A NEW ANALYSIS OF A KEY HEBREW TERM
THE SEMANTICS OF *GALAH* ('TO GO INTO EXILE')

David K. H. Gray

Summary

This study is an attempt to update James Barr's work on the semantics of biblical language by analysing one Hebrew term: גלה II (galah II) 'to go into exile'. The article criticises existing entries in theological dictionaries, as well as providing a new analysis. The writer is one of the researchers on the Key Terms of Biblical Hebrew project. The project should benefit others who would like to dig deeper into the meaning of Hebrew terms as they are used in the Old Testament.

1. Introduction

The *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* analyses גלה (*galah*) in two main sections.[1] One, which I will call '*galah* I' is termed 'religious' and contains *galah*'s use in the sense of 'to uncover, reveal'. The other, henceforth *galah* II, is termed 'secular' and contains *galah*'s use in the sense of 'to go into exile'. This arbitrary distinction typifies early top-down word studies, particularly those carried out by many of those who contributed to Kittel's New Testament word-books.[2] This movement, and the theological word-books it spawned, has been much criticised, not least by James Barr in his monumental work *The Semantics of Biblical Language*.[3] The study that follows is an analysis of *galah* II using the principles of modern linguistics, including

---

[1] Hans-Jürgen Zobel in *TDOT* II (translated by John T. Willis; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1977, rev. edn): 476-88.

[2] Gerhard Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vols.1-11 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938-74).

[3] Barr, J, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961). Though in TDOT's defence, they did respond to Barr's criticism of certain articles in TDNT by modifying their approach.

cognitive linguistics, which is an attempt to find out how the brain's cognitive processes organise information. The Key Terms of Biblical Hebrew project (henceforth KTBH)[4] uses this as its theoretical basis, and is therefore attempting a bottom-up approach in order to determine the meaning of Hebrew words in their context. As one of the researchers on KTBH my purpose is to show how this approach solves some of the problems in word studies. The use of *frames* and (more artificially) *semantic domains*, as ways of organising information in our minds, is the basis of cognitive linguistics. Top-down approaches that start with theological ideas and premises and work down to the text are much less productive than methods that look at how words are actually used in their various contexts. The following study shows that *galah* II has 'religious' meanings. Conversely *galah* I has 'secular' meanings, such as 'to uncover.'[5]

The *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*[6] article on *galah* suggests that the two senses can both be understood under a basic sense of 'uncover', in which case *galah* II means 'to uncover the land'.[7] This appears to be an example of '*the myth of point meaning* – the supposition that even if a word has a range of possible meanings attested in the dictionary, there lies behind them all a single "basic" meaning'.[8] In practice it makes little difference whether it is one original root or two, as deciding whether to put the two main senses down as homonyms or polysemous uses simply depends on the etymology – that is, the historical derivation of the root. The two basic senses, as far as we can see, are:

> i.   uncover, reveal
> ii. depart, go into exile

---

[4]   This project is organised by SIL-Eurasia, SIL being Wycliffe's linguistic sister organisation, but involves researchers from many different organisations, including the United Bible Societies. See <http://www.ktbh-team.org/> [accessed 20th Feb. 2007] for further information, including the entry for *galah* and some other sample entries.

[5]   E.g. Lev. 20:11 (!). Further proof of this will be found in the final KTBH article, which will cover all meanings of *galah* I & II.

[6]   Willem A. VanGemeren, ed., *NIDOTTE* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997).

[7]   'There is no need to postulate two homologous roots for these two meanings, however, since "emigration" or "exile" can be understood as an uncovering of the land, and thus revealing, uncovering, could be the original meaning of *galah* (Zobel, TDOT 2:478; so also Westermann-Albertz, THAT 1:418-19), and a people uncovers the land by emigrating or being sent into exile.' David M. Howard, Jr. in VanGemeren, ed., *The New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Vol. 1 (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997): 861.

[8]   Peter Cotterell in *NIDOTTE*, Vol. 1: 148.

The focus of this paper is the latter sense.

The bulk of KTBH research, and therefore my research, consists of *syntagmatic analysis*. This involves analysis of the term within the sentence, showing grammatical and semantic relationships with words in other categories. For instance someone analysing a verb will be interested in agents (often the subject), patients (often the object), experiencers, and so on.

Some *paradigmatic analysis* has also been carried out. The editor of *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*[9], David Clines, describes the difference between the two types of analysis as follows:

> **Paradigmatic analysis**. The purpose of a paradigmatic analysis is to situate a word within the functioning system of the language (langue, in Saussure's terminology). Whereas **syntagmatic analysis** attempts to establish the meaning of a word by considering its connection with other words in the same sentence, paradigmatic analysis attempts to fix its meaning by considering other words available to the speaker or author of a given sentence, but rejected by him or her in favour of the word that now stands in our text.
>
> *… For us, Synonyms and Antonyms mean essentially words attested in our texts in synonymous or antonymous relationship with the term under consideration*.[10] (italics mine)

The last sentence is key – we in KTBH have taken this principle on board for our analysis of Hebrew terms. The intention is to use a bottom-up approach[11], where we start with texts and use paradigmatic analysis to construct domains. A top-down approach would start with an artificially-constructed set of domains, and work down to Hebrew terms, whereas in this article, (paradigmatic) semantic analysis of *galah* shows the similarities between *galah* and other Hebrew terms used in the context.

Here is an example of syntagmatic and paradigmatic analysis of the verb 'to sleep' in the following quote:

---

[9]   David J.A. Clines, ed. *DCH* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993-2001)

[10]   David Clines, 'The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew', published in *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays 1967-1998*, Volume 2 (JSOTSup, 292; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), pp. 602-12 and found on <http://www.shef .ac.uk/uni/academic/A-C/biblst/DJACcurrres/Postmodern2/Dictionary.html> [accessed 8th Sept. 2006]

[11]   See Sue Groom, *Linguistic Analysis of Biblical Hebrew* (Cumbria: Paternoster, 2003):164-168 for an example.

> Let China sleep, runs Napoleon's famous saying, for when she awakes, she will shake the world.[12]

Syntagmatic analysis focuses on the words 'let sleep' and 'China'. 'China' is the theme, that is the subject being talked about. 'Let sleep' assumes an agent, but the agent is not made explicit.

Paradigmatic analysis shows that 'to awake' is an antonym for 'to sleep'. This is because the two words are clearly in contrast with each other.

In summary then, syntagmatic analysis helps in finding out what meaning the word has in a certain context, triggered by its frame of use; whereas paradigmatic analysis helps find out its domain by identifying close synonyms and antonyms. Many readers will want to know the difference between domains and frames, so these are explained next.

The usefulness of *(semantic) domains* when undertaking word studies has been shown by dictionaries such as that of Louw and Nida[13] and *NIDOTTE*[14]. A domain can be thought of as an area or range of meanings containing the meaning of the term in question: for example the domain 'sea creatures' in English would contain 'fish' and 'mollusc'. *NIDOTTE*, in its 'Guide to Old Testament Theology and Exegesis', gives an example by analysing the term דבק (*dabaq*) as it is used in Ruth:

> Consider other words (synonyms or antonyms) that help one define the nature of *dabaq*, cling, in Ruth. The article on this verb (See *dabaq*, H1815) offers two such possibilities: *'ahab*, love (H170; cf. Gen. 34:3; 1 Kgs 11:2; Prov. 18:24) and *chesed 2* (H2876; see *TDOT* 3:79-84, esp. 83). Both of these are in the semantic field of love…

> The semantic field may open further possibilities for exploration. Which words are used in Ruth? What is the difference between *'ahab*, *chasad 2*, *racham*, and *dabaq*? A study of this kind helps in determining more closely the meaning of *dabaq* in the discourse of Ruth 1.[15]

For *semantic field* read 'domain'. Turning to the article on *dabaq* we find the following:

---

[12]   Financial Times Weekend, Saturday March 18th 2006: 1.
[13]   Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains* (1988).
[14] especially Volume 5, which contains an 'Index of Semantic Fields'
[15]   VanGemeren in the 'Guide' of *NIDOTTE* (electronic version) or Vol. 1: 214.

> Three times *dabaq* is used almost synonymously in association with *'ahab*, love (H170): Gen. 34:3; 1 Kgs 11:2; Prov. 18:24. Psalm 63 can be considered a meditation on the full spiritual significance of the term, though it is notable that whereas *dabaq* is suitably used of human attachment to God, God's relationship to humans is expressed rather through *chesed 2* (H2876; see *TDOT* 3:79-84, esp. 83).[16]

Here we can see the theological reasoning behind the author's analysis of *dabaq*, especially when they contrast it with חֶסֶד (*khesed,*[17] 'loyal love'): the author is contrasting divine love with human love – a theological distinction. The fact is that *dabaq* and *khesed* are unrelated, in paradigmatic terms.[18] Further, *dabaq* and אהב (*'ahav*) are not found together in Ruth, though they are related elsewhere. *NIDOTTE* has, partially at least, used a top-down approach whereby the domains are defined first, and the terms are fitted into these artificially-constructed domains afterwards. 'The listing of about two thousand fields … provides a convenient way of finding groups of Hebrew words that are collocated in the Hebrew text or are conceptually interrelated through the use of *English words with similar meaning*' (emphasis mine).[19] It is the latter practice of involving English concepts, coupled with theologically-based reasoning, which shows their approach. For a linguistically-sound example of a word-study, see Sue Groom's analysis of מכר (*makhar*).[20]

A word is best defined by comparing it with its close synonyms, and contrasting it with its antonyms, as defined by *DCH* (see above). The question, 'Why this designation, and not that?' arises, and can only be answered by a comparison of the use of each of the designations as they occur in the Hebrew Bible.

The usefulness of the concept of *frames* in recent linguistic research cannot be underestimated. Frames show the way the mind organises information, according to cognitive linguistics.[21] They can be defined as '… specific unified frameworks of knowledge, or coherent

---

[16] George J. Brooke in *NIDOTTE* (electronic version) or Vol. 1: 911.

[17] Transliterated as 'chesed' in *NIDOTTE*.

[18] The terms only occur together in Gen. 19:19, where חֶסֶד is paradigmatically related to חֵן (khen), rather than דבק.

[19] VanGemeren in *NIDOTTE:* Vol. 1: 12.

[20] Groom, *Linguistic Analysis*: 164-68. There is also a KTBH entry for מכר (makhar) 'to sell' on the KTBH website (see above).

[21] It is a reaction against classical, or structuralist views of categories. George Lakoff *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: what categories reveal about the mind* (Chicago: University Press, 1990): 10, 153-54.

schematizations of experience'.[22] Taylor defines frames as a knowledge network linking multiple (semantic) domains.[23] Langacker uses the designation 'primary domain' for what we have been referring to as 'frame',[24] but a quote from his work illustrates the usefulness of these 'primary domains' (read 'frames'):

> Further refinement of the network model permits the resolution of an additional problem, illustrated by the contrast between *roe* and *caviar*. Each term designates a mass of fish eggs … What, then, is responsible for the semantic contrast between *roe* and *caviar*, which are definitely nonsynonymous?
>
> The difference, I suggest, lies in the relative prominence of certain domains in the matrices of these lexical items. In the case of *roe*, the role of the designated mass with respect to the reproductive cycle of fish is central and obligatorily accessed, whereas its role in abstract domains pertaining to the preparation and (conspicuous) consumption of foods is peripheral and activated only on a contingent basis. This ranking is reversed in the case of *caviar*: the domains that construe the designated mass as an item of consumption are salient and obligatorily activated, but the relation of this mass to fish reproduction is secondary (and often suppressed).
>
> The choice of primary domain is … responsible for the semantic contrast between roe and caviar.[25]

So frames are conceptual networks that cut across domains, and therefore link them, and vice versa. For a given word in a given cotext, only one frame will be active; but consider a word as a sign pointing to a bundle of meanings: it can interact with multiple frames and domains.[26] An example from Old Testament studies may help. The domain 'sacrifices' would include terms such as עלה (*'olah*) and שלם (*shelem*). They would be close synonyms of one another. The frame

---

[22] Fillmore, quoted in F. Ungerer and H. J. Schmid *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics* (Harlow, England: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd. 1996): 209.

[23] J. R. Taylor, *Linguistic Categorization* (Oxford: OUP, 1989; 2nd edition, Oxford: OUP, 1995).

[24] Related terms are 'scenes, scripts, schemata' which can either be defined more rigorously, or used to mean 'frame' as we have defined it above, depending on the author.

[25] Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1987): 164-65.

[26] Frames are not only useful in discussing alternative designations for one referent. They are also useful in explaining why, for instance, 'large black cat' sounds more correct than 'black large cat'. It is a question of primary frames. The most prominent adjective occurs next the noun it describes, so: (large) black cat rather than (black) large cat. The frame of colour is more prominent than that of size, when referring to cats.

'sacrifice' would include not only be evoked by those terms, but also מִזְבֵּחַ (*mizbeakh*) and all the הַקֹּדֶשׁ (*haqodesh*) 'the holy [place/ thing]'s referred to in Exodus-Numbers. The frame 'sacrifice' would also include information about utensils for sacrifice, places where sacrifices were carried out, and the people who were allowed to place them on the *mizbeakh*. This means that domains such as 'utensils' and 'priests' intersect with the frame 'sacrifice'. According to cognitive linguistics, frames are the primary way our minds actually categorise encyclopedic knowledge (about, e.g., 'sacrifice'), whereas domains cut across frames and link them at the level of synonyms, antonyms and associated terms as we hear or read the text. Associated terms would include those used for utensils and priests, for example.

A study of the frames evoked by the term *galah* shed light on the metaphorical conceptual network underlying its use and helped to identify and define its non-core senses. This article shows that *galah* II has a dominant frame of 'exile', and intersects with several domains, including 'divine punishment' and 'covenant'. It also shows that *galah* II is found in contexts where the frame activated is other than exile, for example 'leaving' or 'removal'. (See meaning 3 in the KTBH entry for *galah* II on the KTBH website.[27]) A study of domains helped in showing how the various senses of *galah* and its cognates relate to its close synonyms and antonyms, as well as to other key terms. The need to find the term's domains required paradigmatic analysis. Of particular interest is the study of terms that occur in synonymous or antithetical parallelism with *galah*.

Instead of grammatical categories, it is often helpful to employ participant roles when analysing the use of a term. Often the syntactical analysis of parts of a sentence and their semantic import do not line up exactly. Linguists used to refer to this as *skewing*, but recent studies in both cognitive linguistics and relevance theory have shown that communication is heavily dependant on shared cognitive backgrounds, and uses implicatures far more than we had previously realised. Readers need to know more than the linguistic information encoded in the phrase in order to interpret it. They need some additional context. Both cognitive linguistics and relevance theory talk about *encyclopedic information*, which is accessed by readers as and when needed in order

---

27 http://www.ktbh-team.org.

to interpret sentences. It is usually possible to intuit from the context which information needs to be accessed.

In addition it may be good to note that grammatical analysis often raises unhelpful distinctions. For example, the *hiphil* of *galah* 'to take into exile' and the *hophal* of the same verb 'to be taken into exile' both have an agent, but with the passive form of the verb the agent is only implied rather than stated. Somebody took the people into exile. The patient is the same in each case: the people. The sense of *galah* is virtually the same in each case. The difference is a matter of *focus*.[28] With the *hiphil* the focus will often be on the agent, whereas when the *hophal* is used the focus is on the people or their movement into exile. In order to analyse the various texts we choose, it helps to have a set of semantic labels to refer to the roles of the various *participants*. The following table summarises the main terms used by KTBH, and therefore in this paper:

Participant roles	Explanation
AGENT	In an event involving action, the agent is the one with control over the event.
EXPERIENCER	A sentient being that experiences an internal state.
EFFECTOR	The doer of an action.
CONTENT	The entity that is perceived or experienced by experiencers.
PATIENT	The one undergoing a change in condition.
THEME	The one undergoing a change in location.
INSTRUMENT	The one causing the agent to take action, or the experiencer to participate in the action.
BENEFACTIVE	The one for whom an action is taking place.
RECIPIENT	The one who receives something.
SOURCE	The origin of a motion event, whether locative or directive.
GOAL	The end point of a motion event, whether locative or directive.
PATH	A route. The intervening point(s) of a state of affairs.
LOCATION	A spatial locus or state of affairs.
SOURCE	A beginning. The point of origin of a state of affairs.

---

[28] See Jean Marc Heimerdinger, *Topic, Focus and Foreground In Ancient Hebrew Narratives* (Sheffield: JSOT SS 295, 1999).

In summary then, participant roles can encode information more appropriately than grammatical categories, since the analysis is concerned with pragmatic (meanings in context), rather than syntactic (meanings in isolation) roles. They have therefore been used in this paper in preference to grammatical categories.

2. Methodology

First it is necessary to outline the problems:

1. Which occurrences are *galah* II rather than *galah* I?
2. How have texts been chosen for analysis?

The following comments on the above will suffice for the moment:

1. Evan Shoshan's concordance largely solves the first issue by analysing *galah* I and II separately.[29] One occurrence could go either way, however: Isaiah 38:12 could be *galah* I *or galah* II.
2. All seventy-four occurrences of *galah* II have been studied in their context.[30] The corpus chosen is therefore the entire Hebrew Bible. Any dubious occurrences (lines of Hebrew which are footnoted in BHS[31] or labelled in the HOTTP[32] as being corrupt or having alternative readings due to their apparent incomprehensibility) have been avoided or noted. It is interesting to note that *galah* II does not occur in the Torah, but does occur in the Prophets and Writings.

3. Analysis

What follows here is a rationale for the breakdown of senses and contextual meanings of *galah* in the KTBH entry (on the website), and an explanation of the entry in general.

---

[29] Evan Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Old Testament* (2nd Edition, Jerusalem: Baker, 1993): 235-36.

[30] There are 187 occurrences of *galah* overall. There has not been space in this article to show the analysis of all of them, however.

[31] Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia

[32] Hebrew Old Testament Text Project <http://www.ubs-translations.org/cms/index.php?id=108,0,0,1,0,0#_Preliminary_and_Interim> [accessed 2nd April 2007]

Some examples of syntagmatic and paradigmatic analysis that enabled a breakdown of the meanings of *galah* II follow.

2 Kings 25:21   וַיִּגֶל יְהוּדָה מֵעַל אַדְמָתוֹ

'… So Judah went into captivity, away from its land.'

- The frame is exile.
- Syntagmatic analysis: *the people Judah* are the theme.
- Paradigmatic analysis: אֲדָמָה (*'adamah*)[33] *'land'* intersects with exile here, so 'the land' needs to be added to the list of domains.

Jeremiah 29:1   עַד אֲשֶׁר־הֵסִיר יְהוָה אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַל פָּנָיו

כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּיַד כָּל־עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים וַיִּגֶל

יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַל אַדְמָתוֹ אַשּׁוּרָה עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:

'… until the LORD removed Israel out of his sight, as he had spoken by all his servants the prophets. So Israel was exiled from their own land to Assyria until this day.' (RSV)

- The frame is exile.
- Syntagmatic analysis: *the people Israel* are the theme, or patient. *The LORD* is the agent.
- Paradigmatic analysis: סור (*sur*) 'to remove' is a synonym of *galah*.

Isaiah 24:11b, c   עָרְבָה כָּל־שִׂמְחָה גָּלָה מְשׂוֹשׂ הָאָרֶץ

'… all joy has reached its eventide;
the gladness of the earth is banished.' (RSV)

- The frame for this and all the following examples is a metaphorical extension of exile, in this case 'leaving or departing in general'.
- Syntagmatic analysis: *gladness of the earth* is the theme.
- '… the gladness of the earth has left'? Most translations (RSV, ESV, NIV, NJB, NLT, NRS, TNK[34]) seem to use 'is/has been

---

[33] One interesting further study would be the choice of אֲדָמָה (*'adamah*, 'land') rather than אֶרֶץ (*'erets*, 'land') in e.g. 2Kgs 25:21 וַיִּגֶל יְהוּדָה מֵעַל אַדְמָתוֹ 'and Judah was exiled from its land' i.e. why is there a tendency for the former to be used with גלה or one of its synonyms in the frame of exile? The verbs used with מֵעַל + אֲדָמָה will enable one meaning of אֲדָמָה with its associated frame of use to be isolated. But that is for the compilers of אֲדָמָה to look into.

[34] Revised Standard Version, English Standard Version, New International Version, New Jerusalem Bible, New Living Translation, New Revised Standard Version, Tanakh

banished', but this goes too far. The translators have read the sense 'exile' into this, very different, context.[35]

- Paradigmatic analysis: the verb ערב (*'arav*) 'to turn to darkness' in *b* is in parallel with *galah* in *c* and should be added to the domain of *galah* as one of the close synonyms.

Job 20:28   יִגֶל יְבוּל בֵּיתוֹ נִגָּרוֹת בְּיוֹם אַפּוֹ

'The possessions of their house will be carried away,
dragged off in the day of God's wrath.' (NRS)[36]

- Syntagmatic analysis: יְבוּל (*yebul*) *possessions* is the theme. Notice that we have נגר (*nagar*) 'to vanish', in parallel with *galah*, which would normally help us find the sense of *galah* in this context. One associated domain here is *divine punishment*.
- Paradigmatic analysis: נגר ('to vanish') is in parallel with *galah*, and is therefore a synonym here.

Proverbs 27:25a   גָּלָה חָצִיר וְנִרְאָה־דֶּשֶׁא

'When the grass is gone, and new growth appears …'

חָצִיר (*hatsir*) *grass* is the theme. *Galah* must mean either 'to wither and disappear', or 'to be cut', given that grass in that climate would normally be eaten by animals, gathered to make into hay, or withered by the sun, that is it dies during the summer, and only reappears as new growth in the spring. In the KTBH entry we have chosen the former meaning. One domain is *grass and herbs (agriculture)*. The niphal of ראה (*ra'ah*, 'to appear') is therefore an antonym of *galah*. The overall theme of verses 23-27 is the temporal nature of riches, and the need to plan ahead.

Using syntagmatic and paradigmatic analysis for the verb *galah* II, and looking at all occurrences (see full entry on the KTBH website), it was found to have five main meanings:

  (1) To go into exile[37]

---

[35] What James Barr called 'illegitimate totality transfer' *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London, OUP: 1961): 218.

[36] Many translations choose to follow LXX, but MT makes good sense, so emmendation is unnecessary.

[37] This includes uses of metonymy – 'land' for 'people of the land'. The most literal solution would be to translate עַד־יוֹם גְּלוֹת הָאָרֶץ in Judges 18:30 as 'until the land went into exile', though most receptor languages (English included) are unlikely to support that possibility.

(2) To take, or be carried, into exile (The people are deported by YHWH, a foreign king, or similar agent.)

(3) To depart

(4) To be carried away

(5) To wither and disappear

(6) To be removed

Meaning (7) has been reserved for the as-yet-uncompiled meaning of *galah* I 'to reveal'. The meaning listed as (1) in the KTBH entry contains several different grammatical forms of the verb, but all these occurrences have basically the same meaning, and hold that meaning within one frame – exile. The other meanings (2-6) have been separated out according to their frame of use:

No.	Meaning	Frame
(1)	To go into exile	Exile
(2)	To take into exile; to be taken into exile	Exile
(3)	To depart	A metaphorical extension of 'Exile' – leaving or departing in general
(4)	To be carried away	A metaphorical extension of 'Exile' – being taken away
(5)	To wither and disappear	A metaphorical extension of 'Exile' – departure, removal
(6)	To be removed	A metaphorical extension of 'Exile' – removal

Meanings (1) and (2) may share the same frame, but they differ substantially in their participant roles: in (1) the people going into exile are the *theme*; in (2) there is an *agent*, and the people are the *patient* (or *theme*).

Meaning (2) has been broken into its contextual uses, as shown:

	Contextual Use	Verb Form	Comments
(a)	To take into exile	Hiphil	Agent: foreign king; Patient (or theme): the people
(b)	To be taken into exile	Hophal	Implicit agent: (foreign king); patient (or theme): the people

It could be argued that (a) and (b) are one contextual use, but they have been separated out due to the implicit nature of the agent in (b).

So the KTBH entry has been broken up into the above meanings and contextual uses. Please go to the analysis and entry on the KTBH website for further details.

4. Syntagmatic Analysis of 'galah' – Finding its Frames of Use

The complete analysis of *galah* shows that it evokes the following frames (see above, and the KTBH entry on the KTBH web-site for further details):

> Exile (in both of the first two meanings).
> A metaphorical extension of 'exile' – leaving or departing in general.
> A metaphorical extension of 'exile' – being taken away
> A metaphorical extension of 'exile' – departure, removal
> A metaphorical extension of 'exile' – removal

These frames help us to predict the meaning of *galah*. The outcome of this is that Bible translators using the resources provided by KTBH will be able to translate abstract Key Terms such as this systematically, instead of resorting to 'elegant synonymous variation.'[38]

Notice that some of the above frames are 'religious'. Frames show the way the Hebrew mind organised information, according to cognitive linguistics. So using a bottom-up method (syntagmatic analysis), it is now possible to deduce that *galah* II was used in both 'religious' and 'secular' ways, using *TDOT's* categories. The so-called religious uses are simply extended meanings of the verb which evidently became one of the main uses in the Old Testament. This took place as the peoples of Israel and Judah experienced deportation to and exile in Assyria and Babylonia (respectively). Their change in life situation necessitated a new vocabulary, as well as a new theology, as Walter Brueggemann has shown.[39]

---

[38] Robert Alter, *Genesis: Translation and Commentary* (New York, London: W.W. Norton, 1996): xxvi.
[39] Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis, Fortress: 1997): 435-47.

5. Paradigmatic Analysis of 'galah' – Finding its Domains

סור (*sur*) hiphil 'to remove' is a synonym of *galah* (see below). It is used in parallel with *galah* in 2 Kings 17:23, and 'from his [YHWH'S] presence' is also in parallel with 'from its [Israel's] land' (see above).

The hiphil of סגר (*sagar*), 'to deliver up' is used in place of the hiphil of *galah* in Amos 1 (compare v. 6 and v. 9).

The hiphil of בוא, (*bo'*) 'to bring' is used in parallel with the hiphil of *galah* in 1 Chronicles 5:26.

The corresponding verbs *galah* and שבה (*shavah*) 'to take captive' both occur in Jeremiah 13:17-19, below, with the RSV in parallel:

17 וְאִם֙ לֹ֣א תִשְׁמָע֔וּהָ בְּמִסְתָּרִ֥ים   תִּבְכֶּה־נַפְשִׁ֖י מִפְּנֵ֣י גֵוָ֑ה   וְדָמֹ֤עַ תִּדְמַ֨ע

But if you will not listen, my soul will weep in secret for your pride

וְתֵרַ֤ד עֵינִי֙ דִּמְעָ֔ה   כִּ֥י נִשְׁבָּ֖ה עֵ֥דֶר יְהוָֽה: ס

my eyes will weep bitterly   because the LORD's flock
and run down with tears,   has been taken captive.

18 אֱמֹ֥ר לַמֶּ֛לֶךְ וְלַגְּבִירָ֖ה   הַשְׁפִּ֣ילוּ שֵׁ֑בוּ

Say to the king and the   Take a lowly seat,
queen mother:

כִּ֣י יָרַד֙ מַרְאֲשֽׁוֹתֵיכֶ֔ם   עֲטֶ֖רֶת תִּפְאַרְתְּכֶֽם:

for your beautiful crown has come down from your head.

19 עָרֵ֥י הַנֶּ֖גֶב סֻגְּר֑וּ   וְאֵ֣ין פֹּתֵ֑חַ

The cities of the Negeb are   with none to open them;
shut up

הָגְלָ֧ת יְהוּדָ֛ה כֻּלָּ֖הּ   הָגְלָ֥ת שְׁלוֹמִֽים:

all Judah is taken into exile,   wholly taken into exile.

Thompson[40] translates the niphal of שבה as 'has been carried away into captivity'. He translates verse 19b as 'All Judah has been taken into exile, completely exiled.' Although some see verses 15-17 as an independent unit, there are clear literary parallels between 17b and 19b. There is no reason to split 15-19 up except for the introduction of new participants in verse 18. Since שבה and *galah* are in a clear paradigmatic relationship in this context, the former has been recognised as a synonym of *galah*.

---

[40] J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah* (*NICOT*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980)

Other synonyms found:

נגר (*nagar*)	'to be poured'	Job 20:28
ערב (*'arav*)	'to become dark'	Isaiah 24:11
נסע (*nasa'*)	'to be plucked up'	Isaiah 38:12

Antonyms:

The hiphil of בוא (*bo'*) 'to bring' is used in parallelism with the hiphil of *galah* in 1 Chronicles 25:26. This is one of the many cases where YHWH is the agent. The others are 2 Kings 17:11, 1 Chronicles 6:15; Jeremiah 29:7; Lamentations 4:22; Ezekiel 39:28 and Amos 5:27. See also 1 Chronicles 5:26 where YHWEH stirs up the spirit of two Assyrian kings to take several tribes[41] from Israel into exile, and Amos 1:6 where he promises to punish those ('Gaza', that is Philistines?) who sold captives from Israel to Edom. Again, we have found clear evidence for the 'religious' use of *galah* II.

Since כנס (*kanas*) 'to gather' is used in clear paradigmatic relation-ship with *galah* hiphil in Ezekiel 39:28 and Lamentation 4:22, we have added it to the domains list below, under 'Antonyms'.

ראה (*ra'ah*) niphal 'to appear' in Proverbs 27:25 is also an antonym.

As a result of the above analysis the following verbs have been listed as synonyms or antonyms of *galah*:

Synonyms:	בוא hi.[42]	Antonyms:	כנס
	סור hi.		שׁוב hi.
	סגר hi.		ראה ni.
	שׁבה ni.[43]		
	ערב		
	נגר		
	נסע		

NIDOTTE's 'Semantic Field' (that is, domain) provides an interesting comparison with the above synonyms and antonyms. Their domain includes more terms:

> ***Captivity, driving out, exile, persecution** —> *barach 2* (drive away, injure, H1369); —> *galah* (uncover, reveal, be/go away, exile, H1655; *golah*, exile, exiles, H1583; *galut*, exile, exiles, H1661); —> *dabar*

---

[41] The Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh.

[42] Hiphil.

[43] Niphal.

1 (turn/drive away, H1818); —> *nadach 1* (banish, be scattered, be cast out, seduce, H5615); —> *nasag* (overtake, catch up, reach, become prosperous, H5952; *maseget*, overtaking, H5371); —> *radap* (be behind, pursue, persecute, H8103; muredap, persecution, H5284); —> *shabah* (take captive, be taken captive, H8647; *shebi*, captivity, captives, H8660; *shibeyah*, captivity, captives, H8664; *shebiah*, captive, H8665; *shebit*, captivity, H8669); see Pursuit; —> Exile: Theology[44]

Yet we have found very little concrete evidence in the text for these terms (apart from the ones outlined above) occurring in the same unit of Hebrew text. If they are synonyms, why are they never used in parallel with *galah* II? It seems that the *NIDOTTE* team has failed to distinguish between domains and frames. Instead they have combined both into their 'Semantic Field'. Also, their lack of use of frames has meant a reliance on other methods of connecting terms – somewhat theologically based, and top-down, or related to English translation equivalents, and perhaps rather alien to the Hebrew worldview. This has lead them to include terms that are not synonyms as defined by KTBH. The advantage of KTBH's frames is that they point to the way the Hebrew mind might have organised information.

Yet there are some domains activated by terms used in conjunction with (that is, paradigmatic relationship with) *galah*. These are:

The land   אֲדָמָה (*'adamah*, 'land')

Covenant   מִצְוֺת (*mitsvot*), for example 2 Kings 17:19-23

Shame   בּוֹשׁ (*bosh*), for example Isaiah 20:4; 49:21-23; 1 Samuel 4:21-22

6. Conclusion

The various senses of *galah* II have been analysed using syntagmatic and paradigmatic analysis, and have produced the results on the web-site which contains a summary of the (still under construction) KTBH entry for *galah* II.[45] We have attempted to use a bottom-up (syntagmatic and paradigmatic), rather than a top-down approach, so that any synonyms or antonyms found had to be in the cotext, and not as the result of any theological presuppositions or relationship between English translation equivalents of the terms. It was found that a study

---

[44]   VanGemeren, ed., *NIDOTTE* (electronic version) or Vol. 5: 33.

[45]   Note that not all the Scripture references are visible.

of the domains and frames of *galah* was helpful in isolating its various senses. The idea of frames is relatively recent. Sue Groom,[46] for instance, does not refer to them. The fact that they cut across domains makes them useful in that they lead to studies of terms not related directly by meaning but by general theme – for example, 'agriculture'. Frames also provide a criterion for isolating each sense of *galah*. Although the most frequent meaning is 'to go into exile', there are several other important senses that vary quite strongly from this, such as 'to depart, leave'.

The most useful resources were found to be Evan Shoshan's concordance, and *DCH*. *NIDOTTE* was disappointing, in that the article on *galah* was short, and the domain of 'exile' was found to contain terms that fail to occur in paradigmatic relationship with *galah* in the corpus of biblical Hebrew. *TDOT* categorised *galah* II as 'secular', perhaps based on presuppositions drawn from systematic theology, despite the fact that 'exile' as a theme is crucial to an Old Testament theology. In any case, any term should be thoroughly analysed before theological conclusions are drawn. This study has concentrated on the linguistic and the exegetical, without drawing theological conclusions, for which there has not been space. Through linguistic study of the term I have discovered that the main meanings of *galah* II relate to the exile, where the agent is often YAHWEH, and if not YAHWEH, a foreign king acting on the his behest. This shows that *galah* II is just as religious a term as *galah* I, 'to uncover, reveal'.

I have also discovered that, far from having one root meaning of 'to uncover,' *galah* I and *galah* II are unrelated in meaning, as *galah* II is only used to refer to 'land' as a metonymy for its inhabitants – that is, 'people'. Some readers, driven by motives other than exegetical and linguistic, are likely to see links between *galah* I and II, because of a desire to draw theological conclusions based on these links, but this is to distort the plain meaning of the text.

---

46 Groom, *Linguistic Analysis* (Carlisle and Waynesboro: Paternoster, 2003).