



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 FOUR

CONJUGATIONS¹

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CONJUGATIONS IN ARAMAIC

An Overview

In common with other Semitic languages, the Aramaic verbal system works along two main axes: the stems and the conjugations.²

The verbal stems consist of diverse morphophonological alterations of the root (gemination of root consonants, vowel lengthening, adjunction of affirmatives) that convey various semantic and morphosyntactic nuances. The verbal stems most commonly encountered in TJS are the *peal* (קָטַל),³ *paal* (קָטַל), *afel* (אָפַל), *itpeel* (אִתְּפַל), *itpaal* (אִתְּפַל) and, to a lesser extent, *ittafal* (אִתְּפַל). The first three stems are also known as the ‘active stems’, the last three as the ‘reflexive/passive stems’.

In turn, each of these stems can be inflected according to a given set of conjugations: the perfect (*qatal*),⁴ imperfect (*yiqtol*) and the imperative (*qtol*). The verbal system also comprises two infinitive forms, the infinitive construct (*miqtal*) and the infinitive absolute (*miqtāl*).⁵ In addition, all stems have a participle (*qāteḥ*); the three active stems for their part also have a passive participle (*qtil*), and by way of contrast their *qāteḥ* is

¹ Parts of this treatment of the conjugations in the Aramaic of TJS are due to appear as ‘Remarks on the Use of the Participle in Targum Jonathan to Samuel’, in: Gzella, H. & M.L. Folmer (eds.), *Aramaic in its Historical and Linguistic Setting*, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz; forthcoming).

² On the use of the term ‘conjugations’ to refer to the verbal categories variously known as ‘perfect’, ‘imperfect’, ‘participle’ (etc.), cf. Gzella (2004: 64-68, esp. 65). For a general treatment of the verbal stems and conjugations in the Semitic languages, cf. Brockelmann (1913: 133-170), Moscati (1964: 122-137), Lipiński (1997: 331-425).

³ The examples in Aramaic feature the conjugation known as ‘perfect’.

⁴ These conjugations are exemplified by means of transliterated *peal* forms.

⁵ On the existence of the infinitive absolute as a discrete verbal category in the Aramaic of TJS, cf. V:2.6.2, esp. footnote n.166.

labelled ‘active participle’.⁶

It is to the conjugations that we now turn. Obviously, the conjugations are not used in the same way in all Aramaic dialects.⁷ This chapter will attempt to present a detailed treatment of the functions and meanings of the conjugations in the Aramaic of TJS. After a short discussion of the relevant literature (V:1.2), the discussion will open with a thorough exposition of the concepts to be used in the analysis (V:1.3), and will then proceed to discuss the conjugations themselves one by one (V:2). Next, a few particular features of the verbal system of TJS will be tackled (V:3) and, eventually, the chapter will close with a synthesis of the findings and a comparative analysis in relation to the other Aramaic dialects (V:4).

1.2 STATUS QUAESTIONIS

In contrast to the other elements of syntax dealt with in this study, the use of the conjugations in TJ has already received scholarly attention. In his monumental grammar of JPA, Dalman⁸ deliberately left syntactical matters out of the discussion. The situation remained as such up to the

⁶ As will be seen later on (cf. V:1.3.4), the imperfective, perfective and perfect aspectual categories play an important role in the analysis of the verbal system of TJS. In order to avoid any confusion with the conjugations traditionally known as ‘perfect’ and ‘imperfect’ in the Hebrew and Aramaic grammatical traditions, the morphological realization of these conjugations in the Hebrew *qal* and Aramaic *peal* will serve as convenient labels throughout the analysis, i.e. *qatal* and *qtal* for the ‘perfect’ in Hebrew and Aramaic respectively, and *yiqtol* for the ‘imperfect’ in the two languages (irrespective of the verbal stems and, in the case of *qal/peal*, of the stem vowel). The imperative, the active and passive participles will also be referred to by their basic form in the *peal*, i.e. *qtol*, *qātel* and *qtil* respectively. The infinitive construct and the infinitive absolute will be referred to as Inf.C. and *qātōl*/Inf.A. respectively. Finally, BH has a few other important conjugations: *wayyiqtol* (‘imperfect consecutive’), *w^eqataltí* (following JM, for the ‘perfect consecutive’), Coh. (‘cohortative’), Juss. (‘jussive’) and *qātēl*/VerbAdj (‘verbal adjective’, the counterpart of the ‘active participle’ for morphologically stative verbs, cf. WoC §37.1b). The active and passive participles in BH will be referred to as *qotel* and *qatul* respectively, in agreement with the labels chosen to designate them in TJS. Importantly, all these labels *qtal*, *yiqtol*, *qātēl* (etc.) will be treated as proper nouns, i.e. they will be featured without the articles ‘the’ and ‘a’ throughout the discussion (e.g. ‘*qtal*’; stative *yiqtol*; prospective *qātēl*; etc.).

⁷ The morphosyntax of the conjugations in Aramaic at large will be discussed in the ‘wider perspective’ at the close of this chapter (V:4.2).

⁸ Dalman (1905).

1920s, when Stevenson published his concise *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*,⁹ intended to provide the English-speaking student with the substance of Dalman's German work while adding to Dalman's *opus* a few remarks on the syntax of the conjugations. In 1984, Cohen¹⁰ published what is probably the finest cross-Aramaic study of the verbal system to date. Though he dealt with OA, IA, BA, QA (GenApoc), JPA (Neofiti) and Modern Aramaic, unfortunately he hardly paid any attention to the Aramaic of TO and TJ.¹¹ Finally, it is only at the very end of the 20th century that the study of the verbal syntax of TO and TJ received significant attention. In a study published in 1997, Bombeck investigated the verbal system of four renditions of the Bible into Aramaic (TO/TJ, Neofiti, PsJ and the Peshitta), in an attempt to elucidate the way in which the BH verbal system was perceived by those who redacted the Aramaic versions.¹²

In his study, Bombeck focusses primarily on the non-translational material, inasmuch as in his view the functions of the conjugations should first be established on the sole basis of instances that do not display translation. However, he is also aware of the fact that the absence of parallelism between the Vorlage and the Aramaic version(s) does not in itself suffice to guarantee that one is dealing with genuinely Aramaic material, inasmuch as, e.g., an untranslated passage may have been construed parallel to, and therefore under the influence of, another translated passage.¹³

As a result of his investigation, Bombeck concludes that all the Aramaic corpora covered by his investigation follow a basic pattern for the rendition of the BH conjugations (*schematische Übersetzung*):¹⁴

⁹ Stevenson (1962).

¹⁰ Cohen (1984: 335-577).

¹¹ On TO and other Targumic documents specifically, cf. Cohen (1984: 455-457). As Gzella (2004: 201, n. 284) points out, however, it is a pity that at various points Cohen's approach does oppose aspectuality and temporality rather than integrating them together with modality into one unified theoretical framework.

¹² Bombeck (1997a). Various aspects of the verbal system of TO were already discussed in Bombeck (1995a) and Bombeck (1995b).

¹³ Bombeck (1997a: 24).

¹⁴ Bombeck (1997a: 59-60). The conjugations, whether Hebrew or Aramaic, are referred to by means of the labels adopted in the present study.

- BH *qatal* > Aram. *qtal*
- BH *yiqtol* > Aram. *yiqtol*
- BH *wayyiqtol* > Aram. *(u)qtal*
- BH *w^eqatalí* > Aram. *(w^e)yiqtol*
- BH *qotel* > Aram. *qātel*
- BH *qatul* > Aram. *qtil*

Obviously, not all renditions of verb forms follow this basic pattern, i.e. deviations from this pattern are observed. Certain deviations, however, are too frequent to be arbitrary or random; in such cases these deviations may be indicative of secondary functions (*Nebenfunktionen*) of the BH conjugations.¹⁵ In addition, the existence of such a pattern is not intended to suggest that e.g. BH *qatal* and Aram. *qtal* share exactly the same functional range within their own linguistic system, but rather that the linguistic context in which they are featured in the two languages is compatible with whatever function(s) the two conjugations may fulfil within their own linguistic system.¹⁶ In the final analysis, Bombeck concludes that in Aramaic *qtal* expresses anteriority, *yiqtol* possibility, *qātel*/simultaneity and *qtil* stativity.¹⁷

On the whole, Bombeck's work is a fine study. Its obscure layout and manifold use of unintuitive abbreviations certainly do not make it easy

¹⁵ Bombeck (1997a: 17-18).

¹⁶ Bombeck (1997a: 16-18).

¹⁷ The functions of the BH verb forms as brought to light by Bombeck's comparative analysis are as follows (cf. Bombeck 1997a: 227-228):

1. Main functions (*Hauptfunktionen*): *qatal* expresses relative anteriority (the temporal point of reference is usually the present); the Jussive and the Cohortative volition (*Wunsch*); *yiqtol* (Imperfect) relative posteriority (the temporal point of reference is usually the present); *wayyiqtol* absolute anteriority; *w^eqatalí* absolute posteriority; *qotel* relative simultaneity (the temporal point of reference is usually the present) and *qatul* stativity;

2. Secondary functions (*Nebenfunktionen*): among other things, *qatal* may express *Koinzidenz* and future; *qatal* of stative verbs expresses stativity; *yiqtol* iterativity and *qotel* durativity.

Obviously, Bombeck's study entails a certain degree of circularity: the meanings and functions of the BH verb forms are elucidated by means of the contextual use of the Aramaic forms, whose meanings and functions were established in the first place by means of the Hebrew forms they are used to translate. I am of the opinion, however, that in a work of this type — a study of the conjugations in a 'dead' language considered from the perspective of another 'dead' language — such a circularity cannot possibly be fully circumvented, and I also believe that this drawback is largely outweighed by the insights gained.

reading, but the fruits of the analysis are worth the effort of working one's way through the book. Though its scope was probably too ambitious for a study of this type—a fact that Bombeck himself readily acknowledges — and though certain conjugations have either been left out of the analysis or not been treated adequately,¹⁸ the fact remains that Bombeck correctly identified the main functional features of most Aramaic conjugations, at least as far as TO/TJ is concerned.¹⁹ Bombeck's work has been constantly consulted in the course of the present study and, as will be seen below, our conclusions concur more often than they differ.²⁰

However, the present study will follow a different course. The corpus is much more restricted, which has allowed me to discuss the material covered in more depth. In some cases, this has led me to refine, or to disagree with, some of Bombeck's conclusions. In addition, the primary aim of this investigation is to elucidate the functions of the verb forms encountered in TJS, not of the functions of the BH verb forms that may (or may not) underlie them. In other words, this study attempts to work out how the Targumist used the verbal system of the Aramaic dialect used for the rendering of Samuel in TJ, not how he viewed the verbal system of BH.²¹ As a result, *all* verb forms encountered in TJS have been examined and their functions discussed.²² It is certainly true that some aspects of the verbal system of TJS can hardly be apprehended

¹⁸ Essentially, the Inf.C. is completely left out of the analysis, and the actuality of the Inf.A. in the Aramaic of TJS is overlooked (cf. V:2.6.2, esp. footnote n.166).

¹⁹ I am not in a position to appraise Bombeck's results with regard to Neofiti, PsJ and the Peshitta, inasmuch as I did not subject these corpora to a first-hand investigation.

²⁰ However, it may be deplored that Bombeck does not explicitly refer (aside from a general reference in the bibliography) to Cohen's work on the verbal system of Neofiti and other Targumic documents (1984: 443-458). In his treatment, summary though it may be when compared to the other Aramaic corpora he deals with, Cohen brought to light quite a number of significant features of the use of the conjugations in the Targums, and also paid attention to some fundamental methodological issues when dealing with Targumic texts linguistically.

²¹ For that reason, I will refrain from speculating on the verbal system of BH and its intricacies, unless such should be of immediate significance for a proper understanding of the verbal system of TJS.

²² This difference of perspective is significant. An inevitable consequence of the approach adopted by Bombeck is that the bulk of his discussion is concerned with the way BH conjugations are rendered in Aramaic. This entails that the verb forms in TJS that are not underlain by verb forms in BH — and there are a significant number — are not systematically addressed in the discussion.

without taking the Vorlage (or absence of Vorlage) into account; bearing that in mind, the Vorlage has constantly been checked, and a clear distinction is made between the Aramaic forms that have a parallel in the Vorlage and those that do not, or do so only in part. But I believe that *all* verb forms encountered in TJS, whether paralleled or not by the Vorlage, ought to be studied in their own rights if a comprehensive treatment of the verbal syntax in TJS is to be aimed at. In the final analysis, cases in which a specific Aramaic conjugation consistently parallels a given Hebrew conjugation tells us potentially as much about the range of meaning of the Aramaic conjugation as the cases in which it does not; conversely, the fact that a given Aramaic verb form has no direct parallel in the Vorlage does not *per se* guarantee that one is confronted with genuine Aramaic material.²³ Finally, the methodology adopted in this study (Functional Grammar) is different from Bombeck's. Aside from the differences in terminology, the fact that various linguistic concepts are understood, defined and applied in different ways has an inevitable impact on the conclusions reached.

1.3 METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Certain linguistic categories such as tense, aspect, grounding, state of affairs (etc.) prove adequate for our description of the verbal system of TJS. However, in the relevant literature many of these categories cover a wide array of concepts, uses and definitions, which has more than a little to do with the methodological frameworks individual scholars have chosen to work with. For that reason, it is essential to clarify from the outset what linguistic categories will be employed in the present analysis. In the main, I have resorted to the theoretical framework of Functional Grammar (FG).²⁴ Though FG cannot (and does not) claim

²³ As mentioned above, Bombeck correctly noted that certain Aramaic constructions, though not *translating* the Vorlage, may have been construed parallel to other Aramaic constructions that *do* translate the Vorlage, and that in such cases one cannot assume that one is dealing with genuine Aramaic material. But one should also bear in mind that even the fact that a given Aramaic item is apparently completely independent of the Vorlage (i.e. neither translated, nor demonstrably influenced by other, translated Aramaic passages) is not *per se* a sufficient condition to guarantee its genuine Aramaic character: the influence of the Vorlage is pervasive throughout TJ and should never be excluded, even in passages where TJ does not show any manifest connection whatsoever to the Vorlage.

²⁴ As exposed in FG1 and FG2.

intellectual paternity for all of these concepts — Semitic philology itself can look back on a long-standing grammatical tradition — it has been chosen for the present study because it offers the tremendous advantage of incorporating a vast array of modern linguistic insights into a unified and coherent framework.

For the present study, six main linguistic categories are to be discussed: state of affairs, fientivity/stativity, temporality, aspectuality, modality and discourse parameters.

1.3.1 STATES OF AFFAIRS

Together with FG, I believe that many of the grammatical features traditionally associated with verbs are in actual fact reliant on the whole of the predication in which the verb in question is embedded. Thus *'I am going to Brussels'* and *'I am going to Brussels tomorrow'* refer to two different temporal spheres, and similarly *'he read a book last week'* and *'he read a book every week'* reflect different aspectual considerations. In these two sets of clauses, however, the temporal or aspectual differences do not come to expression exclusively through the verb forms themselves, but rather through the wider context of the predication in which these verb forms occur. Similarly, theoretically the verb form *רָחֵם* in TJS can, depending on the context, variously express 'he loves' (Lat. *amat*, i.e. 'he is in love with'), 'he loved' (Lat. *amabat*, i.e. 'he was in love with'), 'he loved' (Lat. *amavit*, i.e. 'he loved [his wife all his life]'), 'he fell in love' (etc.). Finally, *מָת* can be taken to mean 'he is dead', 'he was dead', 'he died', 'he has died', 'he had died'. One and the same conjugation can express fientivity or stativity, present or past, perfectivity or imperfectivity: the critical factor is the context in which the verb form occurs. Seen in this light, the various linguistic categories traditionally associated with verbs (temporality, aspectuality, etc.) turn out to be not the effect of the verb forms alone, but rather the result of their cooperation with the other elements of the predication.

In FG, this important distinction is captured by means of the notion of 'State of Affairs' [SoA, pl. *SoAs*].²⁵ For our present purpose, we do not need to discuss all the theoretical implications of the notion of SoA. It will be sufficient to say that a predication such as 'he read a book every

²⁵ Cf. FG1 (105ff.). The terms 'situation' and 'Sachverhalt' are often met in the relevant literature with a similar meaning.

week’ is the linguistic representation of a SoA, and that the verb form ‘(he) read’ is only a component of that SoA, together with the other elements of the predication. An important corollary of this, however, is that all grammatical distinctions to be discussed below (fientivity/stativity, temporality, aspectuality etc.) do not pertain to verb forms *per se*, but rather to SoAs. According to that view, therefore, strictly speaking there is no such thing as a ‘fientive verb’ or ‘stative verb’, but rather a fientive or stative SoA in which a verb is involved and contributes, in co-operation with the other linguistic elements that make up that SoA, to the expression of its fientivity or stativity.²⁶ For the sake of convenience, however, in the discussion below we will be speaking of, e.g., ‘fientive *qtal*’ and ‘imperfective *yiqtol*’. It should be clear, however, that this is only shorthand, and that what is actually intended is the use of *qtal* in a fientive SoA and the use of *yiqtol* in an imperfective SoA,²⁷ *not* an intrinsic property of these two verb forms.

1.3.2 FIENTIVITY AND STATIVITY

Together with traditional grammar, FG operates a crucial distinction between *fientive* and *stative* SoAs through the notion of *dynamicity*.

Essentially, a SoA will be considered *stative* (or ‘non-dynamic’, in FG terminology) when it ‘does not involve any change, i.e. where the entities involved are presented as being or remaining the same at all points of the time interval during which the SoA obtains’,²⁸ e.g. ‘the substance was red’, ‘John was sitting in his father’s chair’. On the contrary, *fientive* (or dynamic) SoAs ‘necessarily involve some kind of change, some kind of internal dynamism. This dynamism may consist in a recurrent pattern

²⁶ This does not mean, of course, that grammatical properties may not at times be reflected in the morphophonological form of verbs. In BH grammar, e.g., the *qal* ‘perfect’ forms *qatal* and *qatel/qatol* are traditionally associated with fientivity and stativity respectively (cf. JM §41). Pertinent though this observation may be, the fact remains that this morphophonological fientivity/stativity is essentially rooted in the history of the language and does not necessarily reflect the *uses* and *functions* of the forms in Biblical usage (JM §41b). For our present purpose, therefore, such morphophonological contrasts are largely irrelevant.

²⁷ Or, to put it in more abstract terms: the use of *qtal/yiqtol* in a fientive/imperfective SoA and in which *qtal/yiqtol* crucially contributes (along with the other linguistic components that make up the SoA) to express the fientivity/imperfectivity of the SoA.

²⁸ FG1 (107).

of changes all through the duration of the SoA [e.g. ‘the clock was ticking’], or in a change from some initial SoA into some different final SoA’ [e.g. ‘the substance reddened’, ‘John opened the door’].²⁹

Again, it must be emphasized that SoAs, *not* verbs, are fientive or stative. Thus, depending on the context the Aramaic clause ידע גברא can designate at least two different SoAs: one stative (‘the man knew’) and one fientive (‘the man understood’). In both cases the verb form remains the same; and the fientive or stative reading depends solely on the larger context in which the SoA is situated.

1.3.3 TEMPORALITY

FG understands temporal distinctions as a means to ‘locate the SoA [...] at some interval along the time axis’.³⁰ Together with Comrie (1985), FG distinguishes various temporal categories. Probably the most relevant for our purpose is the distinction between *absolute* and *relative* temporality.³¹

In practical terms, the fundamental temporal relation between a SoA and a moment in time chosen as a point of reference [t_r] can be one of anteriority [$\text{SoA} < t_r$], simultaneity [$\text{SoA} = t_r$] or posteriority [$t_r < \text{SoA}$].

If moreover the chosen point of reference [t_r] coincides with the moment of speaking [t_0], we speak of *absolute* temporality [$t_r = t_0$], and of past [$\text{SoA} < t_r = t_0$], present [$\text{SoA} = t_r = t_0$] and future [$t_r = t_0 < \text{SoA}$]³² respectively:

- Past: ‘John loved Mary’ (Lat. *amabat*, *amavit*);
- Present: ‘John loves Mary’ (Lat. *amat*);
- Future: ‘John will love Mary’ (Lat. *amabit*).

If the point of reference [t_r] is distinct from the moment of speaking [t_0], then the temporal location of the SoA depends not only on its relation (of anteriority, simultaneity or posteriority) to the moment of reference [t_r], but also on the relation of the moment of reference [t_r] to the moment of speaking [t_0]. We are then dealing with *relative* temporality.

²⁹ FG1 (107).

³⁰ FG1 (237).

³¹ FG1 (237-8).

³² Or, more simply, [$\text{SoA} < t_0$], [$\text{SoA} = t_0$] and [$t_0 < \text{SoA}$] respectively.

E.g.:

- ‘John had loved Mary’ [SoA< t_i < t_0] (Lat. *amaverat*);
- ‘John will have loved Mary’ [t_0 <SoA< t_r] (Lat. *amaverit*).

1.3.4 ASPECTUALITY

Various aspectual categories distinguished by FG have been found adequate for the analysis of the verbal system of the Aramaic of TJS: (1) perfectivity and imperfectivity, (2) phasal aspectuality, (3) perspectival aspectuality and (4) quantificational aspectuality.

1.3.4.1 Perfectivity, Imperfectivity and the Internal Constituency of the SoAs

1.3.4.1.1 Perfectivity and Imperfectivity

The perfective and imperfective aspects can be understood as ‘different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation’.³³ In view of the varied and often mutually confusing concepts associated with these two aspectual notions in the relevant literature, it may be useful to explain in some detail the way they will be understood in the present study.

Perfectivity can be defined as an ‘aspectual category involving a lack of explicit reference to the internal temporal consistency of a situation’.³⁴ Essentially, the perfective aspect ‘presents the totality of the situation referred to’: the whole of the situation is as it were looked at from outside, i.e. it is presented as complete, as a ‘single unanalysable whole, with beginning, middle and end rolled into one’.³⁵ In contrast, imperfectivity can be defined as an aspectual category making ‘explicit reference to the internal temporal constituency of the situation’.³⁶ The situation is looked at from inside. It is presented as non-complete. It can be divided between beginning, middle and end, and focusses on

³³ Comrie (1976:3).

³⁴ Trask (1993: 204).

³⁵ Comrie (1976: 3).

³⁶ Comrie (1976: 4).

the middle of the situation while not taking the beginning and end into consideration. In order to illustrate the difference between the two, Comrie offers a useful example:

‘John read the book yesterday; while he was reading it, the postman came’. In this example the various forms of the verb ‘to read’ all refer to the same situation of reading. In the first clause, however, John’s reading is presented as a complete event, without further subdivision into successive temporal phases [perfective]; in the second clause, this event is opened up, so that the speaker is now in the middle of the situation of John’s reading [imperfective], and says that it was in the middle of this situation that the event of the postman’s arrival took place.³⁷

1.3.4.1.2 Instantaneous and Durative as Aspectual Categories ?

In the relevant literature one regularly encounters the notions of ‘durative’ and ‘instantaneous’ (or ‘punctual’) as categories describing the aspectuality of SoAs. An SoA is said to be durative when ‘perceived as lasting for a certain length of time’³⁸ and, conversely, is described as punctual (or instantaneous) when ‘confined to a single instant of time’.³⁹ In addition, these two notions are usually linked to those of imperfectivity and perfectivity, durativity and punctuality being thought of as subdivisions of imperfectivity and perfectivity respectively.

In the FG framework, however, durativity and punctuality are not included in the discussion of aspectual categories. Essentially, the notions of durativity and punctuality are viewed as intrinsic semantic properties

³⁷ Comrie (1976: 4). FG captures the semantics of the opposition perfective / imperfective as follows: perfective SoAs are presented as complete, bounded, closed, indivisible, from an external viewpoint; in contrast, imperfective SoAs are presented as non-complete, non-bounded, open, divisible, from an internal viewpoint. In addition, FG (quoting Isaenko 1962) provides us with another useful metaphor to characterize the opposition between perfectivity and imperfectivity: ‘Compare the SoA to a parade. In the imperfective, the parade is presented as if from the point of view of a person marching along in it: we are in the middle of the parade, unable to oversee the beginning, the end, and the full length of the parade. In the perfective, on the other hand, the parade is presented as if from the viewpoint of a spectator who, from some elevated vantage point, can oversee the entire extension of the parade’ (FG1: 222).

³⁸ Trask (1993: 87).

³⁹ Trask (1993: 224).

of SoAs,⁴⁰ whereas the perfective and imperfective aspects relate to the angle from which SoAs are viewed. In other words, according to FG durativity and punctuality lie deeper than aspects in the underlying linguistic structure of SoAs.

If it is true that as a rule punctuality is incompatible with the notion of imperfectivity,⁴¹ the same is not true of durativity. For instance, the clauses ‘John was singing a song (when I came in)’ and ‘John sang a song (and then left the room)’ can refer to precisely the same SoA, namely John’s singing a song, which is intrinsically durative. Nonetheless, the imperfective aspect is brought to bear on the SoA in the first clause, and so is the perfective aspect in the second. Therefore, durativity cannot be associated with imperfectivity in a one-to-one relationship.

It bears emphasizing that this adjustment does not detract from the overall value of the notions of durativity and punctuality. They prove quite useful when confined to the structural level at which they operate (semantics of SoAs), as is evidenced by their treatment within the FG framework, and therefore play a definite role in understanding the verbal system of TJS. It is simply critical to distinguish them clearly from aspectual categories.

1.3.4.2 Phasal Aspects

Phasal aspects ‘bear on the developmental phase of the SoA, in terms of beginning - continuation - end of the SoA’.⁴² Essentially, FG distinguishes four different phasal aspects:

- Ingressive: focusses on the beginning of the SoA, e.g. ‘John started crying’;

⁴⁰ Punctuality and durativity are actually treated as *semantic parameters* of SoAs, and are referred to as ‘momentaneous’ and ‘non-momentaneous’ respectively (FG1: 111).

⁴¹ Comrie (1976: 41-44), especially ‘Thus a punctual situation, by definition, has no internal structure, and in a language with separate imperfective forms to indicate reference to the internal structure of a situation, then clearly punctuality and imperfectivity will be incompatible’ (*ibid.*, 42). A SoA describing, e.g. John’s killing someone, which is inherently telic and instantaneous, cannot be made imperfective without forcing a particular interpretation of that SoA (as in ‘John was killing him’, where the act of killing must be thought of as gradual and progressive for the clause to make sense), which comes down to making it durative in the first place.

⁴² FG1 (225).

- Progressive: focusses on the middle of the SoA, e.g. ‘John was crying’;
- Continuous: focusses on the middle of the SoA, and adds the notion of persistence, e.g. ‘John continued crying’;
- Egressive: focusses on the end of the SoA, e.g. ‘John stopped crying’.

1.3.4.3 Perspectival Aspects

Perspectival aspects, an aspectual category closely connected to the notion of temporality, allows us to capture various features of the verbal system of TJS. FG defines the perspectival aspects as follows: ‘Perspectival Aspects distinctions concern the way in which the SoA is viewed upon from an external point in time. When we look forward to the SoA, it is presented *prospectively*: this is Prospective Aspect. When we look backwards to the SoA, it is presented *retrospectively*: this is commonly called the Perfect Aspect. At first sight, there is little difference between Future Tense and Prospective Aspect, or between Past Tense and Perfect Aspect. The differences can be illustrated with such examples as the following:’

1. ‘One day, stocks will rise again’ [Future Tense].
2. ‘Stocks are going to rise again’ [Prospective Aspect].
3. ‘In 1959 I lived in New York’ [Past Tense].
4. ‘Since 1959 I have lived in New York’ [Perfect Aspect].

‘(1) is a simple statement about what will happen in the future. (2), on the other hand, is a prediction about what is going to happen in the future on the basis of what information the speaker has now [...]. (3) simply locates my living in New York in the past. (4), however, can only be used correctly if, at the moment of speaking, I am still living in New York: the Perfect links the past to the present; it tells me something about the past which is still relevant at reference time’.⁴³

⁴³ FG1 (238-39). For the sake of completeness, FG further distinguishes between *Prospective* (‘John is going to cry’) and *immediate prospective* (‘John is about to cry’) on the one hand, and between *perfect* (‘John has cried’) and *Recent perfect* (‘John has just cried’) on the other.

1.3.4.4 Quantificational Aspects

Finally, as their name indicates, quantificational aspects quantify over SoAs, without affecting the internal structure of the SoAs the way other aspects such as perfective and imperfective do. Quantificational aspects deal primarily with the frequency with which the SoA is said to occur.⁴⁴ For the present study, we will be mainly concerned with the iterative aspect, that indicates that the SoA occurs several times (e.g. ‘he met her on various occasions’) and the semelfactive aspect that, in contrast, indicates that the SoA occurs only once.⁴⁵

It is essential, however, to distinguish between iterativity as an aspect and iterativity as a semantic parameter:

1. Aspectual iterativity obtains when a single SoA is repeated over time, as in the example ‘he met her on various occasions’ above, which suggests that the act of meeting occurred at several points in time;
2. Iterativity as a semantic feature (or ‘semantic iterativity’ as a shorthand) applies to a SoA that, though it occurred on a single occasion, is made up of a repetition of events, as in ‘he met many people at the reception’. The SoA described is unique, in that it refers to a single reception, not several. But the SoA refers to several encounters, not to only one (as in ‘he met John on Monday’). The same applies to the SoAs ‘(in the hours that followed) the climbers continued reaching the summit’ and ‘(after a while) he continued shooting at the targets’, which refer to a single situation or SoA: the climbing of a mountain by several climbers (rather than several such climbs on different occasions) and one single shooting session. Nevertheless, as a result of the plurality of the participants involved, the climbers and the targets respectively, these SoAs comprise an iterative component, as the reaching of the summit obtains with each

⁴⁴ FG1 (236).

⁴⁵ FG introduces other quantificational nuances as distinct quantificational aspects. Thus the *frequentative* aspect, which indicates that the SoA occurs many (i.e. not merely several) times, and the *habitual* aspect, which indicates that the SoA ‘(potentially) recurs due to a habitual propensity of the participant involved’ (FG1: 236-37), e.g. ‘he used to meet her whenever he left his office for lunch’. For the purpose of the present study, however, these finer distinctions will be treated as variations of the iterative aspect.

climber and the shooting with each target.⁴⁶

Seen in that light, iterativity considered as a semantic parameter operates at the same level as durativity and punctuality discussed above, i.e. it bears on the intrinsic semantics of SoAs and lies deeper than aspectual iterativity in the underlying structure of SoAs:⁴⁷

Aspectuality of SoAs:	Imperfectivity / Perfectivity	Iterativity
Semantic features of SoAs:	Durativity / Punctuality	Iterativity

1.3.4.5 Remarks on Aspectuality

Considering the different views on the aspectual categories encountered in the relevant literature, a few remarks are in order:

1. The perfect, perfective and imperfective aspects should not be confused with the traditional labels ‘perfect’ and ‘imperfect’ used to refer to certain conjugations in the Semitic languages in general, and in Hebrew and Aramaic in particular. The Aramaic ‘perfect’ *qtal* is not necessarily perfect nor perfective in meaning, nor is the Aramaic ‘imperfect’ *yiqtol per se* imperfective.
2. Obviously, the categories delineated above are interconnected. Thus, a progressive SoA is as a rule imperfective as well and has to be semantically durative in the first place; in the same vein, the ingressive aspect often goes hand in hand with the perfective aspect and with semantic punctuality.
3. As suggested above (V:1.3.4.1.2), perfectivity is not related to the actual internal constituency or complexity of a situation. Perfective situations are sometimes represented by a *point* (·), in contrast to imperfective situations that are represented by either a series of points (⋯⋯ iterative) or a line (—— progressive). However,

⁴⁶ What is here referred to as semantic iterativity is labelled ‘pluralic’ by others (e.g. Bombeck 1997a). For its part, FG considers such instances involving different participants as ‘distributive’, but treats this notion of distributivity as a quantificational aspect rather than as an intrinsic semantic feature of the SoA (FG1: 236). On the other hand, FG also suggests that SoAs can sometimes receive an iterative ‘interpretation’ (FG1: 111), which comes closer to our notion of semantic iterativity.

⁴⁷ As can be seen from the fact that aspectual iterativity and semantic iterativity can co-occur in one and the same SoA: ‘he used to meet many people at those receptions’.

such a metaphor can be misleading. It must indeed be noted that SoAs expressed in the perfective *can* have an internal constituency or complexity: the use of the perfective does not preclude it, it merely *disregards* it. Thus the clause ‘Paul read his book for two hours’ refers to a durative SoA, and likewise the clause ‘for many years Paul met with his friends every week’ describes an (aspectually) iterative SoA, i.e. it does not denote a single situation, but rather a series of repeated, and possibly lasting, situations. In other words, these two SoAs have internal complexity. What makes them perfective, however, is the fact that the process described, complex though it may be intrinsically, is not considered from inside, but is rather looked at from outside, ‘wrapped up’ as a single whole by way of summarizing Paul’s reading or social activities.⁴⁸

4. SoAs expressed in the perfective are *complete*, not completed. In other words, the perfective allows us to capture a SoA as a single, complete whole. As such it is concerned with the *totality* of a situation, and says nothing as to whether the situation has already been completed (and therefore belongs to the past) or not. Similarly, SoAs expressed in the imperfective are *non-complete*, not non-completed. The imperfective permits us to open up the situation to look at it from an internal viewpoint. The situation, however, may very well belong to the past and as such no longer be relevant at the moment of utterance.
5. Perfective and imperfective aspects are compatible with both fientive and stative SoAs. Contrast Fr. *il courrut* (‘[on that day] he ran [to the station]’) and *il courrait* (‘he was running [to the station when he saw me]’) on the one hand, and *il aimait* (‘he loved [his wife all his life]’) and *il aimait* (‘[in all these years], he loved [his wife more than anything in the world]’) on the other hand.

⁴⁸ As a result, Comrie adds that perfective situations should rather be envisioned as a *blob* (•) rather than a *point* (·): ‘the perfective reduces a situation to a blob, rather than to a point: a blob is a three-dimensional object, and can therefore have internal complexity, although it is nonetheless a single object with clearly circumscribed limits’ (1976: 18).

1.3.5 MODALITY

Another grammatical category important for the study of the verbal system of TJS is modality. As FG points out, it is difficult to offer a unified account of moods and modality, because they do not constitute a unified semantic domain.⁴⁹ As a result, FG distinguishes a whole range of modality types.⁵⁰ Not all of them are relevant for the present study, however, and another complicating factor is the fact that in BH — and even more so in the Aramaic of TJS — various types of modality overlap to a certain extent, insofar as they are expressed by means of the same conjugation(s). As we shall see, this makes the distinction of modal nuances rather delicate and open to speculation. In the final analysis, the modal distinctions that have been found adequate for the study of the verbal system of TJS are deontic, epistemic and volitional:

- Deontic modality: deontic modal ‘distinctions define relations between a participant and the realization of the SoA in which he is involved. These distinctions may consist in the ability or the willingness of a participant to do the SoA (*can, be able to / want, be willing to*), or in the question of whether the participant is obliged (*must, have to*) or permitted (*may, be allowed to*) to do the SoA’.⁵¹
- Epistemic modality: according to FG, in epistemic modality ‘the speaker evaluates the actuality [i.e. the likelihood of occurrence] of the SoA’, in terms of certainty / probability / possibility / improbability / impossibility.⁵²
- Volition(al modality): this type of modality expresses the speaker’s wish, hope (etc.) that the SoA will be realized.⁵³

⁴⁹ FG1 (241).

⁵⁰ Cf. FG1 (241-242; 295-297).

⁵¹ FG1 (241).

⁵² FG1 (242).

⁵³ FG1 (296).

1.3.6 DISCOURSE PARAMETERS

Linguistic parameters active at the discourse level (i.e. at the level of linguistic expression where *texts* as a whole, in contrast to isolated sentences, are organized) have been found to provide valuable insight into the verbal system of the Aramaic of TJS. In the present study, we will be using two of them: discourse type and grounding.

Within the present study, we will distinguish two main discourse types: narrative and direct speech. In practical terms, narrative can be defined as a discourse type featuring ‘accounts of past events or stories’,⁵⁴ whereas direct speech can be understood as a discourse type featuring ‘the reporting of what someone has said by quoting her/his exact words’.⁵⁵ The basic difference between the two is essentially one of temporality: by their very nature, narrative discourse refers to the past whereas direct speech is concomitant with the present.⁵⁶

With regard to the narrative discourse specifically, another parameter is needed: grounding. Essentially, the notion of grounding has to do with the way narrative material is presented. Narrative discourse can be described as a discourse type that ‘represents events in the past’.⁵⁷ Essentially, the speaker (or writer) recounts events that happened before the moment of utterance, in a recent or remote past, and inasmuch as the past situations recounted do not coincide with the situation of the moment of utterance and are therefore not directly inferrable from it, the speaker must set the stage. As a result, conceptually a narrative can be understood as a ‘sequential chain of completed events’, interrupted at various points by an ensemble of situations supposed to provide the context in which these events are meaningful. Consider the following example:

‘John walked into the bedroom. He was exhausted. Mary, who was lying on the bed, looked up from her book and smiled at him’.

⁵⁴ Trask (1993: 178).

⁵⁵ Trask (1993: 83).

⁵⁶ Obviously, cases of narrative embedded in direct speech also occur, typically when the speaker refers to past events within a dialogue situation. In addition, direct speech can also refer to events due to take place in the future, e.g. ‘tomorrow I will go to the movies’.

⁵⁷ Johnstone (2001: 639).

This short narrative recounts three events: John's walking into the room, Mary's looking up from her book and her smiling at him. The only purpose of the remaining SoAs, John's being exhausted and Mary's lying on the bed, is to provide information to assist the reader in making sense of the events being reported. In the present case, these SoAs are descriptive and set the stage for the whole situation.

The chain of events narrated make up the backbone of the narrative: it is their recounting that justifies the existence of the narrative in the first place. Contextual information, on the other hand, is secondary and subsidiary to them. One regularly refers to these two levels of discourse organization as 'main (story)line' or 'foreground' on the one hand, and 'subsidiary (story)line' or 'background' on the other.⁵⁸ The process by which the narrative material is patterned in foreground and background, understood as a device of discourse organization, is referred to as 'grounding'.⁵⁹

Concerning the interactions between aspectuality and grounding, one will note that imperfectivity is incompatible with the foreground. By its very nature, the foreground is made up of a sequence of complete situations, presented without regard to their internal constituency. This

⁵⁸ The notion of background is best defined in contradistinction to that of foreground. The background then comprises all material in a narrative that is not foreground, i.e. all material that does not directly contribute to forwarding the main line, the chain of reported events (Buth 1995: 88). This covers, *inter alia*, circumstantial clauses (simultaneous material, pluperfect past reference, stative descriptions, habitual actions, etc.), reason and purpose clauses, and relative clauses. In view of the breadth of the backgrounded material it is to be expected that not all backgrounded clauses should behave in exactly the same way linguistically. Research on these matters, interesting though it may be, is far beyond the scope of the present study, and is better left for later investigation.

⁵⁹ It must be emphasized that grounding is to a certain extent a pragmatic (as against semantic) function, in that organizing the various components of a story into foreground and background is really a question of *subjective* choices on the part of the storyteller. To borrow from Buth: the two clauses 'he got in the boat and sailed away' and 'having got in the boat he sailed away' convey precisely the same semantic contents; the former, however, presents two foregrounded events, whereas the latter foregrounds the second only, the first being backgrounded so as to set the stage for the second. In other cases, SoAs that a strict sense of sequentiality would ascribe to the background are coded as foreground (Buth quotes Jon 1.16-2.1 and Jdg 11.1 as cases in point) and vice versa. Be that as it may, it must be underscored that the intrinsic subjectivity of the use of the grounding function does not detract from its value as a linguistic parameter: as Buth concludes, 'the advantages of including foreground as a pragmatic function greatly outweigh the disadvantage [of its being defined as a subjective function]. If languages develop structures that are subjectively used, then we must make room for that in our grammar. Nothing else would be scientific' (1995: 86-88).

rules out imperfectivity,⁶⁰ and opens the way to perfectivity, whether the foregrounded situations be semantically punctual, durative or iterative.⁶¹ On the other hand, the background does not impose such constraints, so that backgrounded SoAs can be either perfective or imperfective.

Finally, the contrast between foreground and background is also useful when dealing with *future* temporality (direct speech). The main line then features a chain of (in a broad sense) anticipated situations and the background adduces material circumstantial to these situations, e.g. ‘you will get up early (foreg.), will go to the station (foreg.) and will meet a man (foreg.) carrying a book (backg.), and greeting him (backg.) you will say (foreg.) ...’.⁶²

2. The Conjugations in Targum Jonathan to Samuel

2.1 *Qtal*

In a discussion of the uses and functions of *qtal* in the Aramaic of TJS, it is of importance to distinguish between fientive and stative SoAs.

⁶⁰ Comrie (1976: 26).

⁶¹ Concerning the interrelationship between perfectivity and the foreground, Comrie (1976: 5) states that a ‘sequence of forms with perfective meaning will normally be taken to indicate a sequence of events, e.g. *the wind tore off the roof, snapped the clothes-line, and brought down the apple-tree*. Since each of the three situations is presented without regard to its internal constituency, a natural interpretation is to take them as events that occurred in succession, each one complete in itself; moreover, they will normally be taken to have occurred in the order in which they are presented in the text’.

⁶² For reasons to be discussed later in this chapter, however, the contrast between foreground and background is less manifest in future than in past temporality (narrative discourse). In substance, the reason is that *yiqtol*, which is the conjugation *par excellence* for the foreground in future temporality, is liable — and even prone — to be used in the background as well, thereby displacing the conjugations at home there. Such a confusion hardly if ever occurs in the narrative discourse, where foreground and background conjugations are kept strictly separate.

2.1.1 FIENTIVE SOAS

Together with Bombeck, I consider the primary function of fientive *qtal* (i.e. the use of *qtal* with fientive SoAs) in TJS to be the expression of anteriority.⁶³ In addition, the aspect is perfective.

2.1.1.1 Narrative Discourse

Expressing both anteriority and perfectivity, fientive *qtal* is the conjugation *par excellence* of the narrative discourse.

1. In the foreground, fientive *qtal* typically refers to complete events in the past, i.e. anterior to the moment of narration (absolute anteriority [SoA<t₀]). Our corpus consisting for a very large part of narratives, examples abound:⁶⁴ I.10.21 וקריב ית שבטא דבית בנימין לזרעיתיה ואתאחדת זרעית מטר ואתאחד וקריב ית שבטא דבית בנימין לזרעיתיה ואתאחדת זרעית מטר ואתאחד 'and he *brought near* the tribe of the house of Benjamin by its families, and the family of Matar *was singled out*, and Saul the son of Kish *was singled out*', I.17.40 ונסיב חמריה בידיה ובחר ליה חמשא שעיצי אבניא מן נחלא ושוי 'and he *took* his staff in his hand, and *chose* for himself five smooth stones from the wadi, and *placed* them in the shepherd's clothing that was his ... and *drew near* to the Philistine', II.8.1 ונסיב דויד 'and David *struck down* the Philistines and *shattered* them, and David *took* ...', II.14.31 וקם יואב ואתא לות אבשלום 'and Joab *arose* and *came* unto Absalom to the house, and *said* to him'.

2. In the background, fientive *qtal* likewise refers to past, complete events. In contrast to the foreground, however, in the background the anteriority expressed by fientive *qtal* can be read in two different ways.

⁶³ Cf. Bombeck (1997a: 24).

⁶⁴ As Cohen's and Bombeck's works suggest, there are regular patterns of correspondence between conjugations in TJS and conjugations in BH, the Targumist making consistent use of a given Aramaic form to render a given BH form in specific contexts. These patterns of correspondence will be discussed as the analysis goes along, the various correspondences being noticed for each conjugation in each of its distinctive uses. Unless otherwise stated, however, the verb forms featured as examples in the core of the text do not deviate from those patterns. The deviations (i.e. TJS rendering a BH verb form differently, or inserting a verb form absent in the Vorlage) will be mentioned when the patterns of correspondence themselves are discussed.

In practical terms, backgrounded events are liable to have occurred either simultaneously with, or prior to, the events recorded in the main storyline (absolute and relative anteriority respectively).⁶⁵ In substantival, causal and relative clauses the anteriority is usually relative:

- Substantival clauses: I.23.13 אַרִי אֶשְׁתִּיב דָּוִד (‘and it was told to Saul that David had escaped’, II.5.17 אַרִי מִשְׁחָו יֵת דָּוִד (‘(and the Philistines heard) that they *had anointed* David’;
- Causal clauses: II.1.12 אַרִי אֶתְקַטְלוּ בַּחֶרֶב (‘(and they lamented ... over Saul and over Jonathan ...) for they *had been killed* by the sword’, II.3.30 עַל דִּקְמֵל יֵת עֲשָׂהאֵל (‘(and Joab and Abishai his brother killed Abner) because he *had killed* Asahel’;
- Relative clauses: II.11.22 יֵת כָּל דְּשִׁלְחִיהּ יֹאב (‘(and he told David) everything that Joab *had sent him* (to tell)’.

In circumstantial clauses, however, it is not always easy to draw a clear line between absolute and relative anteriority, as illustrated by the following examples: I.1.5 וּמִן קִדָּם יְיָ אֶתְנַנֵּעַ מִנָּה וְלֹד (‘and from before the Lord a child had been withheld from her’, I.9.5 אֲנֹן אִתּוֹ בָּאֶרְעָא ... וְשָׁאֹל אָמַר לְעוֹלִימְיָה (‘(when) they *entered/had entered* the land (...), Saul said to his young man’, I.11.5 ... וְהָא שָׁאֹל אֵתָא בְּתֵר תּוֹרִיָּא מִן חִקְלָא וְאָמַר שָׁאֹל (‘and behold (when) Saul *came/had come* behind the oxen from the field, Saul said’, I.15.34 וְשָׁמוּאֵל לָרַמְתָּא וְשָׁאֹל סָלִיק לְבֵיתָהּ (‘and Samuel went to Ramah, and Saul *went up* to his house’, I.16.14 וְרוּחַ גְּבוּרָא מִן קִדָּם יְיָ דְּהָוָת עִם שָׁאֹל עֵדָת מְנִיָּה (‘now the spirit of power from before the Lord that was with Saul *had passed* from him’, I.18.25 וְשָׁאֹל חָשִׁיב לְמַסְרָא יֵת דָּוִד (‘and Saul *had planned* to deliver David’, I.21.1 וְקָם וְאָוַל וַיְהוֹנָתָן עַל לְקֶרְתָּא (‘and he arose and went, and Jonathan *entered* the city’, II.2.12-13 וַיֵּצֵא אֲבִנֶר ... וַיֹּאב ... וְעַבְדֵי דָּוִד נִפְקִין (‘and Abner ... went forth, and Joab ... and the servants of David *went forth*’, II.18.18 וְאַבְשָׁלוֹם נָסִיב וְאַקִּים לֵיהּ (‘and (while he was still alive) Absalom took/*had taken* and (had) erected for himself (the pillar ...), II.19.25 וּמִפִּיבֹשֶׁת בֶּר שָׁאֹל נַחַת לְקֶדְמוֹת מַלְכָּא וְלֹא שִׁטַּף רִגְלוּהּ (‘as for Mephiboseth, he went down to meet the king, and he *had not* washed his feet nor shaved his upper lip nor

⁶⁵ In the latter case it corresponds to what we call ‘pluperfect’ (cf. JM §166j). In addition, the twofold reading of backgrounded fientive *qtal* is a function of the very nature of the background as secondary to the foreground, which allows us to consider the anteriority of the events recorded in the background either in relation to the moment of utterance [$SoA < t_r = t_0$], or in relation to the temporal point of reference of the storyline itself [$SoA < t_r < t_0$]. In other words, in the former case the background is anterior to the moment of utterance and therefore comes to stand in line with the foreground; in the latter case, the background is anterior to the foreground itself.

whitened his garments (from the day that the king was exiled)’.

In addition, the SoA expressed by *qtal* in narrative discourse is typically semelfactive and punctual, as in most instances above. But *qtal* may also denote semantically durative or iterative SoAs.⁶⁶ Thus I.17.16 וקריב פלשתאה מקרים ומחשיך ואחעתד ארבעין יומין ‘and for forty days the Philistine *drew near* early and late and *took up his stand*’ refers to an iterative process, conveying that during forty days Goliath did a particular action every day.⁶⁷ Such a SoA is nonetheless perfective, however, because the process described, complex though it may be intrinsically, is not considered from inside, but is rather looked at from outside, ‘wrapped up’ as a single whole.⁶⁸

As in all examples above, fientive (*u*)*qtal* typically corresponds to BH *wayyiqtol* when coordinated and BH *qatal* when not coordinated.⁶⁹ In certain cases, however, the use of (*u*)*qtal* in TJS has no direct equivalent in BH, because TJS either adds a passage, or translates an existing one

⁶⁶ On the notions of ‘durativity’ and ‘semantic iterativity’, cf. V:1.3.4.1.2 and V:1.3.4.4 respectively.

⁶⁷ With their notion of global representation of repeated/continuous actions, JM §111e mean essentially the same thing.

⁶⁸ In this particular instance, the SoA is perfective because it is a part of the foreground, and perfectivity is a *conditio sine qua non* to foregrounding (cf. V:1.3.6). One will note, however, that SoAs expressed by *qtal* in the background, though semantically iterative (cf. V:1.3.4.4) or durative, can just as well be in the perfective aspect when they refer to complete events anterior to the situations of the main line. I.7.15 ודן שמואל ית ישראל ‘and Samuel judged Israel (all the days of his life)’ and I.4.18 והוא דן ית ישראל ‘and he [= Eli] had judged Israel (for forty years)’ aptly illustrate that contrast: both verses describe precisely the same process, namely the repeated judging of Israel over an extended period of time; what sets them apart, however, is the fact that they are part of the foreground and background respectively.

⁶⁹ Bombeck (1997a: 60, 143). More rarely, in cases of coordination the Vorlage has *w^eqatal* rather than *wayyiqtol*, especially when *waw* does not indicate succession but rather mere juxtaposition (‘simple *waw*’, JM §115; cf. also Bombeck 1997a: 157-159). Examples include: I.2.20^{BH} והלכו ‘and they went’ [י^{TJ} ואולו], I.17.38^{BH} ונתן קובע [י^{TJ} ויהב] ‘(and Saul clothed David with his clothing) and put a helmet of bronze upon his head’, II.12.16^{BH} ובא ולן ושכב [י^{TJ} ועל] ‘and he went and spent the night [י^{TJ} ובת] and slept [י^{TJ} ושכב]’, II.12.31^{BH} והעביר [י^{TJ} וגרר] ‘and he had (them) pass [י^{TJ} ואתא]’, II.17.17^{BH} והלכה השפחה והגידה להם [י^{TJ} ואולת] ‘and a maid went [י^{TJ} ואולת] and told [י^{TJ} וחויאת] them’. Overall, the question of the use of *qatal*, *wayyiqtol* and *w^eqatal* in BH is notoriously intricate. One should note, however, that this does not make any difference in TJS, which does not distinguish formally between the simple *waw* and the energetic *waw*, and therefore translates BH *wayyiqtol* and *w^eqatal* uniformly as *uqtal*.

differently:

- a) Examples of *(u)qtal* in TJS without a verb form in the Vorlage: I.2.2 אתנבִּיאַת ואמַרַת 'she prophesied and said', I.3.3 וקִלָּא אִשְׁתַּמַּע 'and a voice was heard', I.14.21 וְאִףּ אָנֻן תִּבּוּ 'and even they turned (to be ...)', I.20.26 דְּלִמָּא לֹאֻרַח אֹזַל וְאַנְחָנָא לֹא זִמְנָהּ 'perhaps he went on the road, and we did not invite him', I.23.28 אֶתְרָא דִּאֲתַפְלִיג בֵּיהּ לְבָא דְּמֶלְכָא 'the place in which the heart of the king was divided', II.6.8 אֶתְרָא דְּמִית בֵּיהּ עֻזָּא 'the place where Uzzah died', II.21.8 דְּרִבְיָאָת מִיכַל '(the five sons of Merab) whom Michal raised';
- b) Examples of *(u)qtal* in TJS with *qatal/wayyiqtol* of a different verbal lexeme in the Vorlage: I.10.26 דִּאֲתִיְהִיב דְּחֵלָא מִן קִדָּם יְיָ בְּלִבְהוֹן 'in whose heart fear was given from before the Lord' [אֲשֶׁר נָגַע אֱלֹהִים בְּלִבָּם] 'that God had touched in their heart'], I.15.11 וְעָלִי 'and he prayed' [וְיָעֵק] 'and he cried'], II.1.15 וְקִטְלִיהּ 'and he killed him' [וּמָת] 'and he died'].

2.1.1.2 Direct Speech

Used in direct speech, i.e. in a discourse context whose temporal point of reference is as a rule concomitant with the moment of utterance, the basic meaning of fientive *qtal* remains unchanged.

1. In the first place, fientive *qtal* can be used to report past events. In such cases, the speaker, involved in a dialogue situation, evokes some complete event that took place in the past. This is but a special case of narrative, the only difference being that in the present case the narrated episode is embedded in direct speech.⁷⁰ Examples include: I.6.6 כִּמָּא דִּיקְרוּ 'as the Egyptians and Pharaoh hardened their heart?', I.10.18 אֲנָא אִסְיָקִית יִתְּ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרַיִם וְשִׁוִּיבִית 'I brought Israel up from Egypt and saved you', I.20.19 לֵאדְרָא דִּאֲמַרְתָּא תִּמְן '(and you will go) to the place where you hid yourself', II.12.21 צִמְתָּא וּבְכִיתָא 'you fasted and wept', II.19.29 וְשִׁוִּיתָא יִתְּ עִבְדְּךָ בְּאֶכְלִי פִתּוֹרְךָ 'and you set your servant among those eating at your table'.

In other cases, the past event reported by fientive *qtal* has some bearing on the present situation (the moment of utterance). Fientive *qtal* then becomes an expression of the perfect aspect, e.g. I.1.15 וְחִמַּר

⁷⁰ This entails that all the nuances discussed above with respect to the contrast between foreground and background are valid here as well.

למא כדן 'and new and old wine I have not drunk', I.19.17 חדת ועתיק לא שתיתי 'why have you thus deceived me and sent away (my enemy)?', I.25.35 שקרת בי ושלחת ארי פומך אסהיד בך II.1.16 'and I have taken up your request', II.12.13 חבית קדם יי 'for your mouth has borne witness against you', II.24.17 חבית ואנא סרחית (lit.) 'I have sinned before the Lord', II.24.17 חבית ואנא סרחית (lit.) 'I have sinned and I have sinned'.⁷¹

As in all the examples above, *(u)qtal* corresponds to BH *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*, just as in plain narratives, of which the cases under discussion are but a reflection in direct speech.⁷² Here too, however, in some cases the use of *(u)qtal* in TJS has no direct equivalent in BH:

- a) Examples of *(u)qtal* in TJS without verb form in the Vorlage: I.9.20 ואת אתיהא למבעיהן 'and you have come to search for them', I.15.14 ואילו קיימתא 'and if you have fulfilled (it)', I.15.17 גרמת '(it) caused', I.15.24 ובסרית על פתגמך 'and I have despised your word', II.3.8 מכען הויתי גבר הדיוט 'have I now become a common man?', II.7.22 עד דעלו ... דיהבת להון 'until they entered (the land ...) that you had given them';
- b) Examples of *(u)qtal* in TJS with a different conjugation in the Vorlage: I.1.8 ולמא לא אכלת '(why are you weeping,) and why have you not eaten?' [I.21.15 ולמא לא תאכלי] 'and why are you not eating?']⁷³ I.21.15 כד חזיתון ... למא איתיתון יהיה לותי 'when you saw [תראו] 'you see' (that the man is mad,) why did you bring [תאביאו] 'do you bring' him unto me?', I.25.28 ובשתא לא אשתכחת בך מיומך 'and evil has not been found

⁷¹ The event reported may also have begun in the past and persist up to the present, e.g. I.8.5 בנד לא הליכו באורחתך 'your sons have not walked/do not walk [הלכין] in your ways', II.22.22 ארי נשרית אורחן דתקנן קדם יי 'for I have kept/keep ways that are good before the Lord' [יהוה] 'for I have kept/keep the ways of the Lord'].

⁷² As before, sometimes one encounters *w^eqatal* rather than *wayyiqtol*, e.g. II.6.21^{BH} ושחקתי לפני יהוה '(before the Lord, who chose me over your father ...), and I played [I] 'and I gave praise' before the Lord', II.7.9^{BH} ועשיתי לך שם גדול '(and I was with you in every place ...) and I made [I] 'and I gave praise' before the Lord'. As expected, TJS renders such cases unproblematically with *uqtal*.

⁷³ This instance of *qtal* is most peculiar, inasmuch as the two other parallel verbs of this passage are *qātel* (באיש, בכיא) and the verbs underlying these three forms in the Vorlage are uniformly *yiqtol* (ירע, תאכלי, תבכי). In actual fact, *qātel* would have better fitted the general context of the verse in TJS. Should we then consider the vocalization אַלְלָהּ the product of a scribal error and read *qātel* with an enclitic pronominal subject instead? To be sure, such a construction with a 2.f.sg. clitic would be unusual by TJS' standards, but then again precisely this unusual character might explain why this construction was not recognized as such by the scribes who vocalized the text of TJ.

[‘is not found’] in you from your days’;^{74,75}

- c) Examples of *qtal* in TJS with *qatal* of a different verbal lexeme in the Vorlage: I.4.17 ואֶרְוֹנָא דִּינִי אֶשְׁתַּבִּי (‘Israel has fled ...’) and also your two sons have been killed [מתו ‘have died’] ... and the ark of the Lord has been captured [נִלְקְחָה ‘has been taken’], I.25.35 קִבִּילִית מִנִּיךְ ‘I have accepted from you’ [שָׁמַעְתִּי בְקוֹלְךָ ‘I have heard your voice’], II.7.20 וְאַתָּה עֲבַדְתָּא בְעוֹת עֲבַדְךָ ‘and you have done the request of your servant’ [יָדַעְתָּ אֶת עֲבַדְךָ ‘you have known your servant’].

2. Fientive *qtal* can also be used to refer to actions concomitant with the moment of utterance (*Koinzidenzfall*), viewed as unique (*semelfactive* aspect) and punctual. Examples include: I.1.28 מִסְרֵתִיהָ ‘I hand him over’, I.17.10 אֲנָא חֲסִידִית יֵת סַדְרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יוֹמָא הַדִּין ‘today, I put to shame the ranks of Israel’, II.17.11 כְּדִין מַלְכִית ‘thus I counsel’, II.19.8 אֲרִי בְמִמְרָא דִּינִי קִיִּמִּית ‘for by the Memra of the Lord I swear’, II.19.30 אֲמַרִית ‘I say (: you and Ziba will divide the property)’. In such cases, the perfective component of *qtal* is more manifest than its past element.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ On the use of *yiqtol* in the Vorlage in this particular instance, cf. Driver (1913: 201). On the use of *qtal* to render it in TJS, cf. Van Staaldune-Sulman (2002: 443-444).

⁷⁵ 2Sam 22 in the Vorlage is peculiar in that *yiqtol* is encountered several times where the context would have led one to expect *qatal* or *wayyiqtol*, and on various occasions an alternation between *yiqtol* and *qatal/wayyiqtol* is witnessed in one and the same verse. Examples include II.22.14^{BH} יָרַעַם מִן שָׁמַיִם יְהוָה וְעֲלִיִן יֵתֵן קוֹלוֹ ‘The Lord *thundered* from the heavens, and the Highest *gave forth* his voice’, II.22.20^{BH} וַיֹּצֵא לְמַרְחָב אֶתִּי יַחֲלֹצֵנִי כִּי חָפִצָּן בִּי ‘he brought me forth to the open place; *he rescued me*, for he took delight in me’, II.22.40^{BH} וַתּוֹרֵנִי חֵיל לְמַלְחָמָה תִּכְרִיעַ קִמִּי תַחְתָּנִי ‘and You have girded me with strength to battle, *You have subdued* under me those who rose up (against me)’. These uses of *yiqtol* in BH are usually explained as esthetic refinements characteristic of elevated and poetic style (e.g. JM §113h and §113o). In 2Sam 22, the Targumist for his part abundantly paraphrases the Vorlage and inserts much additional material. When rendering the Hebrew, however, he usually follows Aramaic principles by translating these unusual *yiqtol* forms with *qtal*, e.g. II.22.14 אֲכַלִּי ‘(the Lord) thundered’, II.22.20 שִׁיבֵנִי ‘he rescued me’, II.22.40 תִּבְרַתָּא ‘you shattered’ (other instances include verses 18, 23, 36, 37, 38); and this also applies to cases of paraphrase and non-literal rendition, e.g. II.22.14 אֲרִים ‘(the Highest) lifted up (his Memra)’ (also verse 43). The only exception is II.22.19 יִקְדָּמוּנִי ‘they came before me’ that, however, can be explained as a Hebraism (the correct form in the Aramaic of TJS would be יִקְדָּמוּנִי, cf. Dalman 1905: 368) and can be related to II.22.6 קָדְמוּנִי (which probably has to be read יִקְדָּמוּנִי).

⁷⁶ Some of these instances reflect what is known in BH grammar as the ‘performative perfect’ (JM §112f). For a detailed discussion of the ‘performative perfect’ in BH and Aramaic, cf. Rogland (1999; 2001; 2003a; 2003b).

As a rule, in this use *qatal* corresponds to BH *qatal*.⁷⁷ In contrast to the uses of *qatal* discussed above, however, one will note that the use of *qatal* with present meaning is not encountered in unparallel passages. In a few cases TJS inserts a verb form with that function, but *qātel* is employed rather than *qatal*, and in one instance *qātel* is even used where the Vorlage features *qatal* (cf. V:2.3.2). This may be taken as an indication that *qatal* with present meaning is not a productive grammatical device in TJS.⁷⁸

3. Finally, in direct speech fientive *qatal* can also refer to a backgrounded SoA situated in the future, but prior to some other foregrounded situation taken as a temporal point of reference $[t_0 < \text{SoA} < t_r]$.⁷⁹ When *qatal* is employed, TJS emphasizes the anteriority of the event to the detriment of its futurity.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ This use of *qatal* does not seem to be frequently accompanied by the coordinating conjunction *waw* in the Vorlage of Samuel, so that the resulting behaviour (i.e. *wayyiqtol* or *w^eqatal*) can hardly be established. In any event, the difference is of no relevance to the Aramaic of TJS, as it does not have the energetic *waw*.

⁷⁸ Bombeck (1997a: 74) shares this view, inasmuch as he claims that *qatal* cannot denote *Koinzidenz*. His formulation suggests however that with *qatal* present temporality (i.e. really simultaneity with the moment of utterance) could be ‘intended’ in BH, which leads him to conclude that by employing *qatal* the Targumist rendered those cases of BH *qatal* ‘leicht übertreibend’ as anterior SoAs. Finally, on the general line of the argument, cf. Cohen who suggests that ‘il est bon de poser en principe qu’une construction syntaxique qui dans la langue de traduction, n’est attestée que dans des cas où elle correspond rigoureusement à la construction traduite, ne doit pas être considérée comme significative; elle est particulièrement suspecte s’il se trouve, en outre, qu’elle est fondée sur les mêmes lexèmes que la construction traduite; elle doit être tenue pour totalement artificielle et hétérogène à la langue, si elle n’apparaît que dans de rares cas, alors que le plus souvent la même construction hébraïque est rendue autrement en araméen’ (1984: 444).

⁷⁹ Known in the relevant literature as ‘past future’ (JM 112i), or *futurum exactum* (Gesenius 1910: §106o).

⁸⁰ In other words, in such circumstances the Targumist has to make a choice between expressing the posteriority of the event to the moment of utterance (i.e. its futurity, in absolute temporality) or expressing its anteriority to the moment in the future chosen as the point of reference (relative temporality), i.e. $[t_0 < \text{SoA} < t_r]$ or $[(t_0 <) \text{SoA} < t_r]$. When the former is opted for, *yiqtol* is used; when the latter is, *qatal* is resorted to. According to Bombeck (1997a: 67), the use of *yiqtol* is intended to avoid *qatal*, which in such a context might be interpreted as an expression of absolute anteriority. Be that as it may, one will note that such a choice between *yiqtol* and *qatal* is not unknown in BH, that may also opt for *yiqtol*, e.g. I.1.22^{BH} *עד יגמל הנער* ‘until the child is weaned’ [^{TJ} יתחסיל], II.7.12^{BH} *אשר יצא ממעיך* ‘(and I will establish your seed after you) who will come forth from your loins’ [^{TJ} תוליד] ‘(your son)

BH past future *qatal* can be rendered with *qatal* in TJS, e.g. II.5.24 'for then the angel of the Lord will have gone forth [צא]'. But more often *yiqtol* is found instead and, like the use of *qatal* with present meaning discussed above, in actual fact no clear case of *qatal* with past future meaning is found in unparallel passages in TJS, *yiqtol* being the rule (cf. V:2.2.1). This may be taken as an indication that *qatal* in that function is not an active grammatical device in TJS.

2.1.2 STATIVE SOAS

As its designation indicates, stative *qatal* indicates primarily a state. The temporal framework is present or past, depending on the discourse setting, and the aspect is imperfective:⁸¹

- a) In direct speech, the state is envisioned as obtaining at the moment of utterance, i.e. in the absolute present. E.g.: I.2.1 'my horn is exalted', I.2.1 'I rejoice', I.5.7 'his stroke is heavy upon us', I.12.2 'and I am old', I.18.22 'behold, the king *delights* in you, and all his servants *love* you', II.1.5 'you know', II.7.19 'and this is small', II.15.10 'Absalom reigns in Hebron';
- b) In a narrative setting, the state belongs to the background and is envisioned as obtaining in the past at the moment of reference determined by the events of the narrative. E.g.: I.5.11 'the stroke of the Lord was very heavy there', I.14.3 'and the people did not know ...', II.1.4 'and even Saul and Jonathan his son were dead', II.13.15 'for the hatred with which he *hated* her was greater ...', II.14.26 'for it was heavy upon him', II.19.33 'and Barzilai was very old'.

Two remarks are in order:

1. All the instances above have imperfective meaning, i.e. the states referred to are opened up so as to focus on their internal constituency, which is that of an enduring, non-dynamic situation obtaining at the moment of utterance (direct discourse) or at some point in time (indirect discourse). E.g.: II.15.35^{BH} 'every word that you will hear' [TJ 'every word that you will hear'].

⁸¹ Stative *qatal* is not usually encountered in future temporality, *yiqtol* being used instead (cf. V:2.2.1, esp. footnote n.98).

determined by the events of the foreground (narrative discourse). However, a stative SoA is liable to be *perfectivized*. When this happens, stative *qtal* can typically be read in one of two ways: *ingressive* or *constative*.⁸²

- a) When ingressive, the focus is laid on the inceptual moment of the state, i.e. it is not so much the state itself that is recorded as its *advent*: ידע 'he understood, came to know' (vs. imperfective 'he knew'), רחם 'he fell in love, became fond of' (vs. imperfective 'he was in love, he was fond of'). Typically, this type of perfectivization takes place when the stative SoA is integrated into the foreground, so that the advent of the state recorded becomes one of the events⁸³ that make up the backbone of the narrative. Examples include: I.1.20 ועדיאת חנה 'and Hannah became pregnant', I.15.11 ותקף לשמואל 'and it fell hard on Samuel', II.3.37 ביוםא ההוא ... וידעו כל עמא 'and all the people ... understood on that day', II.6.16 ובסרת עלוהי 'and she despised him', II.10.1 ומלך חנן 'and Hanun became king';⁸⁴
- b) When constative,⁸⁵ aspectually the point of view becomes external: the state's inception, duration and (possible) conclusion are wrapped up as a single, complete, indivisible whole. The aspectual circumstances of stative *qtal* then become identical with that of *fientive qtal*, which allows the former to behave like the latter:⁸⁶

⁸² Cf. WoC (§30.2.3b), with reference to BH. FG1 (224) provides an illustration of the process of perfectivization with reference to the ingressive aspect. In addition, aside from 'constative' and 'ingressive' WoC (§30.5.3) distinguishes a third type of perfectivization in BH: 'telicity', which can be defined as the property of 'having a recognizable goal the achievement of which would necessarily bring the activity [denoted by the verb] to an end' (Trask 1993: 276). However, in the examples adduced by WoC (involving the BH verb כלה 'to be complete', as in 1Kgs 6.38) the telicity does not seem to be so much the effect of perfectivization as of the semantics of the verb כלה itself. Seen in that light, the verb כלה intrinsically indicates the state of 'being complete', and its use in 1Kgs 6.38 is actually ingressive, i.e. it denotes the process of 'becoming complete, entering a state of completeness'.

⁸³ It is important to note that the perfectivization of the ingressive type actually brings about a 'fientivization' of the state: the meaning becomes fientive, as the advent of a state involves a dynamic process from not being in a state into being in that state.

⁸⁴ Contrast the perfectivized use of the verbs תקף in I.15.11 and ידע in II.3.37 with their strictly stative meaning in e.g. II.22.8 ארי תקף רגויה 'because his anger was strong' and I.14.3 ועמא לא ידעו 'and the people did not know (that Jonathan had gone)'.

⁸⁵ Cf. WoC (§30.2.3b).

⁸⁶ In actual fact, the constative type of perfectivization of stative SoAs is very

- Usually, this allows stative *qtal* to enter the foreground, so that the state recorded, now situated on the main storyline, is understood as embedded in the series, or chain, of situations that make up the main line of the narrative, e.g. I.5.6 ותקיפת 'and the stroke of the Lord was heavy on the men of Ashdod', I.11.15 וחדו תמן שאול 'and Saul rejoiced there', I.18.8 ותקיף לשאול לחדא ובאיש בעינוהי פתגמא הדין 'and this word was very hard for Saul and (was) evil in his eyes', II.2.10 ותרתין שנין מלך 'and he reigned two years (over Israel)', II.11.27 ובאיש פתגמא דעבד דויד קדם דיו 'and the thing that David had done was bad before the Lord', II.12.18 ודחילו עבדי דויד לחואה ליה 'and the servants of David were afraid to tell him', II.17.4 וכשר 'and the word was pleasing in the eyes of Absalom';⁸⁷
- Stative *qtal*, once perfectivized, also has the possibility of remaining in the background, but then as a situation anterior to the events recorded on the main line,⁸⁸ e.g. I.6.19 על דחדיא 'and he killed some among the men of Beth-shemesh) because they *had rejoiced* that they had looked in the ark of the Lord (when it was exposed)' כי ראו בארון יהוה] 'because they had looked in the ark of the Lord'], II.13.15 מרחמתא דרחמה '(for the hatred with which he hated her was greater) than the love with which he *had loved* her'.

2. Like the fientive SoAs, a stative SoA can belong to a narrative inserted in direct speech. Being a part of a narrative, according to whether the stative SoA is backgrounded or foregrounded it will either:

- Maintain its imperfectivity and belong to the subsidiary storyline

close to the treatment of progressive / iterative fientive SoAs in the foreground (cf. V:2.1.1.1). In both cases, we are dealing with situations that have an internal complexity, whether dynamic (i.e. fientive: progressive or iterative) or not (i.e. stative). This internal complexity, however, becomes latent, implicit as a result of the perfectivization.

⁸⁷ The distinction between stative *qtal* with imperfective meaning and perfectivized stative *qtal* is best captured when related to languages that possess distinct forms to express the imperfective and perfective past, e.g. Lat. *amabat* and *amavit*, Fr. *il aimait* and *il aimait*, 'he loved'.

⁸⁸ This is the exact counterpart of fientive *qtal* in the background with anterior meaning (cf. V:2.1.1.1). Besides, one will understand that in contrast to fientive *qtal* simultaneity is not an option here: the expression of a state concomitant with the events on the main line is the basic and essential function of backgrounded stative *qtal*, which therefore does not need to be perfectivized in the first place.

of the narrative, e.g. I.22.15 ארי לא ידע עבדך ‘for your servant did not know’; or

- Be perfectivized and belong to either the main storyline or the subsidiary line of the embedded narrative (whereby the perfect aspect may also be brought to bear on the SoA),⁸⁹ e.g. I.14.30 לא סגיאת מוחתא בפלשתא ‘the slaughter against the Philistines has not been much’ (perfect), I.26.21 יקרת נפשי בעינך ‘my life has been precious in your eyes’ (perfect), II.1.14 איכדין לא דחילתא ‘how were you not afraid?’, II.11.23 תקיפו עלנא גבריא ‘the men were strong against us’.

As in all instances above, the BH counterpart of stative (*u*)*qtal* is invariably stative *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*.⁹⁰ The reverse is not the rule, however. When TJS features a stative verb form where the Vorlage has none, (*w*^e)*qātel* is the rule.⁹¹ When the Vorlage features stative *qatal*/*wayyiqtol*, which TJS renders though with a different verbal lexeme, (*u*)*qtal* can be used,⁹² but (*w*^e)*qātel* is more common (cf. V:2.3.3). This suggests that the use of stative *qtal* is not a productive grammatical device in the Aramaic of TJS.

⁸⁹ This usage mirrors the behaviour of fientive SoAs (cf. V:2.1.1.2).

⁹⁰ Here too, in cases of coordination the Vorlage has occasionally *w*^e*qatal* rather than *wayyiqtol*, e.g. I.10.2^{BH} נטש אביך את דברי האתנות ודאג לכם ‘your father has left off caring for the asses and worries [ויציף] about you’, I.12.2^{BH} ושבתי ‘and I am old’ [וסיבית]. Just as with the fientive verbs, it does not make any difference in TJS, Aramaic *uqtal* being used for both *w*^e*qatal* and *wayyiqtol*.

⁹¹ The only unambiguous instance of insertion of stative (*u*)*qtal* in TJS is I.18.8 ומכען לא אשתארת ליה עוד אלהין מלכותא ‘and from now on there is not left to him except the kingdom!’ [ויעוד לו אך המלוכה] lit. ‘and only the kingdom can he have more’.

⁹² Examples include: I.2.1 תקיף לבי ‘my heart is strong’ [עלין ‘exults’], I.26.24 כמא גדלה ‘was great’ [גדלה] ‘just as your life this day was precious [גדלה] in my eyes’, II.1.26/II.24.14 עקת לי ‘it is painful to me’ [צר לי] ‘I am distressed/grieved’, II.10.9 ארי תקיפו עלוהי עבדי קרבא ‘(and Joab saw) that the wagers of battle were strong against him’ [כי היתה אליו פני המלחמה] ‘that the front of the battle was against him’, II.19.43 ולמה זה חרה לך ‘and why are you angry?’ [ולמה זה חרה לך].

2.2 *Yiqtol*

According to the present study, the functions of *yiqtol* in TJS are threefold: *yiqtol* may indicate posteriority (V:2.2.1), modality (V:2.2.2) and imperfectivity (V:2.2.3).⁹³

2.2.1 POSTERIORITY

1. The use of *yiqtol* as an indicator of posteriority is by and large its most frequent use in TJS. In this function, *yiqtol* commonly occurs in a direct speech setting, so that the moment of reference of the SoA coincides with the moment of utterance. We are then dealing with absolute temporality [$t_r = t_0$], so that the posteriority [$t_r < \text{SoA}$] expressed by *yiqtol* is an expression of the future [$t_r = t_0 < \text{SoA}$]. In addition, *yiqtol* is aspectually neutral, so that it can be used both in the foreground and in the background, and can convey fientive and stative SoAs indifferently:

- a) Fientive SoAs: I.2.36 וימר 'and he will say', I.6.8 ותסבון ית ארונא דיני ותחתון 'and you will take the ark of the Lord and will set it down [ותחתון] on the wagon, and the vessels of gold ... you will place in the chest at its side, and you will send it away and it will go', I.8.20 ויתפרע לנא מלכנא ויפוק ברישנא 'will judge us' [ושפטנו], and he will go forth at our head and he will wage our battles', I.10.7 ויהי ארי יתן אחיא האלין לך 'and when these signs will come to you', I.17.26 לגברא דיקטול ... ויעדי חסדא '(what will be done) for the man who will kill ... and will take away the shame?';
- b) Stative SoAs: I.1.22 ויחב תמן עד עלמא 'and he will abide there forever', I.8.9 מלכא דימלוך עליהון 'the king who will reign over them', I.16.16 וימב לך '(and ... when the evil spirit ... will reside upon you, he will play with his hand) and it will be good for you', I.24.13 בך לא תהי בך '(and may the Lord avenge me from you,) but my hand will not be against you', II.16.21 ויתקפון ידי כל דעמך 'and the hands of all those

⁹³ Cf. Stevenson (1962: §18.9). According to Bombeck (1997a: 25-26), *yiqtol* expresses primarily potentiality (*Möglichkeit*). The various instances that he adduces cover what is referred to in this study as posteriority and modality (including volitive modality). The fact that he leaves imperfectivity (progressive and iterative) out has probably to do with the fact that, as will be seen below (V:2.2.3), *yiqtol* is not used for the expression of imperfectivity in unparallel passages.

who are with you *will be strong*', II.24.2 ואדע ית חשבן עמא 'I will know the number of the people'.

2. In certain cases the moment of reference and the moment of utterance do *not* coincide, so that temporality is relative. A common example of this is when the moment of reference is anterior to the moment of utterance [$t_r < t_0$], so that *yiqtol* becomes an expression of the future in the past [$t_r < \text{SoA} < t_0$]. Examples include: I.22.22 ארי חואה יחי לשאול '(I knew that) he would surely tell Saul', II.1.10 ארי לא ייחי '(I knew) that he would not live', II.11.20 ית דירמון עליכון מן שורא '(did you not know) that they would throw down upon you from the wall?', II.17.17 ואגון ייזלון ויחזון מלכא דויד 'and they would go and tell King David'.

As in all instances above, these two uses of (*w^e*)*yiqtol* in TJS typically correspond to BH *w^eqataltí* when coordinated⁹⁴ and BH *yiqtol* when not coordinated.⁹⁵ In certain cases, however, the use of (*w^e*)*yiqtol* in TJS has no direct equivalent in BH, because TJS either adds a passage, or translates an existing one differently:

- a) Examples of (*w^e*)*yiqtol* in TJS without verb form in the Vorlage:
 I.1.12 עד דתפסוק '(Eli was waiting for her) until she would stop' (future in the past), I.2.1 יתעבדן להון 'they will be saved', I.2.1 יתעבדן להון 'signs and mighty deeds will be done for them', I.2.1 נסין וגבורין 'therefore the assembly of Israel will say', I.2.2 בכין תימר כנשתא דישראל 'the corpses of his camp will fall', I.2.32 בחר כין איתי 'afterwards I will bring prosperity over Israel', I.12.21 משריתיה 'and you will not serve', I.12.23 אורחא דתהכון 'I will turn from my sins and it will be forgiven to me', II.1.21

⁹⁴ Occasionally, in cases of coordination the Vorlage has *w^eyiqtol* rather than *w^eqataltí*, usually when the *waw* is not meant to indicate succession but rather mere juxtaposition (i.e. 'simple *waw*', JM §115). Examples: I.10.5^{BH} ויהי כבאך 'and it will come to pass when you enter' [ייהי כמיעלך]^{TJ}, I.12.3^{BH} ואשיב לכם 'and I will return (it) to you' [ואתיב לכון]^{TJ}, I.28.19^{BH} ויתן יהוה גם את ישראל 'and the Lord will also give Israel (... into the hand of the Philistines)' [וימסר יי]^{TJ} 'and the Lord will deliver'. One should note, however, that this does not make any difference in TJS, which does not distinguish formally between the simple *waw* and the energetic *waw*, and therefore translates BH *w^eyiqtol* and *w^eqataltí* uniformly as *w^eyiqtol*.

⁹⁵ Cf. Bombeck (1997a: 108, 147, 148). As already noted, according to Bombeck *yiqtol* does not fulfil the same function in BH and TJ: relative posteriority in the former, potentiality in the latter. According to Bombeck, the use of *yiqtol* in TJ merely reflects the fact that any future SoA is not (yet) sure to obtain, i.e. it is, by its very nature, only potential.

‘(the dew will not come upon you) and the rain will not be in you’, II.15.25 ‘and I will worship before him’, II.19.38 ‘and I will be buried in the tomb of my father and my mother’, II.22.32 ‘all nations ... will give thanks and will say ... and your people will say’;

- b) Examples of $(w^e)yiqtol$ in TJS with a different conjugation in the Vorlage: I.1.14 ‘will you not let your wine evaporate?’ [‘put away your wine!’], I.2.16 ‘they will take’ [lit.] ‘I have taken’];⁹⁶
- c) Examples of $(w^e)yiqtol$ in TJS with $yiqtol/w^eqataltí$ of a different verbal lexeme in the Vorlage: I.2.15 ‘even until the fat pieces would be brought up (to the altar)’ [lit. ‘even until the fat pieces would be brought up (to the altar)’] ‘even before they would boil down the fat pieces’] (future in the past), II.9.10 ‘and he will be provided for’ [‘and he will eat it’].

It is very remarkable that in future temporality, foreground and background often feature the same conjugation, whether in BH or in TJS: as a rule, *yiqtol* (and also $w^eqataltí$ in BH) is typical of the foreground. But as a result of its unmarkedness with reference to aspects and fientivity/stativity it is not *per se* incompatible with the background, which explains why it is found there.⁹⁷ The question remains as to whether the use of *yiqtol* in backgrounded clauses confers on them more grounding prominence.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Bombeck (1997a: 76) interprets this use of *qatal* as a means to present ‘übertreibend’ a future SoA as ‘as good as completed’. For its part, TJ resorts to *yiqtol*, the usual form for the expression of future temporality.

⁹⁷ As we shall see, both BH *qotel* and TJ *qātel* can also be used with fientive SoAs in backgrounded clauses in the future (cf. V:2.3.2).

⁹⁸ To denote backgrounded stative SoAs in the future (i.e. stative SoAs obtaining at the moment the events of the main line are to take place), BH can make use of *yiqtol*, which conveys the futurity of the SoAs while leaving their stativity unexpressed, as is the case in the instances discussed so far. But BH can also resort to stative *qatal*, which has the opposite effect (i.e. the stativity of the SoAs is conveyed in contrast to their futurity, the very nature of the background as concomitant with the situations of the main line ensuring the correct temporal interpretation of the backgrounded SoAs), e.g. II.17.13^{BH} ‘(we will drag [the city] to the valley) until not even a pebble is found there’. The following pairs of clauses further illustrate this contrast: I.8.11^{BH} ‘(this will be the manner of) the king who will reign over you’ vs. I.12.14^{BH} ‘(both you and) the king who reigns over you (will follow eagerly...)’;

3. Finally, another case in which the moment of reference and the moment of utterance do not coincide is the past future. We have already noted that *qtal* is not regularly used for the expression of past future SoAs (cf. V:2.1.1.2). The conjugation *qtal* is encountered in a few instances where the Vorlage features *qatal* as well, but *yiqtol* is usually found instead, e.g. II.17.12 בחד מן אתריא דישתכח תמן '(and we will come upon him) in one of the places where he will be found [נמצא 'he has been found']', II.20.6 דלמא ישכח ליה קרוין כריכן '(pursue after him,) lest he will find [מצא 'has found'] for himself fortified cities'. In addition, in unparallel passages *qtal* is not encountered, *yiqtol* being found instead, e.g. II.17.3 בחר דיתקטיל גברא '(all of them will return) after the man ... will be killed', II.22.32 על נסא ופרקנא דתעביד למשיך 'therefore on account of the sign and the redemption that you will work for your anointed one (... all the nations ... will give thanks and say)'.

2.2.2 MODALITY

The conjugation *yiqtol* is regularly used to express various types of modality. Clear and well defined though these modal categories may be conceptually, in actual fact they cannot always be distinguished easily, not only because semantically they blend into one another to a certain extent,⁹⁹ but also because formally they all make use of the same form *yiqtol* in TJS.¹⁰⁰ BH, however, possesses different conjugations where TJS has only one. A formal analysis of the Vorlage can therefore contribute to shedding some light on the matter in TJS.

From a formal viewpoint, BH allows us to distinguish two categories of modality underlying the use of *yiqtol* in TJS: modality expressed by

I.24.5^{BH} כאשר יטב בעיניך '(and you will do to him) as will be good in your eyes' vs. II.15.26^{BH} כאשר טוב בעיניו '(he will do to me) as is good in his eyes'.

TJS, for its part, usually opts for *yiqtol*, e.g. II.17.13 עד דלא נשאר תמן אבנא 'until we will not leave there a stone' (with a slight deviation from the Vorlage), I.8.11/I.12.14 מלכא דימלוך עליכון (the only possible case involving stative *qtal* in TJS is II.21.5^{BH} ... האיש [אשתויצינא ^{TJ} 'the man ... who plotted against us (that) we be destroyed [אשתויצינא ^{TJ}]', though this passage is admittedly difficult). On occasions, however, TJS may opt for some other construction; thus טוב^{BH} 'to be pleasing, good' in the construction טוב^{BH} בעיני 'to be good in the eyes of ...' that, owing to its stativity, is always rendered in TJS with the adjective תקין 'right, fitting' rather than with a verb, hence I.24.5/II.15.26 (כמא דתקין בעינד/קדמוהי).

⁹⁹ FG1 (241).

¹⁰⁰ As well as *qtol* in the case of volitional modality, cf. V:2.4.

the ‘imperfect’ *yiqtol* (and its coordinated counterpart *w^eqatalti*)¹⁰¹ on the one hand, and modality expressed by the ‘jussive’ *yiqtol* (and the other so-called Volitives) on the other.¹⁰² As the latter type also involves other conjugations than *yiqtol*, it will be discussed in a separate section (cf. V:2.4). The section below will deal with the former type of formal modality, i.e. the one expressed by the ‘imperfect’ *yiqtol*.

1. In BH, *yiqtol* is commonly used to express deontic modality.¹⁰³ This use of *yiqtol* in BH finds an exact counterpart in the Aramaic of TJS, *yiqtol* being used there with the same function. In that use, *yiqtol* can convey fientive and stative SoAs equally. Typical uses of *yiqtol* for the expression of deontic modality in TJS include:¹⁰⁴

- Obligation (‘must, have to, shall/should’): I.10.4 ותקביל מידהון ‘and you must accept from their hands’, I.21.16 הדין ייעול לביתי ‘does this one have to enter my house?’, I.30.8 ארדוף בחר משריתא הדא ‘shall I pursue after this army?’, II.2.1 האסק בחדא מקרויא דבית יהודה ‘shall I go up against one of the cities of the House of Judah?’, II.3.33 הכימנח רשיעין ימות אבנר (lit.) ‘should Abner die like the dying of wicked men?’, II.5.19 האסק על פלשתא ‘shall I go up against the Philistines?’;

¹⁰¹ Cf. JM (§119w).

¹⁰² The form *yiqtol* is ambiguous, as according to our current understanding of the BH verbal system it actually represents two different historical conjugations: the ‘long imperfect’ **yaqtulu* and the ‘short imperfect’ **yaqtul* (cf. JM §117c). Though these two forms had largely merged by the time Biblical literature was committed to writing, the difference can still be detected in some cases, e.g. יקום *yaqūm* and יקם *yaqom*, יגלה *yiglē* and יגל *yigel*. In addition, other elements from the linguistic context (e.g. word order, use of the negative particle אֵל and entreating particle נא) may contribute to elucidating the matter. For the sake of clarity, in the present study the label ‘*yiqtol*’ will be reserved for the ‘long imperfect’, whereas the ‘short imperfect’ will be referred to by means of the label ‘Jussive’.

¹⁰³ Though BH possesses distinct lexical items to express deontic modality (such as אֵבָה ‘to want, be willing to’ and יָכַל ‘can, to be able to’), it does not commonly make conspicuous use of them and prefers to resort vicariously to *yiqtol* to convey these nuances (cf. JM §113l). The same applies to TJS, which follows BH closely in this matter. The only exceptions in TJS are II.13.11 ולא אבא למיכל ‘(and she brought [them] near to him,) but he did not want to eat’, II.18.3 ארי כען את יכיל למסעד כותנא עסרא אלפין ‘for you can help ten thousand like us’ and II.22.39 ולא יכילו למקם ‘and they were not able to rise’, where TJS adds the auxiliary verbs אבא and יכיל where the Vorlage lacks it or features modal *yiqtol* only (II.22.39^{BH} ולא יקומון). (In I.17.39, II.2.23 and II.13.9 TJS has אבא where the Vorlage features other verbs such as ויאל ‘he tried’ and וימאן ‘he refused’.)

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Bombeck (1997a: 109-124, *passim*).

- Willingness ('want, be willing to'): I.2.15 'and he will not take from you boiled meat', I.21.10 'if you want to take it for yourself', I.26.6 'who will go down with me unto Saul?', II.3.13 'I will cut a covenant with you', II.10.2 'I will/want to do good with Hanun';
- Ability ('can, be able to'): I.16.2 'how can I go?', I.30.15 'can you bring me down to this camp?', II.19.36 'can I know [to discern] between good and bad ... can your servant taste ... can I hear ...?';
- Permission ('may, be allowed to, be entitled to'): II.14.32 'he may kill me', II.16.10 'and who is entitled to say?'.

2. In addition, the form *yiqtol* can also express epistemic modality. The fact that *yiqtol* is used in a wide array of functions makes the task of identifying clear instances of epistemic modality particularly difficult, as in such instances *yiqtol* can often also be read as an expression of deontic modality, or even of the future.¹⁰⁵ The following, which can be considered plausible cases of epistemic modality, will clarify the point: I.18.18 'who am I ... that I should be son-in-law to the king?', I.20.2 'why should my father hide this thing from me?', I.20.9 'would I not tell it to you?', I.27.5 'and why should your servant dwell in the royal city with you?', I.29.4 'with what could this one be reconciled to his master?', II.19.35 'how many days of years of my life are there) that I should go up with the king to Jerusalem?'.

As a rule, as in the instances above the modal use of (*w^e*)*yiqtol* corresponds to BH *w^eqatalti* when coordinated and to BH *yiqtol* when not coordinated. In certain cases, however, TJS inserts a verb form, so that the use of (*w^e*)*yiqtol* has no direct equivalent in BH: II.1.21 'enough that they could make from it the dough offering', II.2.22 'why should I (kill you) and cast you down to the ground, and how could I (lift up my face) and look at Joab your brother?'.

¹⁰⁵ On epistemic modality, its formal connections with deontic modality and the ensuing difficulty to capture it formally, cf. Gzella (2004: §5.1, esp. §5.1.2).

2.2.3 IMPERFECTIVITY

Finally, the form *yiqtol* can also be used for the expression of SoAs upon which the imperfective aspect is bearing, i.e. SoAs that are ‘opened up’ so as to focus on their internal constituency.

1. Usually, the SoA is fientive and the aspect is iterative.

In narratives, the SoA is part of the background, describing some situation that took place on several occasions at the time the events recorded in the foreground occurred, e.g. I.1.7 *וכן יעביר שנה בשנה* ‘and so he did year by year’, I.2.19 *ומעיל זעיר תעביד ליה אמוה* ‘and his mother made for him a little robe (and brought it up to him from the time of festival to festival)’, I.19.24 *על כן יימרון* ‘therefore they would say’, II.15.32 *ריש מורא* ‘the top of the mountain where he used to bow before the Lord’.

In direct speech, the SoA describes some recurring situation that can be said to obtain at the moment of utterance [SoA= t_0], e.g. I.2.23 *למא תעבדון כפתגמיה האלין* ‘why do you do these things?’, I.23.23 *דיטמר תמן* ‘(and see and learn of all the hiding places) where he hides himself’, II.5.8 *על כן יימרון* ‘therefore they say’.

Moreover, the recurrence of the SoA expressed by *yiqtol* sometimes takes on the value of a general truth or of a truth of experience:¹⁰⁶ I.24.14 *מירשיעיא תפוק חובתהון* ‘from the wicked comes forth their guilt’, II.11.25 *כדין וכדין תקטול חרבא* ‘the sword kills [האכל ‘eats’] now this one and now that one’.

2. Most occasionally, the aspect is progressive, e.g. I.17.8 *למא תפקון לסדרא קרבא* ‘why are you coming forth to arrange battle?’. Finally, in a few instances imperfective *yiqtol* is encountered with stative SoAs. This last use is mostly confined to the verbs *יכיל* ‘can, be able to’ (e.g. I.17.33 *לא תכול* ‘you cannot go against this Philistine’, II.12.23 *האכול לאתבותיה* ‘can I bring him back?’) and *ידע* ‘to know’ (e.g. I.28.1 *תדע* ‘you know’, II.3.38 *הלא תדעון* ‘do you not know?’).¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ This use of *yiqtol* echoes BH usage, cf. JM (§113c).

¹⁰⁷ Some of these cases of *yiqtol* are interrogative. As JM (§113d, esp. n.3) point out with reference to BH, they have but little to do with modality, inasmuch as other verb forms, e.g. *qatal*, can also be used in questions.

The imperfective use of *yiqtol* corresponds to *yiqtol* in BH as well.¹⁰⁸ What is significant, however, is that contrary to what the previous sections might have led us to expect, BH *w^eqatal^{tí}* with imperfective meaning (i.e. the coordinated counterpart of imperfective *yiqtol*)¹⁰⁹ is *never* rendered with *w^eyiqtol* in TJS, but always with the synonymous *w^eqātel*.¹¹⁰ In addition, one will note that in all instances of imperfective *yiqtol* in TJS (whether iterative, progressive or stative) the Vorlage features *yiqtol* as well:¹¹¹ when TJS adds a passage, it tends to avoid *yiqtol* and to resort to other conjugations, especially *qātel* (V:2.3.2). These two facts, added to the strikingly meagre number of cases of imperfective *yiqtol* in TJS, suggest that *yiqtol* with imperfective meaning is no longer a productive grammatical device in TJS.¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ On the use of BH *yiqtol* for the expression of imperfectivity, cf. JM (§113c-f). Bombeck's notion that the main function of BH *yiqtol* is the expression of (relative) posteriority makes it difficult for him to explain its imperfective use (1997a: 135).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. JM (§119u).

¹¹⁰ Cf. V:2.3.2. This means that the BH sequence *yiqtol ... w^eqatal^{tí}* with imperfective meaning is rendered with the sequence *yiqtol ... w^eqātel* in TJS (in future and modal use, in contrast, the expected sequence *yiqtol ... w^eyiqtol* obtains, cf. above).

¹¹¹ In two instances TJS uses a different verb: I.9.6 כל דיתנבי 'all that he prophesies (indeed comes to pass)' כל אשר ידבר 'all that he says', I.20.2 ולא יחוי לי '(my father does not do anything great or anything small) and does not tell me' ולא יגלה את אונאי 'and does not inform me'. The first part of that verse ^{BH} לו עשה אבי דבר גדול או דבר קטן 'my father does not do anything great or anything small' displays a difficult *ktib* in the Vorlage, which suggests the use of *qatal* together with a preposition. The *qre* corrects this to לא יעשה, and TJS appears to reflect that correction: לא יעביר אבא פתגם רב או פתגם זעיר.

¹¹² Meagre though the imperfective use of TJ *yiqtol* may be, Bombeck (1997a: 124-135) hardly pays attention to it. In his view, the use of BH *yiqtol* as an expression of *vermehrte Sachverhalte* (cf. footnote n.114 below) is but a secondary function. He suggests that in TJ *qātel* is the rule, simply (1) specifying that TJ *yiqtol*, in its meaning of *Möglichkeit*, can be used for the expression of general SoAs in relative clauses with an indeterminate antecedent (1997a: 135, without any instance from TJ) and (2) mentioning in passing one case in which TJ *yiqtol* is used to render BH *yiqtol* (1997a: 132).

2.3 *Qātel*

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION

According to the present study, the primary function of *qātel*¹¹³ in TJ is the expression of relative simultaneity and imperfectivity: the SoA is envisioned as occurring at the temporal point of reference (which can be located in the past, present and, to a certain extent, the future), and is ‘opened up’ so as to allow to look at it from inside and make its inner constituency available. This concerns both fientive and stative SoAs. The simultaneity expressed by *qātel*/being relative, the temporal sphere is not a part of the semantics of the conjugation itself and must be recovered from the discourse type or general context. As a result, a SoA featuring *qātel* can in principle be located in the past, present and, to a certain extent, the future.¹¹⁴

2.3.2 FIENTIVE SOAS

With fientive SoAs, the imperfectivity of *qātel* expresses progressivity or iterativity. The time sphere can be past, present, or future, so that *qātel* typically expresses SoAs that are (or were, or will be) in progress or recurrent at some moment in time. In past and future temporality specifically (narrative and direct discourse respectively), the SoA is part of the background, describing some situation that was (or will be) unfolding or recurring at the time the events recorded on the main storyline occurred (or will occur), i.e. the SoA denoted by *qātel* is concomitant with the SoAs reported on the main line.

¹¹³ Hebrew and Aramaic know two main syntactic uses of the active participle (BH *qotel* and TJ *qātel*): predicative and attributive. In TJS, the predicative use of *qātel* is far more extensive than its BH counterpart, but conversely its attributive use is less extensive than that of *qotel* in BH. The present chapter will deal with the predicative use of *qātel*/only. The label *qātel* stands for both the active participle of the ‘active’ stems *peal*, *paal* and *afel* (*qātel*, *m^eqattel* and *maqtel* respectively) and the participle of the reflexive/passive stems *itpeel*, *itpaal* and *ittafal* (*mitq^etel*, *mitqattal* and *mittaqtal* respectively).

¹¹⁴ Cf. Stevenson (1962: §21.10). This conclusion is in line with Bombeck's. As Bombeck (1997a: 26, 173) explains, *qātel* expresses primarily relative simultaneity and, with real (as against potential and unreal) SoAs, also ‘vermehrte Sachverhalte’, which Bombeck uses as a generic term for durative, iterative, pluralic (i.e. multiple subject or object), habitual and general truth (Bombeck 1997a: 15).

1. Progressive:

- Past: I.1.13 and Hannah was praying [מְדַבֶּרֶת ‘speaking’] in her heart; only her lips were moving [נִעְוָה] and her voice was not being heard [לֹא שִׁמְעָה], I.9.14 האָנוּן עַלֵין בְּנוּ (and they went up to the city), they were entering [בָּאִים] in the midst of the city and behold, Samuel was coming out [צָא] towards them’, I.13.17 מִשְׁרִיתָא חַדָּא מִתְפְּנִיא לְאוֹרָה עִפְרָה (one company was turning [פְּנָה] to the way of Ophrah’, I.17.23 וְהוּא [מְדַבֵּר] and while he was speaking with them a man from their midst was coming up [עָלוּהָ], I.29.2 וּמִוֹרֵי and the chiefs of the Philistines were passing [עָבְרִים] by hundreds and by thousands, and David and his men were passing [עָבְרִים] in the back with Achish’, II.11.4 וְהִיא מִתְקַדְשֶׁת [מִתְקַדְשֶׁת] and she was cleaning herself from her uncleanness’;¹¹⁵
- Present: I.1.8 מָה לַעֲמֹא ‘why are you weeping [תִּבְכִּי]’, I.11.5 רוּחַ בִּישָׁא ‘what has the people, that it cries [יִבְכּוּ]’, I.16.15 a spirit of evil from before the Lord is agitating you [מִבְעִתָּךְ]’, II.1.3 ‘where are you coming [תְּבוֹא] from?’, II.3.25 הַמִּיקָר ‘everything that you are doing [עֲשֶׂה]’, II.10.3 אֲנָא מִתְעַכֵּב ‘is David honoring [מְכַבֵּד] your father?’, II.15.28 I am delaying [מִתְמַחֵמָה] in the plains of the wilderness’, II.20.17 שָׁמַע אֲנִי ‘I am listening’;¹¹⁶
- Future: I.10.3 (and three men) going up (to worship before the Lord in Bethel will find you there,) one carrying [נִשָּׂא] ..., one carrying [נִשָּׂא] ... and one carrying [נִשָּׂא] ..., I.10.5 (and when you (will) enter there to the city, you will meet) a band of teachers going down [יֵרָדִים] ... and (they will be) singing praises’ [מְחַנְבְּאִים].

2. Iterative:

- Past: I.2.14 everything that the fork brought up [יָעִלָּה], (he) took [יָקַח] ... thus they were doing [יַעֲשׂוּ], I.2.22 and he was hearing [וְשָׁמַע] everything that his sons were doing [יַעֲשׂוּ] ... and that they were

¹¹⁵ For further instances of progressive *qātel* in past temporality, cf. Bombeck (1997a: 185-188).

¹¹⁶ For further instances of *qātel* in present temporality, cf. Bombeck (1997a: 173-177).

- sleeping [ישכבון]’, I.9.9 ‘the prophet today was called [יקרא] in olden times the seer’, I.14.47 ‘and in every place that he was turning [יפנה], he was condemning [ירשיע]’, II.1.22 ‘the arrows of the bow ... were not turning back [נשוג]’¹¹⁷ ... and the sword ... did not come away [תשוב] empty’, II.12.3 ‘from his bread it was eating [תאכל], and from his cup it was drinking [תשתה], and in his lap it was sleeping [תשכב]’;¹¹⁸
- Present: I.5.5 ‘therefore to this day the idol priests of Dagon ... do not step [יורכנו] upon the threshold of Dagon’, I.9.13 ‘for the people do not eat [יאכל] until his coming’, I.24.10 ‘why do you listen [תשמע] to the words of the sons of man?’, II.13.12 ‘it is not done [יעשה] this way in Israel’.¹¹⁹

As with *yiqtol*, the recurrence of an iterative SoA expressed by *qātel* sometimes takes on the value of a general truth or of a truth of experience:¹²⁰ I.2.7 ‘The Lord makes poor [מוריש] and makes rich [מעשיר]; he humbles [משפיל] and he exalts [מרומם]’, I.2.8 ‘he raises up [מקים] the poor from the dust, from the dunghill he exalts [ירם] the needy one’, I.16.7 ‘the sons of men see [יראה] with their eyes’, I.17.47 ‘not by sword and by spear does the Lord save [יהושיע]’, II.19.4 ‘as people steal away [יחגב]’.

As can be seen in the instances above, TJS (*w^e*) *qātel* corresponds primarily to BH (*w^e*) *qotel*,¹²¹ and also translates very often BH imperfective *yiqtol/w^e qatalí*, a function it shares with TJS *yiqtol* with no noticeable

¹¹⁷ Morphologically speaking, this form might just as well be interpreted as *qatal*. However, reading it as *qotel* better fits the past iterative context of the passage.

¹¹⁸ For further instances of iterative *qātel* in past temporality, cf. Bombeck (1997a: 188-189).

¹¹⁹ TJS features no clear example of iterative *qātel* in the background in the future. This may very well be nothing more than a coincidence, however, since *qātel* with progressive meaning is attested in the same circumstances (cf. above).

¹²⁰ Cf. V:2.2.3. In contrast, in BH *yiqtol* is regularly used instead, cf. JM (§113c, esp. n.5).

¹²¹ Cf. Bombeck (1997a: 173).

difference in meaning.¹²²

1. As already noted, however, whereas BH imperfective *yiqtol* can be rendered with either *yiqtol* or *qātel* in TJS, BH imperfective *w^eqatalti* specifically is always rendered with *w^eqātel*, never with *w^eyiqtol* in TJS.¹²³ To summarize the facts: as a rule, BH (*w^e*)*qotel* is rendered with (*w^e*)*qātel* in TJS; BH imperfective *yiqtol* is rendered with TJ *yiqtol* or *qātel* (with no noticeable difference in meaning), and BH imperfective *w^eqatalti* with TJ *w^eqātel*. Additional examples of the last sort include: I.2.15 ואחי עולימא דכחנא ואמר '(and even before the fat pieces were brought up ...) the young man of the priest would come and say', I.5.7 ואמרין 'and they were saying', I.7.16 ואזיל ... ומסתחר ... ודאין 'and (he) would go ... and make a circuit ... and judge', I.16.23 וחי ... ונסיב דויד ית כנרא ומנגין בידיה ומתרוח 'and it happened (when a spirit of evil from before the Lord was residing upon Saul) David would take the lyre and would play with his hand and it would be refreshing to Saul ... and (an/the evil spirit ...) would go up from him', II.14.26 ומספר ליה ותקיל ית סער רישיה '(and it was at the end of the year that he would cut it) ... and he would cut it, and would weigh the hair of his head', II.15.2 ומקדים אבשלום וקאים 'and Absalom used to get up early and stand', II.15.5 ומושיט ית ידיה ומתקיף ביה ונשיק ליה 'and he would reach out his hand, and take hold of him and kiss him'.¹²⁴

2. In addition, as already noted *qātel* renders on one occasion BH *qatal* with present (performative) meaning, albeit with a different verb: II.16.4 מודינא 'I thank you' [השתחוית 'I do obeisance' or 'I bow (before you)'] And *qātel* is featured in a few unparallel passages where the performative use of *qatal* might have been expected in the Vorlage: II.3.12 מקיימנא 'במן ... דעבד ארעא 'by the one who made the earth, I establish, (saying: 'cut a covenant with me')', II.13.16 את אמר לשלחותני '(after what you have done to me,) you say to send me away'.¹²⁵

¹²² Cf. V:2.2.3. In the Vorlage of Samuel, however, one will note that *qotel* is not frequently used for iterative SoAs, and tends to restrict its usage to progressive SoAs. The conjugation *yiqtol*, for its part, does not appear to impose such restrictions. Concerning the relationship between imperfective *qotel* and *yiqtol* in BH, cf. JM (§121h).

¹²³ Bombeck (1997a: 152) noted that *w^eqātel* is often used to render BH *w^eqatalti*, from which he concluded that in BH *w^eqatalti* is the counterpart of *yiqtol* for the expression of iterativity in the past.

¹²⁴ For more instances, cf. Bombeck (1997a: 160-167).

¹²⁵ It is worthy of note that TJS is not unique in this regard. At times BH also

3. Finally, in yet other cases the use of $(w^e)qātel$ in TJ has no direct equivalent in BH, because TJ either adds a passage, or translates an existing one differently:

a) Examples of $(w^e)qātel$ in TJS without a verb form in the Vorlage:

I.11.11 תרין דערקין כחדא ‘(and there were not left among them) two who fled together’, I.31.12 כמא דקלן על מלכיא ‘as they used to burn kings’, II.6.4 אתן עם ארונא דיוי ‘they were coming with the ark of the Lord’, II.7.19 לעלמא דאתי ‘for the age that is coming’, II.11.23 והווינא מעדן דמתנכיס תמידא ‘and we were driving them back’, II.24.15 ועד דמתסק and until it is removed’. With $(w^e)qātel$ expressing a general truth or truth of experience: I.15.23 ... עמא דטען ... כל אנש דבצר ומוסיף גבריא דשאלין ... כל גבר דמסריב ... (for like the guilt of) the men who inquire (from the diviner, so is the guilt of) every man who rebels (against the words of the Law; and like the sins of) the people who go astray (after idols, so is the guilt of) every man who cuts out or adds (to the words of the prophets), I.15.29 ולא תאיב ממא דאמר ... דאמרין ומכדבין ‘and (he) does not turn from whatever he says (for he is not like the sons of men) who say and act deceitfully, decree and do not carry out’, I.25.29 כמא דמפרחין אבנא בקלעא ‘as they make fly off a stone in the sling’;

b) Examples of $(w^e)qātel$ in TJS with different conjugation in the Vorlage: II.6.22 דאת אמרא ‘(of) whom you are speaking’ [אשר אמרת], II.20.8 והוא יצא ותפל ‘and he was going forth and striding’ [והוא יצא ותפל] ‘and he went forth and it fell out’;

c) Examples of $(w^e)qātel$ in TJS with $(w^e)qotel$ or $yiqtol/w^eqatal$ of a different verbal lexeme in the Vorlage: I.3.8 מן קדם יוי מתקרי לרביא ‘(and Eli understood that) from before the Lord it was being called to the boy’ [יהוה קרא לנער] ‘the Lord was calling the boy’, I.3.13 מתפרע אנא ‘I am taking vengeance from the men of his house’ [שפט מן אנש ביתיה] ‘I am judging his house’, I.9.6 וגברא מתנבי קשוט ‘and the man prophesies the truth’ [והאיש נכבד] ‘and the man is held in honour’, I.26.20 כאשר ירדף הקרא ‘as a partridge is pursued

features other conjugations than *qatal* in contexts that are not markedly different from that of performative utterances, e.g. *qotel* as in I.24.5^{BH} הנה אנכי נתן את איביך בידך [TJ] ‘Behold, I am giving your enemy in your hand’ [TJ], and possibly also *yiqtol*, as in II.3.8^{BH} היום אעשה חסד עם בית שאול [TJ] ‘today I am doing kindness with the house of Saul’ [TJ]. Prospective *qātel* in TJS also deserves mention here (cf. V:2.3.4) and, depending on the temporal interpretation of *qātel*, there may also be some amount of overlap with the rather uncommon use of *qātel* in the foreground in the future (cf. footnote n.126 below).

‘as one pursues a partridge’] in the mountains’ (truth of experience), I.28.9 למה אתה מתנקש [‘why are you attacking my life?’] ובען למקמל ית חד יחיד [‘why are you laying a snare for my life?’], II.14.7 ‘and they were seeking to kill the only one’ [‘and they would quench my coal’], II.17.12 כמה דשרי מלא על ארעא ‘as the dew encamps [‘falls’] upon the ground’ (truth of experience), II.22.4 ‘I am calling before the Lord’ אקרא יהוה [‘I am calling on the Lord’].¹²⁶

2.3.3 STATIVE SOAS

With stative SoAs, the time sphere can be present or past, so that *qātel* expresses a SoA that obtains at the moment of utterance or did obtain at some point in the past.¹²⁷ In narrative discourse, as with fientive *qātel* the SoA is part of the background. E.g.:

- Past: I.14.3 ואחיה ... לביש איפודא ‘and Ahijah ... wore [נשא] the ephod’, I.24.4 ודוד וגברוהי ... יתבין ‘and David and his men were dwelling [ישבים] (in the extremities of the cave)’, I.26.12 ארי כלהון דמכין ‘for all of them were sleeping’ [ישנים], II.15.30 והוא אויל ויחיה ‘and he was going barefoot’ [הלך];
- Present: I.20.30 רעי את בבר ישי ‘you are pleased [בחר] ‘you choose’] the son of Jesse’, I.23.3 אנחא דחלין ‘we are afraid’ [יראים], II.11.5 מעריא אנא ‘I am pregnant’ [הרה], II.13.4 אנא רחום ... ית תמר ‘I love [אהב] Tamar’, II.17.2

¹²⁶ Mention must also be made of a few instances with *qātel* used in direct discourse to express imperfective (progressive or iterative) SoAs in the foreground in the future. In one instance the passage has no parallel in the Vorlage: I.10.19 לית אנחא מתפרקין ‘we will not be saved’. In the others the Vorlage features future *yiqtol* or, occasionally, *qotel*: I.20.20 ואנא תלתת גרין בקשת שדי ‘and I will shoot [אורה] three arrows’, II.9.10 ומפיששת ... אכיל תדירא לחמא על פתורי ‘and Mephiboshet (the son of your master) will always be eating [אכל] the bread on my table’, II.12.23 אנא אויל לותיה והוא לא ‘I shall go [הלך] towards him, but he shall not return [ישוב] to me’, II.17.10 ממסא מסי ‘it will indeed melt [ימס]’. According to Bombeck (1997a: 28, 173, 177ff.), in these cases *qātel* is used for the expression of the future when, in analogy to the present, the future is presented as certain; conversely, in questions *qātel* can be used for future SoAs that are expected not to happen, e.g. II.12.23 למה דנן אנא צאים ‘why should I fast [צם]?’; II.18.22 למה דנן את רחיש ‘why should you run [רץ]?’ On the whole, however, this phenomenon remains largely marginal, *yiqtol* being the rule for foregrounded SoAs in the future (cf. V:2.2.1).

¹²⁷ With respect to future temporality, no instance of stative *qātel* in the background has been found in TJS, *yiqtol* usually fulfilling that function (cf. V:2.2.1, footnote n.98).

עמא כפין ומשלהי וצחי במדברא II.17.29 [וַעֲנֵה], ‘when he is weary’ כד הוא משלהי
 ‘the people are hungry [רעב] and weary [עָיֵף] and thirsty [צָמָא] in
 the wilderness’.

TJS stative *qātel* typically corresponds to BH *qotel* and VerbAdj (with morphologically fientive and stative verbs respectively), as in all examples above. It regularly renders BH stative *yiqtol* with stative (i.e. imperfective) meaning as well.¹²⁸ In addition, rather remarkably *qātel* not infrequently translates BH stative *qatal*.¹²⁹ Finally, in certain cases the use of *qātel* in TJS has no direct equivalent in the Vorlage, because TJS adds a passage or translates an existing one differently: I.5.7 ארי שויא עליהון מחתא ‘(they saw) that the stroke was alike upon them’ כי כן [‘that it was so’], I.6.4 ‘for one plague is on all of you’ כי מגפה אחת לכלם [‘one stroke is alike on all of you’], I.9.7 מרעם דכשר לית לאעלא לנביא ‘there is nothing that is fitting to bring to the prophet’ תשורה אין להביא [‘there is not a present to bring...’], I.11.12 לא כשר שאול לממלך ‘Saul is not fitting to rule’ [שאול ימלך עלינן]

¹²⁸ As we have seen, stative *yiqtol* with imperfective meaning is rather exceptional in TJS (cf. V:2.2.3). Examples with stative *qātel* include: I.1.8 ולמא באיש ליד לבין ‘and why is your heart sad [ירע] to you?’, I.17.39 לית אנא יכיל למיול ‘I cannot [אוכל] go’, I.23.22 ארי אף באירות מתחשבא על [ירעם], II.4.2 ‘(for they say to me) that he is cunning’ [ירעם], II.4.2 דבית בנימין [תחשב] ‘for Beeroth was also reckoned with those of the house of Benjamin’. As for the Vorlage, no cases of stative *w^cqatalī* are found in Samuel. What is occasionally encountered, however, is cases of BH *yiqtol* or *w^cqatalī* referring to stative SoAs that are *perfectivized* and *iterativized* so as to denote a state that used to obtain at various points in the past (background in narrative discourse): I.16.23 ומאיכ ליה (David would take the lyre and play with his hand ...) and it would be good to him’, II.13.18 ארי כין לבשן בנת מלכא בתולתא כרדושין ‘for thus the virgin daughters of the king wore tunics’. On the perfectivization of stative SoAs and their ensuing capacity to adopt the grammatical behaviour of fientive SoAs, cf. V:2.1.2.

¹²⁹ Cf. Bombeck (1997a: 68-69). However, it must be added that, in TJS, in present temporality this occurs only with the verb ידע ‘to know’ in 1/2.sg., e.g. I.17.28 ידענא ית בקרנותך ‘I know your thoughtlessness’ [ידעת], I.24.21 ידענא ‘I know (that ...)’ [ידעת], II.17.8 את ידעת ית אבוק ‘you know your father (and his men)’ [ידעת]. In addition, Bombeck’s formulation (1997a: 68), if I understand it correctly, suggests that the use of *qātel* for BH stative *qatal* obtains in present temporality only. This is not accurate, as the following instances of past temporality attest: I.1.5 ארי ית חנה רחם ‘for he loved [אהב] Hannah’, I.3.15 ושמואל דחיל ‘and Samuel feared’ [ירא], I.22.22/II.1.10 ידענא ‘I knew’ [ידעת], II.15.11 ולא ידעין ‘and they did not know’ [ולא ידען], II.16.23 ומלכא ... דמליך ‘and the counsel ... that he was counselling [יעין] in those days’. Obviously, in instances such as II.13.22 ארי סני אבשלום ית אמנון ‘for Absalom hated [שנא] Amnon’ one cannot establish whether one is dealing with a VerbAdj or with *qatal*. Finally, I.20.39 ועולימא לא ידע מרעם ברם יהונתן ודוד ידעין ית פתגמא ‘and the young man knew [ידע] nothing, only Jonathan and David knew [ידע] the matter’ is a case in point, as the verb ‘to know’ occurs twice, both times with *qatal* in BH, but once with *qatal* and once with *qātel* in TJ.

‘will Saul reign over us?’], I.14.5 שָׁנָא חֲדָא מִסְתַּכִּיָּא מִצְפוֹנָא ‘one crag looked out from the North’ [הָשָׁן הָאֶחָד מִצּוֹק מִצְפוֹן] ‘onetooth was (like) a pillar northwards’], I.23.13 בְּאֵשֶׁר יִהְיֶה לָהֶם לָלֶכֶת ‘in a place it was fitting to go’ [בְּאֵשֶׁר יִהְיֶה לָהֶם לָלֶכֶת] ‘wherever they could go’], I.28.7 אִתְּתָא דִּידְעָא לְאַסְקָא בְּדִין ‘a woman who knows how to bring up lying oracles’ [אִתְּתָא דִּידְעָא לְאַסְקָא בְּדִין] ‘a woman mistress of necromancy’], II.15.20 לְאֵתֶר דְּלִית אֲנָא יָדַע (and I am going) to a place that I do not know (where I am going)’ [עַל אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי הוֹלֵךְ] ‘(I am going) I know not where’].¹³⁰

2.3.4 INTENTIONAL PROSPECTIVE: ‘*Qātel*/OF INTENTION’

As seen above, *qātel* is used to refer to imperfective (i.e. progressive, iterative or stative) SoAs that obtain, obtained or will obtain at some point in time. With special reference to the present/future temporal sphere, however, *qātel* knows another function.

Essentially, *qātel* can be used in direct speech to refer to a SoA supposed to occur at some later point in time, whether near or remote. In contrast to *yiqtol*, which in such a context would refer to the SoA itself,¹³¹ *qātel* actually conveys the intention to let the SoA occur. As such, the SoA’s nature (fientive/stative, instantaneous/durative, etc.) and aspectuality are irrelevant, since what is actually referred to is not the future SoA itself, but rather the present attitude of the speaker. In that sense, this use of *qātel* can be considered a specific type of the prospective aspect, as it allows to look forward to a future SoA from the standpoint of the present. In view of the intentionality it involves, we will refer to it as ‘intentional prospective’.

The actual doer of the SoA (i.e. the one upon whom the advent of the SoA depends or by whom it is supposed to happen) is usually the speaker him/herself, e.g. I.3.11 הָאֲנָא עֲבִיד פִּתְגָמָא בִּישְׂרָאֵל ‘Behold I am doing something in Israel’, I.23.4 אֲנָא מְסַר יָת פִּלְשְׁתִּיָּא בִּידְךָ ‘I am giving the Philistines into your hand’, I.24.5 אֲנָא מְסַר יָת בְּעַל דְּבִבְךָ בִּידְךָ ‘I am giving your enemy into your hand’, II.12.11 הָאֲנָא מְקִים עֲלֶיךָ בִּישָׂא מִבֵּיתְךָ ‘behold I am raising evil from

¹³⁰ Cf. JM (§158o). As with fientives SoAs (cf. footnote n.126 above), however, in direct discourse stative *qātel* is occasionally used for the expression of future (imperfective) SoAs in the *foreground*, e.g. I.1.14 עַד אֲמַתִּי אֶת מִשְׁתַּחֲסִיָּא ‘how long will you be demented?’, I.16.1 עַד אֲמַתִּי אֶת מִתְאַבֵּל עַל שְׂאוּל ‘how long will you be grieving over Saul?’. But this phenomenon remains largely marginal, *yiqtol* being the rule for future foregrounded SoAs (cf. V:2.2.1).

¹³¹ I.e. to its posteriority with regard to the moment of reference [$t_r < \text{SoA}$], which, in direct speech, typically coincides with the moment of utterance, thus [$t_u = t_r < \text{SoA}$].

your house’. But the doer can also be another party, e.g. I.6.3 אִם מְשַׁלְחִין ‘if you are to send away the ark of the God of Israel’, I.12.16 דִּי עֵבִיד לַעֲיִנְכֹן ‘(and see this great thing) that the Lord is doing before your eyes’.

In any event, *qātel* refers to the doer’s attitude towards the SoA, whether it is a simple statement of an intention or resolve, a promise or a pledge, etc.¹³² As a result, pragmatically speaking *qātel* actually conveys a state (‘X has the intention to SoA, X has on his/her mind to SoA, X is planning to SoA’) and the occurrence of the SoA being intimately connected to the intention that underlies it, impressionistically the SoA is presented as being already in progress.

In this function, *qātel* usually corresponds to BH *qotel*, which also has such a use.¹³³

2.4 VOLITIONALS *yiqtol* AND *qtol*

The Aramaic of TJS has various conjugations to express volitional modality, which can be defined as the linguistic expression of a volition that the SoA may (or may not) obtain.

BH has a greater variety of conjugations than TJS to express volitional modality, however, and just as in the case of *yiqtol* it may therefore be useful to examine the state of affairs in the Vorlage. BH possesses three volitive forms: *yiqtol* (‘Jussive’), *qtol* (‘Imperative’)¹³⁴ and *eqtlā* (‘Cohortative’).¹³⁵ These forms cover various types of volitions, e.g. wishes, resolves, injunctions, commands, prayers, requests (etc.), depending on the context in which they are used and on whose will is involved.¹³⁶ The fientivity and stativity of the SoAs is irrelevant. In addition, when a

¹³² This can also be used as a rhetorical device expressing confidence or certainty that a given SoA will obtain, e.g. I.12.16.

¹³³ Cf. JM (§121e).

¹³⁴ The Imperative also knows a specific form *qotlā*, known as the ‘Imperative with paragogic ā’ (cf. JM §48d). The Aramaic of TJS does not possess such a form and renders both *qtol* and *qotlā* invariably as *qtol*.

¹³⁵ Generally, the Cohortative *eqtlā* is typical of the 1st person, the Imperative *qtol* (and *qotlā*) of the 2nd person and the Jussive *yiqtol* of the 3rd person. Since the Imperative cannot be negated, the Jussive is regularly used with the negative particle ܠ in the 2nd person, and has then the value of a negated Imperative.

¹³⁶ Cf. JM (§114, §116).

volitive form follows upon another and is accompanied by the conjunction *waw*,¹³⁷ the function of the second volitive varies according to the semantic nature of the *waw* ('simple' *waw* or 'energetic' *waw*). In the former case the second volition is merely juxtaposed to the first, completing or adding to its meaning (direct volitive, e.g. 'let's SoA₁, and let's SoA₂'); in the latter case, however, the second volition is subordinated to the first and takes on a nuance of consecution and purpose (indirect volitive, e.g. 'let's SoA₁, so that SoA₂').¹³⁸

The so-called 'entreating particle' נ (loosely translated as 'please !'), which often accompanies volitives in BH,¹³⁹ is rendered in TJS as כען (lit. 'now').¹⁴⁰ In addition, TJS does not have a specific negative particle for volitives the way Hebrew does: BH לא¹⁴¹ is regularly translated with the general negative particle ל in TJS.

In contrast to BH, the Aramaic of TJ has only one *formally distinct* volitive form: the Imp. (u)qtol. This form is regularly used to translate BH (u)qtol and (w^e)qatlā.¹⁴² Specific Coh. and Juss. forms are not attested in the Aramaic of TJS,¹⁴³ and as a rule BH Juss. (w^e)yiqtol and Coh.

¹³⁷ More rarely, the volitive follows upon a non-volitive form (cf. JM §116). But this has no impact on the behaviour of the volitive and on the behaviour of the corresponding form in TJS.

¹³⁸ Cf. JM (§115).

¹³⁹ Cf. JM (§105c).

¹⁴⁰ The rendition of BH נ with TJ כען is as a rule absolutely faithful, i.e. the particle כען is used only if the Vorlage features it, and when used it follows BH word order as closely as possible. On the whole, only two deviations from the Vorlage are found in TJS. In one case (II.24.10 אעבר ית חובא דעבדך '(and now O Lord,) take away the sin of your servant' [BH אעבר נא את עון עבדך]), כען is omitted where the Vorlage has נ, but this may be a scribal error in Or 2210 (according to Sperber's edition, most other manuscripts feature it); in one other case כען is inserted where the Vorlage does not have נ: I.4.3 נסב כען לנא 'let us take now for ourselves (from Shiloh the ark of the covenant of the Lord)' [BH נקחה אלינו].

¹⁴¹ Cf. JM (§102j).

¹⁴² Occasionally TJS *uqtol* corresponds to BH *w^eqataltí*, e.g. I.12.24 ופלחי קדמוהי '(but fear the Lord) and worship [ועבדתם אתו] before him!', I.22.5 איתא ואיזיל לך לארעא דבית יהודה 'come, and go to the land of the house of Judah' [לך ובא לך]. The fact that we encounter *uqtol* instead of *w^eyiqtol* (the expected rendition of *w^eqataltí* in TJS) may suggest that TJS has preferred to express succession (or simple juxtaposition) rather than purpose/consecution (one will note that such fluctuation is also found in BH, cf. JM §119i). For a slightly different interpretation, cf. Bombeck (1997a: 150).

¹⁴³ This is an important difference between the Aramaic of TJ and older types of

(*w^e*)*eqtlā* are rendered by TJ (*w^e*)*yiqtol* in the appropriate person.¹⁴⁴ Examples of direct volitives are numerous in our corpus:

- BH Coh.: I.9.5 ונתוב '(come,) and let us return', I.14.36 נהקרב 'let us draw near', II.3.21 אקום ואזיל ואכנוש 'I will rise and go and gather', II.14.15 אמליל כען קדם מלכא 'let me now speak before the king', II.16.9 אעבר כען ואעדרי ית רישיה 'let me pass over now and take off his head';
- BH Juss.: I.12.20 לא תדחלון 'do not be afraid', I.17.8 וייהות לותי '(choose ... a man) and let him come down unto me!', I.26.19 וכען ישמע כען ויסגי שמך עד עלמא 'and now let my master king hear', II.7.26 לא יבאש בעינך ית פתגמא הדין 'and your name will be great forever', II.11.25 לא תשוין ית לביך לפתגמא הדין 'let not this thing be evil in your eyes', II.13.20 'do not set your heart on this matter', II.14.2 ולא תשופין 'and do not pour';
- BH Imp.: I.14.7 עביד כל דבלבך 'do everything that is in your heart', I.9.18 חוי כען לי 'tell me now (where...)', I.25.8 שאל ית עולימך 'ask your young men', II.1.9 קום כען עלי וקשולני 'stand now ... and kill me', II.3.14 'give my wife', II.14.12 מלילי 'speak'.

The nuance of consecution/purpose is often a subtle one, so that it may be difficult to identify instances of indirect volitives unequivocally. The following, however, can be safely considered of the indirect type:

- BH Coh.: I.11.3 ונשלח אנדן '(wait for us seven days,) that we may send messengers', I.27.5 ואתיב תמן '(let them give me a place ...) so that I may live in it', II.14.7 ונקטלניה '(give over the one who killed his brother) so that we may kill him', II.20.16 ואמליל עמך '(draw near here,) that I may speak with you';
- BH Juss.: I.7.3 וישויב יתכון '(set your heart for the service of the Lord ...) that he save you', I.12.17 ויתין קלין ומטר '(let me pray before the Lord) that he give thunder and rain', I.12.19 ולא נמות '(pray ... before the Lord your God) that we may not die' [ואל נמות], I.25.8

Aramaic, in which a specifically Juss. conjugation can be formally distinguished from the 'Imperfect' conjugation (cf. V:4.2).

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Bombeck (1997a: 95, 97-98). The conjugation *yiqtol* in TJ otherwise has a variety of uses (posteriority, deontic modality and imperfectivity), which entails that strictly speaking it is not possible to establish with any certainty whether a specifically volitive nuance was intended in the use of (*w^e*)*yiqtol* to render the BH volitives. The examples of (*w^e*)*yiqtol* below have therefore been collected on the sole basis of the BH conjugations — Juss. or Coh. — (*w^e*)*yiqtol* is used to render. Likewise, according to Bombeck (1997a: 103) in TJ the indirect use of the volitives as an indication of consecution and purpose is not a part of the meaning of the forms themselves. As a result, a form such as *uqtol* does not convey more than a coordinated volition.

- ויתוב לאתריה (ask your young men) that they tell you', I.29.4 ויחזון לך
'(make this man return,) that he return to his place';
- BH Imp.: II.11.25 ופגרה (strengthen your attack against the city) and destroy it!', II.21.3 וברכנו ית אחסנת עמא דיין (what shall I do to you ...) so that you may bless the inheritance of the people of the Lord?¹⁴⁵

Sometimes, the use of $(w^e)yiqtol$ and $(u)qtol$ in TJS has no direct equivalent in BH, because TJS either adds a passage, or translates an existing one differently:

- Examples of a volitive in TJS without a verb form in the Vorlage:¹⁴⁶
II.15.19 איזיל לך לאתריך (and if you are an exile,) go to your own place', II.15.20 ועבד עמהון טיבו וקשומ (and do with them goodness and truth!'), II.20.18 אדכר כען (remember now (what is written ...));
- Examples of $(w^e)yiqtol$ and $(u)qtol$ in TJS with $(w^e)yiqtol$, $(w^e)eqtlā$ or $(u)qtol$ of a different verbal lexeme in the Vorlage: I.12.3 אסחידו בי (bear witness against me!) ענו בן [answer me], I.14.36 ונקטול בהון עד (and let us plunder them) until the morning light', I.26.24 כן תיקר נפשי קדם יי (so let my life be precious [let (my life) be great] before the Lord', II.13.6 ואיכול מן ידה (and I will eat [ואברה] from her hand'.

2.5 *Qtil*

According to the present study, the primary function of *qtil*¹⁴⁷ in TJS is the expression of perfect (as against perfective) stativity in relative simultaneity: *qtil* conveys a stative SoA presented as the product of a fientive SoA that is completed at the moment of reference, i.e. a state of

¹⁴⁵ I.28.22 features a remarkable sequence of indirect volitives, mirrored by the corresponding forms in TJS: ואשי קדמך פתא דלחמא ואכול ויהי בך חיל (and let me set [ואשימה] before you a piece of bread, so that you may eat [ואכול] and (so that) there may be [ויהי] strength in you'.

¹⁴⁶ As a result of its versatility, it is not possible to establish whether $(w^e)yiqtol$, in any given instance in which it is inserted, is really intended to express a volition (as against posteriority and deontic/epistemic modality) in TJ. Accordingly, only instances involving $(u)qtol$, the only conjugation that is distinctly volitive in the Aramaic of TJS, are mentioned here.

¹⁴⁷ As already noted (V:1.1), the form *qtil* designates the 'passive participle' of the active stems: *peal (qtil)*, *paal (m^eqattal*, also *m^equttal* and quadriliterals of the type *m^ešūqtal*, cf. Dalman 1905: 253, 283) and *afel (maqtal)*.

‘having been done’.¹⁴⁸ Like *qātel*, the meaning of *qtil* is purely aspectual. As a rule, temporal considerations are not part of the semantics of the form itself and must be recovered from the discourse type or general context. Moreover, when situated in past or future temporality, the stative SoA expressed by *qtil* is, again like *qātel*, normally part of the background.

In the sphere of the past (background in narrative discourse): I.2.18 עולימא אסיר כרדוט דבין ‘the young man was girt with a sleeved tunic of linen’, I.5.4 וריש דגון ותרתינ פסת ידוהי קצצן ‘and the head of Dagon and the two palms of his hands were cut off’, I.26.7 ומורניתיה נעיצא בארעא ‘and his spear was stuck in the ground’, II.1.2 ולבושוהי מבועין ‘and his garments were torn’, II.15.11 מאתן גברין מירושלם זמנין ‘two hundred men (who) were summoned from Jerusalem’, II.15.30 וריש ליה מכרך ‘and his head was covered’, II.20.3 והואה נמירן ‘and they were guarded’.

In the sphere of the present (direct discourse): I.9.24 לזמנא נמיר לך ‘for (this) occasion it is kept for you’, I.14.24 ליט גברא דייכול לחמא עד רמשא ‘cursed is the man who will eat bread until evening’, I.21.10 הא היא מכרכא בשופנא ‘behold it is wrapped in the cloak’, I.23.21 בריכין אתון קדם יי ‘blessed are you before the Lord’, I.26.19 ליטין און קדם יי ‘cursed are they before the Lord’, II.1.18 הא כתיבא ‘behold it is written’, II.18.10 הא חזיתי ית אבשלום תלי בבושמא ‘behold, I have seen Absalom suspended in the terebinth’.¹⁴⁹

Qtil typically corresponds to its BH counterpart *qatul*, as in the examples above. Very often, however, the use of *qtil* in TJS has no direct equivalent in BH, because TJS either adds a passage, or translates an existing one differently:

- a) Examples of *qtil* in TJS without a verb form in the Vorlage: I.2.3 ועל כל עובדוהי מתיח דינא ‘and upon all his works judgement is extended’, I.2.26 ותריצין עבדוהי בנו בני אנשא ‘and his works were upright among the sons of men’, I.2.27 ומשעבדין לבית פרעה ‘and (when they were) enslaved to the house of Pharaoh’, I.5.4 מוחתן על סקופתא ... ‘and the head of Dagon and the two palms of his hands were ... placed on the threshold’, I.14.13 ונפלו מטענין קדם יונתן ‘and they fell wounded before Jonathan’, I.15.29 כבר גזיר עלך ‘it is already decreed upon you’, I.20.25 שויא דמתקן ליה ‘the seat that was prepared for

¹⁴⁸ For a similar view, cf. Bombeck (1997a: 28, 189).

¹⁴⁹ The text of TJS does not feature any instance of *qtil* in future temporality reflecting *qatul* in the Vorlage. For cases of *qtil* with a different (or without) Vorlage, cf. below.

him', I.22.23 'for you are kept (safe) with me' [משמרת אתה] lit. 'you are watch'], II.1.2 'and dust was thrown upon his head', II.8.16 'and Joab ... was appointed over the army';

- b) Examples of *qtil* in TJS without *qatul* in the Vorlage: I.5.4 'and behold Dagon was thrown down [נפל] upon his face upon the ground', I.9.16 'for the distress of my people is revealed before me' [כי ראיתי את עמי] 'for I have seen my people', I.10.22 'behold he is hidden [נחבא] among the baggage', I.16.7 'before the Lord are revealed the plans of the heart' [ויהוה יראה ללבב] 'and the Lord sees to the heart', I.20.7 'evil is determined [כלתה] from him', I.21.5 'if the young men are kept from the defilement of woman' [אם נמירין עולימוא לחוד מסואבת אתתא] 'have abstained ... from women', I.22.9 'and he was appointed [נצב] over the servants of Saul', II.5.12 'and that his kingdom was exalted' [נשא] 'he had exalted', II.7.16 'the throne of your kingdom will be made secure [נכון] forever', II.17.2 'and his hands will be weakened' [והוא ... weak of hands]',¹⁵⁰
- c) Finally, occasionally *qtil* is employed in a sense that has been described as 'active'.¹⁵¹ In TJS, such a use of *qtil* usually pertains to mental attitudes, e.g. I.15.2 'I remember (what Amaleq did)', I.23.11 'does Saul intend to come down?', II.19.44 'and also in David I delight more than you', II.22.3 'I trust'. But this use of *qtil* is apparently not restricted to mental attitudes, e.g. II.1.6 'and Saul was leaning [נשען] upon his spear', where the verb denotes a physical position.¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ Like *qātel*, *qtil* can occasionally be used in direct discourse to express situations in the foreground in the future (cf. footnotes n.126 and 130 above). Only one unambiguous instance is encountered in TJS: II.20.21 'behold his head is (lit.) about to have been thrown [משלך] to you from the wall'. One may suggest that here too the future is presented as certain.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Dalman (1905: 283-284), Bombeck (1997a: 28). This phenomenon is known from other Aramaic dialects, e.g. Syriac (cf. Nöldeke 1898: 211). For an analogous phenomenon in BH, cf. JM (§121o), who suggest that this use of *qatul* has resultative force.

¹⁵² The forms יתיב and שרי are not *qtil*, but *qātel* in TJS, e.g. II.7.2 'and the ark of the Lord dwells in the tent'.

The instances adduced above do not exhaust the use of *qtil* in TJS. The wealth of instances that do not render *qatul* in the Vorlage suggests that *qtil* is not only a fully active grammatical device in the Aramaic of TJS, but also used much more productively than its counterpart *qatul* in BH.

2.6 THE INFINITIVE FORMS: *Miqtal* AND *Miqtāl*

The Aramaic of TJS possesses two infinitive forms: the Inf.C. *miqtal* and the Inf.A. *miqtāl*.¹⁵³ Just like their BH counterparts, by nature TJS *miqtal* and *miqtāl* are verbal nouns, combining nominal and verbal properties, and are unmarked for temporality, aspectuality and modality.¹⁵⁴

2.6.1 *Miqtal*: THE CONSTRUCT INFINITIVE

TJS uses the Inf.C. in a way very similar to BH. Essentially, as in BH the Inf.C. in TJS can be employed both nominally and verbally,¹⁵⁵ and can

¹⁵³ On the existence of the Inf.A. in the Aramaic of TJS, cf. V:2.6.2.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. JM (§123, §124); WoC (§35, §36).

¹⁵⁵ When one has a close look at the criteria employed to draw the line between the nominal and verbal uses of the Inf.C. in BH (e.g. WoC: §36.1.2), however, one realizes that there are very few hard facts to tell them apart. The presence or absence of the preposition לְ to introduce the Inf.C. (cf. JM §124m) has no bearing on its nominal or verbal character (e.g. I.15.22^{BH} שָׁמַע מִזְבֵּחַ טוֹב לְהִקְשִׁיב מִחֻלָּב אֵילִים ‘to obey is better than sacrifice, (and) to hearken than the fat of rams’, cf. JM §124b), nor does the presence or absence of an object, whether direct or indirect. In the end, the sole indisputable argument is the *casus* of the subject of the Inf.C. (nominative when verbal, genitive when nominal: cf. JM §124g), the recognition of which is not facilitated by the absence of case distinctions in BH. All in all, aside from some instances in which the vocalisation of the form provides clues (JM §124g), the only cases in which one can establish that the subject is in the genitive, and therefore the Inf.C. nominal, are (1) when the Inf.C. bears a pronominal suffix and one can ascertain that this suffix expresses the subject, e.g. when the *casus* of the suffix is morphologically marked (only 1.sg.: קָטַלְתִּי as against קָטַלְתָּ, cf. JM §65a), or (2) when the verb in the Inf.C. is intransitive (e.g. בֹּאֲךָ ‘your coming’), or (3) when the verb is transitive but otherwise provided with an explicit, non-suffixal object (e.g. קָטַלְתָּ אֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ ‘his killing the king’), all of which indicate the genitive of the subject (*genitivus subjecti*) and therefore the nominal character of the Inf.C. (cf. JM §124i). In Aramaic specifically, the use of the *d*-relation (e.g. I.18.19 אֲתִיבָא דְמֵרַב ‘the being given of Merab’), by its very nature a genitive construction, can be another clear indication of the *genitivus subjecti* and therefore of the nominal

fulfil different semantic and syntactic functions in the clause. In addition, another matter of import is the question of the presence or absence of the preposition *ל-* to introduce the Inf.C.: whereas BH can dispense with a preposition, featuring a bare Inf.C., TJS is considerably less flexible in this regard. For obvious reasons, this question is mainly relevant when the Inf.C. fulfils the function of subject or direct object, i.e. is not already governed by a preposition or the A-term of a genitive construction.¹⁵⁶

1. Subject of the clause:¹⁵⁷

I.15.22 *הא קבלא למימריה מנכסת קדשין טב לאצתא למלי נביהי מתרב פשימין* ‘behold accepting [שמע ‘listening’] his Memra is better than holy offerings, to listen [להקשיב ‘to hearken’] to the words of the prophets is better than the fat of fatlings’, I.16.4 *שלם מיתך [בואך] peaceful?’*, I.18.23 *הועירא בעיניכון לאתחתנא במלכא* ‘is it a small thing in your eyes to become a son-in-law [התחתן] to the king?’, I.29.6 *ותקין בעיני מפקך ומיעלך [צאתך] and your coming in [באך] are good in my eyes*, II.7.27 *על כין הות בלבא דעבדך לצלאה קדמך* ‘therefore it was good in the eyes of your servant to pray before you’ [על כן מצא עבדך את לבו] ‘and your going out [צאתך] and your coming in [באך] are good in my eyes’, II.7.27 *על כן מצא עבדך את לבו* ‘therefore has your servant found in his heart to pray’, II.18.11 *ועלי פון למתן לך עסר סלעין דכסף* (lit.) ‘and it would have been upon me to give [לתת] you ten selas of silver’, II.20.18 *הכדין הוה לך למשאל באבל* ‘thus it was for you to inquire in Abel’ [/]

Overall, the use of the Inf.C. as subject is not very frequent in TJS.¹⁵⁸

use of the Inf.C. As a result of the above, the distinction between the nominal and verbal uses of the Inf.C. is largely immaterial and will be referred to only when relevant for the discussion.

¹⁵⁶ As a note of interest, it is also relevant in the case of *negated* Inf.C. BH regularly negates the Inf.C. with the particle *לבלתי*, e.g. II.14.7^{BH} *לבלתי שום לאישי שם* ‘in order not to place for my husband a name and a remainder on the face of the earth’, II.14.13^{BH} *לבלתי השיב המלך את נדחו* ‘in that the king does not bring back his exiled one’, II.14.14^{BH} *לבלתי ידח ממנו נדח* ‘so as not to scatter from him an exile’. TJS, for its part, uses the construction *ל-* *בדיל דלא* to introduce the Inf.C., which involves the preposition *ל-*: II.14.7 *בדיל דלא לשואה*, II.14.13 *בדיל דלא לאתבא*, II.14.14 *בדיל דלא לבדרא*.

¹⁵⁷ Due to the occasional paucity of the evidence in TJS, in contrast to the practice adopted in other sections of this chapter the section below displays relevant instances of the Inf.C., whether paralleled or not by the Vorlage. The state of affairs will be clarified by the systematic addition of the Vorlage between square brackets.

¹⁵⁸ In addition, when an Inf.C. is used as the subject of the clause TJS follows BH in its wavering gender agreement (cf. JM §124b). Thus we find masculine agreement

2. Direct object of the clause:

I.3.6/I.3.8 ואוסיף יי מקרי (lit.) ‘and the Lord continued to call’ [קרא], I.3.21 ואוסיף יי לאתגלאה ‘and the Lord continued to reveal Himself’ [להראא], I.14.35 שרי למבני מרבחא ‘he began to build [לבנות] an altar’, I.16.18 ידע לנגנא ‘(a son of Jesse ..., who) knows how to play’ [לשון], I.18.2 ולא שבקיה למתב ‘and he did not let him return’ [לשוב], I.26.23 ולא אביתי לאושמא ‘and I did not want to send forth’ [לשלח], II.3.25 למדע ית מפקך וית מיעלך ‘in order to know your going forth [מוצאך] and your coming in [מבואך]’, II.12.23 האכול לאתבותיה ‘can I bring him back?’ [להשיב], II.20.19 לית אנחנא צריכין למסב ‘we do not need to take’ [ל/].

As the examples above have shown, when the BH Inf.C. is subject or direct object of the clause, TJS regularly inserts the preposition ל- (in its semantically neutral value):¹⁵⁹

- a) Direct object: the insertion of ל- is the rule, e.g. I.15.9 ולא אבו לגמרותהון ‘and they did not want to destroy them’ [ולא אבו החרים], I.16.18 ידע לנגנא ‘(a son of Jesse ..., who) knows how to play’ [ידע נגן];¹⁶⁰
- b) Subject: (insertion of ל-:) I.18.23 הועירא בעיניכון לאתחתנא במלכא ‘is it a small thing in your eyes to become a son-in-law [התחתן] to the king?’; (no insertion of ל-:) I.15.22 הא קבלא למימריה מנכסת קדשין שב ‘behold accepting [שמע ‘listening’] his Memra is better than holy offerings’.¹⁶¹

in I.15.22 and I.29.6, and feminine agreement in I.18.23. In the same vein, when TJS deviates from the Vorlage gender agreement varies, e.g. masculine in II.20.18; feminine in II.7.27.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. JM (§124m).

¹⁶⁰ Similarly, the odd construction I.16.16^{BH} ידע מנגן ‘knowing (how) to play’ is resolved with a regular infinitive structure ידע לנגנא. The only two exceptions to the compulsory use of the preposition ל- are I.3.6/8 ואוסיף יי מקרי ‘and the Lord called again’ [ויסף יהוה קרא], where TJS reproduces the bare Inf.C. of the Vorlage. Be that as it may, extending the analysis to the whole of TJFP confirms that the addition of ל- to the Inf.C. in object function is the rule rather than the exception, e.g. Jos 3.7 יכילית למעבר ‘I was able to do’ [אחל גדלך], Jdg 8.3 אשרי לרבייתך ‘I will begin to magnify you’ [אחל גדלך], 1kgs 3.7 לית אנא ידע למפק ולמיעל ‘I do not know (how) to go out or come in’ [יכלתי עשות], 2kgs 13.23 ולא אבא לחבלותהון ‘and he did not want to destroy them’ [לא אדע צאת ובא]. Finally, the fact that the presence of the preposition ל- is the rule in TJS is clear from the passages in which TJS features an Inf.C. absent from the Vorlage, e.g. I.3.2 החלו כחות ‘began (to become) dim’ [החלו כחות] ‘and his eyes began to dim’ ועיניו שריאה למכהי, I.3.7 עד לא אוליף למדע אלפן מן קדם יי ‘and he had not yet learnt to know instruction from before the Lord’ [טרם ידע את יהוה] ‘he did not yet know the Lord’.

¹⁶¹ When BH features an Inf.C. without preposition but with a pronominal suffix

3. Indirect (i.e. prepositional) object of the clause:

I.10.13 'and he ceased to praise' [מהתנבוח 'to prophesy'],
I.23.13 'and he withdrew from going forth' [ויחדל לצאת].

With the exception of the preposition מן 'from', cases involving an Inf.C. as prepositional object of a verb are not overly frequent in Samuel.

4. Genitive: the Inf.C. can also be used as the B-term of a genitive relation. In TJS, this occurs generally in prepositional phrases of time involving the nouns יום 'day', עת 'time' and זמן 'time', e.g.:

I.1.7 'in the time of her going up', I.18.30 'at the time of their going forth', I.21.7 'on the day of its being taken away', II.11.1 'at the time of the going forth of the kings'.

5. With prepositions: the Inf.C. can be used in prepositional phrases with various semantic functions:

a) Temporal: depending on the exact temporal nuance (simultaneity, anteriority, etc.) conveyed, various prepositions can be used: I.10.8 'you shall wait until I come', I.17.28 'when he was speaking', I.18.6 'when they came in', II.3.13 'before you bring Michal', II.15.10 'when you will hear', II.17.21 'and after their going'. The temporal use of the Inf.C. is very frequent, particularly in conjunction with a form of the verb הזה, e.g. I.13.10 'and as he completed offering up the holocaust'.¹⁶²

b) Purpose: various prepositions are encountered. Most usually, ל- alone is sufficient to express purpose, e.g.: I.1.3 'to worship and to sacrifice', I.17.15 'and David was going and returning ... to pasture the sheep', II.10.11 'to rescue you', II.14.16 'for the king will hear), to save his handmaid', II.16.2 'for the eating of the young men, (and the wine is) for the drinking of those grown weak'.

But BH features other prepositions as well, such as למען and לבעבור.

denoting the subject, ל- is not added in TJS, e.g. I.16.4 'is your coming peaceful?', I.29.6 'and your going out and your coming in are good in my eyes'.

¹⁶² This construction is usually considered a Hebraism (cf. Lambdin & Huehnergard, unpublished: 29).

In TJS, both are rendered with *בדיל* that, interestingly enough, is always accompanied by the preposition *ל-*: I.1.6 *בדיל לאקנייתה* ‘in order to make her jealous’, I.15.15 *בדיל לדבחה* ‘in order to sacrifice’, I.17.28 *בדיל למחזי עבדי קרבא* ‘for in order to see the wagers of battle (you have come down)’, II.10.3 *הלא בדיל למחקר ית ארעא* ‘is it not to investigate the land?’, II.18.18 *בדיל לאדכרא שמי* ‘to make my name remembered’.

- c) Consecution: the preposition *ל-* is usually employed (which at times blurs the line between purpose and consecution),¹⁶³ e.g. I.4.19 *מערדיא למילד ... וכלתיה* ‘and his daughter-in-law ... was pregnant to (the point of) giving birth’, II.13.2 *ועקת לאמנון לאתמורעא* ‘and it distressed Amnon to (the point of) falling sick’, II.22.5 *היא מסכנא לממת* ‘she is endangered to (the point of) dying’ [/].

But other prepositions are occasionally used, e.g. *על גב* ‘upon, next to’, as in I.19.5/I.28.21 *כעל גב לאתקטלא* ‘(and I/he gave up my/his life) so as to be killed’ [/].

- d) Epexegetical:¹⁶⁴ here again the preposition *ל-* is standard, e.g. I.12.17 *למשאל לכון מלכא* ‘(great is your wickedness, which you have done) to request for yourselves a king’, I.14.33 *למיכל על דמא* ‘(the people are sinning before the Lord) to eat even the blood’, I.19.5 *למקטל ית דויד מנן* ‘(and why are you guilty of innocent blood,) to kill David for nothing?’, II.12.9 *למעבר דביש קדמי* ‘(why have you despised the word of the Lord) to do what is evil before me?’, II.14.20 *למודע* ‘(and my master is wise ...,) in that he knows’. The common phrase *למימר* ‘(by) saying’, counterpart in TJS of BH *לאמר*, is a prominent example of this type.
- e) Means: the preposition *ב-* is used: I.11.2 *במיקר לכון כל עינא דימניא* ‘(I will cut a covenant for you) by digging out for you every right eye’, II.5.6 *אלהין באעדיותך* ‘(you shall not enter here) except by your removing’ [*כי אם הסירך* ‘except your removing’].
- f) Comparative: the preposition *כ-* is the rule: I.15.22 *כקבלא למימרא דיוי* ‘(is there delight before the Lord in holocausts and holy offerings) as in accepting the Memra of the Lord?’ [*כשמע בקול יהוה*], II.3.33 *כמימנא* ‘should Abner die as wicked men die?’, II.3.34 *כמפל קדם* ‘as one falls before wicked men, you have fallen’.

As a rule, TJS Inf.C. *miqtal* corresponds to BH Inf.C. *qtol*. In certain cases, however, the use of *miqtal* in TJS has no direct equivalent in BH,

¹⁶³ Cf. JM (§124I).

¹⁶⁴ Lat. *faciendo*. Also termed ‘explanatory’ (cf. WoC §36.2.3e).

because TJS either adds a passage, or translates an existing one differently. Various instances have already been mentioned in the foregoing discussion. Additional examples of *miqṭal* in various semantic and syntactic contexts without a verb form in the Vorlage include: I.2.28 לשמשא קדמי 'to serve before me', I.9.7 מא עמנא למעבד 'what is with us to do?', I.15.12 אתר לפלגא ביה בותא 'a place in which to divide the spoil', I.17.1 לאחא קרבא (and the Philistines gathered their camp) to wage battle', I.19.10 ולמברוה (David earnestly asked me) למיזל 'to go to Bethlehem', I.22.23 דבעי למקטלי בעי למקטלך 'the one who seeks to kill me [את נפש] seeks to kill you [את נפשך]', I.23.28 למיזל לכא ולכא '(the place in which the heart of the king was divided) to go here and there', I.25.17 למיזל למיזל למיזל '(for evil is determined) to come upon our master', I.30.24 למיזל למיזל למיזל '(the one who was left behind) in order to guard the baggage', II.5.24 לאצלהא קדמך '(for then the angel of the Lord will have gone forth) to prosper before you', II.12.7 למיזל למיזל למיזל '(I anointed you) to be king over Israel', II.20.2 למיזל למיזל למיזל '(and all the men of Israel withdrew ...) to go after Sheba'.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁵ Certain cases of deviation from the Vorlage raise the impression that a faithful rendition of some BH prepositional structures would have produced an awkward grammatical structure in TJS and have then been replaced with some other appropriate construction, e.g. I.15.7/I.27.8^{BH} בואך שור(ה) ‘(as) you go to Shur’ [^{TJ} ומסרניה ביד מלכא lit. ‘(and now come down ..., O king,) and ours is his delivering in the hand of the king!’] [^{TJ} ומסרניה ביד מלכא lit. ‘(and now come down ..., O king,) and ours is his delivering in the hand of the king!’], II.3.18^{BH} ביד דוד עבדי הושע את עמי ‘by the hand of David my servant is (the) saving my people’ [^{TJ} ‘I will save’] (but Gesenius 1910: §113dd4 suggests amending the BH form אושע to הושע ‘I will save’, which makes it consonant with the reading of TJS); II.5.6^{BH} כי אם הסירך העורים והפסחים ‘(you shall not enter here,) except your removing the blind and the lame’ [^{TJ} ‘except by your removing the sinners and the guilty’] (the Targumist retains the Inf.C. but has it introduced by the preposition ב-, thereby highlighting its function as an indication of means); II.6.20^{BH} כהגלות נגלות אחד הרקים כמא דחלין [^{TJ} ‘like the blatant exposing oneself of one of the worthless ones’] (lit.) ‘as one of the worthless (ones) strips and exposes himself’] (BH displays a sequence of two Inf.C., in which the first seems to function as an Inf.A. to the second); II.15.20^{BH} תמול בואך ‘yesterday was your coming’ [^{TJ} ‘yesterday you came’], II.18.29^{BH} לשלח את עבד המלך יואב ואת עבדך ‘(I saw a great tumult) at Joab’s sending the king’s servant and your servant’ [^{TJ} ‘after Joab sent the king’s servant and your servant’] (replacement of the unusual prepositional construction לשלח ‘at the sending’ with a full clause, yet expressing posteriority rather than simultaneity), II.24.13^{BH} אם שלשה חדשים נסך לפני צריך lit. ‘(shall there come to you seven years of famine in your land,) or for three months your fleeing before your enemies?’ [^{TJ} ‘or for three months you will be fleeing’]. Occasionally, however, a BH prepositional structure is maintained in TJS, even when it seems unusual or awkward, e.g. I.25.2^{BH} ויהי בנוז את צאנו בכרמל lit. ‘and he was at shearing his sheep [^{TJ} ויהי במנוז את צאנו in Carmel’, II.24.13^{BH} ואם היות שלשת ימים דבר בארצך

2.6.2 *Miqṭāl*: THE ABSOLUTE INFINITIVE

In addition to the Inf.C. *miqṭal*, the Aramaic of TJS also possesses the Inf.A. *miqṭāl*.¹⁶⁶ TJS is more parcimonious than BH in its use of the Inf.A. Essentially, TJS has only the paronomastic use of the Inf.A. and this use is more restricted than that of its BH counterpart, in that it is subjected to various syntactic constraints.

2.6.2.1 Paronomastic Use of the Infinitive Absolute in Biblical Hebrew

When used paronomastically, the Inf.A. usually has a *modal* nuance.¹⁶⁷ Functioning at the illocutionary level of the clause structure (i.e. at the structural level at which the clause is conceived of as a speech act), it allows one to reinforce the illocutionary force of the clause: in an affirmative clause the affirmation becomes stronger, in a conditional or ‘of that there should be [יָאֵם מָדוּי^{TJ} for three days death in your land?’ (contrast with the rendition of the Inf.C. נָסַךְ in the same verse above).

¹⁶⁶ Contra Bombeck (1997a: 19), who argues that there is no such form as the Inf.A. in the Aramaic of TO and TJ because such cannot be identified on the basis of the consonantal text alone. This view is not correct: the *verba tertiae infirmae* show a clear consonantal contrast between Inf.C. and Inf.A. in the *peal*, thus ‘to weep’ מִבְּכָה/מִבְּכִי *mibkē/mibkā* (e.g. I.30.4/I.1.10); ‘to seek’ מִבְּעָה/מִבְּעִי *mibē/mibā* (e.g. II.5.17/I.20.6), and TJS features other Inf.A. forms without corresponding Inf.C.: I.1.11 מְגַלֵּא ‘reveal’, II.17.10 מְבַסֵּס ‘melt’. This contrast was already noted by Dalman (1905: 339-340) with reference to the Aramaic of TO. It must be granted, however, that the *peal* of the *verba tertiae infirmae* is the only case in which Inf.C. and Inf.A. are distinct in the consonantal text. In the *peal*, all other verb types except the *verba secundae infirmae* indicate their Inf.A. by means of a vocalic contrast only (e.g. ‘to reign’ מִמְלַךְ/מִמְלֵךְ *mimlak/mimlāk*); the *peal* of the *verba secundae infirmae*, and all verb types in the other stems, do not make any distinction at all. Nonetheless, the existence of a consonantal contrast between the two types of infinitives in the *peal* of the *verba tertiae infirmae* allows us to posit that the Inf.A. forms encountered in TJS, whether or not their consonantal structure be morphologically distinct from that of the Inf.C., reflect a genuinely Aramaic grammatical feature rather than some ulterior artificial differentiation for the sake of faithfulness to the Vorlage.

¹⁶⁷ This modal nuance does not seem to result so much from the very nature of the Inf.A. as from the paronomastic character of its use. As will be seen later on, in certain circumstances *qātel* can also be used in TJS to render an Inf.A. in the Vorlage, and there are no reasons to suspect that the function of *qātel* in such contexts is any different from that of *miqṭāl* elsewhere.

interrogative clause the dubitative character becomes stronger, etc.¹⁶⁸

1. The most constant use of paronomastic *miqtāl* is that of ‘prepositive Inf.A.’. When we find *qātōl*/preposed in the Vorlage, TJS almost invariably features *miqtāl* in the same position. Examples include: I.1.10 ומבכא בכיא ‘and she was weeping *very much*’, I.6.3 ארי אתבא תתיבון קדמוהי קרבן אשמא ‘(if you send away the ark of the God of Israel, do not send it away empty;) for *indeed* you should return Him a guilt offering’, I.20.6 אשתאלא אשתאל מני דויד ‘David *urgently* requested [נשאל נשאל] of me (to go to Bethlehem)’, I.22.16 ממות תמות אחימלך ‘*so much is certain*: you shall die, Ahimelech (you and all the house of your father)’, II.1.6 אתערעא אתערעית במורא דגלבע ‘I *happened* to be on the mountain of Gilboa’, II.9.7 מעבר אעביד עמך טיבו ‘(do not fear,) *be assured that* I will do good with you (on account of your father Jonathan)’, II.17.16 ואף מעבר תעבר ‘(do not spend the night in the plains of the wilderness) but *by all means* pass over’, II.19.43 המיכל אכלנא מנכסי מלכא ‘(and why are you angry about this matter?) Did we *ever* eat from the property of the king?’.

2. The range of meaning conveyed by the postpositive Inf.A. is more difficult to capture.¹⁶⁹ In TJS, it is also considerably less frequent than the prepositive Inf.A. One reason for this is that the postpositive use is less frequent than the prepositive in the Vorlage of Samuel as well: TJS therefore merely reflects the state of affairs witnessed in the Vorlage. Another, more significant reason is that the use of the postpositive Inf.A. in TJS is subjected to one specific syntactic constraint unknown in BH, which can be formulated as follows: in TJS, the postpositive use of *miqtāl* is allowed only if *miqtāl* follows *immediately* upon the verb it depends upon, as in II.3.24 ואל מיל ‘and he is quite gone’ [וילך הלך]. When it is separated from the verb by one or more intervening words, *qātel* is used instead, e.g. II.8.2 ומשח להון בערבא רמי יתהון לארעא ‘and he *measured* them with the lot, *casting* them down to the ground’ [compare וימדרם בחבל השכב [אותם ארצה].¹⁷⁰

A more frequent occurrence of the postpositive Inf.A. in the Vorlage of Samuel, however, is its use in conjunction with another Inf.A. (or the VerbAdj *qātel*) in constructions of the type *qātōl w^e qātōl*, or *qātōl w^e qātel*,

¹⁶⁸ JM (§123d), and especially Muraoka (1985a: 83-92).

¹⁶⁹ JM (§123d).

¹⁷⁰ This particular case features no paronomasia (cf. JM §123r). More examples of *qātel* instead of *qātōl* are featured below.

following upon a finite verb and expressing simultaneousness.¹⁷¹ When this happens, TJS systematically behaves as follows: as in the case of the isolate use of the postpositive Inf.A. discussed above, in TJS the first Inf.A. is rendered with *miqtāl* or *qātel* according to whether it does (or does not) follow immediately upon the verb; as for the second form, whether it is an Inf.A. or a VerbAdj in the Vorlage, it is systematically rendered with *qātel* in TJS, inasmuch as by its very position in the construction it does not follow immediately upon the finite verb.¹⁷² This produces the following patterns:

- BH Inf.A. + Inf.A. (immediately postverbal): TJS Inf.A. + *qātel*, e.g. I.6.12 מִיֶּזֶל וְנִעִין חָד אֹרֶן בְּכַבְשָׁא ‘on one path they were going along, *lowing as they went*’ [הֶלֶךְ וְנִעִין], II.15.30 וְסִלְקִין מִסָּב וּבִכְן ‘and they were going up, *weeping as they went*’ [עָלָה וּבִכְה];
- BH Inf.A. + Inf.A. (not immediately postverbal): TJS *qātel* + *qātel*, e.g. I.17.16 וְקָרִיב פְּלִשְׁתָּאָה מִקְרִים וּמַחֲשִׁיךְ ‘and the Philistine drew near *early and late*’ [הֶשְׁכֵּם וְהָעֶרֶב], II.3.16 וְאֹזֵל עִמָּה בַּעֲלָה אֹזֵל וּבִכְי ‘and her husband went along with her, *weeping as he went*’ [הֶלֶךְ וּבִכְה];
- BH InfA + VerbAdj (immediately postverbal): TJS Inf.A. + *qātel*, e.g. I.14.19 וְהַמִּוֶּנֶה ... אֹזֵל מִיֶּזֶל וְסָגִי ‘and the multitude ... was growing *more and more*’ [הֶלֶךְ וְרָב], II.18.25 וְאֹזֵל מִיֶּזֶל וְקָרִיב ‘and he kept coming and approaching’ [הֶלֶךְ וְקָרַב];
- BH InfA + VerbAdj (not immediately postverbal): TJS *qātel* + *qātel*, e.g. II.5.10 וְאֹזֵל דָּוִד אֹזֵל וְסָגִי ‘and David became *greater and greater*’ [הֶלֶךְ וְגָדַל].¹⁷³

¹⁷¹ JM (§123m).

¹⁷² In addition, according to the grammatical standards of the Aramaic of TJS *qātel* is the appropriate form to use, as it indicates a SoA in progress at a given moment (which, in the present context, is the point in time at which the SoA expressed by the finite verb obtains).

¹⁷³ The Vorlage also features three instances (I.19.23, II.13.19 and II.16.13) involving the sequence Inf.A. + finite form (considered doubtful by JM §123n). TJS treats them as follows: the finite form is rendered with *qātel*, which is precisely what we should expect since it expresses an imperfective SoA concomitant with the SoA expressed by the Inf.A. As for the Inf.A., TJS follows the general principle, rendering it with an Inf.A. when it follows immediately upon the finite verb it is postposed to, and with *qātel* otherwise. In II.16.5 the Vorlage features a sequence Inf.A. + *qotel* (immediately post-verbal), which is accordingly rendered with the sequence Inf.A. + *qātel* in TJS. Finally, it is noteworthy that the use of the Inf.A. in constructions of this type is not compulsory in BH: a combination of *qotel* forms is also possible. Obviously, in these cases TJS makes use of its Aramaic counterpart *qātel*. In this regard II.15.30 displays a very interesting configuration, as the phrase ‘going up and weeping’ occurs twice in the same verse, but is expressed in

The BH Inf.A. הרבה being frequently used with a purely adjectival or adverbial meaning ('many, much, a lot'), TJS systematically renders it with the adjective/adverb סגי, as in I.26.21 'behold, I have been exceedingly foolish and stupid', II.8.8 'King David took very much bronze', II.12.2 'the rich man had very many sheep and cattle'.

2.6.2.2 Non-Paronomastic Use of the Infinitive Absolute in Biblical Hebrew

TJS does not feature the Inf.A. in non-paronomastic use. When the Inf.A. is used non-paronomastically in the Vorlage, TJS substitutes another conjugation that fits the contextual meaning of the BH Inf.A., e.g. I.1.9 'after they had drunk' [אחרי שתה], I.2.28 'and I took delight [בחר 'chose'] in him from all the tribes of Israel', I.22.13 'and you inquired [ושאל] for him by the Memra of the Lord', I.25.26 'and your hand from avenging [הושע 'delivering'] yourself', I.25.33 'and my hand from avenging [השע 'delivering'] yourself', II.24.12 'go [הלך] and speak with David!'.¹⁷⁴

By way of summary, the paronomastic use of the BH Inf.A. is rendered in TJS with the Inf.A. or *qātel*, according to a definite pattern.¹⁷⁵ The

BH now by a sequence of *qotel*, now by a sequence of Inf.A.:^{BH} ... עלה ובוכה ... (lit.) 'And David went up ..., *weeping as he went* ... and all the people who were him ... went up, *weeping as they went*'. TJS renders both sequences faithfully, translating them according to its own grammatical standards, i.e. a sequence of *qātel* for the former [סליק ובכי^{TJ}] and a sequence Inf.A. + *qātel* for the latter [מסק ובכן^{TJ}].

¹⁷⁴ For further instances of Inf.A. in non-paronomastic use, cf. Bombeck (1997a: 192-196).

¹⁷⁵ Sometimes TJS translates slightly differently, featuring the Inf.A. of another verb (stem); but this usually does not result in a major alteration of meaning, e.g. I.1.11 'indeed the affliction of your handmaid has been revealed before you' [ראה תראה 'you indeed see'], I.9.6 'everything that he prophesies, is *indeed* realized' [בוא יבוא 'indeed comes to pass'], I.12.25 'but *should* your works *ever* be evil' [הרע תרענ 'indeed you do evil'], I.14.39 'if it be in Jonathan my son, *so much is certain*: he will be killed' [ארי אתקטלא יתקטיל 'he shall certainly die'], I.25.28 'for *I am confident*

non-paronomastic use of the Inf.A. is systematically replaced with other appropriate conjugations. Finally, in some passages involving the Inf.A. in the Vorlage TJS translates non-literally and drops the BH Inf.A. altogether: I.2.16 אורִיךְ עד דיתסקון תרביא ‘wait until the fat pieces be brought up’ [החלב] קטר יקטירון ... ‘let them indeed burn the fat pieces’], I.3.12 אגמר ואשיצי ‘I will consume and destroy’ [החל וכלה] ‘from beginning to end’].¹⁷⁶ In no case, however, does TJS feature the Inf.A. where the Vorlage does not have it.

3. REMARKS ON THE USE OF THE CONJUGATIONS

The sections below discuss four particularities of the verbal system of TJS: (1) occasional deviations in number agreement between a verb and its subject, (2) the periphrastics הוּה + *qātel* or *qtil*, (3) the use of עתיד and (4) aspectual discrepancies between TJS and the Vorlage.

3.1 DEVIATIONS IN NUMBER AGREEMENT

The Aramaic of TJS seems to enforce the number agreement of a verb with its grammatical subject more strictly than BH. Thus, when the subject is plural and the Vorlage features a verb in the singular, TJS not infrequently (though not consistently) features a verb in the plural. Examples: I.1.2 והוו לפננה בנין ‘and Peninnah had children’ [ויהי], I.18.16 וכל ישראל ויהודה רחמין ית דוד ‘and all Israel and Judah loved [אהב] David’, II.3.22 והא עבדי דוד ויזאב אתו ‘and behold the servants of David and Joab came’ [בא], II.12.2 לעתירא הוו ען ותורין סגני לחדא ‘the rich one had very many sheep and cattle’ [היה], II.20.10 ויאב ואבישי אחוהי רדפו ‘and Joab and Abishai his brother pursued’ [רדף], II.21.6 יתחבון לנא שבעה גברין ‘let there be given [ינתן] to us seven men’.

The same also applies to collective nouns. Whereas BH tends to treat that the Lord will establish עשה יעשה ‘will surely make’ for my master a lasting kingdom’, II.12.14 ארי מפתח פתחתא פומא דסנאי עמא דיוי ‘because you have *indeed* opened the mouth of the enemies of the people of the Lord’ נאץ נאצת ‘you have utterly scorned the enemies of the Lord’].

¹⁷⁶ See also I.15.23, II.14.14 and II.23.7. In six cases (I.2.16, I.23.22, II.14.14, II.19.43 and II.20.18 two times) TJS drops the Inf.A. for no obvious reason, in that the Aramaic text, though deviating slightly from the Vorlage, does not differ in such a way as to make the use of the Inf.A. grammatically unthinkable in TJS.

them indifferently as plural or singular,¹⁷⁷ TJS treats them as plural more often than the Vorlage (though this is not systematic), e.g. II.7.10 (and I will appoint a fixed place for my people, for Israel,) and I will establish them [ונשמעתי], and they will reside [ושכן] (...) and they will not be shaken [ירגז] anymore',¹⁷⁸ II.8.14 והיו כל אנש אדום עבדים 'and all the men of Edom were slaves' [ויהי כל אדום עבדים], with sg. verb and pl. predicate], II.10.15 והיו אנש ארם 'and the men of Aram saw' [וירא],¹⁷⁹ II.16.21 ושמעו כל ישראל 'and all Israel will hear' [ושמע], II.19.4 ... כמא דמתגנבין עמא 'and the people stole away [ויתגנב] ... as people steal away' [יתגנב], II.19.10 והיו כל עמא מתוכחין 'and all the people were [ויהי] arguing [נדרין]', II.19.16 ויהודה בא 'and those of the house Judah came' [ויהי יהודה אתו], II.19.29 ארי לא הו כל בית אבא אלהין גברי חייבי קטול 'for all the house of my father were [היה] but men guilty of killing', II.24.9 והיו ישראל 'and Israel was [והיה]'.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁷ JM (§150e).

¹⁷⁸ Interestingly, however, further in the same verse TJS reverts to the singular: 'and sons of wickedness will not continue to afflict it'.

¹⁷⁹ As exemplified in II.8.14 and II.10.15, BH is prone to use toponyms/ethnonyms to refer to ethnic groups, e.g. ^{BH} 'all (the people of) Edom', ^{BH} ארם '(the people of) Aram'. TJS appears to be less fond than BH of such ellipses, and usually resorts to the collective noun אנש in the construct state (e.g. אנש אדום 'the men of Edom'). BH usually treats toponyms/ethnonyms of this type as singular when they follow upon the verb, e.g. II.10.15 וירא ארם 'and (the people of) Aram saw' (exceptions: II.10.17 and II.10.19); TJS for its part treats the corresponding syntagms consistently as plural, e.g. II.10.15 והיו אנש ארם. This also applies to II.8.5, II.8.6, II.10.14, II.10.17, II.10.18 and II.10.19 (exception: in II.10.11, אנש is not inserted in TJS and the singular is maintained). In the same vein, in II.3.1 ובית דויד אולין ותקיפין 'and the house of David was getting stronger [וידוד הלך וחזק]', TJS replaces the singular entity 'David' with 'the house of David' and treats it as plural.

¹⁸⁰ Examples of singular agreement in TJS: I.14.26 ואתא עמא 'and the people came' [ויבא], II.6.19 ואול כל עמא 'and all the people went away [ויילך]', II.17.2 ויערוק כל עמא 'and all the people will flee' [ונס], II.23.11 ועמא אפך 'and the people fled' [נס]. Without Vorlage: I.2.1 תימור כנשתא דישראל 'the assembly of Israel will say'. Moreover, in I.13.15 עמא דאשתכח 'the people who were found' [העם הנמצא] and I.13.16 עמא דאשתכח 'the people who were found' [העם הנמצא] one can see that the number agreement holds on to the Vorlage.

3.2 PERIPHRASTICS: הוה + *qātel/qtil*

Periphrastic structures involving a form of the verb הוה ‘to be’ and *qātel* or *qtil* are occasionally encountered in TJS.¹⁸¹

In certain cases, the verb הוה is already present in the Vorlage, and TJS does nothing but render it faithfully in Aramaic, e.g. I.3.1 ופתגמא דיני ‘and the word of the Lord was hidden in those days’ [הוה כסי ביומא האנון ‘was precious’, with predicative adjective], I.7.10 והוה שמואל מסיק עלתא [ויהי שמואל מעלה] the burnt offering’, I.23.26 והוה דוד מתבעת ‘and David was hurrying’ [ויהי דוד נחפז], I.25.29 והוה נפשא דרבוני גניזא ‘and the soul of my master will be hidden’ [והיתה] and II.3.6 ואבנר הוה ‘and the soul of my master will be bound’ [היה מתחזק] in the house of Saul’, II.3.17 אף תמלי אף דקדמוהי הויתון בען ‘both yesterday and the day before you were seeking’ [הייתם מבקשים], II.7.26 ובית עבדך דיוד יהי מתקן קדמך [יהיה נכון] before you’, II.10.5 ‘because the men were ashamed’ [כי היו האנשים נכלמים], II.13.32 ‘for in the heart of Absalom (this) was hidden’ [היתה שומה] ‘and they were guarded’ [והיוה נשירן] II.20.3 [והייתה צררות].¹⁸²

In other cases, however, TJS does not follow the Vorlage faithfully. Sometimes, TJS inserts הוה in a passage that is already present in the Vorlage but does not feature הוה,¹⁸³ e.g. I.2.12 ‘they

¹⁸¹ Cf. Stevenson (1962: §22); Bombeck (1997a: 191-192). On periphrastics in Hebrew, cf. JM (§154m); Muraoka (1999).

¹⁸² Sometimes TJS features a different verb in the *qātel* form, or *qtil* instead of an adjective in the Vorlage, as shown by some of the instances. In a few cases TJS inserts *qātel* after an already existing הוה in the Vorlage, e.g. II.16.19 כין איהי פלח קדמך ‘so I will be serving you’ [כן אהיה לפניך] ‘thus I will be before you’, II.24.16 ומלאכא דיני הוה ‘and the angel of the Lord was resting at the threshing-floor of Arwan’ [ומלאך יהוה היה עם גרן הארנה] ‘and the angel of the Lord was at the threshing-floor of Araunah’].

¹⁸³ Occasionally with a replacement of a ‘simple’ (i.e. non-periphrastic) conjugation in the Vorlage with a periphrastic one in TJS, e.g. BH *yiqtol/w^cqatalti* with future meaning being replaced with *y^chī qātel* in TJS, or BH stative *qatal* with past meaning being rendered with *hwā qātel* in TJS. Yet other cases present us with an even less literal rendition of the Vorlage, but feature nonetheless the insertion of הוה, e.g. I.21.6 והוה לא באורח חולא הוה אויל ‘and it was not going on a profane journey’ [והוא דרך חל] ‘and it was a profane journey’, II.17.11 ואת תדי אויל ברישנא ‘and you will be going at our head’ [ופניך הלכים בקרב] ‘and your faces (= person) will be going in battle’, II.22.24 והוה נשר נפשי מחובין ‘and I was keeping my soul from sins’ [ואשתמרה מעוני] ‘and I kept myself from my guilt’].

did not know to fear from before the Lord’ [לא ידעו],¹⁸⁴ I.2.32 ותהי מסתכל
 ‘and you will be considering’ והבטת [‘and you will look’], I.15.17 הלא מן
 ‘were you not from your beginning base and weak?’ שריותך הויתא שיט וחלש
 [‘were you not little?’] II.1.24 והיה מלביש לבן ‘who was clothing
 you’ [המלבישכם], II.13.2 והיה מכסא בעיני אמנון ‘and it was concealed [ויפלא
 ‘and it was wonderful’] in the eyes of Amnon’.

At other times, the use of הוה with *qātel/qtil* is not paralleled in the Vorlage, e.g. I.2.32 ותהי חזי ‘and you will be seeing’, II.4.10 מהנא ליה מתנא
 ‘who was imagining (me) to give to him a present’, II.11.23 והוינא מרדין להון
 ‘and we were driving them back’.

In the final analysis, we can see that the use of הוה may or may not run parallel to that of היה in the Vorlage. In the latter case, הוה is inserted in a passage where היה is absent in the Vorlage. The reason why the Targumist has at times found it useful to insert הוה in his rendition of the Hebrew original is not quite clear. One thing seems beyond doubt, however: the combination of הוה with *qātel/qtil* is connected to semantic durativity/iterativity, and it may be worthwhile suggesting that the use of the periphrastic structure is a *marked* indication of the durativity/iterativity of the SoAs concerned.¹⁸⁵ On the other hand, whatever the precise shade of meaning conveyed by such periphrastics may be, they are altogether not so frequent in TJS, which is in all likelihood to be ascribed to TJ's faithfulness to the Vorlage.

3.3 Periphrasis with עתיד

In a few, non-translational passages, TJ features the adjective עתיד ‘ready, destined’ in a twofold construction:

- a) עתיד דיסק followed by *yiqtol*: I.2.1 עתיד דיקום, I.2.1 עתידין דיתון, I.2.2 עתיד דיסק, I.2.5 עתיד דיתון, II.23.3 עתיד דיקום;
- b) עתיד ל- followed by an Inf.C.: I.2.1 עתיד למהוי, I.2.3 עתידין למהוי, I.2.6 עתיד לאסקא, II.22.28 עתיד למפרק, II.22.29 עתיד למשלם, I.2.3 עתיד לשלמא, II.23.1 עתידין למית, II.23.4 עתידין לאזהרא, II.23.7 עתיד לאזהרא, II.23.4 עתידין לאתוקרא.

¹⁸⁴ With the verb ידע, according to Bombeck (1997a: 65) the periphrastic construction reflects a specific strategy intended to clarify the stative (as against fientive) character of the SoA, i.e. ‘to know’ as against ‘to understand’.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Bombeck (1997a: 28, also 151).

Although this twofold construction can be considered a mere juxtaposition of independent lexemes, its uses in context suggest that it fulfils a particular pragmatic function. Though it bears on the future, it is distinct from *yiqtol* in its use as an indicator of posteriority, as can be gathered from the fact that *yiqtol* also occurs in these very passages with that very meaning:¹⁸⁶ עתיד can therefore not be dismissed as a mere alternative for the expression of posteriority.¹⁸⁷ A clue as to its function may be derived from the discourse type to which belong the two portions of TJS in which this construction occurs (I.2 and II.22-23), a discourse type that we may term ‘prophetic’. Essentially, the construction with עתיד appears to be used in order to convey the idea that what is being said is not merely a statement about a possible future SoA, but is rather a *prediction* of the speaker. As such, this use may be labeled ‘predictive’, and may best be rendered in English with ‘shall’ or the periphrase ‘to be (destined) to’, e.g. I.2.1 שמואל ברי עתיד למהני נביא על ישראל ‘My son Samuel *shall/is (destined) to be* a prophet on behalf of Israel’, II.23.3 הוא משיחא עתיד דיקום וישלוט ברחלתא דיוי ‘he is the Messiah (who) *shall/is to* rise and rule by fear of the Lord’.

3.4 Imperfectivity and Perfectivity in the Vorlage and Targum Jonathan to Samuel

Sometimes, we encounter aspectual discrepancies between the Vorlage and TJS. Most usually, the discrepancy revolves around imperfectivity (iterative and progressive aspects) and perfectivity, TJS featuring imperfective forms where the Vorlage has perfective forms, or *vice versa*. On the whole, a close scrutiny of the passages involved allows us to distinguish two main cases: the restoration of discourse consistency (V:3.4.1) and background demotion (V:3.4.2).

¹⁸⁶ E.g. I.2.1 יתפרקון ‘they will be saved’, II.23.5 לא תתקיים כל מלכו ... ‘no kingdom ... will be established’, and contrast the use of עתיד and of *yiqtol* in II.23.7 באשתא עתידין לאתקדא ‘... in the fires that are *destined* to be kindled. They *will be kindled* ...’

¹⁸⁷ I fail to understand the exact purport of Cook’s statement that this form, which is also attested in Neofiti, is used to ‘emphasize the futurity of an event’ (Cook 1986a: 217).

3.4.1 RESTORATION OF DISCOURSE CONSISTENCY

In certain passages, the Vorlage features *wayyiqtol* for the expression of past SoAs that our common sense would treat as imperfective (iterative or progressive), e.g. וַיִּאֲסְפוּ in I.14.52^{BH} ... וַיִּאֲסְפוּ אֵלָיו (‘and the war was tough against the Philistines all the days of Saul,) and each time Saul would see a warrior man ... (and) *he gathered* him unto him’.¹⁸⁸ This use of *wayyiqtol* is considered ‘irregular and improper’ in BH grammar,¹⁸⁹ the expected forms in such a context being *w^eqataltí*. In such cases, the Targumist usually renders BH *wayyiqtol* with *w^eqātel* in TJS. Thus BH וַיִּאֲסְפוּ in I.14.52 above is rendered with וְכָנִס לִיה (‘and) he would gather him’ in TJS. Other examples include I.1.10^{BH} וְהָיָה מֵרַת נֶפֶשׁ (‘and she was bitter of soul, and prayed [TJ וּמִצְלִיא ‘and was praying’] before the Lord, and was weeping very much’, I.14.19^{BH} וַיְהִי עַד דְּבַר שְׂאוֹל אֶל הַכֹּהֵן וְהַחֲמוֹן אֲשֶׁר בַּמַּחֲנֶה פְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיִּלָּךְ הַלֹּךְ וּרְבַח וַיִּהְיֶה דֹד אֵת (‘and while Saul was speaking with the priest, the multitude that was in the camp of the Philistines grew [TJ אֵיל ‘was growing’] more and more’, I.27.9^{BH} וַיִּהְיֶה דָוִד וְלֹא יָחִיהָ אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה וְלִקַּח צֶאֱן וּבָקָר ... וַיָּשָׁב וַיָּבֵא אֶל אַכִּישׁ הָאָרֶץ (‘and David would smite the land, and would leave neither man nor woman alive, and would take away the sheep and oxen (...) and he returned and came [TJ וַיָּחִיב וַיָּחִיב ‘and he would return and come’] to Achish’. Overall, these instances produce the impression that the use of *w^eqātel* is intended to better reflect the meaning of the forms expressed with *wayyiqtol* in BH; as such the use of *w^eqātel* can be seen as a specific strategy on the part of the Targumist to restore the consistency of the discourse.¹⁹⁰

The examples above instantiate isolated cases of awkward use of *wayyiqtol* in the Vorlage. Sometimes, however, we see that entire passages in the Vorlage display that kind of awkwardness. Usually, such passages are quite evidently iterative in meaning, in that they report situations that occurred several times. But formally they waver between *yiqtol/w^eqataltí* (iterative) and *qatal/wayyiqtol* (semelfactive). When this happens, the

¹⁸⁸ Lit. ‘when Saul saw each warrior man ...’.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. JM (§118n).

¹⁹⁰ Sometimes, the awkwardness of the Vorlage is resolved in a different way, e.g. in I.2.6^{BH} יְהוָה מָמִית וּמַחְיָה מוֹרִיד שְׂאוֹל וַיַּעַל ‘the Lord puts to death and makes live, brings down to Sheol and raises up’ the BH form וַיַּעַל, unexpected in such a context, is rendered with a specific structure involving עָתִיד in TJS (cf. V:3.3). For a different view, cf. Bombeck (1997a: 147).

Targumist usually reacts in one of two ways: by restoring the formal iterativity of the passage by rendering BH *qatal/wayyiqtol* with *yiqtol/w^e qātel*, akin to the isolated cases discussed above, or contrariwise by treating it as semelfactive by means of *(u)qatal*. One will note that both approaches can be used in one and the same passage, part of the passage being expressed consistently with iterative forms, while some other part is expressed with semelfactive forms. As we shall see, in the latter case the narrator raises the impression that he is moving to a particular case: even though the situation reported occurred on several occasions, the Targumist chooses to single out and relate *one* occurrence of that situation, which can be understood as a way to promote the vividness of the narrative. This process, however, leads the Targumist at times to reinterpret the function(s) of some other verb forms of the passage so as to make them consistent with the general temporal and aspectual interpretation of the passage as a whole.

For the sake of the illustration, one such passage will be analysed in detail below: II.15.2-6.

II.15.2a^{BH} ... והשכים אבשלום ועמד 'and Absalom used to get up early and stand',

II.15.2b^{BH} ויהי כל האיש ... ויקרא אבשלום אליו 'and when a man ... was about (to come to the king) Absalom called him',

II.15.2c^{BH} ... ויאמר ... ויאמר 'and said ... and [the man] said',

II.15.3^{BH} ויאמר אבשלום אליו 'and Absalom said to him',

II.15.4^{BH} ויאמר אבשלום 'and Absalom said',

II.15.5^{BH} והיה בקרב איש ... ושלח את ידו והחזיק לו ונשק לו 'and whenever it happened that a man drew near ... [Absalom] would reach out his hand, would take hold of him and would kiss him',

II.15.6a^{BH} ויעש אבשלום כדבר הזה לכל ישראל אשר יבאו 'and Absalom acted on this manner for all Israel that came ...',

II.15.6b^{BH} ... ויגנב אבשלום 'and Absalom stole (the heart of the men of Israel)'.

In this passage, the Vorlage is ambiguous. From II.15.2a and II.15.5 it is clear that the passage is iterative. Nonetheless verses II.15.2b to II.15.4 feature non-iterative forms only, describing the dialogue between Absalom and any man who approached him with a request. II.15.5 then reverts to iterative mode, and describes Absalom's actions framing the dialogue, and II.15.6 alternates between iterative and non-iterative forms (*wayyiqtol* ... *yiqtol* ... *wayyiqtol*).

In view of the general iterative character of the situation, it is likely that in II.15.2b - II.15.4 the writer has moved to a particular case.¹⁹¹ One will also note that these verses encompass the dialogue portions of the situation to the exclusion of the actions: it may therefore be worth suggesting that in the whole passage the writer depicts a recurring situation in the past, appropriately by means of iterative forms, but switches to semelfactive mode when moving on to report the words exchanged by Absalom and those who approached him, thereby depicting one out of many dialogue situations, in all likelihood for the sake of vividness in the rendition of the dialogue. Seen in that light, II.15.6 would then serve as a transition back to the main narrative frame of the story: the SoAs reported (ויעש and ויגב) are semantically iterative in character, which confirms the frequentative reading of the whole passage, but are perfectivized, the perfective being the aspect *par excellence* of the foreground in narrative discourse.¹⁹² II.15.6 therefore brings the whole backgrounded passage to an end, II.15.6a providing a summary of the passage and II.15.6b its long-term result and consequences.

The Targumist, for his part, follows the Vorlage, by opting (partially) for semelfactive forms:

II.15.2a ... ומקדים אבשלום וקאים 'and Absalom used to get up early and stand ...',

II.15.2b ... וְהָיָה כִּלְ גִבֹּר ... וְקָרָא אֶבְשָׁלוֹם לֵיה 'and when a man ... would be about (to come to the king ...) Absalom would call him',

II.15.2c ... וְאָמַר ... וְאָמַר 'and [Absalom] said ... and [the man] said ...',

II.15.3 וְאָמַר לֵיה אֶבְשָׁלוֹם 'and Absalom said to him',

II.15.4 וְאָמַר אֶבְשָׁלוֹם 'and Absalom said',

II.15.5 ... וְהָיָה כִּדְ קָרִיב גִּבֹּרָא ... וּמוֹשִׁיט יָת יָדֵיהּ וּמַתְקִיף בֵּיהּ וְנִשְׁקָא לֵיה 'and whenever it happened that a man drew near ... [Absalom] would reach out his hand, would take hold of him and would kiss him',

II.15.6a ... וְעָבַד אֶבְשָׁלוֹם 'and Absalom acted (in this way for all Israel ...)',

II.15.6b וְנָגַב אֶבְשָׁלוֹם 'and Absalom stole (the heart of the men of Israel)'.

The difference between TJS and the Vorlage is that TJS sets the limit

¹⁹¹ As suggested by JM (§118n).

¹⁹² On the process of perfectivization, cf. V:2.1.1.1. The form יָבֵא in II.15.6a can formally express its semantically iterative character (and hence that of II.15.6 as a whole) by means of *yiqtol*, as it is in the background (relative clause) and therefore in no need of perfectivization.

elsewhere, by confining the semelfactive forms within the boundaries of the dialogue proper (II.15.2c - II.15.4), and expressing the introduction to the dialogue with formally iterative forms (II.15.2b), whereas BH already makes the switch to semelfactive forms a little earlier and thereby encroaches on the integrity of the narrative. For the rest, as in BH, TJS features the introduction of the whole scene (II.15.2a) and the description of the actions (II.15.5) in iterative mode, and expresses the final statement, comprising the summary and the long-term consequences of the situation, with perfectivized iterative forms (II.15.6a-b).

On the whole, this passage shows that both the Vorlage and TJS can make use of semelfactive forms in semantically iterative contexts, often as a way to enhance the vividness in the rendition of the events depicted. However, TJS and the Vorlage do not resort to semelfactive forms in the same passages or to the same extent, and TJS even features formally iterative forms in places where the Vorlage has semelfactive ones. The overall impression is that the Targumist's endeavours are more successful at preserving (or restoring) the linguistic consistency of the discourse than those of the Vorlage.

3.4.2 BACKGROUND DEMOTION

Finally, in a few cases TJS features an imperfective form where the Vorlage has a perfective form (usually TJ *w^e qātel* for BH *wayyiqtol*) for none of the reasons discussed above. Examples include: I.6.12^{BH} במסלה 'and the cows went straight on the road, upon the road to Beth-shemesh;) on one path they went along [אולן^{TJ}] (going and lowing, and they did not turn to the right or to the left)', I.19.23^{BH} וילך הלך ויתנבא '(and a/the spirit of God was upon him too,) and he went about and sang praise' [ואזיל מויל ומשבח^{TJ}], I.21.14^{BH} ויתו על דלתות ה שער ויורד רירו אל זקנו '(and he became demented in their hands,) and made marks [ומסריט^{TJ}] upon the doors of the gate, and let his spit run down [ומחית^{TJ}] upon his beard', II.2.23^{BH} ויהי כל הבא אל המקום ... ויעמדו '(and it happened [והוי^{TJ}] that all who came [כל דאתי^{TJ}] to the place ... stood still' [וקימין^{TJ}], II.13.19^{BH} ותלך הלך וועקה '(and Tamar took ashes upon her head ... and placed her hand upon her head) and she went about and cried' [ואזלא מויל וצוחא^{TJ}], II.19.4^{BH} ויתנבא '(and on that day the victory was (turned) to mourning ...) and the people stole away [ומתנבין^{TJ}] to enter into the city on that day'.

The reasons for such deviations are not straightforward, inasmuch as maintaining the perfective aspect of the Vorlage would not have produced an ungrammatical or otherwise awkward or unusual expression in TJS. Bombeck, for his part, notes that in such cases the durativity or iterativity of the SoA is expressed, to the detriment of its anteriority.¹⁹³ Though this is certainly correct, upon closer inspection I have come to the conclusion that these deviations actually involve a process of imperfectivization that reflects some specific strategy on the part of the Targumist, which may be labelled *background demotion*.

As explained in the introduction to this chapter, grounding is a pragmatic rather than semantic function. This suggests that the organization of the literary contents of a narrative into foreground and background is not the result of some objective process by which SoAs, on the basis of some intrinsic semantic properties, would lend themselves unequivocally to an integration into the foreground or background. On the contrary, the application of the grounding function is an essentially subjective process; and the SoAs that compose the narrative are featured in the foreground or background as a result of specific choices of the narrator.¹⁹⁴

Concerning the cases under discussion, one can see that the *wayyiqtol* forms rendered with *w^e qātel* in TJS belong to the narrative discourse, and that they follow upon preceding *qatal/wayyiqtol* forms that have clearly set the stage in the narrative past. In addition, and more importantly, these *wayyiqtol* forms do not appear really to continue the narrative; rather, they expand upon the SoAs conveyed by the preceding *qatal/wayyiqtol* without forwarding them.¹⁹⁵ As a result, on purely *semantic* grounds it would be justifiable to treat these SoAs as background information. Their actual treatment as foreground or background, however, depends on *pragmatic* choices on the part of the narrator, and the use of imperfective forms in TJS suggests that the Targumist has made different choices than the Vorlage: whereas the Vorlage presents these SoAs pragmatically as parts of the foreground, the Targumist has apparently deemed it preferable to demote them to the background, featuring them as *descriptive* material intended to support the unfoldment of the main storyline. Seen in this light, the

¹⁹³ Bombeck (1997a: 143).

¹⁹⁴ Cf. V:1.3.6, esp. footnote n.59.

¹⁹⁵ JM (§118j-k) explain that *wayyiqtol* can at times have an explanatory value and do hardly more than develop the meaning of a preceding verb.

passages above in TJS may be read as follows: I.6.12 בַּכְּבֶּשֶׂא חַד אֹזֶלִין ‘(and the cows went straight on the road, upon the road to Beth-shemesh;) on one path they were going along (going and lowing, and they did not turn to the right or to the left)’, I.19.23 וְאוֹיֵל מִיֹּזֶל וּמִשְׁבַּח ‘(and a spirit of prophecy from before the Lord resided upon him too,) and he was going about singing praise’,¹⁹⁶ I.21.14 וּמִסְרִישׁ עַל דְּשֵׁי תַרְעָא וּמַחֲזִית רִירִיה עַל דְּקִנְיָה ‘(and he became demented in their hands,) making marks upon the doors of the gate, and letting his spit run down upon his beard’, II.2.23 וְהָיִי כָל ‘and it was happening that all who (lit.) was coming to the place ... were standing still’, II.13.19 וְאוֹלָא מִיֹּזֶל וְצוּחָא ‘(and Tamar took ashes upon her head ... and placed her hand upon her head,) and she was going about crying’, II.19.4 וּמַתְּנַגְבִּין עֲמָא בְיוֹמָא הַהוּא לְמִיעַל לְקִרְתָּא ‘(and on that day the victory was (turned) to mourning ...) and the people were stealing away to enter into the city on that day’.¹⁹⁷

4. CONCLUSIONS

4.1 SUMMARY

As the preceding sections have attempted to show, the conjugations of the Aramaic of TJS function according to a largely consistent set of principles, and this system remains globally consistent throughout the corpus, whether the Targumist attempts to stick as closely as possible to the Vorlage, takes some liberty in its rendition, or inserts new material. The use of the conjugations in TJS can be summarized as follows:

¹⁹⁶ It must be noted that the presence of a finite form after the Inf.A. הָלֹךְ in the Vorlage in I.19.23 and II.13.19 is considered doubtful by JM (§123n), who consider that an Inf.A. should be read instead. If that should be the case, then the use of *qātel* in TJS should be taken to reflect the BH Inf.A. (cf. V:2.6.2.1) rather than be an instance of background demotion.

¹⁹⁷ A similar phenomenon is encountered in II.20.8^{BH} וְעַמְשָׂא בָּא לְפָנֵיהֶם ... וְהוּא יֵצֵא וְתַפֵּל ‘and Amasa came before them ... and he [Joab] went forth and it [his sword] fell out’, rendered in TJS with וְעַמְשָׂא אֲתֵי לְאַפִּיהֶון ... וְהוּא אֹזִיל וּפִסַּע ‘and Amasa was coming before them ... and he [Joab] was going and walking heavily’. One will note, however, that the latter part of the verse^{BH} וְהוּא יֵצֵא וְתַפֵּל ‘and he [Joab] went forth and it [his sword] fell out’ in the Vorlage denotes intrinsically punctual SoAs, and that it is only because the Targumist has departed from the Vorlage that the substituted SoAs, inherently durative, could be demoted to the background as imperfective SoAs fulfilling a descriptive function.

1. In the narrative discourse (past temporality), with the fientive SoAs *(u)qtal* is the form *par excellence* in the foreground, which makes up the backbone of the narrative. In the background, which provides additional information intended to make sense of the situations reported in the foreground, *qtal* and *(w^e)qātel* are the usual forms. The form *yiqtol* is also encountered instead of *qātel*, though only when the Vorlage features it as well, and almost exclusively with the iterative SoAs.

Stative SoAs are usually featured in the background to describe stative situations that obtained at the moment of reference of the foreground. *(w^e)qātel* is the standard form, *(u)qtal* being as a rule confined to instances paralleling the Vorlage. In addition, *qtil* can also be used when the stative situation is specifically envisioned as the product of a completed fientive SoA. Finally, stative SoAs can be featured in the foreground when they are perfectivized, whereby they are granted an ingressive or constative interpretation and come to behave as fientive SoAs.

We have seen that fientive *(u)qtal* usually renders BH *qatal*/*wayyiqtol*. In the background, *(w^e)qātel* corresponds to BH *(w^e)qotel*. Both *yiqtol* and *qātel* are used to render BH imperfective *yiqtol*; but only *(w^e)qātel* renders BH imperfective *w^eqataltí* (in other words, in TJS *w^eyiqtol* is never used to translate BH imperfective *w^eqataltí*). Stative *(u)qtal* is used only when the Vorlage features *qatal*/*wayyiqtol*, otherwise *(w^e)qātel* is the usual form. Finally, *qtil* corresponds to BH *qatul*, but may render other grammatical forms too.

2. The direct discourse presents a more complex state of affairs than the narrative discourse, not only because it covers both present and future temporalities, but also, and more essentially, because the range of speech acts that it allows is much broader than that presented by the reporting mode of the narrative discourse:

- a) In the sphere of the future, *(w^e)yiqtol* is the standard form, both with fientive and stative SoAs, and corresponds as a rule to BH *yiqtol*/*w^eqataltí*. *Qātel* is also used in the background, providing circumstantial material, and renders BH *qotel*. Exceptionally, *qātel* is encountered in the foreground as well;
- b) In the sphere of the present, *(u)qtal* can be used for the expression of performative utterances and of stative SoAs. *Yiqtol* is also found, rarely with fientive SoAs (the SoA is then usually iterative in character) and even less frequently with stative SoAs. In these

cases, as a rule *(u)qtal* and *yiqtol* parallel BH *qatal/wayyiqtol* and *yiqtol* respectively.

Otherwise, *(w^e)qātel* is the standard form in present temporality, both with fientive and stative SoAs, and it is also encountered instead of *(u)qtal* and *yiqtol* with no noticeable difference in meaning (e.g. ידעית or ידענא ‘I know’). The form *qtil* is used to express a state that obtains at the moment of reference and that is envisioned as the product of a completed fientive SoA. Finally *qātel* can be used to express an intention (resolve, pledge, etc.) to let a SoA obtain;

- c) For the expression of modal nuances (deontic and epistemic), *(w^e)yiqtol* is used, and usually renders BH *yiqtol/w^eqataltí*. The range of meaning of the paronomastic use of the Inf.A. also pertains to modality, as it allows one to reinforce the illocutionary force of the SoA. For the expression of volitional modality, *(u)qtol* is used, and corresponds to BH *qtol/qotlā*. The form *(w^e)yiqtol* is used to render BH Jussive *(w^e)yiqtol* (‘short imperfect’) and Cohortative *eqtlā*, but the question remains as to whether *yiqtol* in TJS does really convey volitional modality.

4.2 WIDER PERSPECTIVE

As Folmer noted, work in comparative Aramaic syntax is made difficult by the sheer lack of syntactic studies on various Aramaic dialects.¹⁹⁸ This is especially true of the verbal syntax: as Rogland recently acknowledged, comprehensive studies of the Aramaic verbal system are virtually non-existent.¹⁹⁹ In spite of the incomplete state of our knowledge in that area, an attempt must be made to relate the observations made in this chapter to the broader context of Aramaic.²⁰⁰

The conjugations are not used in the same way in all Aramaic dialects.

¹⁹⁸ Folmer (1995: 45).

¹⁹⁹ Rogland (2003b: 421). An important exception is Cohen (1984), who offers a transversal treatment of many important features of the Aramaic verbal system.

²⁰⁰ The morphology of Aramaic has developed in the course of the long history of the language, and the conjugations are no exceptions. Thus, in Syriac the Ip.f. appears as *neqtol* rather than *yiqtol*. Notwithstanding, throughout this comparative discussion I will go on using the terms *qtal*, *yiqtol*, *qātel* (etc.) as convenient labels, even if the actual morphology of these conjugations may vary from dialect to dialect.

In the following, we shall attempt to survey the main features of the verbal system of Aramaic throughout its history and development.

A major leitmotiv in that history is the emergence of *qātel* as a conjugation *stricto sensu* and its subsequent remarkable expansion within the verbal system. In the earliest stages of Aramaic, the form *qātel* stood outside the verbal system proper, and was generally employed nominally or adjectivally.²⁰¹ It is only towards the advent of IA, probably in the 7th or 6th centuries B.C., that *qātel* was integrated into the verbal system proper.²⁰² Starting with IA, *qātel* steadily expanded its range of use in the individual dialects, which often led it to encroach on the territory of the other conjugations. This regularly gave rise to competition with those conjugations, a competition which *qātel* won more often than not.

I. Probably the first conjugation which *qātel* came to rival is ‘long’ *yiqtol*. The earliest stages of Aramaic bear witness to the preservation of the distinction between a ‘long’ imperfect **yaqtulu* and a ‘short’ imperfect **yaqtul*, a distinction that was preserved until the turn of our era (cf. below). From the earliest stages, long *yiqtol* served mainly the expression of imperfectivity, of the future and of various modal nuances.²⁰³

In IA, however, long *yiqtol* was hardly employed for the expression of imperfective SoAs in any temporal sphere,²⁰⁴ *qātel* being used for that purpose. Indeed, in IA the main function of *qātel* appears to have been the expression of simultaneity with the moment of reference

²⁰¹ Degen (1969: §77); Cohen (1984: 337-338, 344, 348). Similarly, *qātel* is not used in predicative function in Samalian (Dion 1974: 271).

²⁰² Hug (1993: 118-119); Gzella (2004: 201-202); Cohen (1984: 344, 348). This development has rightly been described as one of the most momentous innovations of the Aramaic verbal system (cf. Gzella 2004: 201, n. 284, referring to Cohen 1984).

²⁰³ Degen (1969: 108-113); Hug (1993: 117-118); Martínez Borobio (2003: 131-132); Gzella (2004: 322); Cohen (1984: 339-341, 343-4). On Samalian specifically, cf. Dion (1974: 263-270); Tropper (1993: 236-237). Energic forms of the ‘imperfect’ are also attested in the earliest stages of Aramaic, cf. Degen (1969: §65); Folmer (1995: §4.14); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §§24l-m). With only a few possible exceptions in IA, however, these forms are restricted to cases of adjunction of pronominal suffixes to the ‘long’ imperfect (Beyer 1984: 473; Muraoka & Porten 2003: §§38b-c); a functional opposition between energic forms and ‘plain’ long forms cannot be established on the basis of the available evidence (Muraoka & Porten 2003: §53g).

²⁰⁴ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §§52b,h). Cohen (1984: 358) notes the existence of a handful of cases of *yiqtol* with present value in the documents from Elephantine, but adds that we might be dealing with a fossilized and stereotyped use of *yiqtol*.

(imperfective aspect).²⁰⁵ ‘Bare’ *qātel* was usually employed in present temporality; in combination with the *qtal* or *yiqtol* form of הָוָה, however, it could express imperfective SoAs in past and future temporalities as well.²⁰⁶ The absence of long *yiqtol* and the omnipresence of *qātel* for the expression of imperfective SoAs suggests that long *yiqtol* was being dislodged from that function already at that time.

The periphrastic use of *qātel*/with הָוָה for the expression of imperfective SoAs in temporalities other than the present will be continued in later types of Aramaic, in MA (BA, QA, Palmyrene)²⁰⁷ and LA (JPA, Syriac, Mandaic, JBA).²⁰⁸ In parallel, the use of ‘bare’ *qātel* will also generalize. Thus *qātel* can also be used on its own for the expression of imperfective SoAs in past temporality (background of narrative discourse) in QA, in JPA, in Syriac, and possibly also in BA.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁵ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §55); Gzella (2004: 194ff.).

²⁰⁶ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §55g); Gzella (2004: 308-309), Cohen (1984: 358-363, 367, 375-376, 377; 379).

²⁰⁷ Bauer & Leander (1927: §§81i-j, p-q); Gzella (2004: 308-309); Cohen (1984: 426-427, 431); Schattner-Rieser (2004: 120-121); Fitzmyer (2004: 291-292); Cantineau (1935: 78). Cohen (1984: 432) distinguishes between Ezra and Daniel as regards the use of the periphrastic constructions with *qātel*, and adequately contrasts the use of the periphrastic constructions with both bare *qātel* and *qtal* in GenApoc (1984: 437-441, 442). Finally, on the verbal system of BA and QA generally, see also Rosén (1961) and Bezer (1976-1977) respectively.

²⁰⁸ Odeberg (1939: §433); Cohen (1984: 448-449, 457); Stevenson (1962: §22); Cook (1986a: 219-220); Nöldeke (1898: §277); Nöldeke (1875: §264); Schlesinger (1928: §28). In Syriac the possibilities of periphrasis with ܩܬܠ will even expand considerably, producing constructions of the type ܩܬܠ ܕܡܢ, ܩܬܠ ܕܡܢܝܢ, etc. (for details, cf. Nöldeke 1898: §263, §268; Joosten 1996: 109-131; Williams 2001: 100-116; Muraoka 2005: §§85-89).

²⁰⁹ On QA, cf. Cook (1998: 377); Schattner-Rieser (2004: 118-121); Cohen (1984: 440). On JPA, cf. Cohen (1984: 451); Cook (1986a: 218). On Syriac, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §275). On BA, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §§81k-o); for different views, cf. Cohen (1984: 389, 401ff.); Gzella (2004: 251ff.). Be that as it may, aside from the fact that the periphrastic construction specifies the temporal sphere of the SoA referred to and makes its imperfectivity explicit, according to Fitzmyer (2004: 292) the exact shade of meaning conveyed by the periphrastic construction as against bare *qātel* cannot always be detected. Cohen (1984: 437-440, 442-443, 448-450) is of another opinion. In his view, in QA and JPA (Neofiti) the use of *qātel*/with the *qtal* form of הָוָה also allowed one to express perfectivized durative or iterative SoAs in the foreground (what has been termed ‘constative’ above, cf. V:2.1.2): ‘Ainsi [ces constructions périphrastiques] n'apparaissent pas comme des imparfaits descriptifs ou concomitants, dont le caractère de passé serait explicitement marqué par un auxiliaire au passé, mais plutôt comme des prétérits ou des parfaits duratifs. Il s'agit de procès réalisés entièrement et limités, mais dont on souligne que leur

Overall, it can be said that starting with IA the use of *yiqtol* for the expression of imperfective SoAs is on the wane, *qātel*/with or without ܩܬܠ gradually taking over that function.²¹⁰ This is obvious e.g. in Syriac, where *yiqtol* is no longer used for imperfective SoAs, *qātel* being employed instead.²¹¹ And it would appear to be also the case in Neofiti.²¹² Finally, *yiqtol* is only rarely used to express imperfective SoAs in past temporality in PsJ.²¹³ But the imperfective use of *yiqtol* never entirely disappeared. So the narrative framework of Ahiqar, the Behistun inscription and BA generally still bears witness to the use of long *yiqtol* for imperfective SoAs in the present, and possibly also in the past.²¹⁴ Similarly, the use of *yiqtol* for the expression of imperfective SoAs is still encountered in learned texts in QA.²¹⁵ And a LA dialect such as Mandaic still uses *yiqtol* for the expression of imperfectivity in present temporality, curtailed by *qātel* though that use may be.²¹⁶

The encroachment of *qātel* on the territory of long *yiqtol* can also be detected in the expression of posteriority. The expression of the future is indeed a common use of long *yiqtol*, and it was to remain so until MA.²¹⁷ From BA onwards, however, *qātel* can also be used to denote *réalisation a durée un certain temps* (Cohen 1984: 438). In contrast, still according to Cohen, in QA and JPA the use of bare *qātel* was a clear indication of imperfective SoAs in the background. Cohen's observations suggest that in QA this bipartition was neat, whereas in Neofiti the periphrastic construction could take over the function of bare *qātel* as well; in actual fact, Cohen (1984: 451) suggests that bare *qātel* in Neofiti was mostly used in cases of literal rendition of BH *qotel*, the periphrastic construction being otherwise the usual construction.

²¹⁰ Cohen (1984: 363).

²¹¹ Gzella (2004: 149-150; 202, n.286).

²¹² Cohen (1984: 447).

²¹³ Cook (1986a: 216-217).

²¹⁴ Bauer & Leander (1927: §§78b-d, l-m); Gzella (2004: 202, n.286). In the Behistun inscription specifically *yiqtol* is used with the value of a present (Cohen 1984: 377); in the narrative framework of Ahiqar with the value of a general present (Cohen 1984: 373). With regard to the use of imperfective *yiqtol* in past temporality in BA, cf. extensive discussion in Gzella (2004: 136-151).

²¹⁵ Gzella (2004: 149); Cook (1998: 376). Cohen (1984: 434-435), for his part, doubts that *yiqtol* is ever used with a present value in GenApoc.

²¹⁶ Nöldeke (1875: §259); Macuch (1965: §285).

²¹⁷ Degen (1969: §75); Hug (1993: 117-118); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §52); Gzella (2004: 215ff.); Cohen (1984: 356-357, 366, 372, 377, 378, 387, 433, 442); Bauer & Leander (1927: §§78e-k); Schattner-Rieser (2004: 117); Cantineau (1930: 108); Cantineau (1935: 76).

future SoAs. So in BA and QA one notes cases of *qātel* with future meaning,²¹⁸ though in those dialects long *yiqtol* seems to remain the usual form. In JPA, though *yiqtol* is still in use *qātel* serves as an ordinary future tense.²¹⁹ Similarly, in CPA *qātel* is often used for the rendition of Greek future forms.²²⁰ Finally, in the Eastern LA dialects the future use of *yiqtol* loses even more ground. In Mandaic, *yiqtol* is still used, but *qātel* is largely found with that function.²²¹ In Classical Syriac, the future use of *yiqtol* is rare and mainly restricted to subordinate clauses;²²² in JBA it has almost entirely disappeared in favour of *qātel*.^{223, 224}

All in all, it is the modal use of long *yiqtol* that proves to be the most stable in Aramaic. The modal use of long *yiqtol* is indeed normal in IA, BA and QA (GenApoc).²²⁵ Due to the restrictions laid on the imperfective and future uses of *yiqtol* in the Eastern LA dialects, in Classical Syriac and JBA, the use of *yiqtol* in independent clause is mostly confined to the expression of modality.²²⁶ It should be noted, however, that there are signs that *qātel* could be used even for the expression of modality in Classical Syriac, in JBA and (in Western Aramaic) in CPA as well.²²⁷

In addition, as we have seen the earliest stages of Aramaic made a

²¹⁸ Bauer & Leander (1927: §§81f-g); Gzella (2004: 219ff.); Cook (1998: 377-378); Schattner-Rieser (2004: 118-120); Cohen (1984: 437; 442).

²¹⁹ Odeberg (1939: §§408, 439); Stevenson (1962: §§18.8, 21.9). Cook also notes that in PsJ *qātel* is sometimes used to describe future events (Cook 1986a: 218). With regard to Neofiti, Cohen (1984: 452-455) notes a distribution between *yiqtol* ('non-durative' future) *yihyē qātel* (durative/iterative future), and bare *qātel* (near future), but adds that this distribution is far from systematic, e.g. *qātel* being also able to express the future plain and simple.

²²⁰ Gzella (2004: 202), referring to Schulthess (1924: §§173.2).

²²¹ Nöldeke (1875: §259, §260); Macuch (1965: §285).

²²² Nöldeke (1898: §267, but cf. also §272); Muraoka (2005: §82).

²²³ Schlesinger (1928: §§26, 27).

²²⁴ On the whole, it is in adverbial clauses and dependent clauses complementing another verb that the future use of *yiqtol* best maintains itself; in such clauses its use is indeed frequent, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §267); Muraoka (2005: §82); Nöldeke (1875: §259); Schlesinger (1928: §26). In the same vein, Cohen (1984: 457) describes the evolution of the verbal system towards LA concisely as 'Recul de [*yiqtol*] vers les emplois secondaires et la modalisation [... et a]vance simultanée de [*qātel*] qui hérite progressivement des fonctions principales de [*yiqtol*]'.
²²⁵ Cf. Gzella (2004: 305, §5.1); Cohen (1984: 357, 366-367, 372, 378, 387, 433-434).

²²⁶ Joosten (1996: 113); Muraoka (2005: §82); Schlesinger (1928: §26).

²²⁷ Cf. Schulthess (1924: §§173.1); Nöldeke (1898: §276); Schlesinger (1928: §27).

distinction between long and short forms of *yiqtol*.²²⁸ Also preserved in IA,²²⁹ this distinction maintained itself until MA, where it is still visible in BA and QA.²³⁰ In OA short *yiqtol* appears to have had a narrative function in some instances.²³¹ Its chief function, however, is the expression of volitive modality,²³² and it remains indeed its primary usage in IA, BA and QA.²³³ Other MA dialects such as Nabatean and Palmyrene no longer reflect the distinction between the two conjugations,²³⁴ however, nor do the LA dialects. Short *yiqtol* as a discrete verbal category apparently disappeared towards the turn of our Era; the expression of volitive modality was then taken over by the prevailing ‘long’ *yiqtol*, thereby enriching its range of modal functionalities.²³⁵

II. From the earliest stages of Aramaic, the basic function of the form *qatal* seems to have been the expression of relative anteriority. So, in OA *qatal* could be used, depending on the temporal point of reference, to express anteriority to the moment of utterance (‘I did’), to some moment of reference situated in the past (‘I had done’) or in the future (‘I will have done’); a perfect nuance (‘I have done’) could also be conveyed.²³⁶ The value of *qatal* as an expression of anteriority holds true throughout

²²⁸ Degen (1969: 64-65, 113-114); Hug (1993: 76-77).

²²⁹ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §24k, §53a).

²³⁰ On BA, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §§26a-d), though the form is not found in Ezra, where the function of the Jussive traditionally associated with short *yiqtol* (volitive modality, cf. below) is assumed by long *yiqtol* (Cohen 1984: 387, 388). On QA, cf. Schattner-Rieser (2004: 67-71 *passim*); Cohen (1984: 434).

²³¹ Degen (1969: 113ff.); Muraoka (1998); Kottsieper (1999); Martínez Borobio (2003: 133); Gzella (2004: 322-324); Cohen (1984: 342-343). To this day, it remains questionable whether the graphic sequence *wyqtl* does reflect the ‘imperfect consecutive’ well-known in BH. This question has been (and still is) the object of lively scholarly discussions (for a recent *status quaestionis*, cf. Gzella 2004: 322-324).

²³² Degen (1969: 113-114); Hug (1993: 118); Cohen (1984: 340).

²³³ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §53b); Gzella (2004: 271ff.); Bauer & Leander (1927: §§78r-u); Cook (1998: 376); Schattner-Rieser (2004: 117); Fitzmyer (2004: 291).

²³⁴ Cf. Cantineau (1930: 78); Cantineau (1935: 76).

²³⁵ Beyer (1984: 152, 472).

²³⁶ Degen (1969: §74); Martínez Borobio (2003: 130-131); Fitzmyer (1995: 208ff.); Cohen (1984: 339, 342, 344). Hug (1993: 115-116) favours an essentially aspectual (as against temporal) analysis of the Aramaic verbal system. On Samalian specifically, cf. Dion (1974: 257-260); Tropper (1993: 235).

the history of Classical Aramaic.²³⁷ The ancient use of *qtal* for the expression of stative SoAs is also attested.²³⁸

It appears that *qtal* has been employed for the expression of performative utterances from the earliest stages of Aramaic. Thus, *qtal* is the usual form in IA.²³⁹ As we have seen, however, starting with the entry of *qātel* into the Aramaic verbal system the other conjugations became more and more challenged in their various uses. This is true of the performative use of *qtal* as well. Thus from the advent of MA onwards one witnesses the emergence of *qātel* for the expression of performative utterances.²⁴⁰ More specifically, BA bears witness to the parallel use of *qtal* and *qātel*.²⁴¹ In QA, the use of *qtal* is rare;²⁴² in Neofiti one witnesses a situation analogous to the one observed in TJ²⁴³

²³⁷ Thus in IA, cf. Muraoka & Porten (2003: §51a); Gzella (2004: 114, 151ff., 164ff.); Cohen (1984: 349-351, 356, 370-372, 377). On BA, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §79); Cohen (1984: 383-387, 430). On QA, cf. Cook (1998: 376); Schattner-Rieser (2004: 116); Cohen (1984: 436, 442). On Nabatean, cf. Cantineau (1930: 107). On Palmyrene, cf. Cantineau (1935: 75). On JPA, cf. Odeberg (1939: §407); Cohen (1984: 447-448); Cook (1986a: 216). On Classical Syriac, cf. Nöldeke (1898: §§255-258). On Mandaic, cf. Nöldeke (1875: §258). On JBA, cf. Schlesinger (1928: §25). I have not been able to find detailed syntactic observations on the use of the conjugations in CPA (aside from a few scanty remarks offered by Nöldeke (1868: 512-513) and Schulthess (1924: §171)) and SA, but the instances of *qtal* featured in Müller-Kessler (1991: 152-155) and Macuch (1982: §46) point in the same direction.

²³⁸ So in IA, cf. Muraoka & Porten (2003: §51c); Gzella (2004: 164-166); Cohen (1984: 351). On Samalian, cf. Dion (1974: 256-257); Tropper (1993: 235-236). On Classical Syriac: cf. Muraoka (2005: §81).

²³⁹ Unambiguous evidence of performative utterances is lacking in the oldest stages of OA (Gzella 2004: 206), but is attested in Aramaic texts from the Neo-Assyrian period (cf. Hug 1993: 116-117). On the possible use of *qtal* for the expression of instantaneous SoAs in present temporality in Samalian, cf. Dion (1974: 258). On IA, cf. Muraoka & Porten (2003: §51b); Gzella (2004: 206, 214-215); Cohen (1984: 365ff.). Cohen recognizes the existence of the use of *qtal* for performative utterances in the documents of Elephantine (1984: 350-51); he also notes that use in the Hermopolis papyri but wonders whether it was normal there (*ibid.*: 365-366). Finally, for a discussion of performativity in Aramaic, cf. Rogland (1999; 2001; 2003b).

²⁴⁰ Cf. Gzella (2004: 214, 307).

²⁴¹ Cf. Gzella (2004: 214-215).

²⁴² Cf. Schattner-Rieser (2004: 116-117); Gzella (2004: 215). Cf. also Muraoka (1993: 46). Rogland (1999: 280) suggests that in QA *qātel* has become the common form for performative utterances and is tempted to see in the one unambiguously attested instance of performative *qtal* in QA a linguistic fossil used in specialized (i.e. legal) contexts.

²⁴³ I.e. *qātel* is the usual form for the expression of performative utterances, but this is not systematic, *qtal* being also used in some instances, which can be

and in Classical Syriac *qātel* seems likewise to have become the dominant form.²⁴⁴ This encroachment of *qātel* on the territory of *qtal* from MA onwards suggests that the expression of the simultaneity of the SoA with the moment of utterance has come to prevail over its perfectivity (*Koinzidenz*).

Similarly, already in IA *qātel* knows a preterital use, i.e. a use of *qātel* for the expression of perfective SoAs in past temporality.²⁴⁵ This use will be continued in MA (BA) and LA (JPA, Syriac, Mandaic), where *qātel* is found to continue, and alternate with, *qtal*.²⁴⁶ Here too one notices that *qātel* encroaches upon the territory of *qtal*.

III. The function of *qtil* as an indication of perfect stativity (i.e. the expression of a state resulting from a completed process) appears to be stable throughout Classical Aramaic. Evidence in OA is scanty,²⁴⁷ but *qtil* is attested with that function in IA, BA, QA, JPA, CPA, Syriac, Mandaic and JBA.²⁴⁸ One will note the existence of the syntagm *qtil l-*, roughly equivalent to the English present or past perfect. Already attested in IA,²⁴⁹ it is absent from BA,²⁵⁰ present in JPA²⁵¹ and is particularly frequent in Eastern LA.²⁵²

seen as a calque (Cohen 1984: 446-447).

²⁴⁴ Cf. Gzella (2004: 214); Muraoka (2005: §81) and especially Rogland (2001: 245, 249), who is of the opinion that *qātel* is the normal, idiomatic form for performative utterances in Syriac, *qtal* being confined to cases of mechanical translation from BH.

²⁴⁵ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §55d).

²⁴⁶ Bauer & Leander (1927: §§81r-t); Odeberg (1939: §§437-438); Stevenson (1962: §17.8); Nöldeke (1898: §274); Nöldeke (1875: §260); Cohen (1984: 451); Cook (1986a: 217-218). In BA, however, the narrative use of *qātel* appears to fulfil a specialized function (cf. Gzella 2004: 120ff. for an extensive discussion).

²⁴⁷ Degen (1969: §77).

²⁴⁸ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §54a); Bauer & Leander (1927: §82); Odeberg (1939: §§442ff.); Nöldeke (1898: §278); Nöldeke (1875: §262); Schlesinger (1928: §30). No detailed syntactic observations are available on the use of the conjugations in CPA, but the instances of *qtil* featured in Müller-Kessler (1991: 162) point in the same direction.

²⁴⁹ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §54c); Folmer (1995: 376-380); Cohen (1984: 381-382).

²⁵⁰ Folmer (1995: 379).

²⁵¹ Odeberg (1939: §445).

²⁵² Nöldeke (1898: §279); Muraoka (2005: §84); Nöldeke (1875: §263); Schlesinger (1928: §30). Cf. esp. Kutscher (1977).

IV. The paronomastic use of the Inf. is attested in OA.²⁵³ It is not found in IA.²⁵⁴ It is attested in JPA, though very rarely.²⁵⁵ Finally, it is attested in the Eastern LA dialects: in JBA;²⁵⁶ in Syriac, where it is not rare;²⁵⁷ and in Mandaic, where it is rather frequent.²⁵⁸

4.3 The Conjugations and the Aramaic of Targum Jonathan to Samuel

First of all, the syntagm *qtil l-*, attested in IA, and JPA, and typical of the Eastern LA dialects, is absent from the Aramaic of TJS.²⁵⁹ Obviously, the influence of the Vorlage cannot be excluded, inasmuch as such a construction is nonexistent in BH as well. Be that as it may, its absence in our corpus highlights a sharp contrast between the Aramaic of TJ on the one hand and IA, JPA and Eastern LA on the other.

This being said, the elements most significant to the positioning of the Aramaic of TJS within the broader context of Aramaic with regard to the use of the conjugations are the interactions of the conjugations *qātel*, *qtal* and *yiqtol*.

1. In the Aramaic of TJS, *(u)qtal* is the standard form for the expression of anteriority, and therefore occupies a central position in the narrative discourse. In that respect, the Aramaic of TJS does not differ from the other classical Aramaic dialects. Moreover, the form *(u)qtal* is still attested for the expression of stative SoAs when the Vorlage features *qatal*/*wayyiqtol*, but is not normally found in passages that do not parallel the Vorlage, *qātel* being used instead. The same can be said of the use of *qtal* for the expression of performative utterances: *qtal* is still used, but only

²⁵³ Degen (1969: §78); Hug (1993: 119); Muraoka (1983-1984: 100ff.); Fitzmyer (1995: 144).

²⁵⁴ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §24).

²⁵⁵ Dalman (1905: 280); Odeberg (1939: §425).

²⁵⁶ Cf. Dalman (1905: 280).

²⁵⁷ Cf. Nöldeke (1898: 225-228).

²⁵⁸ Cf. Nöldeke (1875: §271).

²⁵⁹ Cf. also Müller-Kessler (2001: 185).

when the Vorlage features it as well; otherwise *qātel* is employed. This suggests that stative *qtal* and performative *qtal* are no productive grammatical devices in the Aramaic of TJS. From the comparative viewpoint, this last element is significant: with the absence of performative *qtal* and the use of *qātel* instead, TJS is markedly different from IA where the use of *qtal* is normal; it likewise differs from BA, in which *qtal* and *qātel* are found side by side. In this regard, TJS comes closest to QA and the LA dialects, in which in this use *qtal* is rare or non-existent and *qātel* has become the dominant form.

2. In TJS, *yiqtol* for the expression of imperfective SoAs is found only when the Vorlage features *yiqtol* too, and then again not systematically, *qātel* being often used instead. As we have seen, the use of *qātel* with imperfective SoAs is even more striking in the case of BH *w^eqataltí*, which is systematically rendered with *w^eqātel* rather than *w^eyiqtol* in TJS. These observations suggest that the use of *yiqtol* for the expression of imperfective SoAs is not productive in the Aramaic of TJS. From the comparative standpoint, this indicates a linguistic stage further developed than that evidenced by BA, which still features imperfective *yiqtol*. Here again, the closest parallels are presented by QA, in which this use of *yiqtol* is attested but appears to belong to a learned language register; and Syriac, where imperfective *yiqtol* is no longer used. Interestingly, the fact that in TJS imperfective *qātel* can stand on its own in past temporality rather than require the cooperation of ܩܬܠ (*‘bare’ qātel*) brings TJS close to QA and Syriac.
3. In contrast, in TJS *yiqtol* remains standard for the expression of posteriority, as illustrated by the many instances of *yiqtol* and *w^eyiqtol* either mirroring BH *yiqtol* and *w^eqataltí*, or being featured in passages deviating from the Vorlage. The idea that *yiqtol* is the standard form for the expression of the future is further suggested by the fact that *yiqtol* tends to replace past future *qtal*: in TJS, both *qtal* and *yiqtol* can be used to render BH *qatal* in that function, but *yiqtol* is more frequent; when no Vorlage is being rendered, however, *yiqtol* is the rule.
In this regard, TJS agrees with ‘pre-Late’ Aramaic. The LA dialects show the encroachment, to various degrees, of *qātel* on the territory of *yiqtol* for the expression of futurity, JBA forming the paroxysm

of this process. In TJS, in contrast, the use of *qātel* with future SoAs is sporadic at best, which is reminiscent of the situation witnessed in BA and QA, and again brings to the fore the connections between TJS and QA.

4. Similarly, *yiqtol* is the usual form for the expression of modality in TJS. As we have seen, the Aramaic of TJ no longer has a distinct short form of *yiqtol*. In that respect, the Aramaic of TJ contrasts with BA and QA on the one hand and sides with other MA dialects (Nabatean, Palmyrene) and the LA dialects on the other.

If in that respect the Aramaic of TJ relates morphologically to the LA dialects, syntactically it stands in sharp contrast to them. In the Aramaic dialects where the loss of a distinct short form of *yiqtol* occurred, the prevailing ‘long’ *yiqtol* became (together with *qtol*) the standard form for the expression of modality, volitional or otherwise. In LA, however, *qātel* further encroached on the territory of modal *yiqtol*, akin to what happened to future *yiqtol*, though apparently to a lesser degree. In contrast, in TJ *yiqtol* retains the full scope of its modal functionalities, which is particularly visible from the numerous instances of modal *yiqtol* in TJ, whether they parallel the Vorlage or not. This, again, links the Aramaic of TJ to MA dialects such as BA and QA.

5. Finally, *qātel* also encroaches on the territory of the Inf.Abs. As we have seen, the morphology of the Inf.Abs. shows it indisputably to have been a part of the grammatical stock of the Aramaic of TJS. But it also appears that in that dialect its use was severely curtailed in comparison with the Vorlage, the Inf.Abs. being permitted only in paronomastic use and replaced by suitable conjugations in all other contexts. But we have also seen that even the paronomastic use was not systematic: as soon as a postverbal Inf.A. is not immediately conjoined to the finite verb it depends upon in the Vorlage, *qātel* takes over, backgrounded imperfectivity being appropriate for the expression of the notion of concomitance often conveyed by the BH Inf.A. in that usage. Unfortunately, the overall lack of adequate linguistic information on the syntax of the Inf.Abs. in other Aramaic dialects precludes any definite statement on that basis alone with regard to the position of the Aramaic of TJ within the broader context of Aramaic.

All in all, the above shows that in various contexts the use of the conjugations in TJS was heavily influenced by the Vorlage. Looking beyond those influences, however, it appears that *qtal* expressed mostly anteriority, *yiqtol* futurity and modality, whereas *qātel* expressed the simultaneity with the moment of reference, enabling it to express a true present (including performative utterances) as well as all manners of imperfective SoAs in past (and, to a lesser extent, future) temporalities. As has been shown above at various points of the discussion, on the basis of the linguistic information available in the relevant literature this state of affairs comes closest to that observed in QA.

6. Finally, TJS features cases of periphrastic constructions with הוה. However, we have also seen that the precise shade of meaning expressed by periphrastics does not come out clearly, which is mainly due to the relative rarity of its occurrence. The use of periphrastics in TJS is indeed not as far developed as in a LA corpus such as Neofiti.²⁶⁰ This infrequency of use, however, is probably due to TJ's faithfulness to the Vorlage, where periphrastics are also altogether infrequent.²⁶¹ This, in turn, precludes any firm conclusion on the distribution and functional range of periphrastics in TJS.

²⁶⁰ Cf. Cohen (1984: 457).

²⁶¹ Cohen (1984: 446).