



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 TWO

NUMERALS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 NUMERALS IN ARAMAIC

An Overview

Semitic languages display both commonalities and differences in their morphosyntactic treatment of numerals.¹ All Semitic languages possess two distinct series of numerals for the numbers 1-19, the use of which is conditioned by the gender of the noun modified. Another important, striking feature shared by all Semitic languages is the so-called *chiastic concord*, whereby formally feminine forms of the numerals from 3 to 10 (and, by extension, from 13 to 19 as well) are employed to quantify masculine nouns and vice versa, e.g. in BH שלשה בנים ‘three sons’ as against שלש בנות ‘three daughters’. On the other hand, the behaviour of numerals in the Semitic languages can vary in three main, often interrelated regards:

1. Placement of the numeral in relation to the noun it modifies, e.g. בנים שלשה vs. שלשה בנים;
2. Grammatical relation obtaining between the noun and the numeral, e.g. apposition (שלשה בנים, בנים שלשה) and genitive (שלשת בנים);
3. Grammatical treatment of the noun quantified, inasmuch as the presence of the numeral and the type of grammatical relation it imposes on the noun can influence the noun in terms of grammatical number, casus (for the languages that know such distinctions) and determination, e.g., in Classical Arabic, *’arbaʿatu kutubin* ‘four books’ (noun in genitive plural), *’alfu kitābin* ‘thousand books’ (noun in genitive singular), *’arbaʿataʿašara kitāban* ‘fourteen books’ (noun in the indeterminate accusative singular).²

¹ This chapter will discuss the cardinal numerals only. For the sake of convenience, however, mention will be made of ‘numerals’ only, without further specification. For a general treatment of numerals in the Semitic languages, cf. Brockelmann (1908: 484-492); Moscati (1964: 115-120); Lipiński (1997: 280-297).

² This last construction likewise displays a third type of grammatical relation, common in Classical Arabic, obtaining between noun and numeral, and is known

Aramaic is no exception. According to the dialects and depending on the numerals, the numeral can precede or follow the noun it modifies. When it follows the noun, the grammatical relation between noun and numeral is one of apposition; when it precedes the noun, the relation is either a genitive construction (construct relation) or an apposition. With numerals higher than ‘one’ the noun is usually in the plural, and its formal determination varies according to the dialects (and the way these deal with the question of determination generally).³

1.2 STATUS QUAESTIONIS

Regarding the Aramaic of TJ specifically, the question of the morphosyntax of the numerals has hardly been investigated in the extant literature. Tal, in his pioneer study of the Aramaic of TJ, has dealt only with phonological and morphological aspects of the numerals, leaving out their morphosyntax entirely.⁴ The same applies to Dalman with reference to the Aramaic of TO,⁵ and to Segert who does not address the Aramaic of TO and TJ specifically.⁶ On the whole, the only treatment of the morphosyntax of the numerals in the Aramaic of TO/TJ that we have so far is the very apt (if, by necessity, summary) notes of Lambdin and Huehnergard in their introductory grammar of the Aramaic of TO.⁷

2. MORPHOSYNTAX OF THE NUMERALS IN TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

A careful analysis of our corpus shows that in terms of morphosyntactic in Arabic grammar as ‘specification of number’, cf. Wright (1967: vol. 2, §44e, rem. b).

³ Cf. D:5. The morphosyntax of the numerals in Aramaic at large will be discussed in N:4.2.

⁴ Tal (1975: 65-69).

⁵ Dalman (1905: 124ff.).

⁶ Segert (1975: §§6.4.1-6.4.3).

⁷ Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 45, 51-52).

behaviour cardinal numerals fall into two groups: the numeral 1 on the one hand, all others (that is 2 and higher) on the other.⁸

2.1 THE NUMERAL ‘one’

2.1.1 MODIFYING A SIMPLE NOUN

In TJS the modifier חד (masc.) / חדא (fem.) ‘one’ is always postposed, i.e. placed after the noun it modifies, and the grammatical relation between noun and numeral is one of apposition, e.g. II.3.13 פתגמא חד ‘one thing’, I.6.4 מחתא חדא ‘one stroke’.⁹ Semantically speaking, as in BH the strictly quantifying function of חד/חדא is sometimes watered down to that of an indefinite adjective (i.e. ‘a boat’ as against ‘one boat’),¹⁰ e.g. I.24.15 חלש חד ‘a weakling’, II.12.1 קרנא חדא ‘a city’. But this functional difference does not appear to have any impact at the morphosyntactic level.

Interestingly, the numeral חד/חדא does not seem to exert a noticeable influence on the formal determination of the noun it modifies. In four instances the noun is semantically determinate, and occurs accordingly in the st.emph.: I.13.17/I.13.18(2x) משריתא חדא (lit.) ‘the one company’ [הראש אחד] and I.14.5 שנא חדא (lit.) ‘the one crag’ [השן האחד].¹¹ All other instances encountered in TJS involve semantically indeterminate nouns:

⁸ The behaviour of the noun נבר ‘man’ with certain numerals is peculiar, and will be dealt with in a separate section at the close of this chapter (N:4).

⁹ In this regard TJS is in agreement with the Vorlage which, in Samuel at least, always postposes the numeral אחד / אחת (for other morphosyntactic options in BH, cf. JM §142b). Postposition in TJS also appears to be the rule in passages without (or with a different) Vorlage, e.g. I.20.3 פסעא חדא ‘one step’ [פשע] and I.24.15 חלש חד ‘a weakling’ [כלב מת] ‘a dead dog’.

¹⁰ Cf. JM (§137u).

¹¹ In all four instances the function of the numeral is to contrast several items in a series (as in I.13.17-18 ‘the first company ..., the second company ..., the third company ...’), not to underscore their oneness or uniqueness. In addition, one will note that the Aramaic of TJS does not distinguish between determinate and indeterminate forms of the numeral (א)חד. Whereas BH can have the numeral adjective אחד/אחת preceded by the definite article when it is semantically determinate, TJS never does, e.g. I.14.5 שנא חדא vs. ^{BH} השן האחד (where the noun שן is feminine in TJS and treated as masculine in BH). This also comes out clearly from the pronominal use of (א)חד, e.g. II.4.2 ‘the name of the one’ (referring to one of the men of Saul’s son) שום חד vs. ^{BH} שם האחד; II.14.6 ‘and the one smote the other’ ומחא חד ית חד vs. ^{BH} ויכו האחד את האחד.

- a) Adjectives used substantively (D:3.1.1) are in the st.abs.: I.26.20 חלש חד 'a weak (man)';
- b) Formally feminine nouns occur in the st.emph.: I.6.4 מחתה חדא 'one stroke', I.13.17 משריהא חדא 'one army', II.12.1 קרתא חדא 'one city', II.14.27 ברתא חדא 'one daughter';¹²
- c) Formally masculine nouns: the evidence is often ambiguous, inasmuch as the Type of many nouns cannot be established (D:2.2.3):
- Type A nouns: I.24.15 הדיוט חד 'a commoner';¹³
 - Type B nouns: I.7.12 אבנא חדא 'a stone', I.9.15 יומא חד 'one day', II.3.13 פתגמא חד 'one thing', I.25.14 עולימא חד 'one young man';¹⁴
 - Nouns of uncertain Type: I.6.12 כבשא חד 'one road', I.14.40 עברא חד 'one side', I.20.3 פסעא חדא 'one step', I.22.20 ברא חד 'one son', II.6.19 פלוג חד 'one portion'; the noun זמן 'time' occurs once in the st.abs. (II.23.8 זמן חדא 'one time'), once in the st.emph. (I.26.8 זמנא חדא 'one time').¹⁵

2.1.2 MODIFYING A COMPLEX NOUN PHRASE

When the noun modified is actually a complex noun phrase, TJS appears to follow the Vorlage closely, i.e. if at all possible the numeral חדא/חד occupies the same position within the noun phrase in Aramaic as its counterpart in Hebrew:

- When the BH features a genitive relation modified by postposed אחד/אחת, so does TJS, e.g. I.7.9 אמרא דחלבא חד 'one suckling lamb' [חלבא דחלבא], II.6.19 גריצתא דלחם אחד 'one cake of bread' [חלת לחם אחת], even though the BH construct relation being rendered with a

¹² This is precisely what we should expect, inasmuch as formally feminine nouns belong as a rule to Type B (cf. D:2.2.2). However, one will note two exceptions, encountered in one and the same verse: II.2.25 סיעא חדא 'one troop', רמא חדא 'a hill'.

¹³ I.1.5 חולק חד בחיר 'one chosen portion' will be discussed in N:2.1.2, inasmuch as it features an attribute. Notwithstanding, one will note that the noun חולק is in the st.abs., in agreement with its Type (cf. D:2.2.3).

¹⁴ The noun גבר is peculiar with certain numerals (cf. N:3). With the numeral חד, however, it behaves as any other noun of Type B, i.e. it occurs in the st.emph., e.g. I.11.7 גברא חד 'one man'.

¹⁵ II.18.11 אספניקי חד 'one belt' is not dealt with here, as the noun אספניקי is indeclinable (cf. D:3.1.3).

d-relation in TJS the Targumist might have taken advantage of the flexibility inherent in that construction by inserting the numeral between the two terms of the *d*-relation,¹⁶ as is the case in I.9.8 *וְזוּזָא חַד דְּכֶסֶּפֶּא* ‘one zuz of silver’, the only instance in our corpus of a *d*-relation involving the numeral *חַד/אֶחָד* that does not attempt to render the Vorlage (*רַבַּע שֶׁקֶל כֶּסֶף* ‘a quarter of a shekel of silver’) literally and where TJS is therefore at liberty to follow word-ordering principles of its own, viz. insertion of the numeral between the A- and B-terms of the *d*-relation.

- When in BH the nucleus noun is modified by an attributive adjective TJS sticks to the BH word order closely, e.g. I.6.7 *עֲגֻלָּתָא חֲדָתָא חַדָּא* ‘one new wagon’ [*עֲגֻלָּה חֲדָשָׁה אַחַת*] as against II.12.3 *אִמְרָתָא חַדָּא זְעִירָא* ‘one little ewe’ [*כִּבְשָׁה אַחַת קְטַנָּה*].
- Even when TJS follows the grammatical structure of the Vorlage more loosely, the position of the numeral *חַד/אֶחָד* in the noun phrase as a whole is where possible the same as in the Vorlage, as in I.1.5^{BH} *מִנָּה אַחַת אִפִּים* (lit.) ‘one portion (of/with) face’ and I.1.24^{BH} *אִיפָה אַחַת קִמָּח* ‘one ephah of flour’, two appositional constructions rendered in TJS with an attributive construction *חֻלְקָא חַד בְּחִיר* ‘one chosen portion’ and a genitive construction *מִכִּילְתָּא חַדָּא דְּקִמָּחָא* ‘one measure of flour’ respectively, in which despite the structural difference the numeral occupies the same position as in the BH original. In the same vein, in II.7.23 *עַמָּא חַד בְּחִיר בְּאַרְעָא* ‘one people, chosen in the earth’ [*גוֹי אֶחָד בְּאֶרֶץ*] the passive ptc. *בְּחִיר* ‘chosen’ has been appended to the noun phrase without further altering the word order of the Vorlage.

As for determination, the scarcity of the evidence makes it difficult to assess whether the presence of the numeral *חַד/אֶחָד* has any incidence on *d*-relations:

- In total, four instances of *d*-relations in which the A-term is a simple noun modified by *חַד/אֶחָד* are encountered in TJS. In two cases the A-term of the *d*-relation is a feminine noun which, as

¹⁶ Cf. G:4.3. This lack of autonomy of TJS with regard to the BH original is further illustrated by I.16.20 *גִּדְיָא בֶר עֵז חַד* (lit.) ‘one kid, child of a goat’ (compare BH *גִּדְי עֵזִים אֶחָד* ‘one kid of goats’), where the placement of the numeral sticks closely to the Vorlage even though the internal structure of the noun phrase has been so modified (i.e. the BH construct relation has been disrupted, its A-term becoming autonomous and its B-term being expanded into a new construct relation *בֶּר עֵז*) that the numeral could theoretically be placed immediately after *גִּדְיָא* ‘kid’.

expected, occurs in the st.emph.: I.1.24 מכילתא חדא דקמחא ‘one measure of flour’, II.6.19 גריצתא דלחים חדא ‘one cake of bread’;¹⁷ in the two other cases the A-term is a masculine noun occurring in the st.emph. but whose Type can otherwise not be established on the basis of the available evidence in TJS (D:2.2.3): I.7.9 אמרא דחלבא חד ‘one suckling lamb’, I.9.8 זוזא חד דכספא ‘one zuz of silver’;

- In three cases the noun is modified by a bare attributive adjective or participle: I.1.5 חולק חד בחיר ‘one *chosen* portion’, I.6.7 עגלתא חדתא חדא ‘one *new* wagon’ and II.12.3 אמרתא חדא זעירא ‘one *little* ewe’. In the first two instances, as expected the noun and adjective/participle agree in formal determination (D:3.2.1.2.1); only in the third is the agreement in determination disrupted;¹⁸
- In II.7.23 עמא חד בחיר בארעא (lit.) ‘one people, chosen on the earth’ the noun is modified by a participial phrase; accordingly, noun and phrase are autonomous in terms of determination (D:3.2.1.2.3). The same applies to I.16.20 נדיא בר עוי חד (lit.) ‘one kid, child of a goat’, in which the noun נדיא ‘kid’, the term actually modified by the numeral, is modified by an appositional phrase בר עוי ‘child of a goat’.¹⁹

2.2 THE NUMERALS ‘two’ AND HIGHER

2.2.1 MODIFYING A SIMPLE NOUN

All other numerals (i.e. 2 and higher) follow straightforward rules. The noun modified is systematically in the plural²⁰ to the effect that the distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. is observed (D:2.1): when the

¹⁷ As was seen before, II.6.19 גריצתא דלחים חדא is exceptional in that the formal determination of the A-term does not pass to the B-term (cf. D:3.2.2.1, footnotes n.72 and 78). But there is no indication that this is incumbent to the presence of the numeral and is better treated as an exception to the principles of determination in *d*-relations.

¹⁸ On this instance, cf. D:3.2.1.2.1, footnote n.62.

¹⁹ Cf. D:3.2.1.2.3, footnote n.69.

²⁰ As will be seen shortly, aside from the collective noun עין ‘sheep’ that regularly occurs in the sg. with numerals (cf. I.25.2 עין תלתא אלפין ‘3000 sheep’ and I.25.18 חמיש עין תכברא ‘five stuffed sheep’), the only exceptions to this rule in our corpus involve the nouns מאה ‘hundred’ and גבר ‘man’ (cf. N:2.2.2(2) and N:3 respectively).

noun is semantically indeterminate the st.abs. is used; when it is semantically determinate the st.emph. (or any other grammatical structure conveying determination, e.g. a pronominal suffix) is employed:²¹

- Semantically indeterminate: I.11.3 שבעה יומין 'seven days', I.25.2 אלף עזין '1000 goats', II.1.26 תרתין נשין 'two wives', II.8.4 מאה רתכין '100 chariots', II.9.10 חמשת עסר בנין 'fifteen sons', II.14.26 מאתן סלעין '200 selas', II.15.7 ארבעין שנין 'forty years';
- Semantically determinate: I.2.1 ארבעת עסר בנודי 'his fourteen sons', I.6.18 חמשה מורינא 'the five chiefs', I.17.14 תלתה רברביא 'the three eldest (ones)', II.4.4 תרתין רגלודי 'his two feet', II.18.24 תרין תרעיא 'the two gates', II.19.18 עסרין עבדודי 'his twenty servants', II.23.17 תלתא גבריא 'the three warriors'.²²

As for the numeral, it is always in apposition to the noun it modifies. Regarding word order, here too the Vorlage is followed closely. Numerals come before the noun they modify, as in all examples above, with the exception of four instances where the numeral is postposed so as to remain faithful to the Vorlage: I.1.24 תורין תלתה 'three bulls' [פרים שלשה], I.25.2 ען תלתה אלפין '3000 sheep' [צאן שלשת אלפים], II.1.1 יומין תרין 'two days' [ימים], II.24.24 סלעין חמשין 'fifty selas' [שקלים חמשים].²³

²¹ Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 45) note the same with regard to TO, which is what we should expect since the historical distinction between st.abs. and st.emph. is also maintained with plural nouns in TO (*ibid.*: 44).

²² No instance of a determinate noun phrase involving hundreds/thousands and a bare noun are found in our corpus. Besides, the following exceptions should be noted: I.17.40 חמשה חלקי אבניא 'five smooth stones' [חמשה חלקי אבנים] (but cf. remark on the determination of the noun אבן, D:2.1, footnote n.30), II.13.6 תרתין חלימא 'two dumplings' [שתי לבבות 'two cakes']. But nothing indicates that they are the effect of the presence of the numeral specifically. Finally, one should also note the most remarkable II.23.4 שבעת יומיא 'seven days', irregular not only in terms of determination (the phrase is semantically indeterminate) but also because it is the only instance in our corpus to feature a st.cst.-form of the numeral (the reason behind the use of this construction is unclear). Finally, this instance is all the more significant because there is no Vorlage.

²³ Note the following instances without (or with a different) Vorlage: I.2.1 ארבעת עסר בנודי 'his fourteen sons' [/], II.1.26 תרתין נשין 'two women' [נשים 'women'], II.4.2 תרתין משרין 'two armies' [גדודים 'bands']. They suggest that the preposing of the numeral is not merely the effect of a Hebrew influence, but is the natural position of the numeral in the Aramaic of TJS. Additional evidence is provided by cases in BH involving a noun in the dual. As TJS does not use dual forms (with the exception of the numerals תרתין/תרין 'two' and מאתן '200'), in Aramaic the BH dual noun is dissociated into a phrase involving a noun in the pl. and the numeral 'two'. What is significant

2.2.2 SPECIAL CASES

Note should be taken of the following special cases:

1. When the noun actually quantified is the numeral אלף ‘thousand’ (in noun phrases of the type ‘three thousand X’) the general rule applies: the noun אלף occurs in its plural form אלפין, and since all the instances encountered happen to be semantically indeterminate the noun actually quantified by the numeral אלפין occurs in the st.abs. pl., e.g. I.13.5 ‘30000 chariots’, II.10.18 ‘40000 horsemen’.²⁴

2. When the noun modified is the numeral מאה ‘hundred’, all instances being likewise indeterminate the noun actually quantified is in the st.abs. pl. (including the noun אלף ‘thousand’ in numeral constructions of the type I.11.8 ‘300000’), in accordance with the rules indicated above. The noun מאה itself, however, remains invariable, in disagreement with the general rule, e.g. II.8.4 ‘1700 horsemen’, II.23.8 ‘800 killed’.²⁵

3. In BH, certain common nouns such as יום ‘day’, שנה ‘year’ sometimes remain in the sg. after numerals.²⁶ Interestingly the Aramaic of TJ does not follow the BH usage, in that these nouns occur regularly in the pl., in full agreement with the general rule, e.g. I.17.16 ‘forty days’, I.25.38 ‘ten days’, II.4.4 ‘five years’, II.5.4 ‘three years’ here is that the numeral ‘two’ is systematically preposed, e.g. I.13.12 ‘2000’ [אלפין], I.18.11 ‘two times’ [פעמים], II.9.3 ‘two feet’ [רגלים], II.13.23 ‘two years’ [שנתיים].

²⁴ Cf. Dalman (1905: §21.4) for a similar phenomenon in TO. In this, the Aramaic of TJS and its exclusive use of the pl. differs markedly from BH and its alternation between the sg. אלף and the pl. אלפים (JM §100l-n; Gesenius 1910: §97g): as a rule, in our corpus BH employs the pl. in conjunction with the numerals 2-10 only, e.g. I.13.5 ‘6000 (horsemen)’; with all other numerals the sg. is used, e.g. II.8.13 ‘18000’, II.18.7 ‘20000’, II.24.9 ‘500000 (men)’. In addition, for the numeral ‘2000’ BH possesses the special dual form אלפין, which has no counterpart in TJS.

²⁵ Cf. Dalman (1905: §21.4) for a similar phenomenon in TO. Here again the Aramaic of TJS differs from BH, which in such cases consistently uses the pl. מאות ‘hundreds’, cf. JM (§100l); Gesenius (1910: §97g). Besides, for ‘200’ both TJS and BH know a special dual form, מאות and מאות respectively.

²⁶ Cf. JM (§142e-j); Gesenius (1910: §134e-h *passim*). Essentially, in the Vorlage of Samuel these two nouns appear to follow the same pattern as אלף ‘thousand’, i.e. they occur in the pl. when they are modified by the numerals 2-10 only, e.g. II.5.5^{BH} ‘seven years’. With all other numerals they occur in the sg., e.g. I.17.16^{BH} ‘forty days’ (with the exception of the numeral ‘two’, in conjunction with which special dual forms such as יומים and שנתיים may be used).

‘thirty years’, II.19.33 תמנן שנין ‘eighty years’, II.24.8 עסרין יומין ‘twenty days’.

4. When a given BH grammatical structure has no direct counterpart in the Aramaic of TJS, or would for some reason be undesirable if it should be translated literally, the Targumist tends to replace it with an equivalent structure at home in the Aramaic of TJ. This tendency can also be seen at work with numerals. A frequent instance of this bears on expressions of quantity. Whereas in such expressions the Vorlage readily dispenses with any indication of measure, e.g. II.18.11^{BH} עשרה כסף (lit.) ‘ten silver’,²⁷ the Aramaic of TJS does not appear to be fond of that kind of ellipse. As a result, the noun denoting the mass or material, which stands on its own in the Vorlage, is replaced with a genitive (or sometimes appositional) construction in TJS, a noun of measure being inserted in the Aramaic translation as the A-term of a genitive construction and the noun actually denoting the mass or material becoming the B-term (or standing in apposition to the noun of measure):²⁸ II.18.11 עסר סלעין דכסף ‘ten selas of silver’. Other examples include:

- Genitive construction: I.10.4 תרתין גריצן דלחם ‘two loaves of bread’ [שתי לחם (lit.) ‘two bread’], I.17.17 עסר מלמין דלחמא ‘(these) ten loaves of bread’ [עשרה לחם (lit.) ‘(these) ten bread’], I.21.4 חמיש מלמין דלחמא ‘five loaves of bread’ [חמשה לחם (lit.) ‘five bread’],²⁹ I.30.12 תרין אתכלין ‘two clusters of dried grapes’ [שני צמקים (lit.) ‘two raisins’];
- Apposition: I.25.18 מאתן מנן דבילתא ‘200 portions of figs’ [מאתים דבלים (lit.) ‘200 figs’], II.16.1 מאה מנן דבילתא ‘100 portions of figs’ [מאה קיץ (lit.) ‘100 summer fruit’].³⁰

²⁷ Cf. JM (§142n).

²⁸ Cf. JM (§131d-e).

²⁹ I.17.17 and I.21.4 are irregular, inasmuch as the A-term and the B-term disagree in determination (cf. D:3.2.2.1, footnote n.72). I.17.17 is further irregular because being semantically determinate a construct relation would have been more appropriate (cf. G:2.5.2). However, the puzzling state of affairs in I.17.17 can be taken to reflect the complexity of the Vorlage, inasmuch as the BH phrase עשר לחם, though formally indeterminate, is really semantically determinate.

³⁰ As can be seen from these examples, the Aramaic of TJS appears to favour the use of a genitive relation to that of an appositional construction. This can also be observed from the fact that occasionally an appositional construction in the Vorlage is rendered with a genitive relation in TJS, e.g. I.17.5 חמשא אלפין תקלי נחשא ‘5000 shekels of bronze’ [חמשת אלפים שקלים נחשת], I.17.7 שית מאה תקלי ברזלא ‘600 shekels of iron’ [שש מאות שקלים ברזל]. But this is not systematic, e.g. I.25.18 חמיש סאון קליא ‘five seahs of grain’ [חמש סאים קלי].

3. SPECIAL CASE

THE NOUN 'man' גבר

The state of affairs concerning the use of numerals with the noun גבר 'man' is peculiar, which indeed mirrors its complications with respect to determination (D:4). Essentially, two cases must be considered:

1. With the numerals 1-10 the noun גבר behaves regularly:

- a) As a member of Type B, with the numeral חד 'one' the noun גבר occurs in the st.emph. This occurs four times in our corpus: I.1.1, I.11.7, II.18.10, II.19.15 גברא חד 'a/one man'. The st.abs. is never encountered in this context.
- b) With the numerals 2-10 it occurs in the pl., and since all instances happen to be semantically indeterminate it is in the st.abs., e.g. I.10.3 תלתא גברין 'three men', I.28.8 תרין גברין 'two men', II.21.6 שבעה גברין 'seven men'.

2. With the numerals 11 and higher, the noun גבר remains quite surprisingly in the singular.³¹ In three cases it is semantically determinate, and therefore occurs regularly in the st.emph.: I.27.2, I.30.9 שית מאה גברא 'the 600 men', I.30.21 מאתן גברא 'the 200 men'. In all other instances it is semantically indeterminate and, as a member of Type B, therefore occurs in the st.emph. unless some factor in favour of the st.abs. (essentially the presence of an attributive adjective, participle or apposed noun, cf. D:3.2.1.2) comes into play:

- a) Without factor: I.6.19 גברא שבעין 'seventy men', I.9.22 תלתין גברא 'thirty men', I.14.14 עסרין גברא 'twenty men', I.22.18 תמנן וחמשא גברא 'eighty-five men', II.2.30 גברא חמשינן 'fifty men';³²

³¹ From this angle the noun גבר 'man' is, of all nouns whose BH counterpart is liable to remain in the sg. with numerals, the only one that sides with Hebrew, the other nouns of this type featured in our corpus (e.g. יום 'day', שנה 'year') occurring regularly in the pl., in agreement with the general rule. However, its otherwise atypical properties (cf. D:4) suggest that this is not necessarily a mere imitation of the Vorlage.

³² Not many exceptions have been found. Only two instances have been found in our corpus, where TJ features the pl. and thereby departs from its own principles: II.3.20 עסרין גברין 'twenty men', II.15.11 מאתן גברין '200 men' (note that in the case of II.3.20 this departure runs parallel to the Vorlage ^{BH} עשרים אנשים). One should also note II.10.6 אלף גבר '1000 men' that, though it is in the sg. according to the rule, is not in line with the general usage in terms of determination, inasmuch as it occurs in

- b) With factor: I.4.10 תלתין אלפין גבר רגלי '30.000 men footsoldiers', I.24.3 '400 young men', I.30.17 תלתא אלפין גבר עולים '30.000 young men', II.8.4 עסרין אלפין גבר רגלי '20.000 men footsoldiers', II.24.9 '800.000 men warriors (drawers of sword)'. תמני מאה אלפין גבר גבר (שלפי סיפא)

4. CONCLUSIONS

4.1 SUMMARY

In this chapter attention has been paid to some similarities and differences observed in the morphology and (morpho)syntax of the numerals in the Aramaic of TJS and BH. Before we proceed to extend the discussion to the other Aramaic dialects, it may be appropriate to summarize the main facts that our comparison with BH has brought to the fore. On the whole, the present study allows us to draw the following conclusions:

1. Whereas for some numerals BH features various forms, TJS has but one (irrespective of gender distinctions, of course). Thus the fluctuation in BH between the st.abs. and st.cst. forms of various numerals (e.g., in the masculine, ^{BH}אֶחָד and אֶחָד 'one', שְׁנַיִם and שְׁנֵי 'two', שִׁבְעָה and שִׁבְעַת 'seven')³³ is unattested in TJS, which displays complete uniformity in this respect (viz. חַד, תְּרִין and שִׁבְעָה respectively).³⁴ In the same vein, the specific dual forms that add to the variety of the numeral system of BH (e.g. שְׁנַתַּיִם 'two years') are replaced in TJS with ordinary numeral constructions involving the numeral 'two' (e.g. תְּרִיתַיִן שְׁנֵי 'two years'), with the exception, obviously, of the numerals תְּרִיתַיִן/תְּרִין 'two' and מֵ(א)תַּן '200' themselves.

2. Whereas in BH with some numerals certain common nouns remain in the singular, in TJS the plural is the norm for all nouns.³⁵ As a result, e.g. BH עֶשְׂרִים יוֹם 'twenty days' and עֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה become עֶסְרִין יוֹמִין and עֶסְרִין שָׁנִין in the st.abs. even though no factor in favour of the st.abs. can be detected.

³³ Cf. JM (§100b-d).

³⁴ Our corpus features but one exception, in which a st.cst. form of a numeral is attested: II.23.4 שִׁבְעַת יוֹמִיא 'seven days'.

³⁵ The only exceptions are the numeral מֵאָה 'hundred', which is always in the sg. when preceded by another numeral (as in תְּלַת מֵאָה '300'), and the noun גִּבּוֹר 'man' which, as we have seen, is peculiar in various respects (cf. D:4, N:3).

TJS, and therefore are treated no differently from any other noun, e.g. עסרין עבדין ‘twenty servants’. The use of the plural with numerals therefore appears to be more consistent in TJS than in BH, which incidentally gives rise to a neat morphosyntactic distribution between the numeral ‘one’ (governing agreement in the sg.) and numerals higher than ‘one’ (governing agreement in the pl.).

3. Whereas BH has various ways to place numerals, TJS has but one. Thus BH places numerals sometimes before, sometimes after the noun they modify (e.g. שלשה בנים, שלשת בנים and בנים שלשה ‘three sons’),³⁶ TJS systematically postposes the numerals חדא / חד ‘one’ and preposes all others, e.g. בר חד ‘one son’ and תרין בנין ‘two sons’.³⁷

All in all, the Aramaic of TJS therefore presents us with a numeral system which from all viewpoints is far more simple, consistent and homogenous than BH. This comes out most clearly in cases with a Vorlage, where we see that the diversity of the Hebrew original is harmonized into a uniform system in TJS, e.g. I.10.8^{BH} שבעת ימים ‘seven days’ becomes שבעה יומין in TJS; I.17.13^{BH} (יש) שלשת בני ‘the three sons of (Jesse)’ and II.2.18^{BH} (צרויה) שלשה בני ‘the three sons of (Zeruiah)’ are both harmonized into תלתה/א בני (...) ‘the three sons of (...)’; and similarly I.13.1^{BH} שתי שנים, II.2.10^{BH} שתיים שנים and II.14.28^{BH} שנתיים are all harmonized into תרתין שנין ‘two years’.

4.2 WIDER PERSPECTIVE

As was noted at the beginning of this chapter, the Aramaic dialects vary in the way they deal with the morphosyntax of the numerals. The morphosyntactic features that we shall use for the purpose of comparison are (1) the grammatical number of the noun modified, (2) the formal determination of the noun modified, and (3) the relative positioning of the numeral and the noun modified. A few less prominent features will

³⁶ Cf. JM (§142).

³⁷ However, it should be noted that in this regard the Vorlage always prevails. In other words, with numerals TJS follows its own word-ordering principles as long as these are not in contradiction with the Vorlage: when this happens, TJS gives way and conforms to the BH pattern (cf. N:2.2.1). In this, the word order of the numerals is remarkably different from their morphology and number agreement, inasmuch as with these two aspects TJS applies its own principles in all circumstances, even at the expense of the faithfulness to the Vorlage.

be briefly discussed as well.³⁸

4.2.1 GRAMMATICAL NUMBER OF THE NOUN MODIFIED

The grammatical number of the noun modified is probably the most stable morphosyntactic feature of the numerals in Aramaic. As a rule, the noun modified is in the singular with the numeral ܠܐ/ܠܐ, ³⁹ and in the plural with all other numerals.⁴⁰ Further, the following points should be mentioned:

1. The dual is encountered in the numeral ‘two’, and with nouns that naturally go in pairs (esp. body parts).⁴¹ The dual is also used for the number ‘200’, except in certain JPA corpora where no independent dual form is extant.⁴² Finally, SA is unique in that it possesses a special dual form for ‘2000’, a *unicum* in Aramaic that is probably the product of Hebrew influence.

2. The numeral ܠܐ constitutes a prominent exception to the use of the plural with numerals higher than ‘two’, inasmuch as until the MA period it always remains in the singular when it is quantified, e.g. BA

³⁸ Cf. Segert (1975: 343-346). The general discussion of the individual Aramaic idioms below is based on the following sources: on OA, cf. Degen (1969: 60-61, 104-105); Hug (1993: 70-71, 100-101); Martínez Borobio (2003: 65). On Samalian specifically, cf. Dion (1974: 247-248); Tropper (1993: 206). On IA, cf. Muraoka & Porten (2003: §§21, 67). On BA, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §§67, 95). On QA, cf. Fitzmyer (2004: 288-289); Muraoka (1972a: 21-22); Beyer (1985: 458-461); Schattner-Rieser (2004: 127-128). On Nabatean, cf. Cantineau (1930: 94-98). On Palmyrene, cf. Cantineau (1935: 124ff.). On JPA, cf. Dalman (1905: 124-131); Fassberg (1990: 127-133); Cook (1986a: 146-149); Fassberg (1985); Lund (1986; 1988). On CPA, cf. Schulthess (1924: 51-54, 85); Müller-Kessler (1991: 133-137). On SA, cf. Macuch (1982: 311-315). On Classical Syriac, cf. Nöldeke (1898: 92-95, 177-178); Joosten (1996: 59-63); Muraoka 1972b; 2005: §91c). On JBA, cf. Schlesinger (1928: 92-96); Epstein (1960: 125-129); Margolis (1910: §52). On Mandaic, cf. Nöldeke (1875: §§152-154, 240); Macuch (1965: 230-232, 413-414).

³⁹ The oldest Aramaic material also has a particular construction in which the noun modified is in the plural (cf. footnote n.47 below).

⁴⁰ The singular can also be used with collective nouns, cf. Segert (1975: 346).

⁴¹ By extension, it may be encountered even when a number other than ‘two’ is intended, e.g. BA Dan 7.7 קרנין עשר ‘ten horns’, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §53l); Segert (1975: 346).

⁴² Thus in the fragments of the Cairo Genizah and in Neofiti, cf. Fassberg (1990: §52g). The number ‘200’ is unattested in OA.

E6.17 מאה ארבע ‘400’, and so also in IA, QA, Nabatean and Palmyrene.⁴³ In the LA period, one witnesses an interesting contrast between the Eastern and Western Aramaic dialects. Whereas Eastern Aramaic dialects continue the historical use of the singular with מאה, Western Aramaic dialects use the plural side by side with the singular, e.g. Neofiti תלת מאה and תלת מאון ‘300’ — in SA, the plural is even the only usage.⁴⁴

4.2.2 FORMAL DETERMINATION OF THE NOUN MODIFIED

Until the MA period, the noun modified occurs in the st.abs. when semantically indeterminate and in the st.emph. when semantically determinate.⁴⁵ The situation of the LA dialects is more complex, inasmuch as the historical distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. is not dealt with in the same way by all dialects. In a general way, Western Aramaic dialects continue the historical distinction of the MA period, the noun modified by a numeral being in the st.emph. or st.abs. as appropriate,

⁴³ The number ‘100’ is unattested in OA.

⁴⁴ Cf. Lund (1987), who concludes that the use of the plural is due to the influence of Hebrew, whereas the origin of the use of the singular — which appears to be typically Aramaic — is uncertain.

⁴⁵ OA and IA texts feature the st.abs. only. But the exception is only apparent:

1. All instances of noun phrases composed solely of a bare noun and a numeral mentioned by Degen, Hug and Muraoka & Porten are *semantically indetermined*, e.g. (Sf. I A 24) שבע שנה ‘seven years’. Concerning IA specifically, no sure instance of a semantically determinate noun phrase of this type (i.e. ‘*the* seven years’) is attested in Egyptian Aramaic (personal communication from Prof. Muraoka): the absence of the st.emph. is therefore not abnormal.

2. That the st.emph. would be the expected form in such phrases is further suggested by the following facts:

a) The phrase ‘his seven daughters’ is rendered with שבע בתה in OA (cf. Sf. I A 24, in Degen 1969: 104), i.e. with a noun formally determined by a suffix pronoun: the absence of phrases of the type ‘the seven years’ is therefore not the effect of an incompatibility between numerals and (formally) determined nouns, but is better ascribed to the contingencies of the texts in which numerals are featured;

b) More significantly, when a demonstrative adjective is featured in such phrases (i.e. ‘*these* seven years’), in which the noun modified is by necessity semantically determinate, the st.emph. is the normal form in IA, e.g. גבריא אלך תרין ‘those two men’ (C1.1:56, in Muraoka & Porten 2003: §§67d, 67f).

whereas Eastern Aramaic dialects have largely dropped the st.abs.⁴⁶

4.2.3 PLACEMENT OF AND GRAMMATICAL RELATION BETWEEN NOUN AND NUMERAL

It is in the relative positioning of noun and numeral where one observes the most variation across the Aramaic dialects. The numeral can occur either before or after the noun modified. When the numeral comes after the noun, the grammatical relation between noun and numeral is appositional; when the numeral comes before the noun, the relation is either appositional or genitival (in the latter case, numeral and noun are the A-term and B-term respectively of a construct relation). The following distinctions must be made:

1. Until the MA period, the numeral ܠܚܕ/ܠܚܕܐ follows the noun it modifies, and stands in apposition to it.⁴⁷ In contrast, LA dialects display variation in this regard, insofar as the numeral ‘one’ can be either anteposed or postposed in one and the same dialect.⁴⁸ When the numeral ‘one’ is

⁴⁶ Cf. D:1.1, 5.2. However, Nöldeke (1898: §202D) notes with reference to Classical Syriac that the presence of a modifying numeral appears to encourage the use of the st.abs. with semantically indeterminate nouns. Cf. Joosten (1996: 59-63) for a detailed treatment of the relationship between numerals and determination in the Peshitta of Matthew.

⁴⁷ With regard to OA, a possible exception (Sf. I B 30) מן חד מלך ‘from one king’ (?) may be mentioned. The earliest Aramaic texts also display constructions of the type (Sf. I B 26.28) חד מלכן ‘one king’, where the numeral and the noun modified (in the *plural*) appear to form a construct relation of the type ‘one of kings’, cf. Degen (1969: 104); cf. also Segert (1975: §6.4.2.1.8). This construction is also attested in Samalian, cf. Dion (1974: 247); Tropper (1993: 206). The useable evidence of OA is overall scarce and uncertain (cf. also Hug 1993: 70), which, as was pointed out above, is also due to the fact that in many cases the number ‘one’ is expressed by a cipher rather than by the numeral ܠܚܕ/ܠܚܕܐ.

⁴⁸ With the possible exception of SA, inasmuch as the evidence adduced by Macuch (1982: 312) features only instances of anteposition. In addition, the variation between anteposition and postposition witnessed in other LA dialects appears to be at least partly related to the function of the numeral ‘one’ as pure quantifier (‘one man’) or indefinite article (‘a man’), with the exception of CPA, for which Müller-Kessler (1991: 134) claims that there are no semantic differences between the two positions. For detailed treatments of the placement of the numeral ‘one’ in Syriac and JPA, cf. Muraoka (1972b), Lund (1986; 1988); Joosten (1996: 59-61). Finally, with respect to Syriac Muraoka (2005: §91c) notes that when the noun modified is also qualified by an attributive adjective, the numeral ‘one’ appears either immediately before or after the noun modified, e.g. ܐܢܝ ܥܠܝܐ ܫܡܝܐ ‘the only

anteposed, however, it appears to be in apposition to the noun following as well.

2. With numbers higher than ‘one’, one also witnesses variation across the Aramaic dialects. Thus these numerals tend to come before the noun in OA and after the noun in IA.⁴⁹ In MA (QA, BA, Nabatean and Palmyrene) they are liable to come before as well as after the noun.⁵⁰ In LA, the Western dialects and Babylonian Aramaic tend to antepose the numerals higher than ‘one’, whereas in Syriac and Mandaic these numerals can either precede or follow, though anteposition appears to be more frequent.⁵¹ Finally, here too the anteposed numeral is either in the st.abs. (apposition) or in the st.cst. (genitive), depending on the dialects and the grammatical context, but under specific circumstances beloved son’ vs. ܠܒܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘a new wagon’. Muraoka further draws the attention on the position of the numeral ‘one’ in ܠܒܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘one hair’.

⁴⁹ The numeral ܡܐܬܐ is the only exception in Egyptian Aramaic, insofar as when it is quantified it always follows its quantifier, e.g. (A6.2:16) ܡܐܬܐ ܐܪܒܥܐ ‘400’, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §95j). On the other hand, the general tendency of Egyptian Aramaic to have the numeral follow the noun modified gives it a distinct position among the Aramaic dialects as regards the treatment of quantified thousands (Muraoka & Porten 2003: §21e), a feature also shared by Nabatean.

⁵⁰ In the dialects in which the numeral is anteposed the following features should be noted. The anteposed numeral ‘two’ is usually in the st.cst. (genitive relation) in Nabatean, and in the st.abs. (appositional relation) in QA and Palmyrene (with reference to BA evidence is lacking). The numerals higher than ‘two’ can theoretically be in either status in these dialects, though in QA the st.cst. is frequent and in BA (and possibly also in Palmyrene) the st.abs. is more common than the st.cst. In Egyptian Aramaic, Muraoka & Porten note that when the noun modified is also qualified by an attributive adjective, the numeral is usually inserted between the two, e.g. (with ‘one’) *TAD* A2.2:11 ܠܒܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘a swift horse’ (2003: §67g), but that when the noun modified is further qualified by a zy-relation, the numeral is at times inserted between the A-term and the B-term, e.g. *TAD* B2.6.11 ܠܒܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘one mirror of bronze’; and at times follows the whole zy-relation, e.g. *TAD* A4.7:9 ܠܒܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ‘five gates of stone’ (2003: §67h). Finally, in those dialects in which the numeral can be either anteposed or postposed there may be a correlation between ante-/postposition (and appositional/genitive relation in the case of anteposition) and (in)determination of the noun modified, e.g. BA, Palmyrene.

⁵¹ All three Western Aramaic dialects also attest to the development of special st.cst. forms ending in *-ti/te* for the numerals from ‘three’ to ‘ten’. According to Fassberg (1990: §47e), in the JPA of the Cairo Geniza fragments these forms were used with determinate nouns, e.g. ܬܠܬܐ ܫܗܕܝܐ ‘the three witnesses’, whereas with indeterminate nouns the st.abs. form of the numerals was used, e.g. ܐܪܒܥܐ ܡܠܚܝܢ ‘four kings’, and on the basis of the instances adduced by Müller-Kessler (1991: 134) and Macuch (1982: 313) it would appear that this was also the case in CPA and SA. In contrast, an Eastern Aramaic language such as Syriac possessed only a st.cst. form of the numerals in *-at*, cf. (Nöldeke 1898: §152).

Mandaic and Syriac also attest to the use of the *d*-relation with the numeral ‘1000’.⁵²

4.2.4 OTHER FEATURES

One may note the two following points:

1. Until the MA period the numerals have two forms (for each gender): st.abs., the basic form, and st.cst. when preceding the noun within a construct relation. Certain LA dialects,⁵³ however, attest to a specific st.emph. form for the numeral ‘one’ (and some, such as CPA and SA, also for higher numbers). According to the dialects, this form is used pronominally (e.g. as a way to express ‘the one’ as against ‘the other, the second’) or adjectivally (i.e. as a modifier accompanying determinate nouns, e.g. דכרא חדתה ‘the one ram’).⁵⁴

2. Inasmuch as in Syriac the st.emph. has become unmarked with respect to determination, the st.cst. form of numerals up to ‘ten’ with pronominal suffix may be used in apposition to clarify the determination of the noun modified, e.g. שבעה מלכים תלך ‘the five kings’ (vs. שבעה תלך ‘five kings’ or ‘the five kings’).⁵⁵

4.3 THE NUMERALS AND THE ARAMAIC OF TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

On the basis of the discussion above, the morphosyntax of the numerals in TJS can be sketched as follows:

1. The use of the singular and plural is consonant with the other

⁵² Cf. Nöldeke (1898: 177; 1875: 348). The use of the *d*-relation suggests that in these cases the numeral ‘1000’ is used substantively.

⁵³ CPA, SA, JPA of the Cairo Geniza fragments and of Neofiti; though not in the JPA of PsJ and of the Fragment Targum, nor in Syriac (Fassberg 1990: 132), nor in Mandaic (Nöldeke 1875: 187).

⁵⁴ One should note that Palmyrene also attests to a determinate form of numerals employed to denote days within a week or month (e.g. יום שבעתא ‘day number seven’), which is reminiscent of JPA and Classical Syriac, cf. Cantineau (1935: 127).

⁵⁵ Cf. Nöldeke (1898: 178). Palmyrene displays similar uses of the st.cst. form of the numerals, e.g. צלמא אלן תריהון ‘these two statues’ (Cantineau 1935: 128), though deficient expression of determination cannot be the cause of it.

Aramaic dialects: the singular is used with the numeral ‘one’, the plural with all other numerals. The noun ܢܐܪ is an exception, inasmuch as it is consistently in the singular after numerals higher than ‘two’, but in this respect TJS is in keeping with a common Aramaic practice that only the Western LA dialects do not follow. The noun ܢܝܪ ‘man’ is also an exception, inasmuch as with numbers higher than ‘ten’ the singular is used, but again this is in keeping with the Vorlage of Samuel, which uses as a rule the pl. ܐܢܝܝܡ with numerals from ‘two’ to ‘ten’ and the sg. ܐܢܝ with numerals higher than ‘ten’. An imitation of the Hebrew practice can therefore be assumed. The use of the singular with the noun ܐܢ ‘sheep’ suggests that with collectives the singular might have been acceptable, as is the case in other Aramaic dialects. Finally, for the numeral ‘200’ TJS always uses the dual of ‘100’, in contrast to some other JPA corpora, but a special dual form for ‘2000’ is not attested.

2. The use of the st.emph. and st.abs. corresponds closely to the general principles of determination at work in TJS: in the pl. (i.e. with numerals higher than ‘one’) the distinction between the status is observed, whereas in the sg., i.e. with the numeral ‘one’, nouns tend to follow their own Type (inasmuch as their Type can be established, cf. D:2.2). In this, TJS is in keeping with OA, IA, all other MA dialects as well as with Western LA, and differs markedly from the Eastern LA dialects.

3. The relative placement of the numeral and the noun modified is probably the aspect of the morphosyntax of the numerals that display the largest variety of usage across the Aramaic dialects, and as such it is a criterion particularly suitable for the purpose of comparison. Unfortunately, this criterion is largely irrelevant as regards TJS, inasmuch as the placement of the numerals can be shown to be almost entirely dependent on the Vorlage. In the Vorlage of Samuel, the numeral ‘one’ follows the noun modified and, with only a few exceptions, the numerals higher than ‘one’ precede. TJS closely follows these word ordering patterns, to the point of postposing the numerals higher than ‘one’ in the few cases that the Vorlage does.⁵⁶ In some instances, a numeral is inserted in Aramaic when TJS departs from the Vorlage, e.g. when rendering a BH dual noun with a noun modified by the numeral ܐܢܝܢ/ܐܢܝܢ. In such cases, it is clear that the numeral ‘one’ follows the noun and that the numerals higher than ‘one’ precede it. However, one cannot exclude the possibility of an influence on the part of the principles at

⁵⁶ Similarly, the positioning of numerals in complex phrases (e.g. noun phrases involving an attributive adjective or a *d*-phrase) follow the Vorlage closely.

work elsewhere in the Vorlage. As a result, though these cases of insertion of a numeral are significant, the extent to which they reflect genuine word ordering patterns of the Aramaic of TJS, rather than the usual patterns at work in the Vorlage of Samuel, is difficult to assess. Definite conclusions are therefore precluded.

4. The grammatical relation obtaining between the numeral and the noun modified is appositional in all cases, whether the numeral follows ([חד]א) or precedes (other numerals). As a result, the Aramaic of TJS also lacks forms typical of the st.cst., such as those in *-at* in other MA dialects and Syriac, and in *-te/ti* in the Western LA dialects.⁵⁷ In that respect, TJS is closer to BA⁵⁸ (and possibly Palmyrene) than to any other dialect of the MA and LA periods. Finally, the use of the *d*-relation with the numeral ‘1000’, or any other numeral, is not attested in TJS, in contrast to Syriac and Mandaic.

5. Finally, in contrast to some LA dialects, TJS does not have a st.emph. form of the numeral (א)חד.⁵⁹ Insofar as TJS follows closely the word order of the Vorlage, it does not have the custom of clarifying the determination of semantically determined nouns by apposing a form of the numeral provided with a pronominal suffix.

⁵⁷ Only one exception involving a preceding numeral in the st.cst., II.23.4 שבעת ימיא ‘seven days’, is encountered in TJS.

⁵⁸ BA displays only one unambiguous instance of a preceding numeral in the st.cst., Ezr 7.14 שבעת יעטדי ‘his seven counsellors’. Obviously, in a case like תלת עלעין the status of the numeral is bound to remain inconclusive, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §67c).

⁵⁹ The absence of such a form is all the more surprising because the Vorlage, which in many respects TJS follows so faithfully, *does* have a determinate form of the numeral, viz. האחת, האחד.