

## פָּלִיט

(For fuller discussion of the lexical field as a whole see the ‘Overview of SAHD entries for “Deliverance” words’ on this site)

### Introduction

Grammatical Type: n m.

Occurrences: Total 19x OT, 0x Sir, 1x Qum (4Q217 fr12.3; plus Is 45.20 written as MT in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>), 0x inscr.

Text Doubtful:

**A.1** Licht (1957:100) restored פָּלִיט in 1QH 5.6. Delcor (1962:156) rejects this restoration, though Vermes (1997:267) translates the term “[deliverance]” and thus suggests a restoration similar to that of Licht: probably *pallēṭ* (infinitive piel). The reading here is too isolated and uncertain to be of semantic use.

**A.2** The occurrence of פָּלִיט in 4Q217 12.3 is almost certain, and is adopted by DJD (XIII:32). This should probably be taken as *pālīt* rather than *pālēṭ* because of the plene spelling and because the phraseology with שׁוּב ‘return’ seems closer to Jr 44.28 than to Jr 44.14b.

**B.1** BHS Ezk 24.27 suggests that אֶת־הַפָּלִיט may have been added, although this suggestion has no direct textual support, and there is no obvious process for the addition of this phrase to take place.

**B.2** BHS Jdg 12.4 claims that much of v. 4b, including פָּלִיט, was not represented in the earliest form of the LXX, but this not semantically relevant.

Qere/Ketiv: none.

### 1. Root and Comparative Material

**A.1** See פָּלַט Qal.

**A.2** Ben-Hayyim (1957:559) attests פָּלִיט in Samaritan Hebrew.

**A.3** GenR 42.8 on Gn 14.13 uses פָּלִיט.

**B.1** Hubbard (1997:623) says that פָּלִיט “comes from” the adjective פָּלִיט (written with short “a”), though there is no evidence for this.

### 2. Formal Characteristics

**A.1** Hasel (1989:593 = 2001:555) says that the form פָּלִיט “entstammt einer Adjektivform”, and defines it as a *qati:l* form (thus also HAL:880a). Barth (1894:§125e) states that this *qati:l* form is an active participle from an *i*-imperfect verb (the *i*-imperfect is attested in the proper name יִפְלֵט [1Ch 7.32, 33]). In contrast to Barth, Waltke & O’Connor (1990:88, §5.3c) suggest that in the case of פָּלִיט the form has a passive sense.

**B.1** [nil]

### 3. Syntagmatics

**A.1** Subj בּוֹא (Gn 14.13, Is 45.20, Ezk 24.26, 33.21), נגד hiph (Gn 14.13), אָמַר (Jdg 12.4, 5), יָצָא (2Kg 9.15), קָבַץ niph (Is 45.20), נָשַׁח hitp (Is 45.20), הָיָה (Jr 42.17, 44.14, La 2.22), שׁוּב (Jr 44.28, 4Q217 fr12.3?), זָכַר (Ezk 6.9), פָּלַט qal (Ezk 7.16), מָלַט niph (Am 9.1).

**A.2** Obj שָׂאָר hiph (Josh 8.22), כָּרַח hiph (Ob 14).

**A.3** Nomen regens of אֶפְרַיִם (Jdg 12.4, 5), הַגּוֹיִם (Is 45.20), תָּרַב (Jr 44.28, Ezk 6.8).

**A.4** Nomen rectum of בּוֹא infinitive construct (Ezk 33.22). In its deep structure it is the subject of בּוֹא.

## **B.1** [nil]

## **4. Versions**

### *a. LXX:*

τῶν ἀνασωθέντων τις (Gn 14.13);  
ἀνασωζόμενοι (Ezk 6.8, 9 [+ def. art.], 7.16, Ob 14);  
ἀνασωζόμενος (Ezk 24.26, 27, Am 9.1, La 2.22);  
ἀνασωθείς (Ezk 33.21);  
οἱ διασσωσμένοι (Jdg 12.4, 5 [Codex A]);  
οἱ διασωζόμενοι (Jdg 12.4, 5 [Codex B]);  
οἱ σωζόμενοι (Is 45.20);  
σωζόμενος (= וְפָלַט יִרְדּוּ Jr 42[49].17);  
σεσωσμένος (= פָּלַט וְיִרְדּוּ Jr 44[51].14);  
οἱ σεσωσμένοι (Jr 44[51].28);  
διαπεφευγώς (Josh 8.22, 2Kg 9.15);  
αὐτόν (Ezk 33.22). [see B.1]

### *b. The Three:*

Aq σεσωσμένος (Jr 42.17, 44.14);  
Sym τοὺς λειφθέντας (Jdg 12.4);  
Sym ἐκφεύγοντες (Ezk 7.16);  
Sym διαφευγόντων/διαφυγών (Gn 14.13);  
Sym ὁ διαφεύγων (Ezk 24.27);  
Thd οἱ διαπεφευγότες (Is 45.20).

### *c. Pesh:*

*mn d' tplt* (Gn 14.13);  
*'ylyn dmtpltyn hww* (Jdg 12.5);  
*dmtplt* (2Kg 9.15);  
*sryd'* (= וְפָלַט יִרְדּוּ Josh 8.22);  
*dmštwzb* (Jr 42.17);  
*mšwzb'* (Ob 14);  
*plyt'* (Jr 44.14a, 28, La 2.22);  
*'ylyn d' tpsyw* (Ezk 6.8, 9);  
*'ylyn dmtpsyn* (Is 45.20, Ezk 7.16);  
*mtpsyn'* (Ezk 24.26, 27);  
*d' tpsy* (Ezk 33.21);  
*hw d' tpsy* (Ezk 33.22 [2x for MT's 1x]);

*dmtpš*’ (Am 9.1);  
zero (Jdg 12.4).

*d. Tg:*  
שִׁיזָבָא (La 2.22);  
מְשִׁיזְבָא (Gn 14.13 [TgO, TgNeo], Jdg 12.4, 2Kg 9.15, Is 45.20, Jr 44.28, Ezk 6.8, 9, 7.16a, 24.26, 27, 33.21, 22);  
מְשִׁיזִיב (Josh 8.22, Jr 42.17);  
חֵד מְשִׁיזְבָא (Jdg 12.5);  
מִשְׁתִּיזֵב (Am 9.1);  
שָׂאֲרָא וּמְשִׁיזִיב (= פְּלִיט וְשָׂרִיד Jr 44.14a);  
מְעָרְקוּהִי (Ob 14);  
דְּאִישְׁתִּיזִיב with paraphrase (Gn 14.13 TgPsJ);  
מִתְפַּצִּיָּה (Gn 14.13 Samaritan Tg).

*e. Vg:*  
*unus qui evaserat* (Gn 14.13);  
paraphrase involving *salvor* (Josh 8.22);  
*qui salvati estis* (Is 45.20);  
*liberati vestri* (Ezk 6.9);  
*profugus* (2Kg 9.15);  
*fugitivus* (Jdg 12.4);  
*fugiens* (Jdg 12.5, Ezk 24.26);  
*is qui fugit* (Ezk 24.27);  
*ii qui fugerint* (Ob 14);  
*qui fugerat* (Ezk 33.21, 22);  
*qui fugerit* (Am 9.1);  
*qui fugerint* (Jr 44.28, Ezk 6.8, 7.16);  
*qui effugiat* (Jr 44.14);  
*qui effugeret* (La 2.22).

**A.1** Each version shows a preference for a particular root in its own language. The LXX generally translates the lexeme by a compound of or cognate of σῶζω ‘save’. Sym usually translates by a compound of φεύγω ‘flee’. Pesh, when not translating by cognate *ʾtplt*, most often uses *ʾtpšy* ‘be delivered’. Tg generally uses שִׁיזֵב and cognates, and Vg *\*fug-* based words. The impression of meaning from all the versions is that the lexeme means “one who is saved through flight”. In addition there is some variation between translation equivalents that present the escape or flight as in the past, and those that present it in the present.

**A.2** The possible exceptions, where the meaning given is more negative, are מְעָרְקוּהִי in Tg at Ob 14 (‘fugitives, refugees’) and in Vg *fugitivus* and some or all of the forms of *fugio*, ‘flee’, where there is no guarantee of a positive outcome.

**A.3** The versions reveal no obvious distinction between פְּלִיט and פָּלַט.

**B.1** LXX in Ezk 33.22 uses αὐτόν to refer back to its rendering of פְּלִיט in v. 21 to avoid repetition.

## 5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s)

**A.1** For a discussion of the semantic field of lexemes of the root פלט, and for a contrast of these lexemes with those of the root מלט see Lexical/Semantic Field(s) of פלט piel.

**A.2** It has been suggested by Zorell (651a) that פלט supplies the absolute pl of פליט, which only occurs in the absolute sing, construct pl and suffixed pl. However, this distribution may be merely a by-product of the fundamental difference these lexemes display, despite some overlap in meaning. Generally the פליט is someone who has completed his escape, whereas the פלט is someone who is still on the move from danger or has not found a settled situation. This does not mean for either category that no danger remains. It merely identifies the relationship between the fugitive and the danger they initially flee, and the safety they seek. Thus in Gn 14.13, Ezk 24.26, 27, 33.21, 22 the פליט has essentially left the area where they were initially under threat. Of course a different threat may encounter the fugitive at this stage (e.g. Ob 14). The פליטי אפרים in Jdg 12.5 are in mortal danger, but have left the initial danger horizon of the battlefield. Whatever פליטי אפרים means in Jdg 12.4, it is clear that those denoted have left Ephraim as a horizon in the past. Likewise the פליטי הגוים (Is 45.20), and פליטיכם (Ezk 6.9) are those who have already survived the danger. In statements that there was/should be/will be no one who escaped/escapes, פליט is used (Josh 8.22, 2Kg 9.15, Jr 42.17, 44.14, Am 9.1, La 2.22), because this term best refers to successful escape (cf. Ezk 7.16). The difference in distribution between the two terms may also be illustrated by the distinction between פליטי הרב (Jr 44.28, Ezk 6.8) for whom the process of flight is complete (the danger horizon of the הרב is in the past), and the פלטים מהרב (Jr 51.50) who are addressed as still on the run, and are encouraged not to stop. Likewise, the פלטים, parallel with נסים, in Jr 50.28 are still on the run.

Because a פלט is often someone who still has to journey to complete their escape, the term can take on a negative connotation (e.g. Nu 21.29). On the other hand, for the phrases negating the existence of a פליט to have a negative connotation (e.g. Josh 8.22), a פליט must be able to be an essentially positive thing. This also relieves the tension felt in Jr 44.14 where the existence of a פליט is denied, but the presence of פלטים is permitted. If the latter has negative connotations and the former positive ones then both statements are to be understood as negative in tone. The existence of פליטי הרב in Jr 44.28 need not contradict 44.14, since פליטי הרב are merely those who have escaped the sword, and are not designated “escaped ones” in an unqualified sense.

Some support for this general distinction in meanings is given by morphology. If the explanation of Waltke & O'Connor is preferred to that of Barth (see Formal Characteristics A.1), and פליט is a passive participle and פלט an active one, it would be natural for the former to take on a past time frame reference.

The distinction between the lexemes need not be absolute. Thus in Am 9.1 נס appears in parallel to פליט suggesting that the פליט was still on the move.

**A.3** Parallel with שריד (Josh 8.22, Jr 42.17, 44.14, Ob 14, La 2.22), נס (Am 9.1).

**B.1** [nil]

## 6. Exegesis

**A.1** The exegesis of a number of individual passages is covered in Lexical/Semantic Field(s).

**A.2** Hasel (1974:184) believes that in Am 9.1 the terms אֶתְרִית and פָּלִיט “throw light upon each other”. However, the relationship between נָס and פָּלִיט is closer.

**A.3** Zorell (651a) understands פָּלִיט as “qui salvus seu superstes est”, and Alonso Schökel (584b) understands it as “superviviente, evadido, escapado, fugado, fugitivo”.

**A.4** The notion of survived danger is not at all obvious for Jdg 12.4.

**B.1** [nil]

## 7. Conclusion

**A.1** The פָּלִיט is generally a person who has escaped a horizon of danger. It is often to be contrasted with פָּלֵט, which depicts someone as still on the move, or unsettled. פָּלִיט does not have the negative connotations usually present in פָּלֵט.

**B.1** Zorell (651a) advocates the complementary nature of פָּלִיט and פָּלֵט, the latter seeming to supply the absolute pl of פָּלִיט. It has been argued in Lexical/Semantic Field(s) that this conclusion cannot be sustained.

## Bibliography

- Barth, J. <sup>2</sup>1894. *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*. Leipzig.
- Ben-Hayyim, Z. 1957. *Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans*. Vol. 2. Jerusalem.
- Delcor, M. 1962. *Les Hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot): Text Hébreu, Introduction, Traduction, Commentaire*. Paris.
- Hasel, G.F. <sup>2</sup>1974. *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah*. Andrews University Monographs. Studies in Religion 5. Berrien Springs.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Article פָּלֵט in *TWAT* VI:589-606 = *TDOT* XI:551-67 (2001).
- Hubbard, R.L. 1997. Article 7117 פָּלֵט in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 3, Carlisle:621-26.
- Licht, J. 1957. *The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: Text, Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*. Jerusalem.
- Vermes, G. 1997. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London / New York / Victoria / Toronto / Auckland.
- Waltke, B.K. & M. O'Connor. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana.

P.J. Williams

First printed 27 October 1998