it is not necessarily denoted.

Perhaps it does not matter much for Classical Hebrew what a cognate verb meant in Akkadian, but consider this notation in the most recent dictionary of Biblical Hebrew, the *Konziise und aktualisierte Ausgabe des hebräischen und aramäischen Lexikons zum Alten Testament* (KAHAT):⁴⁶ ‘שָׁדָשׁ sem. *qdš heilig sein (Akkad. rein werden, sein)’. The implication is that Akkadian is out of line with the other Semitic languages, but that is so only if you follow von Soden and not CAD.

Finally, we may consider the case of Arabic *qadusa*, cognate with שָׁדָשׁ. The first Arabic lexicon by a European scholar, that of Jacob Golius (1586–1667),⁴⁷ begins its article on *qdš* with ‘Purificavit: sanctificavit, consecravīt’, and continues with ‘Sancto

44. Wolfram von Soden (1908–1996), *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch unter Benutzung des lexikalischen Nachlasses von Bruno Meissner*, II (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1972), p. 891a.

45. John A. Brinkman et al. (eds.), *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, XIII (Q) (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1982), p. 46a.

46. Walter Dietrich (b. 1944) and Samuel Arnet (b. 1970) (eds.), *Konziise und aktualisierte Ausgabe des Hebräischen und aramäischen Lexikons zum Alten Testament* (KAHAT) (Leiden: Brill, 2013), p. 492a. It might be noted that KAHAT does not find it necessary to invoke the sense ‘make pure’ except in connection with the hithpael (p. 493a).

47. Golius, *Lexicon arabico-latinum*, col. 1865.

puroque benedixit'. The same combination of glosses continues throughout the entries for Arabic terms related to *qdš*. Golius had clearly not been infected with the theory that the root means essentially 'be clean'. But when we get to Freytag (1835),⁴⁸ whose work is otherwise largely a reproduction of Golius's, we find the root is defined simply as 'purus fuit'.

The same mixture of 'holy' and 'pure' glosses features also in Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*. His first gloss is: 'It was, or became, [holy, accord. to the most common usage, or] pure'.⁴⁹ Thereafter we encounter in the article 'hallow, sanctify', but also 'declare to be far removed, or free, from every impurity or imperfection, or from everything derogatory from his glory'. These are clearly 'definitions' derived from Arab authorities, and not the constructions even of a nineteenth-century lexicographer.

The problem with the Arabic *qdš* is not only, as BDB puts it, 'in Ar. otherwise under infl. of Heb.'⁵⁰ – which means to say that we cannot be sure whether we are dealing under this word with the evidence of a Semitic language truly independent of Hebrew – but also that the major European lexica are so heavily dependent on mediaeval Arabic-language lexica innocent of the requirements of modern lexicography, Golius on al-Jauhari (d. 1002 or 1008), Freytag and Lane on the *Qāmūs* of al-Firūzābādī (d. 1414).⁵¹

I conclude that the evidence for the sense 'be pure, clean' is very thin. Not only is there no philological justification for it, the textual evidence is almost non-existent.

3. *Prepare*

3.1 *Buxtorf*

A third 'basic meaning' for Hebrew *qdš* among lexicographers, especially favoured in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, was 'prepare'. It is apparent in Buxtorf's 1615 lexicon, which defines *קדש* as 'parari, praeparari, destinari ad aliquid, generaliter: in specie;

48. Freytag, *Lexicon arabico-latinum*, III, p. 407b.

49. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, VII (ed. Stanley Lane-Poole, 1885), p. 2496c.

50. Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Lexicon*, p. 871a.

51. See, briefly, John Kaltner (b. 1954), *The Use of Arabic in Biblical Hebrew Lexicography* (CBQMS, 28; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1996), pp. 17-20. Lane used especially the expansion of the *Qāmūs* by al-Zabīdī (1732-1790) known as the *Tāj al-'Arūs*.

sacrari, consecrari, sanctificari, sanctum, sanctum esse vel fieri' ('be made ready, be prepared, be destined for something, in general; specifically, be made sacred, be consecrated, be sanctified, be or become holy or sacred').⁵² 'Prepare', for him, was the most basic meaning, and the meaning 'be holy' was viewed as a specific sense of a general meaning 'be prepared'. By distinguishing between a 'general' meaning and a 'specific' one Buxtorf was attempting to analyse the relation of the terms 'prepare' and 'be holy', but the attempt cannot be judged very successful, for it is hard to see how being made sacred can be a specific sense of 'prepare'.

3.2 Before Buxtorf

Buxtorf did not invent this view. I can trace it back beyond Buxtorf to Johann Reuchlin's *De rudimentis hebraicis* of 1505,⁵³ the very first Hebrew–Latin lexicon; the article begins: 'Iniciavit, consecravit, sanctificavit'; the same in his *Lexicon hebraicum* (1537).⁵⁴ Likewise in the most extensive treatment of the *Thesaurus linguae sanctae* of Santes Pagninus (1577; orig. 1529); his article begins: 'Sanctificare: praeprare: immundum esse' (the meaning 'prepare' is removed to the second place).⁵⁵

3.3 After Buxtorf

After Buxtorf's early editions, the same view can be seen in Edward Leigh's *Critica sacra* (1641),⁵⁶ the first Hebrew lexicon to be written in both Latin and English. A side note to the verb says: 'It signifieth preparation in general, as in Mic. 3.5, to prepare warre: when it concerns holinesse it signifies make holy, Lev. 21.23'. The same view was reported by Edward Robertson

52. Johann Buxtorf the Elder (1564–1629), *Epitome radicum hebraicarum et chaldaicarum complectens omnes voces* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1607), p. 745; *Lexicon hebraicum et chaldaicum complectens omnes voces* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1615), p. 658. Buxtorf's lexicon is, incidentally, the longest-lived of Hebrew dictionaries: first published in 1607, its latest edition was in 1824, 217 years later. Gesenius's lexicon is a close rival, first published in 1810, latest edition in 2013–203 years later.

53. Reuchlin, *De rudimentis hebraicis*, p. 463.

54. Johann Reuchlin, *Lexicon hebraicum* (Basel: Henricus Petrus, 1537), p. 364a.

55. Santes Pagninus (1470–1541), *Thesaurus linguae sanctae* (Lyon: Bartholomäus, 1577; orig. 1529), pp. 2419–34.

56. Edward Leigh (1602–1671), *Critica sacra* (London: Thomas Underhill, 1641, and many subsequent editions).

in 1680,⁵⁷ propounded in the often-reprinted lexicon of Christian Reineccius, *Lexicon hebraeo-chaldaicum biblicum* (1704),⁵⁸ adopted by Christian Stock in his influential *Clavis linguae sanctae* (1717),⁵⁹ noted in Charles François Houbigant's *Racines hébraïques sans points-voyelles* (1732),⁶⁰ and held in the *Lexicon hebraicum* of Joannes Bouget (1737),⁶¹ and in Jacques Gousset's *Lexicon linguae hebraicae* (1743).⁶² It was still being propounded in the 1789 edition of Buxtorf's lexicon.⁶³

3.4 Textual Evidence

The ground for this sense was entirely textual. A key passage was Mic. 3.5, where false prophets 'declare war' on anyone who does not pay their fee. The connotation of the phrase *קִדְּשׁ מִלְחָמָה* is no doubt 'declare war' or perhaps, less likely, 'prepare war', but its denotation must be 'sanctify war', i.e. declare or prepare a holy war. It is because war is often regarded as a holy undertaking that the verb *qdš* is used here, not because the verb *qdš* means 'declare' or 'prepare'. Other texts that might have been used for the same argument as Mic. 3.5 are Jer. 6.4 'prepare war against it', Jer. 22.7 'I will prepare destroyers against you', Joel 3.9 'prepare war, stir up the nations', and 2 Kgs 10.20 'prepare a solemn assembly for Baal'. In all these cases, it should be evident that *qdš* is being used in its normal sense of 'sanctify' rather than in any sense of 'prepare', though that may be a convenient translation of the term in English.

57. William Robertson (d. 1686?), *אוצר לשון הקדש*. *Thesaurus linguae sanctae* (London: Samuel Roycroft, 1680), p. 917a.

58. Christian Reineccius (1688–1752), *Lexicon hebraeo-chaldaicum biblicum* (Leipzig: Haeredes Lanckisianorum, 1741; 1st edn, 1704), p. 154.

59. Christian Stock (1672–1733), *Clavis linguae sanctae* (Jena: J.F. Bielck, 4th edn, 1739; 1st edn, 1717), p. 926.

60. Charles François Houbigant (1686–1783), *Racines hébraïques sans points-voyelles: ou dictionnaire hébraïque par racines* (Paris: Claude Simon, 1732), p. 143.

61. Joannes [Johannes] Bouget [Bougetius] (1692–1775), *Lexicon hebraicum, et chaldaico-biblicum ordine alphabetico*, III (Rome: Hieronymus Mainardus, 1737), p. 158a.

62. Jacques Gousset (1635–1704), *Lexicon linguae hebraicae* (2nd edn, Leipzig: W. Deer, 1743), p. 1391a.

63. Johannes Buxtorf, *Lexicon hebraicum et chaldaeo-biblicum* (ed. F.J. Montaldi; Rome: J. Zempel, 1789), p. 1231.

It is something of a mystery how a meaning so narrowly based⁶⁴ could have become adopted as a supposed basic meaning of the root קדש.

4. Be Unclean

4.1 Münster and Others

A fourth ‘basic meaning’, not infrequently proposed in the sixteenth century and sometimes later, was, surprisingly, ‘be unclean’. The early lexicon of Münster (1523) actually distinguished two roots spelled קדש: 1. Sanctificavit, 2. Prophanavit,⁶⁵ but most other lexicographers regarded these senses as belonging to the same word. In his 1535 edition Münster explained the second sense (‘the same as טמא, be unclean’) in reference to Hag. 2.12,⁶⁶ and derived קדש and קדשה ‘prostitute’, male and female, from that sense.⁶⁷ The influential lexicon of Sanctes Pagninus in 1529, explicitly a translation and exposition of Kimchi, began the article on קדש with three key senses: ‘sanctificare, præparare, immundum esse’ (‘make holy, prepare, be unclean’);⁶⁸ the very

64. I should admit that no fewer than 19 alleged occurrences of this sense are listed in the *Concordantiæ sacrarum Bibliorum hebraicorum* of Mario [Marius] de [di] Calasio (1550–1620) (London: J. Hodges, 1747–1749), III, cols. 1170–71 (original edition, Rome: Stephanus Paulinus, 1621), viz. Exod. 19.10, 14, 22; Num. 11.18; Josh. 3.5; 7.13; 1 Sam. 16.5; 2 Kgs 10.20; 2 Chron. 35.6; Isa. 30.29; Jer. 6.4; 12.3; 51.27, 28; Joel 1.14; 2.15, 16; 3.14 (MT 4.9); Mic. 3.5; Zeph. 1.7. But no one today would offer the sense ‘prepare’ for any of them, I believe, except perhaps as a free translation (especially for Jer. 6.4; 51.27, 28; Mic. 3.5, Zeph. 1.7 [as RSV]).

65. Sebastian Münster (1488–1552), ערוך השורש, *Dictionarium hebraicum* ([Basel]: Froben, 1523), p. 409. It is not clear to me whether Münster thought there were two verbs, or, more probably was simply attempting to convey the two different senses. Münster (and others) do not seem to have distinguished properly between ‘profane’ and ‘unclean’ (Münster is the only Hebrew lexicographer to have his image appear on a banknote, the 100 DM note used from 1962 to 1991).

66. But he did not explain how he understood the verse. Reuchlin, *De rudimentis hebraicis*, p. 463, and *Lexicon hebraicum*, p. 364a, expressed the same view of קדש, appealing to a similar sense in Vergil’s phrase *auri sacra fames* (‘the accursed hunger for gold’) (*Aeneid* 3.57); so also Louis Thomassin (1619–1695), *Glossarium universale hebraicum* (Paris: Joanne Anisson, 1697), col. 867. The sense of *sacer* is acknowledged by the standard lexicon of P.G.W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 1246a: ‘execrable, detestable’.

67. Münster, *Dictionarium hebraicum*, p. V 4b.

68. Pagninus, *Thesaurus linguae sanctae* (1529), col. 2106.