

Jolanta Szarlej

Akademia Techniczno-Humanistyczna w Bielsku-Białej
jszarlej@ath.bielsko.pl
ORCID: 0000-0002-1529-0886

Semantics of Phrasemes Defining Interpersonal Relations in the Hebrew and Polish Linguistic Image of the World (Based on the Material from the Books of Prophets)

This article constitutes a fragment of a broader research¹, which I have devoted to the analysis and description of biblical representations of man, his nature, his relationship with the Creator, and the world of other creatures. The following Hebrew roots are scrutinised there: אדם, זכר, נקב, אנש, אשש. The collected material has revealed the linguistic image of man as a species (אדם *ādām* i חוה *ḥawwā^h*) as a biological being (a woman נקבה *naqēbā^h* and a man זכר *zākār*), and as an individual (איש *iš*, אשה *iššā^h*). The text presented here represents a small part of the material I have examined in relation to the noun איש *iš*, which has given rise to my reflection on the semantics of phrasemes describing interpersonal relations.

¹ This article presents a slightly modified version of a lecture delivered at a conference entitled *Starożytny Bliski Wschód i jego dziedzictwo* [*The Ancient Near East and Its Heritage*] organised by the Institute of Judaic Studies in Kraków on 28–29 September 2015. It constituted a presentation of a small fragment of my research published in my habilitation dissertation entitled *Językowy obraz człowieka w profetycznych księgach Starego Testamentu* [*The Linguistic Image of Man in the Prophetic Books of the Old Testament*] (Bielsko-Biala 2013). In this form it was published in Polish in the jubilee volume titled *Studia hebraica. Księga pamiątkowa Seminarium Wiedzy o Hebrajszczyźnie Biblijnej dedykowana Pani Profesor Kamilli Terminińskiej* [*Hebraica studies. Commemorative book. Biblical Hebrew Knowledge Seminar dedicated to Professor Kamilla Terminińska*], eds. M. Zając, I. Kida, Katowice 2019, pp. 273–293.

Research material

The linguistic material, which forms the basis of my considerations, comes mainly from the prophetic books, i.e. from the part of the *Hebrew Bible* called *Nəḥîʾîm*², which includes the collection of the first prophets' writings (*The Book of Joshua, The Book of Judges, The 1st and 2nd Books of Samuel, The 1st and 2nd Books of Kings*), the material from the so-called *Book of the Twelve*, i.e. from the writings of the prophets Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and other later prophets – Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

Created by them, the collection of texts is really miscellaneous, dating from between the 8th and 5th centuries B.C. It is also a truly comprehensive collection, accounting for almost 30% of the entire *Old Testament*³. It comprises a wide variety of texts, diverse in terms of language, literary form, and subject matter.

My selection of texts is based on a search of Gerhard Lisowsky's concordance⁴ for Hebrew roots denoting a human being. Of the several ones listed in the cited work i.e. אדם, זכר, נקב, אנש, אשש, אנש, in my article I only have enough space to discuss selected texts containing the noun איש⁵.

Methodology

Methodologically, the present analysis falls within the scope of cognitive research, which – in my opinion – offers a chance to overcome the limitations of semiotic analysis conducted in the spirit of structuralism – the principle of the immanence of the text⁶, the recognition of language

²The classification is given after G. Ignatowski, *Kościół i synagoga. O dialogu chrześcijańsko-żydowskim z nadzieją* [*The Church and the Synagogue. On Christian- Jewish Dialogue with Hope*], Warsaw 2000, p. 104.

³H.W. Mouse, R. Price, *Tablice biblijnego prorocstwa* [*Tables of Biblical Prophecy*], [an entry], in: J.H. Walton, H.W. Mouse, R.L. Thomas, R. Price, *Tablice biblijne. Chrześcijańskie tablice encyklopedyczne* [*Biblical Tables. Christian Encyclopaedic Tables*], translated by Z. Kościuk, vol. 1, Warsaw 2007, p. 381.

⁴*Konkordanz zum hebräischen „Alten Testament“*, ed. H.P. Rüger, Stuttgart 1993.

⁵I write more about the relation between the noun איש and the roots אנש, אשש in my work titled *Językowy obraz człowieka...*, pp. 115–123.

⁶Cf. Pontifical Biblical Commission, *Interpretacja Pisma Świętego w Kościele. Przemówienie Ojca Świętego Jana Pawła II oraz dokument Papieskiej Komisji Biblijnej* [*Interpretation of Sacred Scripture in the Church. An address by the Holy Father John Paul II and a document of the Pontifical Biblical Commission*], translated by K. Romaniuk, Poznań 1994, p. 38.

as an autonomous structure⁷, and consequently – confining the research procedure to “extra-textual references”⁸. Adopting the basic assumption for cognitivism “about the conventional (social) character of linguistic knowledge, or, to be more precise, about the conventional character of linguistic units”⁹, makes it possible to reach the mechanisms of categorisation¹⁰, which depend on the external world (natural, social, historical conditions, etc.) in which the categorising subject lives, as well as on the culture that shapes him or her, and on the system of values to which s/he adheres¹¹. As part of the current ethnolinguistic research, cognitivism indirectly becomes a method of learning about the community in which the *Bible* was written, and thus offers a better understanding of the message contained in *The Book of Books* itself.

It is common knowledge that the prophetic books of *The Old Testament*, similarly to other biblical books, do not reflect the scientific knowledge about the world. Created in antiquity and representing the way of thinking typical of people in those times, they are a record of those people’s ideas about the world and a reflection of their state of knowledge about reality. They often contain an image of the world that is fundamentally different from ours, and often contradictory to it. This image can be deciphered from the (not only lexical) properties of the text: words and word compounds, proverbs, symbols, as well as grammatical forms and syntactic rules. The study of the linguistic image of the biblical world thus offers a chance to read the LINGUISTIC POTENTIAL OF THE TEXT, free from confessional and theological readings of *The Book of Books*.

The subject matter of this article situates it in the context of a broader – one could say – centuries-old, discussion on the relation between language,

⁷ Cf. H. Kardela, *Ogdena i Richardsa trójkąt uzupełniony, czyli co bada gramatyka kognitywna* [*Ogden and Richards’ Triangle Completed, or What Cognitive Grammar Examines*], in: *Językowy obraz świata* [*Linguistic Image of the World*], ed. J. Bartmiński, Lublin 1999, p. 19.

⁸ The wording used in the work cited above *Interpretacja Pisma Świętego w Kościele...*, p. 39.

⁹ H. Kardela, *Ogdena i Richardsa trójkąt uzupełniony...*, p. 18.

¹⁰ Following Jolanta Maćkiewicz, I define categorisation as “a mechanism that organises and pre-interprets a given experience,” which “contributes to building an image of the world that enables a human being to move in the surrounding chaos. To a person, it suggests a ‘fragmented’ world, simplified and immobilised, adjusted to human cognitive capabilities. The ‘fragmentation’ depends on the nature, i.e. the immediate environment of the categorising subject, and on culture, i.e. his or her interests, needs and the system of values recognised by him or her.” (J. Maćkiewicz, *Kategoryzacja a językowy obraz świata* [*Categorisation and the Linguistic Image of the World*], in: *Językowy obraz świata...*, p. 53).

¹¹ Cf. *ibid.*

the human being, and the real, extra-linguistic, “three-dimensional” world. Without getting entangled in the meanders of this question, I would like to point out that I share views on the subject represented by three researchers: Wojciech Chlebda (as well as John Lighton Synge and Jerome S. Bruner, quoted by him), Kamilla Termińska, and Roland Langacker.

Following Polish researchers, especially Renata Grzegorzczkova, I assume that language does not reflect the world in a mechanical way, neither does it create it. Language interprets the world¹². This is due to a number of cognitive constraints, among which Wojciech Chlebda distinguishes extralinguistic (biological, cultural, mental, situational and style- and genre-related) and intralinguistic factors¹³.

Jolanta Maćkiewicz writes about the function of the image of the world created by man, emphasising – similarly to Wojciech Chlebda – the entanglement of language in human thinking and acting:

The image of the world (or: the linguistic image of the world, which is one of its manifestations) fulfils two basic functions: interpreting and regulating. It interprets the reality with which an individual comes into contact and regulates human behaviour towards this reality. In this way it is connected with two areas of human activity: thinking and acting¹⁴.

Linguistic image of the world

My understanding of the linguistic image of the world is shaped by the views of German philosophers Johann Georg Hamann (the turn of the 18th century), Johann Gottfried Herder (the 18th century), Wilhelm von Humboldt and Helmut Gipper:

[...] language is a kind of key to the world (*Sprache – Schlüssel zur Welt*)¹⁵ – opening up this world, securing and enabling access to it and at the same

¹² Cf. R. Grzegorzczkova, *Pojęcie językowego obrazu świata* [*The Concept of the Linguistic Image of the World*], [in]: *Językowy obraz świata...*, p. 42.

¹³ Cf. W. Chlebda, *Elementy frazematyki, wprowadzenie do frazeologii nadawcy* [*Elements of Phrasematics. Introduction to the Addresser's Phraseology*], Łask 2003, pp. 61–93.

¹⁴ J. Maćkiewicz, *Kategoryzacja a językowy obraz świata...*, p. 52.

¹⁵ This is the title of a volume published by Helmut Gipper in honour of Leo Weisgerber.

time closing it down, by means of capturing, framing and stopping it as if in some metaphorical frame [...]”¹⁶.

As Jerzy Anusiewicz states while referring to Helmut Gipper’s views, “[...] not only does the semantic content determine the linguistic image of the world but it is also given to us in (and through) grammatical categories and syntactic ways of combining words and word constructions [...]”¹⁷. The following definition of the linguistic image of the world can be found in the oeuvre of the German linguist:

it is a specific way in which the world exists (reveals itself) (in a broad sense that includes both the human and the universe) in the semantic disjunctions of the lexical system of a given language, in its grammatical categories, and in the ways in which the units of that language are syntactically combined¹⁸.

In Helmut Gipper’s statement this particular appreciation of the grammatical structure of language as an element that transmits and perpetuates the linguistic image of the world can easily be discerned. The German linguist, heir to the thought of Wilhelm von Humboldt, Leo Weisgerber, and Benjamin Lee Whorf, expresses this thought more clearly in one of his earlier definitions of the linguistic image of the world from 1962:

[...] it is the totality of developed categorical relationships in a given natural language (mother tongue), its semantic structures in terms of vocabulary and in terms of syntax, together with all the possibilities of expression and evaluation opened up by these structures. In other words: the way in which the reality experienced, lived and imagined by the communicative community is brought into the language¹⁹.

¹⁶ J. Anusiewicz, *Problematyka językowego obrazu świata w poglądach niektórych językznawców i filozofów niemieckich XX wieku [Issues Concerning the Linguistic Image of the World in the Opinions of Some 20th Century German Linguists and Philosophers]*, in: *Językowy obraz świata...*, p. 273.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 273.

¹⁸ H. Gipper, *Sprachliches Weltbild, wissenschaftliches Weltbild und ideologische Weltanschauung*, in: J. Zimmermann, ed. *Sprache und Welterfahrung [Language and World Experience]*, Munich 1978, p. 165. Cited after: J. Anusiewicz, *Problematyka językowego obrazu świata...*, p. 274.

¹⁹ H. Gipper, H. Schwarz, *Bibliographisches Handbuch zur Sprachinhaltsforschung*, Köln/Opladen 1962, p. 1744, item 12719, translated by A. Mańczyk. Cited after: J. Anusiewicz, *Problematyka językowego obrazu świata...*, p. 273.

In the undertaken research, I have considered it particularly valuable to be able to show – mainly to the Polish reader – the fundamental differences in the way the linguistic image of the world is constructed in different languages (here: Polish and Classical Hebrew) at the level of syntactic structures²⁰. The structures identified while analysing the biblical material featuring the noun אִישׁ *ʾiš*, which semantically complement the linguistic representation of complex interpersonal relations depicted on the pages of the Bible, serve as a perfect argument in this regard.

Analysis

A considerable proportion of syntactic structures with the lexeme אִישׁ are phrasemes²¹ describing several types of interpersonal relations: from relations of cooperation, reciprocity and unanimity to relations of conflict and rivalry.

These phrasemes constitute combinations of the nouns אִישׁ, רֵעַ, אָח and the prepositions בְּ, לְ, עַל, אֶל, אֵת, מִן.

In classical Hebrew, the first of the nouns אָח²² means “a brother” in the broad sense of the word. *The Great Hebrew-Polish Dictionary*²³ defines it in the following manner:

1. a “full” brother (from the same father and mother), twins (Hos 12:4); a place in the family;
2. a half-brother (from another mother);
3. blood ties; a nephew, a relative, in relations – a cousin (male and female);

²⁰ In the Polish cognitive tradition, grammar treated as a component of the linguistic image of the world constitutes the object of research less frequently than, for example, lexis, which is why I considered the collected phrases and the meanings they convey to be particularly worth emphasising.

²¹ Cf. W. Chlebda, *Elementy frazematyki...*: Phrasemes are “forms of expressing content potentials typical of certain situations and relatively fixed in those situations”. (p. 256) [...] A phraseme is not a “finished” product, “it occurs primarily in a number of its variants, the identity of which is guaranteed by the invariant deposited in the brain” (p. 257). It can take the form of a word, a word group or even a sentence (cf. p. 256).

²² Cf. P. Briks, *Podręczny słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski „Starego Testamentu”* [A Concise Hebrew-Polish and Aramaic-Polish Dictionary of the Old Testament], Warsaw 1999, p. 26. Hereinafter designated as PSHP (abbreviated according to the Polish title) with the reference to the relevant page.

²³ Cf. L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, J.J. Stamm: *Wielki słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski „Starego Testamentu”* [The Great Hebrew-Polish and Aramaic-Polish Dictionary of the Old Testament], vol. 1–2, Warsaw 2008. Hereafter designated as WSHP (abbreviated according to the Polish title), quotations are indicated by volume and page number.

4. (without kinship) a brother by choice, a companion;
5. a tribesman;
6. a compatriot;
7. a companion;
8. a phrase of courtesy to strangers;
9. in public, official relations; [cf. WSHP, vol. 1, p. 29].

Thus, in Hebrew, the defining features of the noun **חָבֵר** include not only semantic properties indicating closer or further kinship, but also spiritual, ancestral and tribal ties²⁴.

The second of the above-mentioned nouns **רֵעַ** is an ambiguous word, fusing at least²⁵ two components of meaning fixed in the root **רעה**: the idea of common ancestry, kinship, and spiritual closeness (*qal* “to associate [with someone]”; *pi’ēl* “to maintain intimate relations”; *hithpa’ēl* “to be/make friends with”) and the idea of grazing cattle (“to graze; to feed on grass; to pasture (a grassland, a country); to feed; to protect; to lead”; *participium masculinum* “shepherd”; *femininum* “shepherdess”; *hiph’īl* “to tend to a herd”) [PSHP, p. 332].

From the perspective of the Polish language, the large semantic difference between these two aspects of meaning may be puzzling, but it is quite easy to explain by the conditions of life in Palestine: a neighbour is someone who tends to the flock with me, who can be trusted in a threatening situation, who will support you in a fight against an attacker or wild animals; it is someone you can count on.

The noun **רֵיב** can be used both in the meaning of “a compatriot, tribesman, countryman”, as well as “a relative”, but also as “a friend, companion, lover” [PSHP, 332]. The authors of *The Great Hebrew-Polish Dictionary* give several meanings of the word: “1. a friend; 2. darling,

²⁴ A specific redefinition of this notion is introduced by the well-known *New Testament* scene described in Matthew 12:46-50. Christ considers as close relatives those who do the Heavenly Father’s bidding, thus transferring the idea of brotherhood to the spiritual sphere and abandoning its biological, physical dimension. Cf. the footnote to Mt 12:50 in: *Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych (Biblia Tysiąclecia)* [*The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in Translation from the Original Languages (The Millennium Bible)*], 5th edition, Poznań 2000, p. 1138.

²⁵ A third component is sometimes mentioned: “sound, thunder”, but this meaning of the noun **רֵעַ** is derived from another root, namely – from the root **רוע**, which in *pol’al* means as much as “to exclaim/to shout (joyfully)”; in *hiph’īl* “to shout; to holler; to call out/to bugle for battle; to blow the trumpet; to shout (for joy/for terror)”; *hithpol’ēl* “to shout/to exclaim (for joy; for terror)” [PSHP, p. 326].

favourite, beloved; 3. a companion, comrade (in the sense of compatriot); 4. a neighbour; 5. mutually, one to another”; it is also sometimes used as a reflexive pronoun “themselves” [WSHP, vol. 2, pp. 291-293].

As it results from the analysis of word combinations **אִישׁ אֶת־אָחִיו** and **אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ**, a human being was created by nature as a relational being, and the natural state for him/her is to live among people who are kind, friendly, supportive.

This interpretation seems to be confirmed by subsequent sentences containing the examined type of phrasemes.

RELATIONS OF PARTNERSHIP/MUTUALITY²⁶ [**אִישׁ אֶת־אָחִיו**] in an emotional and spiritual dimension are illustrated by two texts from *The First Book of Samuel* and *The Book of Zechariah*.

The phraseme **MAN WITH HIS FELLOW HUMAN** in the former text (1 Sm 20:41) expresses a state that is nowadays called empathy – a touching image of co-suffering (kissing as a sign of love and crying as a sign of sympathy) of David and Jonathan – the fullest image of friendship in *The Old Testament*. The phraseme is co-created by two nouns **אִישׁ** and **רֵעַ**, and they are connected by the preposition **אֶת**, with the meaning “together with; with the help of” [PSHP, p. 48; WSHP, pp. 97–98].

אִישׁ אֶת־אָחִיו

הַנֶּעֱרָ, בָּא, וְדָוִד קָם מֵאֶצְלֵ הַנָּגֶב, וַיִּפֹּל לְאַפָּיו אֶרְצָהּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה שְׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים; וַיִּשָּׁקוּ
אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ, וַיִּבְכּוּ אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ, עַד־דָּוֶד, הַגִּדִּיל

*hannaʿar bāʾ wəḏāwīd qām mēʿēsel hannégeb wayyippōl ləʾappāyw ʾársā^h
wayyištāhû šālōš pəʿāmīm wayyiššəqû ʾiš ʾet-rēʿéhû wayyibkû ʾiš ʾet-rēʿéhû
ʿad-dāwīd hiḡdīl*

And as soon as the lad was gone, David arose out of a place toward the south, and fell on his face to the ground and bowed himself three times; and they kissed one another and wept one with another, but David more.

(1 Sm 20, 41)²⁷

²⁶ Cf. the following texts: 2 Kings 3:23; Mi 7:2; Jer 31:34.

²⁷ The biblical texts are quoted here as follows: in Polish – *Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych (Biblia Tysiąclecia...)*, hereafter designated as BTP; in Hebrew – www.mechon-mamre.org/pt/pt0.htm; in English – www.biblehub.com. I adopt the transliteration rules for the Hebrew texts according to *Transliterated BAS Hebrew Old Testament 2001*, in: *The BibleWorks Program*, version 5.0.

The latter text (Ze 7, 9) is a call for empathy in social relationships, beyond the individual, for the building of social bonds based on love and mercy. These are to constitute the foundation of the moral order in the life of the chosen people, whose members are to be “brothers” to one another.

כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, לֵאמֹר: מִשְׁפַּט אֱמֶת, שְׁפֹטוּ, וְחֶסֶד וְרַחֲמִים, עֲשׂוּ אִישׁ
אֶת-אָחִיו

*kōh^h ʾāmar yhw(ʾādōnāy) šəḇāʾōt lēʾmōr mišpaṭ ʾēmet šəpōtū
wəḥēsed wəraḥāmîm ʿāsū ʾiš ʾet-ʾāḥîw*

“Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, ‘Execute true judgment, and show mercy and compassions every man to his brother’.

(Ze 7, 9)

The text from *The Book of Jeremiah* (Jer 31, 34) reveals yet another aspect of human relations:

אִישׁ אֶל-רֵעֵהוּ וְאִישׁ אֶת-אָחִיו as well as

וְלֹא יִלְמְדוּ עוֹד, אִישׁ אֶת-רֵעֵהוּ וְאִישׁ אֶת-אָחִיו לֵאמֹר, דַּעוּ, אֶת-יְהוָה: כִּי-כֹלֵם
יָדְעוּ אוֹתִי לְמִקְטָנָם וְעַד-גְּדֹלָם, נֶאֱמַר-יְהוָה--כִּי אֶסְלַח לְעוֹנָם, וְלִחְטָאתָם לֹא
אֶזְכֹּר-עוֹד

*wəlōʾ yəlamməḏū ʿōd ʾiš ʾet-rēʿehū wəʾiš ʾet-ʾāḥîw lēʾmōr dəʿū ʾet-
yhw(ʾādōnāy) kî-kūllām yēdʿū ʾōtî ləmiqtannām wəʿad-gəḏōlām nəʾum-
yhw(ʾādōnāy) kî ʿeslah laʿāwōnām ûləḥattāʾtām lōʾ ʾezkor-ʿōd*

And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour and every man his brother, saying, ‘Know the Lord.’ For they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them,” saith the Lord, “for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.”

(Jr 31, 34)²⁸

What in *The Millennial Bible* expresses the idea of reciprocity (“they will not have to instruct one another”), in the original Hebrew of the prophet

²⁸ In the source material www.mechon-mamre.org/p/pt/pt0.htm this is verse 33. In the text compiled by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (4th ed., Stuttgart 1990) a different notation of the word לְמִקְטָנָם (no geminate in the letter ק). Original transliteration after the adopted source: *Transliterated BAS Hebrew Old Testament 2001*, in: *The BibleWorks Program*, version 5.0.

Jeremiah's statement is constructed by the already discussed doubled – according to the principle of binarity – phrase “every one his friend” and “every one his brother”²⁹, expressing the Semitic ideal of community³⁰. What constitutes its essential element are undoubtedly family ties, resulting from kinship. However, a broader tribal community, built on the unity of territory, tradition, history and religion, is no less important. Hence, the injunction to care for the knowledge of God by all members of this community – as a religious duty – applies to all Israelites. Mutual instruction of the followers of Mosaism is an expression of responsibility for the life, conduct and spiritual development of their neighbour as well as – indirectly – for the moral condition of the whole nation, the foundation of which is God's law. The prophet's words foretell the interiorisation of the process of spiritual discernment (Jer 31, 33), based on the relationship with the Creator, and not on instructing fellow tribesmen.

RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS

אִישׁ לְאִישׁ

A very practical model of community, resulting from action, is drawn up in his instruction by the prophet Ezekiel. His statement may be regarded as – speaking in today's language – a model of the principles of social justice and as a standard of honesty in interpersonal relations:

בְּנֶשֶׁךְ לֹא-יִתֵּן, וְתַרְבִּית לֹא יִקַּח--מֵעֹל, יֵשִׁיב יְדוֹ; מִשְׁפָּט אֱמֶת יַעֲשֶׂה, בֵּין אִישׁ
לְאִישׁ

*bannēšek lō³-yittēn wətarbîṭ lō³ yiqqāḥ mē^cāwel yāšîb yādô mišpaṭ
³emet̄ ya^cāse^h bēn ʾîš ləʾîš*

he that hath not given forth upon usury, neither hath taken any increase,
that hath withdrawn his hand from iniquity, hath executed true judgment
between man and man,

(Ez 18, 8)

²⁹ The translation proposed in: *Hebrajsko-polski „Stary Testament”. Prorocy. Przekład interlinearny z kodami gramatycznymi, transliteracją i indeksem rdzeni* [The Hebrew-Polish Old Testament. Prophets. An Interlinear Translation with Grammatical Codes, Transliteration and Root Index], ed. A. Kuśmirek, Warsaw 2008, p. 1084. Hereinafter the volume is indicated as PI (abbreviated according to the Polish title) with the reference to the relevant page.

³⁰ It is worth noting that this is also the Semitic way of expressing the reciprocal pronoun.

Integrity in business, turning away from evil and honesty in the adjudication of contentious matters mark the moral foundations of an honest man's life. The idea of "interpersonality" is expressed by the formula **אִישׁ לְאִישׁ**, in which two uses of the noun are linked by the *nota dativi* in the form of the preposition **לְ** with the meaning of "being inside, standing in the middle between values/persons and turning to them/towards them/in their direction" [PSHP, p. 171; cf. also WSHP, vol. 1, pp. 478–482]³¹.

MAN TO ...HIS BROTHER/FRIEND³²

MUTUAL COMMUNICATION (INTERPERSONAL DIALOGUE)

A slightly different sense of the same preposition is revealed in the sentence from Zechariah's prophecy: here the idea of reciprocity is exposed (the preposition **לְ** used to mean "to; in relation to; in favour of; for") [PSHP, p. 171] in the sense of opening up to another person, finding joy in being with them.

אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא, נֹאֵם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, תִּקְרְאוּ, אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ--אֶל-תַּחַת גִּזְּנוֹ, וְאֶל-תַּחַת תְּאֵנָה

bayyôm hahû' nō'ûm yhwḥ(ʿādōnāy) šəḇā'ôṭ tigrə'û 'îš ləre'êhû 'el-tāḥaṭ gēḇen wə'el-tāḥaṭ tə'ēnā^h

In that day,' saith the Lord of hosts, 'shall ye call every man his neighbour under the vine and under the fig tree.'

(Ze 3, 10)

Zechariah is (like Aggeus) a prophet of restoration, but in his teachings the focus is on the spiritual renewal of the nation, rather than on the rebuilding of the material foundations of worship, which was to be expressed in the rebuilding of the temple³³. In the fourth one of Zechariah's visions (out of eight), there is a symbolic foreshadowing of this fact (the

³¹ Cf. P. Briks, *Podręczny słownik hebrajsko-polski...*, p. 171: **לְ** to; at; up to; towards; in the direction of; within; with reference to; in favour of; according to; for; because of; *nota dativi*; *lamed auctoris*.

³² Cf. the following texts: Judg 6:29; 2 Kings 7:3; 2 Kings 7:9; Jer 36:16; Jer 46:16; 2 Kings 7:6; Jer 25:26.

³³ Cf. *Księgi prorockie. Wstęp* [The Prophetic Books. Introduction], in: *Biblia Jerozolimska* [The Jerusalem Bible], issue 1, Poznań 2006, p. 1030.

vision of the stone and the seven eyes on it³⁴) and a foreshadowing of the messianic era (here, the presence of the messianic title “Offshoot”, originally perhaps referring to Zorobabel, but which could also mean a descendant of the royal Davidic dynasty)³⁵. A sign of this new, “better” era are the renewed interpersonal relations, the literary image of which are the fraternal, neighbourly, friendly meetings under the vine and the fig tree: literally, “you will call upon every one of your neighbours to (sit) under the vine and to (sit) under the fig tree” [PI, p. 1534].

The role of communication in interpersonal relations is revealed in two further texts from *The Book of Jeremiah* and *The First Book of Samuel*. The preposition אֶל, – meaning “to; toward; in the direction of; for” [PSHP, p. 32] constructs the phrase used in both texts:

אִישׁ אֶל-רֵעֵהוּ

וַיְהִי, כִּל-יִוָּדְעוּ מֵאֲתָמוּל שְׁלֹשָׁם, וַיִּרְאוּ, וַהֲגִה עִם-נְבִיאִים נְבִיא: וַיֹּאמְרוּ הֵעָם אִישׁ
אֶל-רֵעֵהוּ, מִה-זֶה הָיָה לְבֶן-קִישׁ--הַגַּם שָׂאוֹל, בְּנֵיבִיאִים

*wayəhî kol-yôd‘ô mē‘ittəmôl šilšôm wayyir‘û wəhinnē^h ‘im-nəḥī‘îm
nibbā’ wayyô‘mer hā‘ām ‘îš ‘el-rē‘ēhû ma^h-zze^h hāyā^h ləḇen-qîš
hăḡam šā‘ûl bannəḥī‘îm*

And it came to pass when all who knew him before saw that, behold, he prophesied among the prophets, then the people said one to another, “What is this that has come unto the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?”
(1 Sm 10, 11)³⁶

הֲרָבָה, כּוֹשֵׁל; גַּם-נֶפֶל אִישׁ אֶל-רֵעֵהוּ, וַיֹּאמְרוּ קוֹמָה וְנִשְׁבָּה אֶל-עַמָּנוּ וְאֶל-אַרְצֵךְ
מוֹלְדֹתֵנוּ, מִפְּנֵי, חָרַב הַיּוֹנָה

*hirbā^h kôšēl gam-nāḥal ‘îš ‘el-rē‘ēhû wayyô‘mərû qūmā^h wənāšūbā^h
‘el-‘ammēnû wə‘el-‘éreš mōladtēnû mippənē ḥéreb hayyônā^h*

³⁴ Cf. the footnote to Ze 3, 9, in: *Biblia Jerozolimska...*, p. 1331.

³⁵ Cf. A. Cody, *Księga Zachariasza [The Book of Zechariah]*, in: *Katolicki komentarz biblijny [The Catholic Commentary on the Bible]*, R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer, R.E. Murphy (eds.), Oficyna Wydawnicza “Vocatio”, Warsaw 2001, pp. 876–877.

³⁶ In the text compiled by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (4th ed., Stuttgart 1990) there exists a different notation of the word שְׁלֹשָׁם.

He made many to fall, yea, one fell upon another; and they said, 'Arise, and let us go again to our own people and to the land of our nativity, from the oppressing sword'.

(Jr 46, 16)

This nominal phrase with the meaning "every one to his neighbour" (i.e. to the one standing next to him), "a man to his friend" (1 Sm 10, 11) [PI, p. 257], "each one to his friend" (Jer 46:16) [PI, p. 1149] in the Millennial Bible are rendered once with the adverb "mutually", once with an expression composed of numerals (the main numeral "one" is used secondarily as a pronoun) and the preposition "one to another". Both texts show the dialogical nature of man, namely in a situation of uncertainty, surprise, astonishment, making important decisions, he seeks a second opinion, another person's opinion. This is an attempt to objectivise his own feelings, judgments and convictions. This is an element of an attitude that is less and less obvious in the contemporary world of Western culture – the need to open up to the other, to go towards the other not only through necessary joint action, but through the verification of judgements and thoughts.

THE IDEA OF SHARING ACTIVITIES (in the positive sense of cooperation, and the negative one of opposition/conflict/fighting³⁷) is expressed by a nominative construction with the preposition אֶל [cf. WSHP, p. 100]. Among its 24 meanings recorded in *The Great Hebrew-Polish and Aramaic-Polish Dictionary of the Old Testament*, there is also one that points to the idea of "sharing an activity" [WSHP, vol. 1, p. 101] with someone else, both in the sense of cooperation, being in someone's company, [cf. WSHP, vol. 1, p. 101], e.g. helping with building or joining a war expedition, and also communicating with someone, e.g. talking to someone, as well as in a negative sense, i.e. acting against someone, being hostile towards someone.

It is this last sense of the preposition אֶל "to face someone in battle/to turn against someone" that is very well expressed in the text from *The Book of Judges*, describing an episode of the Israelite-Madianic war, which ends with Israel's success and a heavy defeat of the powerful nomads.

³⁷ Cf. also Mal 2, 10.

אִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ

וַיִּתְקְעוּ, שְׁלֹשׁ-מֵאוֹת הַשּׁוֹפְרוֹת, וַיִּשָּׂם יְהוָה אֶת חֶרֶב אִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ, וּבְכָל-הַמַּחֲנֶה;
וַיָּנֹס הַמַּחֲנֶה עַד-בַּיִת הַשְּׁטָה, צָרְרָתָהּ--עַד שְׁפַת-אֲבָל מְחֹלָה, עַל-טַבַּת

*wayyitqəʿû šəlōš-mēʾōt haššōpārōt wayyāsem yhwh(ʾādōnāy) ʾēṭ
ḥereb ʾiš bərəʿēhū ūbəkōl-hammaḥāne^h wayyānos ḥammaḥāne^h ʿad-
bēt haššittā^h šərērātā^h ʿad šəpat-ʾābēl məḥōlā^h ʿal-ṭabbāt*

And the three hundred blew the trumpets; and the Lord set every man's sword against his fellow, even throughout all the host; and the host fled to Bethshittah towards Zererah and to the border of Abelmeholah unto Tabbath.

(Jdgs 7, 22)

Through Yahweh's interference in this holy war, a small group of Gideon's warriors defeat a more powerful enemy force by means of a trick. Chosen by Yahweh from among Gideon's large army, the warriors wreak havoc at night in the enemy camp itself: they feign an attack by a powerful army, sending the Midianite troops into a panic. Awakened and frightened by the sirens, the Madianic soldiers fight among themselves³⁸. This thought is accurately represented by the examined phraseme אִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ, occurring in larger syntactic units – verbal phrasemes “one against the other pointed the sword” [BTP], “YHWH turned the sword of the husband against his companion” [PI, p. 142]. The havoc in the enemy's ranks is the work of Yahweh. Gideon's warriors merely put His design into action and observed its astonishing results.

כִּי, לִפְנֵי הַיָּמִים הָהֵם, שָׁכַר הָאָדָם לֹא נִהְיָה, וַיִּשְׁכַּר הַבְּהֵמָה אִינְנָה; וַלְיֹצֵא וְלָבֹא
אִין-שְׁלוֹם מִן-הַצָּר, וַאֲשַׁלַּח אֶת-כָּל-הָאָדָם אִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ

*kî lipnê hayyāmîm hāhēm šəkar hāʾādām lōʾ niḥyā^h ūšəkar
habbəhēmā^h ʿénennā^h wəlayyôšēʾ wəlabbāʾ ʿên-šālôm min-ḥaššār
waʾāšallah ʾeṭ-kol-hāʾādām ʾiš bərəʿēhū*

³⁸ Cf. M. O'Connor, *Księga Sędziów [The Book of Judges]*, in: *Katolicki komentarz biblijny...*, p. 224.

For before these days there was no hire for man nor any hire for beast, neither was there any peace for him that went out or came in because of the affliction; for I set all men, every one, against his neighbour.

(Ze 8, 10)

In Zechariah's prophecy, the time of trial to which Yahweh had subjected the chosen people was just coming to an end. Its element of particular severity was the discord between the nations: "and for those going out and for those coming in there was no peace because of the oppressor, for I have sent every man against his neighbour" [PI, p. 1543]. In the foreshadowing of the Messianic era, which takes the shape of "ordinary and peaceful happiness, achieved through the blessing of Yahweh present in Zion"³⁹, the ancient Hebrews' idea of a happy life and a proper social order is perpetuated: the images of old men and old women with canes in their hands "because of the multitude of days" are moving here [PI, p. 1542] (Pro 8:4), children playing carelessly (Pro 8, 5). The sign of God's blessing on the surviving Remnant will be the "seed of peace": "the vineyard shall yield its fruit", "the earth shall yield its crop", "the heavens shall give their dew" [PI, p. 1543] (Ze 8, 12).

אִישׁ-בְּאֶחָיו
אִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ

וְסִכְסַקְתִּי מִצָּרִים בְּמִצָּרִים, וְנִלְחַמוּ אִישׁ-בְּאֶחָיו וְאִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ, עִיר בְּעִיר, מַמְלָכָה
בְּמַמְלָכָה

*wəsiḵsaktî mišráyim bəmišráyim wənilḥāmû ʾiš-bəʾāhîw wəʾîš
bərēʿehû ʿîr bəʿîr mamlākā^h bəmmamlākā^h*

And I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians; and they shall fight every one against his brother and every one against his neighbour, city against city, and kingdom against kingdom.

(Is 19, 2)⁴⁰

By proclaiming Yahweh's words of warning against Judah's alliance with Egypt, the prophet Isaiah pronounces an oracle against Egypt. The

³⁹ Cf. The footnote to: Ze 8, 1–23, in: *Biblia Jerozolimska...*, p. 1333.

⁴⁰ Cf. also Is 3, 5. I discuss the text in the concluding chapter of my dissertation *Językowy obraz człowieka...*, pp. 216–217.

cruel image of a human carcass (Is 18, 6) leaves no illusions about the fate of this once powerful state⁴¹. The text under examination (Is 19:2) gives an account of the time of Osorkon IV, the last ruler of the Twenty-third Dynasty. Yahweh is portrayed here as the ruler of history, who influences the fate of Egypt by inciting the Egyptians to civil war⁴². In Isaiah's prophecy we find scenes corresponding to times of anarchy, of cruelty, when there are no longer any sanctities – neither do blood ties count (*ʾiš-bəʾāḥîw wəʾiš bərēʿêḥû*) nor national ties (*mišrāyim bəmišrāyim*), neither do social laws work (*ʿîr bəʿîr*) nor state laws (*mamlākā^h bəmmamlākā^h*) – everyone fights against everyone.

ADVERSARY

literally EVERY ONE HIS MAN⁴³

אִישׁ אִישׁוֹ

וַיִּכּוּ, אִישׁ אִישׁוֹ, וַיִּגְסוּ אֹרָם, וַיִּרְדְּפֵם יִשְׂרָאֵל; וַיִּמָּלֹט, בֶּן-הַדָּד מֶלֶךְ אֲרָם,
עַל-סוּסִים, וּפָרָשִׁים

wayyakkû ʾiš ʾišô wayyānūsû ʾārām wayyirdəpēm yiśrāʾēl
wayyimmālēt ben-hāḏad mēlek ʾārām ʿal-sūs ûpārāšîm

And they slew every one his man; and the Syrians fled, and Israel pursued them; and Benhadad the king of Syria escaped on a horse with the horsemen.

(1 Kgs 20, 20)

The war episode from the period of Ben Hadad's invasion and the victorious battle between the Israelites under King Ahab and the Syrians (or Aramaeans)⁴⁴ provides a succinct, laconic description of the struggle on the battlefield: "Each [of the Israelites] defeated his opponent" ("And they smitten every one his adversary") [PI, p. 594]. The remarkable success of

⁴¹ This is confirmed by historical facts. Egypt was plundered by the Assyrians under Asarhaddon and Assurbanipal in the first half of the seventh century B.C. Cf. the footnote to Jer 18:4, in: *Biblia Jerozolimska...*, p. 1052.

⁴² Cf. J. Jensen, W.H. Irwin, *Księga Izajasza. Proto-Izajasz (Iz 1–39)* [*The Book of Isaiah. Proto-Isaiah (Isaiah 1–39)*], in: *Katolicki komentarz biblijny...*, p. 632: "The period leading up to the unification under Piankhi was a time of internal strife and struggle, with not only minor princes but even rival dynasties coming up against each other: The Twenty-third Dynasty came into the political arena when the Twenty-second Dynasty was still making claims to power, whereas the Twenty-fourth came to power even before the final collapse of the Twenty-third".

⁴³ Cf. also Is 3, 5. I discuss the text further herein.

⁴⁴ Cf. J.T. Walsh, C.T. Begg, *Pierwsza i Druga Księga Królewska* [*The First and Second Books of Kings*], in: *Katolicki komentarz biblijny...*, p. 283.

the war is expressed in Hebrew by the phraseme **וַיִּכּוּ אִישׁ אִישׁוֹ**, literally, “they killed/injured/slaughtered (3rd person *masculinum pluralis hiph‘il imperfectum*) every man his own man/every human his own human”⁴⁵ [cf. the meaning of **נָכַח** in PSHP, p. 228], which builds an exceptionally vivid picture of a battle scene: in a battle in which Yahweh sides with his people, each of the Israelites successfully defeats the Aramaean who stands before him; each successive duel in this battle scene ends with an Israelite’s victory.

THE IDEA OF UNANIMITY⁴⁶

AS ONE MAN

כְּאִישׁ אֶחָד

כְּ – “originally a deictic participle, a locative preposition”, also a comparative participle: “1. an expression of sameness, 2. an expression of conformity of measure, 3. an expression of conformity of features” [cf. WSHP, vol. 1, pp. 429–430] – organizes this nominal phrase conveying the idea of unanimity very close to the Polish phrase “[together] as one man”.

In a literal sense the phraseme **כְּאִישׁ אֶחָד** occurs in the description of the holy war between Gideon’s army and the Midianites. In this context it means that the battle against the multitude of Midianite soldiers will be easy (“as if with only one man”), for it is Yahweh who will fight. The victory belongs to Him⁴⁷:

וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלָיו יְהוָה, כִּי אֶהְיֶה עִמָּךְ; וְהָפִיתָ אֶת-מִדְיָן, כְּאִישׁ אֶחָד

wayyōmer ʿēlāyw yhwḥ(ʿādōnāy) kī ʿehye^h ʿimmāk wəhikkîṭā ʿet-miḏyān kəʾiš ʿehād

And the Lord said unto him, “Surely I will be with thee, and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one man.”

(Jdgs 6, 16)

The idea of unanimity is reflected in another sentence from the same book:

⁴⁵ The analysed phraseme also constitutes a grammatical means of expressing distribution pronoun.

⁴⁶ Cf. also: Judg 20:1; Judg 20:11; 1 Sm 11:7.

⁴⁷ Cf. the footnote to Judges 7:1–25 and Judges 7:22, in: *Biblia Jerozolimska...*, pp. 278–299.

וַיִּקָּם, כָּל-הָעָם, כְּאִישׁ אֶחָד, לֵאמֹר: לֹא גִלָּד אִישׁ לְאַהֲלֹוֹ, וְלֹא נָסוּר אִישׁ לְבֵיתֹו

wayyāqom kol-hā‘ām kəʾiš ʿeḥād lēʾmōr lōʾ nēlēk ʾiš ləʾohōlō wəlōʾ nāsūr ʾiš ləbêtō

And all the people arose as one man, saying, “We will not any of us go to his tent, neither will we any of us turn into his house.

(Jdgs 20, 8)

The phraseme **כְּאִישׁ אֶחָד** reflects the full consent of all the Israelites, present at the assembly at Mispa, where a strategy was determined for action against the Benjaminites who had committed the terrible crime at Gibeā. It was decided unanimously “as one man” about the vengeance that must befall this wicked generation.

OUT OF EVERY TRIBE A MAN

אִישׁ-אֶחָד אִישׁ-אֶחָד (מִן ...)

Two texts, fragments of the story of the second “passage”⁴⁸ or, more precisely, the commemoration of the passage of the twelve tribes of Israel under Joshua across the Jordan, contain phrasemes meaning “one by one/ one at the time” and specifying the representation of each tribe in this work.

קָחוּ לָכֶם מִן-הָעָם, שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר אַנְשִׁים--אִישׁ-אֶחָד אִישׁ-אֶחָד, מִשִּׁבְט

qəḥû lākem min-hā‘ām šəṇēḥ ʿāsār ʾānāšîm ʾiš-ʿeḥād ʾiš-ʿeḥād miššābet

Take you twelve men out of the people, out of every tribe a man,

(Jsh 4, 2)

וַיִּקְרָא יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, אֶל-שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר אִישׁ, אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ מִכִּין, מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל--אִישׁ-אֶחָד אִישׁ-אֶחָד, מִשִּׁבְט

wayyiqrāʾ yəhōšūʿ ʿel-šəṇēḥ ʿeḥād ʾiš ʾāšer hēkîn mibbənê yisrāʾēl ʾiš-ʿeḥād ʾiš-ʿeḥād miššābet

⁴⁸ Cf. the footnote to Jsh 3:1-5, 12 in: *Biblia Jerozolimska...*, p. 243.

Then Joshua called the twelve men, whom he had prepared of the children of Israel, out of every tribe a man.

(Jsh 4, 4)

The principle of binarity dictates that one should treat the structures examined here, i.e. $\text{ʔiš-}^{\text{ʔehād}}$ $\text{ʔiš-}^{\text{ʔehād}}$, not as components of a simple repetition, but as elements constituting a new semantic quality: $\text{ʔiš-}^{\text{ʔehād}}$ miššābet + $\text{ʔiš-}^{\text{ʔehād}}$ miššābet “one man from a generation” + “one man from a generation” gives the term representation, i.e. “one from each generation”. The phraseme conveys well the idea that each generation had a representative in the work of commemorating the crossing of the Jordan at Gilgal.

A MAN FOR...

אִישׁ עַל-בְּנוֹ

וְהָיוּ לִי, אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, לְיוֹם, אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי עוֹשֶׂה סִגְלָה; וְחִמַּלְתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם--כַּאֲשֶׁר
נְחִמַל אִישׁ, עַל-בְּנוֹ הַעֲבָד אֹתוֹ

*wəhāyû lî ʔamar yhw(ʔādōnāy) šəbāʔōt layyôm ʔāšer ʔānî ʕōšeh
səgullāh wəḥāmallî ʕālêhem kaʔāšer yaḥmōl ʔiš ʕal-bənoḥāʕəbəd ʔōtō*

“And they shall be Mine,” saith the Lord of hosts, “in that day when I make up My jewels; and I will spare them as a man spareth his own son who serveth him”.

(Mal 3, 17)

עַל – the preposition with the meaning “1. on the side, 2. on the account of someone, 3. on account of, with regard to, 4. according to, 5. against, 6. to, towards” [...] [cf. PSHP, p. 260, WSHP, vol. 1, pp. 770–772] builds the phraseme expressing the relation of closeness, directing towards the other, doing something for the other. The use of this phrase in a sentence from *The Book of Malachi* may be regarded as exemplary. It shows the Lord of Hosts as the greatest ally of those who are God-fearing and faithful to Him. God will be turned towards them and will act for their good (cf. Mal 3:20–21). This idea is expressed by a comparison based on the Semitic concept of paternity, which presupposes the absolute power of the father

over his offspring who are recognised as his own, but – and this is worth emphasising – this power is not so much objectifying as inseparable from responsibility and care, care which goes to the point of fighting to death in defence of the family member. This idea is well reflected in the interlinear translation “And they will be for Me [...] my property and I will take care of them” [PI, p. 1570].

Conclusions

The analysis of phrasemes built from combinations of the nouns אָח, רֵעַ, אִישׁ and the prepositions בְּ, לְ, עַל, אֶל, אֶת, כִּי allows us to clarify their role in the sentence – the prepositions in the constructions studied (here: nominative, although it is possible in Classical Hebrew to combine them with a verb in the infinitive or with a pronoun) determine the syntactic function of the word with which they are combined (as a substitute for information carried by accidental inflection). In other words: they are an exponent of the relation between the word in question and the word determined in the sentence⁴⁹. In the biblical texts under study, the indicated prepositions indicate the relationship between the nouns defining man אִישׁ, אָח, רֵעַ.

The conducted analysis makes it possible to state that in the biblical linguistic image of the world man appears as a being constantly turned towards other people – individuals and communities – open to relations with another human being (through empathy, dialogue, objectivisation of own feelings, cooperation) and with the community (tribal, territorial, religious).

Human being is a social being: s/he grows in conditions that are favourable to them, which are determined by such factors as friendship, unity, understanding, cooperation, support. The biblical ideal is a united, unanimous, cooperating community. A situation of conflict, struggle, disunity, condemnation or rejection has a destructive effect on them; and in the social dimension – it leads to anarchy. Disunity, struggle, discord are defined in the biblical perspective on man as deviation, disruption of the Creator’s original design. This communal dimension of human life on earth is indeed characteristic of the entire Old Testament. There is no place

⁴⁹ Cf. A. Tschirschnitz, K. Wojciechowska, *Gramatyka języka hebrajskiego w zarysie* [An Outline of Hebrew Grammar], Warsaw 1996, p. 209.

here for the apotheosis of individualism so characteristic of contemporary Western civilisation.

In the background of human relations, the presence of God is constantly discernible. Relationships with neighbours are a consequence and a reflection of man's relationship with God.

The examined phrasemes and the texts in which they are included portray interpersonal relationships as complex and varied. There are many images of closeness, cooperation, care, unanimity, but also feuds, conflicts, ruthless struggle and rivalry.

In the biblical image, people are brothers in God the Creator – by virtue of the community of creation. In the prophetic books, this applies mainly to the community of the chosen people, although even the cruel wars waged against the peoples of Canaan or other enemies of Israel were not motivated by cruelty or hatred, but had a religious motivation of destroying everything that conflicts with the purity of the worship.

Jolanta Szarlej

Semantics of Phrasemes Defining Interpersonal Relations in the Hebrew and Polish Linguistic Image of the World (Based on the Material from the Books of Prophets)

In the course of her research, the Authoress aims to show the fundamental differences in the way the linguistic image of the world is constructed in different languages (here: Polish and Classical Hebrew) at the level of syntactic structures. This component of the linguistic image of the world less frequently constitutes the object of research in the Polish cognitive tradition than, for example, lexis, which is why the Authoress considers the collected phrasemes and the meanings they convey to be particularly worth highlighting. The linguistic material that forms the basis for the research comes from the part of the *Hebrew Bible* called *Nəḇi'îm*, and the syntactic structures themselves are selected from the biblical material with the noun **אִישׁ** *iš*, which defines man in the Bible as an individual. The structures presented here, built from a combination of the nouns **אָח**, **רֵעַ**, **אִישׁ** and the prepositions **לְ**, **בְ**, **עִלְ**, **אֶל**, **אֶת**, **כְּ** express complex and varied interpersonal relations: there are many images of closeness, cooperation, care, unanimity, but also feuds, conflicts, ruthless

struggle and rivalry, with which the history of Israel was marked. Semantically, they complement the linguistic image of the intricate interpersonal relationships portrayed on the pages of the Bible.

Keywords: *phrasemes, prophetic books, interpersonal relations, cognitivism, linguistic image of the world*