



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Studies in the syntax of Targum Jonathan to Samuel

Kuty, R.J.

Citation

Kuty, R. J. (2008, January 30). *Studies in the syntax of Targum Jonathan to Samuel*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/12588>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/12588>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

CHAPTER ONE

DETERMINATION

The Use of the Emphatic and Absolute States¹

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 DETERMINATION IN ARAMAIC

An Overview

In common with other Semitic languages Aramaic nouns vary in gender, number and state. All Semitic languages possess two genders, masculine and feminine, and three numbers, singular, plural and dual.² Unlike some other Semitic languages, however, Aramaic knows three *status*:³ construct (*status constructus*, or st.cst.), absolute (*status absolutus*, or st.abs.) and emphatic (*status emphaticus*, or st.emph.).⁴ The first of these three *status*, the st.cst., is specific to a particular grammatical

¹ An abridged version of this chapter has appeared as ‘Determination in Targum Jonathan to Samuel’ (Kuty 2005). I have had the occasion to discuss the content of that article with several scholars, including Prof. Dr. H. Gzella (Leiden University) and Prof. Dr. J. Huehnergard (Harvard University). My understanding of determination in TJ has greatly benefitted from their valuable remarks, for which I wish to express my gratitude. In addition, as will be seen in the final conclusions (C:2.2), subsequent research on the syntax of TJ has led me to refine some of the views that I maintained in that article.

² The dual appears as an active, fully exploited grammatical device in but a few of the classical Semitic languages, e.g. Classical Arabic and Ugaritic (cf. Moscati 1964: 93-94). For a general treatment of determination in the Semitic languages, cf. Brockelmann (1908: 466-474); Moscati (1964: 96-102); Lipiński (1997: 265-278).

³ In order to clearly distinguish between ‘state’ in its common meaning and ‘state’ as referring to the specific grammatical categories to be discussed in this chapter, the latter will be referred to by its Latin name *status* (pl. *status*).

⁴ Akkadian also possesses a third state, termed *status absolutus* (Von Soden 1995: §62c). Yet, this form should not be confused with the Aramaic st.abs., inasmuch as the term ‘absolutus’ used to denote the Akkadian form refers essentially to the fact that it is uninflected, in contrast to the *status rectus* and *status constructus* (which correspond formally to the st.abs. and st.cst. in Aramaic). Interestingly, however, though the Akkadian *status absolutus* and the Aramaic st.abs. refer to different formal categories, they also display some functional commonalities (cf. D:5.2).

structure referred to as the ‘construct relation’. The st.cst. and the construct relation are employed prominently for the expression of the genitive and will be discussed in chapter 3. The first two, the st.emph. and st.abs., are intimately connected with the notion of determination.

Languages vary in the means used to express the determination or indetermination of a given term. Variations in word order, changes in intonation patterns, and the use of specific morphemes — or a combination of the above — feature among the most commonly encountered.⁵ As far as can be judged, in OA, the most ancient stage of development of the Aramaic language, determination or lack thereof was primarily expressed through morphological accident, a given term being put in the st.emph. when determinate and in the st.abs. when indeterminate.⁶ It is generally agreed that this state of affairs was paramount until the MA period.⁷ Thus, this basic distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. was on the whole also the rule in IA, BA, QA, Nabatean, and Palmyrene.⁸

By the advent of the LA period, however, a significant change had occurred. The Aramaic dialects of the western part of what had been the Achaemenid Empire (JPA, CPA and SA) preserved the original state of affairs, continuing the historical distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. In contrast, the Aramaic dialects practised in the eastern part of the Empire (Syriac, Mandaic and JBA) had witnessed a thorough weakening of the determining force of the st.emph. Having become unmarked semantically, the st.emph. was gradually promoted to the status of basic form of the noun *par excellence*. In the process the

⁵ Cf. FG1 (183-188, esp. 187).

⁶ Cf. Degen (1969: §66); Hug (1993: 89-90); Segert (1975: §6.3.3). One will note, however, that according to some scholars the connection between determination and use of st.emph. was not systematic in the earliest phases of Aramaic (cf. Huehnergard 1995: 270). Samalian is a case in point, cf. Dion (1974: 135-138); Tropper (1993: 193-194).

⁷ Segert (1975: §6.3.3.1.1).

⁸ On IA, cf. Muraoka & Porten (2003: §46). On BA, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §88). On QA, cf. Fitzmyer (2004: 289-290); Muraoka (1972a: 11ff.); Beyer (1984: 447); Schattner-Rieser (2004: 124). The distinction between st.abs. and st.emph. in the Targum of Job (TgJob; 11QtgJob) is less clear-cut, though, which has been explained as a result of Eastern Aramaic influence, cf. Kutscher (1970b: 180); Sokoloff (1974: 23-24); Muraoka (1974: 432). Schattner-Rieser (2004: 85) points out, however, that the neutralization of the st.emph. in that text is not as advanced as in LA. On Nabatean, cf. Cantineau (1930: 109-110). On Palmyrene, cf. Cantineau (1935: 119-124). In his very instructive survey of Palmyrene, Rosenthal (1936) hardly addresses syntactic matters.

st.abs. was largely driven back, its use being confined to certain specific contexts, and the uses of the st.cst. were severely curtailed as well. As a result of this, other methods to express determination and indetermination emerged.⁹

Towards the advent of the LA period, the distinction in form and use among the st.abs. and st.emph. had therefore ceased to be a pan-Aramaic feature. Because of that, the retention or abandonment of this distinction has often been employed in the relevant literature as an important argument to determine the date and place of origin of Aramaic texts. Considering TJ's uncertainty in this regard, it can be conceived easily that the use and function of these two *status* in the Aramaic of TJ form a significant question.

1.2 STATUS QUAESTIONIS

Significant though this question may be, as yet it has never been thoroughly investigated. In his monumental *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, Dalman mostly did not take syntactic issues into consideration, but noted in passing that determinate forms with indeterminate meaning are found in the Targums.¹⁰

In 1971 Kutscher, in his brilliant but by its very nature necessarily concise exposition of the Aramaic language, declared laconically that

⁹ The remarkable break between Western and Eastern LA is condensed most unequivocally by Kutscher (1970b: 180) in the following statement: '[T]here is not the slightest doubt that W[estern]A[ramaic], i.e. [JPA], [SA] and [CPA] do distinguish correctly between the different states, and it is only in the contemporary E[astern]A[ramaic] that these distinctions have broken down'. Cf. also Nöldeke (1875: 300); Kutscher (1971: 273, 275; 1976: 7); Kaufman (1974: 133-135); Greenfield (1978a: 39-40) and, more recently, Kaufman (1997: 123). The diachronic process witnessed in the Eastern Aramaic dialects is a typical instance of 'markedness shift' (FG1: 44-47), which might have taken place under Akkadian influence, cf. Kaufman (1974: 135). Concerning the individual idioms: on JPA, cf. Levy (1974: 196); Kutscher (1976: 7-8); Lund (unpublished: 27) and Fassberg (1990: §56). Odeberg's statement (1939: 76-77) should be reevaluated in the light of Kutscher (1976). Determination in PsJ displays difficulties similar to those evinced by TO (Cook 1986a: 170-173), which are at least partly due to PsJ's dependence on TO (Cook 1986a: 40-52). On CPA, cf. Nöldeke (1868: 475, 507); Schulthess (1924: §156); Müller-Kessler (1991: 113-115). On SA, cf. Macuch (1982: 282ff.). On Classical Syriac, cf. Duval (1881: 249, 335-338); Nöldeke (1898: §202); Joosten (1996: 67-73); Bohas (1998); Muraoka (2005: §18, §71, §72). On JBA, cf. Margolis (1910: §43); Epstein (1960: 117). On Mandaic, cf. Nöldeke (1875: §216); Macuch (1965: 384-385).

¹⁰ Dalman (1905: 188).

‘the determined form which originally was employed apparently correctly (as in the dialects of Western Aramaic) does not function properly any more’ in the Aramaic of TO/TJ, whereby he obviously meant that determination no longer respects the classical norm set by Old and Official Aramaic, a linguistic feature which, Kutscher claimed, TO and TJ, while fundamentally Western in origin, share with Eastern Aramaic.¹¹

In 1975, in his pioneer work on the language of TJ, Tal was even more emphatic and stated categorically that ‘the use of the determination marker is not consistent in TJ’.¹² While he did not reject the idea that this may be the product of an Eastern influence at the time of the final redaction of TJ in Babylonia, he also insisted that not all deviations from the BH original should be counted as errors, considering that the notion and use of determination in Aramaic seems to have been at least slightly different from the understanding of determination in Hebrew, as can be seen from the uncommon uses of the *st.emph.* in Palestine and elsewhere, even from the earliest stages of Aramaic.

A decade prior to Tal’s study Kaddari investigated various (morpho)syntactic issues in TO, the idiom of which is generally seen to be so close to that of TJ as to be virtually identical (cf. I:3.1). Essentially, in the wake of Kutscher Kaddari believed that the Aramaic of TO was Western in origin. Concerning determination specifically, he concluded that two different systems of determination function side by side in TO: one in which the opposition between *st.emph.* and *st.abs.* is maintained, and one in which this opposition has been abandoned for the benefit of the *st.emph.* He also suggested that one does not need to resort to alleged Eastern influences (and therefore treat the Aramaic of TO as transitional between Western and Eastern Aramaic) to explain the presence of the latter system in TO. Instead of analysing these two systems along geographic lines, he prefers to understand them in diachronic terms and regard them as two distinct phases in the historical development of Aramaic: the suppression of the contrast between determinate and indeterminate nominal forms in TO, he claimed, is a general development in any language where such a contrast is present,

¹¹ Kutscher (1971: 268). In this regard Kutscher appears to have revised his view diametrically, as a decade before he stated, in his assessment of the linguistic proximity of TO to Western Aramaic, that ‘the most outstanding trait is the nearly always correct use of the determination’ (Kutscher 1958: 10, n.43). Considering the most intricate state of affairs observed in TJ, one cannot but understand Kutscher’s revision.

¹² Tal (1975: 85).

and may therefore be considered an immanent development within Western Aramaic, marking the transition to LA.¹³

In his grammatical study of the Targum Fragments of the Cairo Genizah, Fassberg adopted a more cautious attitude and stated, in passing, that as against Palestinian Syriac, Samaritan Aramaic and Galilean Aramaic where the distinction in form and use among the three *status* is preserved, ‘the determining force of the determined form is *sometimes* lost in Targum Onqelos’ [emphasis mine], thereby suggesting that as a rule it is not.¹⁴ In his grammar of Babylonian Aramaic, Epstein had likewise noted that the use of the emphatic ending begins to blur in the Aramaic of TO and TJ.¹⁵ Most recently Müller-Kessler counted the ‘difficulty in distinguishing between the absolute and emphatic state’ among the distinctive features of the Aramaic of TO/TJ.¹⁶ Finally, Lambdin and Huehnergard’s (as yet unpublished) *Introduction to the Aramaic of Targum Onqelos* also notes that ‘the distinction between the use of the emphatic and absolute forms [in TO] is a difficult problem’.¹⁷ Lambdin and Huehnergard’s work, though only intended as an introductory textbook, offers nonetheless important insights into the working of determination in TO.

All these observations are certainly valuable. But as was pointed out above, the fact remains that the question of determination in TJ (and TO too, of course) still awaits a more thorough investigation. It is the purpose of this chapter to contribute to filling this lacuna. Our corpus has been subjected to a close scrutiny, so as to provide a detailed account of the working of determination in TJS and assess its alleged state of collapse. In what follows an attempt will be made to show that the assumption that determination in TJS is not working properly anymore is in need of revision.

¹³ Kaddari (1963a: 235-241).

¹⁴ Fassberg (1990: 136).

¹⁵ Epstein (1960: 117).

¹⁶ Müller-Kessler (2001: 188).

¹⁷ Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 44).

1.3 THE NOTION OF DETERMINATION ADOPTED IN THIS STUDY

In the course of this chapter a distinction will be made between formal and semantic determination, the former referring to form, the latter to meaning. Formal determination therefore refers to the actual linguistic marking of determination. As for semantic determination, for the purpose of this study it will be understood along a twofold axis: cognitive availability and genericity:¹⁸

1. Cognitive availability:

Given a verbal interaction involving a speaker and an addressee, a term will be presented as semantically determinate by the speaker if he believes that the term is in some way available to the addressee. As a rule, a term is deemed available because:

- a) It has been mentioned previously in the verbal interaction (anaphora), e.g. I.25.5 ‘and David sent ten young men, and David said to *the young men*’;
- b) It refers to an entity thought to be unique in the addressee’s knowledge of the world, e.g. I.20.24 ‘the moon’, I.13.7 ‘the Jordan’;
- c) It refers to an entity otherwise well-known to him, e.g. I.19.22 ‘and he came to *the great cistern that is in Secu*’;
- d) It is perceptually available in the situation, e.g. ‘do you see *the man over there* ?’. The vocative, designating typically a person one addresses at the moment of the utterance (e.g. ‘O king !’), also belongs here;
- e) It can be inferred from some piece of information already available to the addressee, e.g. ‘I wanted to open the door but I could not find *the key*’ (the entity ‘key’ can be inferred from the entity ‘door’). This category also covers a whole range of possessive uses, e.g. I.18.10 ‘and Saul had his (*lit.* the) spear in his hand’ (Saul’s possessing a spear can be inferred from our background knowledge that he is a warrior).

¹⁸ The notion of determination adopted in this study is largely based on our traditional understanding of determination in Hebrew and Aramaic, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §88); WoC (§13); JM (§137); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §46). Its formulation, however, is framed by Functional Grammar (FG1: 127ff., 183ff.).

2. Genericity:

Nouns are used generically when they are intended to refer to a whole class or species. They can occur both in the plural (e.g. I.28.1 ‘the Philistines’) and in the singular (e.g. I.2.8 ‘the poor, the needy’). In the former case the class is treated as a unity; in the latter a representative of the class is singled out to represent the whole.¹⁹

According to the above, therefore, the noun אִתְּמָא ‘woman’ in II.11.2 וְחָזָא אִתְּמָא ‘and he saw a woman’ will be considered semantically indeterminate (because it has not been mentioned previously in the text), but formally determinate (in that it occurs in the st.emph., the primary way determination is expressed in Classical Aramaic).

1.4 THE POSITION ADOPTED IN THIS STUDY

The conclusions that a study of determination in TJS has allowed me to reach can be outlined as follows:

1. Determination in TJ appears to function according to a largely consistent linguistic system. In other words, in the main the use of the st.emph. and st.abs. appears to be the effect of rules rather than the product of some arbitrary process;
2. The apparent irregularity of use of the st.emph. and st.abs. is a consequence of the fact that the linguistic system governing their use is dependent on two distinct (sub)systems:
 - a) A linguistic system in which the distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. is fully maintained and carried out;
 - b) A linguistic system in which the distinction between the two is neutralized to the advantage of the st.emph., that by and large proves to exert both functions;
3. Though these two systems are coexistent in the linguistic system of the Aramaic of TJS, they are not intermingled. In other words, they are not interchangeable, and a close scrutiny of our corpus

¹⁹ As shall be seen later on, the *genitivus materiae* and related constructions follow rules of their own in terms of determination, due to specific patterns of interaction between the A-term and B-term of the genitive relation. As a result, the B-term of these constructions, though generic in meaning and therefore semantically determinate, is not systematically in the st.emph. (cf. D:3.2.2.1).

reveals that each of them is used under distinct circumstances.²⁰

As a result of the above, the state of affairs witnessed in the Aramaic of TJS is twofold. In certain circumstances st.emph. and st.abs. are used properly, i.e. in agreement with the classical norm set by OA and IA; in other circumstances the st.emph. is the usual form, with the exception of certain specific areas of grammar where the st.abs. has maintained its sway. The foremost conclusion that can be drawn from this bipartite distribution is that the Aramaic of TJS displays a clear preference for the st.emph., allowing it to encroach on the domains that were traditionally the prerogative of the st.abs.

2. STATUS EMPHATICUS AND STATUS ABSOLUTUS IN TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

Probably one of the most remarkable results produced by the present study is the fact that determination does not work in the same way in the singular and in the plural. Essentially, with regard to the expression of determination our analysis of TJS allows us to draw a sharp line between singular and plural nouns.

2.1 NOUNS IN THE PLURAL

A close scrutiny of our corpus demonstrates that in the plural the classical distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. is systematically maintained: when semantically determinate the noun occurs in the st.emph., when semantically indeterminate it occurs in the st.abs., and this applies to both masculine and feminine nouns.²¹ Countless examples

²⁰ The idea that two different systems of determination are co-existent in the Aramaic of TJ is consonant with Kaddari's views on the working of determination in TO (cf. D:1.2). In contrast to Kaddari's views, however, the present study suggests that the use of these two systems is not arbitrary, but rather follows definite rules.

²¹ Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 44) have reached a similar conclusion independently with regard to the Aramaic of TO. This was unknown to me at the time Kutty (2005) was submitted for publication.

illustrate this state of affairs:²²

1. Indeterminate nouns:

- Absolute use: I.2.1 נסין וגבורין ‘signs and mighty deeds’, I.14.48 משרין ‘armies’, II.3.2 בנין ‘sons’, II.5.13 לחינן ‘concubines’, II.7.6 במשכנין וביריעין ‘in tents and in curtains’;
- Modified by an attributive adjective or participle: I.6.7 תורן מונקן ‘milk-cows’, I.6.18 קרוין כריכן ‘fortified cities’, I.19.4 פתגמין תקנין ‘good words’, I.28.8 לבושין אחרנין ‘other clothes’, II.4.11 גברין רשיעין ‘wicked men’, II.16.1 חמרין השיקין ‘saddled asses’;
- With numeral: I.2.21 תלתה בנין ותרתין בנין ‘three sons and two daughters’, I.13.17 תלת משרין ‘three companies’, II.9.10 עסר בנין ועסרין עבדין ‘fourteen sons and twenty servants’, II.15.16 עסר נשין ‘ten women’;²³
- Accompanied by a noun in apposition: II.2.7 גברין גברין ‘warrior men’, II.20.3 נשין לחינן ‘women concubines’;
- With modifier כל ‘all’: II.6.5 כל אעי בירוון ‘all (manner of instruments made of) fir wood’, II.22.3 כל חטופין ‘all robbers’, II.22.30 כל כרכין תקיפין ‘all strong cities’;
- As the B-term of a construct relation: I.16.21 נמיל זנין ‘a bearer of weapons’.²⁴

²² The semantic (in)determination of all nouns adduced as examples in this chapter has been established on the basis of the criteria exposed above (cf. D:1.3). The relevance of the subcategories in which the instances are organized parallel the complex state of affairs witnessed with singular nouns and will be self-explanatory when singular nouns are discussed (cf. D:2.2).

²³ On the use of the numerals with pl. nouns, cf. N:2.2.

²⁴ Instances of indeterminate plural nouns in the st.abs. can be mentioned *ad libitum*, e.g. II.5.11 ושלח חירם מלכא דצור אונגדין לות דויד ואעי ארוין ונגרין דאומנין למקן אעין וארדיכלין דאומנין ... בבנין כותליא ... ‘and Hiram the king of Tyre sent *messengers* unto David, and *wood of cedars* and *carpenters* who were *trained* to cut wood and *artisans* who were *trained* in the building of walls’. Instances of Topic Introduction/Maintenance are particularly suitable for illustrating this principle, i.e. instances where a noun (or, strictly speaking, its referent) is introduced into the discourse for the first time and is therefore semantically indeterminate, to be mentioned again later as a part of the story, this time as a determinate term because its referent is deemed available to the addressee (cf. W:4.2.1.1.1), e.g. I.6.10 ודברו תרתין תורן ‘and they took two *cows*’, continued in I.6.12 ואכוינא תורתא ‘and *the cows* went straight’; I.25.5 ושלח דויד עסרא עולימין ואמר דויד לעולימיא ‘and David sent *ten young men*, and David said to *the young men*’; I.19.14 ושלח שאול אונגדין ‘and Saul sent *messengers*’, continued in the next verse I.19.15 ושלח שאול ית אונגדיא ‘and Saul sent *the messengers* (again)’; II.6.17 ואסיק ‘and David brought up *holocausts* before the Lord and *offerings of holy things*’, continued in the next verse II.6.18 ושיצי דויד מלאסקא עלתא ונכסת קרשיא ‘and David finished bringing up *the holocausts and the offerings of holy things*’.

2. Determinate nouns:

- Absolute use: I.12.21 לטעותה 'the idols', I.31.8 קטיליא 'the killed ones', II.6.22 אמהתא 'the handmaids', II.15.31 מרודיא 'the rebels';
- With numeral: I.6.18 חמשה מורניא 'the five lords', II.18.24 הרין תרעיא 'the two gates', II.23.22 תלתה גבריא 'the three warriors';
- With modifier כל 'all': I.10.18 כל מלכותא 'all the kingdoms', II.10.19 כל מלכיא 'all the kings';²⁵
- As the B-term of a construct relation: I.17.22 נטר מניא 'the keeper of the baggage', II.I.20 בנת ערליא 'the daughters of the uncircumcised ones'.²⁶

There are only a few exceptions to what may be termed the 'plural factor'. In some instances, the awkward use of the *status* in TJS has a parallel in BH with its occasional obscure (lack of) use of the article. Finally, instances involving both determinate and indeterminate items will fully clarify the point, e.g. II.13.18 כין לבשן בנת מלכא בתולתא כרדושין 'thus *the virgin daughters* of the king wore *tunics*'.

²⁵ The behaviour of the noun יום 'day' is peculiar when it is used to render BH phrases of the type (1) כל ימי מלך דוד 'all the days of David's reign(ing)' or (2) כל הימים 'all the days that David reigned', i.e. followed by יום in the plural, either (1) as the A-term of a construct relation whose B-term is an Inf.C. with a nominal or pronominal subject in the genitive (*genitivus subjecti*), or (2) with the definite article and a subordinate clause. In such cases, יום in BH is always formally determinate, whether (1) by virtue of the determinate B-term or (2) by the presence of the definite article. TJS, for its part, always translates with a subordinate clause (i.e. construction n°2), but for some reasons the noun יום is formally indeterminate when the Vorlage features construction n°1 and determinate when the Vorlage features construction n°2, e.g.:

- Construction n°1: I.22.4^{BH} כל ימי היות דוד במצודה 'all the days that David was in the stronghold' [כל יומין דהוה דוד ממצודה במצודה^{TJ}], I.25.7^{BH} כל ימי היותם בכרמל 'all the days that they were in Carmel' [כל יומין דהוו בכרמלא^{TJ}], I.25.16^{BH} כל ימי היותנו עם רעים הצאן 'all the days that we were with them keeping the sheep' [כל יומין דהוינא עמהון רען ענא^{TJ}].
- Construction n°2: I.20.31^{BH} כל הימים אשר בן ישי חי 'all the days that the son of Jesse lives' [כל יומיא דבר ישי קיים^{TJ}], I.27.11^{BH} כל הימים אשר ישב בשדה פלשתים 'all the days that he dwelt in the field of the Philistines' [כל יומיא דיתיב ...^{TJ}], 1Kgs 8.40^{BH} כל הימים אשר הם 'all the days that they live in the land' [כל יומיא דאנון קימין ...^{TJ}]; the only exception encountered in our corpus is I.1.28^{BH} כל הימים אשר חיה 'all the days that he lives' [כל יומין דהוא קיים^{TJ}].

²⁶ Cases of a plural determinate noun modified by an attributive adjective or participle (e.g. מלכיא טביא 'the good kings') are not encountered in our corpus, but a few instances are found in other parts of TJFP, e.g. Jos 23.15 כל פתגמיא תקניא 'all the good things', Jos 24.17 אתיא רברבתא האלין 'those great signs', Jdg 5.24 נשיא טבתא 'the good women'.

e.g. I.17.43 ‘that you come to me with *staves*’ [במקלות], I.18.8 ‘they have given to David *ten thousands* [רבבות], and to me they have given (*the*) *thousands* [האלפים]’, I.28.6 ‘neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by teachers’ [גם בחלמות גם באורים גם בנביאים], I.30.17 ‘who rode upon *camels*’ [הגמלים], II.1.22 ‘from the blood of *the killed*, from the fat of *the warriors*’ [גבורים and חללים], II.1.23 ‘(they were) swifter than *the eagles*, more powerful than *the lions*’ [באבנים], II.16.6 ‘(and he was pelting) with stones’ [מגמלים]. Such instances aptly remind us that determination in Hebrew is not without problems of its own.²⁷ In addition, the notion of determination may not have been exactly identical in Hebrew and Aramaic, which might explain certain discrepancies between the two.²⁸ One should therefore be extremely cautious in assessing what is and is not ‘regular’.²⁹

As a result, the number of problematic instances drops drastically. These include I.2.32 ‘(because of) the sins (that you have sinned ...)’ [עפלים], I.5.9 ‘(and they were stricken) with haemorrhoids’ [במחורי], I.8.12 ‘farm laborers’ [אכרי], I.8.12 ‘craftsmen’ [אומני], I.10.5 ‘(you will meet) a band of teachers’ [חבל נביאים], I.21.16 (lit.) ‘lacking of mad men’ [חסר משגעים], I.22.7 ‘(will he appoint) chiefs of thousands and chiefs of hundreds?’ [שרי אלפים ושרי מאות], II.7.2 ‘with panels of cedars’ [שתי לבבות], II.13.6 ‘two dumplings’ [שתי לבבות].³⁰

²⁷ A case in point is ‘imperfect determination’, i.e. cases of nouns that, though cognitively unidentifiable, are formally determinate (JM §137mff.), which may very well explain some of the instances mentioned.

²⁸ Cf. Tal (1975: 85-87).

²⁹ All the more so because one’s understanding of determination is inevitably biased by one’s own linguistic background. Obviously, the use of the definite article in English is not necessarily the same as the use of the st.emph. in Aramaic.

³⁰ Interestingly, among the exceptions one will note that a few nouns in the pl. are consistent in their use of the st.emph., whether semantically determinate or indeterminate, e.g. אבניא ‘(the) stones’, ספריא ‘(the) teachers’, מיא ‘(the) water(s)’. With only a few exceptions (II.5.20, II.18.17), with these nouns the st.emph. appears to be the rule. The same seems to apply to *gentilicia*. TJS features only two instances involving a plural gentilic adjective in a semantically indeterminate context, both of which feature the st.emph.: I.18.25/II.3.14 ערלת פלשתאי ‘foreskins of Philistines’. On the other hand one will note one unique instance of st.abs. in a semantically determinate context: II.20.14 כל ברין ‘all the Berites’. Finally, it is noteworthy that the bulk of the exceptions feature semantically indeterminate items being rendered by formally determinate nouns rather than the opposite: this is therefore consonant with the notion that it is the st.emph. that encroaches on the territory of the

In the final analysis, plurality, a morphosyntactic parameter, appears to guarantee the observance of the classical distinction, and one may note in passing that this fact alone is sufficient to invalidate the claim that st.emph. and st.abs. do not work properly anymore in TJ.

2.2 NOUNS IN THE SINGULAR

2.2.1 TYPE A AND TYPE B

Singular nouns can be divided into two groups, depending on their grammatical behaviour when semantically indeterminate:

- Type A: Nouns that occur in the st.abs., e.g. וְלֹד ‘child’,³¹ as in I.1.5 בֵּן קִדְמָה יְיָ אֱתֹמֵנֶה מִנָּה וְלֹד ‘from before the Lord *a child* was withheld from her’;
- Type B: Nouns that occur in the st.emph., e.g. אִשָּׁה ‘woman’, as in I.28.7 בְּעוּ לִי אִתְּחָא דִידְעָא ‘seek for me *a woman* who knows...’.³²

In other words, in the singular Type A nouns maintain the classical norm of determination, whereas Type B nouns have dropped it for the benefit of the st.emph. Though it should be clear from the above, it may be worth emphasizing that the distinction between the two Types of nouns reveals itself only in the singular indeterminate state. The behaviour of singular nouns in terms of determination can therefore be summarized as follows:

- Semantically determinate nouns occur in the st.emph.;
- Semantically indeterminate nouns occur in the st.abs. or st.emph. according as they belong to Type A or Type B.³³

st.abs. rather than the other way round (cf. D:1.4).

³¹ As a rule, nouns in the singular will be featured in the st.abs., which morphologically is the basic form of the noun. When this form is not attested in TJS, the st.emph. will be used instead, accompanied by an asterisk to clarify the form.

³² As will be seen shortly, however, certain linguistic contexts encourage specific behavioural patterns with regard to formal determination, enforcing – irrespective of semantic determination – the respect of the classical distinction between the st.abs. and the st.emph., or alternatively neutralizing it for the benefit of either. These factors will be treated below (D:3). Pending that treatment, all instances adduced in the discussion can be considered free of such influences.

³³ In the plural, as we have seen, all nouns maintain the classical distinction between st.abs. and st.emph. (cf. D:2.1).

As already suggested (D:1.4), the foremost conclusion that can be drawn from this bipartite distribution and from the very existence of Type B is that the Aramaic of TJS displays a preference for the st.emph., allowing it to encroach on the domains that were traditionally the prerogatives of the st.abs. As a result of this, the rest of this chapter will focus on the behaviour of semantically indeterminate nouns, which likewise appear without the article in the Vorlage.

The question that has to be answered now is which noun belongs to which Type. A close scrutiny of our corpus suggests that yet another nominal category is influential in this respect: formal gender. It can be observed that nouns formally marked as feminine (i.e. provided with the feminine marker הא- in the st.emph.sg.) do not behave in the same way as nouns that are not marked as feminine. For the sake of convenience, we shall refer to the former as ‘formally feminine’ and to the latter as ‘formally masculine’.³⁴

2.2.2 FORMALLY FEMININE NOUNS

Another remarkable feature brought to the fore by the present study is the fact that fem.sg. nouns display an overwhelming tendency to occur in the st.emph. irrespective of their own semantic determination: the feminine nouns occurring frequently in our corpus display a clear preference for the st.emph. as against the st.abs., and the feminine nouns occurring only sporadically largely confirm this preference.

Typical instances include: I.2.13 כל גבר דנכס נכסתא ‘every man who offered *a sacrifice*’, I.7.9 ואסקיה עלתא ‘and he offered it up as *a burnt offering*’, I.24.4 ותמן מערתא ‘and there was *a cave* there’, I.25.25 ומפשותא עמיה ‘and *stupidity* is with him’, I.28.7 בעו לי אתתא דידעא ‘seek for me *a woman* who knows...’, I.30.12 $\text{ויהבו ליה פילס דבילתא}$ ‘and they gave to him a cake of *figs*’, II.3.7 ולשאול לחינתא ‘and Saul had *a concubine*’, II.4.8 $\text{ועבד זוי ... פורענותא}$ ‘and the Lord has worked *vengeance*’, II.6.8 $\text{תרע זוי תרעתא בעזא}$ ‘the Lord made *a break* on Uzzah’, II.11.14 וכתב דויד אגרתא ‘and David wrote *a letter*’, II.12.3 והות ליה כברתא ‘and it was like *a daughter* to him’, II.13.2 בתולתא היא ‘she was a *virgin*’, II.17.9 הות מחתא בעמא ‘there has been *a slaughter* among the people ...’, II.18.25 בסורתא בפומיה ‘there is *news* in his mouth’, II.20.15

³⁴ It must be noted that nouns referred to as ‘formally masculine’ include not only semantically masculine nouns (e.g. מלך ‘king’), but also semantically feminine nouns without formal feminine marker (e.g. חרב ‘sword’).

‘and they piled up *a rampart* against the city’, II.20.19 ‘we are at peace *in good faith* with Israel’, II.20.19 ‘you are seeking to destroy *a city* (that is a great capital and a mother in Israel)’, II.22.10 ‘*a cloud* covered the way before him’, II.22.27 ‘Jacob who was walking *in purity*’, II.23.21 ‘and in the hand of the Egyptian was *a spear*’. Such a state of affairs strongly suggests that feminine nouns as a whole belong to Type B.³⁵

Exceptions, instances involving a fem. sg. noun in the st.abs., are few in number. Infinitives, feminine in form in the derived stems, make up a consistent category of exceptions and will be discussed in a separate section (D:3.1.2). Other instances reflect the state of affairs encountered in BH, e.g. II.17.17 ‘and a maid went’ [והלכה השפחה]. Yet other instances involving the st.abs., treated here as exceptions, may be the effect of some parameters other than those to be discussed below.³⁶ In the final analysis, the only clear exceptions (i.e. uses of the st.abs. that cannot be explained on the basis of clearly identified factors) are: I.2.36 ‘for *a coin* of silver’, II.2.25 ‘and they were as *one troop*’,³⁷ II.7.11 ‘the Lord will establish *a kingdom* for you’ (also II.7.27 ‘I will establish *a kingdom* for you’), II.14.10 ‘whoever will speak to you *a word*’, II.19.29 ‘and what *right* do I still have ...?’, II.22.5 ‘*distress* surrounded me like *a woman* who sits ...’, II.22.50 ‘and to your name I will speak *praise*’. Some of these instances can be confidently ascribed to contamination.³⁸ As for the others, the question remains as to whether the use of the st.abs. is merely the product of contamination or indicative of a possible classification as Type A.

³⁵ The passage I.6.14-15 ‘and they offered up the cows as *a holocaust* ... and the men of Beth-Shemesh brought up *holocausts*’ is a case in point, as the noun ‘holocaust, burnt offering’, semantically indeterminate in both verses but sg. in the former and pl. in the latter, occurs in the st.emph. and st.abs. respectively.

³⁶ The factors referred to are likely to be at work in TJS, but their existence cannot be confidently established on the basis of the available evidence. Some of these potential factors will be discussed in D:3.4.

³⁷ On the combination of nouns with the numeral (ס)חד, cf. N:2.1.

³⁸ On contamination, cf. D:2.2.3.

2.2.3 FORMALLY MASCULINE NOUNS

In contrast, the behaviour of formally masculine nouns with regard to determination is more difficult to assess. With very few exceptions, no distinct linguistic considerations can be identified that would condition the Type of masculine nouns. As a result, which of the two Types a given item belongs to is largely unpredictable and must be determined on an individual basis, i.e. by studying its grammatical behaviour in its actual occurrences. Such an undertaking, however, entails difficulties of its own:

- a) Some formally masculine nouns are very poorly attested in TJS, many of them occurring only once or twice in the whole corpus. Thus the nouns *בדור* ‘exile’ and *חתן* ‘son-in-law’ occur only once each in a semantically indeterminate context: the former in the st.abs., II.14.14 *בדיל דלא לבדרא מניה בדור* ‘so as not to scatter from him *an exile*’; and the latter in the st.emph., I.18.18 *אידי חתנא למלכא* ‘I should be *son-in-law* to the king’. In such cases, the sheer paucity of the evidence precludes any definite statement on the nouns’ classification as either Type;
- b) Other formally masculine nouns are more amply attested, but it turns out to be difficult to find ‘pure breeds’, i.e. nouns that occur systematically either in the st.abs. or in the st.emph. when semantically indeterminate. Thus the noun *שקר* ‘treachery, deception’ occurs twice in our corpus in a semantically indeterminate context: once in the st.abs., I.15.29 *דלית קדמוהי שקר* ‘before whom there is *no deception*’; once in the st.emph., II.18.13 *או עבדית בנפשי שקרא* ‘otherwise I would have done *treachery* against my own life’. Such a state of affairs should not come as a surprise, however: inasmuch as two determination systems rooted in two widely different principles co-exist side by side in the Aramaic of TJS a certain amount of confusion — actually interference, or *contamination* — is inevitable. But inevitable though this contamination may be, the ambiguity it causes can make the evidence inconclusive.

For these reasons, the state of affairs of the masc.sg. in TJS is often not straightforward, and in not a few cases it has proven difficult to assign masculine nouns to Type A or Type B. Extending the analysis to the whole of TJ would no doubt contribute to dispelling the ambiguity, but

this is beyond the scope of the present study. In view of the material that we have at our disposal in our corpus, in many cases the question of the classification of formally masculine nouns as either Type is therefore bound to remain uncertain.³⁹

In other cases, however, masculine nouns can be assigned to a Type. The two lists below feature, in alphabetical order, the formally masculine nouns that can be assigned to Type A or Type B with some confidence, together with a few select examples. Before providing these lists, a few words of explanation on the criteria used for the purpose of establishing a noun's classification are in order:

- a) The classification results from an analysis of formally masc.sg. nouns occurring in a semantically indeterminate context in TJS. When in doubt as to the state of determination of a given item, the Vorlage was where possible consulted to settle the matter;⁴⁰
- b) Instances where the use of the st.abs. or st.emph. with a semantically indeterminate item in TJS can be presumed to be the product of some specific factor or linguistic context are not taken into consideration. The classification of a noun is therefore based solely on the instances where the use of the st.abs. or st.emph. can be taken to be a reflection of the Type of the noun rather than the manifestation of some other contingency. On the other hand, instances where a factor, established by other means, is ignored double in import and are obviously counted as part of the admissible evidence;

As a result, the evidence considered admissible for the analysis consists of all formally masculine sg. nouns (1) that are semantically indeterminate and (2) whose use of the st.abs. or st.emph. can be held to be the effect of their own Type.

- c) Then, in order to qualify for classification as either Type it was decided that a given item had to occur at least *three* times in the

³⁹ In that sense, Müller-Kessler (2001: 188) is right in counting the 'difficulty in distinguishing between the absolute and emphatic state' among the characteristic features of the Aramaic of TO and TJ, a description apter than the categorical statements made by others.

⁴⁰ I am aware that resorting to the Vorlage in case of doubt is not the ideal solution. But insofar as in many cases the Aramaic of TJS can be shown to follow the BH original closely, referring to the Vorlage, in addition to being the last resort, is not out of place.

status congruous with the Type (st.abs. for Type A, st.emph. for Type B);⁴¹

- d) In addition, in the case of contamination (i.e. cases where an item is not a ‘pure breed’) it was decided that the attestations in the congruous *status* had to represent *more than 2/3* (i.e. 67% and higher) of the admissible evidence, the attestations displaying contamination (i.e. featuring the other *status*) therefore representing less than 1/3 (i.e. 33% or lower) of the admissible evidence.⁴²

1. Type A:

- ‘god’: I.17.46 הוּיָא אֱלֹהִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל ‘there is a *god* in Israel’, II.7.24 הוּיָא לָהֶוּן לְאֱלֹהִים ‘you were for them for *god*’;
- ‘man’ (Lat. *homo*): I.2.33 וְאִישׁ לֹא אֶפְסִיק לְךָ ‘and a *man* I shall not cut off for you’, I.30.2 וְלֹא קָטְלוּ אִישׁ ‘and they did not kill a *man*’;
- ‘place’: I.15.12 מִתְקִין ... אֶתֵּר לְפִלְגָא בֵּיהּ בּוּתָא ‘he set up ... a place to divide up the spoil’, I.27.5 יִתְּנוּן לִי אֶתֵּר ‘let them give to me a place’;
- ‘commoner’: I.24.15 בַּתֵּר הַדְּיוּט חַד ‘(after whom are you pursuing? ...) after a commoner’, II.3.39 וְאִנָּא יוֹמָא דִּין הַדְּיוּט וּמִרְבָּא לְמַלְכוּ ‘and this day I, a commoner, am anointed for kingship’;
- ‘child’: I.1.5 מִן קִדָּם יוּי אֶתְמַנַּע מִנָּה וְלֵד ‘from before the Lord a *child* was withheld from her’, II.6.23 לֹא הוּיָא לָהּ וְלֵד ‘she had no *child*’;
- ‘part, share, portion’: I.1.1 נְבִרָא פְלִיג חוּלְקָא (lit.) ‘the man was dividing a *share*’, II.20.1 לִית לָנָא חוּלְקָא בְּדוּיָד ‘there is no *portion* for us in David’;
- ‘hand’ (fem.): I.19.9 וְדוּיָד מִנְגִין בִּיד ‘and David was playing by *hand*’, II.23.6 עַד דְּלִית אֶפְשֵׁר לְמִקְרַב לָהֶוּן בִּיד ‘until it is impossible to approach them by *hand*’;
- ‘food’: I.22.13 בְּמַתְנַךְ לִיהּ מִזִּין וְחַרְבָּא ‘by giving to him *food* and a sword’,⁴³ II.9.10 וְיֵהִי לְבַר רְבֻנְךָ מִזִּין ‘and it will be *food* for the son of

⁴¹ The minimal number of attestations required to assign a given item to either Type was an issue. On the one hand, setting the lower limit at three instances seemed hardly secure enough. On the other hand, the limited extent of our corpus also had to be reckoned with, as setting the lower limit at four or higher would have reduced the amount of workable material considerably. Again, extending the analysis to TJ as a whole would no doubt allow us to refine the analysis.

⁴² Here too an arbitrary lower limit had to be set. For the same reason as above, setting the limit at 2/3 offers a reasonable balance between plausibility and workability.

⁴³ This instance presents us with a very apposite illustration of the two Types of nouns, מִזִּין (Type A) occurring in the st.abs. and חַרְבָּא (Type B) in the st.emph.

- your master’;
- ‘people’: I.12.22 לעם ... לתכון ‘to make you ... into a people’, II.7.23 למפרק ליה עם ‘to save for him a people’;
 - ‘covenant, oath’: I.1.11 וקיימת קים ‘and she swore an oath’, I.20.16 וגזר יהונתן קים ‘and Jonathan cut a covenant’;⁴⁴
 - ‘name’: II.7.23 ולשואה ליה שום ‘and to make for him a name’, II.23.22 וליה שום בתלתא גבריא ‘and he had a name among the three warriors’;
 - ‘peace’: I.20.7 שלם לעברך ‘there is peace to your servant’, II.18.32 השלם לעולימא ‘is there peace to the young man?’.

2. Type B:

- ‘stone’ (fem.): I.17.49 נסיב מתמן אבנא ‘he took from there a stone’, II.17.13 עד דלא נשאר תמן אבנא ‘until we will not leave there a stone’;
- ‘guilt’: I.6.3 קרבן אשמא ... תתיבון ‘you will bring .. a (lit.) offering of guilt’, I.6.8 קרבן אשמא ... קרבן דאתיבתון ‘and the vessels of gold that you are returning ... (as) an offering of guilt’;
- ‘house’: II.5.11 ובנו ביתא לדוד ‘and they built a house for David’, II.7.6 לא אשריתי שכנתי בביתא ‘I have not made my Shekinah reside in a house’;
- ‘man’ (Lat. *vir*): I.9.16 אשלח לותך גברא ‘I will send to you a man’, I.17.4 ונפק גברא מבניהון ‘and a man from among them came forth’;⁴⁵
- ‘sin, guilt, debt’: I.20.8 אם אית בי חובא ‘if there is sin in me’, I.28.10 אם יערענך חובא (lit.) ‘if harm happens to you’;⁴⁶
- ‘strength, army’: I.2.9 מן דאית ביה חילא ‘who(ever) in whom there is

⁴⁴ One will note that in most instances encountered in TJS קים occurs in the phrase גזר קים ‘to make a covenant’. If this phrase should be reckoned an idiomatic expression, then one could not rule out the operation of a lexical factor (cf. D:3.3), to the effect that all these instances would have to be dismissed as inadmissible for the purpose of Type classification.

⁴⁵ The noun גבר ‘man’ is intricate in various respects and will be treated more fully in D:4. Nonetheless, its attestations outside those difficult contexts suggest that it belongs to Type B.

⁴⁶ Theoretically, the form חובא might be read as the st.abs. of the feminine noun חובא, to the effect that there would be no case for classifying this item as Type B. However, it is significant that (1) when there is a Vorlage all instances of the form חובא in a semantically indeterminate context in TJS render BH עון, and that (2) conversely, in all cases where BH עון is rendered in TJS with an *inflected* form of חובא, an unambiguously masculine form is encountered, not a feminine (thus I.3.13, I.3.14, I.20.1, II.3.8, II.22.24). This suggests that the cases of חובא discussed above should be read as the st.emph. sg. of the masculine noun חוב rather than the st.abs. sg. of the feminine noun חובא.

- strength*', I.28.20 אף חילא לא הוה ביה 'there was no *strength* in him';
- חרב 'sword': I.17.45 את אתי עלי בחרבא 'you are coming against me with a *sword*', I.17.50 וחרבא לית בידא דדויד 'and there was no *sword* in the hand of David';
 - יום 'day': I.2.34 ביומא חד יתקטלון תרויהון 'in one *day* the two of them will be killed', I.27.1 דלמא אתמסר יומא חד בידא דשאול 'perhaps I will be given over *one day* in the hand of Saul';⁴⁷
 - לחים 'bread, food': I.30.11 ויהבו ליה לחמא 'and they gave him *bread*', II.3.35 אמעום לחמא או כל מדעם '(if) I should taste *bread* or anything else';⁴⁸
 - מדבח 'altar': I.14.35 למבני מדבחה קדם יוי 'to build *an altar* before the Lord', II.24.18 אקים קדם יוי מדבחה 'erect before the Lord *an altar*';
 - מות 'death': II.24.13 ואם מהוי תלתא יומין מותא בארעך 'and that there be three days death in your land', II.24.15 ויהב יוי מותא בישראל 'and the Lord gave *death* in Israel';
 - עמא דשאלין מניה מלכא 'king': I.8.5 מני לנא מלכא 'appoint for us *a king*', I.8.10 עמא דשאלין מניה מלכא 'the people that asked of him *a king*';⁴⁹
 - מתן 'gift, present': I.30.26 ... הא לכון מתנא מבות 'behold *a present* for you from the spoil of ...', II.19.43 אם מתנא מני לנא (lit.) 'if he portioned out (*any*) gift to us';
 - עולים 'young man': I.25.14 חוי עולימא חד 'and one *young man* told Abigail', II.17.18 וחוא יתהון עולימא 'and *a young man* saw them';
 - עפר 'dust': II.15.32 ועפרא רמי ברישיה 'and *dust* was cast upon his head', II.16.13 ומשדי עפרא 'and throwing *dust*';
 - פרקן 'redemption, delivery, victory': I.11.9 מחר יהי לכון פרקנא 'tomorrow you will have *deliverance*', I.19.5 ועבד יוי פרקנא רבא לכל ישראל 'and the Lord worked *a great victory* for all Israel';

⁴⁷ On the combination of nouns with the numeral (א)חד, cf. N:2.1.

⁴⁸ In not a few cases the noun לחמא is featured in a phrase involving the verb אכל 'to eat', as in II.9.7 תיכול לחמא על פתורי 'you will eat *bread* on my table'. In those cases, one cannot exclude the possibility that the st.emph. should reflect a generic (i.e. semantically determinate) use of the noun לחים, or be a part of an idiom (cf. D:3.3). Be that as it may, one will note that in those cases BH regularly features the st.abs. לחם.

⁴⁹ In many cases the noun מלכא refers specifically to the king of Israel, i.e. to one particular individual, as in I.13.14 ופקדיה יוי למהוי מלכא על עמיה 'and the Lord commanded him to be king over his people'. In those cases, BH regularly features the st.abs. מלך. Though the present study treats these cases of מלכא as semantically indeterminate ('a king'), one cannot exclude that a semantically determinate reading 'the king' was intended, inasmuch as מלכא refers to an entity thought to be unique in the addressee's knowledge of the world (cf. D:1.3).

- *פתא ‘piece (of bread)’: I.2.36 למיכל פתא דלחמא ‘to eat *a piece* of bread’, I.28.22 ואשוי קדמך פתא דלחמא ‘and let me set before you *a piece* of bread’;
- פתגם ‘word, thing’ as in I.3.11 האנא עביד פתגמא בישראל ‘behold I am doing *a thing* in Israel’, I.21.3 מלכא פקדני פתגמא ‘the king commanded me *a word*’.

3. FACTORS

Reference has been made above to situations in which the use of the st.emph. or st.abs. with singular, semantically indeterminate nouns is not the product of the Type to which they belong, but is rather the effect of the context in which they find themselves. Essentially these situations can be explained by the existence of various linguistic factors that enforce the respect of the classical distinction between the st.emph. and the st.abs., or alternatively neutralize it for the benefit of either *status*.

These factors can be organized in three groups, depending on the level of linguistic expression at which they operate: morphological (D:3.1), (morpho)syntactic (D:3.2) and lexical (D:3.3). Lexical factors revolve around the notion of idiom, a given noun occurring in the st.abs. or st.emph. because it is a part of a set phrase. The *status* of the noun can further be determined by its form (morphological factors) or by the broader syntactic context in which it occurs ((morpho)syntactic factors).

3.1 MORPHOLOGICAL FACTORS

3.1.1 ADJECTIVES AND PARTICIPLES USED SUBSTANTIVALLY

When used on their own with the value of a substantive, adjectives and participles respect the classical distinction, e.g. I.2.32 לא יהי סב בביתך ‘there will not be *an old (man)* in your house’, I.16.1 גלי ... כשר ... למהוי מלכא ‘there is revealed ... *one fitting* ... to be the king’, I.18.23 הועירא בעיניכון ‘is it *a small (thing)* in your eyes?’, I.23.17 אהוי לך לתנין ‘I will be *second* to you’, I.26.20 חלש חד ‘a weak (man)’, II.3.29 סגיר ‘one leprous’, II.3.38 רב ושליש נפל ‘like *a chief and powerful (one)* has fallen this day’, II.4.10

one bringing good news’, II.12.11 האנא מקים עלך בישא ‘behold I am raising up *evil*’, II.15.19 ואם גלי את ‘and if you are *an exile*’, II.18.32 כל דקמו עלך לבישא ‘all who have risen up against you for *evil*’.⁵⁰

Sometimes, however, participles are used as substantives so consistently that they cease to be felt as verbal forms and end up being treated as ordinary substantives.⁵¹ Examples include רעי ‘shepherd’ (as against ‘one who pastures’), נטר, ‘guard, guardian’ (as against ‘one who watches/guards/keeps’), which are assigned to Type B, as the attestations encountered in TJS suggest (e.g. I.17.34 רעיא הוה עבדך ‘your servant was a *shepherd*’, I.28.2 נטרא לרישי אשוניך ‘I will make you *guardian* for my head’).⁵²

Finally, particularly notable here is the nominal pattern *qātīl*, whose

⁵⁰ As a rule, the adjectives טוב ‘good’ and ביש ‘evil’, when used on their own to express ‘good thing, goodness, good’ and ‘evil thing, badness, wickedness, evil’ respectively, tend to follow the Vorlage closely. Thus one usually encounters טוב and ביש where the Vorlage has טוב and רע; רע and טבא; רעה/טובה and בישא where the Vorlage has רעה/טובה and טבא; הרע/הטוב; and בשתא and טבתא when the Vorlage has הרעה and הטובה. Examples include I.24.18 ארי את גמולתני טבתא ואנא גמולתך בשתא ‘for you have repaid me *good* [הטובה] and I have repaid you *evil* [הרעה]’, II.19.36 האדע בין טב לביש ‘do I know between *good* [טוב] and *bad* [רע]?’’. Cases where TJS substitutes a relative clause for the BH phrase definite article + adjective, as דביש for הרע (e.g. I.15.9, I.15.19, I.27.1, I.29.6, II.12.9), form a regular category of exceptions. Other cases of discrepancy between TJS and the Vorlage are encountered: I.16.23, I.24.20, I.25.21, I.25.21, I.25.26, I.25.28, II.14.17, II.16.12. The question remains as to whether these discrepancies originate in a different notion of determination on the part of the Targumist. Finally, a few instances involving a semantically determinate element can be mentioned: I.2.8 כאחתא ... מוקים ... מסכינא ... מרים חשיכא ‘he raises up *the poor* ... he exalts *the needy*’, II.14.2 מתאבלא על מיתא ‘like the woman ... mourning over *the dead one*’ (genericity); I.12.20 גרמתון ית כל בשתא הדא ‘you have brought about all *this evil*’, I.13.17 ונפק מחבלא ‘and *the destroyer* went forth’, I.14.49 שום רבתא ... שום זעירא ‘the name of *the elder* ... the name of *the younger*’, I.16.11 עוד אשתאר זעירא ‘*the youngest* is still left’, II.12.2-3 ולמסכינא לית כל מדעם ‘*the rich (man)* had sheep ... and *the poor (man)* had nothing ...’ (cognitive availability).

⁵¹ This phenomenon is also observed with infinitives, cf. D:3.1.2.

⁵² It is uncertain whether the *pael* ptc. משמיש belongs here, i.e. whether in some cases at least it should be read as ‘servant’ rather than ‘one who serves’ (e.g. I.1.11 ואמסרניה דידי משמיש קדם יוי ‘and I will hand over him, who will be *servant/a servant* before the Lord’). If that should be the case, then evidence suggests that the noun משמיש would have to be classified as Type A. The question would then remain of to what extent the verbal stem is relevant for classifying the Type of participles used substantivally, i.e. whether the fact that נטר/רעי can be classified as Type B and משמיש as Type A should be taken as an indication that participles of the simple stem (*paal*) and participles of the derived stems behave differently when promoted to the status of ordinary nouns.

nouns were originally Peal participles.⁵³ As a rule, nouns of that pattern (e.g. כהן 'priest', ניק 'young, child, suckling', פריק 'redeemer, deliverer', מאית 'dying (person)', סהיד 'witness', דאיב 'one having flow', עריק 'fugitive') appear to respect the distinction and should therefore be classified as Type A, e.g. פריק as in II.10.11 ותהי לי לפריק 'and you will be *a deliverer* for me', II.22.42 ולית להון פריק 'and there was *no deliverer* for them', ניק as in I.1.24 כד הויתי פריק 'when I was *a fugitive*', מאית as in II.14.14 מותא דמאית 'the death of *a dying person*', כהן as in (indeter.) I.2.28 למחוי כהן ביה ... ואחרעיתי ביה 'and I took delight in him ... to be *priest*' vs. (deter.) I.21.5 ואתיב כהנא ית דויד 'and *the priest* answered David'.

3.1.2 INFINITIVES USED SUBSTANTIVALLY

Infinitive forms used substantivally appear to form a consistent, though peculiar, category of nouns. The instances encountered in TJS suggest that they occur in the st.abs. not only when semantically indeterminate, as in II.15.14 לא תהי לנא שיזבא 'there will be no *escape* for us'; but also when unambiguously semantically determinate, as in I.4.6 קל יבבא רבא הדין 'this sound of *the great shouting*' (with agreement in determination of the accompanying attributive adjective, cf. D:3.2.1.2.1), I.18.19 אתיהבא דמורב 'the being given of Merab', II.16.2 משתי דמשלהי 'the drinking of those grown weak'.⁵⁴

However, when infinitives are used as ordinary rather than verbal nouns, they prove to be like any other noun, in that they belong to one of the two Types and behave accordingly. Thus משתי 'feast, banquet' (as against 'to drink, the drinking') turns out to be of Type B, e.g. I.25.36 ועבד דויד 'and behold he had *a feast* in his house', II.3.20 'and David made *a banquet* for Abner ...'.⁵⁵

⁵³ Dalman (1905: 282).

⁵⁴ In this connection, II.23.7 אתגלאה בית דינא רבא (lit.) 'the unveiling of the great court' is particularly noteworthy, inasmuch as it features an infinitive in the st.abs. as A-term of a (semantically determinate) construct relation (contrast with I.9.15 מיתי שאיל 'the coming of Saul', where the infinitive A-term is in the st.cst., cf. G:2.2.2.1(1)).

⁵⁵ In addition to their strictly verbal use, participles too can be used as ordinary substantives (cf. D:3.1.1).

3.1.3 NOUNS OF FOREIGN PROVENANCE

Certain nouns borrowed from foreign languages always occur in the st.abs., even when semantically determinate, e.g. אַספִּינִיק 'belt for sword' as in II.21.16 וְהוּא אַסִּיר אַספִּינִיק חֲדָתָא 'and he was girded with a new belt', תְּבֵל 'world' as in I.2.8 שְׂכִלִיל לְהוֹן תְּבֵל 'he established the world for them', II.22.16 וְשֹׂאֵל יָתִיב ... שְׂפֹלִי 'and Saul dwelt ... beneath the pomegranate tree which is in Migron',⁵⁶ רְמוֹן דְּבַמְגֵרוֹן 'ravine, forenoon' (?) as in II.2.29 וְאֵלּוּ כָּל בְּתֵרוֹן 'and they went all the afternoon'.⁵⁷ In actual fact, these nouns are not in the st.abs. *stricto sensu*. They know no accident in Aramaic; they know but one form — the one in which they were borrowed — which, lacking the typical ending of the st.emph., looks by default like the st.abs.⁵⁸

3.2 SYNTACTIC AND MORPHOSYNTACTIC FACTORS

Syntactic and morphosyntactic factors are involved when the use of the st.abs. or st.emph. with a noun is conditioned by the broader syntactic context in which the noun is embedded. These factors bear on both masculine and feminine nouns, though not always to the same extent or in the same way.⁵⁹ When relevant, masculine and feminine nouns will be treated separately.

⁵⁶ This instance is all the more remarkable because the noun רְמוֹן has a st.emph. form רְמוֹנָא in Aramaic, attested in TO (Ex 28.34, Ex 39.26).

⁵⁷ On loan-words in the Aramaic of TJ, cf. Tal (1975: 159-190). This omnipresence of the st.abs. makes these nouns similar, albeit for different reasons, to the infinitives (cf. D:3.1.2).

⁵⁸ It should be noted that the grammatical integration of loan-words into Aramaic varies from item to item. Thus other nouns of foreign provenance appear to have been fully incorporated into Aramaic, thereby adopting its grammatical mechanisms, among which the inflections, e.g. נִימוֹס (or נִמוֹס) 'law, custom' (from Gr. *nomos*), st.emph. נִמְסָא.

⁵⁹ This echoes their difference in terms of Type classification (cf. D:2.2.1).

3.2.1 ADJECTIVES / PARTICIPLES AND DETERMINATION

3.2.1.1 Adjectives / Participles in Predicative Function

Adjectives and participles in predicative function occur in the st.abs. Innumerable instances illustrate this state of affairs, e.g.:

- Adjective: II.7.22 רב את 'you are great', II.6.22 זעירנא 'I will be small' (with crasis of adjective and pronoun), II.13.15 סגיאנא סנאתא 'greater was the hate ...';
- Active ptc.: I.18.9 וזהו שאול כמין לדויד 'and Saul was lying in wait for David', I.29.9 ידענא 'I know' (with crasis of participle and pronoun), II.6.2 דשכנתיה שריא עיל מן כורביא 'whose Shekinah resides above the Cherubim', II.11.5 מעדיא אנא 'I am pregnant';
- Passive ptc.: I.14.28 ליש גברא ד- 'cursed be the man who ...', I.20.7 גמירא בישתא מניה 'evil is determined by him', II.5.12 מנמלא מלכותיה 'his kingdom was exalted'.⁶⁰

In this context it should be emphasized that a participle or adjective does not need to be at the core of the predication to function predicatively, e.g. I.10.5 ותערע סיעת ספריא נהתינ 'and you will meet a band of teachers going down ...', II.6.16 וחזת ית מלכא דויד מרקיד ומשבח 'and she saw King David dancing and praising', II.11.2 הוא אתחא משתמפא 'he saw a woman washing herself', II.18.10 חזיתי ית אבשלום תלי בבושמא 'I have seen Absalom suspended in the terebinth', II.18.24 והא גברא רהיש בלחודוהי 'and behold a man was running by himself'.⁶¹

⁶⁰ As already underlined, this factor obtains with adjectives and participles only. In contrast, *nouns* used predicatively know no such constraint and occur in the st.abs. or st.emph. according to their Type, e.g. (Type A) I.17.33 יניק את 'you are a child'; (Type B) II.13.2 בתולתא היא 'she is a virgin', II.14.5 ארמלתא אנא 'I am a widow', II.5.17 משחו ית דויד למהוי מלכא על ישראל.

⁶¹ In these cases the lack of agreement in determination between noun and participle — the former being formally determinate (whether because a proper noun, or in the st.emph. etc.), the latter in the st.abs. — clarifies the nature of the grammatical relation between the two. One will note that formal ambiguity only arises when the noun is formally indeterminate as well, e.g. I.9.11 ואנן אשכחו עוליבן נפקן 'and they found young women going forth ...'. Care must be taken not to confound predicative and attributive uses of the participle. Finally, II.12.1 חד עתירא וחד מסכינא 'one was rich and one was poor' is exceptional, inasmuch as the predicative adjectives are in the st.emph.

3.2.1.2 Nouns Modified by Adjectives / Participles in Attributive Function

3.2.1.2.1 Introduction Determination Agreement in Noun Phrases

The factor to be discussed below bears upon noun phrases involving a noun and an attributive adjective (e.g. II.14.2 אַתְּתָא חַכִּימְתָא ‘a wise woman’) or participle (e.g. I.1.13 אַתְּתָא רוּיָא ‘a drunken woman’).

In order to appreciate the cases under discussion, however, mention must first be made of a general principle of determination which, straightforward though it may seem, is nonetheless worth underscoring, in view of the otherwise unusual working of determination in the Aramaic of TJS. Pending an essential qualification to be made below, this principle dictates that *the agreement in determination between the various constituents of a noun phrase is observed*. This suggests that e.g. when a noun is modified by an attributive adjective or participle the adjective or participle will conform to the noun that it modifies, i.e. occur in the st.emph. or st.abs. according as the noun is formally determinate or indeterminate, and irrespective of its actual semantic determination. Thus in II.20.16 אַתְּתָא חַכִּימְתָא ‘a wise woman’ and I.2.5 אַתְּתָא עִקְרָא ‘a barren woman’ the attributive adjective is in the st.emph. and st.abs. respectively so as to agree formally with the noun that it modifies, even though in the two phrases the noun is semantically indeterminate.⁶²

3.2.1.2.2 Influence of Attributive Adjectives / Participles on the Determination of the Noun Phrase

This being said, we can now proceed to examine the working of determination in the noun phrases under discussion. Generally, one notes that the presence of an attributive adjective/participle encourages

⁶² Not many exceptions to this principle have been found in TJS. One may note II.12.3 אַמְרְתָא חַדָּא זַעִירָא ‘one small lamb’, II.12.30 אַבְנָא טַבָּא ‘a precious (lit. good) stone’ (which, however, various variant readings render as II.12.3^v אַמְרְתָא חַדָּא זַעִירָא and II.12.30^v אַבְנָא טַבָּא ‘a precious (lit. good) stone’ respectively). One may note in passing that this principle is understandably of wider application. To mention but one typical instance, the demonstrative adjectives הַדָּא/הַדִּין accompany both semantically and formally determinate noun phrases, e.g. I.6.9 בַּשְׂתָּא רַבְתָּא הַדָּא ‘this great evil’, I.14.45 פְּרַקְנָא רַבָּא הַדִּין ‘this great victory’. Only one exception is encountered in TJS: I.17.12 בֶּר גַּבְרַא אֶפְרַתִּי הַדִּין ‘the son of that Ephraimite’, which is probably better to be explained as a Hebraism (בֶּן אִישׁ אֶפְרַתִּי הַזֶּה^{BH}).

the use of the st.abs. with semantically indeterminate nouns or, to put it another way, the presence of an attributive adjective/participle significantly curtails the use of the st.emph. with semantically indeterminate nouns. Nonetheless, one also notes that formally masculine and feminine nouns do not respond to this factor in exactly the same way.

1. With formally masculine nouns the use of the st.abs., though by no means absolute, is very frequent:

- a) With adjectives: I.1.15 חמר חדת ועתיק ‘new and old wine’, I.2.2 נס סני ‘a great sign’, I.17.25 עוחר סני ‘great wealth’, I.20.2 פתגם זעיר ‘a small thing’, I.21.7 לחים חמים ‘hot bread’, I.25.8 יום טב ‘a good day’, I.25.26 גבר חכים ‘a righteous man’, II.4.11 דם זכי ‘innocent blood’, II.13.3 גבר חכם ‘a wise man’, II.13.36 בכי סניא לחדא ‘a very great weeping’, II.14.25 גבר שפיר ‘a handsome man’, II.15.23 קל רב ‘a loud voice’, II.18.18 גבר רשיע ‘a good man’, II.20.1 גבר טב ‘a good man’, II.22.17 מלך תקיף ‘a strong king’;
- b) With participles: I.2.15 בסר מבשל ‘boiled meat’, I.17.43 כלב שטי ‘a despised dog’, I.21.3 אתר כסי וממיר ‘a place concealed and hidden’, I.24.20 אורח תקנא ‘a good way’, I.27.12 עבד פלח ‘a servant serving’, II.7.10 אתר מתקן ‘an appointed place’, II.18.20 גבר כשר ‘a suitable man’.⁶³

Exceptions are also found,⁶⁴ but it is significant that in several instances involving an item whose classification as Type B is hardly disputable the presence of an attributive adjective or participle is the only obvious reason for the use of the st.abs., e.g. I.21.7 לחים חמים ‘hot bread’, II.22.17 מלך תקיף ‘a strong king’ and the multiple examples involving גבר ‘man’ above.

⁶³ Obviously, with semantically determinate noun phrases the st.emph. is the rule, e.g. I.19.22 גבא רבא ‘the great cistern’, I.25.25 גברא רשיעא הדין ‘this evil man’, I.30.16 כל עדא סניא ‘all the great booty’, II.11.15 קרבא תקיפא ‘the hard(est) combat’, II.12.4 כלבא מותא הדין ‘this dead dog’. Only a few exceptions are found in our corpus, e.g. I.12.23 אורח תקנא וכשרא ‘the right and fitting way’, II.6.6 אתר מתקן ‘the appointed place’. But nothing indicates that this exceptional behaviour is due to the presence of the participle.

⁶⁴ I.10.9 לבא אחרנא ‘another heart’, I.14.33 אבנא רבתא ‘a great stone’, I.19.5 פרקנא רבא ‘a great victory’, I.28.14 גברא סבא ‘an old man’, I.30.11 גברא מצראה ‘an Egyptian man’, I.30.13 עולימא מצראה ‘a young Egyptian man’, I.30.13 גברא עמלקאה ‘an Amalekite man’, II.9.12 ברא זעירא ‘a small son’, II.18.17 כומצא רבא ‘a great pit’, II.18.26 גברא אחרנא ‘another man’ (vs. I.10.6 גבר אחרן, II.18.29 המונא סניא ‘a great crowd’).

2. With formally feminine nouns the state of affairs is more ambiguous. If indeed the st.abs. is regularly used, in many other cases the st.emph. is encountered:

a) With adjectives:

- St.abs.: I.2.5 אַתָּא עֲקָרָא ‘a barren woman’, I.2.35/I.25.28 מַלְכוּ קִימָא ‘a lasting kingdom’, I.6.19/I.19.8/I.23.5 מַחָא סְגִיָּא ‘a great blow’, I.26.12 שְׁנָא תְּקִיפָא ‘a heavy sleep’,⁶⁵ II.13.36 בְּכִיָּא סְגִיָּא ‘a great weeping’, II.18.27 בְּסוּרָא טַבָּא ‘good news’;
- St.emph.: I.4.17 מַחָא רַבְתָּא ‘a great blow’, I.6.7 עֲגִלְתָּא חֲדָתָא חֲדָא ‘one new wagon’, II.13.1 אַחְתָּא שְׁפִירְתָּא ‘a beautiful sister’, II.13.15 סְנֵאחְתָּא רַבְתָּא ‘a great hatred’, II.14.2 אַחְתָּא חֲכִימְתָּא ‘a wise woman’, II.14.5 אַחְתָּא אֲרַמְלְתָּא ‘a widow woman’;

b) With participles: I.1.13 אַתָּא רוּיָא ‘a drunken woman’, I.3.1 נְבוּאָה גְלִיָּא ‘(a) revealed prophecy’, II.22.9 אִישָׁא בְּעֵרָא ‘a burning fire’.

In all likelihood, this equivocal state of affairs reflects the formally feminine nouns’ more systematic preference for the st.emph. (Type B). In any event, it should be noted that exceptions, i.e. the use of the st.emph. in these phrases, are restricted to instances involving adjectives. Instances involving participles (both active and passive), few though they may be, always feature the st.abs., with both masculine and feminine nouns.

3.2.1.2.3 Adjectival / Participial Phrases

The noun phrases discussed above featured a *bare* adjective or participle. Yet, our corpus also features noun phrases involving an adjective accompanied by a complement or a participle followed by its object, e.g. II.14.27 אַחְתָּא שְׁפִירְתָּא חִיּוּ ‘a woman beautiful of appearance’, I.16.18 גִּבְרָא עֲבִירָא קִרְבָּא ‘a man waging battle’. In these cases, the adjective/participle and its complement form a phrase (cf. below) that, unlike bare adjectives/participles, stands in an appositional rather than attributive relation to the noun upon which it bears. This is particularly significant, for by virtue of the inherently loose character of appositional relations the noun and the adjectival/participial phrase are autonomous, i.e. both follow their own rules with regard to formal determination. Thus

⁶⁵ This particular instance might also have been influenced by the immediately following phrase מִן קִדְמָא דִּי ‘from before the Lord’ (cf. D:3.3.3).

I.1.15 עולימא אסיר כרדוט דבוץ ‘a woman anguished of spirit’, I.2.18 אתתא שפירת חיזו ‘a woman beautiful of appearance’, where the noun is formally determinate and the phrase indeterminate respectively; and I.13.14 גבר עביד רעותיה ‘a man doing his good pleasure’,⁶⁶ where the reverse takes place.⁶⁷

As in the examples above, formally the phrase in apposition is usually a construct relation, which can be seen most clearly when the phrase is in the pl. or in the fem.sg.⁶⁸ However, the relationship can also be of another nature, e.g. I.16.18 נברא שפיר בריויה ‘a man handsome in his appearance’, II.7.23 עמא חד בחיר בארעא (lit.) ‘one people, chosen on the earth’, which feature prepositional phrases. Whether a construct relation or a prepositional phrase, there is no difference in terms of determination agreement between noun and phrase; and with reference to I.16.18 specifically one will note the semantic analogy between the prepositional phrase שפיר בריויה ‘handsome in his appearance’ and construct phrases like II.14.27 שפירת חיזו ‘beautiful of appearance’.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Concerning noun phrases involving the noun גבר ‘man’, cf. D:4.

⁶⁷ Similarly, the autonomy between noun and phrase is manifest in II.24.9 תמוני מאה אלפין גבר גבר שלפי סיפא ‘80000 men warriors drawing the sword’, where the noun phrase גבר גבר (cf. below) is formally sg. (because of the preceding numeral, cf. N:3) and the participial phrase is formally pl. (in agreement with the semantic number of the whole noun phrase). Obviously, however, noun and phrase do not always disagree in determination and/or number, e.g. I.2.3 אלהא ידע כולא ‘an all-knowing god’ (where, however, the use of the st.emph. with the noun אלהא is unusual, inasmuch as it belongs to Type A), I.13.19 אומן עביד זין ‘a craftsman making armor’, I.16.18 גבר עביד קרב ‘a man waging battle’.

⁶⁸ Examples in the pl.: I.2.8 צדיקיא עבדי רעותיה ‘the just ones doing his good pleasure’, I.26.19 עממא פלחי שעותא ‘the nations worshipping idols’, II.8.2 עבדין נשלי פרס ‘servants bearing tribute’, II.18.15 עולימין נשלי זיניה ‘young men bearing his weapon’, II.23.6 רשיעיא עבדי חטאה ‘the evil ones doing sin’. Examples in the fem.sg.: I.1.15 אתתא עיקת רוח ‘a woman anguished of spirit’, II.14.27 אתתא שפירת חיזו ‘a woman beautiful of appearance’.

⁶⁹ Finally, it would appear that nouns in apposition have the same behavioural properties as attributive adjectives and participles. Thus when the modifier is a bare noun the st.abs. is preferred, e.g. I.4.20 בר דכר ילידת ‘you have born a son, a male’, I.24.3 תלתא אלפין גבר עולים (lit.) ‘30.000 men young (people)’, I.30.17 ארבע מאה גבר עולים (lit.) ‘400 men, young (people)’, II.1.13 גבר גיור ‘a man, a stranger’, II.3.8 גבר הדיוש ‘a man, a commoner’, II.8.4 גבר רוגלי ‘20000 men foot-soldiers’, II.17.10 והוא אף גבר גבר (lit.) ‘and he, even (if he is) a man warrior’. These instances also illustrate that the determination agreement between noun and modifier (cf. D:3.2.1.2.1) is observed, as with bare attributive adjectives and participles. On the other hand, when the apposition is a complex noun phrase both noun and phrase are autonomous in terms of determination, e.g. I.16.20 גדיא בר עזי חד ‘one kid, child of a goat’, where formally the noun and the appositional phrase are determinate and indeterminate

3.2.2 GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS AND DETERMINATION

Genitive constructions will be discussed in Chapter 3, but pending this discussion something can be said at this point about the working of determination in genitive constructions irrespective of the parameters that condition their selection and use. Essentially, two factors appear to be at work in genitive constructions, that reflect specific interactions between the two terms of the construction.

3.2.2.1 *D*-Relation and Determination

D-relations always feature agreement in determination between the A-term and the B-term: from a formal viewpoint, both are always either indeterminate (i.e. st.abs.) or determinate (i.e. st.emph. or st.pron.⁷⁰ for the A-term; st.emph., st.pron. or proper noun for the B-term), e.g.:

- Indeterminate: I.16.20 גרב דחמר ‘a skin of wine’ (likewise in the pl. I.25.18 גרבין דחמר ‘skins of wine’), I.17.6 מסחפא דנחשא ‘the javelin of bronze’, I.17.38 קולס דנחש ‘a helmet of bronze’ II.8.15 דין דקשוט ‘judgement of truth’, II.18.11 סלעין דכסף ‘selas of silver’, II.21.19 אכסן דגרדיאין ‘the beam of the weavers’;⁷¹
- Determinate: II.18.29 עבדא דמלכא ‘the servant of the king’, II.7.27 לבא דעבדך ‘the heart of your servant’, I.14.51 אבוהי דשאול ‘the father of Saul’.⁷²

respectively (the phrase as a whole being semantically indeterminate). Unfortunately, the scarcity of the evidence precludes any definite statement.

⁷⁰ I.e. ‘Status Pronominalis’, a traditional label referring to nouns featuring a suffix pronoun (in this case with proleptic function).

⁷¹ These (and other) instances are sufficient to invalidate Müller-Kessler’s claim that TO and TJ show no *d*-relations with both A-term and B-term indeterminate, cf. Müller-Kessler (2001: 188, n.30). Other instances include I.10.3 פתין דלחים ‘pieces of bread’, I.22.19 פתגם דחרב ‘(by) the edge of the sword’, II.14.14 ממון דשקר ‘the mammon of falsehood’, II.17.29 גובנין דחלב תורין ‘cheeses of (the) milk of cattle’ (remarkable for the complexity of the B-term, itself an indeterminate construct relation), II.21.20 גבר דמשחן ‘a man of stature’, II.22.9 גומרין דנור ‘coals of (burning) fire’. In some of these cases the indetermination is formal only, due to TJ’s own grammatical circumstances. It must be granted, however, that such instances are statistically far less numerous than the cases of *d*-relation involving determinate A-term and B-term.

⁷² Examples of this agreement principle are countless. Leaving out the instances involving an infinitival A-term (cf. D:3.1.2), on the whole only seven exceptions have been found in our corpus, among which five involve a *genitivus materiae*

The agreement in determination between the two terms of a *d*-relation was already noted by Kaddari with regard to TO.⁷³ Kaddari also noted an influence of the B-term on the A-term in terms of determination, namely that the A-term is determinate (i.e. in the st.emph.) when the B-term is for some reason determinate, and that the A-term is not determinate if the B-term is not itself determinate.⁷⁴ Though it is certainly true that *d*-relations involving an indeterminate A-term and a determinate B-term (of the type ‘a brother of David’) are hardly attested in our corpus,⁷⁵ I believe that Kaddari’s statement is not entirely accurate. Indeed, the linguistic evidence suggests that when an influence in determination is exerted by one of the terms of the *d*-relation upon the other, it usually goes the other way round, i.e. from the A-term to the B-term.⁷⁶ This observation is mainly derived from the genitive of matter and partitive genitive (cf. G:2.5), in which this influence can be spotted in contrastive pairs of the type I.2.36 מֵעָא דְכֶסֶף ‘a coin of silver’, II.5.20 מִן דְחֶסֶף ‘a vessel of clay’, II.16.1 גֵּרְבַּ דְחֶמֶר ‘a skin of wine’ vs. I.1.24 מִכִּילְהָא ‘one measure of flour’, I.9.8 זִזְזָא חֶדְ דְכֶסֶפָא ‘one zuz of silver’, I.17.6 מִסְחָפָא דְנַחְשָׂא ‘a javelin of bronze’, I.19.13 נֹדָא דְעֹזָא ‘a goatskin’. In all these cases the A-term is in the st.abs. or st.emph., whether by virtue of its Type or through the influence of some factor, and the formal determination of the A-term is taken over by the B-term.⁷⁷ This influence comes out most clearly in the cases where the B-term belongs to Type B and occurs nonetheless in the st.abs. so as to conform to the A-term, (four with indeterminate A-term and determinate B-term: I.17.17/I.21.4 מְלֵמִין דְלַחְמָא ‘loaves of bread’, I.17.18 גֻּבְנִין דְחֶלְבָא ‘cheeses of milk’, II.21.16 סְלַעִין דְנַחְשָׂא ‘selas of bronze’; one with determinate A-term and indeterminate B-term II.6.19 גְרִיצְתָא דְלַחִים ‘cake of bread’), one a partitive genitive (II.21.19 אֵע דְמוֹרְנִיתִיהָ ‘the wood of his spear’), and finally II.14.14 מִיתָא דְמָאִית ‘the death of a dying (person)’.

⁷³ Kaddari (1963a: 241-245).

⁷⁴ Kaddari (1963a: 243, 244, 245).

⁷⁵ The few instances encountered in TJS have been mentioned in footnote n.72 above. In view of the tight linguistic affinity between TO and TJ one may suspect that exceptions are just as few in number in TO.

⁷⁶ Margain (1994: 237) observed a similar phenomenon with reference to IA.

⁷⁷ In the genitive of matter and the partitive genitive the B-term typically denotes the material of which the A-term is an instance or the mass of which it is a part. As such, it is neither individuated, nor sensitive to cognitive availability. The fact that the B-term is less permeable to the parameters of semantic determination than the A-term probably explains the vulnerability of its formal determination to that of the A-term.

e.g. I.10.3 פתין דלחים 'pieces of bread', II.16.1 גריצן דלחים 'loaves of bread'.⁷⁸

3.2.2.2 Construct Relation and Determination

The present study brings another tendency to the fore: in construct relations, if the A-term is a plural *noun* or *participle* the B-term, if it is sg., is systematically formally determinate.⁷⁹ In other words, if the B-term is a singular common noun without pronominal suffix it occurs in the st.emph., irrespective of its actual semantic determination.⁸⁰ By its very nature this tendency concerns indeterminate nouns, and as indeterminate fem. sg. nouns naturally tend to occur in the st.emph. it bears more specifically on masc. nouns. As was noted above, the Type of many of these nouns is uncertain; what is significant, however, is that with only a few exceptions the B-term of these construct relations is always in the st.emph. Instances include I.6.4 מהורי דהבא '(five) haemorrhoids of gold', I.6.4 עכברי דהבא '(five) mice of gold', I.10.27 נברי רשעא 'men of wickedness', II.1.24 תקני דהבא 'ornaments of gold', II.8.10 מני כספא 'vessels of silver', II.12.31 מורגי ברזלא 'picks of iron', II.14.2 לבושי אבלא 'garments of mourning', II.22.11 כנפי רוחא 'wings of wind'; (with active participle as A-term) I.10.26 דחלי המאה (lit.) 'fearers of sin', II.24.9 שלפי סיפא (lit.) 'drawers of sword'.⁸¹

⁷⁸ In a very few instances, we see that the B-term remains true to its Type, even at the expense of the agreement principle between A-term and B-term, e.g. I.21.4 מלמין דלחמא 'loaves of bread'. In contrast we also find II.6.19 גריצתא דלחים חדא 'one cake of bread', where the A-term, which is of Type B, is in the st.emph. and the B-term, though undisputably also of Type B, is in the st.abs. This is doubly remarkable, because by being in the st.abs. the B-term not only disrupts the determination agreement between A-term and B-term, but also contradicts its own Type.

⁷⁹ Plural *adjectives* might not be subjected to this rule, e.g. I.26.16 נברי חיבי קטול 'men deserving killing'. Instances of this type are not sufficiently attested in TJS to permit any definite conclusions.

⁸⁰ As expected, if the B-term is plural the classical distinction between the *status* is maintained, e.g. I.14.32 בני תורין 'calves' (lit. 'sons of oxen'), II.1.24 לבושי צבענין 'garments of coloured stuff', II.22.5 סיעת חיבין 'a company of sinners', II.23.7 אעי מורנין 'wood of spear'. One may note a few exceptions: I.2.10 משרית עממין חטופין 'the armies of the violent nations', I.10.5 סיעת ספריא 'a band of teachers', II.7.2 כיורי ארוזא 'pannels of cedar', II.18.1 רבוני אלפי 'chiefs of thousands' (as against the regular I.8.12 רבוני אלפין with identical meaning).

⁸¹ Exceptions are rare. One may note II.8.2/II.8.6 נמלי פרס 'bearers of tribute', II.22.6 מני קטול 'weapons of killing', II.22.41 מוחורי קדל 'those who turn back their neck' (lit. 'turners-back of neck'). Obviously, this principle is irrelevant when the

3.2.3 REPETITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

The st.abs. is used in what may be termed ‘repetitive constructions’, i.e. in constructions involving the consecutive repetition of a given lexical item (ordinarily with an accompanying preposition) so as to bring out a specific nuance, which in our corpus mostly falls under the scope of iterativity.⁸² Examples include I.1.3 מִזְמַן מוֹעֵד לְמוֹעֵד ‘from the time of festival to festival’, I.1.7 שָׁנָא בְּשָׁנָא ‘year by year’, II.14.26 מִזְמַן עֵדֶן לְעֵדֶן ‘from time to time’. Sometimes the preposition is part of the repetitive construction, e.g. II.13.4 בְּצַפֵּר בְּצַפֵּר ‘morning after morning’; at other times two different prepositions are used, e.g. I.18.10 כִּיּוֹם בְּיוֹם ‘day by day’, I.20.25 כִּזְמַן בְּזְמַן ‘(this time) as at other times’.⁸³

3.3 LEXICAL FACTORS

In certain idiomatic expressions the *status* in which a given noun occurs is not open to variation, but rather pre-determined by the larger context of the set phrase in which the noun is embedded.⁸⁴ These lexical considerations are not factors *stricto sensu*, as they are dependent on

B-term is one of those nouns that have one, st.abs.-like form only, e.g. II.22.16 שְׁכֵלֹלֵי תִבְלִי ‘the foundations of the world’. Finally, it must be underscored that the significant point in all these instances is the fact that the Vorlage systematically features the st.abs. where TJS has the st.emph. Obviously, it could be objected that we are not dealing with any principle here, but rather that in all these instances the B-term belongs to Type B, in effect that the use of the st.emph. is merely a reflection of its Type. No doubt that a more encompassing study of TJFP would contribute to determining the Type of many of these nouns with more certainty and would therefore shed more light on this question.

⁸² Cf. FG1 (236). In my view, Nöldeke’s *terminus technicus* ‘Distributive Wiederholung’ is not entirely felicitous in this context, as the distributive character of the construction is not always immediately apparent. The term ‘repetitive construction’ offers the advantage of referring only to the formal aspect of the construction (viz. the repetition of a given lexical item), irrespective of the semantic nuances it conveys. At the risk of introducing neologisms, the term ‘dittological construction’ might be appropriate for designating these structures.

⁸³ The only unambiguous exception encountered in TJS is II.21.1 שְׁתָּא בְּתָר שְׁתָּא ‘year after year’.

⁸⁴ Similarly, in the English expression ‘to kick the bucket’ the direct object must be formally determinate, i.e. provided with the definite article, for the expression to have its idiomatic reading ‘to die’. The clause ‘John kicked *a* bucket’, though certainly not ungrammatical, can only be interpreted literally (FG1: 103-104).

the lexicon more than on grammatical structures. But inasmuch as on account of their idiomatic character the st.abs. or st.emph. is encountered irrespective of the noun's actual semantic determination they deserve to be noted here.

3.3.1 WORD PAIRS AND ENUMERATIONS

The st.abs. is preferred in various word pairs (falling usually under the scope of hendiadys) featuring semantically indeterminate nouns, even when either or both of the nouns involved belong to Type B. Examples include I.24.12 חוב וסרחן 'guilt and corruption', I.28.3 בדין וזכורו 'fictions and necromantic apparitions', II.2.6 טיבו וקשומט 'goodness and truth', II.14.7 שום ושאר 'name and remainder', II.15.4 דין ומצו 'judgement and quarrel', II.8.15 דין (דקשומט) וזכו 'judgement (of truth) and righteousness' [משפט וצדקה], II.22.47 תקוף ופרקן 'strength and salvation'.

This is also the case with enumerations, e.g. I.27.9 גבר ואהא 'man and woman', I.22.19 ותור וחמר ואמר 'and ox and ass and sheep', I.15.3 מגבר ועד אהא 'from man unto woman', I.22.19 מגמל ועד חמר 'from camel unto ass', I.22.19 מעולים ועד יניק 'from youth and unto suckling'.⁸⁵

3.3.2 PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES WITH ADVERBIAL CHARACTER

Various prepositional phrases with adverbial character require the st.abs., irrespective of the Type which the noun they feature belongs to. Examples include:

- בשלם 'in peace', as in II.3.21 ואול בלשם 'and he went in peace' and I.1.17 איילי לשלם 'go in peace!';
- לרוחצן 'in security', as in I.12.11 ויתיבתון לרוחצן 'and you dwelt in security';
- בקשומט 'in truth', as in I.26.4 אהא שאול בקשומט 'Saul had really come';
- לסגי 'for multitude', as in II.17.11 כחלא דעל ימא לסגי 'like the sand which is on the sea for multitude';
- בשלו 'in carelessness', as in I.14.45 בשלו עבד יומא הדין 'in carelessness he acted this day';

⁸⁵ I.15.3 and I.27.9 show that the nouns involved in enumerations can be connected by simple coordination or by more complex prepositional structures. Moreover, inasmuch as enumerations may have a generic value determinate forms are also encountered, e.g. I.5.9 מועירא ועד רבא 'from the small and unto the great'.

- ‘with joy’, as in II.6.12 ‘and he brought up the ark of the Lord ... with joy’;
- ‘with delight’, as in II.24.23 ‘may the Lord your god accept your offering with good pleasure’;
- ‘in secret’, as in I.18.22 ‘speak with David in secret’;⁸⁶
- ‘in haste’, as in II.17.18 ‘and the two of them went quickly’ and I.21.9 ‘the word of the king was in haste’.⁸⁷

Not all prepositional phrases that our own perception would consider endowed with an adverbial character belong here, however. Thus II.22.27 ‘Jacob who was walking in purity’, II.22.40 ‘and you helped me with might’. In the same vein, the phrase ‘in secret’ is always in the st.emph. in TJS, whereas it is semantically equivalent to the phrase ברו.⁸⁸ For this reason, the prepositional phrases discussed above are better regarded as idioms.⁸⁹

3.3.3 PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE ‘from before the Lord’

The prepositional phrase ‘from before the Lord’ is peculiar in that the noun that precedes it immediately, when feminine, occurs as a rule in the st.abs., irrespective of its own semantic determination, e.g.:

- Indeterminate: I.10.26 ‘fear from before the Lord’, I.16.15 ‘a spirit of evil from before the Lord’, I.26.12

⁸⁶ All the more significant because it corresponds to a determinate phrase in BH (בלט).

⁸⁷ Sometimes the st.emph. is found with those phrases, e.g. ‘in peace’ (as in II.19.31 ‘my master the king has come in peace’), ‘in truth’ (as in II.14.5 ‘in truth I am a widow woman’). In other phrases, the st.emph. is the rule, e.g. ‘forever’, ‘from of old’, as in I.27.8 ‘they were inhabitants of the land from of old’, II.7.26 ‘and your name will be great forever’ (only exceptions in TJS: I.15.29/I.27.12). The questions remain as to whether nouns such as עלם constitute exceptions to the adverbial phrases under discussion, or whether the use of the st.emph. is merely a reflection of their own Type.

⁸⁸ Thus I.19.2 ‘and you will remain in secret’, II.12.12 ‘for you acted in secret’. One should note, however, that the use of the st.emph. in this phrase is consistent with the formal determination of its BH counterpart בסתר.

⁸⁹ For another potential factor bearing on prepositional phrases, cf. D:3.4(1).

שיבו מן קדם יי' II.9.3 'a heavy sleep from before the Lord',⁹⁰ 'good from before the Lord';

- **Determinate:** I.10.6 'the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord', I.16.14 'the spirit of power from before the Lord', I.16.23 'the spirit of evil from before the Lord' (contrast with I.16.15 above), II.7.4 'the word of prophecy from before the Lord'.⁹¹

3.3.4 MISCELLANEOUS EXPRESSIONS

Finally, in certain common idiomatic expressions the use of st.abs. is the rule. Among them one may note:

- a) The nouns אִתּוֹ 'wifehood', אַמְהוּ (lit.) 'handmaid-hood' and מַלְכוּת 'kingship' in the prepositional phrases:
 - לְאִתּוֹ, e.g. I.18.27 'and Saul gave to him Michal his daughter for a wife';
 - לְאַמְהוּ, e.g. I.25.41 'behold your handmaid (has become) a handmaid';
 - לְמַלְכוּת, e.g. II.23.1 'the man who was raised to kingship';⁹²
- b) The noun רְעוּא 'will, pleasure' in the expression (lit.) 'to have pleasure in', e.g. I.2.25 'for it was good pleasure before the Lord to kill them', I.15.22 'is there delight before the Lord in holocausts and holy offerings?', I.18.25 'the king has no pleasure in bridal presents';
- c) The noun בָּעוּ 'wish, request' in the expression 'please, by

⁹⁰ In this particular case the presence of the attributive adjective תְּקִיפָא might also have encouraged the use of the st.abs. (cf. D:3.2.1.2.2).

⁹¹ The use of the st.abs. with the nouns נְבוּאָה 'prophecy', גְּבוּרָא 'might' and בִּישָׂא 'evil' in such expressions was already noted by Van Staalduine-Sulman (2002: 179; on the reading of בִּישָׂא as the st.abs. of בִּישְׁתָּא specifically, cf. n.180). On the whole, only one exception has been found in TJS: II.22.16 'wrath from before the Lord'. As regards *masculine* nouns, the evidence is insufficient to allow us to make any definite statement: I.3.7 'instruction from before the Lord'; I.14.15 'a shaking from before the Lord' vs. I.11.7 'fear from before the Lord'.

⁹² The use of the st.abs. with these three items has already been noted by Van Staalduine-Sulman (2002: 390-391).

request', as in I.15.32 בבועו רבוני מריר מותא 'please, my master, death is bitter';

- d) The nouns פתגם and חרב in the prepositional phrase לפתגם דחרב 'by the edge of the sword', as in II.15.14 וימחי קרתא לפתגם דחרב 'and (lest) he strike the city by the edge of the sword'.

Nouns such as פתגם and חרב belong to Type B, and the same applies in all likelihood to the five nouns אמהו, אהו, מלכו, רעוא and בעו, inasmuch as they are formally feminine. This makes the relevance of these idiomatic constructions all the more significant.⁹³ The fossilized character of the use of the st.abs. is probably to be explained on account of the high degree of conservatism associated with idiomatic expressions.

3.4 OTHER FACTORS

The basic principles of determination in TJS, i.e. the maintenance and disruption of the classical distinction between st.emph. and st.abs., accommodated by the various factors treated in the foregoing discussion, provide overall a satisfactory account of the working of determination in TJS. Notwithstanding, there remain instances not conforming to these principles and factors. Some of these instances are in all likelihood scribal errors; others can be considered borderline cases, viz. cases that do not really fit into any of the parameters of determination and that are therefore open to linguistic ambiguity and variation. But there are also cases that cannot be explained as errors or borderline cases. The possibility must therefore be entertained that the present account is not exhaustive, and room should be made in our analysis for other factors that may be at work in the Aramaic of TJS but that the present

⁹³ Other cases involve nouns whose Type cannot be ascertained due to the lack of evidence, e.g. the noun לב 'heart' in the expression שוי לב 'to pay attention' (e.g. II.18.3 לא ישוון עלנא לב 'they will not pay attention to us'), the noun דין 'justice, law, judgement' as the direct object of the verbs עבד 'to do' and אעיל 'to bring' in the expressions עבד דין 'to make judgement' and אעיל דין 'to bring judgement' (e.g. I.24.16 כל גבר דיהי 'and (may he) make judgement between me and you', II.15.2 ליה דין למיעל 'every man who had judgement to bring'). Pending a more comprehensive analysis, the nature of these phrases is bound to remain inconclusive. Conversely, one will note the following idiom, involving the st.emph.: איח קרבא 'to wage battle', e.g. I.17.32 ויגח קרבא עם פלשתאי הדין 'and he will wage battle with this Philistine', II.12.29 ואיח קרבא בה 'and he waged battle against it' (only one instance with st.abs. in TJS: I.4.9 ותגחון קרב 'and wage battle !').

study has not permitted to establish due to the lack or equivocal character of the evidence.

Four candidates to the status of factor can be mentioned and briefly discussed here. These four potential factors are most visible with formally feminine nouns:

1. A few prepositional phrases feature a fem. noun in the st.abs. Though not adverbial in character strictly speaking (cf. D:3.3.2), these phrases have in common the fact that they are used in combination with verbs implying (*oral*) *expression*, thereby providing a context for the ‘expression act’ denoted by the verb: I.1.15 אמרית עלבן נפשי בצלו קדם יי ‘I have told the sorrow of my soul in prayer before the Lord’, I.7.6 ושפכו לבהון בתשובה ‘and they poured out their heart in repentance’, II.22.1 ושבח דויד בנבואה קדם יי ‘and David gave praise in prophecy before the Lord’, II.22.4 אמר דויד בתשבחא ‘David said in praise’.⁹⁴
2. When used together with the modifier כל ‘all, every’, semantically indeterminate fem. nouns appear to favour the st.abs., e.g. I.4.8 בכל מוחא ‘with every plague’, I.26.24 כל עקא ‘all distress’, II.4.9 כל עקא ‘every grief’,⁹⁵ II.23.5 כל מלכו ‘every kingdom’.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Inasmuch as it refers to a context of oral expression, the phrase I.16.18/II.23.8 סכלתן בעיצא ‘prudent in counsel’ probably belongs here, though it is not formally associated with a verb. As for masculine nouns, their behaviour is insufficiently attested. One may note the phrase בשליא ‘in quiet’ (as in II.3.27 למלא עמיה בשליא ‘to speak with him in quiet’), which features the st.emph.

⁹⁵ Theoretically, the form עקא might just as well be read as the st.emph. of the masculine noun עק (with identical meaning). However, it is significant that (1) the form עקא in the two instances under discussion renders the BH feminine noun צרה, and that (2) conversely, when an inflected form of BH צרה is rendered in TJFP (and TO) with a form of (א)עקא, an unambiguously feminine form is encountered, not a masculine (thus I.10,19; cf. also Jdg 10.14 and, in TO, Gen 35.3, 42.21 (2x), Deut 31.17, 31.31). This is suggestive that the cases of עקא discussed above should be read as the st.abs. sg. of the feminine noun עקא rather than the st.emph. sg. of the masculine noun עק.

⁹⁶ Other parts of TJFP provide additional evidence, e.g. Jos 11.14 לא אשארו כל נשמה (lit.) ‘they did not leave any breath’, 1 Kgs 1.29 פרק ית נפשי מכל עקא ‘(the Lord who) saved my soul from all distress’, 1Kgs 7.14 למעבד כל עבידא בנוחשא ‘to work every work in brass’; but also feature a few counterexamples, probably due to the preference of formally feminine nouns for the st.emph. (Type B): e.g. Jdg 21.11 כל אחתא דידעת משכבי דכורא תגמרון ‘you shall destroy ... every woman who has lain by man’, 1Kgs 8.38 כל צלותא וכל בעותא לכל מלכותא ‘for any kingdom’. The behaviour of masc. nouns is not clear-cut either, not in the least because their Type classification is far from straightforward. Whatever their Type, however, one will note that the st.abs. is generally encountered: I.13.21 כל מן דברויל

3. When used in combination with the negatives לא (absolute negation) and לית (or its temporal variants לא הוא etc., as an expression of absence or inexistence), fem. nouns seem to favour the st.abs.: I.3.1 לית נבואה גליא 'there was no revealed prophecy',⁹⁷ I.12.21 ולית בהון 'and there is no profit in them', II.1.21 לא תהי בכון עללא 'let there be no yield on you', II.18.22 ולך לית בסורא מתיחבא 'no (good) news is being given to you', II.20.1 לא אחסנא לנא בבר ישי 'there is no inheritance for us in the son of Jesse'.⁹⁸
4. In construct relations involving a singular noun, participle or adjective as A-term, the B-term, if it is a fem. sg. indeterminate noun, will occur in the st.abs.⁹⁹ The instances attested in our corpus are: I.2.1/II.23.2 רוח נבואה 'a spirit of prophecy', I.13.1 בר שנא (lit.) 'son of a year', I.22.2 מרי רשו (lit.) 'lord of a claim', II.2.25 בית משרא (lit.) 'a house of guard', II.20.3 ריש רמא חרא 'the top of a hill', II.22.3 בעדן עקא 'in time of distress'.¹⁰⁰

'every kind of iron', I.18.5 בכל אתר דשלח ליה שאול 'in every place that Saul sent him', II.6.14 בכל תקוף 'with all power' (Type A), II.13.9 אנש כל lit. 'every person' (Type A), II.15.2 כל גבר ד- 'every man who ...' (Type B), II.22.4 בכל עדן 'at all times'. Only four instances in the st.emph. are found in TJS, two of which involve the noun גבר 'male' (cf. D:4): I.11.2 כל עינא דימינא 'every right eye' (involving a *d*-relation), II.15.4 כל גברא ד- 'every man who' (compare II.15.2 above), II.20.13 כל גברא 'every man' and II.22.27 כל פסולא 'every blemish'.

⁹⁷ In this particular case the presence of the attributive participle גליא might also have encouraged the use of the st.abs. (cf. D:3.2.1.2.2).

⁹⁸ Here again the behaviour of masc. nouns is ambiguous. Thus the following instances feature the st.emph.: I.9.2 לית גברא מבני ישראל 'there was no man from the sons of Israel', I.17.39 לית בהון נסא 'there is no experience in them', I.17.50 לית בידא דדוויד 'there was no sword in the hand of David', I.26.18 לית בידי חובא 'there is no guilt in my hand', I.30.4 לית בהון חילא 'there was no strength in them'. However, the presence of a negative marker might be the reason behind the use of the st.abs. in a few instances involving a noun of Type B: I.21.2 גבר לית עמך 'there is no man with you', II.22.5 חיל לית לה למילד 'she does not have strength to give birth'.

⁹⁹ Irrespective of grammatical gender, this potential factor therefore appears as complementary to the factor bearing on construct relations already discussed (cf. D:3.2.2.2). In substance, with singular B-terms the principle under discussion ensures the respect of the classical distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. when the A-term is singular, whereas the principle discussed above neutralizes it for the benefit of the st.emph. when the A-term is plural.

¹⁰⁰ The only exception is II.5.24 קל צוחתא 'the sound of a cry'. Finally, here too the behaviour of masculine nouns is ambivalent, many occurring in the st.emph., e.g. I.1.16 בת רשעא 'a daughter of wickedness', I.6.3 קרבן אשמא ... תתיבון 'you will bring .. a (lit.) offering of guilt', I.16.18 גבר חילא (lit.) 'a warrior of army', I.18.13 רב אלפא 'chief of a thousand'. What is significant, however, is the fact that some nouns whose

No doubt that a more comprehensive study of TJFP would cast a fresh light on these points.

4. SPECIAL CASE THE NOUN גבר 'man'

To conclude this analysis, the noun גבר 'man' has to be discussed, inasmuch as it displays patterns of behaviour so odd that it almost forms a type of its own.

As was seen above (D:2.2.3), the noun גבר 'man' basically belongs to Type B, in that when semantically indeterminate it will occur in the st.emph. (e.g. I.17.8 בחרו לבון גברא 'choose for yourselves a man', II.1.2 האית עוד 'and behold a man came from the camp', II.9.3 גברא לבית שאול 'is there still a man belonging to the house of Saul?'),¹⁰¹ unless some factor encourages the use of the st.abs., e.g. when the noun גבר is:

- Modified by a bare adjective (e.g. II.13.3 גבר חכים 'a wise man') or participle (e.g. I.21.15 גבר שמי 'a mad man');
- Involved in an enumeration, e.g. I.27.9 גבר ואחא 'man and woman';
- Involved in a repetitive construction, e.g. I.2.25 אם יחוב גבר לגבר 'if a man sins against a man';¹⁰²
- Modified by כל 'all, every': I.15.23 כל גבר דמסריב 'every man who rebels', II.15.2 כל גבר דיהי ליה דין 'every man who had a judgement'.¹⁰³

classification as Type B has been posited do occur in the st.abs. in this context, e.g. II.20.8 אספיקי חרב 'a sword belt'.

¹⁰¹ Exceptions are not many. One may note I.21.2 וגבר לית עמך 'and there is no man with you' (on this particular instance, cf. D:3.4(3)), II.10.6 אלף גבר 'one thousand men' (for the use of the sg. with the numeral, cf. N:3), II.19.8 אם יבית גבר עמך (lit.) 'if a man lodges with you'.

¹⁰² This particular instance, though not iterative semantically, displays nonetheless the formal features of a repetitive construction, and may therefore have been treated accordingly.

¹⁰³ As we saw, the evidence involving the noun modifier כל is ambiguous in TJS, to the effect that its influence on determination was reckoned among the potential factors. However, it is very significant that the noun גבר, whose classification as Type B is hardly open to discussion, is regularly in the st.abs. as in the examples mentioned. On the whole, only two counterexamples have been encountered in TJS: II.15.4 כל גברא דיהי ליה דין 'every man who has a judgement' (contrast with II.15.2 כל גברא דיהי ליה דין 'every man who had a judgement') and II.20.13 עבר כל גברא בתר יואב 'every man crossed with identical meaning)

In certain other contexts, however, the noun *גבר* does not behave like other nouns. Regarding determination, this is particularly noticeable in two types of circumstances:¹⁰⁴

1. When the noun *גבר* 'man' is involved in *distributive constructions*¹⁰⁵ it always occurs in the st.abs., e.g. I.10.11 *וַאֲמַר עַמָּא גַבְרַ לְחַבְרִיָּה* 'and the people said, each man to his fellow', I.14.34 *וַקְרִיבוּ כָל עַמָּא גַבְרַ תּוֹרִיָּה* 'and all the people brought near, each man his ox', I.26.23 *וַיּוֹי יְהִיב* 'and may the Lord return to each man his righteousness and his truth', II.2.27 *אֲסַחֲלַק עַמָּא גַבְרַ מִבְּחַר אַחֲוֵי* 'the people would have gone up, each man from after his brother', II.13.29 *וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל אַפְךָ גַבְרַ* 'and each rode upon his mule', II.19.9 *לְקַרְוֵהי* 'and Israel fled, each man to his city'.
2. In contrast to other nouns of Type B, when the noun *גבר* is sg., indeterminate and modified by an adjectival or participial *phrase* (as against *bare* adjectives and participles) standing in apposition to it (cf. D:3.2.1.2.3), it displays a clear tendency to occur in the st.abs., e.g. I.13.14 *גַבְרַ עֲבִיד רַעוּתִיָּה* 'a man doing his good pleasure', II.12.5/II.16.7 *גַבְרַ חַיִּיב קְטוּל* 'man guilty of killing', II.17.8 *גַבְרַ דְּחִיל חַמָּאִין* 'a man fearing sins'.¹⁰⁶

over after Joab'.

¹⁰⁴ For specific patterns of behaviour of the noun *גבר* with regard to grammatical number, cf. N:3.

¹⁰⁵ As against repetitive constructions, cf. D:3.2.3.

¹⁰⁶ In contrast to other nouns of Type B, e.g. I.2.18 *עוֹלִימָא אַסִּיר כְּרֻדוּשׁ דְּבוּיָן* 'a young man girl with a sleeved tunic of linen', II.14.27 *אַתְתָּא שְׁפִירַת חַיּוּ* 'a woman beautiful in appearance' (etc.). In cases such as I.22.2 *כָּל גַבְרַ מַעֲקָ רוּחַ* 'every man anguished of spirit', I.22.2 *כָּל גַבְרַ מְרִיר נַפְשׁ* 'every man bitter of soul' the use of the st.abs. might further have been prompted by the presence of the modifier *כל* (cf. D:3.4(2)). Obviously, here as elsewhere counterexamples are encountered: I.26.2 *תַּלְחָה אֶלְפִין גַבְרָא* '3000 men, chosen of Israel' (lit.) and I.16.18 *גַבְרָא שְׁפִיר בְּרִיּוּיָה* 'a man handsome in his appearance'.

5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 SUMMARY

As was noted above (D:1.1), in OA determination and indetermination were indicated by the use of the st.emph. and st.abs. respectively. OA thereby established a standard that was maintained until the MA period. By the advent of the LA period, towards the beginning of the Christian Era, a significant change had occurred. This change is usually analysed along geographic lines: whereas the Western Aramaic dialects preserved the original state of affairs, in the Eastern Aramaic dialects the st.emph. saw its determining force weakened. Having become unmarked semantically, the st.emph. had come to do double duty with the st.abs., and had largely ousted it. The st.emph. had therefore become the basic, unmarked form of the noun, and the st.abs. was confined to certain grammatical contexts in which it could maintain its sway.

The foregoing discussion has attempted to demonstrate that in contrast to the common view, according to which determination in TJ is not used correctly anymore, it is possible to find a largely consistent pattern for the distribution of the st.emph. and st.abs. in TJS. It has been suggested that the apparent irregularity is due to the fact that the system of determination in TJS is not a monolithic whole, but is rather founded on two different linguistic (sub)systems, rooted in two different understandings of determination: in the first of these systems, the distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. is fully maintained and carried out; in the other system this distinction is neutralized to the advantage of the st.emph. that, by and large, proves to exert both functions, with the exception of certain specific contexts in which the st.abs. remains common. It has also been suggested that, though coexistent in the linguistic structure of the Aramaic of TJS, these two systems are not interchangeable, and a close scrutiny of our corpus has revealed that each of them is used under specific circumstances. In other words, the Aramaic of TJS presents us with a hybrid system.

Finally, it has been shown that the borderline between the two systems closely follows certain grammatical categories. Essentially, two fundamental distinctions must be made on the basis of number and gender: as a rule plural nouns maintain the classical norm of determination (first system), feminine singular nouns do not (second

system) and masculine singular nouns are shared between those that do and those that do not, i.e they are shared between the two systems.

5.2 WIDER PERSPECTIVE

Strange though that state of affairs may be, it is most significant to note that these two determination subsystems, inasmuch as a linguistic analysis of TJS permits to retrieve them in their pristine state, tally with what we are accustomed to understand in terms of the Western / Eastern divide prevalent in LA: insofar as the first system of determination in TJS involves the respect of the historical distinction between st.emph. and st.abs., it corresponds to the norm set by OA and continued in Western LA, as against Eastern LA from which it is markedly different.¹⁰⁷ In contrast, the second system is strikingly reminiscent of Eastern LA. More specifically, it shares with well-known Eastern LA dialects such as Syriac and Mandaic not only the same basic principle, viz. the critical position granted to the st.emph., but also many of its restrictions, grammatical contexts in which the st.abs. has not been (entirely) supplanted by the st.emph.¹⁰⁸ Details of these contexts are presented below; when applicable, instances from the Peshitta of Samuel are adduced to illustrate the point:¹⁰⁹

- Repetitive constructions: I.1.7 ܠܫܢܐ ܠܫܢܐ ܕܠܐ ‘year by year’, II.14.26

¹⁰⁷ Thus in Mandaic the st.abs. almost never occurs with plural nouns (Nöldeke 1875: 305), whereas in Classical Syriac the st.abs.pl. is encountered only in certain contexts, e.g. with numerals, but not without a severe competition on the part of the st.emph. (Nöldeke 1898: §202D). Cf. also Greenfield (1978a: 40): ‘[t]he Western dialects preserved the distinction between *malkin* and *malkayyā* “kings : the kings”, *malkān* and *malkātā* “queens : the queens”; but Eastern Aramaic knew only *malkē* and *malkātā*.

¹⁰⁸ It must be noted that no counterpart of the notion of *plus déterminé* as proposed by Avinery (1977a) with reference to Classical Syriac has been found in TJS. Similarly, the use of the demonstrative adjectives as a means to clarify the semantic determination of nouns occurring in the now ambiguous st.emph. (Muraoka 2005: §72) has no parallel in TJS. Yet, the possibility must be entertained that this might be due to the influence of the Vorlage on the text of TJ, and as such it can therefore not be held to characterize the Aramaic of TJ. On the other hand, as in BH the numeral ‘one’ is sometimes used as an indefinite article in TJS (cf. N:2.1.1).

¹⁰⁹ Not infrequently, a comparison between TJS and the Peshitta of Samuel proves to yield little result, as in many of the passages where factors have been found to be at work in TJS the two corpora render the Vorlage differently.

- ܠܡܢ ܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ‘from time to time’;¹¹⁰
- Predicative use of adjectives and participles: I.14.28 ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘cursed be the man who ...’, II.7.22 ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘you are great’, II.11.5 ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘I am pregnant’;¹¹¹
- Prepositional phrases with adverbial character: I.27.12 ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘forever’;¹¹²
- With certain loanwords, e.g. I.2.8 ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘the world’;¹¹³
- After the noun modifier ܕܥܠܡܐ : II.4.9 ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘every grief’;¹¹⁴
- With the negatives ܕܥܠܡܐ and ܕܥܠܡܐ .^{115,116}

¹¹⁰ Compare I.1.7^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ , II.14.26^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ . However, the use of the st.abs. in this context is not unchallenged by the st.emph., as the following instance demonstrates: II.13.4 ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘morning after morning’ [^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ]. On Syriac and Mandaic, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §202C); Joosten (1996: 70); Nöldeke (1875: 301); Macuch (1965: 386-387).

¹¹¹ Compare I.14.28^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ , II.7.22^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ , II.11.5^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ . On Syriac and Mandaic, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §204); Joosten (1996: 67-69); Nöldeke (1875: 306-308); Macuch (1965: 385). In contrast to Syriac, the apparent use of the st.emph. with predicative adjectives as a means to indicate essential (as against accidental) qualities is not evidenced in TJS, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §204B); Joosten (1989a); Goldenberg (1991); Joosten (1996: 67). TJS displays only two cases of predicative adjective in the st.emph. (II.12.1 ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘one was *rich* and one was *poor*’). Considering the virtual non-existence of this use of the st.emph. in TJS, the question remains as to whether the use of the st.emph. in this particular passage should be held to convey a nuance similar to that conveyed by the st.emph. in Syriac.

¹¹² Compare I.27.12^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ . But note that in contrast to Syriac this particular phrase normally occurs in the st.emph. ܕܥܠܡܐ in TJS (cf. footnote n.87 above). On Syriac and Mandaic, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §202G); Nöldeke (1875: 302-303); Macuch (1965: 388).

¹¹³ Compare I.2.8^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ . But note also I.14.2 ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘the pomegranate tree’ [^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ]. On Syriac and Mandaic, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §202L); Nöldeke (1875: 305); Macuch (1965: 389).

¹¹⁴ Compare II.4.9^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ . But note also II.6.14 ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘with all power’ [^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ], II.15.2 ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘every man who ...’ [^{TJ} ܕܥܠܡܐ]. On Syriac and Mandaic too, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §202D); Joosten (1996: 63-65); Nöldeke (1875: 301-302); Macuch (1965: 387).

¹¹⁵ None of the instances in which the presence of a negative might be entertained as a factor tipping the scales in favour of the st.abs. in TJS (cf. D:3.4(3)) is paralleled by the Peshitta of Samuel. On Syriac and Mandaic, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §202F); Joosten (1996: 70-71); Nöldeke (1875: 302); Macuch (1965: 387).

¹¹⁶ Interestingly, some of these grammatical contexts have also been found to promote the use of the st.abs. in IA (Muraoka & Porten 2003: §46) and the use of

On the whole, determination in TJ therefore appears to result from a combination of two different systems: one that shares with Western LA the respect for the distinction between st.emph. and st.abs., and one that partakes of Eastern LA as regards the critical position granted to the st.emph. and some of the limitations set upon its use. Obviously, the question arises as to how such an unusual state of affairs may have come into being. More specifically: how did these two systems originate, and by what process could two so widely different concepts of determination come to coexist, each with its own domain of use, in one and the same Aramaic dialect? The final conclusions of this study will attempt to account for that rather unusual situation (C:2.2). For the time being, though no one can afford to be dogmatic in that area a few remarks can be ventured on some of the linguistic factors that may have played a role in the process.

5.3 DETERMINATION AND THE ARAMAIC OF TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

The distribution of the two systems of determination along the axes of grammatical number and gender is not easy to explain. Semantic considerations may have been involved in the basic distinction between singular and plural nouns, inasmuch as the individuating and generic functions of determination did perhaps not overlap to the same extent in the plural as it did in the singular, so that the distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. could be kept more easily.¹¹⁷ Morphophonological considerations may have played a role too. Thus in the plural st.abs.

the *status absolutus* in Akkadian (Von Soden 1995: §62; Kaufman 1974: 134; and especially Moscati 1962; yet, it should be borne in mind that formally the Akkadian *status absolutus* does not correspond to the Aramaic st.abs.). Notwithstanding, these commonalities have no bearing on the close relationship between the second determination system of TJS and the determination system of Eastern Aramaic. What is significant here is not the fact that the Aramaic of TJS and Eastern Aramaic dialects should share these contexts to the exclusion of other types of Aramaic, but rather that the *distribution* of these contexts is identical within two linguistic systems (the determination system of Eastern Aramaic and the second determination system of TJS) that otherwise do not know the distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. anymore. In other words, it is the combination of these two elements — identical distribution of the contexts and predominance of the st.emph. — rather than either individually, that brings out the commonality of the Aramaic of TJS and of the Eastern Aramaic dialects as against other types of Aramaic.

¹¹⁷ This view was suggested to me by Prof. Dr. H. Gzella (Leiden University).

and st.emph. were formally distinct, as both involved the use of markedly different endings (viz. masc. pl. *-īn/ -ayyā*, fem. pl. *-ān/ -ātā*). Confusion might therefore have been less likely to arise in the pl. than in the sg., where e.g. the ending *-ā* had to do double duty, with regard to both gender and *status* (viz. מלכא st.abs. fem. ‘a queen’ or st.emph. masc. ‘the king’). Inasmuch as the ending *-(^h)tā* was markedly feminine, the systematic use of the st.emph. with fem.sg. nouns (מלכתא ‘the/a queen’), no doubt under the influence of Eastern Aramaic usage,¹¹⁸ might have been prompted by the need to dispel the ambiguity. But no such resort was available for masc. sg. nouns., which may explain why they present us with such a confusing picture.

¹¹⁸ This will be elaborated upon in the general conclusions (C:2.2).