(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), 0x inscr.
Text Doubtful:
A.1 Licht (1957:100) restored פלי 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 pallēt (infinitive piel). The reading here is too isolated and uncertain to be of semantic use.
A.2 The occurrence of יט in 4Q217 12.3 is almost certain, and is adopted by DJD (XIII:32). This should probably be taken as pālīṭ rather than pālēṭ because of the plene spelling and because the phraseology with שׁוב ‘return’ seems closer to Jr 44.28 than to Jr 44.14b.

B.1 BHS Ezek 24.27 suggests that אتض 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 Judges 12.4 claims that much of v. 4b, including פלי, 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 פלט Qal.
A.3 GenR 42.8 on Gn 14.13 uses פליט.

B.1 Hubbard (1997:623) says that פלט “comes from” the adjective פלי (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 פלט “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 יפליט [1Ch 7.32, 33]). In contrast to Barth, Waltke & O’Connor (1990:88, §5.3c) suggest that in the case of פלט the form has a passive sense.

B.1 [nil]

3. Syntagmatics
A.1 Subj אֶל (Gn 14.13, Is 45.20, Ezk 24.26, 33.21), gegen hiph (Gn 14.13), בּוֹא (Jdg 12.4, 5), אָמַר (2Kg 9.15) niph hitp (Is 45.20), היִרְד (Jr 42.17, 44.14, La 2.22), יָּצָּא (Jr 44.28, 4Q217 fr12.3?), זָּכַר (Ezk 6.9), הָּיָּה (Jr 44.28, 4Q217 fr12.3?), אָמַר (Jdg 12.4, 5), יָּצָּא (2Kg 9.15), אָּמַר (Jdg 12.4, 5). In its deep structure it is the subject of בּוֹא.

A.2 Obj שָׁר hiph (Josh 8.22),твор hiph (Ob 14).

A.3 Nomen regens of בּוֹא (Jdg 12.4, 5), הַגּוֹיִם (Is 45.20), חֶרֶב (Jr 44.28, Ezk 6.8).

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

4. Versions

a. LXX:
τῶν ἀνασωθέντων τις (Gn 14.13);
ἀνασῳζόμενοι (Ezk 6.8, 9 [+ def. art.], 7.16, Ob 14);
ἀνασῳζόμενος (Ezk 24.26, 27, Am 9.1, La 2.22);
ἀνασωθεῖς (Ezk 33.21);
oi διασωθημένοι (Jdg 12.4, 5 [Codex A]);
oi διασωθημένοι (Jdg 12.4, 5 [Codex B]);
oi διασωθημένοι (Is 45.20);
σωζόμενος (= διαφεύγως Jr 42[49].17);
σωζόμενος (= διαφεύγως Jr 44[51].14);
oi σωζόμενοι (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 λειψάνους (Jdg 12.4);
Sym έκφευγόντες (Ezk 7.16);
Sym διαφεύγοντον/διαφυγόν (Gn 14.13);
Sym ὁ διαφεύγων (Ezk 24.27);
Thd oi διαπεφευγότες (Is 45.20).

c. Pesh:
mn dʾiplt (Gn 14.13);
ʾylyn dmpltyn hww (Jdg 12.5);
dmplt (2Kg 9.15);
syrdʾ (= שָׁרִיJosh 8.22);
dmszwzb (Jr 42.17);
mšwzbʾ (Ob 14);
plyʾ (Jr 44.14a, 28, La 2.22);
ʾylyn dʾpsyw (Ezk 6.8, 9);
ʾylyn dmtpsyn (Is 45.20, Ezk 7.16);
mtpsynʾ (Ezk 24.26, 27);
dʾpsy (Ezk 33.21);
hw dʾpsy (Ezk 33.22 [2x for MT’s 1x]);
$dmtp\textsuperscript{ṣ}'$ (Am 9.1);
zero (Jdg 12.4).

d. Tg:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{שֵׁיזָּבָּא} (La 2.22);
  \item \textit{משׁיזבא} (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);
  \item \textit{משׁודוּב} (Josh 8.22, Jr 42.17);
  \item \textit{miteszib} (Jdg 12.5);
  \item \textit{משׁיח} (Am 9.1);
  \item \textit{משׁיתיזב} (Am 9.1);
  \item \textit{משׁודוּב} (Jdg 12.5) = \textit{כָּלֵים וְשָׁרִיד Jr 44.14a};
  \item \textit{משׁיתיזב} (Ob 14);
  \item \textit{משׁיתיזב} with paraphrase (Gn 14.13 TgPsJ);
  \item \textit{משׁיתיזב} (Gn 14.13 Samaritan Tg).
\end{itemize}

e. Vg:

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

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 \textit{σῴζω} ‘save’. Sym usually translates by a compound of \textit{φεύγω} ‘flee’. Pesh, when not translating by cognate \textit{ʾtplṭ}, most often uses \textit{ʾtpṣy} ‘be delivered’. Tg generally uses \textit{שׁיזב} 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 \textit{משׁיתיזב} in Tg at Ob 14 (‘fugitives, refugees’) and in Vg \textit{fugitivus} and some or all of the forms of \textit{fugio}, ‘flee’, where there is no guarantee of a positive outcome.

A.3 The versions reveal no obvious distinction between \textit{חַד מְשׁיֶזֵיָב} and \textit{משׁיֶזֵיָב}.

B.1 LXX in Ezk 33.22 uses \textit{αὐτόν} to refer back to its rendering of \textit{כָּלֵים} 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 פָּלֵט, and for a contrast of these lexemes with those of the root מָלט see Lexical/Semantic Field(s) of piel.

A.2 It has been suggested by Zorell (651a) that פָּלֵט supplies the absolute pl of פָּלִיט, 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 פָּלִיט is someone who has completed his escape, whereas the פָּלֵט 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 פָּלֵט 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 פָּלִיט in Jdg 12.5 are in mortal danger, but have left the initial danger horizon of the battlefield. Whatever פָּלִיט אֶפְרַיִם means in Jdg 12.4, it is clear that those denoted have left Ephraim as a horizon in the past. Likewise the פָּלִיט (Is 45.20), and פָּלִיט אֵל (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, פָּלֵט 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 פָּלִיט חֶרֶב (Jr 44.28, Ezk 6.8) for whom the process of flight is complete (the danger horizon of the חֶרֶב is in the past), and the פָּלֵט מָחַר (Jr 51.50) who are addressed as still on the run, and are encouraged not to stop. Likewise, the פָּלִיט, parallel with נָּס, in Jr 50.28 are still on the run.

Because a פָּלֵט 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 פָּלֵט to have a negative connotation (e.g. Josh 8.22), a פָּלִיט must be able to be an essentially positive thing. This also relieves the tension felt in Jr 44.14 where the existence of a פָּלֵט is denied, but the presence of פָּלִיט 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 פָּלִיט חֶרֶב in Jr 44.28 need not contradict 44.14, since פָּלִיט חֶרֶב 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 פָּלִיט is a passive participle and פָּלֵט 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 נָּס appears in parallel to פָּלִיט נָּס suggesting that the פָּלִיט was still on the move.

A.3 Parallel with נָּס (Josh 8.22, Jr 42.17, 44.14, Ob 14, La 2.22), נָּס (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 אַחֲרִית and פָּלִיט “throw light upon each other”. However, the relationship between נָּס 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.
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