1. INTRODUCTION
Towards the end of the 1980’s a totally new lexicographic product saw the light, when Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, with the help of Rondal B. Smith and Karen Munson, published their *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. This lexicon was based on the latest insights in modern semantic analysis and, as a result of that, was organized in a way that differed drastically from what had been done so far. This lexicon will henceforth be referred to as LN.

LN is a powerful tool, primarily designed for Bible translators, but also very useful for biblical scholars, pastors, and theological students. There is a need for a similar dictionary for Biblical Hebrew as well.

This paper deals with the question as to what extent Louw and Nida’s methodology can be used to create such a dictionary.

2. WORDS AND MEANINGS
We cannot determine the meaning of a particular word or other lexical unit in a particular language without a proper study of the culture and world view behind that language. According to Nida (1975b:14) “the meaning of a word relates to a concept or a set of concepts that people have about an entity or a set of entities in the world around them. And these concepts may vary from one language or culture to another.” Fillmore and Atkins (1992:76f) confirm this by stating that “a word’s meaning can be understood only with reference to a structured background of experience, beliefs, or practices, constituting a kind of conceptual prerequisite for understanding the meaning. Speakers can be said to know the meaning of the word only by first understanding the background frames that motivate the concepts that the word encodes.”

In addition to this, it is not possible to determine the meaning of a word or other lexical unit without studying it in combination with other words or lexical units that are semantically related to it. According to Nida (1975a:32), words “have meaning only in terms of systematic contrasts with other words which share certain features with them but contrast with them in
In other words, each particular word is a member of a larger group of words that have certain aspects of meaning in common. Such a group can be called a *semantic field* or a *semantic domain*. The meaning of a word can only then be fully understood if we study it in combination with other words that belong to the same semantic domain. Only in this way we can discover the different semantic features of a word. Which will enable us to determine which of these features are *shared* by different words and which features are to be considered *distinctive*. This is confirmed by Kittay and Lehrer in a more recent publication (1992:3f), where they say that “the meanings of words must be understood, in part, in relation to other words that articulate a given content domain and that stand in the relation of affinity and contrast to the word(s) in question.”

In other words, before we can write a dictionary of a particular language we need to start with a set of semantic domains. We need a semantic framework on which it is to be based. The next question that we will have to deal with, then, is the following: How can we build such a framework? From where do we get those semantic domains?

Is there a universal set of domains that cover all languages of the world? The answer to this question is no. Every language has its own system of experience, beliefs, and practices. Every language has its own world view, thought patterns, etc. It is an illusion to think that there is one universal framework of semantic domains that covers them all.

In the following sections I will try to show that Louw and Nida’s framework does not work for Biblical Hebrew.

### 3. LOUW AND NIDA’S LEXICON

Louw and Nida’s lexicon differs substantially from the more traditional dictionaries of Biblical languages. The user who expects an alphabetic list of Greek words finds a list of 93 semantic domains instead, ranging from *Geographical Objects and Features* to *Names of Persons and Places*. Most semantic domains contain a number of subdomains. Even at that level words have not been arrayed alphabetically. Instead of that, words with *generic* meanings are listed before words with more *specific* meanings. In order to be able to find a particular word an index has been added, that lists each entry alphabetically and leads the user to the various semantic (sub)domains where this word can be found.

In their domains Louw and Nida have followed the well-known division of lexical units into four semantic categories: *Objects, Events, Abstracts, and Relationals* (Nida 1964). More information about Louw and Nida’s methodology can be found in the introduction to their dictionary, and in Louw (1985) and Nida and Louw (1992).

### 4. LOUW AND NIDA’S APPROACH AND BIBLICAL HEBREW

This new lexicon with its innovative approach was well received, although there has been some amount of criticism as well. Some scholars have criticized LN’s way of organization of the dictionary. Others consider LN’s list of semantic domains too arbitrary. According to them, it does not really reflect the Greek line of thought.

This presentation, however, is not intended to simply criticize Louw and Nida’s dictionary. I am not really concerned about New Testament Greek at this stage. My concern is the following: At an early stage in my research in Hebrew lexicography I tried to apply LN’s method to Biblical Hebrew. I went through all Hebrew words starting with the letter cheth (ח), trying to create lexicographic entries for each of them, and I soon discovered that it was impossible to achieve satisfactory results using this method.
LN’s methodology --as far as its usefulness for Biblical Hebrew is concerned-- has two major problems, which will be discussed in the following subsections:

4.1 Semantic Domains

The first weakness of Louw and Nida’s semantic framework lies in the fact that it does not seem to match the world view and thought patterns that underlie the text of the Old Testament.

Let me illustrate this. One scholar who has seen the need for a new dictionary of Biblical Hebrew based on semantic domains is James A. Swanson. In 1997 Logos Research Systems™ published an electronic version of A Dictionary of Biblical Languages, consisting of both a Hebrew and an Aramaic part. This is an Old Testament dictionary that has used Louw and Nida’s setup of semantic domains. Each word is listed in its alphabetical order and every (sub)entry contains a reference to one of Louw and Nida’s (sub)domains. Instead of using the name of that (sub)domain Swanson uses its index number or a range of those numbers. By clicking on that index reference the program will display Louw and Nida’s dictionary.

In his Author’s Preface Swanson readily admits that this method has its disadvantages. According to him “the purpose was not to suggest that Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek thought structures are of the same. There is no suggestion that a lexeme in the OT language mathematically equals (univocal) the Greek lexemes in meaning. There is also no suggestion that a Greek language domain structure should be imposed on a Hebrew culture domain structure.” The reasons why he makes use of Louw and Nida’s system are primarily pragmatic as he regards it as “an organizational principle to keep track of the tens of thousands of meanings of OT lexemes”. Secondly, Swanson argues that “there is at least an analogical connection between the domains of meaning in the Greek New Testament and Hebrew/Aramaic culture. Many of these domains could relate to nearly any culture of the world”. But he also agrees that “certain domains in the Hebrew have to be more carefully studied and debated as to their cultural mindset”.

Let us now take two Hebrew words about which we can be sure that --at least in a number of contexts-- they belong to the same semantic domain: δεσποζ and τεμπ. These two words have very much in common. Even though their basic meanings may differ, in quite a number of contexts these two words are mentioned in one breath, as a word pair, where they either have an identical meaning or complement and intensify each other. Now the power of a semantic domain dictionary is that it enables the user to compare words like these and see which semantic features they share and in which aspects they differ. According to LN’s system, however, δεσποζ would have to be classified under Attitudes and Emotions (LN 25), whereas τεμπ would have to be located under Hold a View, Trust (LN 31). In other words, there is no way to compare these two entries.

This shows that research is needed in order to determine the specific needs of Biblical Hebrew, which, consequently, should be incorporated into the basic framework of semantic classes, to result in a Hebrew lexicon that is based on a linguistically adequate semantic foundation that does justice to biblical Hebrew and the world view behind it.

4.2 Figurative Language

The Hebrew Old Testament contains more than one literary genre. A substantial part of it is written in poetry, and one of the features of Hebrew poetry (as in so many other languages) is the use of figurative language. But also in non-poetic texts we can find an impressive amount of figurative language. Certain metaphors and other figures of speech are so common in
Biblical Hebrew that it becomes hard to see them as highly marked specialized expressions. They seem to have become a structural part of the language.

Let us take a word like $\beta\lambda\rho\varepsilon\zeta$, for example. Literally, this word means “sword” and, according to Louw and Nida’s classification, would belong to LN 6 (Artifacts). But if we go through all occurrences of this word in the Old Testament we will discover that it is often used in a metaphorical sense, with focus on the activity that a sword is most commonly used for: “violence, aggression, war”.

Now if it were easy to indicate in which context $\beta\lambda\rho\varepsilon\zeta$ refers to “sword” as an artifact and in which context it denotes “violence, aggression, war”, we would not have a problem. $\beta\lambda\rho\varepsilon\zeta^a$ would be classified under Artifacts and $\beta\lambda\rho\varepsilon\zeta^b$, under Violence, Harm, Destroy, Kill. But this is exactly where the problem lies. In a considerable number of passages it is not easy to choose between these two possibilities. Let us take the RSV translation of Jeremiah 47:6,7 as an example:

> Ah, sword of the LORD! How long till you are quiet? Put yourself into your scabbard, rest and be still! How can it be quiet, when the LORD has given it a charge? Against Ashkelon and against the seashore he has appointed it.

This is just one of several cases in which “sword” is used in more than a single sense. Is it used as an artifact here? Yes, because of the scabbard. Is it used as an Event here? Sure, because it actually means “war” in this context. This is a case where the way Louw and Nida have organized their lexicon becomes problematic for biblical Hebrew. And this is not just an isolated example. It actually is a structural problem in this language. Many words that basically denote a particular Object are also used to refer to the type of activity that that Object is normally used for. In addition to that there are words in Hebrew that technically should be considered Events, but that -- in certain contexts -- are used to denote the most prominent Object in the argument structure of that Event.

Because of these patterns, however, Louw and Nida’s methodology of organizing words by semantic domains rather than in their alphabetical order may not work well for Biblical Hebrew, because it does not give us sufficient insight in the different ways one single word can be used. And that is exactly what is so important if we want to have an idea of what is happening in Hebrew semantics. If we miss the patterns we will miss the essentials! Even the presence of an index (as is contained in volume II of Louw and Nida’s lexicon) does not sufficiently bridge this gap.

5 NEW METHODOLOGY

We have seen that it is impossible to take Louw and Nida’s framework of semantic domains and apply that to Biblical Hebrew. Biblical Hebrew is a different language with a different system of experience, beliefs, and practices, which ought to be reflected in a dictionary.

Therefore a structural semantic analysis of this language is required before can be determined which semantic domains cover it adequately. This is a detailed study of the way different concepts in the world behind a language are perceived by the speakers of that language and how these concepts are transferred into semantic forms. This will have to be done for each of Nida’s semantic classes: Objects, Events, Abstracts (also called Attributes), and Relationals.

This is the subject to which I have devoted my dissertation. I went through each of Nida’s semantic classes of lexical units and made a detailed study of the way words belonging to these classes are used in the Old Testament. I looked at the semantic argument structure
required by different classes of words, I studied other words that occur in the same context, including synonyms and antonyms, and I also payed a lot of attention to the way words are used figuratively, as these are the ways in which we can gain insight in some of the cognitive processes that might have taken place in the mind of the speakers of this language. Only in this way we can determine the semantic domains that were relevant to the speakers of Biblical Hebrew and that are relevant to us today as well if we want to understand the world behind the Old Testament.

5.1 Modern Technology and the Organization of Dictionaries

Another important point is the following: We have to realize that times are changing. In these days, when the information technology is advancing at an amazing speed we really have to start questioning the usefulness of a printed dictionary. Many scholars already make use of computer programs that display the biblical texts, have powerful search engines, and give access to grammatical, lexicographic, and other relevant information about that text at one click of the mouse. With the help of tools like this there is no need anymore of leafing through large indexes (if they exist) while being referred from one entry to another without the absolute guarantee that you will find what you are looking for.

If we make use of this technology it does not really matter very much anymore how the dictionary is organized. It can be organized both alphabetically (like the more traditional dictionaries) and according to semantic domains (like Louw and Nida’s lexicon). Once we use the right software with the right search facilities we can have our data displayed in whichever way we want.

5.2 Lexical vs. Contextual Meaning

Another important consideration. Louw (1991) makes an important distinction between what he calls the *lexical* and the *contextual* meaning of words. The former deals with those aspects of meaning that a word “contributes in and of itself”, whereas the latter deals with the information provided by the utterance in which that word occurs “involving the circumstances of and the objects referred to in a specific context in terms of its usage in such a context along with other words or phrases contributing to the context”. A distinction like this --though we would have to formulate it a little bit more precisely-- would help us deal effectively with words like δεσιξ and τεσμ. It would be very rewarding if we could make a distinction between the *lexical* meanings of these words and their *contextual* meanings. The former would deal with the meanings of these nouns in their minimal context whereas the latter would deal with their meanings in a wider context. The *lexical* meaning of a word would focus on the *shared* semantic features of all occurrences of that word, whereas its *contextual* meaning would take *all* its semantic features into consideration.

But since we have to study the meaning of a word within its semantic domain, we will need to make a distinction between *lexical* and *contextual* semantic domains as well. This implies that most lexical entries have to be classified twice and receive both *lexical* and *contextual* labels. In other words, every (sub)entry may have one or more *lexical* meanings and will therefore be assigned to one or more *lexical* semantic domains. For each *lexical* meaning, in turn, we may find one or more different contexts, each providing its own relevant information that will need to be covered by one or more *contextual* semantic domains.

In order to illustrate this further, let us look at the word λεβάζεξ “rope”, which, *lexically*, and according to LN’s list of domains, should be classified under *Artifacts*. This word, however, is used in many different contexts, as we can see in the examples below:
(a) as an instrument for measuring:

REF 2 Samuel 8:2
BHS λεβεξαζβ ≤σδαμψρο βαζμτεψα Ρχψρο
RSV And he defeated Moab, and measured them with a line, ...

(b) as an instrument for hunting:

REF Job 18:10
BHS :βψτψνψγλεκ βαζμνοξαμνονανεοεψ /μοαλμνονανεοεψ
RSV A rope is hid for him in the ground, a trap for him in the path.

(c) as an object that helps to keep a tent in its place:

REF Isaiah 33:20
BHS...
RSV ..., an immovable tent, whose stakes will never be plucked up, nor will any of its cords be broken.

(d) as a part of the rigging of a ship:

REF Isaiah 33:23
BHS
RSV Your tackle hangs loose; it cannot hold the mast firm in its place, or keep the sail spread out.

(e) as a sign of submission:

REF 1 Kings 20:31
BHS
RSV ... let us put sackcloth on our loins and ropes upon our heads, ...

Now in whatever context λεβεξ occurs, it remains an artifact. Lexically, nothing changes. Contextually, however, there is a lot of variation.

It should be noted, however, that one single entry may have more than one lexical meaning. The verb υβεξ, for instance, has six lexical meanings, which will be listed below, in the form of definitions:

(a) to go to a location where one will not be readily seen by others and/or be safe from danger

(b) location where one will be safe from danger

(c) causative of [a]: to cause someone else to go to a location where that person will not be readily seen by others and/or be safe from danger

(d) to leave in a such a way that other people do not notice

(e) as [c], but without indication of a specific location: to keep someone from (physical or non-physical) harm

(f) as [a], but extended to events: to come to a stop

For each of these six lexical meanings, however, we can find several different contexts, each of which provides information that can be relevant to the text, and that needs to be covered by
one or more contextual domains. Now if we incorporate this contextual information, in the form of glosses, into the little scheme above, we will get something like this:

(a) to go to a location where one will not be readily seen by others and/or be safe from danger
    • to hide oneself (out of fear of a supernatural being)
    • to hide oneself (out of fear of an aggressor)
    • to hide oneself (out of shame or shyness during a public gathering)
    • to withdraw, step aside (out of respect for someone important during a public gathering)
    • to hide oneself, ambush (in order to attack someone)

(b) location where one will be safe from danger
    • hiding-place (against an aggressor)
    • hiding-place (against the wind)

(c) causative of [a]: to cause someone else to go to a location where that person will not be readily seen by others and/or be safe from danger
    • to put away, hide (in prisons)
    • to hide someone (in order to keep him/her from harm)

(d) to leave in a such a way that other people do not notice
    • to leave secretly

(e) as [c], but without indication of a specific location: to keep someone from (physical or non-physical) harm
    • to hide someone > to protect someone (by God, from slander)
    • to hide someone > to protect someone (by God, in the shadow of his hand)

(f) as [a], but extended to events: to come to a stop
    • to hide oneself (of one's voice) > to become silent, stop speaking (during a public gathering)

For more examples, see the sample dictionary in section 8.

6. LEXICAL SEMANTIC DOMAINS

In my dissertation several chapters have been devoted to a detailed study of all semantic categories in Biblical Hebrew in order to determine the lexical semantic domains that are relevant for this language. It is impossible to summarize this entire research in a few words. I went through each of Nida's semantic classes of lexical units (Objects, Events, etc.) and made a detailed study of the way words belonging to these classes are used in the Old Testament. In this paper I can only outline the results, and I will restrict myself to Objects and Events.

6.1. Objects

As far as the semantic category of Objects, is concerned, I have come to the conclusion that the following eight lexical semantic domains cover the different lexical meanings of this class of lexical units sufficiently:

(a) Animals – all living creatures, with the exception of human beings

(b) Deities – all supernatural beings
(c) **Parts** – all *Objects* that cannot exist in isolation but are an integral part of another *Object* and therefore usually occur as part of an associative construction, or require a possessive pronoun

(d) **People** – all human beings

(e) **Plants** – all plants and trees

(f) **Products** – all inanimate *Objects*, usually of a relatively small size, produced by *People*, *Deities*, *Animals*, or *Plants*.

(g) **Scenery** – all inanimate *Objects*, with the exception of *Plants*, that usually cannot be moved, and are part of the scenery in which events in the Old Testament take place

(h) **Substances** – all inanimate *Objects*, shaped in such a way that they usually cannot be counted but are to be measured instead, and from which other *Objects* can be produced

### 6.2. Events

The following four *lexical* semantic domains were found for the semantic category of *Events*:

(a) **Description** – all *Events* that describe the features of *Objects*, e.g. θζξ “to be strong”, θ ψζΑζ “strong”, η.temperature ζΑζ “strength”, but also ≤μH “to destroy” and ττξ “to break”.

(b) **Position** – all *Events* that describe the relationship between *Objects* and the environment in which they are located, e.g. Φλη “to go”, δμν “to stand”

(c) **Connection** – all *Events* that describe the relationship between *Objects* that are attached to one or more other *Objects*, e.g. ζξο “to grasp”, θβδ “to cleave to”.

(d) **Perception** – all *Events* that describe the relationship between *Objects* and the mind of animate beings, σμΗ “to hear”. σδψ “to know”

As I have mentioned already, *Events* in Biblical Hebrew are often used in a figurative way. This does not happen incidentally. My research has shown that this is a structural phenomenon. Within each *lexical* semantic domain we can discern different patterns of figurative extension of meaning. I have tried to incorporate these patterns in the semantic framework that I would like to propose. For each of the four domains mentioned above we have to make a distinction between three *levels of abstraction*:

A. *Events* occurring in propositions with an *Object* as their main argument, and used with their basic, concrete sense

**REF** [Leviticus 26:31](#): (≤μΗ, hiph. **Description**)

BHS

≤εκψ ΕΗ\(\perp\delta\perp\thetaι\mu\perp\tau\varepsilon\) ψιτ \[ΓμυH(ηΡιω ηA\perpB|\rhoAξ \perpεκψ Ω\perpAω−\tau\varepsilon\]

ψιΓτατ \(\phi\) \(\nu\perp\omega\)

RSV And I will lay your cities waste, and will make your sanctuaries desolate, ...

---

1 Within the *lexical* domain of *Perception*, there is no distinction between *Events* with an *Object* as their main argument and those that have an *Event* in that position.
In addition to this another distinction needs to be made. Semanticists often distinguish between different types of Events: States, Processes, Actions, etc. See, for example Beekman, Callow, and Kopesec (1981). This type of distinction can be made for Biblical Hebrew as well. It is reflected—though somewhat inconsistently—in the different stem formations (binyanim) of the Hebrew verbs. The hithpa’el stem formation often has a reflexive meaning, the hiph’il often functions as a causative of the qal, etc. Unfortunately the actual language data do not allow us to rely on these patterns too much. There are too many exceptions to these “rules”. But even though it is not possible to link these different stem derivations to the binyanim it is still possible to distinguish between a number of different types of Events. I would like to incorporate this distinction in the semantic framework for Events that I am proposing in the following way: Each of the three subcategories (A,B,C) mentioned above is to be further subdivided into the following three levels of derivation:

(1) State/Process – the simplest type of Event, found in propositions of which the main argument (the Statant) is not in control of the Event, (often found in the qal stem formation)

(2) Action – a derivation of the State/Process where the main argument has the semantic function of Agent and is in control of the Event (often found in the qal and hithpa’el stem formations).
(3) **Causative** – a derivation of the *Action* in that a third argument (*Causer*) is added, which takes over the control of the *Event* from the *Agent* and actually causes that *Agent* to perform the *Action* described above (often found in the *pi‘el* and *hiph‘il* stem formations).

Because of the relatively complex hierarchical structure presented above, there is a need to refer to each different *lexical* semantic domain a more concise way. This will be done with the help of (relatively) short labels, e.g.

- *Description A1* (for a, A, 1)
- *Position C2* (for b, C, 2)
- *Connection B3* (for c, B, 3)

etc.

### 7. CONTEXTUAL SEMANTIC DOMAINS

In section 5 I have suggested that we make a distinction between *lexical* and *contextual* semantic domains. As has been explained earlier, the former are intended to cover the core meaning of a word as it occurs in its minimal context, whereas the latter are supposed to cover the word in its entire context, including all semantic features that are relevant to that context. This means that often more than one *contextual* domain will be needed to cover one single (sub)entry in the lexicon.

In section 6 we have discussed the *lexical* semantic domains that are needed to cover the *lexical* meanings of *Objects* and *Events* in Biblical Hebrew. In this section we will briefly discuss some of the aspects of *contextual* semantic domains. In my dissertation I have included a sample dictionary of all words in Biblical Hebrew that begin with the letter cheth (ג). In addition to the *lexical* domains that I have already mentioned in the previous section I needed 86 different *contextual* domains to cover the *contextual* meanings of all these entries in an adequate way.

Among these are the following:

**Affection**

All terms relating to attitudes and emotions of love, affection, or compassion that people and supernatural beings may have for others, including terms indicating the opposite of affection, like feelings of hatred, disgust, and repulsion. For attitudes and emotions of (dis)respect, see: *Status*.

**Alcohol**

All terms relating to alcoholic drinks, and their effects on people.

**Anger**

All terms relating to emotions of dissatisfaction, anger, and irritation.

**Animals**

All terms relating to animals and their behavior, including animal husbandry and hunting and fishing.

**Apparition**

All terms relating to the apparition of supernatural beings to man, both in a somehow physical form and in a more spiritual way.

For an illustration of the way *contextual* semantic domains are functioning in the semantic framework that I am proposing for Biblical Hebrew, see the samples given in section 8.
8. SAMPLES

βοξ noun, m. ββξ

(a) **Objects: Parts**
small bag formed by a folded piece of cloth; part a garment; used to can carry small objects, which will not be visible from the outside

Crafts; Clothing; Search > Publicity; Wrong – βοξ | βμξ “to hide (one's iniquity) in the fold of one's garment” > to hide (one's iniquity) from others (JOB.31:33)

ἐβξ

(1) verb

(a) **Events: Description, Object, State/Process**

hithp. to become solid; of liquid substances; as a result of low temperatures during cold weather

Liquids; Temperature; Weather - to freeze (JOB.38:30)

(2) verb ἐβξαμ noun, m. ἐβξαμ noun, m. ηβξ

(a) **Events: Position, Object, Action**
niph.; pu.; hithp. to go to a location where one will not be readily seen by others and/or be safe from danger

Search; Fear; Apparition - to hide oneself (out of fear of a supernatural being) (GEN.3:8,10; 1CH.21:20; DAN.10:7)

Search; Fear; Hardship - to hide oneself (out of fear of an aggressor) (JOS.2:16; 10:16,17,27; JDG.9:5; 1SA.13:6; 14:11,22; 19:2; 23:23; 2KI.11:3; 2CH.18:24; 22:9,12; JOB.24:4; AMO.9:3)

Search; Status; Groups - to hide oneself (out of shame or shyness during a public gathering) (1SA.10:22)

Search; Status; Groups - to withdraw, step aside (out of respect for someone important during a public gathering) (JOB.29:8)

Search; Violence - to hide oneself, ambush (in order to attack someone) (2SA.17:9)

(b) **Events > Objects: Position, Object, Action**
noun location where one will be safe from danger

Search; Hardship - hiding-place (against an aggressor) (1SA.23:23)

Search; Weather - hiding-place (against the wind) (ISA.32:2)

(c) **Events: Position, Object, Causative**
hiph.; hoph. (passive) causative of [a]: to cause someone else to go to a location where that person will not be readily seen by others and/or be safe from danger

Restriction - to put away, hide (in prisons) (ISA.42:22)
Search; Care; Hardship - to hide someone (in order to keep him/her from harm) (JOS.6:17,25; 1KI.18:4,13; 2KI.6:29)

(d) **Events:** Position, Object, Abstract, Action  
niph. to leave in a such a way that other people do not notice

Travel; Publicity - to leave secretly (GEN.31:27)

(e) **Events:** Position, Object, Abstract, Causative  
niph. (passive); hiph. as [c], but without indication of a specific location: to keep someone from (physical or non-physical) harm

Care; Communication; Providence - to hide someone > to protect someone (by God, from slander) (JOB.5:21)

Care; Hardship; Providence - to hide someone > to protect someone (by God, in the shadow of his hand) (ISA.49:2)

(f) **Events:** Position, Event, Action  
niph. as [a], but extended to events: to come to a stop

Communication; Groups - to hide oneself (of one's voice) > to become silent, stop speaking (during a public gathering) (JOB.29:10)

\(\beta\beta\xi\) verb \(\beta\Omega\xi, \beta\beta\beta\Omega\xi, \eta\Lambda\beta\nu\xi\)

**Events:** Connection, Object, Abstract, State/Process  
qal to experience a deep affection for somebody else

Affection - to love (DEU.33:3)

\(\beta\beta\beta\Omega\xi\) noun, name \(\beta\beta\xi\)

**Relationals:** Object Referents  
son of Reuel; Midianite; ancestor of Kenites

Names; Individuals - Hobab (NUM.10:29; JDG.4:11)

\(\eta\beta\xi\) verb \(\epsilon\beta\xi, \eta\wp\wp\alpha\beta\Gamma\xi, /\psi\beta\epsilon\xi\)

**Events:** Position, Object, Action  
qal; niph. to go to a location where one will not be readily seen by others and/or be safe from danger

Search; Fear; Hardship - to hide oneself (out of fear of an aggressor)  
(1KI.22:25; ISA.26:20; JER.49:10)

Search; Violence - to hide oneself, ambush (in order to attack someone)  
(2KI.7:12)

\(\eta\Lambda\beta\nu\xi\) noun, name \(\beta\beta\xi\)

**Relationals:** Object Referents  
son of Shemer; tribe of Asher
Names; Individuals - Hubbah (1CH.7:34[a])

(a) 1CH.7:34 - MT-Q NIV NJB NJV NRSV CEV; MT-K RSV REB TEV ηΑβνξψ
“Jehubbah”

ρ | βΑξ noun, name

Relationals: Object Referents
river; in Mesopotamia; eastern tributary of Euphrates

Names; Nature - Habor (2KI.17:6; 18:11; 1CH.5:26)

ηρρ βαξ noun, f. ρβξ(1)

Events: Description, Object, State/Process
state of physical injury apparently evident in a mark left on the body, caused by sickness or inflicted by someone else

Body; Hardship - bruise, sore, wound (GEN.4:23; EXO.21:25; PSA.38:6; PRO.20:30; ISA.53:5)

Body; Punish, Reward - bruise, sore, wound (inflicted on someone else as punishment) (EXO.21:25)

Body; Personification; Groups; Hardship - bruise, sore, wound > deplorable condition (of an entire nation) (ISA.1:6)
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